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Haag (Hague) Apologetical Society, a scientific society in Holland, founded in 1785 for the purpose of calling forth scientific works in defence of the Christian religion. It annually offers a prize of 400 florins for the best work on a topic proposed. (A. J. S.)

Nalhah’teri (Heb. with the art. [which the A. V. has mistaken for part of the name] ha-Akhashatari, ἡ Ἀκάσαταρία, pr. of foreign [7 Persian] origin; according to Fürst, an adj. from the word 
Akaskarī, i. e. couister [compare παρθενος, "cambel."
Esth. viii, 10, 14]; according to Genesiins, mule-driver; sept. ο Ασσακαρία π. Βασακαρία, etc., Vulg. Akashathari), the last mentioned of the four sons of Naarah, second of the two wives of Ashur, the founder of Tekoa, the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. iv, 6). B.C. post 1618.

Ha-ammonial. See Chephia-IAammonial.

Haan, Carolus de, was born at Arnheim Aug. 16, 1590. Becoming acquainted with the Reformation, he resolved to leave the Roman Catholic Church and his legal studies, and repaired to Geneva, where he studied theology under Calvin and Beza. In 1599 he became a minister of the Reformed Church at Deventer. Driven from thence by persecution, he was invited to Han by William, duke of Cleves, and exercised his ministry there for sixteen years, until persecution again compelled him to depart. Count Jan van Nassau, stadtholder of Gueldersland, and his son, Lodewijk Willem, stadtholder of Friesland, then secured his services to effect a reformation of the Church in their respective provinces. He afterwards returned to Deventer, but was again compelled to leave it in 1587, when it fell into the hands of the Spaniards. He repaired the same year to Leyden, where he was temporarily appointed professor extraordinary of theology. This position he held for four years. He was then called to Oldenbroek, where he exercised his ministry till he had passed the age of eighty. He died at Leyden Jan. 26, 1616. He wrote an exposition of the Revelation of St. John in Latin, and a work in Dutch against the Anabaptists. See Glasius, Godgeleerd Nederland, l. (P. W.)

Haaraaloth. See Zhebrah-Haaraloth.

Hans, Gerardus de, D.D., was born in 1736. After completing his theological studies at Utrecht, and receiving the doctorate in theology in 1761, he was set- tled successively at Amersfoort, Middelburg, and Amsterdam. His works are chiefly exegetical and dogmatic. The most important of them are, Ammerenkerken over het eeneboeck der Godsdiensten van Jesus (Utr. 1773);—Het rijtje en drie volgende hoofstukken uit Paulus brief aan de Romeinen verklaard (Amst. 1780-38, 3 parts).—Verhandeling over de toenemende wereld (Amst. 1785);—Over de Opgewaard van Johannes (Amst. 1807, 3 parts). He also completed the commentary of Prof. Nahins on the Epistle to the Philippians. It was published at Amsterdam in 1783 in 3 vols. See Glasius, Godgeleerd Nederland, l. (P. W.)

Haba’tiah (Heb. Chabayah’), הָבָהְיָה הָבָהְיָה, protected by Jehovah; Sept. Ὠψαλά and Ἑβαασά, a priest whose descendants returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel, but were degraded from the priestly office on account of not being able to trace their genealogy ( Ezra ii, 6; Neh. vii, 68). B.C. ante 459.

Habak’kuk [many Habak’kuk] (Heb. Chabol’kuk), מֶּה הַבוֹלָקַקְעֵן, endures; Sept. Ἀμβακόος, Vulg. Haba- once; Jerome, Prov. in Heb. translates παρακλήσις, and Susias παράκλησις; other Graecized and Latinized forms are Ἀμβάκοοκ αμβάκοοκ, Ἀμβάκοοκος, Ἀμβάκοοκος, etc.), the eighth in order of the twelve minor prophets (q. v.) of the Old Testament. 1. As to the name, besides the above forms, the Greeks, not only the Sept. translators, but the fathers of the Church, probably to make it more sonorous, corrupt it into Ἀμβάκοοκος, Ἀμβάκοοκος, or, as Jerome writes, Ἀμβάκοοκος, and only one Greek copy, found in the library of Alcalá, in Spain, has Ἀμβάκοοκος, which seems to be a recent corruption made to suit the Hebrew text. The Heb. word may denote, as observed by Jerome, as well a "favorite" as a "straggler." Abarbanel thinks that in the latter sense it has allusion to the patriotic zeal of the prophet fervently contending for the welfare of his country: but other prophets did the same; and in the former and less distant signification, the name would be one like Theophilus, "a friend of God," which his parents may have given him for a good omen. Luther took the name in the active sense, and applied it to the labors and writings of the man, thus: "Habakkuk had a proper name for his office; for it signifies a man of heart, one who is hearty towards another and takes him into his arms. This is what he does in his prophecy; he comforts his people and lifts them up, as one would do with a weeping child or man, bidding him be quiet and content, because, please God, it would yet be better with him." But all this is speculation. See Keil and Delitzsch, Coment. ad cap. l.

2. Of the facts of this prophet's birth-place, parentage, and life we have only apocryphal and conflicting accounts (see Delitzsch, De Habacucii vita et ataque, Lips. 1842, 1844). The Rabbinical tradition that Habakkuk was the son of the Shunammite woman whom Elisha restored to life is repeated by Abarbanel in his commentary, and has no other foundation than a fanciful etymology of the prophet's name, based on the expression in 2 Kings iv, 16. Equally unfounded is the tradition that he was the sentinel set by Isaiah to watch for the destruction of Babylon (comp. Isa. xxxi, 16 with Hab. i, 1). In the title of the history of Bel and the Dragon, as found in the Sept. version in Origen's Tetrápola, the author is called "Habakkuk, the son of Joshua, of the tribe of Levi." Some have supposed this apocryphal writer to be identical with the prophet (Jerome, Proem. in Dan.). The psalm in ch. iii and its title are thought to favor the opinion that Habakkuk was a Levite (De-
HABAKKUK

Habakkuk before the invasion of Judaea by the Chaldeans. Knobel (Der Propheletum, de Hebr.) and Meier (Gesch. d. post. nat. Liter. d. Hebr.) are in favor of the commencement of the Chaldean era, after the battle of Carchemish (9.20) when Jehoiakim was the same age as was Nebuchadnezzar, the king. Some interpreters are of opinion that ch. ii was written in the reign of Jehoiachin, the son of Je- hoikim (2 Kings xxiv, 6), after Jerusalem had been besieged and conquered by Nebuchadnezzar, the king made a prisoner, and, with many thousands of his sub- jects, carried away to Babylon. If this is the case, it could imply that Jehoiachin was the same age as the father of Nebu- chadnezzar, the king of Babylon, and that the Jews saved the poor class of the people (2 Kings xxiv, 14). But of all this nothing is said of the book of Habakkuk, nor even so much as hinted at; and what is stated of the violence and injustice of the Chaldeans does not imply that the Jews had already experienced it. It is also a supposition equally gratuitous, accord- ing to which some interpreters refer ch. ii to the period of the last siege of Jerusalem, when Zebediah was taken, his sons slain, his eyes put out, the walls of the city broken down, and the Temple burned (2 Kings xxv, 1-10). There is no special relation to any of these incidents in the third chapter of Habakkuk.

But the question of the date of Habakkuk's prophecy has been discussed in the most exhaustive manner by Delitzsch (Der Prophet Habakkuk, Einl. § 3), and, though his arguments are rather ingenious than convincing, he is still considered by many to be the founder of the tradition. There is also a little internal evidence. The conclusion at which he arrives is that Habakkuk delivered his prophecy about the twelfth or thirteenth year of Josiah (B.C. 630 or 629), for reasons of which the following is a summary. In Hab. i, 5 the expression "in your days" shows that the fulfilment of the prophecy would take place in the lifetime of those to whom it was addressed. The same phrase in Jer. xvi, 9 embraces a period of at most twenty years, while in Ezek. xii, 25 it denotes about six years, and therefore, reckoning backwards from the twelfth or thirteenth year of Josiah's reign, the prophecy would involve no violation of probability, though the argument does not amount to a proof. From the similarity of Hab. ii, 10 and Zeph. i, 7, Delitzsch infers that the latter is an imitation, the former being the original. He supports this conclusion by many collateral arguments. Now Zephaniah, according to the superscription of his prophecy, lived in the time of Josiah, and from ii, 5 he is supposed to have prophesied after the worship of Jeh-ovah was restored, that is, after the twelfth year of that king's reign. It is thought that he wrote about B.C. 624. Between this period, therefore, and the twelfth year of B.C. 630, there would have been forty years. But Jeremiah began to prophecy in the thirteenth year of Josiah, and many passages are borrowed by him from Habakkuk (compare Hab. ii, 13 with Jer. ii, 58, etc.). The latter, therefore, must have written about B.C. 620 or 629. This view receives some confirmation from the position of his prophecy in the O.T. Canon.

On the other hand, while it is evident, from the constant use of the future tense in speaking of the Chal- dean desolations (i, 5, 6, 12), that the prophecy must have been written before the invasion of Nebuchadnezzar, there are passages (Hab. ii, 6, 7) which were written about the beginning of the reign of Josiah (Olymp. 82), as contemporary with Zephaniah and Nahum; and again in the beginning of the reign of Cyrus (Olymp. 42), as contemporary with Daniel and Ezekiel in Persia, with Haggai and Zechariah in Judaea, and with Baruch in Egypt. In Daniel's "prophesying in the vision of Nebu- chadnezzar," Keil, decides in favor of the early part of the reign of Josiah. Calmet, Jäger, Ewald, Rosenmüller, Maurer, and Hitzig agree in assigning the commencement of Habakkuk's prophecy to the reign of Jehoiakim, though they are divided as to the exact period to which it is to be referred. Ranitz (Introd. ad Hebr. Vatic. p. 24, 59), Stierkel (Prolog. ad interp. tertii cap. Hab. p. 22, 27), and De Wette (Lehrbuch der Historischkritischen Einleitung. Berlin, 1840, p. 338) justly place the age of Hab-
and refers the prophecy not to Nebuchadnezzar, but to "Ezechiel. But in such an arbitrary arrangement the true character of the composition as a perfectly developed poem is entirely lost sight of.

The prophet commences by announcing his office and important mission (i, 1). He bewails the corruption and idolatry of the Jews by which they rendered themselves and their country accessible to Jehovah for his help (2, 4). Next follows the reply of the Deity, threatening swift vengeance (5, 11). The prophet, transferring himself to the near future, foresees the destruction of Jerusalem, the sanctuary, and the house of God, which is enabled to do this by the instruments of correction, assumes (ii, 1) an attitude of hopeful expectancy, and waits to see the issue. He receives the divine command to write in an enduring form the vision of God's retributive justice as revealed to his prophetic eye (ii, 3). The door of the Chaldeans is first foretold in general terms (ii, 6-11), and the announcement is followed by a series of denunciations pronounced upon them by the nations who had suffered from their oppression (ii, 6-20). The strophical arrangement of these "woes" is a remarkable feature of the prophecy. They are divided into three strophes of six verses each, separated by a certain regularity of structure. The first four commences with a "Woe!" and close with a verse beginning with "wv" (for). The first verse of each of these contains the character of the sin, the second the development of the woe, while the third is confirmatory of the woe denounced. The fifth strophe differs from the others in form in having a verse introductory to the woe. The prominent vices of the Chaldeans' character, as delineated in i, 5-11, are made the subjects of separate denunciations: their insatiable ambition (ii, 6-8), their corruption (ii, 9-11), cruelty (ii, 12-14), drunkenness (ii, 15-17), and idolatry (ii, 18-20). The whole conclusion is a review of the prophet's predictions and a personal closing verse ("Hail, Zab Judah's Pindaric eode (Ewald), a composition univalued for boldness of conception, subtlety of thought, and majesty of diction. This constitutes, in Delitzsch's opinion, "the second grand division of the entire prophecy, as the subjective reflex of the two subdivisions of the first, and the lyrical recapitulation of the whole." It is the echo of the feelings aroused in the prophet's mind by the divine answers to his appeals; fear in anticipation of the threatened judgments, and thankfulness and joy at the promised retribution. But, though intimately connected with the prophet's personal woes, it is in itself a perfect whole, as is sufficiently evident from its lyrical character, and the musical arrangement by which it was adapted for use in the Temple service.

The style of this prophecy has always been much admired. Lowth (De Poen. Hebr., p. 267) says: "Poeius est hastabuccii stilus; sed maxime in oda, quae inter absolutissimam in eo genere merito numerari posset." Eichhorn, De Wette, and Rosenmuller are loud in their praise of Habakkuk's style; the first giving a detailed and animated analysis of the construction of his prophecies (Comment. ad Ann. Test. iii, 350). He equals the most eminent prophets of the Old Testament — Joel, Amos, Nahum, Isaiah; and the ode in ch. iii may be placed in competition with Ps. cxviii and lviii for originality and subtlety. His figures are all great, happily chosen, and properly drawn out. His denunciations are terrible, his derision bitter, his consolation cheering. Incidents of borrowed ideas (iii, 19; comp. Ps. xlvii, 34: ii, 6; comp. Isa. xiv, 7; ii, 14; comp. Is. xii, 9); but he makes them his own in drawing them out in his peculiar manner. With all the boldness and fertility of his imagination, his language is not overcharged with his verse melodicous. Eichhorn, indeed, gives a considerable number of words which he considers to be peculiar to this prophet, and supposes him to have formed new words or altered existing ones, to sound more energetic or feeble, as the sentiments to be expressed might require; but his list needs sifting, as De Wette observes.

5. Express commentaries on the whole of this book separately are the following, of which the most important are designated by the critical prefixed: Theological: Commentarius in Opp. iv. Bede, Exposito (in Works, iii, 104); Tanchum of Jerusalem, Commentarius (ed. Munk, Paris, 1845, 8vo); Abahbanel, Commentarius (ed. Spreecher, Traj. 1722. Helmst. 1790, 8vo); Luther, Auslegung (Vitemberg, 1526, 4to; Erf. ed. 8vo; in Latin, Argent. 1528, 8vo); Grapito, Expositio (Argent. 1529, 8vo); Chytry, Lectorum (in Acts p. 364); Gryneus, Hypomnemata (Basil, 1582, 8vo); De Guevara, Commentarius (Rom. Cath.) (Madr., 1585, 4to; Aug. Vind. 1608; Antw. 1609, 4to; Agellius, Commentarius (Antw. 1597, 8vo; Tossan, Paraphrasis (Franz. 1590, 8vo; Garcher, Commentarius in ostr. (Vitemberg, 1605, 8vo; Tar- nopol, Commentarius (Rost, 1623, 8vo); Cocecos, Analyse (in Opp. xvi, 657); Marbury, Commentarius (Lond. 1650, 4to); De Paulilla, Commentarius (Rom. Cath.) (Madr., 1657, 2 vols. 4to; Sulzbach, 1674, 4to; Rome, 1792, 4to); Hafner, Commentarius (incl. Notes) (Franz. 1663, 8vo); van Til, Commentarius (L. B. 1700, 4to); Biermann, De Prop. div. (Utr. 1713, 4to); Esch, Erklärung (Weesel, 1714, 4to); Abicht, Adnotationes (Vie- temb. 1732, 4to); Jansen, Annaletto (in Pettetach, etc.); Schelting, Commentarius (L. B. 1747, 4to); Kalinsky, Illustratio (incl. Nahum) (Vran, 1756, 8vo); Chytry, Annotarii R. (R. ann. Lp. 1752, 4to); Mon- rau, Anemer (from the Dutch, Gottingen, 1759, 8vo); Anon. Traductio (Paris, 1775, 12mo); Peschke, Vereio, etc. (Fran., et. Lp. 1777, 8vo); Ludwig, Erläuterung (Frankf. 1773, 8vo); Faber, Commentatio (Oudol. 1779, 2 vols. 4to); Wahl, Anemer, etc. (Hannover, 1780, 8vo); Kofod, Commentarius (Hafn. 1792, 8vo); Tingstädt, Annem- dierisationes (Uspal. 1795, 8vo); Haenlein, Interpretatio (Erangol, 1795, 8vo); Bather, Ap- plication (in Serm. I, 186); Plum, Observationes (incl. Obasi) (Gotting, 1796, 8vo); Cona, Erläuterung (in Stauden's Bearb.); Hoy, Commentarius (incl. Nahum) (boni- rations (Neurath, 1798, 8vo); Wolfsohn, Annem. (Bresl. 1806, 8vo); Euchel, Erlal. (Copen. 1815, 8vo); Justi, Erläut. (Lpz. 1820, 8vo); Wolff, Commentar (Darmst. 1822, 8vo); Schröder, Annem. (incl. Joel, Nahum, etc.) (Hildesw. 1827, 8vo); Deutsch, Der, etc. (Bresl. 1837, 8vo); Bäuml, Commentarius (Heilbroom, 1840, 8vo); Delitzsch, Auslegung (Lpz. 1843, 8vo); Von Gump- pach, Erklärung (Munch. 1860, 8vo); Robinson, Homilete (Lond. 1865, 8vo). See Prophets, Minor.

The following are on chap. iii exclusively: Bartheil, De equitatione Desi (Ver. 15) (Lips. 1749, 4to); Feiler, Continuation des Commentaire de Daniel (4to. 1774, 4to); Schnecker, Commentarius (Franz. 1777, 4to); Busing, De fulgoribus Dei (Vers. 3, 4) (Bremen, 1778, 4to); Nachagel, Erklär. (in Hencke's Magazine, iv, 180-190); Schröder, Dissertation (Germainingen, 1781, 4to); Schnurrer, Dissertation (Tithung. 1786, 4to): Mörner, Hymanns Hb (Lips. 1794, 4to); Hein- denheim, ð Etq. ð; (etc. Rodenh. 1890, 1826, 8vo; Anna, Expositio (Gritz. 1810, 4to); Stelberg, Annem. (in Schwarz, Jex. 1824, p. 136); Stickel, Prophast (Neust. 1827, 8vo); Reissmann, De Cant. Hb. (Krauth. 1827, 8vo); Strong, Prayer of Hab. (in the Meth. Quar. Rev. Jan. 1861, p. 73). See also Chapter Commentary.

Habazini'ah (Hebrew Habzathanin, הָבָזַתְיָה, lamp of Jehovah, according to first, collection of Jehovah ; Sept. Xa'fisra), the father of one Jeremiah and grandfather of the chief Rohithate Jazannah, which last the prophet Jeremiah tested with the offer of wine.
HABBACUC

in the Temple (Jer. xxxv, 3). B.C. considerably ante 533.

Hab'bacuc (何必巴客; Vulg. Habacuc), the form in which the name of the prophet Habakkuk (q. v.) is given in the Apocrypha (Bel, 33, 34, 35, 37, 39).

Habergeon, an old English word for breastplate, appears in the Auth. Vers. as the rendering of two Heb. terms: כִּבֵּשׁ (Job xlii, 26, where it is named by Zerubbabel with offensive weapons), or כִּבֵּשׁ, shiryon (2 Chron. xxviii, 14; Neh. iv, 16), a coat of mail (as rendered in 1 Sam. xviii, 5, 38); and כִּבֵּשׁ, tachara' (Exod. xxviii, 32; xxxix, 28), a military garment, properly of linen strongly and thickly woven, and furnished around the neck and breast with a mailed covering (see Herod., ii, 182; iii, 47; and comp. the λατώσαγος of Homer, Il. xi, 529, 830). (See Smith's Dict. of Class. Antiq. s. v. Loric.) See ARMOR.

Ancient Egyptian Linen Corset (from the tomb of Rameses III at Thebes).

Haberkorn, Peter, a German divine, born at Butzbach in 1604. After filling various other posts, he was made professor of theology at Giessen, and died there, April, 1676. He was distinguished as a polemic, especially against the Romanists and Synergetists (q. v.). He wrote (1) Vindiciae Luth. fidei:— (2) Heptas disputationum Anti-Walburgen-collection (1650, 1652, 2 vols. 8vo.)—Tholuck, in Herzog, Real-Encyclop., v. 488, 439.

Habert, Isaac, doctor of the Sorbonne, the first Parisian theologian who wrote against Jansenius. He was a native of Paris, studied at the Sorbonne, was appointed canon of the cathedral of Paris, and in 1654 bishop of Vaires. He filled this post for twenty-three years, was reputed a very pious man, and died at Pont de Salars, near Rodez, in 1668. In 1641 he accused Jansenius of holding heretical doctrines on forty points, and thereby provoked Antoine Arnauld to answer him in his Apologie, in which he sought to prove the identity of the doctrines of Jansenius and St. Augustine. Habert nevertheless remained a declared enemy of Jansenius, and to him is ascribed the authorship of the letter sent to pope Innocent X in 1651, and signed by eighty-five bishops, praying him to decide the question finally. The most noteworthy of his works are: De gratia ex partibus graciae (1646):—De menuea hierar-
HABOR

Halah, and Habor, and hara, and to the river Gozan." About seventeen years later, Shalmanezer, the successor of the former monarch, "took Samaria, and carried Is-

rael away into Assyria, and placed them in Halah, and in Habor, on the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medo-
sul (Layard, Nineveh and Babylon, p. 56; Schultens, In-

dex Geogr. in vitam Saladinii, s. v.). Many suppose this to be the Habor of Scripture for the following reasons: 1. It is within Assyria proper, which Ptolemy says was bounded on the west by the Tigris (vi, 1). 2. It is af-

firmed that the Assyrian monarch would place his cap-

tives in a central part of his kingdom, such as this is, and not in the outskirts (Keil on 2 Kings xvii, 4–6). 3. Habor is termed a "river of Gozan" (יחנך יִנְבֻּס), and Gozan is supposed to signify "pasture," and to be identical with the word Zan, now applied by the

Nestorians to the pasture-lands in the highlands of Assyria, where the cattle takes its rise (Gaisford, Christians, p. 124). 4. Ptolemy mentions a mountain called Chabor (Χαβορια) which divides Assyria from Media (vi, 1); and Bochart says the river Chabor has its source in that mountain (Opera, i, 194, 242, 362). Some have supposed that the modern Nestorians are the descendants of the captives the Jews (Grant, L. C.). See Go-

zan.

2. The other and much more celebrated river, Khaba-

rib, is that famous affluent of the Euphrates, which is called Abror (אַבֹר) by Strabo (xvi, 27) and Ptolemy (Bell. It. vii, 5); Abur (אָבּוּר) by Isa-

aiah of Charax (p. 4); Abor (אָבּוֹר) by Zosimus (iii, 12); and Chabor (Χαβορία) by Ptolemy (Χαβορια, v, 18) and Pliny (ii, x. xxx, 3). "It rises about lat. 36° 40', long. 40'; flows only a little south of east to its junction near the Khabir with the river of Nisibis, which comes down from Mous Masius. Both of these branch-

es are formed by the union of a number of streams. Neither of them is fordable for some distance above their junction; and below it they constitute a river of such magnitude as to be navigable for a considerable distance by steamers. The course of the Khabir below Kankuk is tortuous (through rich pasture) with flowers, having a general direction about S.W. to its junction with the Euphrates at Karkeisa, the ancient Ceresium. The entire length of the stream is not less than 300 miles" (Rawlinson, Ancient Monarchies, i, 286; see also Annals of Travels in the Tigris Country, p. 79; Layard, Nineveh and Babylon, p. 304). Ritter (Erkundungen, x, 248), Gesenius (Thebais), Layard, Rawlinson, and others, maintain that this is the ancient Habor. There can be no doubt that Assyria proper was confined to the country lying along the banks of the Upper Tigris, and stretching far back toward Media. But its territory gradually expanded so as to include Baby-

nia (Herodetus, iii, 92), Mesopotamia (Pliny, H. N. vi, 26), and even the country westward to the confines of Cilicia and Phoenicia (Strabo, xvi). At the time of the captivity the power of Assyria was at its height. The Jewish captives were more secure in the western than in the eastern Habor. The ruins of Assyrian towns are scattered over the whole of northern Mesopotamia. "On the banks of the lower Khabir are the remains of a royal palace, besides many other traces of the country, perhaps 729–839, 329. There can be no doubt that the Khabir was in Assyria, and near the centre of the kingdom, at the time of the captivity, further, Ptolemy mentions a province in Mesopotamia called Gauzemnis (καυζημής, v, 18). It lay around the Khabir, and was doubtless identical with Gozan, hence the phrase "the river of Gozan" (2 Kings xxvi, 6), Chalde-

za, appears to be identical with Halah, mention-

ed in the same passage, adjointed Gauzantus. It is a remarkable fact that down as late as the 12th century there were large Jewish communities on the banks of the Khabir (Benjamin of Tudela, in Early Travels in Pers. p. 92 sq). The district along the river would seem to be from a comparison with 1 Chron. v, 26. Ptolemy mentions a town called Chabor (χαβόρ), 18). The Khabir occurs under that name in an Assyrian inscription of the 9th century be-

fore our era (Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 534). See Cu-

niform Inscriptions.

It seems doubtful whether Habor was identical with the river Chobar (גּזַּן), on which Ezekiel saw his vis-

ions. The latter was perhaps farther south in Baby-

nia (Ezek. i, 8, etc.). See CHEBAR.

HACCEREM. See BETH-HACCEREM.

Hachchi'ah (Heb. Chakchugh, חָקְכָּע, according to Gesenius, whose eyes Jehovah eleuens, according to Fürst, ornament of Jehovah or Ṣeph. Ἀγγίας, t. x. Ἀγγίας, the father of Nehemiah, the governor after the captivity (Neh. i, 1, x, 2). B.C. ante 447.

Hachsilah (Heb. Chaksilah, חָקְסִלָה, according to Gesenius, darkæmme; according to Furst, drought; Sept. ἕξιλα, t. x. ἕξιλα), the descriptive name of a well-

wooded hill (הַשִּׁילָה) near ('on the south of', below, "by the way of") the wilderness (Joshua) probably of Ziph, where David lay hid (2 Sam. viii) and Saul pitched his tent at the information of the Ziphites (1 Sam. xxix, 19; xxvi, 3). This is doubtless the Tell Zif reported by Dr. Robinson (Researches, ii, 190, 191) as 'a round eminence situated in the plain, a hundred feet or more in height,' on which David once pitched the tent of his mother, and containing several cisterns ly-

ing a short distance west of the site of the town of Ziph. See ZIPPH. The identification proposed by Schwarz (Palest. p. 113) with "the village Beth-Chachill, 21/2 miles west of Hebron," is unsuitable and out of place.

Hach'moni (Heb. Chakmoni, חָקְמ֥וֹנְי, pl. חָקְמֹנֵי), a name only known to the father (or ancestor; comp. 1 Chron. xxvi, 9) of Jashobeam, the chief of David's bodyguard (1 Chron. xi, 11), where the name Hachmoni is rendered "Hachm-

onite," for which the parallel passage, 2 Sam. xxii, 8, has "Tachmonite"); and also of Jehiel, the companion of the princes in the royal household (1 Chron. xxvi, 82). B.C. considerably ante 1046. Hachmon or Hach-

moni was no doubt the founder of a family to which these men belonged; the actual father of Jashobeam was Zabdiel (1 Chron. xxvi, 2), and he is also said to have belonged to the Korhites (1 Chron. xii, 6); possibly the Levites descended from Korah. But the name Hachmoni nowhere appears in the genealogies of the Levites. See Konen, Ders. p. 72, 82, who can challenge from the fact that names given in Chronicles with Ben are in Samuel given without the Ben, but with the definite article. A less probable view is that which makes this term a title of office, q. d. counselor. See JASHBEAM.

Hach'monite (1 Chron. xi, 16). See HACHMONI.

Hackett, John, an English prelate, distinguished for his talents as a law reformer, was born at London in 1592. He studied at Westminster School, and entered Trinity College, Cambridge, in 1608. He took orders in 1618, and soon after became chaplain of the bishop of Lincoln. At the beginning of the Civil War he was one of the divines chosen to prepare a report of church reforms, to be submitted to the House of Lords. This plan failed from the opposition of the bishops. Hacket was a zealous partisan of Charles, and
HACKET

his house became the head-quarters of the Royalists in his neighborhood. This brought him into trouble, and he was even imprisoned for a short time. After the Restoration he was appointed both to the bishopric of Schiedam and to Gouda, and promised an archbishopric, and he came to the cathedral of Lichfield, which had been much injured during the war, to be repaired, mostly at his own expense. He died at Lichfield in 1670. Hacket was a Calvinist; yet his writings abound, says Coleridge, "in fantastic rags and Lappets of Pugilistic composition," and Jonathan Swift was preoccupied before the King March 22, 1660.—A Century of Sermons upon several remarkable Subjects (published by Thos. Plume, with a life of the author, 1675, fol.):—The Life of Archbishop Williams (1653, fol.). See Bihor, Britannica, 6. The Bishops and Bishops, Magazine, vol. Ixvi; Hook, Eccles. Biography, v. 471; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i. 752; Coleridge, Works (New York edition), v. 123.

Hacket, William, an English enthusiast and fanatic of the 16th century. He was at first the servant of a gentleman named Hussey, but married a rich widow, whose fortune he soon spent in dissipation. He next appears at York and in Lincolnsire, giving himself the name of Charles, and announcing the downfall of the papacy; that England would suffer from famine, pestilence, and war unless the consistorial discipline were established. He was whipped and driven out of the county, but continued his prophecies elsewhere. According to Coleridge, he was a very ready and grandiloquent speaker, so that many among the people thought that he had received a special gift of the Holy Ghost. He affected to place great reliance on his prayers, and asserted that if all England were to pray for rain there should fall none if he prayed for dry weather. Edmund Coppinger and Henry Arthurington became associated with him, the former under the name of Prophet of Mercy, the latter Prophet of Judgment. They proclaimed Hacket the true king of the world, and next in power to Jesus Christ. On Jan. 16, 1591, he sent his disciples through the streets of London crying that Jesus had arrived, was stopping at a certain hotel in the town, and that this time none should undertake anything against him. They ended with the cry, Repent, England, repent! They were finally arrested and put in prison. Coppinger let himself die of starvation: Arthurington published a recantation and was forgiven. As far out as a prophet, and announcing the downfall of the death as guilt of impiety and rebellion, and hung in London in July, 1591. Even on the scaffold he prayed God for a miracle to confound his enemies. See Henry Fitz-Simon, Britanniacon Ministrorum, lib. ii, cap. vii, pars i, v. 206, 209; Camden, Annals, an. 1591, pars iv, p. 619, 623; Bayle, Dict. hist et crit.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxiii, 31.

Hackley, Charles W., D.D., a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, and late professor of mathematics and astronomy in Columbia College, New York, was born March 9, 1808, in Herkimer County, N. Y., and died in the city of New York Jan. 10, 1861. Prof. Hackley graduated at the Military Academy, West Point, in 1829, and was assistant professor of mathematics there until 1832, when he engaged in the study of law, but subsequently abandoned it for theology, and was ordained in 1835. He was professor of mathematics in the University of New York until 1838, then became president of Jefferson College, Mississippi, and subsequently rector of St. Peter's Protestant Episcopal Church, Auburn, N. Y. He was elected professor in Columbia College in 1843, and continued in that post until his death. He was the author of several excellent mathematical works, and a contributor to scientific periodicals and weekly and daily journals.—American Annual Cyclopaedia, 1861, p. 362; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i. 753. (J. W. M.)

Hackspan, Theodor, an eminent Lutheran theologian and Orientalist, was born in 1607 at Weimar, and died at Altorf Jan. 19, 1659. He was educated at Jena, where he studied philosophy, and then went to Altorf, to profit by the instructions of the able Orientalist Schwenter, and thence to Helmstadt, where he studied theology under the famous Calixtus. In 1636 he returned to Altorf, and for many years filled the chair of Hebrew in its university, where he was the first to publicly teach the Oriental languages. In 1654 he was appointed professor of theology in that institution. Hackett was the first to give the chair of Oriental languages. His close application to study and to the duties of his professorships so impaired his health that he died in the fifty-second year of his age. Hackspan is said to have been the best scholar of his day in Hebrew, Chaldee, Syriac, and Aramaic. The liberty of Jolostrud Schmidtmairer, an advocate of Nuremberg, who established in his own house a press, with supplies of types in the different languages, enabled him to publish most of his learned works. Among these we name Tractatus de usi Liberorum Rabbinicorum;—Syllogis Disputations theologicae et philosophicae;—Interpretis Errabundus;—Disputatwos de locutionibus sacris (Altorf, 1648);—Observations Arabico-Variscas in quodam loci Veteris et Noxii Testamenti (ibid. 1663);—De Anglorum demonstrum noxibus (ibid. 1661);—Fides et Leges Mohommediae, etc. (ibid. 1646);—Maximamorum Superiorum (ibid. 1660);—Ecclesiasticae Judicata (ibid. 1669);—Nota philologico-theologica in varia et difficilia Scripturae locis (ibid. 1666, 3 vols.);—Rose, New Gen. Biog. Dict. viii, 169; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxiii, 34. (J. W. M.)

Hadad, a name which occurs with considerable confusion of form in the Heb. The proper orthography seems to be הָּדַּד, Hadad (according to Gesenius from an Arab. root signifying to break forth into shouts; but Furst makes it הָּדַּד, Hadad), which appears in Gen. xxvi, 35, 36; 1 Chron. i, 46, 47, 50, 51 (in all which passages it is rendered by the Sept. Adad, Adon, Adad). In 1 Kings xi, 14-25 (where the Sept. has 'Adap, Vulg. Adad). The other forms are הָּדַּד, Hadad (1 Chron. i, 30, Sept. 'Adad, Vulg. Hadad), הָּדַּד, Hadad (Gen. xxvi, 39; Sept. 'Adap, Vulg. Adar, Eng. "Hadar"), הָּדַּד, Hadar (Gen. xxv, 19, Sept. 'Adad, Vulg. and Eng. and Hadar), and הָּדַּד, Hadad (1 Kings xi, 17; Sept. 'Adap, Vulg. Adad). It was the name of a Syrian idol, and was thence transferred to the king, as the highest of earthly authorities, in the forms Hadad, Ben-Hadad, Lord of Hadad (1 Kings xxii, 40). "Under cover of Hadad," ("assisted by Hadad," Gesenius, Thesaur., p. 218). The title appears to have been an official one, like Pharaoh; and perhaps it is so used by Nicolaus Damascusus, as quoted by Josephus (Ant. vii, 5, 2), in reference to the Syrian king who aided Hadadezer (2 Sam. viii, 5). Josephus appears to have used the name in the same sense, where he substitutes it for Henadad (Ant. ix, 8, 7, compared with 2 Kings xiii, 24). See also HADAD-RIMON.

1. Adad (q.v.) is the indigenous name of the chief deity of the Syrians, the sun, according to Macrobius (Saturnalia, iv, 28). Moreover, Pliny (Hist. Nat. xi, 59, 71), speaking of remarkable stones named after parts of the body, mentions some called "Adadunpheres, ejusdem ocular ac digitus dei," and adds, "et hic colitur a Syris." He is also called Αδάδως βασιλείς θεός by Philo Bythinus (in Eusebius, Praep. Evan. i, 10). The passage of Hesychius which Harbou adds in his note to Pliny concerning the worship of this god by the Phrygians, Jabloslani declares to be inadmissible (De Ling. Lyconicoe, p. 64).

This Syrian deity claims some notice here, because his name is most probably an element in the names of the Syrian kings Hadiad and Hadadzezer. Moreover, several of the older commentators have endeavored to find this deity in Isa. lxv, 17; either by altering the text there to suit the name given by Macrobius, or by
adapting the name he gives to his interpretation and to the reading of the Hebrew, so as to make that extract bear testimony to a god Achad (q.v.). Michaelis has argued at some length against both these views; and the modern commentators, such as Gesenius, Hitzig, Botta, and the late Professor Alsat. Schrader, and I, hardly do not admit the name of any deity in that passage.

2. *Hadar* (q.v.), one of the sons of Ishmael (Gen. xxv. 15; 1 Chron. i. 30). His descendants probably occupied the western coast of the Persian Gulf, where the names *Atite* (Psal. vi. 7; 5 Atite), *Atzine*, and *Chalmo* (Psal. vi. 32) bear affinity to the original name. See ARAMA.

3. Hadad, king of Edom, the son of Belad, and successor of Hashum: he established his court at Avith, and defeated the Midianites in the intervening territory of Moab (Gen. xxxvi. 35; 1 Chron. i. 46). This is the only one of the ancient kings of Edom whose exploits are recorded by Moses. B.C. ante 1618. See AVITH.

4. Hadad, another king of Edom, successor of Baal-Hazon: he established his palace at Pat, and his wife's name was Mehetebel (1 Chron. i. 50). He is called Hadad in the Septuagint, xxxvi, 39, and with him the list of these Edomitic kings closes, it may be conjectured (Turner's *Companion to Genesis*, p. 326) that he lived about the time of the Exode, and in that case he may be the identical king of Edom who refused a passage to the Israelites (Num. xx. 14). B.C. prob. 1309. See Pat; 1 Chron. i. ante 1053. See B.C. 1618.

5. Adad, a king of Syria, who reigned in Damascus, at the time that David attacked and defeated Hadadezer, king of Zobah, whom he marched to assist, and in whose defeat he shared. B.C. cir. 1040. This fact is recorded in 2 Sam. viii. 5, but the name of the king is not given. It is supplied, however, by Josephus (Ant. vii. 5, 2), who reports, after Nicolas of Damascus, that he carried succours to Hadadezer as far as the Euphrates, where David defeated them both; and adds other particulars respecting his fame.

6. Hadad, a young prince of the royal race of Edom, whose country was conquered by David, convinced in the heart of the massacre committed by Joab, to escape with some of his father's servants, or, rather, was carried off by them into the land of Midian. B.C. cir. 1040. Thence Hadad went into the desert of Parna ("Midian," ver. 18), and eventually proceeded to Egypt (1 Kings xvi. 31), ver. 17, the father of the tribe of Gad was called "Gad of Haddar" (2 Sam. xxii. 42; 1 Chron. ii. 54). He was there most favorably received by the king, who assigned him an estate and establishment suited to his rank, and even gave him in marriage the sister of his own consort, by whom he had a son, who was brought up in the palace with the sons of Pharaoh. Hadad remained in Egypt till after the death of David and Joab, when, although dissatisfied by Pharaoh, he returned to his own country in the hope of recovering his father's throne (1 Kings xi. 21). B.C. cir. 1012. The Scripture does not record the result of this attempt further than by mentioning him as one of the troubleurs of Solomon's reign, which implies some measure of staying success (see Ezek. ili. 23, "IIl. 58, ad loc."). After relating these facts the text goes on to mention another enemy of Solomon, named Rezin, and then adds (ver. 25) that this was "besides the mischief that Hadad did: and he abhorred Israel, and reigned over Syria." Our version seems to make this apply to Rezin; but the Sept. refers it to Hadad, reading שדָ נָ הָיָמָ א, instead of שדָ נָ הָיָמָ א, "Aaron or Syria," and the sense would certainly be improved by this reading, inasmuch as it supplies an apparent omission; for without it we only know that Hadad left Egypt for Edom, and not how he succeeded there, or how he was able to trouble Solomon. The history of Hadad is certainly very important, as it shows that the continual pressure of the enemy forced Solomon to allow Hadad to reign as a tributary prince, and that he ultimately asserted his independence. Josephus, however, seems to have read the Hebrew as our version does, "Syria," not "Edom." He says (Ant. viii. 7, 6) that Hadad, on his arrival in Edom, found the territory too strongly garnished by Solomon's troops to afford any hope of success. He therefore proceeded with a party of adherents to Syria, where he was well received by Rezin, then at the head of a band of robbers, and with his assistance seized upon a part of Syria and reigned there. If this be correct, it would have been a different part of Syria from that in which Rezin himself reigned, for it is certain, from ver. 24, that he (Rezin) did reign in Damascus. Carriers supposes that Hadad reigned in Syria after the death of Rezin; and it might reconcile apparent discrepancies to suppose that two kingdoms were established (there were more previously), both of which, after the death of Rezin, were consolidated under Hadad. That Hadad was really king of Syria seems to be rather corroborated by the fact that every subsequent king of Syria is, in the Scripture, called Ben-Hadad, "son of Hadad," and in Josephus simply Hadad, which seems to denote that the founder of the dynasty was called by this name. We may observe that, whether we read Aram or Edom, it must be understood as applying to Hadad, not to Rezin (Pictorial Bible, on 2 Kings xi. 14).—Kitto. The identity of name suggests a common origin for the Edomitic and Assyrian-Syrian dynasties. Josephus, in the outset of his account, appears to call this Hadad by the name of Adar. In any case, however, the preceding must be regarded as distinct persons from each other (see Hengstenberg, *Pentateuch*, ii, 298), the last probably being the son, or, rather, grandson of No. 5. See SYRIA.

Hadad-ezer (Heb. id., הַדַּדְאַזְרָא, Hadad is his help [see Hadad, No. 1], Sept. Αδαπαζοτ in 2 Sam. viii. 7, but Αδαπαζοτ v. r. Αδαπαζο in 1 Kings xi. 20, Vulg. Adarker in both passages), less correctly Hadad-ezer (Heb. id., הַדַּדְאַזְרָא [see under HADAD; yet some MSS. have Hadadezer throughout]), 2 Sam. xv. 16, 19, 1 Chron. xviii. 3-10; xix. 16, 19; 15. Αδαπαζο v. r. Αδαπαζο, Vulg. still Adarker). king of the Aramite state Zobah, a powerful opponent of David. He was defeated by the Israelites in his first campaign, while on his way to "establish his dominion" (B.C. cir. 1035) in the neighborhood of the Euphrates, with a great loss of men, war- riors, horses, and chariots, and was driven from his towns (2 Sam. viii. 3; 1 Chron. xviii. 3), and driven with the remnant of his force to the other side of the river (xix. 16). The golden weapons (גַּלְו, A.V. "shields of gold") captured on this occasion, a thousand in number, were taken by David to Jerusalem (xviii. 7), and dedicated to Jehovah. The foreign arms were preserved in the Temple, and were long known as king David's (1 Chron. xxii. 9; Cant. iv. 4). A division highly serviceable to him was made by a king of Damascus: Syria [see Hadad, 5], who compelled David to turn his arms against him (2 Sam. x. 6-14; 1 Chron. xix. 6-14). The breathing-time thus afforded Hadadezer was turned by him to such good account as to enable his allies of Hanun, king of the Ammonites, and to take a leading part in the confederacy formed by that monarch against David. B.C. cir. 1034. The first army brought into the field was beaten and put to flight by Abishai and Joab; but Hadadezer, not yet discouraged, went into the country of the Euphrates, and was defeated and overthrown by the forces of all his allies and tributaries, which he placed under the command of Shobach, his general. The army was a large one, as is evident from the numbers of the slain; and it was especially strong in horse-soldiers (1 Chron. xix. 18). They crossed the Euphrates, joined the other sides of the field and encamped at a place called Helam (q.v.). To confront so formidable an array, David took the field in person, and in one great victory so completely broke the power of
HADAD-RIMMON

Haddarzére, that all the small tributary princes seized the opportunity of throwing off his yoke, of abandoning the Ammonites to their fate, and of submitting quietly to David, whose power was thus extended to the Euphrates (2 Sam. vii. 5, 15-19; 2 Chron. xiv. 15-19).

But one of Haddarezére’s more immediate retainers, Rezon ben-Eliadah, made his escape from the army, and, gathering round him some fugitives like himself, formed them into one of those marauding, ravaging “bands” (לטְרַמְשׁוֹר) which found a congenial refuge in the thinly peopled districts between the Jordan and the Euphrates (2 Kings vii. 7, 10, 17) (2 Chron. xxv. 20, 22). Making their way to Damascus, they possessed themselves of the city. B.C. cir. 980. Rezon became king, and at once began to avenge the loss of his countrymen by the course of “mischief” to Israel which he pursued down to the end of Solomon’s reign, and which is summed up in the emphatic words, “He was an adversary (a ‘Satán’ to Israel”)... he abhorred Israel” (1 Kings xi. 23-25).

Hadad-rimmon (Heb. Haddad ’Rimmon; הָדָד־רִמְמוֹן), the names of two Syrian idols: Sept. κύριοῦς θεόνος; Vulg. Adorammon), the name of a place in the valley of Megiddo, alluded to in Zech. xii. 11 as a type of the future punishment of the Jews; probably by a proverbial expression from the lamentation for Josiah, who was drily laid to rest (see 2 Chron. xxxiv. 22, 25). (There is a treatise by Wchinmannsen, De planctu Hadad, in the Nov. Theol. Theol.-phil. i, 1101; exegetical remarks on the same text have also been written in Dutch by Vermast [Gonda, 1792, 1794], in German by Maurits [Rost, 1764, 1772], and in Latin by Forsius [1764]). According to Jerome (Comment, on Zech. i. c. and Hos. i), it was afterwards called Maximinopolis (see Ireland, Palest., p. 891), which, according to the Jews, Israel, lay 17 Rom. miles from Cæsarea, and 10 from Esdraelon; being situated, according to Dr. Robinson (new ed. of Researches, iii, 118), a little south of Megiddo (now Leijun) (see Bibliotheca Sacra, 1844, p. 220). The name has been thought to be derived from the worship of the idol Hadad-rimmon (Hitzig on Is. xvii. 9; Movers, Phon., p. 297); but, according to the Targum of Jonathan (followed by Jarchi), it is the ellipsis for Hadad, son of Tab-rimmon, the alleged opponent of Abah at Ramoth-Gilead. As it contains the names of two principal Syrian deities, it may have been an old Syrian stronghold, and hence Josiah may here have made his last stand in defence of the plain of Esdraelon. Such a site, therefore, does not ill agree with being the source of the modern town, a village situated at the foot of the Megiddo hills, in a notch or valley about 1¼ hours of S. of Tell Metzemmim” (Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 338; comp. Narratives, ii, 355; De Saulz, Dead Sea, ii, 311). Schwarz’s attempt (Palest. p. 150) to identify Hadad-Rimmon with Gath-Rimmon of Josh. xx. 25, as the Kefar Ubbi of the Talmud (Gitt. fol. 76a), and a present Kafar Guth, said by him to be located about 24 miles from Leijun, beyond Sephoris, is without foundation. Hadar, a various reading of two Heb. names. See also Ets-Hadar.

1. Chadar (חָדָד), perhaps chamber; Sept. Χαδάδ; Vulg. Hadar), a son of Ishmael (Gen. xxxvi. 15); written in 1 Chron. i. 50, Chadad (חָדָד), (Xoðîας, Hadad, but Gesenius supposes the former to be the true reading of the latter in 1 Chron. i. 50 and is unhappily justified by the appellation of any tribe or place in Arabia, or on the Syrian frontier; but names identical with, or very closely resembling it, are not uncommon in those parts, and may contain traces of the Ishmaelite tribe sprung from Hadar. The mountain Hadad, belonging to Tyrem [see Tema], on the borders of the Syrian desert, north of el-Medineh, is perhaps the most likely to be correctly identified with the ancient dwellings of this tribe; it stands among a group of names of the sons of Ishmael, containing Dumah, Kedar, and Tema. See also Haddad, 2.

2. Hadar (חָדָר), perhaps ornament; Sept. ἀράθος v. ἀράθος; Vulg. Adare), one of the Edomitic kings, successor of Baal-Hanan ben-Achbor (Gen. xxxvi. 39); and, if we connect with the statement of ver. 31, about contemporary with Saul. The name of his city, and the name and genealogy of his wife, are given. In the parallel list in 1 Chron. i, he appears as Hadad. We know from another source (1 Kings xi, 14, etc.) that Hadad was one of the names of the royal family of Edom. Indeed, it occurs in this very list (Gen. xxxvi. 35). See also Haddad.

Hadarazer, the form of the name of the town mentioned in the account of David’s Syrian campaign, as given in 2 Sam. x, and in all its occurrences in the Heb. text (as well as in both MSS. of the Sept. and in Josephus), except 2 Sam. viii. 5, 12; 1 Kings xi, 28, where it is more correctly called Haddarezer (q.v.).

Hadas. See Myrtle.

Hadassah (Heb. Chadassah; חַדָּסָה, new; Sept. Αἰασσα v. τ. Αἰασ(634,254),(929,278)(634,278),(929,292), city in the valley of Judah, mentioned in the second group between Zenan and Migdal-gad (Josh. xv. 37). It has generally been thought (Winer, Realbi. s.v.) to be the same as the Adasa (Ἀδάσα) of Josephus (Ant. xii, 10, 5) and the Apocrypha (1 Macc. vii, 40, 45), and likewise of the Onomasticon (s.v.), which, however, must have lain rather in the mountains of Ephraim, apparently near the town of Joppa, which, according to the Mishna (Erub. v. 6), it evidently contained 50 houses only (Rashad, Pelist. p. 701). See Judah, Tribe of.

Hadasah (Heb. Chadassah; חַדָּסָה; myrtle; comp. the Gr. names Myrto, etc.; Sept. omits, Vulg. Elissa), the earlier Jewish name of Esther (Esth. ii, 7). Gesenius (Theaur. p. 360) suggests that it is identical with Arusa, the name of the daughter of Cyrus (Herod. iii, 183, 184).

Hadathah (Heb. Chadattah; חָדַתָּה, a Chaldaizing form of new; Sept. omits, Vulg. serab), according to the A.V. one of the towns of Judah in the extreme south—“Hazor, Hadathah, and Keriob, and Hezron,” etc. (Josh. xx. 25); but the Masoretic accents of the Hebrew connect the word with that preceding it, as if it were Hazor-chadathah, l.e. New Hazor, in distinction from the older Hazor as mentioned in ver. 23. This reading is expressly sanctioned by Eusebius and Jerome, who speak (Onomast. s. v. Asor) of “New Hazor” as lying in their day to the east of and near Ascalon. (See also Raddad, Palest. p. 708.) But Ascalon, as Robinson has pointed out (Researches, new ed. ii, 34, note), is in the Shefelah, and not in the south, and would, if named in Joshuas at all, be included in the second division of the list, beginning at ver. 33, instead of where it is, not far from Ke-desh. Still the total (29) in ver. 32 requires as much abbreviation in the enumerated list of cities in this group as possible. See Hazer-Hadattah.

Haddad. See EN-HADDAD.

Haddock, Chaik R., D.D., a Congregational minister, was born in Salisbury, N. H., in the summer of 1796. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1816. Immediately after graduating, he entered Andover Theological Seminary, where he remained two years. He was then compelled to desist from his studies, and made a journey to the South. He returned in 1819 invigorated in health, and was at once chosen the first professor of rhetoric in Dartmouth College; a position which he held till 1838, when he was chosen professor of intellectual philosophy. In 1830 he received the appointment of charge d'affaires at the court of Portugal, which
Hades

Hades, a Greek word (ᾍδης), derived according to the best established and most generally received etymology, from privative *a-* and ἄδης, hence often written ᾄδης, means strictly what is *out of sight*, or possibly, if applied to a person, what *puts out of sight*. In earlier Greek this last word, if not its only, at least its prevailing application; in Homer it occurs only as the personal designation of Plutus, the lord of the invisible world, and who was probably so designated—not from being himself invisible, for that belonged to him in common with the heathen gods generally—but from his power to render men invisible to his ends—the invisibility (see Cusius, Homerica Lexicon, s. v.). The Greeks, however, in process of time abandoned this use of ᾄδης, and when the Greek Scriptures were written the word was scarcely ever applied except to the place of the departed. In the classical writers, therefore, it is used to denote ὁρατός, or the invisible, in the regions. In the Old Testament it is the common rendering for the Heb. בּוּהֲנָא, sheol, though in the form there often appears a remnant of the original personified application; for example, in Gen. xxxvii, 35, "I will go down to my son, תִּיָּכָא גֹּזֶעַ, i. e. into the abodes or house of hædes (בּוּוֹאָר or בּוּוֹוֹאָר being understood). This elliptical form, ᾄδης being the classic rendering in the Greek Scriptures, even after ᾄδης was never thought of but as a region or place of abode.

1. The appropriation of ἁδεσ by the Greek interpreters as an equivalent for sheol may undoubtedly be taken as evidence that there was a close agreement in the ideas conveyed by the two terms as currently understood by the Greeks and Hebrews respectively—a substantial, but not an entire agreement; for in this, as in all other terms which related to subjects bearing on things spiritual and divine, the different religions of Jew and Gentile necessarily exercised a modifying influence on each. The idea of the departed, coupled with the conception of the departed spirits, of good as well as bad; second, that it was divided into two compartments, the one containing an Elysium of bliss for the good, the other a Tartarus of sorrow and punishment for the wicked; and, thirdly, that in respect to its locality, it lay under ground, in the mid-regions of the earth. So far as these points are concerned, there is no material difference between the Greek ὅδεσ and the Hebrew sheol. This, too, was viewed as the common receptacle of the departed: patriarchs and righteous men spoke of going into it at their decease, and the mention of the subject was a justification for crucifixion as being in it their proper home (Gen. xlii, 38; Psa. cxxix, 8; Hos. xiii, 14; Isa. xi, 9, etc.). A twofold division also in the state of the departed, corresponding to the different positions they occupied, and the courses they pursued on earth, is clearly implied in the revelation of Scripture. The subject, though with the Hebrews less prominently exhibited, and without any of the fantastic and puerile inventions of heathen mythology. Yet the fact of a real distinction in the state of the departed, corresponding to their spiritual conditions on earth, is in various passages not obviously indicated. Divine retribution is represented as pursuing the wicked after they have left this world—pursuing them even into the lower regions of the earth (Deut. xxxii, 22; 2 Sam. xiv, 2); and the bitterest shame and humiliation are described as awaiting there the most prosperous of this world’s inhabitants, if they have abused their prosperity to the dishonor of God and the injury of their fellow-men (Psa. lxxx, 14; Isa. xiv). On the other hand, the righteous remain in his own peace, and are assured that, in the viewless regions of sheol, as well as amid the changing vicissitudes of earth, the right hand of God would sustain him; even there he would enter into peace, walking still, as it were, in his uprightness (Prov. xiv, 22; Psa. xxxix, 8; Isa. lii, 2). That sheol, like hades, was regarded as a lower region compared with the present world, is so manifest from the whole language of Scripture on the subject, that it is unnecessary to point to particular examples; in respect to the good as well as the bad, the passage into sheol was contemplated as a descent; and the name was sometimes used as a synonym for the very lowest depths (Deut. xxxii, 22; Job xi, 7-9). This is not, however, to be understood as affording anything of the actual locality of disembodied spirits; for there can be no doubt that the language here, as in other cases, was derived from the most remote assurances of things not seen. The idea of death was committed to the lower parts of the earth, so the soul was conceived of as also going downwards. But that this was not designed to mark the local boundaries of the region of departed spirits may certainly be inferred from other expressions used regarding them—that God took them to his sepulchre; or that it was to be their place to see the path of life; that he would make them dwell in his house forever; or, more generally still, that the spirit of a man goeth upwards (Gen. v, 24; Psa. xvi, 11; xxiii, 6; Eccles. lii, 21; xii, 7). During the old dispensations there was still no representation of heaven respecting the person of the righteous condition or external relationships of departed spirits; the time had not yet come for such specific intimations; and the language employed was consequently of a somewhat vague and vacillating nature, such as spontaneously arose from common feelings and impressions. For the same reason, the ideas entertained even by God’s people upon the subject were predominantly sombre and gloomy. Sheol wore no inviting aspect to their view, no more than hades to the superstitious heathen; the very men who believed that God would accompany them thither and keep them from evil, contemplated the darkness and silence, and shrank from it with instinctive horror, or gave hearty thanks when they found themselves for a time delivered from it (Psa. vi, 5; xcv, 3, 9; Job iii, 13 sq.; Isa. xxxviii, 16). The reason was that they had only general assurances, but no specific light on the subject; and their comfort rather lay in overlooking the gulf of sheol, and fixing their thoughts on the better resurrection some time to come, than in anything they could definitely promise themselves between death and the resurrection-morn.

In this way one important point of difference between the Jewish and the heathen hades, originated by the diverse spirit of the two religions, that to the believing Hebrew alone the sojourn in sheol appeared that only of a temporary and intermediate existence. The heathen had no prospect beyond its shadowy realms; its only contemplation was the immanent satisfaction of the desire, the satisfaction of the intellect was utterly strange alike to his religion and his philosophy. But it was in connection with the prospect of a resurrection from the dead that all hope formed itself in the breasts of the true people of God. As this alone could effect the reversion of the evil brought to pass in by sin, and really destroy the destroyer, so nothing less was announced in that first promise which gave assurance of the crushing of the tempter; and though as to its nature but dimly apprehended by the eye of faith, it still necessarily formed, as to the reality, the great object of desire and expectation. Hence it is said of the
patriarchs that they looked for a better country, which is a heavenly one; and of those who in later times resided unto blood for the truth of God, that they did it to obtain a better resurrection (Heb. xi, 16, 55). Hence, too, the spirit of prophecy confidently proclaimed the arrival of a day when the temple should be cast down, when the sheol itself should be destroyed, and many of its inmates be brought forth to the possession of everlasting life (Isa. xxvi, 19; Hos. xiii, 14; Dan. xii, 2). Yet again, in apostolic times, Paul represents this as emphatically the promise made by God to the fathers, to the realisation of which our countrymen as with one heart were hoping to come (Acts xxvi, 7); and Josephus, in like manner, testifies of all but the small Sadducean faction of them, that they believed in a resurrection to honor and blessing for those who had lived righteously in this life (Ant. xviii, 3). This, however, cast a gleam of light across the darkness of hades for the Israelite, which was altogether unknown to the Greek. Closely connected with it was another difference also of considerable moment, viz., that the Hebrew sheol was not, like the Gentile hades, viewed as an altogether sepulchral and indecent region, without the hope of a future resurrection. The Hebrews, in fact, deriving the term from the principal fountain of life, and subject to another dominion than the world of sense and time, Pluto was ever regarded by the heathen as the rival of the king of earth and heaven; the two domains were essentially antagonistic. But to the more enlightened Hebrew there was but one region of the dead, and the chamber of sheol was as much open to his eye and subject to his control as the bodies and habitations of men on earth; so that to go into the realms of the deceased was but to pass from one department to another of the same all-encompassing sway of Jehovah. See Sheol.

2. Such was the general state of belief and expectation regarding hades or sheol in Old-Testament times. With the introduction of the Gospel a new light breaks in, which shoots its rays also through the realms of the departed, and relieves the gloom in which they had still appeared shrouded to the view of the faithful. The term hades, however, is of comparatively rare occurrence in New-Testament scripture; in our Lord's own discourses it is found only thrice, and on two of the occasions it is used in a somewhat rhetorical manner, by way of contrast with the region of life and blessing. He said of Caperneum, that from being the gate of life, it should be brought down to hades (Matt. xxi, 23)—that is, plainly, from the highest point of fancied or real elevation to the lowest abasement. Of that spiritual kingdom, also, or church, which he was going to establish on earth, he affirmed that "the gates of hades shall not prevail against it" (Matt. xvi, 18). Except the allusions to the keys of death and of hades; ch. vi, 8, where death is symbolized as a rider, smiting all around him with weapons of destruction, and hades following to receive the souls of the slain; ch. xx, 18, 14, where death and hades are both represented as giving up the dead that were in them, and afterwards as being themselves cast into the lake of fire, which is the second death. In every one of these passages hades stands in a dark and forbidding connection with death—very unlike that association with paradise and Abraham's bosom in which our Lord, as Pilate, exhibited the hope of a future reanimation of people's souls to the eye of faith; and not only so, but in one of them it is expressly as an ally of death in the execution of judgment that hades is represented, while in another it appears as an accursed thing, consigned to the lake of fire. In short, it seems as if in the progress of God's grace a real, spiritualised sphere or region be reserved in darkness and misery to the judgment of the great day, and other names, with other and brighter
ideas, were employed to designate the intermediate resting-place of the redeemed. It was meet that it should be so; for by the personal work and mediation of Christ the whole Church of God rose to a higher condition; all things passed away, all things were new; and it is but reasonable to suppose that the change in some degree extended to the occupants of the intermediate state—the saved becoming more enlarged in the possession of bliss and glory, the lost more sunk in anguish and despair. See DEATH.

3. Such being the nature of the scriptural representation on the subject, one must not only condemn the fables that sprung up amid the dark ages about the limbus or antechamber of hell, and the purgatorial fires, through which it was supposed even redeemed souls had to complete their ripening for glory, but also reject the form in which the Church has embalmed its belief respecting the personal history of Christ, when it said "descended into hell." This, it is well known, was a later addition to what has been called the Apostles' Creed, made when the Church was far on its way to the gloom and superstition of the Dark Ages. Though the words are capable of a rational and scriptural explanation, yet they do not present the place and character of our Lord's existence in the intermediate state as these are exhibited by himself; they suggest something painless, rather than that it should be a bleeding and lamentable; and, if taken in their natural sense, they would rob believers of that sure hope of an immediate transition into mansions of glory, which, as his followers and participants of his risen life, it is their privilege to entertain. See HELL.

4. There are two other terms so often associated in Scripture with hades as to render their signification in some measure synonymous.

(1) ἀβαγία (ἀβαξογία, without bottom). The use of this word to represent three different Hebrew words: 1. הַבַּעַל, a depth or deep place (Job xli, 23); or ולֵפָה, the deep, the sea (Isa. xxiv, 27). 2. בָּבָל, a broad place (Job xxxvi, 16). 3. בָּבָל, a mass of waters, the sea (Gen. viii, 2, etc.), the chaotic mass of waters (Gen. i, 2; Ps. civ, 6), the subterraneous waters, the "deep that lieth under" (Gen. xlix, 25), "the deep that coucheth beneath" (Deut. xxxii, 13). In the N. T. it is used always with the article, to designate the abode of the dead, hades, especially that part of it which is also the abode of devils and the place of woe (Rom. vii; Luke viii, 31; Rev. ix, 5, 11; xi, 7; xvii, 6, 8; x, 3). Revelation 20:13, translated in the A. V. "bottomless pit," by Luther "Abgrund." In ix, 1, mention is made of "the key of the bottomless pit" (οῖς λειτομαῖς τοῦ θανάτου τῶν ἄνθρωπων), the key of the pit of the abyss, where hades is represented as a bottomless depth, which is entered by means of a shaft covered by a door, and secured by a lock (Alford, Stuart, Erdw, De Wette, Diderieck). In ver. 11 mention is made of "the angel of the abyss," by whom some suppose is intended Satan or one of his angels. See AVRA.

(2) ἠδωρισμόν, from the Heb. הָדוֹרְשׁ, destruction, the place of the dead, Job xxvi, 6; Prov. xv, 11), the name given in Rev. ix, 11, to "the angel of the abyss," and explained by the writer as equivalent to the Greek ἢδος, destroyer. The term may be understood either as a personification of the idea of destruction, or as denoting the being supposed to preside over the place of the dead. The Rabbins frequently use this term to denote the lowest regions of sheol or hades (Ezrubal, fol. xix, 1; Sohar Num. fol. 74; Sohar Choddash, fol. 22; comp. Eissennegger, Bemerkungen zu Jüd. ii, 224 sq.) and the addition, "an angel of the abyss," seems to favor the former position or the king of this place is alluded to here. But it may be doubted whether the angelology of the Rabbins finds any sanction from the N. T. and it accords better with the general character of the passage to suppose a personification here of the idea of destruction, so that the symbol may find many realizations in the history of the Church: as there are many Anti-christs, so there are there also many Apollonys. The identification of Abaddon with the Asmoderus of the Apocrypha and the Talmud rests upon no solid basis. See ABADDON.

5. A full view of the extensive literature of this subject more appropriately belongs to the present volume, where notice is specially borne upon the opposite states of the dead: Jour. Sac. Lit. October, 1852, p. 85 sq.; April, 1853, p. 56 sq.; July, 1853, p. 418 sq.; Hiebsteracht, Hades and Heaven (London 1866). See HEAVEN.

Had'id (Heb. חָדִיד, pointed, perf. from its situation on some craggy eminence, Gesenius, Thesaur. p. 446; Sept. Ἀδαίος in Neh. xi, 81, elsewhere unites with prec. word, ἀδιδότε; Vulg. Hidid, placed in the tribe of Benjamin, in the vicinity of Lod and Ono, whose inhabitants returned from the captivity to their old seat under Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 33, where some copies read ἀδιδότης, Ἀριάδνη in Neh. vii, 37; xii, 34). It is probably the same with one of the cities called Ἀδίδα (q. v.) by Josephus (War, iv, 9, 1), but not that of the Apocrypha (1 Mac. ix, 40). Comp. Josephus, Ant. xiv, 5, on the time of Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s. v. Ἀδειά), a town called Æditha (Ædæn) existed to the east of Dissopas (Lydda). According to Schwarz (Phys. Description of Palestine, p. 134), it was identical with the present village el-Chariduka, situated 5 Eng. miles east of Lod, on the summit of a round mountain: probably the same with that seen by Dr. Robinson, and called by him el-Heidiek, a large village just at the mouth of a wady, as it issues from the hills east of Ludd into the plain" (new ed. of Researches, lli, 143, note). This district, although within the territory of Dan, belonged to Benjamin. The same place is described by the old Jewish traveller ha-Parchi as being "the summit of a round hill," and identified by him, no doubt correctly, with Hadid (Zinz, in Asher's Benj. of Tudea, i, 439).

Hadj (Hadj, Haji, Arab.), pilgrimage, especially to Mecca. The name hadj is also given to the body of pilgrims to Mecca; and the word is defined to mean "aspiration." Every Mohammedan, male or female, is bound, once at least in his lifetime, to make the hajj to Mecca. Some of the Mohammedan authorities, however, hold that a substitute may be employed; while lunatics, slaves, and minors are free from the obligation. The solemnities at Mecca are held in the twelfth month of the Mohammedan year; and the male pilgrims, arriving at certain points near Mecca, put on the sacred habit and prepare their minds for the ceremonies. Arriving at Mecca, each pilgrim walks seven times around the Kaubah; next he visits Mount Arafat, twelve miles from Mecca, for prayer and instruction. The next night is spent in devotion at Mugdalipah, and the next day the pilgrim visits a sacred monument at the spot where Mohammed went to pray. The ceremonies end with sacrifices. Every returning pilgrim is styled Ha:gij (Haji) thereafter.

Had'in (Heb. חָדִיד, "defectively" דָּבֵדְיָם in Chor.); First suggests [Heb. Lex. s. v. דָּבֵדְיָם, "Badman" [L. & S. for Ador, the fire-god; see Hadram] (xvii); see Hadram]. The Sab. at Gen. x, 27 has Adoron; Sept. in Gen. x, 27, Ædorsj, Vulg. Aedors; in 1 Chron. i, 21, Ædorj; in 1 Chron. xiv, 10, Ædors; in 2 Chron. x, 18, Ædors; Vulg. in all these last, Aderon), the name of three men.
HADRACH

1. HADRACH, the fifth son of Joktan, and progenitor of a tribe of the same name in Arabia Felix (Gen. x., 27; 1 Chron. vi., 21). E.C. post 241 B.C. B. C. 180 B.C. (Philo's, ii, 20; Josephus, Ant. xiv. 4, 3). HADRACH or DRAKE or Dracon is in the Persian Gulf (Plin. vi., 32), and the promontory Kopodamat (Ras el-Hai) of Prov. vi. 7, 11. Michaelis (Spicileg. ii, 162) despairs of all identification of the tribe in question. Schultess (Parad. p. 83) and Gesenius (Thes. Heb. v. 28) believe HADRACH or Adracon are mentioned from Pтолeman (Alcaeitara, Geog. vi. 7) places on the southern shores of Arabia, between the Horemites (Hamarites) and the Socharites, an account with which Phiny ("Aram.ios"), Hist. Nat. vi. 28, 32; xii. 14, 30) substantially agrees.—Winer, i, 433. Frenzel cites an Arab author who identifies the tribe with the Jordan; but that being a contraction of Jehoram, which contains the name of Jeho- vah, is peculiarly an Israelitish appellation. By Josephus (Ant. vii. 5, 4) he is called Alobomos. 3. ADONIRAM (q. v.), as he is elsewhere more fully called (1 Kings iv. 6; vi. 14; Josephus constantly Alobomos) the son of Abda, the treasurer of taxes under Solomon, and who was stoned to death by the people of the northern tribes when sent by Rehoboam to exact the usual dues (2 Chron. x., 18). Ha'adrach (Heb. Chadorack, הדרּךָ, signif. unknown, but possibly connected with Hador—see HADRACH; Sept. Zechar, Vulg. Hadrach), apparently the name of a country, and (as we may gather from the parallel member of the sole and obscure passage where it occurs) near or identical with Damascus (Zech. ix. 1). The meaning seems to be, "The utterance of the word of Jehovah respecting the land of Hadrach; and Damascus is the place upon which it rests." On the locality in question, great division of opinion exists. Adin- chenius says, "Adra, or Hadrach, alias Adra . . . is a city not far from Damascus, about twenty miles from Babylon, and from it the adjacent region takes the name of Land of Hadrach. This was the land which formed the subject of Zechariah's prophecy" (Theorum Terrarum Sanctarum, p. 75). Rabbi Joseph, a Damascene, according to Darchi, declared he knew a place of this name east of Damascus; and Michaelis says (Stephens, p. 627), "To this I may add what I learned, in the year 1769, from Joseph Abbasi, a noble Arab of the country beyond Jordan. I inquired whether he knew a city called Hadrak . . . He replied that there was a city of that name, which, though now small, had been the capital of a large region called the land of Hadrak," etc. The two names, however, are entirely different (מער, Hadrach; Arab, Edraa), and there is no historical evidence that Edraa's ever was the capital of a large territory. See EINIEL. Yet corroborative of the existence of the place in question are the explicit statements of Cyril and Theodoret in commenting on the above passage. But to these it is objected that no modern traveler has heard of such a place in this region; Gesenius especially (Theaur. Heb. p. 449) urges that the name could not have become extinct. Yet no other explanation of the word Hadrach hitherto offered is as all satisfaction. Movers (in his multiplication of the names of Israel, a. v.) suggests that Hadrach may be the name of one of the old deities (compare Adon, Justin, xxxvi, 2, and Atergattis) of Damascus (Die Philosoph., i, 478); and Bleek conjectures that reference is made to a king of that city (Studien u. Kritiken, 1852, ii, 258). Henderson (Comment. ad loc.) supposes it to be only a corruption of מער, the common names of the kings of Syria. See HADRACH. Jarchi and Kimchi say, "Rahbel juda interpreted it as an al- legory, relating to the blessing of the Messiah, Who was kdrach (מער) to the heathen, and mow (מער) to Israel." Jerome's interpretation is somewhat similar: "Et est ordo verborum; assumptio verbi Domini, aveti in pec- cateores, molla in justos. Adracip quippe hoc resonat ex duobus integris nomen compositum: Ad (מער) acutum, RACH (מער) mole, tenequum significans" (Comment. in Zuch. ad loc.). Hengstenberg (Christol. iii, 372) adopts the same etymology and meaning, but regards the word Hadrach as a symbolical appellation of the Persian empire, whose power should be overthrown by Alexander Zechariah here foretells. He says the prophet does not mention the real name, because, as he lived during the supremacy of Persia, such a reference would have exposed him to danger. See ZECHARIAH, BOOK OF.

Looking at the passage in which appears to be its plain and natural meaning, no scholar can deny that, according to the usual construction, the proper name following 711s is the name of the "land" itself, or of the nation inhabiting the land, and the analogy presented by all the other names in the section is sufficient proof that this must be the case here (Hengstenberg, iii, 372; Hitzig, iv, 348). Other names mentioned in the same connection—Damascus, Hamath, Tyre, Zidon, Gaza, etc.; it is natural to infer that Hadrach is also the name of a place known to the prophet. Its position is not accurately defined. The words of the passage do not connect it more closely with Damascus than with Hamath. It is remarkable that no such name is elsewhere found in ancient writers. The translators of the Sept. were ignorant of it. So was Jerome. No such place is now known. Yet this does not prove that there never was such a name. Many ancient names have disappeared, as it seems to be the case with this (see Alföldi, Plac. de terris Chadrach, Tr. ad Rhen. 1762; also in Uglino, vii). See DAMASCUS.

HADRIAN, T. See ADRIAN.

HADRIANUS, P. EMMILIUS, the 14th Roman emperor (from A.D. 117-138), was a relative and the ward of Trajan, and married Julia Sabina, the granddaughter of Marciana, sister of that emperor. In regard to the place of his birth, the statement of Spartianus (De vita Hadriani, i) that he was born at Rome Jan. 24, A.D. 76, is not corroborated as the most reliable, though others name Italia in Spain, where his ancestors had settled in the time of Scipio (see Eutrophius, vii, 6, and Eusebius, Chronicon, No. 2155, p. 166, ed. Scaliger). Aid- ed by the preference of Trajan's wife, Plotina, and showing himself capable in the positions intrusted to him, he rose rapidly, and on the death of Trajan succeeded to the empire, having been either really adopted as his suc- cessor by that emperor, or palmed off as such by Plotina and her party. For a statement of the conflicting opin- ions on this point, see Spartianus (De vita Hadriani, iv.) and Dinn Cassius (Ixix, 1). When Hadrian assumed the reins of empire, his name was Dinius (A.D. 117), he found the quiet of the empire threatened at several points, but, adopting a general policy of peace, he succeeded in preventing out- break and invasions in nearly every instance. In fur- therance of this peaceful policy, he withdrew the legions from some of the provinces of his predecessor in Syria, the Tigris and Euphrates, and would have also abandoned Dacia had not populous Roman colonies existed there. Impelled by curiosity, or, more probably, by a desire to see for himself the condition of the empire, he jour- neyed extensively through it, leaving everywhere monu- ments of his munificent liberality, besides other useful or ornamental works. He made many improvements in the laws, and the Exspectum perpetuum Hadriani (a codification of prudential edicts made by his orders) marked a era in the historical development of
The Roman law. Hadrian, though a volupturny in private life, was a patron of the arts and of learning; was fond of the society of artists, poets, scholars, philosophers, etc., and even aspired to rank among them; but his inferior taste, his jealousy, his overweening vanity, and his imprudent frankness and contradiction led him to acts of cruel injustice towards the learned men he gathered about him.

His conduct towards the Christians was marked by a sense of justice. The pronouncement of Asia Minor having compelled Hadrian that the people at their festivals demanded the crucifixion, the Christians had a script forbidden such executions, and requiring that all complaints against the Christians should be made in legal form. Though this edict failed to secure immunity to Christians from persecution, since the fourth persecution occurred during his reign, Hadrian was not blamed by Melito, Tertullian, or Eusebius among their persecutors, and his reign is regarded as in general favorable to the progress of Christianity. 

The peace of his reign was broken by one serious war. Among the Jews a spirit of discontent had been kept alive ever since the capture of Jerusalem by Titus. Wishing to eradicate this spirit by the destruction of the Jewish nationality, Hadrian issued an edict forbidding the practice of circumcision, and determined to erect on the ruins of Jerusalem a new Roman city, to be called after himself, Elia Capitolina. Consequently a furious revolt of the Jews broke out under the lead of Bar Cochba, a pretended messiah, and it was only after having suffered great losses, and having almost exterminated the Jewish nation (500,000 Jews are said to have perished), that the imperial armies succeeded in crushing the revolt, although the able general, Flavius Silva, had been recalled from distant shores of Britain to lead them. Elia Capitolina rose over the ruins of the Holy City, but the Jew was forbidden, on the pain of death, to enter it, and from that time the race was dispersed through the world. Antoninus Pius yielded the prohibition of circumcision. Hadrian died at Baiae on July 19, 138; but his last days had been marked by such outrageous cruelties that Antoninus, his successor, with difficulty secured the customary honors to his memory.

Hemorrhage. See Isura.

Hemorrhoids (αναπορεία, techoriai), prob. tumors mucos, i.e. the piles, so called as protruded (the root is ἀπορία, to stretch) from the fundament, or from the straining or tenesmus with flow of blood, which the Mucosities have everywhere inserted in the margin for the textual [he apparently more vulgar and less proper] in the beginning of the edition of 1644. In the beginning of the edition of 1644. In the beginning of the edition of 1644.

References: Orig. Heb. ii. 14; Sibylline, and Medullar. p. 23; and Sept. and Vulg. understand a see in the secret parts, a painful disease with which the Philistines were afflicted by God as a punishment for defiling the sacred ark at Ashdod after they had captured it in the battle (2 Sam. v. 6). The word occurs among the physical curses denounced among the Israelites by Moses in case of apostasy (Deut. xxviii, 27). Interpreters are not agreed on the exact signification of the original terms, or nor on the nature of the disease, although most think that those painful tumors in the fundament are meant which sometimes turn into ulcers. e. the piles (id. xxviii, 66). Other passages with the name of the fundament itself, podex (Bochart, Hieroz. i. 382; see Fuller in Miscel. Sac. v. 8; Kanne, Die goldene Aere der Philist, Nurim, 1820). The Sept. and Vulg. add to ver. 9 that the Philistines made seats of skins, upon which to sit with more ease, by reason of their incontinence. The cause of this disease is no more known than the effect of it. The Philistines, perhaps, thus related the story: but it is evidently passed for truth that this disease was ancient, and had been sent among them by some avenging deity. To remedy this suffering, and to remove the ravages committed by rats, which wasted their country, the Philistines were visited by the images of the emperors to return the ark of God with the following offerings (1 Sam. vi, 1-18): five figures of a golden emerald, that is, of the part afflicted, and five golden rats; hereby acknowledging that this plague was the effect of divine justice. This advice was followed; and Josephus (Ant. xii. 7, 6, 1, for a description of the image see J. ii. 19.) says that the images of the emperors were also set up in the sanctuary (see Frey, De more simulacrorum innumeros conservandii, Alt. 1746); and such kinds of ex votos are still frequent in Catholic countries, being consecrated in honor of some saint who is supposed to have wrought the cure: they are images of wax or of metal, exhibiting those parts of the body which had been diseased, and seated. The scholar on Aristophanes (Acharn. 231) mentions a similar plague (followed by a similar subsequent prophitiation to that mentioned in Scripture), as sent upon the Athenians by Bacchus. The opinion is also often mentioned by the Jews (esp. by Philo). Lichtenstein (in Eichhorn's Biblioth. vi. 405-467), that the plague of emerods and that of mice are one and the same, the former being caused by an insect (olypgas) as large as a field-mouse, is hardly worth serious attention. Kito thinks that they were rather infamias specially occupying the field-mice, and he determined the cause of obviating the effects of the disease (Daily Bible Illustr. at loc.). The words of 1 Sam. v. 12, "The men that did not were smitten with emerods," show that the disease was not necessarily fatal. It is clear from its parallelism with "both" and other diseases in Deut. xxviii, 27, that τασπόμος is a disease, not a part of the body (see Beyer, De hemorroidibus ex lege Moabici, Lips. 1792). Now 1 Sam. v. 11, how the images of the emperors were set up, after they were actually made and placed in the ark. It thus appears probable that the former word means the disease and the latter the part affected, which must necessarily have been included in the actually existing image, and have struck the eye as the essential thing represented, to which the disease was an incident. As some morbid swelling, then, seems the most probable nature of the disease, so no more probable conjecture has been advanced than that hemorroidial tumors or bleeding piles, known to the Romans as warseae (Juv. i. 18), are intended. These are very common in Syria at present, Oriental habits of a want of cleanliness, and the improper food, producing derangement of the liver, constipation, etc., being such as to cause them. See Disease.
ers of the Reformed faith in the Netherlands, was probably born about the year 1525 in Schouwen. The parents of Adrian van Heiden seem to have been among the earliest in Zealand to embrace the Reformed faith. He understood several languages, wrote in both Latin and Dutch. His Dutch style is remarkable for perspicacity and strength. Adrian van Heiden was in 1557 ministering to the Reformed church in Antwerp, and his labors there were eminently successful. Deeply sympathizing with the persecuted Protestants in France, he wrote in Latin a letter to Henry the Second of France, in which he remonstrates with him and pleads with him to exercise clemency. This letter is dated Dec. 1, 1557, and is thus in advance of the measures set on foot by Calvin and Beza in behalf of these persecuted followers of Christ. Van Haemstede in this letter suggests a conference such as was held at Paderborn in 1530. Van der Heiden, sent at his request by the church at Emden to assist him at Antwerp, having arrived, he took occasion to leave for a time (Feb. 1558). During his absence dark clouds gathered, and soon after his return the storm burst. Van der Heiden, whose place of preaching had been betrayed by a woman, was seized. Van Haemstede remained, though a price was set upon his head, and certain death awaited him if captured. His two faithful helpers, Gillis and Antoine Verdikt, were both burned at Brussels. He left Antwerp probably in March, 1559, and sought refuge in Ost Friesland. Subsequently he labored for a short time at Groningen, and was thence sent to England to take charge of a Reformed church in London. He espoused the cause of the better class of Anabaptists, so far as to maintain that they should not be punished for their doctrinal error respecting the humanity of Christ, since they acknowledged his divinity and depended on him for salvation. This view was in direct conflict with the views and practice of Cranmer and Ridley, who had in 1551 condemned to the flames Joris van Parre, a Netherlander of irreproachable morals, simply on account of his doctrinal belief. As the church in England at that time under the supervision of Edmund Grindal, bishop of London, he was called to account for his views, and, adhering to them, was banished from the kingdom. On his return to Holland he was deprived of all his property. Em- den, too, refused to receive him. He bore his trials and patiently submitted to the cruel and Christian manner in which the earnest request of many of the London congregation, he finally went thither again. The bishop of London demanded a recantation. He refused. Again he was banished.

With a heavy heart he returned to Friesland, where he soon after died. His death occurred in 1562. In his view he was living in liberty, and far in advance of his age, and fell a victim to the reigning spirit of intolerance. He was the author of the first Book of Martyrs published in the Netherlands. It is conjectured that it was first published at Antwerp during the persecution, and issued in sheets as it was prepared. The original edition, which is extremely rare, is in small quarto, bearing the author's name, but not the place of its publication. It met with great favor, and for two centuries it was the manual of thousands, having passed through many successive editions. See an able and interesting monograph of Rev. John Jacob Utrecht in the vith vol. of Kist and Raynard's Archief voor Kerkeleid Geschichte, zuonderhoud van Nederlant (Leid. 1835); Glasius, Godgeleerd Nederland, D. ii. (J. W. W.)

Haendel. See HANDEL.

Hairetic. See HERETIC.

Haereticum combruredo, a writ which, in English, "anciently lay against a heretic, who, having once been convicted of heresy by his bishop, and having abjured it, afterwards falling into it again, or into some other, is thereupon committed to the secular power. The common law does not apply the common law itself; however, the conviction of heresy by the common law was not in any petty ecclesiastical court, but before the archbishop himself, in a provincial synod, and the delinquency was delivered up to the king, to do with him as he pleased; so that the crown had a control over the spiritual power; but by 2 Henry IV, cap. 15, the intervention of a synod, might convict of heretical tenets; and unless the convict abjured his opinions, or, if after abjuration, he relapsed, the sheriff was bound, ex officio, if required by the bishop, to commit the unhappy victim to the flames, without waiting for the consent of the crown. This writ remained in force, and was actually executed on two Anabaptists in the seventh of Elizabeth, and on two Arians in the ninth of James I. Sir Edward Coke was of opinion that this writ did not lie in his time; but it is now formally taken away by statute 29 Car. II, cap. 9. But this statute does not extend to take away or alter the jurisdiction of Protestant archbishops, or bishops, or any other judges of any ecclesiastical courts, in cases of atheism, blasphemy, heresy, or schism; but they may prove and punish the same, according to his majesty's ecclesiastical laws, by excommunication, deprivation, degradation, and other ecclesiastical censures, not extending to death, in 1563, and 1571, and no other, so they might have done before the making of this act."—Buck, Theological Dictionary, s. v.

Haevenrick. See HAEVENRICK.

Hafnerreffer, Matthias (also Hafenerreffer), a Lutheran theologian, was born June 24, 1561, at Lorch, in Württemberg, and died Oct. 22, 1619 at Tubingen. He studied philosophy and theology at the last-named place, and in 1580 was made court-preacher and counsellor of the City of Tubingen: in 1592 became professor of theology, and in 1617 chancellor and provost at Tubingen. To a profound and comprehensive learning, he united a sweet and peace-loving disposition, which led him to keep aloof for the most part from the theological strife of his age, and to find his pleasures in directing the studies of his pupils, and in that affectionate appreciation of him Val. Andrei and others bear testimony. His chief work, Loci theologici certe methodo ex ratione in tres libros tribuit (Tubingen, 1600; an improved and enlarged ed. 1603), published at the request of Frederick, duke of Württemberg, for the use of prince John Frederick, was regarded as a model not only of Lutheran orthodoxy, but also of clearness and definiteness in conception, and expression and simplicity in style. It was the text-book of theology at Tubingen up to the end of the 17th century, supplementing Heerbrand's Compendium, which had almost symbolical authority there. By royal decree it was, in 1615, made the official text-book of dogmatics in the University of Upsala and other Swedish institutions of learning. Charles XII is said to have almost known it by heart. Hafnerreffer wrote also some controversial works against the Romanists and Calvinists, and a work entitled Tempel Zerstöret (Tubingen, 1613, fol.).—Hertzog, Real-Encyklopädie, v. 409. (J. W. M.)

Haffner, Isaac, a French Protestant minister and distinguished humanist, was born at Strasbourg in 1751. After studying at Paris and visiting several of the German universities, he was ordained, and soon acquired great reputation as a preacher. He came successively dean of the theological faculty of that city, and died there May 27, 1831. He had been instrumental in restoring in part the old university of Strasbourg under the title of Protestant theological academy, which was afterwards changed to Protestant seminary. On his inauguration he delivered an address, printed under the title Des Secours que l'étoile des langues, de l'histoire, de la philosophie et de la littérature offtre à la théologie (Strasb. 1783, 8vo); he wrote also De l'éducation littéraire, ou essai sur l'organisation d'un établissement pour les hautes sciences (Strasb. 1792, 8vo). His Discours on the importance of education in the ministry were published under the title Jubilé d'Haffner (French and German, Strasb. 1831, 8vo). See
HAGAR

Hagar (Heb. Ḥagar), a stranger, from her foreign birth [comp. Hagar-ken]; Sept. and N. T. Ἀγαρ, a native of Egypt, and servant of Abraham (Gen. xxix, 9, 10), perhaps one of the female slaves presented to Abraham by Pharaoh during his visit to Egypt (Gen. xii, 15), although she properly belonged to Sarah (Gen. xxh, 16). This continued sterility of Sarah suggested to her the idea (not uncommon in the East) of becoming a mother by proxy through her handmaid, whom, with that view, she gave to Abraham as a secondary wife (Gen. xv). B.C. 2075. See ABRAHAM; CONCUBINAGE.

This honor was toogreat and unexpected for the weak and ill-regulated mind of Hagar; and no sooner did she find herself likely to become the mother of her master’s heir than she openly indulged in triumph over her less favored mistress. The feelings of Sarah were severely wounded, and she broke out into her usual rather in complaints of the servant’s petulance. Abraham, whose meek and prudent behavior is strikingly contrasted with the violence of his wife, left her with unfettered power, as mistress of his household, to take what steps she pleased to obtain the required relief. (See Kirk’s "Daily Bk. of Illust. ad loc.") In all Oriental states where concubinage is legalized, the principal wife has authority over the rest; the secondary one, if a slave, retains her former condition unchanged, and society thus presents the strange anomaly of a woman being at once the material of her master’s household, and mistress of the partner of her master’s permission, however, was necessary in an Eastern household, but it is worthy of remark that it is now very rarely given; nor can we think from the unchangeable-ness of Eastern customs, and the strongly-marked national character of those peoples, that it was usual antici- pately to allow a wife to deal harshly with a slave in Hagar’s position. Left with this authority over her dowal maid-servant, Sarah was neither reluctant nor sparing in making the minion reap the fruits of her in- solence; but whether she actually inflicted blows (Augustine, Epist. xlvi), or merely threw out menaces to that effect, cannot be determined from the limited evidence (to "afflicere"); there employed. Sensible, at length, of the hopelessness of getting the better of her mistress, Hagar determined on flight; and having seemingly formed the purpose of returning to her relations in Egypt, she took the direction of that country, which led her to what was afterwards called Shur, through a long tract of sandy uninhabited country, bringing on herself the destruction of Zipporah, the wife of Jethro, to the extent of 150 miles between Palestine and Egypt. Here she was sitting by a fountain to replenish her skin-bottle or recruit her wearied limbs, when the angel of the Lord appeared, and in the kind-liest manner remonstrated with her on the course she was pursuing, and encouraged her to believe the promise that she would ere long have a son, whom Prov-idence destined to become a great man, and whose wild and irregular features of character would be indubitably impressed on the mighty nation that should spring from him. Oblivious to the heavenly visitor, and having distinguished the place by the name of Beer-lahai-roi (q. v.), "the well of the visible God," Hagar retraced her steps to the tent of Abraham, where in due time she had a son; and, having probably narrated this remark- able interview to Abraham, that patriarch, as directed by the angel, took her, and exchanged her name at the child Ismael, "God hath heard" (Gen. xvi). B.C. 2075. Fourteen years after the birth of Ishmael the appearance of the long-promised heir entirely changed the relations of the family, though nothing materially affecting Ishmael took place till the weaning of Isaac, which, as is gener- ally thought, and was then and at the end of his 8th year. B.C. 2061. Ishmael was then fully capable of understanding his altered relations to the inheritance: and when the newly-weaned child, clad, according to custom, with the sacred symbolic robe, which was the badge of the birthright, was formally instated heir of the father, see Bibilh. Bbl. vol. i; Icasis, Amm. p. 92; Bush on Gen. xxvii, 15), he inconsiderately gave vent to his disap-
feeling points by an act of mockery (Gen. xxii, 9— the Hebrew word כּוֹרָה, though properly signifying "to call") is frequently used to express strong derision, as in Gen. xix, 14; Neh. iv, 19; iv, 1; Ezek. xxxii, 32; accompanied, as is probable on some of the occasions referred to in these passages, with violent gestures, which might very justly be interpreted as persecution, Gal. iv, 28-31. The sonry of Abraham's inheritance to Isaac was guided by the special command of God, and, moreover, was in harmony with the immemorial practice of the East, where the son of a slave or secondary wife is always supplantet by that of a freeborn, even if born long after. This insulting conduct of Ishmael's sons gave offence to Sarah, who herself insisted upon his expulsion from the family, together with his mother as conviving at it. So harsh a measure was extremely painful to Abraham; but his scruples were removed by the divine direction to follow Sarah's advice (see Kito's Daily Bible Illustr. ad loc.). "for," adds the Targum of Jonathan, "she is a prophetessa" (compare Gal. iv, 30). Accordingly, "Abraham rose up early in the morning, and took bread, and a bottle of water (and gave it unto Hagar, putting it on her shoulder), and the child, and sent her away" (Gen. xxii, 14). In spite of the instructions, the two exiles made their way. Overcome by fatigue and thirst, the strength of the young Ishmael first gave way, and his mother laid him down in complete exhaustion under one of the stunted shrubs of this arid region, in the hope of obtaining some momentary relief from smelling the cool bow (Gen. xxii, 21). See Ishmael. In a little distance, unable to witness his lingering sufferings, and there "she lifted up her voice and wept." In this distress, the angel of the Lord appeared with a comforting promise of her son's future greatness, and directed her to a fountain, which, concealed by the bushes, had escaped her notice, and from which she was revived the almost lifeless Ishmael. This well, according to the tradition of the Arabs (who pay great honor to the memory of Hagar, and maintain that she was Abraham's lawful wife), is Zemmzem, near Mecca. (See Well's Bibl. Legens., p. 82.) Of the subsequent history of Hagar, we have no account beyond what is involved in that of Ishmael, who established himself in the wilderness of Paran, in the neighborhood of Sh Hai, was married by his mother to a countrywoman of her own, and maintained both himself and his family by the produce of his flocks (Gen. xxvi, 20, 21). In Gen. iv, 24, the apostle Paul, in an allegory, makes Hagar (רְאוּ 배) represent the Jewish Church, which was in bondage to the ceremonial law, as Sarah represents the true Church of Christ, which is free from this bondage. (See Bloomfield's Note, ad loc.) Some commentators, however, have discovered an allusion in the name here with the Arab, word for stone (been). According to Mohammedan tradition, Hagar (Hujir) was buried at Mecca! (D'Herbelot, Bib. Or. s. v. Hagar.) Mr. Rowlands, in travelling through the desert of Beersheba, discovered some wells and a camel's hump, which he declares the Arabs still designate as the "beast of Hagar." (Williams, Holy City, i, 465 sq.) See Abraham.

Hagarene or Hagarite [commonly Ha'garite] (Heb. Ḥaqr, נבגּ, נבגּית, compare Hagar, from the same root as the Arab. Ḥagirah, i. e. flight); but, according to Flurst, s. v., a patriarch from some ancestor Hagar, otherwise unknown; 1 Chron. xi, 38, Sept. Ḥagirah, Vulg. Agarai, A. V. "Haggar," xxxii, 31, Ḥagar, Agarina, Hagarine; "the pl. Ḥagarites," in the plur. Ḥagešni. ፏaska lxxiii, 6, Ḥagarpe, Ḥagarite, Ḥagarenes; fully Ḥagaritea, Ḥagarites; ʿfather a. v., 1 Chron. vi, 10, 19, 20, Sept. in ver. 10 ʿṭarok, in ver. 19, 20 ʿṭarokat, Vulg. Agarari, A. V. "Hagarites; Baruch iii, 28, ʿrrem Aya, filii Agar, Agerenes," occurs apparently as the national or local designation of this people, and also of a tribe or region, probably the same Arab people who appear at different periods of the sacred history as foreigners to the Hebrews. See Arabia.

1. Of individuals it is twice used in connection with the royal staff in the time of David (q. v.).

In 1 Chron. xi, 38 of Mibhar (q. v.), one of David's mighty men, who is described as ʿŷ ayapi, ʿŷ ayapi, Ḥaga, the son of Haggari, or, better (as the margin), "the son of Haggari," is the "father of the whores," as the rendering of the LXX is not given. This hero differs from some of his colleagues, "Zeluck the Ammonite" (ver. 39), for instance; or "Ithnah the Moabite" (ver. 46), in that, while they were foreigners, he was only the son of a foreigner—a domestic of the king of Moab. See Hagarite.

In 1 Chron. xxvii, 31 of Jazar (q. v.), another of David's retainers, who was "over his flocks." This man was himself a "Hagarite," ʿŷ ayapi, Agera, Ageret. A comparison of the next paragraph (v. 2) will show how well qualified for his office this man was likely to be from an extraction from a pastoral race. "A Hagarite had charge of David's flocks, and an Ishmaelite of his herds, because the animals were pastured in districts where these nomadic people were accustomed to feed their cattle" [or, rather, because their experience made them skilful in such employments], Berthau on Chronica et Istriensiumis (C. I. s. 166) comments on this: one of the effects of this great victory over the Hagarites of Gilead and the East was probably that individuals of their nation entered the service of the victorious Israelites, either voluntarily or by coercion, as freemen or as slaves. Jazar was no doubt among the former, a man of eminence and position, as the name indicates; in one of the districts where he attracted the attention of his royal master, who seems to have liberally employed distinguished and meritorious foreigners in his service. See Hagarite.

II. Of a people three times who appear in hostile relation to the Hebrews, nation.

Our first passage treats of a great war, which in the reign of king Saul was waged between the trans-Jordanic tribes of Reuben, Gad, and half Manasseh on the one side, and their formidable neighbors, the Hagarites, aided by the kindred tribes of Jetur, Nephish, and Nodah, on the other. (Kindred tribes, xiv. 14, 15.) In the evidence of Gen. xxxv, 15. The Arab tribes derived from Hagar and Ishmael, like the earlier stocks descended from Cush and Joktan, were at the same time generall known by the common patronymic of Ishmaelites or Hagarites. Some regard the three specific names of Jetur, Nephish, and Nodah, on the one hand, and his Hagarites with whom the two tribes and a half successfully fought were the clans of Jetur, Nephish, and Nodah. See Forster's Geop. of Arabia, x, 186-189.) The result of this war was extremely favorable to the eastward Israelites: many of the enemy were taken and many slain in the contest (ver. 21, 22); the victorious two tribes and a half took possession of the country, and retained it until the captivity (ver. 22). The booty carried on this occasion was enormous: of sheep 50,000, of camels 3,000, of oxen 500, and 500 sheep and goats (i, 3). Mecha, king of Moab, paid to the king of Israel a tribute of 100,000 lambs and 100,000 rams (2 Kings iii, 4). In further illustration of this wealth of cattle, we may quote a passage from Stanley's Jewish Church, i, 215, 216: "Still the countless flocks and herds may be seen in this very region conquered from the Hagarites, droves of cattle moving on like troops of soldiers, descending at sunset to drink of the springs—literally, in the language of the prophet, 'rams and lambs, and goats and bullocks, all of them fettings of Bashan.' By this conquest, which was still
more firmly ratified in the subsequent reign of David, the promise, which was given as early as Abraham's time (Gen. xv, 18) and renewed to Moses (Deut. i, 7) and to Joshua (ii, 4), began to receive that accomplishment from the large and rapidly increasing area of the tribes and confederate states (1 Kings iv, 21). The large tract of country which thus accrued to Israel stretched from the infinite frontier of the pastoral tribes, to whom were formerly assigned the kingdoms of Sion and Og, to the Euphrates. A comparison of 1 Chron. v, 9-20 with Gen. xxxv, 12-20 shows that the line of the boundary marked by the Tigris (as the history informs us) extended eastward of Gilead and Bashan in the direction of the Euphrates, was substantially the same as that which Moses describes as peopled by the sons of Ishmael, whom Hagar bore to Abraham. "They dwell," says Moses, "from Havilah unto Shur, that is before Egypt as thou goest towards Assyria"—in other words, across the country from the junction of the Euphrates with the Tigris to the isthmus of Suez; and this is the spacious tract which we assign to the Hagarites or Hagarans. The booty taken from the Hagarites and their allies proves that much of this territory was well adapted to pasturage, and therefore valuable to the nomadic habits of the conquerors (Num. xxxii, 1). The brilliancy of the conquest, moreover, exhibits the military prowess of these shepherds. Living amid races whose love of plunder is still ill-defined, and with their enemies in this line of work, they were obliged to erect fortresses for the protection of their pastures (Michaelis, Lausa of Moses, art. xxiii), a precaution which seems to have been resorted to from the first. The sons of Ishmael are enumerated, Gen. xxxv, 16, "by their towns and by their cattle;" and some such defensive erections were no doubt made by the children of Reuben and Gad inNum. xxxii, 16, 17. See Ishmaelites.

2. Though these eastern Ishmaelites became lords paramount of this vast tract of country, it is not necessary to suppose that they exclusively occupied the entire region, nor that the Hagarites and their kindred, though subdued, were driven out; for it was probably in the same neighborhood that "the Hagarans" of our second passage were living when they joined in the great confederacy against Israel with, among others, Edom, and Moab, and Ammon, and Amalek (Psa. lxxiii, 6 [Heb. 21]), which, if it be true that Amalek is the place of little importance here; Mr. Thrupp (Psalms, ii, 60, 61) gives reasons for assigning to it the reigns of Jehoshaphat and of his son Jerobeam II. The psalm was probably written on the triumph of Jehoshaphat over the trans-Jordanic Besouins (2 Chron. xxi). See Psalms. The name Edom, according to the neighborhood of the Euphrates and the three Hagarans with the Hagarites, seem to confirm our opinion that these were still residing in the district, where in the reign of Saul they had been subdued by their Israelitish neighbors. Rosenmuller (Hiss. Geogr., p. 68) state that the Hagarans when vanquished migrated to the south-east, because on the Persian Gulf there was the province of Hagar or Hajr. This is the district which the Arab geographers have carefully and prominently described (compare De Sacy's Chrétomathie d'Abbe, i, 123). Abulfeda [by Reinhard], i, 137, who quotes Jakut's Arabisches Dictionarium, and gives the following commentary on Abulfeda, "In Prope. Hajar, sive Bohr-ruis, p. 87, 88, 89, D'Herbelot, s. v. Hajr." We will not deny that this province probably derived its name and early inhabitants from Hajr and her son Ishmael (or, as some, have supposed, from Solomon, from the same tribe); but we are not of opinion that these Hagarans of the Arabian Gulf, whose pursuits were so different, were identical with the Hagarites of the Psalms before cited, or with the Hagarites of 1 Chron., whom we have identified with the Persian gulf maritime tribe; Rommel quotes two from Arabic geographers, Taifashi and Baki, who both describe these Hagarans of the coast as much employed in pearling and such pursuits. Niebuhr (Reisen in Arabien [Engl. tr.], ii, 151, 152) confirms their statement. Ge- senius is also inexact in identifying these "maritime Hagarans" of the east with the "sanctified" Ebarothesenes, in Strabo, xvi, 767, and Pliny, vi, 24. If the tribes indicated in these classical authors be the same (which is doubtful), they are much more correctly identified by an older writer, Dr. T. Jackson (Works [ed. Oxon.], i, 220), who says: "The seat of such as 18, says the Scripture calls Hagarites, which is on the desert Asia, betwixt Gilead and Euphrates (1 Chron. v, 9, 10). This people were called by the heathen 'Ayybaytun, Agrei, rightly placed by Ptolemy in the desert Arabia, and by Strabo in that very place which the Scripture makes the eastern bounds of Ishmael's posterity, to wit, next into the inhabited sea of Bih-east. And the difficulty of identification, some modern geographers have distributed the classical Agrei in various localities. Thus, in ForSTER'S map of Arabia, they occupy both the district between Gilead and the Euphrates in the north, and also the western shores of the Persian Gulf. The fact seems to be that these districts in Arabia were called by the generic appellation of Hagarites or Hagarans, no doubt after Hagar: as Kutarah, another of Abraham's concubines, occasioned the rather vaguely-used name of Keturans for other tribes of the Arabian peninsula (the Arabic, ii, 31). Forster, Geogr. des Orient, p. 393, mentions the ancient town of Abulbada which we have above quoted, that geographer (after the author of the Moslem) reminds us that the name Hajr (Hagar) is as extensive in meaning in Arabia as Shem (Syria) and Irak elsewhere; in like manner Rommel, within a page or two, describes a Hagar in the remote province of Yemen; this, although an unquestionably different place (Reinhard, ii, 187, note), is yet confined with the maritime Hajar. In proof of the uncertainty of the situation of places in Arabia of like name, we may mention that, while Abulfeda, Eritri, Giauari, and Golias distinguish between the Hagarans of the Greek coast, and those of the remote south-west district which we have just mentioned, Nasir Edin, Olugheig, and Busching confound them as identical. Winer, Recher. s. v. Hagarites, mentions yet another Ojar, which, though slightly different in form, might be written much like our word in Hebrew נך' and is actually identical with it in the Syriac (Assenmann, Bibl. Orient. III, ii, 750). This place was in the province of Hezaj, on the Red Sea, on the main route between Damascus and Mecca. Such being the uncertainty connected with the sites of these Arab tribes, we have no hesitation in placing the Hagarans of the neighborhood of the Persian Gulf, in the situation which was in Saul's time occupied by the Hagarites, "near the main road which led [or, more correctly, in the belt of country which stretched] from the head of the Red Sea to the Euphrates" (Smith's Hist, of Geog., s. v. Agrei; see also Bochart, Phaleg [edit. Villemain], II, ii, 225). The mention both of Ishmaelites and Hagarans in this Psalm has led to the opinion that they are separate nations here meant. The verse, however, is in the midst of a poetic parallelism, in which the clauses are synonymous and not antithetic (comp. ver. 5-11), so that if "Edom and the Ishmaelites" is not absolutely identical in geographical signification with "Moab and the Hagarans," there is at least a poetical identity between these two groups which forbids our separating them entirely from each other in any sense (for the dispersed condition of the Hagarans, see also Fuller, Misc. Dei, p. 215). The Krimchi Fullah, 194, 79, ascribes this identity to the unrelenting hostility of their neighbors towards the Jews to a very late period. One of these is mentioned in 1 Mac. v, as dispersed by Judas Maccabaeus. "The children of Bean" (uay Bayy) of ver. 4 have been by Hitzig conjectured to be the same as those of the Hagarans; there is no sufficient ground for this opinion than their vicinity to Edom and Ammon, and the difficulty of making them fit in with
any other tribe as conveniently as with that which is the subject of this article (see J. Olsenhaus, _The Psalms_, p. 325).

In the passage from Baruch iii, 23 there are attributed to "the Agarenes" qualities of wisdom for which the Arabian nation has long been celebrated, skill in proverbial philosophy (comp. Freytag, _Arab. Proev. tom. iii, pref.); in this accomplishment they have associated with them "the merchants of Meran and of Theman." This is not the place to discuss the site of Meran, which some have placed on the Persian Gulf, and others on the Red Sea; it is enough to observe that their mercantile habits gave them a shrewdness in practical knowledge which rendered them worthy of comparison with "the merchants of Tyr and Gaza" (Ezek. xxi, 26), an attainment which makes the Themanese to be inhabitants of the maritime Bahrain, and therefore Hagarenes (i, 303); but in this he is flagrantly inconsistent with his own good canon (i, 291):

"The name of the son of Eliphaz and of his descendants [the E-lomites] is uniformly written Teman in the original antquus, and family [the Hagarenes or Ishmaelites] as uniformly Tema [without the n]." The wisdom of these Themanese merchants is expressly mentioned in Jer. xlix, 7, and Obadiah, ver. 8. The Hagarenes of this passage we would place among the inhabitants of the shores of the Persian Gulf, where (see i, 291, 292) the scribes place the Hagaretes after their conquest by the trans-Jordanian Israelites. The clause, "That seek wisdom on earth" [that is, "who acquire experience and intelligence from intercourse with mankind"] (the Sept. of _κοιτησμόνι την σίοναν ει τις της γης,_ is surely corrupt, because meaningless: by the help of the Vulgate and the Syriac it has been conjectured by some [by Havernick and Fritzsch, _ad loc._ for instance] that instead of _οι τις_ we should read _ρητι τις_, q. d. "the wisdom [or common sense] which is cognizant of the earth—men and manners," an attainment which mercantile people acquire better than all else), seems to best fall in with the habits of a seafaring and mercantile race (see Fritzsch, _das Buch Baruch_, p. 192; and Havernick, whose words he quotes: "Hagareni terram quasi perlanstrantes discurrant, quippe mercantes longo celebrantem tempore, et habebant eum tempore.

Hagenaus, Conference of, a theological conference called by the German emperor in 1389 in order to bring about a reunion between Protestants and Roman Catholics. Having originally been convoked to Worms, it was transferred to Hagenaus in consequence of an epidemic prevailing in the former city. It lasted from January 15th to March 16th. It was convened in order to send Luther without a special protection, and as Melancthon fell sick during the journey, the Protestants were represented by Brenz, Osiander, Capito, Cruicerig, and Myconius; and the Roman Catholics by Eck, Fasber, and Coelebues. The conference led to no definite results. It was agreed that an equal number of representatives, chosen by the two parties, should meet at Worms, and resume the negotiations for a union.—HERZOG, xix, 569. (A. J. S.)

Hagrite [or Hatgerite] (Heb. _ha-hagri, ha-harir, ha-hargitt_, the Hagrites; Sept. _αυαριψηνι, Vulg. Agarens_), a designation of Jaziz (q. v.), one of David's agricultural officers (I Chron. xxvii, 31). See Hagarite.

Haggadah (Heb. _anecdote, legend_), in the Talmud, and with the Rabbis the name for traditional stories, legends, etc. used in the interpretation and elucidation of the law and the prophets. Many of the _haggadot_ in the Talmud are absurd and preposterous, and they are not held by the best Rabbins as authoritative. Maimonides says of them: "Beware that you take not these words of Hermogenes (wise) literature, which would be degrading to the sacred doctrine, and sometimes to contradict it. Seek rather the hidden sense; and if you cannot find the kernel, let the shell alone, and confess 'I cannot understand this'" (_Peroth Hamishnahgoth._)

First, _Kulturgeschichte d. Juden_, i, 74; _Ethiopisches, Introduction in Hebreo_, i, p. 192; Joseph, _Gesch. d. Juden_, i, 178; ii, 213. The Haggadah is frequently referred to in the Mishnah (rule, norm), the oral law of tradition, brief sentences established by the authority of the Sanhedrin, in which the law was interpreted and applied to individual cases, and which were designated as the "sentences of the elders." See MIDRASH: (J. H. W.)

_Hagga(i) (Heb. _Chaggogi, _ו, festive_; Sept. and Joseph. _Avayauf_; Jerome and Vulg. _Agapeus or Haggaus_, the tenth in the order of the twelve minor prophets, and the third in the three who, after the return of the Jews from the Babylonian exile, proved themselves distinguished for their prophetical gifts. Of the place and year of his birth, his descent, and the leading incidents of his life, nothing is known which can be relied on (see Oehler, in Herzog's _Enzyklo_, v, 471 sqq.). The more fabulous traditions of Jewish writers, who pass him for an ancestor of the _Phasagous Maga_, and enlarge on his literary avocations, have been collected by Carzov (Introduction in V. T., iii, 426). Some interpreters, indeed, taking in its literal sense the expression _ברב ראשות_ (malak Yehkabod) i, 1, 13, have imagined that he was an angel in human shape (Jerome, _Comm. ad loc._). Some ancient writers assert that he was a priest, and in that capacity he came to Jerusalem, when Cyrus, in the year B.C. 538, allowed the Jews to return to their country (2 Chron. xxxiv, 23; Ezra i, 1); the new colony consisting chiefly of people belonging to the tribes of Judah, Benjamin, and Levi, with a few from other tribes. According to the same tradition, he was buried with honor near the sepulchres of the priests (Isidor. Hispal. c. 49; Pseudo-Dorotheus, in Chron. Pasch. 151, d.). It has hence been conjectured that he was of priestly rank. Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, according to the Jewish writers, were the men who were with Daniel when he saw the visions relating to the rebuilding of the temple, and were admitted to the sanctuary of the priests (Isidor. Hispal. c. 49; Pseudo-Dorotheus, in Chron. Pasch. 151, d.). The Seder Olam Zuta places their death in the 52d year of the Medes and Persians, while the extravagance of another tradition makes Haggai survive till the entry of Alexander the Great into Jerusalem, and even till the time of our Saviour (Carzov, _Intro._). In the Roman martyrlogies Hosea and Haggai are joined in the catalogue of saints (Acta Sanctor., 4 Julii). See _Ezra_.

This much appears from Haggai's prophecies (ch. i, 1, etc.), that he flourished during the reign of the Persian monarch Darius Hystaspis, who succeeded the throne B.C. 521. It is probable that he was one of the exiles who returned with Zerubbabel and Jeshua: and Ewald (die _Proph. d. Alte B._), is even tempted to infer from ii, 3, that he may have been one of the few survivors who had seen the first Temple in its splendor (Bleek, _Einleitung_, p. 540). The rebuilding of the Temple, which was commenced in the reign of Cyrus (B.C. 535), was suspended during the reigns of his successors, Cambyses and Pseudo-Smerdis, in consequence of the determined hostility of the Samaritans. On the accession of Darius Hystaspis (B.C. 521), the prophets Haggai and Zechariah urged the renewal of the undertaking, and obtained the permission and assistance of the king (Ezra v, 1; vi, 14; Josephus, _Ant._, xi, 4). Animated by the high courage (magni spiriatus, Jerome) of these devoted men, the people prosecuted the work with vigor, and the Temple was completed and dedicated in the sixth year of Darius (B.C. 516). See _Temple_.

The names of Haggai and Zechariah are associated in the Sept. in the titles of Psalms xxxvii, cxlv—cxxxviii; in the Vulgate in those of Psalms cxvii, cxxv—cxxxvii; in the Peshito Syriac in those of Psalms cxviii, cxxv—cxxxvii, cxlv, cxxxvii, cxliv, cxxxvii. It may be supposed that to these prophets the arrangement of the above-mentioned psalms for use in the Temple service, just as Psalms cxlv is in the Vulgate attributed to Jeremiah and Ezekiel, and
the name of the former is inscribed at the head of Ps. cxxxvi in the Sept. According to Pseudo-Epiphanius (De Vitis Prophec.), Haggai was the first who chanted the Hallelujah in the second Temple: "wherefore," he adds, "we say 'Hallelujah, which is the hymn of Haggai and Zechariah.' It is Haggai who is mentioned in the Apocrypha as Agokus, in 1 Esdr. xiv, 7; 2 Esdr. i, 40; and is alluded to in Ecclus. xlix, 11 (comp. Hag. ii, 23), and Heb. xii, 26 (Hag. ii, 6). See Zechariah.

HAGGAI, PROPHECY OF. These vaticinations are comprised in a book of two chapters, and consist of discontinuous and ampliative summary; the latter being a German theologian to suspect that they have not come down to us in their original complete form, but are only an epitome (Eichhorn, Einleitung in das A. T. iii, § 598; John, Introductio in libros sacros Vet. Test. edit. 2, Vienna, 1814, § 156).

Their object generally is to urge the rebuilding of the Temple, which had, indeed, been commenced as early as B.C. 535 (Ezra iii, 10), but was afterwards discontinued, the Samaritans having obtained an edict from the Persian king (Ezra iv, 7) which forbade further procedure, and incontinently the former pretenders to rebuilding the Temple had not arrived, since the seventy years predicted by Jeremiah applied to the Temple also (Zech. i, 2). As on the death of Pseudo-Smerdis (the "Astarteuxoxes" of Ezra iv, see ver. 24), and the consequent termination of his interdict, the Jews still continued and reached the seventh year of the second temple; they were merely engaged in building splendid houses for themselves, Haggai began to prophesy in the second year of Darius, B.C. 520.

His first discourse (ch. i), delivered on the first day of the sixth month of the year mentioned, denounced the idleness of the people and the profanation of the Temple (verses 5, 7-12), and exhorted them to起来 (v. i. 9), and twenty-four days afterwards the building was resumed. The second discourse (ii, 1-9), delivered on the twenty-first day of the seventh month, shows that a month had scarcely elapsed when the work seems to have slackened, and the enthusiasm of the people to have diminished. The prophet, ever ready to reclaim his zeal, encouraged the flagging spirits of the chiefs with the renewed assurance of God's presence, and the fresh promise that, stately and magnificent as the temple of their wisest king, the glory of the latter house should be greater than the glory of the former (ii, 3-9). The third discourse (ii, 10-19), delivered on the twenty-fourth day of the month, refers to a period when building materials had been collected, and the workmen had begun to put them together. Yet the people were still comparatively inactive, and after two months we thus find them again censoring their slowness, which rendered worthless all their ceremonies and observances. But the rebuke was accompanied by a repetition of the promise (ii, 19). The fourth and last discourse (ii, 20-25), delivered also on the twenty-fourth day of the month, is exclusively addressed to Zerubbabel, the political chief of the new Jewish colony, who, it appears, had asked for an explanation regarding the great political revolutions which Haggai had predicted in his second discourse: it comforts the governor by assuring him they would not take place very soon, and not in his lifetime. As Zerubbabel was prince of Judah, the representative of the royal family of David, and, as such, the local ancestor of the Messiah, this closing predic-
HAGGI

English and German. He was instrumental in the conversion of not a few men of ability, who became ornaments of the ministry. He located, owing to the sickness of his wife, in 1730 instead of 1728, in Baltimore, where he continued to preach with great acceptance. He was one of the original elders of the Church, and died in the faith, Sept. 4, 1823, aged seventy-six years.—Stevens, History of the M. E. Church, ii. 66, 496; iii. 144, 146.

Haggi (Heb. Chagggi, כֹּחַגִּי, festire; Sept. Ἀγγί, the second of the seven sons of the patriarch Gad (Gen. xlvii, 16), and progenitor of the family of Haggrites (Numb xxvii, 15; Sept. Άγγι). B.C. prob. ante 1784.

Haggia (Heb. Chagggiyaḥ, חֲגַגִּיָה, festival of Je- rovaḥ: Sept. Ἀγγύα, a Levite of the family of Merari, apparently the father of Shubael and of Gildad. Aasiah, which last seems to have been contemporary with Da- vid (1 Chron. vii, 30 [Heb. 15]). B.C. ante 1048.

Hag'ite (Heb. only as a collect, with the art. Ha- Chaggii, חֲגַגִּי, [for נְפָרִי]; Sept. Ἀγγί, Vulg. Agiti, A.V. “the Haggites”), the family title of the descendents of the son of Gad of the same [Heb.] name (Numb xxvii, 15). See Haggai.

Hag'ith (Heb. Chaggith, חֲגַגִּית, Sept. Ἀγγίθ, v. r. 471γ, but Ἀγγίθ in 1 Chron. ii, 3; Josephus Αγγίθ, Ant. vii, 14, 4), a wife of David, only known as the mother of Azariah (2 Sam. iii, 4; 1 Kings i. 11, 12; ii. 11, 1 Chron. iii, 2), but apparently married to David after his accession to the throne. B.C. 1038. See David.

Her son was, said Absalom, renowned for his handsomeness of presence. In the first and last of the above passages Haggith is fourth in order of mention among the wives, Adonijah being also fourth among the sons. His birth happened at Hebron (2 Sam. iii, 2,5) shortly after that of Absalom (1 Kings i, 6, where it will be observed that the words “his mother” are inserted by the translators) (Smith, s. v.). The Heb. name is merely the fem. of the adj. that appears in the names Haggai, etc., and seems to be indicative of festivity in the religious sense [see Festival]. First renders it “born at the Feast of Tabernacles” (Heb. Lex. s. v.), and Mr. Grove (in Smith, ut supra) regards it as = “a dancer,” from the primitive sense of the root ־השֵּׁפֶל.

Hag'ia (Ἀγγία or Ἀγγία, Vulg. Aegia), of the Apocrypha (1 Esd. v. 34) as the name of one of the “servants of Solomon” whose “sons” returned to Jerusa- lem under Ezra; but in the Vulgate Bible instead of Hattil (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra ii. 57; Neh. vii, 57), the Heb. Vor. prophesies, 

Hagigad. See Hor-Ha-Gagigad.

Hagigápha. Ἁγιγήφορα (Holy Writinga), a term first found in Epiphanius (Panarion, c. 255), who used it, as well as ἁγαγιά, to denote the third division of the Scriptures, called by the Jews הַגִּיֹּרַה, or the Writers, consisting of fire books [see Miqra'oth], viz. the three poems (יִתְנָה), Job, Proverbs, and the Psalms, and the two books of Chronicles.

These divisions are found in the Talmud (Baba Bath- rah, ed. 1, ed. Amsterdam), where the sacred books are classified under three heads, the Law, the Prophets, and the Writ- ings (Ketubian). The last are divided into three major classes (c. 10, Ruth, the book (perger) of Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Eccle- siastes (Koheleth), the Song of Songs, Lamentations, Daniel, and the books (megillot) of Esther, Ezra, and Chronicles. The Jewish writers, however, do not uniformly follow this arrangement, as they sometimes place the Psalms or the book of Job first among the Hagi- gra. Jerome gives the arrangement followed by the Jews in his time. He observes that they divided the Scriptures into five books of Moses, eight prophetic book (viz. 1. Joshua; 2. Judges and Ruth; 3. Samuel; 4. 1 Kings; 5. Isaiah; 6. Jeremiah; 7. Ezekiel; 8. The twelve prophets), and nine Hagiographa, viz. 1. Job; 2. David, five parts; 3. Solomon, three parts; 4. Kohe- leth; 5. Canticles; 6. Daniel; 7. Chronicles; 8. Esdras, and two books [viz. Ezra and Nehemiah]; 9. Esther. Some, however, he adds, “place Ruth and Lamentations among the Hagiographa rather than among the prophetic books.”

A rabbi reckons thirteen prophetic books, and four con- taining hymns and moral precepts (Apion, i, 8), from which it would appear that after the time of Josephus the Jews comprised many books among the prophets which had previously belonged to the Hagiographa. It has, however, been considered as more probable that Jo- sephus had no authority from manuscripts for his classification.

The earliest notice which we find of these divisions is that contained in the prologue to the book of Eccle- siasticus, written B.C. cir. 140, the author of which re- fers to the Law, the prophets, and the hagiographa, which last were most probably the Hagiographa. Philo also speaks of the Laws, the Prophets, the Hymns, and the other books, but without-classifying them. In the New Testament we find three corresponding divi- sions mentioned, viz. the Law, the Prophets, and the Psalms; which did not receive their knowledge to have been divided into the second division, from the circum- stance of the first being the first in the catalogue (Luke xxi, 44). Havercorn, however (Handbook, p. 78), supposes that Luke calls the Hagiographa by the name of the Psalms, rather than by account of the books of the Psalms, or of several of its parts. The “book of the Prophets” is re- ferred to in the New Testament as a distinct volume (Acts vii, 42, where the passage indicated is Amos v. 25, 26). It is well known that the second class was divided by the Jews into the early Prophets, viz. Joshua, Judges, and Kings; and the later Prophets, viz. Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel (called the major prophets), and the book of the twelve (minor) prophets.

When this division of books was first introduced it is now impossible to ascertain. Probably it commenced after the return from the exile, with the first formation of the council of elders, and more difficult is it to determine the principle on which the classification was formed. The rabbinical writers maintain that the authors of the Ketu- binah enjoyed only the lowest degree of inspiration, as they received no immediate communication from the deity, like that made to Moses, to whom God spoke face to face; and that they did not receive their knowledge through the medium of visions and dreams, as was the case with the prophets or the writers of the second class; but still that they felt the Divine Spirit resting on them and inspiring them with suggestions. This is the view maintained by Abushuel (Tiferet in Psalms, 19, 20, 1), Kings, etc. (in Psalms), Maimonides (More Nebuchim, ii, 45, p. 317), and Elias Levi (Tibbat); which last writer defines the word הִנְנָה to mean a work writ- ten by divine inspiration.

The placing of Ruth among the Hagiographa, and especially the separation of Lamentations from Jeremiah, seems, however, to be irreconcilable with this hypothesis; nor is it easy to assign a satisfactory reason why the historical books of Joshua, Judges, Samuel, and Kings should be placed among the Prophets, and the book of Chronicles among the Hagiographa. The reasons generally assigned for this, as well as for placing in the third class the books of Psalms, Daniel, and Jos. are so fanciful and unsatisfactory as to have led Christian writers to form other and more defi- nite classifications. It will suffice to mention the reason assigned by Rabbi Kimchi for excluding Daniel from the book of Prophets, viz. that he has not equaled the other prophets in his visions and dreams. Others as- sign the same reason for excluding the Psalms, on the insertion of it, as well as of some historical books, in the Hagiographa, inasmuch as the collection of the prophets was closed at the date of the composition of this book (De Wette, § 255). Berkholtz, who is of this opinion (Eindehungen, 6, 79 sq.), thinks that the word Ko- tuban must have been borrowed into the Hebrew from the Greek (p. 81). Hengstenberg (Authentik des Danie|, etc., p. 29 sq.) follows the ancient opinions of the Rabbins, and
maintains that the book of Daniel was placed in the Hagiographa in consequence of the lower degree of inspiration attached to it; but herein he is opposed by Havermick (Handbuch, p. 62). De Wette (§ 19) supposes that the first two divisions (the Law and the Prophets) were closed a little after the time of Nehemiah (compare 2 Macc. ii. 13, 14), and that perhaps at the end of the Persian period, the time of the formation of the Hagiographa, which long remained "changeable and open." The collection of the Psalms was not yet completed when the two first parts were formed. See KETHEMUS.

In 1787 he entered the University of Göttingen, and in 1788 he became a professor of philosophy at the University of Halle. He was appointed to the chair of theology at the University of Breslau in 1802, and in 1807 he became a professor of philosophy. He was a liberal and enlightened thinker, and his works were widely read and admired. He was a frequent contributor to the "Jahrbuch für Theologie." His works include: "Die Lehre von der göttlichen Offenbarung," "Das Evangelium Marcionis," and "Die Lehre vom göttlichen Recht." His influence was great, and he was a defender of the principles of Christianity against the attacks of rationalism.

The word 'Hagiographa' is once used by Jerome in a peculiar sense. Speaking of Tobit, he asserts that the Jews cut off this book from the catalogue of the divine Scriptures, because it contained among those books which they call Hagiographa. Again, of Judith he says, "By the Jews it is read among the Hagiothrapha, whose authority is not sufficient to confirm debated points": but, as in the latter instance, the greater number of MSS. read 'Apocrypha,' which is doubtless the true reading, it is highly probable that the word 'Hagiographa,' used in reference to the book of Tobit, has arisen from the mistake of a transcriber. The two words were in the Middle Ages frequently used synonymously. See DICTYON.-CANONICAL. "Hagiographa" has also been used by Christian writers in a synonymous with Holy Scripture.

The Alexandrian translators have not been guided by the threefold division in their arrangement of the books of Scripture. The different MSS. of the Sept., also vary in this respect. In the Vatican Codex (which the printed editions chiefly follow) Tobit and Judith are placed between Nehemiah and Esther. Wisdom and Ecclesiasticus follow Canticles. Baruch and Lamentations follow Jeremiah, and the Old Testament concludes with the four books of Maccabees. Luther (who introduced into the Bible a peculiar arrangement, which in the Old Testament has been followed in the English Authorised version) first separated the canonical from the non-canonical. Not only do the Alexandrian translators, the fathers, and Luther differ from the Jews in the order of succession of the sacred books, but among the Jews themselves the Talmudists and Masoretes differ. The German and Spanish MSS. follow each a different arrangement. See BIBLE.

Hagiography. See SAINTS, WORSHIP OF.

Hahiroth. See PI-HA-HIROTH.

Hahn, August, a distinguished German Protestant theologian, Orientalist, and opponent of rationalism, was born at Grossostheim, near Querfurt, in Prussian Saxony, March 27, 1792. His father died before he was nine years old, but his pastor, Stütsen, generously instructed the orphan with his own son, and secured his admission to the gymnasium at Eisleben. In 1810 Hahn entered the University of Leipsic, where, he tells us (Preface to Lehrbuch des christlichen Glaubens, 2nd ed.), he lost his early faith and peace, the fruits of a pious, loving mother's teaching, became imbued with the prevailing rationalism. After a three-years' course, in which, besides adding to his stock of classic and theological learning, he studied Oriental languages and literature, especially Syriac and Arabic, he engaged in the study of theology. In 1817 he entered the recently founded theological school at Wittenberg, where, under happier religious influences and inspirations, he regained his lost faith and peace, and was henceforth active in seeking to impart them to other minds and hearts. In 1819 he was appointed professor extraordinary, and in 1821 ordinary professor of theology in the University of Königsberg, and during his occupancy of that post published Barlaeines, Gnostics, Syripernous and pseudomonoglosus (Leipsic, 1819), a work which earned for him the doctorate of theology. This was followed by several other publications in patristic literature, viz. De gnostiaca, Moræsiana (1822); Asterisks (1823); Das Evangelium Marcionis, etc. (1823); De Canone Moræsiana (1824); Chronologie der christlichen Gesch. (1824); and Sitzungsberichte der Königlichen Preussischen, etc., (in conjunction with Seiffert) (1825); besides treatises in several periodicals. Being called in 1826 to the professorship of theology in the University of Leipsic, Hahn was thrown into the midst of theological controversy, and gave expression to his antagonism to the Rationalists in his treatise De Rationalismi, qui dictur, vera Indole et quae censurum Naturalismo continuat raetionum (Leipsic, 1827), in which he asserts the necessity of a supernatural revelation, and the inability of man by nature to attain "certain and complete knowledge of religious truths," and aims to show historically that rationalism had always been regarded by the Church as hostile to Christianity, and that it was the offering of naturalism and deism. He developed this antagonism still further in his Observatio pacis ecclesiasticae, in which he shows the necessity of a supernatural revelation, and the inability of man by nature. In 1827 he was made general superintendent for Silesia, which post he filled until his death, May 13, 1863, and in which he was able to exert considerable influence in behalf of the evangelical party among the clergy. The most important of his writings not already mentioned are, Bibelwissenschaft und Glaubensregeln der apostolisch-katholischen Kirche (1842); Theologische Kirchliche Annalen (1842-44); Das Bekenntnis der evangelischen Kirchen und die ordinaturische Verpflichtung ihrer Diener (1847); Das Bekenntnis der evangelisch-katholischen Kirche in seiner Verhältnisse zu dem von der römisch und griechischen (1853); Predigten und Reden unter den Begegnungen in Kirche und Stadt seit dem J. 1830 (1853). See obituary notice of Hahn in the Allgemeine Kirchen-Zeitung for 1863, No. 75-77, and an autobiographical sketch of his life, in his Obersicht in Dietzsch's Himmel, Journal, 1838, vol. ii, pp. 1; Herzog, Reel-Encykl. xix., 593 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxii., 164; New Amer. Cyclop. viii., 634. (J. W. M.)

Hahn, Heinrich August, eldest son of August Hahn, was born at Königsberg June 19, 1821, and died Dec. 1, 1861, at Greifswald. After having studied at Breslau and Berlin, he devoted himself to Old-Testa-
ment exegesis and theology. He was tutor (privatdocent) at Breslau in 1845, went thence in 1846 to Königsberg as professor ad interim on the death of Havernick, and in 1851 became professor extraordinary, and in 1860 ordinary professor at Greifswald, succeeding Königsegg. He edited Havernick's Kritischen über die Theologie des A. Testaments (1848). His chief works are, a dissertation De Spie immortaliitate sub Vet. Test., etc.; Vetsrer testam. sentimenta de Natura hominis (1846)—Commentar über das Buch Hiob (1860)—Über- setzung und Erklärung des Hohen Liedes (1865)—Er- klärung von Jesu Kapitel 21—46 (forming vol. ii of Drebach's commentary on Isaiah, 1857)—Commentar über das Predigerbuch Salomo's (1869). His work evince the care and fidelity which characterized the man, but his criticisms are sometimes marked by great boldness. He was a man of mild temper and great purity of char- acter. See Allgemeine Kirchen-Zeitung for 1862, No. 25; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. xix, 597. (J. W. M.)

Hahn, Michael, a German theologian, was born Feb. 2, 1758, at Altdorf, near Böblingen, Württemberg. The son of a peasant, he was from early youth under the influence of profound religious convictions, and devoted himself, in retirement, to the study of the Bible, and the preparation of prominent theological works, as Beheim und Oetingre. He claimed to receive from God special revelations, and wrote down their contents. As a speaker in the meetings of the Pietists he attracted large crowds, was several times summoned before the consis- tory to defend himself against the charge of heresy, but was finally allowed to spend the last twenty-four years of his life without further annoyance upon an estate of the duchess Francisca of Württemberg. There he died in great peace in 1819. The followers of Hahn, called the Michelians, constitute an organized communion which has never separated from the State Church, but the members of which annually meet for consultation, and, in particular, for making provision for the poor. The celebrated colony of Kornthal (q. v.), near Stuttgart, was organized under the direct influence of Hahn. The works of Hahn, which contain a complete speculative theosophy, have been published at Tübingen in 12 vols. (1819 sq.). Several of his hymns were received by Albert Knapp into the hymn-book which he prepared for the use of the State Church. Like many of the Württemberg Pietists, Hahn believed in the final restoration of all things—Haug, Die Sekte der Michelianer, in Studien über die Pietisten Württembergs vom übrigen W. vol. xi: Hiegen, Hist. theolog. Zeitschrift, 1841; Romer, Kirch. Geschihten Württembirs; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. v, 472. (A. J. S.)

Ha't (Gen. xii, 8; iii, 3). See Al.

Hail. See Ben-hail.

Hail! (χίλιος, ροζος, as often rendered; "farewell!" also), a salutation, importing a wish for the welfare of the person addressed (Luke i, 28; in mockery, Matt. xxvii, 29, etc.). It is now seldom used among us, but was customary among our Saxon ancestors, and import- ed as much as "joy to you!" or, "health to you!" including in the term health all kinds of prosperity. —Cal- met, s. v. See GREETING.

Hail (!!I, barad), χιλιαζω, or congealed rain, is the symbol of the divine vengeance upon kingdoms and nations, the enemies of God and of his people. As a hail-storm is generally accompanied by lightning, and seems to be produced by a certain electrical state of the atmosphere, so we find in Scripture hail and fire, i.e. lightning, mentioned together (Exod. ix, 23; comp. Job xxxix, 25; Ps. cvi, 32; lxxvii, 48; cxlvii, 8; xviii, 13). See PLAGUES OF EGYPT. That hail, though uncommon, is not absolutely unknown in Egypt, we have the testimony of Mansleben and Manconys, who had heard it thunder during their stay at Alexand- ria, the former on the 1st of January, and the latter on the 17th and 18th of the same month; on the same day it also hailed there. Perry also remarks that it hails, though seldom, in January and February at Cairo. Po- cocke even saw hail mingled with rain fall at Fium in February (compare Exod. xxi, 34). Korte also saw hail fall. Jomard says, "I have several times seen even hail at Alexandria."" Since his time, view of Mount Sinai into that country, some of whose frozen stones he gathered; "and so," he says, "I drank iced water in Egypt." Hail was also the means made use of by God for defeating an army of the kings of Canaan (Josh. x, 11). In this passage it is said, "The Lord cast down upon them an exceeding great hail with fire upon the ground"—i.e. hail-stones of an extraordinary size, and capable of doing dreadful execution in their fall from heaven. Some commentators are of opinion that the miracle consisted of real stones, from the cir- cumstance that stones only are mentioned in the pre- ceding clause; but this is evidently erroneous, there are many instances on record of hail-stones of enormous size and weight falling in different countries, so as to do immense injury, and to destroy the lives of animals and men. In Palestine and the neighboring regions, hail-stones are frequent and severe in desertous districts and among the coasts; but in the plains and deserts hail scarcely ever falls. In the elevated region of Northern Persia the hail-stones are frequently so vi- olen as to destroy the cattle in the fields; and in Com. Porter's Letters from Constantinople and its Environs (i, 44) there is an interesting account of a terrific hail- storm that occurred on the Bosphorus in the summer of 1831, which fully bears out the above and other Scrip- tural representations. Many of the lumps picked up af- ter the storm weighed three quarters of a pound. In Isa. xxxviii, 2, which denotes the approaching de- struction by Shalmaneser, the same images are employ- ed. Hail is mentioned as a divine judgment by the prophet Haggai (ii, 17). The destruction of the Assy- rian army is pointed out in Isa. xxx, 30. Ezekiel (xiii, 11) represents the wall daubed with untempered mortar as being destroyed by great hail-stones. Also in his prophecy against Gog (xxxvii, 22) he employs the same symbol (compare Rev. xx, 9). The hail and fire mingled with blood, mentioned in Rev. viii, 7, are supposed to denote the commotions of nations. The great hail, in Rev. vi, 19, denotes great and heavy judgments on the enemies of Christ and his church; and the grievous storm, in xvi, 21, represents something similar, and far more severe. So Horace (Odys., i, 2); comp. Virgil (En. iv, 120, 161; ix, 669) and Livy (ii, 62, and xxvi, 11).

Hail-stone (!!I, 'ben barad', a stone of hail), See above.

Haimé, John, a soldier in the English army, and one of Mr. Wesley's preachers. He was born at Shaftesbury, Dorsetshire, in 1710, and was bred a gardener, and afterwards a button-maker. From early life he lived in great wickedness, and in constant agony of convic- tion. In 1739 he enlisted in a regiment of dragoons, and some time after he was converted; but, being very ignorant, he alternately lost and regained his hope, but constantly labored to save others. At last he heard and conversed with Mr. Wesley, much to his comfort. The regiment was sent to Flanders in 1743, from which time till Feb. 1746, he was in despair and misery. At that time, while marching into Germany, his evi- dence of pardon returned, and, encouraged by Mr. Wes- ley's letters, he began to preach in the army. At the battle of Dettingen he showed great gallantry. In May, 1744, the army went to Brussels, and here his labors were continued (Exod. ix, 29; comp. Job xxxix, 22, 23; Ps. cv, 32; lxxvii, 48; cxlvii, 8; xviii, 13). See PLAGUES OF EGYPT. That hail, though uncommon, is not absolutely unknown in Egypt, we have the testimony of Mansleben and Manconys, who had heard it thunder during their stay at Alexand- ria, the former on the 1st of January, and the latter on the 17th and 18th of the same month; on the same day
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that date he lived for twenty years "in agony of soul," yet all the time, in Germany, England, Ireland, he ceased not with all the energy of despair to labor, preaching often 20 or 30 times a week, and seeing thousands of souls converted under his efforts, while his own soul was filled with anguish and darkness. At the end of this time he once more obtained the evidence of acceptance with God. He died Aug. 18, 1784, at Whitchurch, in Hampshire. — Jackson, Lives of Early Methodist Preachers, i, 147; Stevens, History of Methodism, vol. ii.

Hair (properly נָעַר, nār, ūnār) is frequently mentioned in Scripture, chiefly with reference to the head. In scarcely anything has the caprice of fashion been more strikingly displayed than in the various forms which the taste of different countries and ages has prescribed for disposing of this natural covering of the head. See Head.

1. Of the more ancient nations, the Egyptians appear to have been most uniform in their habits regarding it, and, in some respects also, the most peculiar. We learn from Herodotus (ii, 86, iii, 12) that they let the hair of their head and beard grow only when they were in mourning, and that they shaved it at other times. Even in the case of young children they were wont to shave the head, leaving only a few locks on the front, sides, and back, as an emblem of youth. In the case of nubile children, those on the sides were covered and indeed in a bag, which hung down conspicuously as a badge of princely rank (Wilkinson, ii, 327, 328). "So

Hair (properly נָעַר, nār, ūnār) is frequently mentioned in Scripture, chiefly with reference to the head. In scarcely anything has the caprice of fashion been more strikingly displayed than in the various forms which the taste of different countries and ages has prescribed for disposing of this natural covering of the head. See Head.

1. Of the more ancient nations, the Egyptians appear to have been most uniform in their habits regarding it, and, in some respects also, the most peculiar. We learn from Herodotus (ii, 86, iii, 12) that they let the hair of their head and beard grow only when they were in mourning, and that they shaved it at other times. Even in the case of young children they were wont to shave the head, leaving only a few locks on the front, sides, and back, as an emblem of youth. In the case of nubile children, those on the sides were covered and indeed in a bag, which hung down conspicuously as a badge of princely rank (Wilkinson, ii, 327, 328). "So

Egyptian Manner of wearing the Hair. (From statues of an officer of rank and his wife or sister, 19th dynasty. British Museum.)

particular were they," says Wilkinson, "on this point, that to have neglected it was a subject of reproach and ridicule; and whenever they intended to convey the idea of a man of low condition, or a slovenly person, the artists represented him with a beard" (Ancient Egyptians, iii, 357). Slaves also, when brought from foreign countries, having beards on them at their arrival, "were obliged to conform to the cleanly habits of their masters; their beards and heads were shaved, and they adopted a close cap." This universal practice among the Egyptians explains the incidental notice in the life of Joseph, that before going in to Pharaoh he shaved himself (Gen. xii, 14); in most other places he would have combed his hair and trimmed his beard, but on no account have shaved it. The practice was carried there to such a length probably from the tendency of the climate to generate the fleas and other vermin which nestle in the hair; and hence also the priest, who were to be the highest embodiments of cleanliness, were wont to shave their whole bodies every third day (Herod. ii, 37). It is singular, however, and seems to in-

dicate that notions of cleanliness did not alone regulate the practice, that the women still wore their natural hair, long and plaited, often reaching down in the form of strings to the bottom of the shoulder-blades. Many of the female mummies have been found with their hair thus plaited, and in no observation. The modern ladies of Egypt come but little behind their sisters of olden time in this respect (see Lane's Modern Egyptians, i, 60). Yet what was remarkable in the inhabitants of a hot climate, while they removed their natural hair, they were accustomed to wear wigs, which were so constructed that "they far surpassed," says Wilkinson, "the comfort and coolness of the modern turban, the reticulated texture of the groundwork on which the hair was fastened allowing the heat of the head to escape, while the hair effectually protected it from the sun" (Anc. Egypt. iii, 304). Josephus (Jr. 6, § 11) notices an instance of false hair (συντελετὴς κεφαλής) being used for the purpose of disguise. Among the Medes the wig was worn by the upper classes (Xenoph. Cyrop. i, 3, 2). See Head-dress.

2. The precisely opposite practice, as regards men, would seem to have prevailed among the ancient Assyrians, and, indeed, among the Asians generally. In the Assyrian sculptures the hair always appears long, combed closely down upon the head, and shielding itself in a mass of curls on the shoulders. The beard was allowed to grow to its full length, and, descending low on the breast, was divided into two or three rows of curls. The mustache was also carefully trimmed and curled at the end (Layard's Nineveh, ii, 327). Herodotus likewise testifies that the Babylonians wore their hair long (i, 196). The very long hair, however, that appears in the figures on the monuments is supposed to have been partly false, a sort of head-dress to add to the effect of the natural hair. The excessive pains bestowed by the ancient nations in arranging the hair and beard appears almost fantastic in contrast with the stern, martial character (Layard's Nineveh, ii, 254). See Beard. The practice of the modern Arabs, with regard to the length of their hair varieties; generally the men allow it to grow to its natural length, the tresses hanging down to the breast, and sometimes to the waist, affording substantial protection to the head and neck against the violence of the sun's rays (Burckhardt's Notes, i, 49; Wellsted's Travels, i, 38, 55, 78).

3. Among the ancient Greeks, the general admiration of long hair, whether in men or women, is evidenced by the expression καρυστορόφωντος άγαλματις ("well-combed Greeks"), so often occurring in Homer; and by the saying, which passed current among the people, that hair was the cheapest of ornaments; and in the representations of their divinities, especially Bacchus and Apollo, whose long locks were a symbol of perpetual youth. But the practice varied. While the Spartans

Grecian Manner of wearing the Hair. (Hope's Costumes.)

in earlier times wore the hair long, and men as well as women were wont to have it tied in a knot over the crown of the head, at a later period they were accustomed to wear it short. Among the Athenians, also, it is understood the later practice varied somewhat from
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arose a variety of superstitious and emblematic observances, such as shaving parts of the head, or cropping it in a particular form; parents dedicating the hair of infants (Tertullian, De Animis) to the gods; young women en their marriage in hair, after a sacred campaign: sailors after deliverance from a storm; hanging it up on consecrated trees, or depositing it in temples; burying it in the tomb of friends, as Achilles did at the funeral of Patroclus; besides shaving, cutting off, or plucking it out, as some people did; or allowing it to grow in sorcery, as was the practice with others, according as the calamity that befall them was common or extraordinary, and their grief was mild or violent. See CUTTINGS IN THE FLESH

4. The Hebrews were fully alive to the importance of the hair as an element of personal beauty, whether as seen in the “curled locks, black as a raven,” of youth (Cant. vii. 4), or in the “crown of glory” that enshrined the head of old age (Prov. xvi. 31). Yet, while they encouraged the growth of hair, they observed the natural distinction between the sexes by allowing the woman to wear it long (Luke vii. 37, John xii. 2, 1 Cor. xi. 6 sq.), while the men restrained theirs by frequent clippings to the moderate length. This distinction between the Hebrews and the surrounding nations, especially the Egyptians, arose, no doubt, partly from natural taste, but partly also from legal enactments, and to some extent from certain national usages of wide extent.

(a.) Clipping the hair in a certain manner, and offering the locks, was in early times connected with religious or superstitious observances. The Arabsians practised a peculiar tonsure in honor of their god Orotal (Herod. iii. 8), and hence the Hebrews were forbidden to “round the corners (יוֹסָה, lit. the extremity) of their heads” (Lev. xix. 27), meaning the locks along the forehead and temples, and behind the ears. See Alteeneck, Coma Hebraearum, Vithe, 1895.

(b.) This tonsure is described in the Sept. by the expression משרות דם מסם (masseos daraim), probably derived from the Hebrew מַרְשֵׁה (mashere), comp. Bochart, Caman, i. 6, p. 379. That the practice of the Arabsians was well known to the Hebrews appears from the expression מַרְשֵׁה וְמַרְשֵׁה, round as to the locks, by which they are described (Jer. ix. 26; xxv. 23; xlix. 32; see marginal translation of the A. V.). The prohibition against cutting off the hair on the head of the priest (Deut. xiv. 14) was probably grounded on a similar reason. See CONSEL.

(b) In addition to these regulations, the Hebrews dreaded baldness, as it was frequently the result of leprosy (Lev. xiii. 40 sq.), and hence formed one of the disqualifications for the priesthood (Lev. xxii. 20, Sept.). See BALINESS. The rule imposed upon the priests, and probably followed by the rest of the community, was that the hair should be polled (בְּשַׁבֵּע, Ezek. xlv. 20), neither being shaved, nor allowed to grow too long (Lev. xxii. 5; Ezek. Lc). What was the precise length usually worn we have no means of ascertaining; but from various expressions, such as הַשָּׁבֶע (šāḇe’), lit. to let loose the hair or the head (=solevere crines, Virgil, Æn. iii. 68; xi. 85; demus laetus more capillos, Ovid, Ep. x. 137) by unbinding the head-band and letting it fall dishevelled. The same word is used as a V., unweave, your hair or your robe, as when it was done in mourning (compare Ezek. xxvi. 17); and again הַשָּׁבֶע, to unweave, the ear previous to making any communication of importance (1 Sam. xx. 2; xxi. 8, A. V., margin), as though the hair fell over the ear, we may conclude that men wore their hair somehow what longer than is usual with us. The word בְּשַׁבֵּע, used as hair (Numb. vi. 5; Ezek. xlv. 20), is especially indicated by the phrase מָשָׂה תְנַעֲרָה, on Lev. xxi. 10). In 2 Kings 1.8, “a hairy man:” literally, “a lord of hair,” seems rather to refer to the flowing locks of Elijah (q. v.). This might be doubtful, even with the support of the Sept. and Josephus—av-
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The approach of age was marked by a sprinkling (κοπάσμα, Hom. vii, 9; comp. a similar use of spargere, Propert. iii, 4, 24) of gray hairs, which soon overspread the whole head (Gen. xiii, 38; xlv, 29; 1 Kings ii, 6, 9; Prov. xvi, 31; xx, 29). The reference to the almond in Eccl. xii, 5, has been explained of the white blossoms of that tree, as emblematic of old age: it may be observed, however, that the color of the flower is pink rather than white, and that the verb in that passage, according to high authorities (Gesen. and Hitzig), does not bear the sense of blossoming at all. See ALMOND. Pure white hair was deemed characteristic of the divine majesty (Dan. vii, 9; Rev. i, 14). See GRAY.

The chief beauty of the hair consisted in curls, whether of a natural or artificial character. The Hebrew terms are highly expressive: to omit the word "locks"—rendered "locks" in Cant. iv, 13, 3; vi, 7; and Isa. lxvii, 2; but more probably meaning a veil—were "locks" (Cant. vii, 11), properly pendulous flexible tresses (according to the Sept., βαρεία, the shoots of the palm-tree) which supplied an image of the comata pendula; הַפְּרַח (Ezek. viii, 8), a similar image borrowed from the curve of a blossom; מַחְלֵק (Cant. iv, 9), a lock falling over the shoulders like a chain of ear-pendants (in uno crine colli sui, Vulgate better, perhaps, than the A. V., "with one chain of thy neck"); והַפְּרַח (Cant. vii, 5, A. V. "galleries"), properly the channels by which water was brought to the flocks, which supplied an image either of the comata flaminis, or of the regularity in which the locks were arranged. הַפְּרַח (Cant. viii, 6), again an expression for comata pendula, borrowed from the threads hanging down from an unfinished roof; and, lastly, הַפְּרַח (Isa. iii, 24, A. V. "well set hair"), properly poised work, i.e. gracefully curved locks. With regard to the mode of dressing the hair we have no very precise information; the terms used are of a general character, as of Jezebel (2 Kings ix, 30), בַּעַר אַתִּיה, i.e. she adorned her head; of Judith (x, 3), בַּעַר אַתִּיה, i.e. arranged (the A. V. has "braided"), and the Vulg. discriminans, here used in a technical sense in the reference to the discriminans or hair-pin: of Herod (Joseph. Ant. xiv, 9, 4), κομμουμινὸς τῆς συνθέσεως τῆς κούρας, and of those who adopted feminine fashions (War, iv, 9, 10), κόμας συνθέτομεν. The terms used in the N. T. (Acts, ii, 3, 4; 31 Pet. iii, 3) are of a general character: Schleusner (Lex. s. v.) understands them of curling rather than plaiting. The arrangement of Samson's hair into seven locks, or more properly braids (ῥαφής, from ραφέω, to interexchange; Sept. κοιμάω; Judg. xvi, 18, 19), involves the practice of plaiting, which was also familiar to the Egyptians (Wilkinson, ii, 36) and Greeks (Homer, Iliad, xiv, 176). The locks were probably kept in their place by a fillet, as in Egypt (Wilkinson, L. c.).

Ancient Egyptian Ladies with their hair bound by fillets.
Ornaments were worked into the hair, as practised by the modern Egyptians, who "add to each braid three black silk cords with little ornaments of gold" (Lane, i, 71): the Sept. understands the term מִשְׂרָסָה (Isa. iii, 18, A. V., "cauls") as applying to such ornaments (judgings.). Ver. 22. ἅπαξ λειτουργίαν. Hoyland approves of this, and conjectures that they were sun-shaped, i. e. circular, as distinct from the "round tires like the moon," i. e. the crescent-shaped ornaments used for necklaces. The Arabian women attach small bells to the tresses of their hair (Niebuhr, Trau, i, 138). Other terms, sometimes understood as applying to the hair, are of doubtful significance, e. g. מִשְׂרָסָה (Isa. iii, 22; "cauls; "crimping-pins"); more probably парти (as in 2 Kings v, 29; מְשֶׁרֶס, Isa. iii, 29; "head-bands"); bridal girdles, according to Schröder and other authorities: מַנָּנָה (Isa. iii, 20, Vulg. discriminativa, i. e. pins used for keeping the hair parted; comp. Jerome in Refia, iii, cap. ult.), more probably turbans. Combs and hair-pins are mentioned in the Talmud; the Egyptian combs were made of wood and double, one side having large, and the other small teeth (Wilkinson, ii, 348); from the ornamental devices worked on them we may infer that they were worn in the hair. Each of the above terms in its place. In the Talmud frequent references are made to women who were professional hair-dressers for their own sex, and the name applied to whom was מַנָּה (probably from mainah; Schottl., "beautifying, ornamenting") (Maimon, in Tr. Shabbath, 6, 6; comp. also Wagenseil, Sotah, p. 137; Jahn, Archsel, pt. i, vol. ii, p. 114). The Hebrews, like other nations of antiquity, anointed the hair profusely with ointments, which were generally compounded of various aromatic ingredients (Ruth iii, 3; 2 Sam. xiv, 2; Ps. xcvii, 3; xlv, 7; xxii, 10; Ezek. xvi, 12; Hosea ii, 24); more especially on the occasion of festivities or hospitality (Matt. vii, 17; xvii, 7; Luke vii, 46; comp. Joseph. Ant. xix, 4, 1, χρυσόμυς μορός τῆς κεφαλῆς, ὡς ἀπό συννομισμοῦ). It is, perhaps, in reference to the glossy appearance so imparted to it that the hair is described as purple (Cant. v, 7). See OINTMENT.

It appears to have been the custom of the Jews in our Saviour's time to swing the hair by the hair (v. 36), much as the Egyptian women still swing by the side-lock, and the men by their beards (Lane, i, 52, 71, notes). See OVAL.

Hair was employed by the Hebrews as an image of what was least valuable in man's person (1 Sam. xiv, 45; 2 Sam. xiv, 11; 1 Kings i, 30; Matt. x, 30; Luke xii, 7; xxii, 18; Acts xxxvii, 34); as well as of what was inexpressible (Ps. xi, 12, lxix, 4), or particularly fine (Judg. xx, 16). In Isa. vii, 20, it represents the various productions of the field, trees, crops, etc. like ἄνθος εὐσεβέστατος of Callim. Dion, 41, or the human comans of Stat. Theb. v, 502. White hair, or the hoary head, is the symbol of the respect due to age (Lev. xiv, 22; Prov. xvi, 31). Hence we find in Dan. vii, 9, God and upon him the title of "Ancient of Days" (comp. Rev. i, 14), the gray locks there represented being the symbol of authority and honor. The shaving of the head, on the contrary, signifies affliction, poverty, and disgrace. Thus "cutting off the hair" is a figure used to denote the entire destruction of a people by the righteous judgments of Providence (Isa. vii, 20). "Gray hairs here and there on Ephraim" portended the decline and fall of the kingdom of Israel (Hos. vii, 9). "Hair like women's" forms part of the description of the Apocalyptic locusts (Rev. ix, 8), and is added to complete the idea of ferocity of the anti-Christian troop of cavalry, bristling with shaggy hair (comp. "rough caterpillars," i. e. hairy locusts, Jer. ii, 27); long and undressed hair in later times being regarded as an image of barbaric rudeness (Hengstenberg, ad loc. Rev.).

Ha'katan, or rather Katan (Heb. Kathan, אָטָא, with the article ה, the little or junior; Sept. ἄκτεν- ταῖς, Vulg. Eccentes), a descendant (or native) of Azagad and father of Johanan, which last returned with 110 male retainers from Babylon with Ezra (Ezra xiii, 12). B.C. ante 459.

Hakkore. See EN-HAK-KORE.

Hak'kaz (1 Chron. xxiv, 10). See KOZ.

Hak'upa (Chaliph, Ḥalīf, Ḥālep, crooked; but according to Furst, inclement; and Chaldaizing form: Sept. ἀκασμάται and ἀγάπα, one of the Nethinim whose descendants returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 51; Neh. vii, 58). B.C. ante 586.

Ha'lah (Hebrew Chalach, Ḥālā, signifies unknown; Sept. Ἀλαί and Ἀλαῖ, Vulg. Hala; but in 1 Chron. v
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Halek (Heb. Chalak, הַלַּכָּה, smooth; Sept. Χαλακίαν and Χαλικη, the name (or, rather, epithet) of a hill (הַלַּכָּה, both with the art. = the bare mount) near the territory of Seir, at the southern extremity of Canaan, among the conquests of Joshua (Josh. xi, 17; xii, 1); so called, doubtless, from its bald appearance, making it a landmark in that direction. Hence it is used by Joshua, as Beersheba was used by later writers, to mark the southern limit of the country—"So Joshua took all that land . . . from the Mount Halak, that goeth up to Seir, even unto Baal-gad, in the valley of Lebanon, under Mount Hermon." The situation of the town is unknown; probably near Edom. It lay east of Edom, and lay on the southern border of Palestine; it must, consequently, have been in, or very near, the great valley of the Arabah. The expression, "that goeth up to Seir" (יהוה נַעֲשֵׂה כָּלָּה, is worthy of note. Seir is the mountainous province of Edom [see Seir]; and Mount Halak would seem to have been connected with it, as if running upwards to it, or joining it to a lower district. About ten miles south of the Dead Sea a line of white cliffs, varying in height from 50 to 150 feet, runs completely across the Arabah. As seen from the north, the cliffs resemble a ridge of hills (and in this aspect the word יְבִי might perhaps be applied to them), bursting in deep valleys, and connecting the mountains of Bashan with the mountains of Seir on the east. It is possibly this ridge which is referred to in Num. xxiv, 5, 4, and Josh. xv, 2, 3, under the name "Ascent of Akrabbim," and as marking the south-eastern border of Judah; and it might well be called the bald mountains, which extends to Seir. It was also a national and religious boundary, and was the mark of the boundary of Palestine, as it is near Kadesh-barnea on the one side, and the northern ridge of Edom on the other. To this ridge, bounding the land in the valley on the south, is appropriately opposed on the north, "Baal-gad, in the land of Bashan, under Mount Hermon" (Keil on Josh. xi, 17). The cliffs, and the scenery of the surrounding region, are minutely described by Robinson (Bib. Res. ii, 113, 116, 120). Still, the peculiar term, "the bald mountain," seems to require some more distinctive eminence, perhaps in this general range. Schwarz thinks it may be identified with Jebel Madura, on the south frontier of Judah, between the south end of the Dead Sea and wady Gaian (Palestine, p. 29); marked on Robinson's map a little south of the famous pass Nukh es-Sufah.

Haldane, James Alexander, brother of the following, was born at Dundee July 14, 1768. Having imbibed the family passion for the sea, he was appointed captain of the Melville Castle in 1798. The vessel, however, did not sail for four months, and during that interval a great change took place in captain Haldane's character. He became serious and thoughtful on the subject of religion, and, having determined to follow the example of his brother, who had already relinquished the seafaring life, he disposed of his command for £5000, and his share in the property of the ship and stores for £2000 more. With this fortune of £15,000 he retired with his wife to Scotland in 1794, and gave himself up to a laborious course of study, chiefly on the Old Testament. Several years elapsed before his views were established; but at length he attained to a knowledge of the truth as well as peace in believing. Mr. James Haldane, having plenty of time at command, oc- cuivered himself with many plans of Christian usefulness; among which was the opening of a Sabbath-school at the Kirkkir; in- cipient preaching, at first in the villages around Edin-burgh, and afterwards in the other large towns of Scot- land, were the chief. His principal coadjutor in these labors of love was John Campbell, the African traveller. In company with the zeal of these Christian friends Mr. Haldane made successful tours throughout all Scotland as far as Orkney, and those who were awakened by their preaching were, through the liberality of Mr. Robert Haldane, accommodated with suitable places of worship. Mr. James eventually accepted the office of stated pastor in the Tabernacle, Rose-bank Walk, Edinburgh, and in that capacity he exercised, without any emolument, all the public and private duties of a minister with unbroken fidelity and zeal for a period of fifty years. Although he vacillated on some points of Church government, he and his brother remained steadfast in their adherence to the general principles of the Scotch Baptists. He died in Edinburgh Feb. 8, 1851. Besides a number of controversial tracts, he published A View of the social Worship of the first Christians (Edinb. 1805, 12mo)—Men's Responsibility and the Extent of the Atonement (Edinb. 1842, 12mo)—Inscriptions from Egypt (Edinb. 1842, 12mo)—The Inspiration of the Scriptures (Edinb. 1846, 12mo).—Jamesion, Religious Biography, p. 242; Rich, Biog. Diet. s. v. Haldane; Lives of the Brothers Haldane (1852, 8vo); Belcher, Memoir of Robert and James Al- exander Haldane, etc. (Ames. Tract Soc.); New Englander, April, 1861, p. 269. See Independents, III.

Haldane, Robert, an eminent Christian philanthropist, was born in London (of Scotch parents) Feb. 29, 1764, and inherited a large estate. His manhood was spent in the navy; he was afterwards an enthusiastic Democrat in politics, and welcomed the French Revolution. After this excitement subsided he was converted, and resolved on dedicating his life to missionary work in India. He was chosen field-preacher, and having secured the promised co-operation of Misses. Innes, Ewing, and Bogue, of Gosport, to whom he guaran- teed adequate stipends, he applied to the Indian gov- ernment to sanction his enterprise. The East India Company directors, after much deliberation, resolved that the superintendents of Hindostan should not be dis- turbed. Mr. Haldane now determined to employ his resources in spreading the Gospel at home, and, in con- junction with Rowland Hill and other eminent evan- gelists, he was instrumental in awakening an extensive revival of religious spirit throughout the Scotch Assembly (1800) on field-preaching, and discour- aged the revival. Mr. Haldane therefore seceded from the Established Church, and at his own expense erected places of worship, under the name of Tabernacles, in all...
Hale, Du

See Du Hale.

Hale, John, a Congregational minister, was born June 3, 1636, in Charlestown, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1657, and was ordained first pastor of the newly-formed Church at Beverley, Sept. 20, 1667, where he remained until his death, May 15, 1700. He published several Sermons (1684) and two addresses. His《Exposition of the Epistle to the Romans》(London, 1839, 2 vols., 12mo)——Verbal Inspiration (6th ed. 1853, 12mo)——and various controversial pamphlets. He died Dec. 12, 1842.—Jameison, Religious Biography, p. 240; Rich, Biog. Dictionary; Darling, Lives of the Masters Haldane (London, 1852, 8vo); Belcher, Memoir of Robert and James Alexander Haldane (Amer. Tract. Soc.).

Halde, Du

See Du Hale.

Hale, Sir Matthew, was born at Alderley, Cheshire, Nov. 1, 1699, admitted at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, in 1626, and at Lincoln's Inn in 1629. In 1633 (under the Commonwealth) he was made one of the judges of the Common Bench, and in 1671 he was elected to be chief justice of the King's Bench. He died Dec. 25, 1675. He was a learned lawyer, an upright judge, and a Christian. The only cloud on his memory as a criminal judge is the notorious fact of his having condemned two wretched women for witchcraft, at the assizes at Bury St. Edmund's, in the year 1665. Hale, in the course of the trial, avowed himself a believer in witchcraft, and the jury found the prisoners guilty, notwithstanding many impartial by-standers declared that they disbelieved the charge. No reprieve was granted, and the prisoners were executed. Hale was a voluminous writer. Of his legal publications we make no mention here; besides them he wrote An Abstract of the Chief Decisions:——A Discourse of Contemplations, Moral and Divine:——The Knowledge of Christ crucified (new ed. Glass, 1828, 12mo). These and other minor pieces are gathered in his Works, Moral and Religious, edited by the Rev. T. Thirlwall, M.A. (London, 1839, 2 vols., 8vo). See Burnet, Life of Sir M. Hale (London, 1862, 12mo) also prefixed to his Works, above named); Baxter, Notes on the Life and Death of Sir M. Hale (London, 1862, 12mo); reprinted, with Hale's Thoughts on Religion, London, 1805, 12mo; Campbell, Lives of the Chief Justices; English Cyclopaedia; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, n. s. v. a.

Hales, John, of Eton, usually called the "ever-memorable," an eminent English scholar and divine, was born in Bath, 1584, and educated at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. In 1606 he was elected fellow of Meriton College, and was employed by Sir H. Savile in the preparation of his fine edition of Chrysostom, published in 1613. His attainments in Greek gained him the professorship of that language at Oxford in 1612, and in 1619 he was ordained and became fellow of Eton. In 1618 he accompanied Sir D. Carleton to the Hague as his chaplain, and attended him to the Synod of Dort (q. v.). He went to that celebrated body a Calvinist, and left it an Arminian, as is shown by a letter of Farindon (q. v.), prefixed to Hale's Golden Remains, in which he says: "I well know that the general synod of Dort at Emaus, as I have often told me" (see Jackson, Life of Farindon, p. xlix). In 1636 he wrote for Chillingworth a tract on Schism, in which he rebuked the claims of high Episcopacy. Laud sought to gain over the great Greek scholar, and offered him any prevenient he pleased. In 1639 he was made canon of Windsor, but was deprived in 1642. Refusing to subscribe to the "covenant," he was compelled to wander from place to place, and at last he had to sell his library for bread. He died May 19, 1656. No man of his time had greater reputation for scholarship and piety. Bishop Pearson speaks of him as a "man of so great a sharpness, quickness, and subtility of wit as ever this or perhaps any nation bred ... a man of vast and illimitated knowledge, of a severe and profound judgment." He wrote unwillingly, and published but few tracts in his lifetime; but after his death, a number of his sermons and discourses on pieces were collected under the title of Golden Remains of the Ever-memorable John Hales (London, 1659, 8vo; best ed. 1673, 4to); his Letters concerning the Synod of Dort are published in the edition of 1678. An edition of his Whole Works (with the language modernized) was published by Lord Halies in 1765 (3 vols. 12mo). See Des Maizeaux, Life of Hales (London, 1719, 8vo); General Biog. Dictionary; Jackson, Life of Farindon (prefixed to Farindon's Sermons, vol. i); Wood, Athenae Oxonienses, ii, 124; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. v, 476-7; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, n. s. v.

Haliburton. See Halyburton.

Half-covenant, the withholding the cup from the laity in the Lord's Supper. This practice of the Church of Rome was first authorized by Innocent III., and then made obligatory by the Council of Constance; and one motive for the innovation appears to have been to exalt the priesthood by giving them some exclusive privilege even in communion at the Lord's table. Tran-substitution, or half-covenant, in one kind only, are ingeniously linked together. Romanists believe that Christ, whole and entire, his soul, body, and divinity, is contained in either species, and in the smallest particle of each. Hence they infer that, whether the communicant receive the bread or the wine, he enjoys the full benefit of the sacrament. Therefore, to support the monstrous dogma, the sacrament is divided in two: transubstantiation justifies communion in one kind, and communion in one kind proves the truth of transubstantiation. In thus denying the cup to the laity, the institution of Christ is mutilated, the express law of the Gospel perverted, and the practice of the apostles abandoned. The withholding the cup was one of the grievances which induced the Hussites to resist the usurpations of the Church of Rome" (Farrar, Eccles. Dict. n. s. v.). See Lord's Supper.

Half-way Covenant, a scheme adopted by the Congregational churches of New England in order to extend the privileges of church membership and infant baptism beyond the pale of actual communicants at the Lord's table. Stoddard, of Northampton, vindicated it, and Jonathan Edwards opposed it. This struggle caused Edwards' removal from Northampton. It is now abandoned by the New England Congregationalists—Hurst, Rationalism, p. 538; Upham, Ratio Disciplinæ, xxii. See Congregationalists; Edwards, Jonathan.

Hal'bul (Heb. Ḥal'bul, כלאב, εὐγήρων, etymol. doubtful, but, according to Fürst, full of hollowes; Sept. Ἀλεξάνδρος. v.}
HALL occurs in the A.V. of the N.T. three times; twice (Matt. xxviii, 27; Mark xv, 16) in reference to the πρατηρίων, prætorium, or residence of the Roman governor at Jerusalem, which was either the palace built by Herod, or the town abode of Caesar (Acts xxiii, 23). Mark adds to the word αἰγίλ, as he is wont in other cases, an explanatory phrase, δὲ ἐν πρατηρίῳ (Vulg. atriium prætorii). In Luke xxi, 65, αἰγίλά means the open court or quadrangle belonging to the high-priest's house, such as was common to Oriental dwellings. It has the same meaning in Matt. xxxvi, 69, and Mark xiv, 66, and in both passages is incorrectly rendered "palace" in the A.V., as the adverb ἡκώ and κατώ plainly distinguish the αἰγίλα from the αἰγόω to which it was attached (Luke xxi, 54). So in Luke xvi, 21. In John x, 16, it means a "sheep-fold," and in Rev. xvi, 2, the outer "court" of the Temple. The αἰγίλα was entered from the street by a παρασκεύα or vestibule (Mark xiv, 68), through a πύλη or portal (Matt. xxvi, 71), in which was a δύο or wicket (John xviii, 16; Acts xii, 13).—Kitto, s.v. Αἰγίλα is the equivalent for Στέπα, an inclosed or fortified space (Geisensow, Thes. p. 512), in many places in the G.T. where the Vulgate uses Α. V. The verb νεῖλος, "village," or atrium, "court," chiefly of the temple or Temple. See Court. The hall or court of a house or palace would probably be an inclosed but uncovered space, impluvium, on a lower level than the apartments of the lowest floor which looked into it. See House.

HALL, Charles, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born at Williamsport, Pa., June 23, 1797, and graduated at Hamilton College in 1824 with great distinction. He passed his theological studies at Princeton, was licensed in 1827, and appointed soon after assistant secretary to the Home Missionary Society. In 1832 he went to Europe for his health, visited most of that continent, and returned after a short absence to his accustomed duties. He died Oct. 31, 1853. He edited for several years The Home Missionary; and published A Treat on Plans and Motives for the Extension of Sabbath Schools (1829);—The Daily Verse Expositor (1832);—A Plan for systematic Benevolence; and A Sermon on the World's Conversion (1841).—Sprague, Amos, iv, 730.

HALL, Gordon, a Congregational minister and missionary to India. He was born in Granville (now Tolland), Mass., April 8, 1781, and graduated from Williams College in 1809 with the first honors of his class. At college he was acquainted with James Wilson, Ebenzer Porter, J. Mills and James Richards, afterwards missionaries. He commenced the study of theology under Ebenzer Porter, afterwards president of Andover Theological Seminary, was licensed to preach in 1809, and supplied for a time a church at Woodbury. But from the time of his acquaintance with Mills it seems he had purposed to become a missionary. In 1810 he went to Andover, was ordained at Salem Feb. 6, 1812, and sailed on the 18th from Philadelphia with Nott and Rice, arriving in Calcutta on the 17th of June. The East India Company refused the privilege of landing in its territory, and Messrs. Hall and Nott embarked for Bombay, where they arrived Feb. 11, 1813. Orders from the governor general followed, commanding them to be sent to England; but by the courage and wisdom of Mr. Hall's memorials, the governor was influenced to repeal his order, and Mr. Hall remained at Bombay zealously and with great success until March 20, 1826, when he was suddenly cut off by cholera. Mr. Hall possessed fine abilities, ardent piety, great courage and self-sacrifice. His inimitable spirit, and the ability of his appeals to the governor general, were the means by which they obtained the way for the furtherance of Christianity in India.—American Missionary Memorial, p. 41. (G. L. T.)

HALL, Joseph, D.D., bishop of Norwich, was born at Asby-de-In-Touch July 1, 1574, and educated at Emanuel College, Cambridge. While rector of Halsted,
In Suffolk, he composed his "Contemplations," which procured him the patronage of prince Henry and the rectory of Waltham. In 1616 he went to Paris as chaplain to the English ambassador. On his return he was appointed to a James to the deanery of Worcester (1617), and in the following year he accompanied his royal master into Scotland, when that monarch made a progress into the northern part of his kingdom to prosecute his irremediable scheme of erecting Episcopacy on the Scottish model. Northerners, as the most unpopular, however, of that measure fell upon Hall, whose character and principles secured him the esteem and respect of the most eminent Scotchmen of the day. He was commanded to go over into Holland to attend the Synod of Dort in 1618; but the protracted meetings of that convocation made so much and so great impressions on his health, and after two months he returned with an impaired constitution to England. In 1627 he was raised to the see of Exeter, and afterwards, without any solicitation, to that of Norwich in 1641. Amidst all the ecclesiastical tyranny of Laud, bishop Hall preserved his moderation. The bishop, however, had himself no sense of trial. When the popular outcry "No bishops" was raised, and an armed mob marched against the House of Lords, Hall, with eleven of the lords spiritual, joined in protesting against the measures which were passed in their absence; and the impeachment which had long been made a ground of impeachment, he, with his protesting brethren, consigned to the Tower. He was released in June following on giving bail for £5000. He continued for a year to exercise his episcopal functions in Norwich; but the popular tide again set in, his house was attacked, his property sequestered, himself insulted, and in mock resignation he retired into a small place called Higham, in Norfolk, where he spent the remainder of his days in acts of piety and charity, and at length died Sept. 8, 1656, in the eighty-second year of his age. Bishop Hall was "a man of very devotional habits, to fortify which, he spent long and rigid fasts. At this time he had set hours for praying, for reading divinity, for general literature and composition; and so intense was his study, in the pursuit of intellectual and spiritual improvement, that for a time he observed the strictest abstemiousness, taking for a while only one meal a day."

His depth of thought and of a graceful and modest eloquence, he has been called the "Christian Seneca." His writings consist, besides the "Contemplations," of sermons, polemical and practical theology, and correpondence; the best edition is Works, with some account of his life and sermons. Hall, Oxford. Many editions of the Contemplations have appeared. See Hughes, Life of Bishop Hall; Hook, Eccles. Biography, v; 514; Rich, Cyclop. of Biography, s. v.; Jamieson, Religious Biography, p. 240; Wordsworth, Eccles. Biography, iv, 253.

Hall, Peter, an English divine and theological writer, was born in 1803. He studied first at Winchester College, and entered Branscoze College, Oxford, in 1820. He was ordained in 1828, and became successively curate of St. Edmund's, Salisbury; rector of Millston, Wilt, in 1834; minister of Tavistock chapel, Drury Lane, London, in 1840, and of Longfleet in 1841. In 1843 he removed to Bath, and became minister of St. Thomas's chapel, Walcot. He died in 1849. Hall wrote Religion illustrata: Documents connected with the Liturgy of the Church of England (Bath, 1847, 5 vols. 18mo) — Formæ sacrae: Documents illustrative of the Liturgy of the Church of England (Bath, 1848, 7 vols. 18mo); and a number of Sermons. Mr. Hall published a new English edition of that valuable work, The Harmony of the Protestant Confessions (1841, 8vo), the two previous English editions of which (Camb., 1866, 12mo; London, 1867, 4to) had become very scarce. He also edited the 8vo. edition of his ancestor, bishop Hall (Oxford, 1837, 12 vols.), and wrote Congregational Reform, four Sermons with notes (London, 1855, 12mo). — Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliog., i, 1873; Allibone, Diction-
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the public in the discourse entitled Sentiments suitable to the present Crisis, which raised Mr. Hall's reputation for large views and powerful eloquence to the highest pitch. In November, 1804, owing chiefly to a disease of the spine, attended by want of sufficient exercise and rest, the health of Mr. Hall was so far impaired that he and who had so long been the theme of universal admiration became the subject of as extensive a sympathy. He was placed under the care of Dr. Arnold, of Leicester, where, by the divine blessing, his health was restored in about two months. But similar causes produced a relapse in his constitution, that of his recovery, from which he was soon restored, though it was deemed essential to the permanent establishment of his health that he should resign his pastoral charge and remove from Cambridge. Two shocks of so humiliating a calamity within the compass of a year deeply impressed Mr. Hall's mind. His own decided purpose to be never before experienced a thorough transformation of character; and there can be no question that from this period his spirit was habitually more humble, dependent, and truly devotional. It became his custom to kneel every morning in a solemn attitude of submission of himself to God, on evangelical principles, and in the most earnest sincerity of heart. In 1807 he became pastor of the Baptist church in Leicester, where he soon after married, and where he labored most successfully for nearly twenty years. At no period was he more highly regarded as the church was in the city, it being larger than the whole congregation when he took the charge of it. But his influence was not confined to the limits of his parish. He took an active part in all the noble charities of the age, and by his sermons, speeches, and writings exerted a wide influence on society, not only in England, but on the continent of Europe, in America, and in India. His review of Zerub'utilisation, his tracts on the Terms of Communion, and his sermons on the Advantage of Knowledge to the Lower Classes, on the Discouragements and Support of the Christian Ministry, on the Character of a Christian Baptism, on the Death of Prince Charles, and of Rev. Dr. Ryland, with several others, were given to the public while residing there. Here also, in 1823, he delivered his admirable course of lectures on the Scriptural Controversy, partially preserved in his Works. At 1829 he removed to a small old congregation at Broadmead, Bristol, and here he remained till his death, which took place at Bristol on the 21st of Feb., 1831. Besides occasional contributions to various dissenting periodical publications, Hall published various tracts and sermons in the last twenty years of his life, in which he concurred with those aforementioned, since his death been collected under the title of The Works of Robert Hall, M.A., with a Brief Memoir of his Life by Dr. Gregory, and Observations on his Character as a Preacher by John Foster, published under the superintendence of Oliphant Gregory, L.L.D., professor of mathematics in the Royal Military Academy (London, 1831-32, 6 vols. 8vo; 11th ed. 1858). It was intended that the Life should have been written by Sir James Mackintosh, but he died (in May, 1832) before beginning it. Dr. Gregory's Memoir, from which we have abstracted the materials of this article, was afterwards published in a separate form. See Gregory, Oliphant. The first volume of Hall's Works contains sermons, charges, and circular letters (or addresses in the name of the governing body of the Baptist Church); the second, a tract entitled On Terms of Communion (1815, in 2 parts), another entitled On the Conflict between Christian Baptism and the Baptism of John (a defense of what is called the practice of free communion, which produced a powerful effect in liberalizing the practice of the Baptist community) (1816 and 1818, in 2 parts); the third, political and miscellaneous tracts, extracts from the works of other authors, and miscellaneous pieces; the fifth, notes of sermons and letters. The sixth, besides Dr. Gregory's memoir, contains Mr. Foster's observations, and notes taken down by friends of twenty-one sermons. The American reprint (New York, Harper and Brothers, 4 vols. 8vo) contains, besides what is given in the English edition, a number of additional sermons, with anecdotes, etc., by Rev. Joseph Bolcher.

Robert Hall was one of the greatest preachers of his age. His "excellence did not so much consist in the predominance of one of his powers as in the exquisite proportion and harmony of them all. The richness, variety, and extent of his knowledge was not so remarkable as his absolute mastery over it. There is not the least appearance of straining after greatness in his most magnificent excursions, but he rises to the loftiest heights with the most childlike ease. His style as a writer is one of the clearest and simplest—the least encumbered with its own beauty—of any which ever has been written. His noblest passages do but make truth visible in the form of beauty, and "clothe upon" abstract ideas till they become palatable in exquisite shapes. Whoever wishes to see the English language in its splendor, may find it in Doctor Hall's masterly and the writings of Rev. Robert Hall. He combines the beauties of Johnson, Addison, and Burke, without their imperfections." He is distinguished, however, rather for expression and exposition than for invention; he was an orator rather than a great thinker. But as an orator he will rank among the masters of his art. For critical estimates of him by Mackintosh and other eminent men, see Life of Hall, by Gregory, prefixed to his Works; also Eclectic Magazine, vii, 1; North British Review, iv, 454; North American Review, lixv, 384; Methodist Quarterly Review, iv, 516; Quarterly Review (London), xlii, 100; English Cyclopaedia; Jamieson, Religious Biography, p. 246.

Hallel (םהל, Gr. ἡλληλῶν), the designation of a particular part of the hymn service, chanted in the Temple and in the family on certain festivals.

1. Origin of the name, contents of the service, etc. The name hallel, hendal, which signifies praise, is καὶ ἀυξον, given to this distinct portion of the hymn service because it consists of Psalms cxviii-cxviii, which are Psalms of praise, and because this group of Psalms begins with ἡλλαλεῖν, ἡλλαλεῖν, the Egyptian Hallel, because it was chanted in the Temple whilst the Passover lamb was first eaten in Egypt, were first eaten in Egypt, and the Lord is among us. There is another Hallel called ἡλλᾶλη, the Great Hallel (so called because of the reiterated response after every verse. "Thy mercy endureth forever," in Ps. cxxxvi, which is part of this Hallel), which, according to R. Jehudah (Peschch, 118) and Maimonides, comprises Psalms cxviii-cxviii (Yod Ha-Cheshuah, Hilchot Chames 1, Moed, viii, 10). Others, however, though agreeing that this Hallel ends with Psalm cxxxv, maintain that it begins with Psalm cxxix or Psalm cxxxv, 4 (Peschch, 118).

2. Time and manner in which it was chanted. This hymn service, or Egyptian Hallel, was chanted at the sacrifice of the first and second Passover, after the daily sacrifice on the first day of Passover (Mishna, Succa, iv, 8), and the eight days of the Feast of Dedication (Mishna, Toah, v, 5), making in all twenty days in the year. On twelve days out of the twenty, viz., at the sacrifice of the first and second Passover, the first and last days of Passover, the Feast of Pentecost, and of the eight days of the Feast of Tabernacles, the flute was played before the altar when the Hallel was chanted (Mishna, Pesachim, ii, 8), whilst after the morning sacrifice during the eight days of the Feast of Dedication the Hallel was chanted in the temple without this accompaniment of the flute. The manner in which these hymns of praise were offered must have been very imposing and impressive. The
Levites who could be spared from assisting at the slaying of the sacrifices took their stand before the altar, and chanted the Hallel verse by verse; the people responsively repeated every verse, or burst forth in solemn and intoned Hallelujahs at every pause, whilst the slaves of the priests, the Levites, and the respectable lay people assisted in playing the flute (comp. Psachim, 64, a; Erachim, 10, a, b; and Taispia on Cap. i; Sotah, 27, b; Tonzik, 28, a, b). No representatives of the people (בּּעַרְּבּּיַּים) were required to be present at the Temple at the morning sacrifices on the days when the Hallel was chanted (Mishna, Tonzik, iv, 4). See Sacrifices.

The Egyptian Hallel was also chanted in private families at the celebration of the Passover on the first evening of this feast. On this occasion the Hallel was divided into two parts; the part comprising Ps. cxii. and cxv was chanted during the partaking of the second cup, whilst the second part, comprising Ps. cxv. and cxvi, was chanted over the fourth and finishing cup (לָּדוּשׁוּ בְּכֶסֶת הלָּדוּשׁוּ, Mishna, Psachim, x, 7). It is generally supposed that the singing of the hymn by our Saviour and his disciples at the conclusion of the Passover supper (Matt. xxvi, 30; Mark xiv, 26) refers to the first part of this Hallel. Dean Alford [Greek Testament, ad loc.] strangely confounds this Hallel with the Great Hallel. In Babylon there was an ancient custom, which can be traced as far back as the 2d century of the Christian era, to recite this Hallel on every festival of the new moon (Tonzik, 28, 8), omitting, however, Psas. cxv, 1-11, and cxvi, 1-11.

The great Hallel (הלָּודֻשׁוּ יִלְּדוּשׁוּ) was recited on the first evening at the Passover supper by those who wished to have a fifth cup, i.e., one above the enjoined number (Maimonides, Jod Ho-Chezaka, Hilkhot Channes u. Maza, vii, 19). It was also recited on occasions of great joy, as an expression of thanksgiving to God for special mercies (Mishna, Tonzik, iii, 1-10).

3. Present use of the Hymnal Service.—The Jews to the present day recite the Egyptian Hallel at the morning prayer immediately after the Eighteen Benedictions (בְּכֶסֶת הלָּדוּשׁוּ) on all the festivals of the year except New Year and the Day of Atonement, omitting Psas. cxv, 1-11, and cxvi, 1-11, on the last six days of the Feast of Passover, and on the new moon. Before the Hallel is recited the reader recites the following prayer: "Blessed art thou, Lord our God, King of the world, who hast sanctified us with thy commandments, and enjoined upon us to recite the Hallel!" At the Passover supper, on the first two evenings of the festival, both the Egyptian Hallel and the great Hallel are now recited; the former is still divided in the same manner as it was in the days of our Saviour.

4. Institution of this Hymnal Service.—It is now impossible to ascertain precisely when this service was first instituted. Some of the Talmudists affirm that it was instituted by Moses, others say that Joshua introduced it, others derive it from Deborah, David, Hezekiah, or Hananiah, Mishael and Azariah (Psachim, 117, a). From 2 Chron. xxxv, 15, we see that the practice of the Levites chanting the Hallel while the Paschal lamb were in the act of being slain was already in vogue in the days of Josiah, and it is not at all improbable that it was customary to do so at much earlier periods.

5. Literature.—Maimonides, Jod Ho-Chezaka, Hilkhot Channes u. Maza, sections vii and viii, i, p. 263-265; Buxtorf, Lexicon Chaldaicum Talmudic et Rabbinicum, s. v. הלודשׁו, col. 613-616; and Bartolocci, Bibliotheca Magna Rabbinica, ii, 227-248, have important treatises upon this subject, but their information is most uncertainly put together, and no distinction is made between earlier and later practices. A thoroughly masterly and critical investigation is that of Krochmal, More Neebone Hissenam (Leopoli, 1851), p. 135 sq.; comp. also Edelman's edition of the Siddur (with Landschut's Critical Annotations (Königspurg, 1845), p. 423 sq.; Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volks Israel (Nordhausen, 1857), ii, 169 sq.

Halleluyah (Heb. hallelu-'yah, הַלָּדוּשׁוּ הַלָּדוּשׁוּ, Praise ye Jehovah, i.e. Jehovah?) (or in its Greek form) Hallelu-iah (Ἀλλαλοῦια, a word which stands at the beginning of many of the Psalms. See Müller, De notione Hallelujah (Cyn. 1890); Wernsdorf, De formula Hallelujah Vitis funeris: from its first use in this position it grew into a formula of praise, and was chanted as such on solemn days of rejoicing. (See Crítica Biblica, ii, 448.) This expression of joy and praise was transferred from the synagogue to the church, and is still occasionally heard in devotional psalmody.—Kitto. The Hebrew terms are frequently rendered "Praise ye the Lord," and so in the mighty chunds, cxv, 1-11; cxvi, 1-11, i.e., 1 (comp. Psas. cxii, 9; cxv, 1-18; cxvi, 19; cxvi, 2). The Psalms from cxiii to cxvii were called by the Jews the Hallel, and were sung on the first of the month, at the Feast of Dedication, and the Feast of Tabernacles, the Feast of Weeks, and the Feast of the Passover. See HO- SANNI. On the occasion Psas. cxiii to cxvii were sung at the school of Hillel (the former only according to the school of Shammai), were sung before the feast, and the remainder at its termination, after drinking the last cup. The hymn (Matt. xxi, 30) sung by Christ and his disciples after the last supper is supposed to have been a part of this Hallel, which seems to have varied according to the feast. See Hallel. The literal meaning of "hallelujah" sufficiently indicates the character of the Psalms in which it occurs, as hymns of praise and thanksgiving. They are all found in the last book of the Bible, and bear marks of being intended for use in the Temple service, the words "praise ye Jehovah" being taken up by the full chorus of Levites. See Psalms. In the great hymn of triumph in heaven over the destruction of Babylon, the apostle in vision heard the multitude in chorus like the voice of the last book of the Bible, and bearevidentall marks of being intended for use in the Temple service, the words "praise ye Jehovah" being taken up by the full chorus of Levites. See Psalms. In the great hymn of triumph in heaven over the destruction of Babylon, the apostle in vision heard the multitude in chorus like the voice of the last book of the Bible, and bear marks of being intended for use in the Temple service, the words "praise ye Jehovah" being taken up by the full chorus of Levites. See Psalms. In the great hymn of triumph in heaven over the destruction of Babylon, the apostle in vision heard the multitude in chorus like the voice of the last book of the Bible, and bear marks of being intended for use in the Temple service, the words "praise ye Jehovah" being taken up by the full chorus of Levites. See Psalms.

HALLELUJAH, a doxology used frequently in the ancient Church, and derived from the Old Testament. The singing Hallelujah sometimes means the repetition of the word, in imitation of the heavenly host (see Rev. xix.); at other times it has reference to one of the psalms beginning with Hallelujah. In the early Christian Church "the more common acceptance of 'hallelujah' is for the singing of the word itself in special parts of divine service, as a sort of mutual call to each other to praise the Lord. In some churches the Hallelujah was sung only on Easter day and the fifty days of Pentecost; in others it was used more generally. Augustine says it was not used in time of Lent (Augustine, Epist. 119, 178). In the fourth Council of Toledo it is mentioned under the name Landes, and appointed to be sung after the reading of the Gospel (Concil. Tota, iv, can. 10, 11). In the 1st century it was occasionally sung at funerals as St. Jerome speaks of it as being sung at the funeral of Fabiola, and says the people made the golden roof of the church shake with echoing forth the Hallelujah (Contra Vigiliant. cap. 1, Epist. xxx, cap. 4). The ancient Church retained the Hebrew word, as also did the Church of England in its first Liturgy; though it is translated "Praise ye the Lord," to which the people reply, "The Lord's name be praised." See Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. xiv, ch. ii, § 4; Procter.
HALLER

Haller, Albrecht von, one of the greatest of modern physiologists, was born in Berne Oct. 16, 1708, and was an able man in childhood, and a man of extraordinary talents. He studied medicine first at Tubingen, and afterwards at Leyden, under Boerhaave. After extensive travels he became professor of anatomy, surgery, and botany at Götttingen in 1736, and remained there until 1743, when he returned to Berne. There he was re-elected, by his fellow-citizens, for nearly a quarter of a century; continued to benefit science by his literary labors; filled several important offices in the state, and adorned the Gospel by his life. He died in Oct.,

1777. A great part of the modern science of physiology is due to the labors and genius of Haller. But his place in our pages is due to his steady religious life, to his constant recognition in his works, of the great truths of Christianity, and especially to his religious writings, viz., Briefe über die wichtigsten Wahrheiten der Offenbarung (Berne, 1772); Briefe zur Vertiefung der Offenbarung (Berne, 1773-77, 3 parts), consisting of letters to his daughter on the truth and excellence of Christianity. See Zimmermann, Leben Hallers (Zürich, 1755, 8vo); Biographie de Haller (Paris, 1846, 2d ed.);

Haller, Berthold, one of the Reformers of Berne, was born at Aldingen, Württemberg, in 1492. At Freiburg he had Melanchthon for a fellow-student, and graduated in 1522. In 1524 Cologn, where working at some time at Rottweil he was invited by Rubulus in 1518 (1518 ?). He became assistant to Dr. Wittlenbach in St. Vincent’s church, and in his society, his knowledge of the Scriptures and his religious character were greatly cultivated. About 1520 he made the acquaintance of Cranach, who was always close to his faithful friend and counsellor. Shortly after he succeeded Wittlenbach as cathedral preacher, and soon began to expound Matthew, instead of following the usual Church lessons only. His eloquence and zeal made him extremely popular. When the strife began in 1522 Haller was a member of the commission, and distinguished himself in the conference by his opposition to the bishop of Lausanne. His hold upon the popular mind was so great that in the subsequent years of strife he held his place as preacher in spite of all opposition, and was supported greatly, not so much by enthusiasm as by his personal force of character, to the establishment of the Reformation in Berne. Even with the Anabaptists, on their appearance in Berne, he obtained great influence. In 1525 he courageously abandoned the Mass. In the Grand Council he defended himself so vigorously that he was still kept in his office as preacher, though he lost his canonicity. In 1527 a number of Reformers were elected to the “Grand Council.” The venerable Francis Kolb, full of fire and energy, was now in Berne, ready to aid and stimulate the more prudent Haller. The “M tratizes” of 1525 and 1526, the former for the latter against the Reformation, were submitted to the people, and they decided for the first. In the “Conference” of 1528, at Berne, Haller took the leading part, aided by Zwingli, Ecalampus, and Bucer. It was finally decided by the Conference that the Mass should be abolished. In 1529 he married. His labors for the Reformation extended to Solothurn, and to other parts of Switzerland; but his chief activity lay in Berne, where he held his pre-eminence as preacher and Reformer until his death, Feb. 25, 1536. He left no writings. See Kirchhofer, Haller oder die Reform. v. Bern (Zurich, 1865); Die Reformierer Berne (Zurich, 1878); D’Aubigné, History of Reformation, ii, 349; iii, 536; iv, 296, 306; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. v, 479.

Haller, Karl Ludwig von, was born at Berne Aug. 1, 1766. In 1795 he became secretary of the city council, and in 1800 emigrated to Germany. In 1806 he resumed, and became professor of history and statis-

count, and in 1818 made a journey through Italy and to Rome. Having secretly become a member of the Roman Church in 1820, he joined it publicly in 1821, and was discharged from his office. He then went to Paris in 1824, and was employed in the ministry of foreign affairs. Having lost that situation in consequence of the Revolution of July, 1830, he finally went to Sobt-

dur, where he was in 1844 appointed member of the lesser council, and elected to the head of the Carma-

montane party, and died May 20, 1845. Haller was an ultra-conservative in politics, and was drawn into the Church of Rome by his fanatical hatred of all liberal re-

forms. His chief work, entitled Restauration der Staats-

wissenschaften (Winterthur, 1815-1834, 6 vols.), was written with the design to annihilate all revolutionary prin-

ciples in politics. Even many Roman Catholic writers expressed a decided dissent from the antiliberal doctrines of this work. The most important among his other works are, Lettre a un famille pour lui declarer son retour a l’Eglise catholique (Paris, 1821; in German by Paul-

luss, Stuttgart, 1821; by Studer, Berne, 1821)—Theorie der geistl. Staaten u. Gesellschaften (Winterthur, 1822); Die Freiuauerrei u. ihr Einfluss auf d. Schweiz (Schaff-

hausen, 1840); Gesch. der kirchl. Revolut. des Cantons Bern (Laurens, 1829, 4th ed.); See Tschirch, der Un-

tritt des Herrn (2d ed.); Zaehringen Kirche (Zurich, 1850); Krug, Apologie der protestantischen Kirche (Leipzig, 1821); Escher, Uber die Philosophie des Staatsrechts mit bes. Beizeh. auf d. Hallersche Restauration (Zurich, 1825); Scherer (ultramontane), Die Restauration der Staats-

wissenschaften. (Laurens, 1845); Hallet, Joseph, an English Nonconformist, was born at Exeter in 1609, ordained in 1718, and succeeded his father as co-pastor with Mr. Pierce over the Independant congregation at Exeter in 1722. Here he dis-

charged his pastoral duties faithfully until his death in 1744. As a writer, he was marked by industry, learn-

ing, and critical acumen. He wrote a number of polemical tracts on the Evidences of Christianity in reply to Tindal and Chubb, and on the Trinity. Besides these, he published A Free and impartial Study of the Holy Scriptures recommended, being notes on peculiar texts of Scripture (London, 1736, 3 vols.); A paraphrase and Notes on the three last Chapters of the Epis-

del to the Hebrews (London, 1733, 4to.). In theology he was a semi-Arian. See Bogue and Bennett, History of Dissenters, ii, 179, 222; Jones, Christian Biography.

Hallifax, Samuel, bishop of St. Asaph, was born at Mansfield, Derbyshire, in 1738. He was made at Jesus College, Cambridge, and at Trinity Hall, and became successively rector of Chaddington, Buckinghamshire, in 1765; professor of Arabic at Cambridge in 1768; pro-

fessor of jurisprudence in 1770; chaplain of George III in 1774; master of Doctors’ Commons in 1775; rector of Warap, Nottinghamshire, in 1778, and bishop of Gloucester in 1781. He was transferred to the see of St. Asaph in 1775, and died in 1780. He wrote An Analysis of the Roman Civil Law compared with the Laws of England (1774, 8vo)—Twelve Sermons on the Prophecies concerning the Christian Religion, and in par-

ticular concerning the Church of Papal Rome, preached in Lincoln’s Inn Chapel at Bishop Warburton’s Lecture (1776, 8vo)—An Analysis of Butler’s Analysis—Discourses on Justification (Camb. 1762, 8vo). See Rose, New General Biog. Dict.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxiii, 197; British Critic, vol. xxvii, 35. Hallow (haw), or, rather, Lochesh (Heb. Lochesh, אֶלֶכֶם, with the article הָלָו, הָלָכֶה, the whis-

pper—Sept. ἀλασκιος and ἀλασκυς, Vulg. Alcoho), the father of Shallum, which latter assisted Nehemiah in repairing the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. iii, 12, where the name is Anglicized "Halothes"). He was one of the popular chiefs that subscribed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. xii, 44). Ecclus. cir. 410. July 25 in the Jewish calendar, to render sacred, set apart, consecrate (Exod. xxvii, 28; xxix, 1, Lev.
HALOHESH  34  HAM

xxii, 2; Numb. v, 10). The English word is from the Saxon, and is properly to make holy; hence hallowed persons, things, places, rites, etc.; hence also the name, power, dignity of God is hallowed, that is, reverenced as holy (Matt. vi, 9). See Holy. Haloheesh (Neh. iii, 12). See Halloheesh.

Halt (ḥaṭṭ, ḥaṅōl), lame on the feet or legs (Gen. xxxix, 31; Psa. xxxviii, 17; Jer. xx, 10; Mic. iv, 6; vii, 1; Zeph. iii, 19). Many persons who were hale were cured by our Lord. See Lamb. To halt between two opinions (Job xxvii, 20), should, perhaps, be translated to the other? it is perhaps sometimes in its meaning: we sometimes say it is an allusion to birds, who hop from spray to spray, forwards and backwards, as the contrary influence of supposed convictions vibrated the mind in alternate affirmation and doubfulness.

Haliburton, Thomas, professor of divinity in the University of St. Andrew's, was born at Duplin, near Perth, in the subject of frequent but ineffectual religious convictions. In 1689 he began to be perplexed respecting the evidence of revealed religion, till, after having experienced some relief from Robert Bruce's Fulfilling of the Scriptures, he received further aid from Mr. Donaldson, an excellent minister who came repeatedly to Perth and paid a visit to his mother. He inquired of his young friend if he sought a blessing from God on his learning, remarking at the same time, with an austere look, "Sirrah, unsanctified learning has done much mischief to the Kirk of God." This led him to seek divine direction in extraordinary difficulties; but this exercise, he acknowledges, left him still afar off from God. He studied at St. Andrew's, and became domestic chaplain in a nobleman's family in 1696. His mind, long disquieted about the evidences of Christianity, was finally settled, and he wrote an Essay into the Principles of Modern Deists, which is still valued. In 1698 he was thoroughly converted; in 1700 he became minister of Ceres parish. In 1711 he was made professor of divinity at St. Andrew's; and died Sept. 23, 1712. He was an excellent scholar, and a very pious man. A sketch of his life is given, in his Works, edited by Robert Bryson, D.D. (London, 1805, 8vo), which volume contains the following, among other writings, viz. The great Concern of Salvation. - Natural Religion insufficient: - Essay on the Nature of Faith. - Inquiry on Justification, and Sermons. Haliburton's Memoirs, with an introductory Essay by W. H. Hume, M.A. (Glasgow, 1824). The volume has been often reprinted, both in Great Britain and America.

Ham (Heb. Cham, כִּפָּה [see below]; Sept. Χαμ [Josephus Χαμας, Ant. i, 4, 1], Vulg. Cham), the name of a man and also of two regions.

1. The youngest son of Noah (Gen. v, 32; comp. ix, 24). B.C. post 2613. Having provoked the wrath of his father by an act of indecency towards him, the latter cursed him and his descendants to be slaves to his brothers and their descendants (ix, 25). B.C. cir. 2514. To judge, however, from the narrative, Noah directed his curse only against Canaan (the fourth son of Ham) and his race, thus excluding from it the descendants of Ham's three other sons, Cush, Mizraim, and Phut (Gen. x, 6). How that curse was accomplished is taught by the history of the Jews, by whom the Canaanites were subsequently exterminated. The general opinion is that all the southern nations derive their origin from Ham (to which the Hebrew root בֹּקֵר, to be hot, not unlike the Greek ἄληθος, lends some force). This meaning seems to be confirmed by that of the Egyptian word Belk, of a minister, which is believed to be an Egyptian equivalent of Ham, and which, as an adjective, signifies "black," probably implying warmth as well as blackness. See Egypt. If the Hebrew and Egyptian words be the same, Ham must mean the swarthys or sun-burnt, like Αθηνης, which has been derived from the Coptic name of Ethiopia, ἐθνος, but which we should be inclined to trace to ἔθνος, "a boundary," unless the Sahidic ἐθνος may be derived from Kish (Cush). It is observable that the names of Noah and his sons appear to have had prophetic significations. This is stated in the case of Noah (Gen. v, 29), and implied in that of Japheth (ix, 27), and it can scarcely be doubted that the same was intended as to Shem, who therefore have been so named as progenitor of the sunburnt Egyptians and Cushites. Cush is supposed to have been the progenitor of the nations of East and South Asia, more especially of South Arabia, and also of Ethiopia, Mizraim, of the African nations, including the Philistines and sons which Greek flabbler and tradition connect with Egypt; Phut, likewise of some African nations; and Canaan, of the inhabitants of Palestine and Phoenicia. On the Arabian traditions concerning Ham, see D'Herbelot (Bibl. Orient. s. a.). See Noah.

A. Ham's Place in his Family. Idolatry connected with his Name. - Like his brothers, he was married at the time of the Deluge, and with his wife was saved from the general destruction in the ark which his father had prepared at God's command. He was thus, with his family, a connecting link between the antediluvian population and the nations of the world. The least fact of his impiety and dishonor to his father had also caused him to be regarded as the transmitter and representative in the renovated world of the worst features of idolatry and profaneness, which had grown to so fatal a consummation among the antediluvians. Lactantius mentions this ancient tradition of Ham's idolatrous degeneracy: "[Cham] profugus in ejus tempore parte conceedit, que nunc Arabiam nominatur; eaque terra de nomine suo Chanaan dicta est, et posteri ejus Chanaeae. Hic fuit prima gens quae Deum ignoravit, Quoniam mense posse [Cham] et conditorem cultum Dei a patre non accipit, maloedicit ob eum; itaque ignornantiam divinatia minores suis religiit" (De origine, errore, i 13; De falsa Relig. 23). See other authors quoted in Beyer's Add. ad Selden Syngogae, de Syria Sylva (Ungoli, Thes. xxiii, 288). This tradition was rife also among the Jews. R. Manasse says, "Moreover Ham, the son of Noah, was the first to invent idols," etc. The Tyrian idols called נושא, Chanaanim, are supposed by Kircher to have their designation from the degenerate son of Noah (see Spencer, De logg. Hb. [ed. Pfaff] p. 470-482). The old commentators, full of classical associations, saw in Noah and his sons the counterpart of Крёсе, or Seraph, and of Γιάγκας, and in three divisions identified Jupiter or Ζεύς with Ham, especially, as the name suggested, the African Jupiter Ammon (Ἀμονός [or, more correctly, Ἀμον], so Gaisford and Bihir) γὰρ Αἰγύπτου καλλιότα τὸν Δία, Herod. Eucter, 42: Plutarch explains Αμονός by the better known form Αμών, Ισρ. et Ost. ix. In Jer. xlix, 25, "the multitude of No" is Νας Να. Amon of No; so in Nahum iii, 8, "Populous No" is No-Αμών, Νας Να. For the identification of Jupiter Ammon with Ham, see J. Conr. Dammhauer's Politica Bibliorum, i; Is. Vossius, De Idol. lib. ii, cap. 7). This identification is, however, extremely doubtful; eminent critics of modern times reject it; among them Ewald (Geschichte des Volkes Israel, i 975 (note)), who says, "Mit dem griechischen Gott Ammon oder Hammon ihn zusammenzubringen hat man keinen Grund," u. s. w. One of the reasons which leads Bochart (Phaleg, i, 1, ed. Willemend, p. 7) to identify Ham with Jupiter or Zeus is derived from the meaning of the name. נא (from the root נָבָט, to be hot) combines the ideas hot and swarthiness (comp. ἄθιοπος); accordingly, according to St. Jerome, the name Belk, of a minister, is believed by the Egypians (Omnost, p. 108) by νεπρ, not incompatible. In like manner, Λατζ is derived a ferrovo, according to the etymology of the etymol. Magn., παρὰ τὴν Σωσ, Σταρυμαρας γάρ ἐν άπο, ἦ ἐν τῷ Σωσ, to thee, or boil, forre. Cyril of Alexandria uses Σταρυμαρας as synonymous (i. ii, Ophthalm. in Genes.). Another reason of identification-
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section, according to Bochart, is the fanciful one of comparative age. Zeus was the youngest of three brothers, and so was Ham in the opinion of this author. He is not alone in this view of the subject. Josephus (Ant. i, 6, 3) expressly calls Ham the youngest of Noah's sons, ὁ τῶν ἄνδρων τετράυς. Genesius (Thea, p. 489) calls him "filius natu tertius et minimus;" similarly First (Hebr. Wurterb., i, 408), Knobel (De Gen. erklär. p. 101), Delsitz (Comment. über die Gen. p. 280), and Kalisch (Gen. p. 229), which last lays down the rule in explanation of the ὁ τῶν ἄνδρων ἐπὶ οὖσαν in Genesis x, 4, "If there are more than two sons, ὁ τῶν ἄνδρων is the eldest, ὁ τῶν ἄνδρων ὁ πιθανότερος is the younger son;" and he aptly compares 1 Sam. xiii, 13, 14. The Sept., it is true, as the LXX., renders by the comparative—ὁ τῶν ἄνδρων ὁ πιθανότερος, "his younger son." But, throughout, Shem is the term of comparison, the central point of blessing from whom all else diverges. Hence not only is Ham ὁ τῶν ἄνδρων, ὁ τῶν ἄνδρων ὁ πιθανότερος, in comparison with Shem, but Japheth is relatively to the same ὁ τῶν ἄνδρων, ὁ τῶν ἄνδρων ὁ πιθανότερος (see Gen. x, 21). That is this the proper meaning of this latter passage, which treats of the age of Japheth, the eldest son of Noah, we are convinced by the consideration just adduced, and our conviction is supported by the Sept. translators, Symmachus, Rashi (who says, "From the words of the text I do not clearly know whether the elder applies to Shem or to Japheth."). But, as we are afterwards informed that Shem was 100 years old, and begat Arphaxad two years after the Deluge [xi, 10], it follows that Japheth was the elder, for Noah was 600 years old when he began to have children, and the Deluge took place in his 600th year. His eldest son must consequently have been 100 years old at the time of the Flood, whereas we are expressly informed that Shem did not arrive at that age until two years after the Deluge (Gen. x, 10), Aben-Enzra, Luther, Junius, and Tremellius, Piscator, Mercerus, Arius, Montanus, Clericus, Dathius, J. D. Michaelis, and Mendelssohn (who gives a powerful reason for his opinion: "The tonic accents make it clear that the word ὁ τῶν ἄνδρων, ὁ τῶν ἄνδρων ὁ πιθανότερος, applies to Japheth; wherever the words of the text are obscure and equivocal, great respect and attention must be paid to the tonic accents, as their author understood the true meaning of the text better than we do." De Nala, Lindenthal, and Raphael's Trans. of Genesis, p. 43). In consistency with this seniority of Japheth, his name and genealogy are first given in the Tobeh Bemi Noah of Gen. x. Shem's name stands first when the three brothers are mentioned together, probably because the special blessing (afterwards to be more fully developed in his great descendant Abraham) was bestowed on him by God. But this prerogative by no means affords any proof that Shem was the eldest of Noah's sons. The obvious instances of Seth, Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Judah, Joseph, Ephraim, Moses, David, and Solomon (besides this of Shem), give sufficient ground for observing that primogeniture was far from always securing the privileges of birthright and blessing; and other distinctions (comp. Gen. xxxv, 23; xlvi, 14, 15, 19, and 1 Sam. xvi, 6-12).

These are the sons of Ham, after their families, or classes, after their tongues, in their countries, and in their nations, Gen. x, 20.
Menologia Graeco, part ii, p. 197. "Felix Arabia Indi vocatur... ubi felix vocatur India Arabica, ut ab Ethiopica et Gangetica distinguatur," Assemani, *Bibl. Orient.,* III, ii, 509), especially the Yemenese; Jones, indeed, on the ground of Sanscrit affinities ("Cua or Cus or Gu as Aryan equivalents of the name of Brahman, being a part of the Hindustan as in west, and east of the river Indus (Greg. Abrubharaghi, *Hist. Dynast.* [ed. Pococke, Oxon. 1673]), Dyn. i, p. 17.

The sons of Ham are stated to have been "Cush," and Mizrael, and Phut, and Canaan" (Gen. x, 6, comp. 1 Chr. v, 21). It is remarkable that the recognition of the "land of Ham" in the Bible (Ps. lxxxviii, 51; cv, 29; cvi, 22), and this, though it does not prove the identity of the Egyptian name with that of the patriarch, certainly favors it, and establishes the historical fact that Egypt, seen as a descendant of Ham, is peculiarly his territory. The name Mizrael we believe to confirm this. The restriction of Ham to Egypt, unlike the case, if we may reason inferentially, of his brethren, may be accounted for by the early civilization of this part of the Hamitic territory, while much of the rest was comparatively barbarous. Egypt may have been the first settlement of the Hamites whence colonies went forth, as we know was the case with the Philitines. See CAPTIVI.

1. CUSH (Josephus *Antiq.* "reigned over the Ethiopians" [African Cushites]; Jerome *in quest. Hebr. in Genesis,* "Both the Arabians, the Ethiopians", which was the parent country, and the Africans, its colony") [Abyssinia = Cush in the Vulg. and Syr.]; but these gradations (confining Cush first to the western shore of the Red Sea, and then extending the nation to the Arabian Peninsula) require further extension; modern discoveries tally with this most ancient ethnographic record. In placing Cush on the Ethiopians and the Persians and the Gulf. When Rosemiller (Scholii in *Gen.* ad loc.) claims Josephus for an *African* Cush as well as an *African* one, he exceeds the testimony of the historian, who says no more than that "the Ethiopians of his day called themselves Cushites, and not only they, but all the Africans also gave them that name" (Ant. i, 6, 2). But Josephus does not specify what Ethiopians he means: the form of his statement leads to the opposite conclusion rather, that the Ethiopians were *African* merely, excluded all from the Asiatice [voir *tawaw* vs *kaww* by *'Ain* *tawaw*, the *tawaw* referring to the *Aksumite* just mentioned. (For a better interpretation of Josephus here, see Volney, *Systeme Geogr. des Hébreux,* in *Quar. v, 224.) The earliest empire, that of Nimrod, was Cushitic, literally and properly, *not per cachatreis,* as Herodotus, Diodorus, and others would have it. "Nubia and Sudan" (On the *Origin of Families of Nations,* in Works, ii, 309) shows an appreciation of the wide extent of the Cushite race in primaeval times, which is much more consistent with the discoveries of recent times than the speculation of the theological school prevt. to this. This distinction of "Ham," he says, "founded in Iran (the country of the lower Euphrates) the monarchy of the first Chaldeans, invented letters, etc." (compare Rosenmiller, as above quoted). According to Volney, the term *Ethiopian,* coextensive with Cush, included even the Hindus; he seems, however, to mean the southern Arabians, who were, it is certain, sometimes called Indians (in

"The Rositt al-Sufish it is written that God bestowed on Ham nine sons," the two which are mentioned at the head of the list. (Wet, cited, with which comp. Abulfaraghi as quoted in one of our notices above), expressly connected the *Hindus* with Ham, although not through Cush, who occurs as the sixth among the Hamite brethren. See the entire extract from the *Khelemeut al-Akhbar of Khondemir.* (Bibl. Gregorii *Kipemippiii, exe. ii,* vol. i, p. 109 ["Bibl. Cusa."] Bohlen (*Genev.* ad loc.), who has a long but indistinct notice of Cush, with his Sanscrit preludes, is for extending Cush "as far as the dark India," claiming for his view the sanction of Rosem, Winer, and Schumann. When Job (xxviii, 19) speaks of "the tops of Ethiopia" (장*Gamaliel 5, 21*), Bohlen finds a *Sanaari* word in *Gamaliel, and consequently a link between India and Cush (장*Gamaliel 5, 21*). Bohlen refers to the Syrian, Chaldean, and Saadia versions as having *India* for Cush, and (after Braam, *De Vet. Sacr.,* i, 115) assigns it to a Semitic authority. Am- mani, who is by Bohlen referred to a futile hope of extracting evidence for the identification of Cush and India (of the *Hindus*), has an admirable dissertation on the people of Arabia (Bibl. *Or. III,* ii, 552 sq.): one element of the Arab population he derives from Cush (see below). We thus conclude that the children of Ham, in the line of Cush, had very extensive settlements in *Asia, as far as the Egyptians and Persian Gulf at least,* and probably including the district of the Indians; while *in Africa* they both spread widely in Abyssinia, and now are scattered through a large part of the continent. The Egyptians: this we feel warranted in assuming on the testimony of the Arabian geographers; e. g. Abulfeda (in his section on *Egypt,* tables, p. 110 in the original, p. 151 transl. by Reinard) mentions a Cush, or rather Kus, as the most important city in Egypt after the capital Thebes, and the Red Sea was contiguous to it. It was a place of great resort by the Mohammedans of the west on pilgrimage. "The sons of Cush, where they once got possession, were never totally ejected. If they were at any time driven away, they returned after a time and recovered their ground, for which reason I make no doubt but many of them in process of time returned to Chaldea, and mixed with those of their family who resided there. Hence arose the tradition that the Babylonians not only conquered Egypt, but that the learning of the Egyptians came originally from Chal- dea; and this like account that the Egyptians were people of the country had come Babylon, and that the wisdom of the Chaldeans was derived from them" (Bryant, *On Ancient Egypt,* in *Works, vi,* 290). See CUSH.

1. *Seba* (Josephus *Antiq.* "is universally admitted by critics to be the ancient name for the Egyptian [Nu- bia?]." *Ant. II,* ii, 10) however, more accurately says that Saba was "a royal city of Ethiopia [Nubia], which Cambyses afterwards named Meros, after the name of his sister." Bohacht would have Saba to be *Saba-Ma-
HAM

in Arabia, confounding our Seba (אבל) with Sheba (אבל). Meroë, with the district around it, was no doubt settled by our Seba. (See Gesen. s. v., who quotes Bochart, loc. cit., and the article on Egypt and Seba in the Encyclopædia Britannica.) See also Bochart, who also identifies Sheba with the modern Arabian Sabāa; Heeren throws his authority into the scale for the Ethiopian Meroë; so Knoch. It supports this opinion that Seba is mentioned in connection with the other Nubian kingdoms (Egypt and Egypt) in Isa. xiii. 3, and xlv. 14. (The Sheba of Arabia, and our Ethiopian Seba, as representing opposite shores of the Red Sea, are contrasted in Psa. lxxii. 10.) See Feldhoff (Volkerkunde, p. 71), who, however, discovers many Sabas both in Africa (even to the southwest coast of that continent) and in Asia (on the Persian Gulf), a circumstance from which he derives the idea that, in this, grandsons of their patriarch, the Hamites displayed the energy of their race by widely-extended settlements. See Saba.

2. Harund (Josephus Bithia, not to be confounded (as he is by Rosem. and apparently by Patrick, after Bochart) with the son of Joktan, who is mentioned in ver. 29. Joseph. and Jerome, as quoted by Corn. a. Lap., were not far wrong in making the Gattelina (the people in the central part of North Africa, between the modern Niger and the Red Sea) to be descended from the Cush of Genesis, and the Nubia of Patrick. (Bibl. Antiq., b. 6, v. 1).) Rightly puts our Havilah in East Abyssinia, by the Straits of Bob el-Mandeb. Gesen. who takes this view, refers to Piny. vi, 28, and Pтол. iv, 7, for the Avallata, now Zehal, and adds that Saadias repeatedly renders ביהילא by Zehal. Bohlen at first identifies the two Havilahs, but afterwards so far corrects himself as to admit, very properly, that there were probably two coasts of the Red Sea a Havilah as well as on the east of it—"just in the same way as there was one Seba on the coast of Arabia, and another opposite to it in Ethiopia." There is no such difficulty as Kalisch (Genesis, Pref. p. 88) supposes in believing that occasionally kindred peoples should have like names. It is not more incredible that there should be a Havilah both in the family of Ham and in that of Shem (Gen. x. v. 7, comp. with ver. 29) than that there were Enochs and Lamechs among the posterities of both Cain and Seth (compare Gen. iv. 17, 18, with ver. 16, 20). Kalisch's cumbersome theory of acontemporary extent of communication of the Persian Gulf running to the southwest and crossing the Red Sea, of the general name of Havilah (possessed at one end by the son of Joktan, and at the other by the son of Cush), removes no difficulty, and, indeed, is unnecessary. The hard "apparent difference" (Bohren, p. 249) in the Mosaic statement of two Havilahs of distinct races, nor any violation of consistency when fairly judged by the nature of the case. Michaelis and Feldhoff strangely founded about in their opposite conjectures: the former supposes our Havilah to be the land of the Cheredit, on the Caspian, the latter places it in China Proper, about Pekin (1). See Havilah.

3. Sabta (Joseph. Σαβθα, Σαβθα) is by Josephus, with great probability, located immediately north of the preceding, in the district east of Meroë, between the Assabara (Tissaque), a tributary of the Nile, and the Red Sea, by the coast of which, as it is called, "the Sabatai, so called from (Σαβθα) Σαβισθα το αποφωτηρος απο ιατρητοεις ποτομος (Gen. vi. i. 6, 2)." Kalisch quite agrees in this "opinion," and Gesenius substantially, when he places S Barth in the southeast coast of the Red Sea, where was the Ethiopian city Saba. (See Strabo, xvi. p. 770 [ed. Casel.], and Pтол. vi. v. 10.) Rosem., Bohlen, and Knoch, with less propriety, place it in Arabia, with whom Delitzsch and Keil, while Feldhoff, with his usual extravagance, identifies it with Thibet. See Saba.

4. Ramsak (Josephus Ρημσοκ, Ρημσοκ) and Dedan (Ιουδα) are separated by Josephus and Jerome, who place the last-mentioned in West Ethiopia (Africa rec, Ἐρυθραίας ἔρημος, Ρᾶμσαῦ, which Jerome translates Gena Ethiopiae in occidentali plaga). Ezekiel, however, in xxvii. 20, 22, mentions these three names together in connection with Arabia. According to Niebuhr, who, in his map of Yemen, has a province called Subeii, and the town of Subbe (in longitude 16° 34′ lat. 16° 18′), the country south to the coast of Yemen, is the country known to the ancients by the name of Ἐρυθραῖας. In his map, the term Subba, which is given to the countries east of the Persian Gulf, the present seat of the Persian Gulf, across Arabia, comprises the territories of Raamkah and his two sons. The city called Ρημσοκ, or Ρῆμυσα, by Pтолemy (vi, 7), is considered to be the present city of Raamakah, as it is written in the original (Ῥῆμα) . . . as one of the islands, Bades, in the Persian Gulf, resembles the name of one of the sons, Dedan. See Dedan.

5. Sabaatka (Joseph. Σαβακαθα, Σαβακαθα) is by Kalisch thought to have settled in Ethiopia, and the form of the word favors the opinion, the other compounds of Seb being apparently of Ethiopia or Cushite origin. It is supposed to be a reference to Seba, the name Subadot, discovered on Egyptian monuments (comp. the king Νύρω, in 2 Kings xvii, 4, and the Sebchos of Manetho), renders its position in Arabia, or at the Persian Gulf, improbable; but Sumgoier, in Gedrosia (as Bochart supposes), or Tobochaster, in Persia (as Bohlen suggests), or Saiotakos, are out of the question. The Targum of Jonathan renders it here "the island of Zirg, which is the Arabic name for the African district Zirgebar, and which is not inappropriate here" (Kalisch). See Sabaatka.

6. Nimrod (Joseph. Νυμρωός), the mighty founder of the earliest imperial power, is the grandest name, not only among the children of Ham, but in primeval history. He seems to have been divined under the title of Βῆλας-Νύρω, or Bel-Nimrod, which may be translated "the god of the chase," or "the great hunter." (The Greek forms Νυμρως and Νυμρωθ serve to connect Νυρω with Νυρωθ.) The native root is thought to be ναρρω, "to pursue," or "to cause to flee," Rawlinson, p. 186.) He is noticed here in his place, in passing, because around his name Nimrod has gathered and exploited an Eastern tradition from all sources, which entirely corroborates the statement of Moses, that the primitive empire of the Chaldeans was Cushite, and that its people were closely connected with Egypt, and Canaan, and Ethiopia. Rawlinson (Fire Great Mon., chap. iii) has collected much of this tradition, and shown that the hints of Herodotus as to the existence of an Astarte Ethiopia as well as an African one (iii. 94; vii. 70), and that the traditional belief which Moses of Chorone, the Armenian historian, has, for instance, that Nimrod is in fact Dieus, and grandfather of Cush by Mizraim (a statement substantially agreeing with that of the Bible), have been too strongly confirmed by all recent researches (among the cuneiform inscriptions) in comparative philology to be set aside by criticism based on the mere conjectures of ingenious men. It would appear that Nimrod not only built cities, and conquered extensive territories, "subduing or expelling the various tribes by which the country was previously occupied" (Rawlinson, p. 150; comp. Gen. x. 10-12 [marginal version]), but established a dynasty of some eleven or twelve monarchs. By and by (about 1500 B.C.) (see Rawlinson, p. 268) the ancient Chaldeans, the stock of Cush and people of Nimrod, sank into obscurity, crushed by a foreign Semitic stock, destined after some seven or eight centuries of submission to revive to a second tenure of imperial power, which culminated in grandeur under the magnificent Nebuchadnezzar. See Nimrod.
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II. MIZRAIM (Joseph,梅尔太,梅尔太), that is, the father of Egypt, is the second son of Cush. Of this dual form of a man's name we have other instances in Ephraim and Shahkaraim (1 Chron. viii, 8). We simply call the reader's attention to the fact, vouched for in this genealogy of the Hamites, of the nearness of kindred between Nimrod and Cush. This point is of great value in the study of ancient Eastern history, and will reconcile many difficulties which would otherwise be insoluble. "For the last 3000 years it is to the Semitic and Indo-European races that the world has mainly been indebted for its advancement; but it was otherwise in Egypt and Asia. Egypt and Cush, Mizrak, Merv, Miao, and Nimrod, both descendants of Ham, led the way and acted as the pioneers of mankind in the various untrodden fields of art, literature, and science. Alphabetic writing, astronomy, history, chronology, architecture, plastic art, sculpture, navigation, agriculture, and textiles industry, seem, all of them, to have had their origin in one or other of these two countries" (Rawlinson, p. 75).

If, as some suppose, Mizrak in the lists of Gen. x, and 1 Chron. i, stands for Mizrak, we should take the singular Mazor to be the name of the progenitor of the Egyptian tribes. It is remarkable that Mazor appears to be identical in signification with maz or mizz, that it may be but another name of the patriarch. See Egypt.

In this case the mention of Mizrak (or Mizirm) would be geographical, and not indicative of a Mazor, son of Ham.

The Mizrakes, like the descendants of Ham, occupy a territory wider than that bearing the name of Mizrak.

We may, however, suppose that Mizrak included all the first settlements, and that in remote times other tribes besides the Philistines migrated, or extended their territories. This we may infer to have been the case with the Hebrews (Ludim) or Libyans, for whom we speak them as in the remote period of the Egyptian history subject to the Pharaohs. He tells us that under the first king of the third dynasty, of Memphis, Nechores, or Nechochos, "the Libyans revolted from the Egyptians, but, on account of a wonderful increase of the moon, submitted through fear" (Cory's Anc. Frag. 2d edit. p. 100, 101). It is unlikely that at this very early time the Memphis kingdom ruled far, if at all, beyond the western boundary of Egypt. See MIZRAIM.

Land of Hm.—By this and similar poetic terms the Psalmist designates Egypt in Ps. cvi, 25 ("Jacob saw and cried in the land of Hm.") (Gen. xxxxi, 52), and in the plural, synonymous with יָם הנְגְּלָה, which with compare ver. 27, and cvi, 22, 29, and in Ps. lxxviii, 51 (where "the tabernacles of Hm.") יָם הנְגְּלָה, is again parallel with יָם הַנּוֹגְלָה.

What in these passages is the poetical name of Egypt in Hebrew, was among the Egyptians themselves probably the domestic and usual designation of their country (Gesenius). According to Gesenius, this name of Hm ("Coptic Chemi," for which Lepsius, however, substitutes another word, Hem [Memphis] or Hm [Memphite]) is derived from the swarthy complexion of the people (what Gesenius calls Coptic Lepsius designates by the now more usual term Memphitic). Gesenius adds the Sahidic (Lepsius's Thebaic) form of "our word Kene [from ken, black]"; but Lepsius denies that the name of Egypt, Hm [חָי], has "any direct connection" with this word, he substitutes the root hem, or hem [Memphite], which is softened into iken, or ikeen, in the sister dialect of Thebes; the meaning of which is to be hot (Tattam, Lex. Egypt. Lat. p. 658, 671). Chemi, however, and Kene, are, no doubt, the constantly used terms for the name of the country (see Tattam, p. 150, 156, and Uhlemann, Phot. Gr. et Lat. p. 154), while Lepsius speaks of the contrast in the color of the sand, which was red, but that of its soil, which formed a strong contrast with the adjacent countries." (Comp. Herodotus melagyn, ii, 12, and Plutarch's Ἀλμυρος ἐν τοῖς μελαστοῖς μελαγγοῦσιοι...Χρήσις καλεσθε, De Isid. et Osir. [Heisek], vii, 487.) In the hieroglyphic language the name occurs as KM. The inscription of it, as it frequently occurs on the Rosetta stone, is pronounced by Champollion, Akerblad, and Spohr, Khn (Gesen. Theor. p. 489). The name by which Egypt is commonly called in Hebrew, יָם הַנּוֹגְלָה should probably be translated Egypt in 2 Kings xix, 24; Isa. xix, 6; xxxvii, 25; and Micah vii, 12; Gesen. and Fürst, s. v.), was not used by the Egyptians (Bühler, He- rodot. p. 348), but by Axarites it appears to have been much used of the land of the Nile, as is evident from the cuneiform inscriptions. The Median form of the name was Mitzarqqa; the Babylonian, Mizir; the Assyrian, Mzeri. The Arabic name of the present capital of Egypt is Misir, and the country is called Mesir (Sir H. Rawlinson, Jour. R. A. Soc. vol. xiv. p. i, p. 18; Lepsius, in Herzog, s. v. Egypt). Josephus (Ant. i, 6, 2) renders the Hebrew name of Egypt by Mitzryp, and of the people by Μηθαια, Whether, however, we regard the native name from the father, or the Asiatic from the son, they both vouch for the Hamite character of Egypt, which probably differed from all the other settlements of this race in having Ham himself as the actual ἀργυρύς of the nation, among whom also he perhaps lived and died. This circumstance would afford sufficient reason both why the nation itself should regard the Hamite race as their εἶναι εἰς τὸν Ἰσραήλ, who only succeeded him in the work of settlement, and why, moreover, foreigners with no other interest than simply to distinguish one Hamitic colony from another should have preferred for that purpose the name of the son, which would both designate this particular nation, and at the same time distinguish it from such as were kindred to it.

On the sons of Mizrak we must be brief. Josephus noticed the different fortune which had attended the names of the sons from that of the grandsons of Ham, especially in the family of Mizrak; for while "time had not hurt" the name "him" (Gen. iv, 2), "we know nothing but their names." Jerome (who in these points mostly gives us only the echo of Josephus) says similarly: "Catene sex gentes ignote sunt nobis...quia usque ad oblivionem preteritorum nomenclum pervenero." They both, indeed, except two names from the obscurity which had oppressed the other six, Lubitum and Philius, and give them "a local habitation with their name." What this is we shall notice soon; meanwhile we briefly state such identifications of the others as have occurred to commentators. Josephus, it will be observed, renders all these plural Hebrew names by singular forms, which would seem to indicate "they were speaking their own languages" (comp. ver. 20, which surmounts our table), centered around their patriarch, from whom, of course, they derived their gentile name: thus, Ludim from Lud: Pathrarium from Pathras, etc. (Feldhoff, p. 94). Lenormant notices the fact of so many nations emerging from Egypt, and spreading over Africa (C. Sis. Occidentale, p. 214), for he understands these names to be of peoples, not individuals; so Michaelis, Spicileg. p. 254, who quotes Aben-Ezra for the same opinion. Aben-Ezra, however, does not herein represent the general opinion of the Jewish doctors. The relative בּוּנָה...בּוּנָה misled him; he thought it necessarily implied locally, and not a personal antecedent. Mendensohn declares him wrong in this view, and refers to Gen. xiv. 24, "It is probably," he adds, "that Ludim and the other names were those of men, who gave their names to their descendants. Such was the opinion of Rashi, etc.," who takes the same view as the old Jewish historian.

1. Ludim (Josephus Aosadusos) is not to be confused with Shem's son Los (ver. 22), the progenitor of the Shechinians of the ancient inhabitants of Scripture (Isa. xxvii, 19; Jer. xlvi, 9; Ezek. xxxvii, 10; xxx, 5) as a warlike nation, skilled in the use of spear and bow, and seem to have been employed (much as the Swiss have been) as mercenary troops (Gesen, Jastius, iii, 911). Bochart (who placed Cush in Arabia) reserved
Hammath, or realpath, is one of his reasons being based on their use of the bow, as he learns of Herodotus, Strabo, Ptolemy, and Diodorus Siculus. But the people of North Africa were equally dexterous with this implement of war; we have therefore no difficulty in connecting the Libyans with the country through which the river Satara passes, as is said in 2 Kings 19. In 2 Kings 14:18, the province of Taphrain (Tangier); so Bohlen, Delitzsch, and Feldhoff, which last writer finds other names of cognate origin in North Africa, e.g., the tribe called Ludyata, inhabiting one of the oases, and the district of Dusbaram, in Nigmia. Delitzsch suggests the Egyptian Lotepe or Lote, and Clarke the Moor of Egypt, while Knobel suggests the Berber tribe Luddath, and Lenormant (L'ère Océan. p. 244) the Nubians; they think a proximity to Egypt would be most compatible with the fact that the Ludii were Egyptian auxiliaries (Jer. xlvi, 9).

2. Assamit (Josephus 'Assamit) are, with unusual unanimity, placed by the commentators in Egypt. Calmet represents the older opinion, quoting Jonathan's Targ. for the Mevortis. Knobel (who with agree Delitzsch, Keil, and Feldhoff) places them in the Delta, the Septuagint rendering 'Assamit of Socin, is supposed by Knobel, and Lenormant, the Egyptians or for north country. The word occurs nowhere else in the Old Testament. See Assamit.

3. Lébañum (Josephus 'Laënian, 'Laënian) is, with absolute unanimity, including even Jerome and Josephus (who says, 'L. tōu katókoukranovn kai týn týn aífr aífr anáklousa), identified with the shorter word ἱππαῖος, Labin, in 2 Chron. xii. 3; xvi. 9; and called Lābân in Nahum iii. 9, Dan. xi. 45. They are there the Lébañim; Bochart limits the word to the Lébañia- nis, on the western front of Egypt; so Knobel. The Hebrew word has been connected (by Bochart) with πιθανόν, and the plur. of ἵππαῖος, which means 'horse.' Rashi supposing that they are so called "because their faces were inflamed with the sun's heat" (Isa. xiii. 8), from their residence so near the torrid zone. Hitig's idea that the Lébañim may be Nubians is also held by Lenormant (L'ère Océan. p. 244). The opinion of the latter is based upon the general principle entertained by him, that, as Cush peoples Ethiopia, and Phut Libya, and Canaan Phenicia, so to Mizrayim must be appropriated Egypt, or (at least) the vicinity of that country. There is some foundation for this view, although the application of it in the case of Lébañum need not confine his choice to Nubia. Libya, with which the name is associated by most writers since Josephus, is contiguous to Egypt, on its western frontier, and would answer the conditions as well as Nubia. See Lébañum.

4. Niksah (Josephus 'Niksa) according to Bochart and Rosenmuller, should be identified with Nebyssus, in the north of Egypt; Bohlen suggests the Nubota, in Libya: Corn. mit S. Lap. the Numidians; Patrick (after Grotius) represents it, in N. Erod. viii. 14, 16, and Jer. xliv. 46, and the Hebrews the peoples of Jehovah (Ezek. xxxvi. 20). See Naphthuchim.

5. Pathrusha (Josephus 'Pathriot) are undoubtedly the people of Upper Egypt, or the Thebaid, of which the capital, Thebes, is mentioned, under the name of No and Napata, in Numb. xvi. 36, 37, Jer. xlix. 2. Pathrusha is an Egyptian name, signifying the South country (pet-ret), which may possibly include Nubia also; in Isa. xi. 11, and probably Jer. xlv. 15. Pathrus is mentioned as distinct from, though in close connection with, Egypt. By Greek and Roman writers the Thebaid is called Nubia Phutirtides (Pliny, Hist. Nat. v. 9; Ptol. iv. 5, 69). So Bochart, Bohlen, Delitzsch, Kalisch, Keil, Knobel. Brugsch's suggestion that our word comes from Pa-Hathor, that is, the Name of Hathor, is an Egyptian deity of the nether world, is an improvable one. See Pathrusha.

6. Casba Bumin (Josephus Hēleos) is, in addition to what is said in 2 Kings 19, probably the name of the district called Casiotis, which Rosenmuller writes Chasriotelo, is compounded of ρες, a "mount," and ὁ λυκός, "to burn," and well indicates a rugged and arid country, out of which a colony may be supposed to have emigrated to a land called so nearly after their own home. (Comp. Mēnebēt, and Chelebok, and Kolhâis, with the metathesis which Gesenius suggests.) This proximity to southwest Palestine of their original abode also exactly corresponds to the relation between these Casbhum and the next mentioned people, expressed in the parenthetical clause, "Out of whom came Philistim" (Gen. x. 14); i.e., the Philistines were a colony of Casbhum, probably not drawn off into the neighboring province in consequence of the poverty of their parental home, the very cause which we may suppose impelled some of the Casbhum themselves to seek a more favorable settlement on the south-east shore of the Black Sea, in Colchis.

Philistim (Josephus Pholostmioi, who, according to Josephus, supposed to the Greeks the name of Palestine. We here advert to the various readings of the Hebrew text suggested by Michaelis (Spicerly, p. 278), who, after Rashi and Masius, would transpose the sentence thus: פִּילִיסְתִּים וּפִילִּסְטִים, that is, "And Casbhum, and Chaphthornim (out of whom came Philistim)." This translation makes the subject, 'origin of the Philistines, according to Amos ix. 7, and perhaps Deut. ii. 23; Jer. xlvii. 4. Rosenmuller, Gesenius, and Bohlen assent to this change, but there is no authority for it either in MSS. Targums, or Versions; and another rendering of the passage, "Out of whom came Philistim and Chaphthornim," is equally without foundation. In the Hebrew text, as well as the Targums and the Sept., Philistim alone appears as a subject, all the other proper names (including the last, Chaphthornim) have the objective sign יִשְׂרָאֵל, יִשְׂרָאֵל, יִשְׂרָאֵל. This is decisive. See Philistines.

7. Chaphthornim (Josephus Χαφθορνίου εἰς Οντκόλος is rendered "Cappadocia," in the Peshito also "Cappadocia." So the other Targums, and (according to some), the ancient versions call this country "Chaptoria," a reminiscence of the origin of the Philistines, to Amos ix. 7, and perhaps Deut. ii. 23; Jer. xlvii. 4. Rosenmuller, Gesenius, and Bohlen assent to this change, but there is no authority for it either in MSS. Targums, or Versions; and another rendering of the passage, "Out of whom came Philistim and Chaphthornim," is equally without foundation. In the Hebrew text, as well as the Targums and the Sept., Philistim alone appears as a subject, all the other proper names (including the last, Chaphthornim) have the objective sign יִשְׂרָאֵל, יִשְׂרָאֵל, יִשְׂרָאֵל. This is decisive. See Philistines.
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Hitzel, Kel, and Kelisch. The versions corroborate it also, for in Jer. xvi. 9 [Sept. xxvi. 9], וָלֵי (Phut) is rendered "Libyans" in the A.V., Libyans in the Vulg., and Αἰγύπτιος in the Sept. Similarly the וָלֵי of Ezek. xxx, 5, is "Libya" in the A.V., Libyans in the Vulg., and Αἰγύπτιος in the Sept. (so xxxviii. 5). Like some of their kindred races, the children of Phut are celebrated in the Scriptures "as a warlike, well-armed tribe, sought as allies, and dreaded as enemies" (Kaisch). Phut and his nation seems to have been skilled in archery, according to the statements of the Bible. We may add, in confirmation of the preceding view of the locality of Phut, that the Coptic name of Libya, nearest to Egypt, was Πυθαί. The supposition of Hitzig that Phutus was Φερος, west of Libya, on the north coast of Africa, and of Kelisch that it might have been Βυτος, the capital of the Delta, on the south shore of the Butic lake, are unlikely to find much acceptance by the side of the universal choice of all the chief writers, which we have indicated above. (Thinly, Hist. Nat. v. 1, has mentioned the river, rendered by Josephus, as the Φυτος; χειροκοπης, and Poleney, in like manner, as the Ψαυσοις, iv, 1, 3; comp. Michaelis, Specieig. l. 160.) It must be admitted that Josephus and those who have followed him are vague in their identification. Libya was of vast extent; as, however, it extends to the Egyptian frontiers, it is perhaps best to fulfill all the conditions of the case, keeping in view the military connection which seems to have existed between Phut and Egypt, if we deposit the postricity of Phut in Eastern Libya contiguous to Egypt, not pressing too exactly the statement of Josephus, who probably meant no more, by his reference to the country of the Moors and the river Phut, than the readily allowed fact that in the vast and unexplored regions of Africa might be found traces, in certain local names, of this ancient son of Ham. The only objection to this extent of Libya is that this part of the country has never a reality assigned to it by the Jews (see above). To us, however, it seems sufficient to obviate this difficulty, to hold that while the Lehabim impinged on the border of Upper Egypt, the children of Phut were contiguous to Lower Egypt, and extended westward along the north coast of Africa, and into the very interior of the continent. Phut was no doubt of much greater extent than the Lehabim, who were only a branch of Mizraim; for it will be observed that in the case of Phut, unlike his brothers, he is mentioned alone without children. Their settlements are included in the general name of their father Phut, without the subdivisions into which their other brothers' children were arranged. The designation, therefore, of Phut is generic; of Λεδαι, Λεβαθίμ, etc., specific, and in territory limited.

IV. Canaan (Josephus Ἀσανίαν, so the Sept.) was the youngest of the sons of Ham, and there is less obscurity concerning his descendants. "Canaan, the fourth son of Ham," says Josephus (Ant. i, 6, 2), "inhabited the country now called Judea (την και κωλομοντι λωνας)." In the time of Josephus, it must be recollected, this included the entire country which we loosely call the Holy Land), and called it after his own name, Canaan. This country is most distinctly described by him, and by other in Holy Scripture, and in the record of Ham's family in Gen. x, its boundaries are sketched (see ver. 19), excluding the district east of the Jordan. The name Canaan, however, is sometimes used in a more limited sense than is indicated here and elsewhere. Thus, in Numb. xiii, 29, "the Children of Israel dwelt by well by well and by the coast of the Jordan" (i.e. obviously in the lowlands, both maritime and inland), in opposition to the Hittites and others who occupy the highlands. This limitation probably indicates the settlements of Canaan only—as a separate tribe, apart from those of his sons—afterwards to be enlarged for a similar reason, by the addition of a more extensive name, Cæsar, De Bell. Gall. i, 1, where Gallia has both a specific and a generic sense; comp. also the specific as well as generic meaning of Angle or Engle in the Saxon Chronicle (Gibson, p. 18; Thorpe, i, 21) of "Angle comon ... East Engla, Middel Angla). On the much- vexed questions of the curse of Noah (who was the object of it, and what was the extent) we can here only touch upon the dominant of Josephus. What he discovered, however, of the power, energy, and widely- spread dominion of the sons of Ham, whom we have hitherto mentioned, offers some guidance to the solution of at least the latter question. The remarkable enterprise of the Cushite hero, Nimrod, his establishment of imperial power, as an advance on patriarchal government; the strength of the Egypt of Mizraim, and its long domination over the house of Israel; and the evidence which now and then appears that even Phut (who is the most obscure in his fortunes of all the Hamitic race) maintained a relation to the descendants of Shem which was far from servile or subject—all clearly tend to limit the application of Noah's maledictory prophecy to the precise terms in which it was intimated: "Cursed be Canaan; a servant of servants shall he [not Cush, not Mizraim, not Phut; but he] be to his brethren" (Gen. ix, 25). The mention of "Amen-Enar, of Cush, Mizraim, and Phut, his father's sons"—with remarkable innuendo to the context: "Blessed be the Lord God of Shem, and Canaan shall be his servant. God shall enlarge Japhet ... and Canaan shall he his servant" (ver. 26, 27). If we, then, confine the imprecation to Canaan, we can without likelihood account for its accomplishment by the subjugation of the tribes which issued from him, to the children of Israel from the time of Joshua to that of David. Here would be verified Canaan's servile relation to Shem; and when imperial Rome finally wrested "the sceptre from Judah," and "dwelling in the tents of Shem" occupied the East and whatever remnants of Canaan were left in it, would not this accomplish that further prediction that Japhet, too, should be lord of Canaan, and that (as it would seem to be tacitly implied) mediately, through his occupancy of "the tents of Shem?"

1. Sidon (Josephus ἅσανοι ὑπ' οὐδάμων καὶ νανιὰς ἐλικτῶν) was the father of the well-known Hittites, who lived in the south of Palestine around Hebron and Beersheba; in the former of which place the sepulchre of Abraham was purchased of them (Gen. xxiii. 3). Essau married "two daughters of Heth," who gave great sorrow to their husband's mother (Gen. xxvi. 16).

3. The Jebusite (Josephus ἰδουβανωτικος) had his chief residence in and around Jerusalem, which bore the name of the patriarch of the tribe, the son of Canaan, Jebus. The Jebusites lost their stronghold only in the time of David.

4. The Amorite (Josephus Αμωριομεναος) seems to have been the largest and most powerful of the tribes of Canaan. (The name "Amorites" frequently denotes the inhabitants of the entire country.) This tribe occupied portions of territory on both sides of the Jordan, but its strongest hold was in "the hill country" of Judah, as it was a long time before the Jebusites were subdued.

5. The Girgasite (Josephus Ἡπαγασια) cannot be for certain identified. (Origen conjectured that the Girgasites might be the Gergasenes of Matt. viii, 18.)

6. The Hivite (Josephus Ἠβινοι) lived partly in the neighborhood of Shechem, and partly at the foot of Hermon and Lebanon.

7. The Arkite (Josephus adds for once a locality—'Ἀρκατικοι δι' ἑξενον) ἀρμον τιν ρι τη' Διαίσια, Ant. i, 6, 2) lived in the Phoenician city of Areis, north of Tripolis. Under the emperors of Rome it bore the name of Caesarea. It was the scene of a notable jubilee celebrated in the time of the Crusades. Its ruins are still extant at Tel Arka (Burckhardt, Syria, p. 162).
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8. The Sinite (Josephus Σωτιαῖος) probably dwelt near his brother, the Arkite, on the mountain fortress of Σωτιαῖος, mentioned by Strabo (xy, 756) and by Jerome. The Areadiac (Josephus Ἀραδιαῖος) is mentioned by Josephus as occupying the island that is later called Crete is celebrated in Phoenician history. (Strabo describes it in xvi, 756.) The men of Aread became celebrated by Ezek., xxvii, 11. See AYVAZ.

10. The Sannite (Josephus Σαννιαῖος) inhabited the town of Sannia (Σαννια, mentioned by Strabo), near the river Eleutherus, at the western extremity of the mountains of Lebanon; extensive ruins of this city are found at the present day bearing the name of Sumurub.

11. The Hamathite (Josephus Ἀμαθιαῖος). The entering in of Hamath indicates the extreme northern frontier of the Holy Land, as 'the great city of Egypt' does its southernmost limit (1 Kings viii, 65 sq.).

In the verse following the enumeration of these names, the sacred writer says, 'Afterwards were the families of the Canaanites spread abroad.' This seems to indicate subsequent conquests made by them previous to their own subjugation by the Israelites. 'To show the great goodness of God towards Israel,' says the Jewish commentator Mendelssohn, 'Moses records in Gen. x the original narrow limits of the land possessed by the Canaanites, which they were permitted to extend by conquest from their neighboring nations. In the case of the Amorite Sihon, Num. xxiii, 26) up to the very time when Israel was ready to take possession of the whole. To prepare his readers for the great increase of the Canaanitish dominions, the sacred historian, in this early chapter, where he mentions their original boundaries, takes care to state that subsequently to their primitive occupation of the land, the families of the Canaanites spread abroad, until their boundaries became such as are described in Numbers xxxiv.' The Hamathites alone of those identified were settled in early times wholly beyond the land of Canaan. Perhaps the ground for the large extension of the Hebrew tribes after their establishment in the land called after their ancestor. One of their most important extensions was to the north-east, where was a great branch of the Hittite nation in the valley of the Orontes, constantly mentioned in the wars of the Pharaohs, and in those of the kings of Assyria. These passages which have occasioned much controversy may here be noticed. In the account of Abraham's entrance into Palestine it is said, 'And the Canaanite [was] then in the land' (Gen. xii, 6); and as to a somewhat later time, that of the separation into the two parts, Philistia and the Perizzites dwelt then in the land (xiii, 7). These passages have been supposed either to be late glosses, or to indicate that the Pentateuch was written at a late period. A comparison of all the passages referring to the primitive history of Palestine and Judæa shows that there was an earlier population expelled by the Hamitic and Abrahamite settlers. This population was important in the time of the war of Chedorlomer; but at the Exodus, more than four hundred years afterwards, there was but a remnant of it. It is most natural, therefore, to infer that the two passages under consideration mean that the Canaanitish settlers were already in the land, not that they were still there.

C. General Characteristics. Such were Ham and his family, notwithstanding the stigma which adhered to that section of them which came into the nearest relation with the Israelites; they were the most energetic of the descendants of Noah in the early ages of the postdiluvian world—at least we have a fuller description of their enterprise than of their brethren's as displayed in the primitive ages. The development of empire among the Euphrates Cushites was a step much in advance of the rest of mankind in political organization; nor was the grandson of Ham less conspicuous as a conqueror. The only coherent interpretation of the important passage which is contained in Gen. x, 10-12, is that which is adopted in the margin of the A.V. After Nimrod had laid the foundation of his empire ('the beginning of his kingdom,' Gen. x, 10, 'as the first ripe in the fig-tree מָנָב הַכַּפֶּרֶת at her first time,' that is, when the tree first begins to bear—Gesenius), in his native Shinar, not satisfied with the splendid acquisitions which he took at first, no doubt, from his own country, he invaded the kingdom of the Hamitic countries, where the children of Shem were for the first time disturbed in their patriarchal simplicity: 'Out of that land [even Shinar, Nimrod] went forth to Ashur [or Assyria], and built Nineveh, and the city Reho-both, and Calah, and Resen, between Nineveh and Calah; the same is the beginning of the Assyrians,' i.e., the combination of the four mentioned, with their interjacent spaces, the 'great city.' The objection to this rendering is based by Rosendtiller (Schol. ad loc.), after other commentators, on the absence of the מִכְלָא local spapended to the מַעֲשֶׂה [which they say ought to be מִכְלָא נַעֲשֶׂה to produce the meaning to Assyria]. The מִכְלָא [local] is, however, far from indispensable for the sense we require, which has been advocated by authorities of great value and weight (e.g., the re-constructed Akkadian of inquiries [which he himself holds our view] mentions Urukku, Targ. Jonathan, Bochart, Clericus, De Wette, Tuch, Baumgarten, Dietrich, as supporting it. He might have added Josephus, who makes Nimrod the builder of Babylon (Ant. i, 4), and Kalisch, and Keil. To make the passage Gen. x, 10-12 descriptive of the Semitic Ashur, is to do violence to the passage itself and its context. Ascher, moreover, is mentioned in his proper place in vers. 22, without, however, the least indication of an intention of describing him as the founder of a rival empire to that of Nimrod. Gesenius admits the probability of our view, without any objection of grammar or of sense. (See, for instances of the accus. noun (without the suffix of local מִכְלָא) after verbs of motion, Num. xxxiii, 4; Gen. xxxiii, 18; 2 Chron. xx, 86. Compare Gesenius, Gram. p. 130, 172, and Nordheimer's Gram. sec. 841.) This is the opinion of Knobel, answering to the theory which has connected the ruins of Khorsabad, Koyunjik, Ninevah, and Keremli to the remains of a vast quadrilateral city, popularly called Nineveh. (For a different view of the whole subject the reader is referred to Mr. Rawlinson's recent volume on The Five Great Monarchies, i, 811-315.) But the genius which moulded imperial power at first, did not avail to retain it long; the scepter, before many ages, returned to the race of Shem (for the Semitic character of the Arabian tribes who crushed the primitive Cushite power of Babylon, see Rawlinson, Great Empires, i, 222, 228. The Arabian Hamites of Yemen seem also to have merged, probably by conquest, into a Joktanite population of Semitic descent [see for these Gen. x, 29-29, and Assemani, Bibl. Orient. III, ii, 558, 544]), except in Africa, where Mizräim's descendants had a longer tenure of the Egyptian monarchy. It is well to bear in mind (and the more so, inasmuch as a different theory has here greatly obscured plain history) that in the primeval Egyptian empire of Babylon considerable progress was made in the arts of civilized society (an early allusion to which is made in Josh. vii, 21; and a later in Dan. i, 4: see Rawlinson, First Monarchy, chap. v). In the genealogical record of the race of Ham (Gen. x) reference is made to the "languages" which they spoke (ver. 20). Comparative philology, which is so rich in illustrations of the unity of the Indo-Germanic languages, has done next to nothing to elucidate the linguistic relations of the families of Ham. Philologists are not agreed as to a Hamitic class of languages. Recently Bunsen has given the term Semitic to the "Hamitic," or, as he writes it, Chalmitism, to the Egyptian language, or, rather, family. He places it at the head of the "Semitic stock," to which he considers it as but
relationship of tongues of different classes. Among these, divergences must needs be wider; but when occasional affinities crop out they will be proportionately valuable as evidences of a more ancient and profound agreement. It seems to us that the facts, which have thus far transpired, indicate that the term Semitic has been applied for the ancient language of the southern coast of Arabia. This terminology depends in every instance upon the race of the nation speaking the language, and not upon any theory of a Hamitic class. There is evidence which, at the first view, would incline us to consider that the term Semitic, as applied to the Syro-Arabic races, should be changed to Hamitic; but, on a more careful examination, it becomes evident that any absolute classification of languages into groups corresponding to the three great Noachian families is not tenable. The Biblical evidence seems, at first sight, in favor of Hebrew being classed as a Hamitic rather than a Semitic form of speech. It is called in the Bible the "language of Canaan," נֵפֵל נַעֲמָת (Isa. xix. 18), although those speaking it are elsewhere said to speak הָרָעָם, Haraas (2 Kings xviii, 26, 28; Isa. xxxvi, 11, 13; Neh. xiii, 24).

But the one term, as Gesenius remarks (Gramm. Introd.), indicates the country where the language was spoken; the other as evidently indicates a people by whom it was spoken: thus the question of its being a Hamitic or a Semitic language is not touched. The circumstance that it was the language of Canaan is agreeable with its being either indigenous (and therefore either Canaanite or Rehebite), or adopted (and therefore perhaps Semitic). The names of Canaanish persons and places, as Gesenius has observed (6. c), conclusively show that the Canaanites spoke what we call Hebrew. Elsewhere we might find evidence of the use of a so-called Semitic language by nations either partly or wholly of Hamitic origin. This evidence would favor the theory that Hebrew was Hamitic; but, on the other hand, we are unable to discover a Semitic language from Semitic peoples. The Egyptian language would also offer great difficulties, unless it were held to be partly of Hamitic origin, since it is mainly of an entirely different class from the Semitic. It is mainly Nigritic, but it also contains Semitic elements. It is the opinion of the latest philologists that the ground-work is Nigritic, and that the Semitic part is a layer added to a complete Nigritic language. The two elements are mixed, but not fused. Some Iranian scholars hold that the two elements are mixed, and that the ancient Egyptian represents the transition from Turanian, and the same term has been used for the ancient language of the southern coast of Arabia. The only solution of the difficulty seems to be that we call Semitic is early Noachian.

(See Rawlinson, Five Great Monarchies, First Mon. ch. iv; Lenormant, Introduction à l'Histoire de l'Afrique occidentale, 1st Appendix; Meier, Heb. Wurzel. w. b. 3rd Anhang; Gesenius, Skizzen des Heb. Lauts, prefixed to his Grammar; Bunsen, Egypt's Place, etc., vol. 1, Append. 1; Wiseman, Lectures on Science and Revealed Religion, p. 445, 24 ed.; Max Müller, Science of Language, p. 269.) See SEMITIC LANGUAGES.

Theories more or less specious have been formed to account for these affinities to the Hebrew from so many points of the Hamitic nations. Not to rise above the degree of precarious hypothesis, nor could it be expected that they should in the imperfection of our present knowledge. It is, indeed, satisfactory to observe that the tendency of linguistic inquiries is to establish the fact avouched in the Pentateuch of the original Hamitic speech. The obvious advantage of comparative philology hitherto has been to prove the affinity of the members of that large class of languages which extend from the Eastern Scandic to the Western Welsh; parallel with this is the comparison among themselves of the various members of the Semitic and Sabeo-Canaanitic languages, which has demonstrated their essential identity; but greater still will be the work of establishing, on certain principles, the natural relationship of tongues of different classes. Among these, divergences must needs be wider; but when occasional affinities crop out they will be proportionately valuable as evidences of a more ancient and profound agreement. It seems to us that the facts, which have thus far transpired, indicate that the term Semitic has been applied for the ancient language of the southern coast of Arabia. This terminology depends in every instance upon the race of the nation speaking the language, and not upon any theory of a Hamitic class. There is evidence which, at the first view, would incline us to consider that the term Semitic, as applied to the Syro-Arabic races, should be changed to Hamitic; but, on a more careful examination, it becomes evident that any absolute classification of languages into groups corresponding to the three great Noachian families is not tenable. The Biblical evidence seems, at first sight, in favor of Hebrew being classed as a Hamitic rather than a Semitic form of speech. It is called in the Bible the "language of Canaan," נֵפֵל נַעֲמָת (Isa. xix. 18), although those speaking it are elsewhere said to speak הָרָעָם, Haraas (2 Kings xviii, 26, 28; Isa. xxxvi, 11, 13; Neh. xiii, 24).

But the one term, as Gesenius remarks (Gramm. Introd.), indicates the country where the language was spoken; the other as evidently indicates a people by whom it was spoken: thus the question of its being a Hamitic or a Semitic language is not touched. The circumstance that it was the language of Canaan is agreeable with its being either indigenous (and therefore either Canaanite or Rehebite), or adopted (and therefore perhaps Semitic). The names of Canaanish persons and places, as Gesenius has observed (6. c), conclusively show that the Canaanites spoke what we call Hebrew. Elsewhere we might find evidence of the use of a so-called Semitic language by nations either partly or wholly of Hamitic origin. This evidence would favor the theory that Hebrew was Hamitic; but, on the other hand, we are unable to discover a Semitic language from Semitic peoples. The Egyptian language would also offer great difficulties, unless it were held to be partly of Hamitic origin, since it is mainly of an entirely different class from the Semitic. It is mainly Nigritic, but it also contains Semitic elements. It is the opinion of the latest philologists that the ground-work is Nigritic, and that the Semitic part is a layer added to a complete Nigritic language. The two elements are mixed, but not fused. Some Iranian scholars hold that the two elements are mixed, and that the ancient Egyptian represents the transition from Turanian, and the same term has been used for the ancient language of the southern coast of Arabia. The only solution of the difficulty seems to be that we call Semitic is early Noachian.

(See Rawlinson, Five Great Monarchies, First Mon. ch. iv; Lenormant, Introduction à l'Histoire de l'Afrique occidentale, 1st Appendix; Meier, Heb. Wurzel. w. b. 3rd Anhang; Gesenius, Skizzen des Heb. Lauts, prefixed to his Grammar; Bunsen, Egypt's Place, etc., vol. 1, Append. 1; Wiseman, Lectures on Science and Revealed Religion, p. 445, 24 ed.; Max Müller, Science of Language, p. 269.) See SEMITIC LANGUAGES.

Theories more or less specious have been formed to account for these affinities to the Hebrew from so many points of the Hamitic nations. Not to rise above the degree of precarious hypothesis, nor could it be expected that they should in the imperfection of our present knowledge. It is, indeed, satisfactory to observe that the tendency of linguistic inquiries is to establish the fact avouched in the Pentateuch of the original Hamitic speech. The obvious advantage of comparative philology hitherto has been to prove the affinity of the members of that large class of languages which extend from the Eastern Scandic to the Western Welsh; parallel with this is the comparison among themselves of the various members of the Semitic and Sabeo-Canaanitic languages, which has demonstrated their essential identity; but greater still will be the work of establishing, on certain principles, the natural
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subsequent history of the Hebrew nation in its relations to the rest of mankind. The intelligent reader of Scripture will experience much help in his study of that history, and indeed of prophecy also, by a constant recurrence to the particulars of this authoritative ethnological record.

We conclude with an extract from Mr. Rawlinson’s *Five Great Monarchies*, which describes, in a favorable though hardly exaggerated light, some of the obligations under which the primitive race of Ham has laid the world: “Not possessed of many natural advantages, the Chaldean people yet exhibited a fertility of invention, a genius, and an energy which place them high in the scale of nations, and more especially in the list of those descended from the Hamitic stock. For the last 2000 years the world has been mainly indebted for its advancement to the Semitic and Indo-European races; he was otherwise in the first ages. Egypt and Babylon, Mmaram and Nimrod—both descendants of Ham—led the way and acted as pioneers of mankind in the various unexplored fields of art, literature, and science. Alphabetic writing, astronomy, history, chronology, architecture, plastic art, sculpture, navigation, agriculture, textile industry, and so on, are all of Ham’s origin in one or other of these two countries. The beginnings may often have been humble enough. We may laugh at the rude picture-writing, the unseemly brick pyramids, the coarse fabric, the homely and ill-shaped instruments, as they present themselves to our notice in the remains of these ancient peoples; they are really worthier of our admiration than of our ridicule. The first inventors of any art are among the greatest benefactors of their race... and mankind at the present day lies under infinite obligations to the genius and industry of these early ages” (p. 73, 74).

2. “THEY OF HAM” [or Cham] (בָּשָׂם, Sept.* Ec 5:22*; Vulg. de stirpe Cham) are mentioned in I Chron. iv, 40—in one of those historical fragments for which the early chapters of these Chronicles are so valuable, as illustrating the private enterprise and valor of certain sections of the Hebrew nation. On the present occasion a considerable portion of the tribe of Simon, consisting of thirteen princes and their clansmen, in the reign of Hezekiah, sought to extend their territories (which from the beginning seem to have been too narrow for their numbers) by migrating “to the entrance of Gebor, even unto the east side of the valley, to seek pasture for their flocks.” First to be mentioned are the Gedorim, who, it would seem, a secure and defenceless population of Hamites (the meaning of I Chron. iv, 40 receives illustration from Judg. xviii, 7, 28), the Simeonites attacked them with a vigor that reminds us of the times of Joshua, and took permanent possession of the district, which was well adapted for pastoral purposes. The Gedor (g.v.) of Josh. xv, 58, there is strong ground, however, for supposing that it may be the Geerah (g.v.). of Judg. xxv, 40, and read הָגָּר for הָגָר, it would be the well-known Gebor. This last would, of course, if the name could be relied on, fit extremely well; in its vicinity the patriarchs of old had sojourned and fed their flocks and herds (see Gen. xx, 1, 14, 15; xxvi, 1, 6, 14, and especially ver. 17-20). Bertheau (die E. der Chronik) on this passage, and Ewald (Gesch. des Völker Israel [ed. 2], i, 322) accept the reading of the Sept., and place the Simeonite conquest in the valley of Gebor, and not of Gebur (Ezech. xxxv, 13) as is usual. Here is a note, contributed by the Rev. J. Rowlands, on the Southern Border of Palestine, and containing an account of his supposed discovery of the ancient Gebar (called Nebot al-Gebar, the ruins of Gebar); see also Van de Velde, *Memor*, (p. 314). In the determination of the ancient Gebor, with which this Gebor is supposed to be identical, it matters but little which of these two localities we accept as the residence of those children of Ham whom the Simeonites dispossessed. Both are within the precincts of the land of the Philistines: the latter, perhaps, may be regarded as on the border of the district which we assigned in the preceding article to the Cushite; in either case “they of Ham,” of whom we are writing, in I Chron. iv, 40, must be regarded as descended from Ham through Gebor and not through Gebaim.

3. HAM (Heb. *עִבְרִי, with k€, prob. meaning a multitude; Eust. [Lex. s. v.] compares the Laut. *Turbo* and *Copia* as names of places; the Sept. and Vulg. translate *vita* *vastaria* [כְּמָנָה], in Gen. xiv, 5, if a proper name at all, was probably the principal town of a people whose name occurs but once in the O.T., “the Zuzim” (as rendered in the A.V.). If these were “the Zamzumims” of Deut. ii, 20 (as has been conjectured by Rashi, Calmet, Patrick, etc., among the older writers, and Gesenius, Rosenmüller, Ewald [Volks Israel, i, 308], Delitzsch, Knobel, and Keil among the moderns), we have some clue to the site; for it appears from the entire passage in Deut. that the Zamzummim were the original occupants of the country of the Ammonites. Such and others have accordingly supposed that our Ham, where the Zuzim were defeated by Chedorlaomer on his second invasion, was the primitive name of Raboboth Asmon, afterwards Philadelphia (Jerome and Eusebius, Onomast. s. v. Amman), the capital of the Ammonite territory. It is still held by some as the ruins of Rameth, according to Robinson (Researches, iii, 168). There is some doubt, however, whether the word in Gen. xiv, 5 be anything more than a pronoun. The Masoretic reading of the clause, indeed, is הַבָּשָׂם הַמּוֹסְרִים, the last word of which is pointed, הַמּוֹסְרִים (A.V. “In Ham”), as if there were three battles, and one of them had been fought at a place so called; and it perhaps makes for this reading according to Kennicott (I Chron. iv, 20*;* read הַבָּשָׂם with Heth), which can produce no other meaning than in Ham, or Cham with the aspirate. Yet the other (that is, the pronounal) reading must have been recognised in ancient Hebrew MSS, even as early as the time of the Sept. translators, who render the phrase “together with them;” as if there were but two conflicts, in the former of which the great Eastern invader “smote the Rephaim in Ashteroth-Karnaim, and the Zuzim [which the Sept. makes an appellative— צִיִּים־יַעַיְיָה, strong nations] along with them,” as their allies. Jerome’s Quast. Hebr. Opera (ed. Bened., Ven. 1767, III, ii, 267) proves that the Hebrew MSS, extant in his day varied in their readings of this passage. This reading he seems to have preferred, הַמּוֹסְרִים, for in his own version [Vulgate] he renders the word like the Sept. Onkelos, however, regarded the reading evidently as a proper name, for he has translated it by בַּשָּם, “in Hentu,” and so has the Pseudo-Jonathan’s Targum; while the Jerusalem has בַּשָּם, “with them.” Saadia, again, has the proper name, in “Hama.” Hillerus, whom Rosenmuller quotes, identifies this Hlam with the famous Ammonite capital Ribkah (2 Sam. xi, 1; 1 Chron. viii, 42), the two names being synonymous—Ribkah meaning populous, as in Lament. i, 1, where Jerusalem is בַּשָּם, the city [that was] full of people, while the more ancient name of the same city, הֶבַּשָּם, has the same signification as the collective word בַּשָּם, that is, a multitude.” See Git. 1.

HAMAKER, Heinrich Arex, a Dutch Orientalist, was born at Amsterdam Feb. 25, 1789; became professor of Oriental languages in the Academy of Franeker in 1815, assistant professor in 1817, and in 1822 professor or ordinarius of the same in the University of Leyden, where he died Jan. 10, 1835. He was the most noted ex- trordination, and was regarded as one of the first Oriental scholars of Holland. His works are not free from marks of negligence, due probably to hasty composition and
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the great variety of subjects treated. Among them may be named Oratio de religioni Magno
vita Graecor apud orientalem incipitum (Leyden, 1817–
18, 4to);—Specimen Catalogi Codicum MSS., Orienta
librum Biblicum Bibliothecae Regiae (Leyden, 1820,
4to);—with valuable notes from Oriental MSS.—a
new ed by Dozy (Leyden, 1834.2, 2 vols. 8vo) contains
bibliographical notes left in MS. by Hamaker.)—
Incerti Autoris Liber de Ezerapynion Memphidae et Alexo
drias, etc. (Leyden, 1825, 4to):—Miscellanea Phcenica
(Leyden, 1828);—Commentatio in librum Vita et Mort.
Prophetarum, etc. (Amst. 1833, 4to):—Miscellanea Sa
maritana, a posthumous work edited by Weyers. He
published also various papers in Annalen der univer
sities of Gottingen (1816–17) and Leyden (1825–24); in
the Bibliotheca Nova of Leydn., Magazin der Weten
schappen van der Kampen, and in the Journal Ana
tique of Paris. Others have been posthumously pub
lished in the Orientalia (Leyden), vol. i and ii.—Pierer,
a.v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, xxiii, 209; De Sacy,
in Jour. des Savants, 1820, 1827, 1829, 1834.
(J. W. M.)

homon, magnificant, or the Sansar, hemen, the planet
Mercury: Sept. "Aqav), a favorite and chief minister
or chief of Persia, whose history is involved in
that of Esther and Mordecai (Esther iii, 1 sq.), B. C. 473.
See Haraseus. He is called an Agagite; and as Agag
was a kind of title of the kings of the Amalekites (see
Agag, it is supposed that Haman was descended from
the royal family of that nation (see Gesenius, Thes. Heb.
in the Bible, p. 99). Haman's parents probably took their way
to Persia as captives or hostages; and that the foreign
origin of Haman was no bar to his advancement at court is
a circumstance quite in union with the most ancient and
still subsisting usages of the East. Joseph, Daniel,
and Mordecai afford other examples of the same kind.
After the failure of his attempt to cut off all the Jews
in the Persian empire, he was hanged on the gallows
which he had erected for Mordecai. Most probably he
is the same Aman who is mentioned as the oppressor of
Achichiarius (Tobit xiv, 10). The Targum and Josephus
(Ant. xi, 6, 5) interpret the description of him
the Agagite—as signifying that he was of Amalekite descent;
but he is called a Macedonian by the Sept, in
Esth. ix. 24 (comp. iii, 1), and a Persian by Sulpicius
Severus. Prideaux (Connex, anno 438) computes the
sum which he offered to pay into the royal treasury at
the king of Persia, for 2,000,000 drachmas; and says he
was in the habit of designating any Christian
enemy by his name (Eisenmenger, Ent. Jud. i, 721).
The circumstantial details of the height which he attained,
and of his sudden downfall, afford, like all the rest of the
book of Esther, a most faithful picture of the customs of an
Oriental court and government, and furnish invaluable materials for a comparison between
the regal usages of ancient and modern times. (See
Kitto's Daily Bible Illustr., &c.). See Esther, Book of.

Hamann, Johann Georg, an eminent German
writer; he was born at Konigsberg, in Prussia, on
the 27th of July, 1685. His early education was mis
cellaneous, and to it he attributed the want of taste and
elegance of his style. At last, when about sixteen
years old, his father decided on sending him to the
school. He there acquired a knowledge of Latin and
of other liberal sciences. For a while in 1725, he
promoted his course of study at Konigsberg with a philological
dissertation entitled De somno et somnis, and turned his
attention to teaching. After teaching for about eighteen
months in Courland he returned to Riga, where he be
came a friend of John Christopher, son of a rich mer-
chant named Berens, at whose house he met all the cele
brities of the day, and for whom, some years after
wards, he made a journey through Hamburg, Bremen,
and Amsterdam, and then returned to Konigsberg with
great celebrity. Before he set out on this journey, however, he
lost his mother, which event deeply affected him. While
in London he consulted a distinguished physician, hop
ing to have the obstruction in his speech removed; dis
appointed in that hope, he spent some months in dissi
pation, and then, feeling himself much disheartened, he
retired to an obscure part of London, procured a Bible,
and applied himself diligently to its study. His eyes
were opened, and he beheld his past life in its true col
ors, of which he gives evidence in his Gedanken iiber
meines Lebensabend (Thoughts on My Life). He then
returned to Riga, where he resided with his friend Be
rens until family circumstances led to an estrangement
between them, and in 1759 he returned to his parents' house.
There he wrote his Sokratiscbe Denkverbiigkei
ten, which were severely criticised at their first appear
ance by the literati of the day, but which gained him the esteem and respect of such men as Clau
dius, Herder, and Moser, to whom we must afterwards add Lavater, Jacobi, and Goethe. His writings did not
suffice for his support, and he had to take other employ
ment, first as copyist, afterwards as clerk in a public office.
On the outbreak of the Seven Years War he was derived from his position, and Hamann married in 1763; but, unfortunately, this
marriage cost him many of his friends, and shortly afterwards he
lost his situation. In 1754 he took a journey to Swit
serland in the hope of meeting his friend Moser, who was to
obtain him employment; but, not meeting with him, he
not only filled a small clerical position, but in 1756
he married the daughter of his employer, and was appoin
ted to a good position in the custom-house. From that
time date his finest epistolary and miscellaneous writ
ings, among which we find his admirable Golgotha and
Schlachtninsins.—"Seat thee at my right." His prospects
now brightened; one of his admirers, Francis Buchholz,
offered him a handsome fortune, with $1,000 towards
the education of each of his four children, on the condition
of his adopting him. The well-known princess Galit
zining having in 1784 become acquainted with his writ
ings, was brought over by them to a positive Christian
belief. In 1767 he came to Munster with his adopted
son Ernst. The princess became acquainted with the
princess of Solms, from thence he went to Pempfert to the philosop
her Jacobi, with whom he remained a short time. He
intended to return there once more, but was prevented by
his death, which occurred on the 20th of June, 1788. He
was, by order of the princess Galitzin, interred in her
garden, from whence, in 1851, his remains were trans
ferred to the cathedral at Munster.

Among the great men of his country, Hamann is wor
thy of a place alongside of Copernicus, Kant, Herder,
and kindred intellects. Although he cannot be called
a classical writer, yet he has claimed for himself
his place among the patriots of the modern school, the uniting link between the old and
the new German literatures. "Hamann is one of those
men of whom it is difficult to give an estimate correct
and satisfactory in all respects. Our estimation of his
character and work is new and uncertain; for a great
part of the age, as may be done with many other men,
because he stood rugged and alone, like a rocky island
in the midst of the waves of the surrounding ocean.
We cannot wholly praise or blame that age, we shall not
admire Hamann." (Hagenbach, German Rationalism, tr. by Gage, p. 267.)
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laboriously woven web of pithy expressions, of hints, and
flowers of rhetoric. "His understanding," says F.
H. Jacob, "was penetrating like lightning, and his soul
was of more than natural greatness." Most of his writ-
ings are collected in Roth's edition of his works (Berlin,
1821-48, 8 vols.). See A. W. Müller's work entitled (1)
"Kodex der Christen in der Hebräischen, Chaldäischen,
und Syrischen Schrift," (Leipzig, 1826). — Herzog, Real-Enzyklopädie, v. 486; Gi
geschiede der deutschen Literatur; Gildemeister, "Hammam's Leben und Schriften," (1864-6, 4 vols.); Saints, History of nationalism, ch. viii.

Hamath (Heb. Chamath, γαμαθος, fortress; Sept.
Japheth, Iaphet, and Hamath, a large and important city,
capital of one of the smaller kingdoms of Syria, of the
same name, on the Orontes, at the northern boundary of
the Holy Land. Thus it is said (Numb. xii, 21) that the
spies "went up and searched the land, from the wilder-
ness of Zin unto Rehob, as men come to Hamath." Ge-
ography is probably right in deriving the word from the
Arabic root Chmaus, "to defend." With this agrees the
modern name of the city, Hamah. The city was at the
foot of Hermon (Josh. xiii, 5; Judg. iii, 3), towards Da-
amascus (Zech. ix, 2; Jer. xlix, 20; Ezek. xviii, 16).
The kingdom of Hamath, or, at least, the southern or
eastern part, appear to have been associated with what
was afterwards denominated Cade-Syria (q. v.). It is
more fully called Hamath the Great in Amos vii, 2, Haramath-Zobah in 2 Chron. viii, 3. The
country or district around is called "the land of Hamath" (2 Kings xxii, 33; xxv, 21).

Hamath is one of the oldest cities in the world. We
read in Gen. xvi, 18 that the youngest or last son of Ca-
avan was the "Hamathite" (q. v.)—apparently so called
because he and his family founded and colonized Hamath.
It was a place of note, and the capital of a prin-
cipality, when the Israelites conquered Palestine; and
its name is mentioned in almost every passage in which
the northern border of Canaan is defined (Numb. xii, 
v. 22; xxiv, 8; 1 Kings viii, 65; 2 Kings xiv, 25, etc.).

Toi was king of Hamath at the time when David con-
quered the Syrians of Zobah, and it appears that he
last reason to rejoice in the humiliation of a dangerous
neighbor, as he sent his own son to congratulate the
victor (2 Kings xi, 9, 10) and to put Hamath under his protection. Hamath was conquered by
Solomon (2 Chron. viii, 8), and its whole territory
appears to have remained subject to the Israelites dur-
ing his prosperous reign (ver. 4-6). The "store-cities"
which Solomon "built in Hamath" (2 Chron. vii, 4)
were perhaps for staples of trade: the importance of
the Orontes valley as a line of traffic always being great.
On the death of Solomon and the separation of the two
kingdoms, Hamath seems to have regained its indepen-
dence. In the Assyrian inscriptions of the time of Ahab
(R.C. 900) it appears as a separate power, in alliance
with the Syrians of Damascus, the Hitites, and the
Phoenicians. About three quarters of a century later
Jeroboam the second "recovered Hamath" (2 Kings
xiv, 20); he seems to have dismantled the place, whence
the prophet Amos, who wrote in his reign (Amos i, 1),
called it "a city of the Great" with the same instance
of desolation (ib. vi, 2). At this period the kingdom of
Hamath included the valley of the Orontes, from the
source of that river to near Antioch (2 Kings xxii, 33;
xxv, 21). It bordered Damascus on the south, Zobah
on the east and north, and Phoenicia on the west (1
Chron. iv, 21; Ezek. xiv, 17; xviii, 1; Zech. x, 2).

In the time of Hezekiah, the town, along with its terri-
ory, was conquered by the Assyrians (2 Kings xvii, 24;
xviii, 34, 13; Isa. x, 9; xi, 11), and afterwards by the
Chaldeans (Jer. xxxix, 2). It is mentioned on the con-
form inscriptions (q. v.). In the time of Antiochus the
land and influential kingdom, for Amos speaks em-
phatically of "Hamath the Great" (vi, 2); and when

Babshakoh, the Assyrian general, endeavored to terrify
king Hezekiah into unconditional surrender, he said,
"Have the gods of the nations delivered them which
my fathers have destroyed, as Gozan, and Haran, and
Rezeph? Where is the king of Hamath, and the king of
Arpad, and the king of the city of Apamia, and Ivah?" (2
Kings x, 12-14; 2 Kings xii, 8 sq.). See ASHISH. The frequent use of the phrase,
"the entering in of Hamath," also shows that this king-
dom was the most important in Northern Syria (Judg.
iii, 8). Hamath remained under the Assyrian rule till
the time of the Medes who overthrew the Great, who were in the
hands of the Greeks. The Greeks introduced their no-
ble language as well as their government into Syria,
and they even gave Greek names to some of the old
cities; among these was Hamath, which was called Epi-
phania (Ἐπιφανεία), in honor of Antiochus Epiphanes (Cyril, Comment. ad Amos).

This change of name gave rise to considerable doubts
and difficulties among geographers regarding the iden-
ty of Hamath. Jerome affirms that there were two
cities of that name—Great Hamath, identical with An-
tioch, and another Hamath called Epiphania (Comment.
ad Amos, vi). The Targums in Numb. xxii, 22 render Hamath Aphanah, and Pael. 1391, Epiphania calls it "a city of Damascus," and affirms that it is not the
same as Epiphania; but Jerome states, after a care-
f ul investigation, "reperi Erasmuth urbes Syriae
appelliari, quae nunc Graeco sermo Epiphaniam dictur" (homest. ad Amos.
iii, 8). There are inscriptions that Great Hamath was Enessos, and the other Hamath
Epiphania (Comment. ad Jerem. iv). Josephus is more accurate when he tells us that Hamath "was still called
in his day by the inhabitants Αρμανη, although the
Macedonians called it Epiphania" (Ant. i, 6, 2). There
is reason to believe that the ancient name Hamath was
always retained and used by the Aramaic-speaking pop-
i lation; and, therefore, when Greek power declined, and
the Greek language was forgotten, the ancient name in its
Arabic form Hamah became universal (ςαμα in
in Ezek. xviii, 16, first occurrence). There is no ground
whatsoever for Ireland's theory (Palest. p. 121) that the
Hamath spoken of in connection with the northern bor-
der of Palestine was not Epiphania, but some other city
much further south. The identification of Riblah and
Zedad places the true site of Hamath beyond the possi-
bility of doubt (Porter, Damascus, ii, 355, 554).

Epiphania remained a flourishing city during the
Roman rule in Syria (Ptolomy, v, 15; Piny, Hist. Nat.
v, 19). It was a city of some name, and still continued as a
bishop of the Eastern Church (Caroli a. sen. Poulou,
Geog. Sac. p. 288). It was taken by the Mohammed-
ans soon after Damascus. On the death of the great
Saladin, Hamath was ruled for a long period by his de-
cendants, the Eyyubites. Abullesta, the celebrated Arab
historian and geographer of the 14th century, was a mem-
ber of this family and ruler of Hamath (Bohadin, Vita
Saladini; Schulten's Index Geographicus, s. v. Hamata).
He correctly states (Tab. Syriac, p. 108) that this city is
mentioned in the books of the Israelites. He adds: "It
is reckoned one of the most pleasant towns of Syria.
The Orontes flows round the greater part of the city on
the east and north. It boasts a lofty and well-built cit-
ad. Within the town are many dams and water-
machines, by means of which the water is led off by canals
to irrigate the gardens and supply private houses. It
is remarkable of this city and of Schulten that they
abound more in water-machines than any other cities
in Syria."

This description still, in a great degree, applies. Ha-
math is a picturesque town, of considerable circum-
ference, and with wide and convenient streets. In Burck-
hardt's time the attached district contained 126 inhabit-
te d villages, or 80 that had between 500 and 3000
inhabitants, of whom about 2500 are Greek Christians, a few Syrians, some Jews, and the
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Map of the Vicinity of Hamath.

rest Moslem. It is beautifully situated in the narrow and rich valley of the Orontes, thirty-two miles north of Emesa, and thirty-six south of the ruins of Assamea (Antonini Itinerarium, edit. Wesseling, p. 188). Four bridges span the rapid river, and a number of huge wheels turned by the current, like those at Verona, raise the water into rude aqueducts, which convey it to the houses and mosques. There are no remains of antiquity now visible. The mound on which the castle stood is in the centre of the city, but every trace of the castle itself has disappeared. The houses are built of sun-dried bricks and timber. Though plain and poor externally, some of them have splendid interiors. They are built on the rising banks of the Orontes, and on both sides of it, the bottom level being planted with fruit-trees, which flourish in the utmost luxuriance. The west end part of the district forms the granary of Northern Syria, though the harvest never yields more than a tenfold return, chiefly on account of the immense numbers of mice, which sometimes completely destroy the crops. The inhabitants carry on a considerable trade in silks and woolen and cotton stuffs with the Belaunin. A number of noble but decayed Moslem families reside in Hamath, attracted thither by its beauty, salubrity, and cheapness (Pococke, Travels, ii, pt. i, p. 143 sq.; Burkhardt, Travels in Syria, p. 146 sq.; Handbook for Syria and Palestine, ii, 620; Richter, Waldvahrten, p. 231; comp. Rosenmüller’s Bib. Geogr. ii, 243-46; Biblioth. Sacra, 1848, p. 990 sq.; Robinson's Bos. new ed. iii, 501, 568),

The entrance of Hamath, or entering into Hamath (תַּמַּת; Sept. στις τροχούσαν τον Αἰγαί, Vulg. introitum Emath), is a phrase often used in the O. T. as a geographical name. It is of considerable importance to identify it, as it is one of the chief landmarks on the northern border of the land of Israel. There can be no doubt that the sacred writers apply the phrase to some well-known "pass" or "opening" into the kingdom of Hamath (Numb. xxxiv, 8; Josh. xiii, 5). The kingdom of Hamath embraced the great plain lying along both banks of the Orontes, from the fountain near Riblah on the south to Apamea on the north, and from Lebanon on the west to the desert on the east. To this plain there are two remarkable "entrances," one from the south, through the valley of Cœle-Syria, between the parallel ranges of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon; the other from the west, between the northern end of Lebanon and the Nusaitrye Mountains. The former is the natural "entrance" from Central Palestine, the latter is the sea-coast. The former is on the extreme south of the kingdom of Hamath, the latter on its western border.

Until within the last few years sacred geographers have almost universally maintained that the southern opening was the "entrance of Hamath." But not a few supposed that the entrance described in Numb. xxxiv, 8, 10, did not extend further north than the parallel of Sidon. Consequently, he holds that the southern extremity of the valley of Cœle-Syria, at the base of Hermon, is the "entrance of Hamath (Palestina, p. 118 sq.)." Kittel set forth this view in greater detail (Die Kudur Mafatil, and he would identify the "entrance of Hamath" with the expression used in Numb. xiii, 21, "as men come to Hamath." Of late, however, some writers regard the latter as only intended to define the position of Beth-rehob, which was situated on the road leading from Central Palestine to Hamath—a "men come to Hamath," that is, in the great valley of Cœle-Syria. Van de Velde appears to locate the "entrance of Hamath" at the northern end of the valley of Cœle-Syria (Travels, ii, 470; and Stanley adopts the same view (Sinai and Palestine, p. 399). Dr. Keith would place the "entrance of Hamath" at that submarine gate through which the Orontes flows from Antioch to the sea (Land of Israel, p. 112 sq.). A careful survey of the whole region, and a study of the passages of Scripture on the spot, however, leads Porter to conclude that the "entrance of Hamath" must be the opening towards the west, between Lebanon and the Nusair, or "entrance of the sea from the (southern) border, till a man come over against Hamath;" and ver. 16, where the "way of Hethlon as men go to Zedad" is mentioned, and is manifestly identical with the "entrance of Hamath," and can be no other than the opening here alluded to. The "entrance of Hamath" must have been to the north of the entire ridges of Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon (Josh. xiii, 5; Judg. iii, 3); but the opening from Cœle-Syria into the plain of Hamath is not so. 4. The territory of Hamath was included in the "Promised Land," as described both by Moses and Ezekiel (Numb. xxxiv, 8-11; Ezek. xlvi, 15-20; xlviii, 1). The "entrance of
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Hamath" is one of the marks of its northern border; but
the opening from Cela-Syria is on the extreme south
of the territory of Hamath, and could not, therefore, be
identified with the entrance of Hamath. 5. The "en-
trance to Hamath" was on the eastern border of Pales-
tine, but north of Riblah (Numb. xxxvi. 10, 11), and
is still extant between Humsa and the seat of
Abelhamet. See RIBLAH. 6. This position agrees with
those of the other names associated on the north-
ly and easterly boundaries, e.g. Mount Hor, Hazar-
Edan, etc. (see Porter’s Danuca, ii. 344 sq.; also
Robinson, Biblical Res. iii. 566). These arguments,
however, will be found, on a closer inspection, to be
incapable of defense (see Keil and Delitzsch, Com-
ment. on Pentat., ii. 256 sq.). The only real force in any of them is
that derived from the supposed identity of Zedoth (q.
v.) and Siphron (q.v.); and this is counterbalanced by
the facts (i) that this district never was actually occu-
pied by the Israelites, and (ii) the more defensible
description of the boundary of Asher and Naphtali in
Josh. xix. 24–39 does not extend so far to the north.
Hence we incline to the older views on this question.

Ha-mathite (Hebrew Chamathiti, with the article
Hamath, Sept. 6 Apa). A designation (Gen. x. 18; 1
Chron. i. 16) of the last named of the families de-
livered from Egypt. Nothing is recorded of them;
doubtless as having been selected (foundation-
ed) the city Hamath (q. v.). The Hamathites were
thus a Hamitic race, but there is no reason to suppose
with Kenrick (Phoenicia, p. 60) that they were ever in
any sense Phoenicians. We must regard them as close-
ly akin to the Hitites (q. v.), on whom they bordered,
and with whom they were generally in alliance. See
CANAITE.

Canaanite-Zobah (Heb. Chamath Thobah, וֹמַת
te.
, i. e. Hamath of Zobah; Sept. Ajash Zobāh v. r.
Bawוז̂, Vulg. Emath Suba), a place on the borders
of Palestine, said to have been attacked and conquered by
Solomon (2 Chron. viii. 9). It has been conjectured to
be the same as Hamath (q. v.), here regarded as in-
cluded in Aram-Zobah, a geographical expression which
has usually a narrower meaning. The conjunction of
the two names here probably indicates nothing more
than that the whole country round Hamath was
brought by Solomon under the power of Judah. The possessions
of David extended to Hamath, and included Zobah (1
Chron. x. 6). Under Solomon, probably added Hamath
also to his empire; certain it is that he had possessions
in that district, and that part of it, at least, was included
in his dominion (1 Kings xix, 19). See ZOBAH.

Hambrooke, Antony, a Protestant missionary, sur-
named the "Dutch Heghns," was born in the early part
of the 17th century. He went as missionary to the
East Indies, and settled in the island of Formosa, then
the most important establishment of the Dutch in the
China Sea. He converted a large number of natives, and
the mission was prospering, when the celebrated
Chinese pirate Coxinga, driven away by the Tartars,
landed in Formosa, and set siege to Tai-Ouan with an
army of 25,000 men, April 30, 1661. Hambrooke, his
wife, and two of his children, were made prisoners, and
the former was sent by Coxinga as envoy to the com-
mander of the town, Frederick Covent, to advise him
to surrender. Instead of this, he advised him to defend
the city to the last, and then returned to the camp of
Coxinga, notwithstanding the remonstrances of Covent,
and the prayers of his two daughters, still in Tai-Ouan,
saying that "he would not permit heathen to say that
the fear of death had induced a Christian to forbear:",
Coxinga, enraged at his courage, caused him to be
beheaded on his return (1661), together with the
other Dutch prisoners, some 500 in number. Covent was
nevertheless obliged to capitulate in Jan. 1662. See
Due Bois, Vies des Gouverneurs Hollandais (La Haye, 1769,
to, p. 210; Recueil des Vies qui ont servi a l’His-
toire et aux progres de la Compagnie des Indes ori-
uentaes (Rouen, 1725, 10 vols. 8vo), vol. x.; Raynal, Hist.
philosophique des deux Indes (Lond. 1792, 17 vols. 8vo),

Hamelmann, Hermann, a German Protestant the-
ologian and historian, was born at Osnabruck in 1525.
He was brought up in the Roman Catholic Church, and
became curate of Camern. Having subsequently
embraced the doctrines of the Reformation, he left his
situation, and went to Wittgenberg, where he lived some time
in intimacy with Melancthon. He afterwards preached the
Protestant doctrines at Bielefeld and Lemgo, and in the
counties of Waldecker, Lippe, Spiegelberg, and Prüm,
and in Holland. He acquired great renown as a
scholar and orator, and was appointed (1555) by William of
Orange, as chargé d’affaires, to Antwerp, to participate in the preparation of a new eccle-
siastic discipline. In 1569 duke Julius of Brunswick appointed him first superintendent of Gandersheim, and
his aid was requested by the counts John and Otho of
Oldenburg, to introduce the Reformation in their
states. He spent the last years of his life in this occupa-
ton, acting as general superintendent of the Protes-
tant churches of Oldenburg, Elmenhorst, and Jever.
He died at Oldenburg June 26, 1595. His theological and
historical works are valuable for the history of the Refor-
mation. Amongst them are: De Traditionibus varia fult-
ique (Frankfort, 1546), and the Buchkan-archis
inter Pontifices et Lutheranos hoc de articulo agitatis
(Frankfort 1566).—De conjullo acerdo, brevis interlocutio-
rum a suffragio et diaconio (Dortmunt, 2d ed. 1582)—
Historia ecclesiastica renatni Evangelii, (Altenburg, 1886).
See Hiberniae, Nachrueck über d. Leben, Redenmung u.
Schriften car. (Quedlinburg, 1729); Burmann, Syllog.
Epiat. i, 430; Rotermund, Gekrönte Hämmer, voii, pi. p.
xiv; Jöcher, Allg. Gelehrten Lexikon, ii, 1340.

Hamitai. See HAMITAI.

Hamilton, James, D.D., an eminent Presbyterian
minister, was born in Strathblane, Scotland, in 1814.
He commenced his ministry at Abersyne, Scotland, and
after a short time was called to Edinburgh. In 1841 he
was called to be pastor of the National Scotch Church,
Regent’s Square, London, and was soon known as one
of the most eloquent and powerful ministers of the met-
ropolis. He died in London November 24, 1867. Dr.
Hamilton’s labors as a minister were very successful,
and he was equally eminent in the field of authorship,
especially in the field of experimental and practical reli-
gion. Of his Life in Earnest, scores of editions have
appeared in England (sixty-fifth thousand, Lond. 1862) and
America; and his Mount of Olives (sixty-fifth thousand.
London, 1863) has been almost as widely circulated.
He was not only one of the most popular religious writers of the
day, and master of one of the most fascinating styles in
which Christian truth and feeling were ever clothed,
but he was also no ordinary theologian in the proper
scientific sense of that term, though he never wrote any theosophical work in scientific form. A com-
plete edition of his works in six volumes is now (1869)
publishing in London, as follows: vol. i, Life in Ear-
nest; Mount of Olives; A Morning beside the Lake of
Galilee; Happy Hour; vol. ii, Light for the Path;
Emblems from Eden; The Parable of the Prodigal Son;
The Church of the Nazarens; The House; vol. iii, Of
Hinduism and Judaism; vol. iv, The Royal Preacher;
Lessons from the Great Biography; vol. v, Notes on Job
and Proverbs; Reviews, Essays, and Poetical Pieces;
vol. v and vi, Selections from unpublished Sermons and

Hamilton, Patrick, the first Scotch reformer,
was nephew to John and Andrew Hamilton. He was
born at Paisley, 1563, and was educated at St. Andrew’s,
where he went to Germany, where he imbibed the opinions of Luther,
and became professor at Marburg. On his return home he
was made abbot of Ferne, in the shire of Ross, where he pro-
mulgated the doctrines of the Reformers, and used such
real as to excite the wrath of the clergy, who caused
him to be apprehended and sent to Beaton, archbishop
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of St. Andrew's. After a long examination he was burnt at the stake, opposite St. Salvador's College, Mar. 1, 1527, in his 24th year. At the place of execution he gave his servant his garments, saying, "These are the last things you can receive of me, nor have I anything now to leave you but the example of my death, which I pray you to follow," and though in the flames, and fearful before men, yet it is the entrance into eternal life, which none shall inherit who deny Jesus Christ before this wicked generation." The fire burning slowly, his sufferings were long and dreadful, but his patience and piety were one and his sorrow fully displayed thereby, in somuch that many were led to inquire into his principles, and to abjure the errors of popery. "The smoke of Mr. Patrick Hamilton," said a papist, "infected as many as it blew upon." His writings called Patrick's "Places may be found in Richmond's Fathers of the Eng- lish Church, i, 475. See Robertson, History of Scotland, bk. ii; Fox, Book of Martyrs, bk. viii; Burnet, History of the Reformation, i, 490 sq.; Hetherington, History of the Church of Scotland, i, 36 sq.

Hamilton, Richard Winter, D.D., an English Independent minister, was born in London July 6, 1794, and died in 1848. His mother had been a member of one of the most important of the Quakers, and was mentioned (as Miss Hesketh) in Wesley's Journal. At sixteen he entered the theological college at Hoxton, and even while he was a student his talent for preaching and the remarkable exuberance of his style attracted great attention. Soon after leaving the college (1812 or 1813) he was called to the charge of an Independent congregation at Leeds, and he held this position during the remainder of his life. He attained great eminence as a preacher, and still greater as a platform speaker. With great excellences he combined grave defects: he was deficient in taste, and his style was often extravagant and pompous; but there was a wide sweep in his thoughts, and he was sometimes eloquent even to sublimity. During his life he was a diligent student. He was president of the Literary and Philosophical Society of Leeds, and contributed for it many valuable papers, some of which were published in his Nove Literaria (1841, sm. 8vo). His other writings are, The Little Sacra- tuary (domestic prayers and offices; Lond. 1838, 8vo): Sermon, first series (1837, 8vo; republished by Carlton and Lanahan, N. York, 1869); second series, 1846, 8vo: -3. Institutions of popular Education (2d ed. 1846, post 8vo; republished with several Additions and Par- titions (Lond. 1847, 8vo; N. Y., Carlton and Lanahan, 1869, 12mo): -Hora et Viducia Subbata (1848, 12mo): Missions, Their Authority, Scope, and Encouragement, a prize essay, second after Harris's Mission (2d ed. 1846, post 8vo; republished with additional Decrees and Social Decisions (2d ed. 1848; also Carlton and Lanahan, N. York, 1869, 12mo): besides occasional sermons, etc. There is a poor biography of him by Stowell (1850, 8vo). (J. B. L.)

Hamiltor, Samuel, a Methodist Episcopal min- ister, was born in Monongahela Co., Va., Dec. 17, 1791, and removed to Ohio in 1806; was converted in 1812; entered as a probationer at the Conference in 1813, and died May 4, 1833. He was a pioneer of Western Methodism, and a widely known and excellent minister. As a preacher, presiding elder, and delegate to General Conference, he was in all respects "a workman that needed not to be ashamed." He was "shrewd, sarcastic, and eloquent," and his labors were abundantly successful among all classes of society.—Min. of Conferences, v, 298; Wake- ley, Heroes of Methodism, p. 337. (G. L. T.)

Hamilton, Sir William, a recent Scotch thinker, who will probably be regarded as the most subtle logician and the most acute metaphysician produced in Britain since Duns Scottus and William of Ockham. (He must not be confounded with his less distin- guished contemporary, Sir William Rowan Hamilton, the Irish mathematician.) He is included, and included himself, among the adherents of the Scotch school of psychology, but he is not of them, having remodelled, interpreted, expanded, and transmuted their doctrines in such a manner as to elevate their character and entirely change their nature. His potent influence is manifested in nearly all the current speculation of the Brit- ish School. After the death of his anti-sceptic, the late Anne of Holy, he died at Edinburgh on May 6, 1856. He thus lived through the whole of the revolution which convulsed the governments, societies, industries, and opinions of modern Europe, and prepared the new earth which is yet to be revealed. He was the son of Dr. William Hamilton, professor of anatomy at Glasgow; of a long-descended line. He claimed a hereditary bar- onety, and deduced his lineage from the ducal and almost royal house of Hamilton and Chastelherault. The illustration of his birth was obscured by the splendor of his intellectual career. He received his early education at the University of Glasgow, from which he was expelled; he passed Balliol College, Oxford, and distinguished himself by his attainments in both classics and mathe- matics. Here he gained his acquaintance with the writings of Aristotle, which have never been disregard- ed in this ancient seat of learning. In the competition for great prizes he professed his enthusiasm, and they were examined on most of the recognised Greek and Latin classics, including many of the works of Plato and Aristotle, and of the writings of the Neo-Platonists and the peripatetic scholars. He had, moreover, already ob- tained some knowledge of Arrows and Avicenna; of the Latin fathers and the great schoolmen; of Cardan, Agricola, Laurentius Valla, and the Scaligers; and had formed a less questionable intimacy with Des Cartes, Leibnitz, and other luminaries of the Cartesian school.

The elucidation of Hamilton commenced early, and was extended throughout his life. It was vast, curious, and recondite. It produces amazement by the continual array of forgotten names and unexplored authors—omne ignotum pro mirabilibus. But it is needlessly ostentatious and frequently deceptive. It is received without challenge, from the inaccessibility of the authorities alleged, and is rarely attempted to be verified, not to mention works. Here has shown that the imputations against Luther rest on invalid quotations taken at second-hand. It is alleged that, in his attack on mathematical studies, he has employed wangled extracts without regarding the context. His references to Aristotle, and his rep- resentations of the doctrines of the Stoic, are illusive, being fragmentary, distorted, or misapprehended, from ignorance of the tenor of his writings. There is too much reason for believing that Hamilton's familiarity with "many a quaint and curious volume of forgotten lore" was derived from the diligent consultation of indexes, and the hasty appreciation of passages thus indicated.

The young philosopher had been designed for the legal profession. He removed to Edinburgh in 1812 to prosecute his judicial studies, and was called to the Scotch bar in 1815. In 1819, on the death of his friend John Thomas Brown, he was a candidate for the chair of moral philo- sophy in the University of Edinburgh. John Wilson, the poet, and editor of Blackwood's Magazine, was a Tory, and, as such, was preferred by the Tory town council, which constituted the electoral body. In the course of the present year, the defeated candidate, rich in brains and various accomplishments, but poor in purse, was appointed by the Faculty of Advocates to the chair of history. His lectures on this great branch of knowl- edge, which is philosophy in its concrete and dynamical aspects, are reported to have been ingenious, original, learned, and acute. This period of Sir William's life exemplified his indefatigable industry, patient research,
versatility of talent, and zealous solicitude for truth. George Combe had attracted much attention in Edinburgh to Phrenology—a suspicious province of speculation lying along the indistinct boundary between intellectual and physical science. The profession of Hamilton's father, and his own youthful associations, may have cherished in him some aptitudes for anatomical and physical science; he had been associated in his youth with the Edinburgh Surgeons' Society with the earnest pertinacity that had been displayed by Des Cartes when tracing the mechanism of vision and endeavoring to discover in the pineal gland the domicile of the mind. With saw and scalpel, and tape and balance, he dissected, measured, and weighed their contents. The reports of his operations were communicated to the Royal Society of Edinburgh in 1826 and 1827, and dissipated the pretensions of Phrenology by demonstrating the falsity of the facts alleged as its foundation. These researches also rectified some physiological misapprehensions, and enabled Sir William to make those delicate observations on the composition and action of the nerves which are introduced into his notes on Reid.

In 1829, his friend, professor Napier, requested from him a philosophical article to inaugurate his literary magazine. On advertising the appearance of his paper, he refused to submit his first, and still remains the most satisfactory exposition of Hamilton's metaphysical views. It purported to be a notice of Victor Cousin's eclecticism, but it presented in broken outlines the "Philosophy of the Conditioned." No metaphysics were practiced. The essay was an experience of religious convictions. It recited the ancient stories of the 13th and 14th centuries. It united the speculative subtlety of Berkeley with the dialectical skill of the schoolmen. It attracted universal admiration at home and abroad, and was promptly translated into foreign languages. It placed its author at once among the great minds of the age and restored the British Isles to their place among the combatants in the shadowy arena of abstract disputations. This remarkable production was followed by others scarcely less remarkable, and similarly distinguished by comprehensive erudition, logical perspicacity, analytical precision, breadth of reasoning, and profundity of thought. Thus his claims were immeasurably superior to those of any other aspirant when the professorship of logic and metaphysics in the university became vacant in 1836. He was not elected, however, to this position, and the hesitancy was removed chiefly by the earnest testimonials of Victor Cousin, and professor Brandis, of Bonn.

In his new domain Sir William commenced the rehabilitation of logical studies, and the restoration of the prince of philosophers to the throne from which he had been removed by more than two centuries of ignorant and uninquiring clamor. So far, indeed, as originality pertains to his own logical and metaphysical speculations, it is obtained by recurrence to the instructions or to the hints of "the master of the wise." He held his chair for twenty years, till his death. To the discharge of his academic duties the length of thought and research on metaphysics. They afford a very imperfect exhibition of either his abilities or his philosophy. They were the first-fruits of his service, hurriedly prepared to satisfy immediate requirements, and precariously modified at intervals by the necessity of augmenting the text by a sort of systematic revision, and were published posthumously from such sketches and loose notes as had been preserved. Throughout the period of their recurrent delivery, their development was restrained and distorted by the traditions, associations, and expectations of the world. He could not resist the allegiance to Reid, or proclaim an independent authority, or render liege-homage to Aristotle. Hence there is throughout his career a continual effort to reconcile by ingenuous tours-de-force his own more profound and comprehensive views with the narrow, shallow, and timid utterances of the Reidian brotherhood. There is nothing in the history of philosophy more grotesque, more inconclusive, and better calculated to mislead, than thearray of the hundred and six witnesses to the universality of the philosophy of common sense. What these depositionsn unanimously attest is not the truth of Reid's characteristic dogmas, but the necessity of admitting indemonstrable principles—a thesis which may be, and has been, argued in many dissimilar ways. This is the true account of his life. Sir William would have been wise to desert this fallacy so well expressed by an Improvviso elenchi been detected in any victim of his critical rash.

Though the lectures of Sir William Hamilton give an imperfect idea of his services and teaching, he efficiently promoted the cause of philosophy by the spirit and breadth of his instructions, by his wonderful display of learning, by the penetration and precision of his distinctions, by attracting earnest attention to the highest walks of speculation, and by training up a generation of enthusiastic inquirers in a branch of knowledge which had been misconceived and degraded by disregard of its loftiest developments. He was untiring in encouraging and guiding the studies of his pupils; he was exacting in his demands upon their powers; but he was remarkably successful in securing their confidence and the esteem of his pupils; and he deepened his influence by the affability of his demeanor and by his imposing bearing. "Sir William," says one of his reviewers, "enjoyed physical advantages almost as uncommon as his intellectual attainments. ... His frame was large and commanding; his head was cast in a majestic face; his voice possessed great compass and mellifluous sweetness." With such a fortunate combination of natural endowments and cultivated acquirements, he was well adapted to become the "magnus Apollo" of a new sect of adorers. System, however, was foreign to his nature: the pursuit of knowledge was more of a pastime than a profession. He never evinced any desire to be the founder of a school: he may have been conscious that such a desire would have been futile, since he built on the substructions of Aristotle, or repainted with his own colors and devices the ruinous walls of the peripatetic temple.

The years of Sir William's scholastic duty were illustrated by other and more important productions than his lectures—productions which reveal more decisively the depth of his genius, and supply the best means for ascertaining the complexity and constitution of his philosophy. It seems extraordinary that he should produce a book either as a title to office or in vindication of his appointment. In accordance with this custom, if not in compliance with it, Sir William signalized his induction into his chair by an edition of Reid's works, accompanied with observations and illustrative discussions. The manner in which this task was executed is characteristic of his habits. The notes were written as the text passed through the press; the supplementary dissertations were added some years afterwards: they were never completed; the last that he published "breaks off in the middle," like the celebrated canto of Hudibras; and the "conceited indices unjoined," which had been announced in the title-page, remains an announcement—to eternity. Sir William has nowhere given any systematic view of his doctrine, either in detail or in summary. He has left behind him elaborate essays on a few cardinal topics; many fragmentary notices of others; and numerous suggestive, but unopened hints. His relics are like the fossil remains of the mighty monsters of remote geological periods: here a thiba, there a maxilla; here a huge vertebra, there a ponderous scapula; here a tusk, there a claw; but nowhere is found the complete form, or even the entire skeleton. Still, from the fragments preserved, the philosophy of Hamilton may be reconstructed. The incompleteness of his labors may be ascribed in part to the polemical character of his procedure; in part to the absence of distinct originality; in part to the vast and unmanageable extent of his information, to the variety...
of his meditations, and to the fastidiousness of his judgment, which sought unattainable fulness and perfection in all the details; but much must be attributed to a more mournful cause—to the paralyzism which crushed his strength and deprived him of the use of his right hand. After ten years of his life compelling him to avoid himself of the assistance of his wife and family for his correspondence and literary labors.

During his later years Sir William was chiefly occupied with the extension and application of his logical innovations. These were expounded to his class as early as 1836, and his work was published in 1846. They provoked a bitter controversy with professor De Morgan.

It is unnecessary to enter into the examination of a dispute in which the parties are satisfied neither with themselves nor with each other, and in which the language is so tortured, rugged, and peculiar as to be almost equally unintelligible to both.

Some critics have commented the style of Sir William, Hamilton as "inequaled for conciseness, precision, and force"—as a "model of philosophical clearness, conciseness, and energy" (non cincumque datum est habere numen). Mr. De Morgan characterized the Hamiltonian style as "inveterate" whatever that term means; and of one expression he says that it is "hard to make sense or English of it." The censure may be applied to both the combatants in this unseemly controversy. Sir William's dialect may be clear, precise, significant, when he has been mentally occupied with his own thoughts. It is not specific of his own compounding, requiring special study just as much as any archaic patois. Berkeley and Hume, Stewart and Spencer, have shown that it is possible to write philosophically, and yet maintain a pure, transparent, natural English idiom. This Sir William rarely does.

Writing. The published works of Hamilton enunciate the lectures on logic and on metaphysics; an edition of Reid, never completed; an edition of the works of David Stewart; and a volume of Discourses on Philosophy and Literature, Education and University Reform (1822; 2d ed., enlarged, 1839; reprinted by Harper and Brothers, N. Y.). There is little evidence of any taste for literature, properly so called, in the volume.

The only essay connected even remotely with polite letters is that on the authorship of the Epistle Obscurorum Virorum, which is, in some respects, his most curious contribution to periodical literature. A writer who separates this from the instructive and entertaining maps, On the Revolutions of Medicine, and on Mathematics not Philosophy. Both of these readily consort with the laborious and learned investigation of the history, condition, objects, and possible ameliorations of university education. The first chapter of the "Discourse" is devoted beginning on the subject of logic and metaphysics. The former science is illustrated by the essay on Logic contributed to the Edinburgh Review in April, 1833; and that on Syllogism, its kinds, causes, notations, etc., contained in the appendix.

The peculiar views of the author are further expounded in the Prospectus of an Essay on the New Analytic of Logical Forms, and in the First Essay of Thomas Spencer Bayes on the same subject, to which should be added the appendix to the lectures on logic.

The principal metaphysical papers in the Discussions are those on The Philosophy of the Conditioned, on The Philosophy of Perceptions, and On Identity of Thoughts in the appendix On the Conditions of the Thinkable. In the editorial labors on Reid, besides many important notes elucidating, rectifying, developing, or altering the statements in the text, which merit careful consideration, should be studied: Note A, On the Philosophy of Common Sense; Note B, On Presentative and Representative Knowledge; and Note D, Distinction of the Primary and Secondary Qualities of Body, which has an intimate relation to the theory of immediate and presentative perceptions.

Philosophy. Logic, metaphysics, and ethics are comprised under the general designation of philosophy. The last of these divisions is untouched by Sir William Hamilton. In the other two he has pushed his inquiries far beyond any of his British contemporaries, and with much more brilliant success. In both he evinced signal acuteness; in both he rendered good service: and in both he deemed himself an inventor and reformer, and not merely an innovator.

The character of his metaphysical doctrine is manifestly determined by the designation which he bestowed upon it—The Philosophy of the Conditioned. It is critical in its procedure; it is mainly negative in its results. In these respects it resembles the philosophy of Kant, to which it is very much indebted. It is certainly a crusade against all theories reposing on the absolute and the unconditioned. It sets out with affirming the essential relativity of all knowledge; it concludes with the restriction of philosophy to the determination of the conditions of thought. In this there is nothing new but the mode of exposition. It was a familiar aphorism of the schoolmen, founded upon the teachings of Aristotle, that all thought was bounded by the limits of the thinking mind—"omnia perceptum est secundum modum percepientis."—"omnia scivit in sciente secundum modum scientis." From this Hamilton was not only a departure, but an innovation: his conceptions pretending to be absolute, and hence denies the possibility of any positive conception of the infinite. Herein he merely repeats Aristotle, but with less moderation in his doctrine. This thesis has been violently assailed by Carlyle, a man not unrepresented by Sir William's own compounding, requiring special study just as much as any archaic patois. Berkeley and Hume, Stewart and Spencer, have shown that it is possible to write philosophically, and yet maintain a pure, transparent, natural English idiom. This Sir William rarely does. The tenet, however, is not presented as an axiom, but receives interpretation, if not demonstration. It is the inevitable consequence of the dualism of our knowledge—a thesis contained in Aristotle. Every act of consciousness "gives a knowledge of the ego in relation and contrast to the non-ego, and a knowledge of if all acts of consciousness in relation and contrast to the ego. The ego and the non-ego are thus given, in an original synthesis, as connected in the unity of knowledge, and in an original antithesis, as opposed in the contrariety of existence." This synthesis as considered is the beginning of an antagonistic scheme of philosophy. With Hamilton it is made to rest upon the basis of immediate perception, and thus he led to the affirmation of direct or presentative perception in opposition to the other theory of indirect or representative perception. This brings him into accordance with the school of Reid—though Reid and his school would scarcely have understood, and certainly could not have appreciated his delicate distinctions; and it must be acknowledged that it is a coarse and materialistic conception of species, images, and impressions which requires any deadly opposition. The present conception involves a negative perception. To one cultivating such divisions and differences, the treatise of Roger Bacon, De Multiplicatione Specierum—the most marvellous result of mediæval science—would be utterly unintelligible.

One of the principal principles of the whole system is the determinative limits and requirements of thought, or, as he phrases it, "the Conditions of the Thinkable." On this subject he has left an admirable and most suggestive paper; but his whole scheme of speculation is without any basis for certainty, without any "support of the Spirit bearing witness to our spirit." It is thus built upon the void; and, like the eclecticim of Cousin, and the transcendentalism of He-
HAMILTON

| Hamilton, Lewis Kent, D.D., LL.D., a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Burlington, Conn., May 10, 1797. His early education was obtained with some view to the Christian ministry; but, arriving at manhood, he studied law, and was admitted to the bar in Lancaster, Ohio. He married in Zanesville, Ohio, and settled there to practice his profession. The death of a little child in 1822 led him to consider his own moral state, and he joined the Methodist Episcopal Church in the autumn of 1828. Soon after he was licensed to exhort, then (1829) to preach. In 1832 he was received on trial in the Ohio Conference, and appointed to Granville Circuit. In 1838 he traveled Athens Circuit, and in 1854 and 1855 he pastored Wesley Chapel, Cincinnati. In 1856 he was elected assistant editor of the Western Christian Advocate, with the Rev. Dr. Charles Elliott. When the Ladies Repository was established in January, 1841, Hamilton was assigned to the work of editing that journal. He remained in this position until, in 1844, he was elected one of the bishops of the Methodist Episcopal Church. This office he filled with great usefulness for eight years, when ill health compelled him to resign it to the General Conference of 1852. His name was reattached to the list of members of the Ohio Conference as a supernumerary, in a supernumerary relation. In 1857 he removed to Mount Pleasant, Iowa, his former confidential friendship with Dr. Elliott, who resided in that place, leading to this change. In an account of his life which bishop Hamilton wrote for his family, he refers to the years from 1802 to 1806; in eight years he had been enabled to make these intelligible very briefly to persons acquainted with the outlines of the sciences in its received forms. 1. Hamilton insists on having, in all propositions through common terms which are set forth for logical scrutiny, a sign of quantity prefixed to predicate as well as to subject. 2. Instead of recognizing only four forms of propositions, the A, E, I, O of the old logicians, he insists on admitting all the eight forms which are possible. (See Thomson and Solly.) 3. He widens the range of the religion by advising all who are capable of making it, to form associations with others who are ambitious of forming a church. 4. The Port-Royal doctrine of the inverse ratio of the extension and comprehension of terms is worked out by him in reference to the syllogism. This application of the doctrine has certainly not been anticipated by any logician; and, when elaborated to its results, it throws many new lights on the characters and mutual relations of the syllogistic figures. The value of these innovations has not been definitely settled, nor has it been ascertained whether they were overlooked by Aristotle, misapprehended by him, or deliberately rejected from his Analytics.

Authors. — An earnest discussion of Hamilton's doctrines may be found in the Methodist Quarterly Review for 1857; a sketch of his metaphysical views is given in the Princeton Review for 1853. One of the most unfortunate figures in the literary history of Sir William was his attack on the reputation of Luther, which was fully answered by Hare in his Vindication of Luther. Hare convicts Hamilton of using second-hand knowledge as if he had studied the original sources. See N. Br. Rev. Nov. 1948, Feb. 1832, July 1859; Rev. and Quarterly Review, June 1856; North American Review, Oct. 1845, p. 485-9; Jan. 1835, art. iii; British Quarterly Review, xvi, 479; Wight, Philosophy of Sir William Hamilton (N. Y. 1856); Mill, Examination of Sir William Hamilton's Philosophy (London 1865); Gough, Examination of the Westminster Review, Jan. 1866, and elaborately answered by H. L. Mansel, The Philosophy of the Condensed (London 1866); De Morgan, Formal Logic (London 1847); Bowen, A Treatise on Logic (Cambridge, 1864). The Life of Sir William Hamilton, by J. Veitch (1868), which had been long expected, has been recently published. (G. F. H.)
HAMMALEKOTHI

Rev. October, 1866; Palmer, Life and Letters of Leoni-

HAMMALEKOTHI. See SCLA-HAMMALEKOTH.

Hamman, or rather CHAMMAN (ךֵּמָן), only in the plur. "hammanim), signifies "images," idols of some kind for idolatrous worship (and so the Sept. and Vulg. understand it). It is rendered "images" in Lev. xxvi, 30; 2 Chron. xiv, 5; xxxiv, 7; Isa. xvii, 8; xxvii, 9; Ezek. vi, 4, 5; but in the margin almost invariably "sun images." In these passages "hammanim" is several times joined with Asherim—statues of Astarite; while from 2 Chron. xxxiv, 4, it appears further that the "ham-
manim" stood upon the altars of Baal. See ASHERAH; BAAL.

Kimchi, and the Arabic of Erpenius, long ago explained the word by near. "images of the sun"; and both this interpretation and the thing itself are now clearly illustrated by ten Panic cippi with inscriptions, consec-
cted to Baal Hamman, i.e. to Baal the solar, Baal the sun. (See the whole subject discussed in Gesenius's Thees. Heb. p. 493-491.) The form chammam, solar, is from חָמָן, chamm'ah, the sun; and the plural Hammah-
im, in the Old Testament, is put elliptically for Baalim Hammanim, and is found in the same context as elsewhere where Baalim, images of Baal.

Ham'math (Heb. Chammath, חַמָּת, ḫammath), springs warm; Sept. "אֲשָׁרָא (יִבְדִּיל, Vulg. Emth), one of the "fenced cities" of Naphtali, mentioned between Zer and Rak-
kath (Jos. xix, 35); generally thought to be the hot springs near Abu Joseph in the desert (Heb. iv, 1), under the name Ananom (Ἀνανός), near Tibersias (Ant. xviii, 3, 3); which latter is, no doubt, the same with the famous warm baths still found on the shore a little south of Ti-
bersias, and called Hamman Taborigheh ("Bath of Tiber-
rias"); properly Hamnah-rakkah (the Tamin of Ge-
nath), or Tamar. This "Hamnah-rakkah" has been thus described by Robinson (Resecheches, iii, 258 sq.; see also Hackett's Script. Illust. p. 815). Pliny, speaking of the Sea of Galilee, says, "Ab occidente Tiberiade, aquas ca-
lidias salubri." (Hist. Nat. v, 15.) Spacious baths were built over the principal spring by Iriaham Pasha; but like everything else in Palestine, they are falling to ruins. Ancient ruins are strewn around it, and can be traced along the shore for a considerable distance; these were recognised by Ibr and Mangles (p. 80, b) as the remains of Vespassian's camp (Josephus, War, i, 4, 3). There are also warm springs at this place. The wa-
ter has a temperature of 144 Fahren. This hot bath taste is ex-
tremely salt and bitter, and a strong smell of sulphur is emitted. The whole surrounding district has a volcanic aspect. The warm fountains, the rocks of trap and lava, and the frequent earthquakes, prove that the ele-
ments of destruction are still at work beneath the surface.
It is said that at the time of the great earthquake of 1837 the quantity of water issuing from the springs was greatly increased, and the temperature much higher than ordinarily (Porter, Handbook for S. and P. ii, 423; Thompson, Land and Book, ii, 68; Wilson, Lands of the Bible, ii, 237). Mr. Lambert, Palaest., p. 302, says, "This spot is also mentioned in the Talmud (Schwartz, Palæst., p. 182), as being situated one mile from Tiberias (Lightfoot, Opp. ii, 224). The Hammothi- dor of Jos. xxi, 32 is probably the same place. See HEMATH; HAMMAN.

The name of Gadara, however, located by the Tal-
mudists (see Lightfoot, iib.), at the mouth of the Jordan, is a different place (see also Zanz, Appendix to Benj. of Tuseila, ii, 408; doubtless the Amathah (q. v.) of Jose-
phus (Ant. x, 5, 2), and the modern Amath on the Yarmuk (Van de Velde, Mop).

Ham'medath (Heb. Hammedatha', חַמֶּדָתָה, ḫamedathah), Sept. "Aqathoth, Vulg. Amandaathas, but both sometimes omit the first two letters of the infamous Hamath (q. v.), and com-
omically designated as "the Agarites" (Ant. xii, i, 188, viii, 5; ix, 24), though also without that title (ix, 10). By Gesenius (Lex. 1855, p. 530) the name is taken to be

HAMMERLIN

Medatha, preceded by the definite article: but First (Lex. a. v.), with more probability, identifies it with the Zendic āhumaēdatē, e. i., "given by Horn," one of the Izedas. For other explanations, see Simonis (Onomastoi-
con, p. 586), who derives it from a Persian word meaning "double." For the termination, compare ARITA-
DAS, Lex. Z., p. 474.

Ham'melech (Heb. ham-Melek, חַמֶּלֶךְ, ĥamelekh, which is merely ĥa-me-lek, king, with the article prefixed to the name; Sept. "βασιλιακ, Vulg. Aneolek), the father of Jerahmeel, which latter was one of those commanded by Jehoiakim to arrest Jeremiah and Baruch (Jer. xxxvi, 26). B.C. ante 605. It is doubtful whether this was the same with the Hammelech, father of Malchiah, into whose dungeon Jeremiah was afterwards cast (Jer. xxxvii, 6). B.C. ante 595. Others, however, regard the word in both cases as an appellative, referring in the first passage to Jehoiakim, and in the latter to Zedekiah. Compare HAMMOLKEKETH.

Ham-menuchoth. See MASHAHTHE.  

Hammer, an indispensable tool designated by sev-
eral Heb. terms: 1. Pa'tith (_parallel, connected etymo-
logically with maritios, to strike), which was used by the gold-beater (Isa. xii, 7, Sept. φθόρα) to overlay with silver the "gold of the surface" of the image, as well as by the quarryman (Jer. xxiii, 29, Sept. πελατός), meta-
pherically of Babylon as a destructive agent (Jer. i, 23, Sept. φθόρα). This seems to have been the heaviest instrument of the kind for hard blows. 2. Makkabah (מַכַּבָּה), properly a tool for following, hence a stone-
cutter's mallet (1 Kings vii, 7), and generally any work-
man's hammer (Judg. iv, 21 [where the form is מַכַּבָּה, makkab'ah]; Isa. xiv, 12; Jer. x, 4). In Isaiah the Sept. takes ῶπορτος, a girdle, in all the rest φθόρα; Vulg. martellum. This Hackett describes (Script. Illust. p. 815), used only in Judg. v, 26; Sept. φθόρα, Vulg. marte
lulm. This was also rendered "embittered" (q-
l. 4, 17), and then with the addition of the word "workmen's" by way of explanation, as this is a poet-
cal word, used instead of the preceding more prosaic term. The pins of the tent of the Bedouin are gener-
ally driven, and are driven into the ground by a mallet, which is probably the "hammer" referred to in this passage (Thomson, Land and Book, ii, 187). Dr. Hackett observes (Amer. ed. of Smith's Dict. a. v.) that "it is spoken of as 'the hammer,' being the one kept for that purpose;" but the Hebrew term used in Judg. v, 26 (to which he refers) is without the art. which, is employed, however, with that found in Judg. iv, 21. See NAM.

A kind of hammer, named nuppa'ts (נָפְפַגַ'ס, Jer. ii, 20 (A. V. "battle-axe"), or mehphits (מֵּפַיתס, Prov. xxv, 19). A. V. "maul," was used as a weapon of war. 5. Only in the plur. מַגְפִּים, kegbophets, Sept. λακεύριαν, Vulg. nucet, a poetic term equivalent to the preceding (Psa. lxixv, 6). See HANDICRAFT.

Hämmerlin or Hammerlein, Felix (Lat. Mul-
colius), a Swiss theologian, was born at Zurich in 1389. He studied canon law at Erfurt, in 1421 appointed canons of Zolingen, and in 1422 provost of Solothurn. With the income of these offices he bought a large li-
Brary, and applied himself earnestly to study. He sub-
sequently took part in the Council of Basle, where he showed great zeal for the restoration of ecclesiastical discipline, and thus made himself a number of enemies. An attempt was made to assassinate him in 1489, but he escaped, though not without being dangerously wound-
ed. He died in his fifty-seventh year, and his name has been perpetuated by his De Nuzelis, in which he abused the confessional cantons which had waged war on Zurich in 1443, made him an object of hatred to a large party of his countrymen. A number of these, having gone to Zurich on the occasion of the Carnival of 1457, sought to arrest Hämmerlin, dragged him to Constance, and had him thrown into prison. As he returned to retrieve anything he had said or written, he was condemned.
et to imprisonment for life in a convent. He was ac-
cordingly placed in a convent of barefooted monks at
Laurenz, where he died some time after 1457, a victim
to his zeal for justice and truth. He wrote Variar
Observationes Opuscula et Tractatus (Basle, 1497, fol.),
containing a number of treatises on exorcism, on monistic
dogma, against the Bechaghis, on the punishments of the
hereafter in three writings against the prevailing corruptions
of the clergy and the convents. He also left some MSS.,
which are preserved in the collegiate library of Zurich.
As Kolms u. Bretzig, Heilige Bibliothek (Zurich, 1735).
Hottinger, Schola Tigurnina, p. 24; Nicorai,
Miméristes (Venice, 1410), vii, 252; Fuchs, Die
Kapitel und Kapitelmeister der Bistümer Nord-Italiens, xxiii,
268; Reber, Felix Hemmerlin (Zurich, 1846).

Hammer-Purgstall, Joseph von, a German Ori-
entalist of great celebrity, was born July 9, 1774, at
Graz, in Styria, and died in Vienna Nov. 24, 1856.
His family name was Hammer, and he is frequently referred
to under that name, or as von Hammer; but having
inherited in 1837 the estates of the counts of Purgstall,
he added that name to his own, and was made a baron.
He entered at an early age the Oriental Academy at
Vienna, and acquired a knowledge of Arabic, Persian,
and Turkish. Having subsequently employed in various
diplomatic missions, he greatly extended his
acquaintance with Oriental languages and literature.
It wrote and spoke ten foreign languages, viz. the three
above named, Greek, Latin, Italian, Spanish, French,
Swiss, and Russian; but his works show rather varied and
extensive research and learning than profound mas-
tery of his subjects. They are free from many errors,
though his careful reference to authorities makes
corrections of mistakes comparatively easy. His writ-
ings, including contributions to journals and scientific
announcements, would make more than 100 octavo volumes,
and on the whole, he regarded himself as the author of
valuable contributions of the present century to Oriental
history and literature. They are noticed here because of
the information they give as to the religious history and
condition of Oriental nations. The most important of
his works in this respect are Encyklopädische Über-
Sichten der Wissenschaften des Orients (Lpz. 1864, 2 vol.
in 1, 8vo), a work based on seven Oriental works, espe-
cially the bibliographical dictionary of Hadji Khalifa:—
Ancient Alphabets and Hieroglyphic Characters exhibi-
ted, with an Account of the Egyptian Priests, their Classes,
incantations, and Superstitions (translated from the
Arabian bin-Abubakir bin-Wahabhi, London, 1806, small
8to):—Fundaminae Orientis, etc., or Minus de l'Ori-
ens explodivii (Vienna, 1809-18, 6 vol. in 3, fol., of
which Hammer-Purgstall was the chief editor):—Morgen-
landische Kokbaurts (Persian and Arab hymns, etc.);
Vienna, 1819, 1 vol. in 8vo);—Geschichte der schmidisch-
ren, der schimisch-ruhmisch, der persisch-isch, der
vieniens (Vienna, 1818, 4to):—Mystereum Bosphoritis revocatum
(Vienna, 1818, fol.); also in vol. vi of Minus de l'Orient:
the author herein seeks to prove from emblems on monu-
ments once belonging to the Templars that their order
was guilty of the crimes charged to it. Bayrowart (Jour-
нал для наук, 1819) refuted this opinion, but Hammer-
Purgstall defended it with new arguments in a paper in the
Memoiren der Academias, 1855)—Geschic-
the de l'Assemblée (Paris, 1833, 8vo, and an English
ed. by Wood, History of the Assassins, Lond. 1835, 8vo).
The author makes various comparisons between the As-
summfi, the Templars and the Freemen generally extant
Geschichtec des Osmanischen Reich (best ed. Pesth,
192, 35, 10 vols. 8vo; French translations by Dancher,
Paris, 1844, 3 vols. 8vo, and by Bellert, with notes and
tables, Histoire de l'Empire Ottoman, Paris, 1835-38, 4
vols. 8vo);—Brief chronicles of the Jesuits in Turkey
(Pesth, 1836-39, 10 vols. 8vo)—a complete history
of Turkish poetry than any existing, even in Turkey itself:—
the celebrated treatise on morals by Ghazali,
under the title of O Kind!: die berühmte ethische Abhand-
nung des Ghazzâlî (Vienna, 1838, 12mo)—Züriwête des
Ghazâlî (in Arabic and German (Vienna, 1844, 8vo),
—Literatur-Geschichte der Araber (Vienna,
1856, 7 vols. 4to: this work, as first published, ends
with the Bagdad caliphate, and contains about 10,000
biographical and bibliographical notices)—Die Arab-
bische Hohe Lied der Liebe, etc., with commentary, and
an introduction relative to mysticism among the Arabs
(Vienna, 1844, 8vo). Hammer left an autograph
letter from his own hand, written to certain writers in
MS., which have been published, or are publishing,
dernder the direction of Auer, director of the imperial
printing-press of Vienna.—New American Cyclopaedia,
Fierer, s. v.: K. Schottlmann, Joseph von H-Purgstall, ein
Grafischer Beitrag neuer Geschichtschrift, xvi, 286.
Hammond, Sir, "The Queen," Sept. 7. Máylíth (Vulg. translates
regina), a woman introduced in the genealogies of Manas-
seh as daughter of Machir and sister of Gilead (1 Chron.
vii, 17, 18), and as having among her three children
Abi-ezer, from whose family sprang the great judge
Gideoni. B.C. prob. between 1674 and 1058. The<br>
Hamman (Heb. Chamannée, Χαμάννη, Sept. "Ayvós and Χαμάν

Hammon (Heb. Chamannée, Χαμάννη, warrn; Sept. "Ayvós and Χαμάν

Hammond, Henry, D.D., a learned divine of the
English Church, was born Aug. 18, 1805, at Chertsey,
Surrey. He was sent at an early age to Eton, whence
he removed to Magdalen College, Oxford, and became
a fellow of that society in 1825. In 1833 the earl
of Lichester presented him to the rectory of Penshurst,
Kent, where he resided till 1843, when he was
archdeacon of Chichester. „By birth and education
a confirmed Royalist, he retired to Oxford soon after
the civil war broke out, continued to reside there while
that city was held by the king, and attended the king's com-
mands to his court at Oxford and at Uxbridge, where he
discussed with Vines, a Presbyterian clergyman. He was
appointed examiner of students of Christchurch and public
orator in 1645, and attended Charles I as his chaplain from the time when he fell
into the hands of the army until the end of 1647, when
the king's attendants were sent away from him. Ham-
mond then returned to Oxford, and was chosen sub-
dean of Christchurch, from which situation he was ex-
HAMMOTH-DOR
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pulled in March, 1648, by the parliamentary visitors, and placed for some time in confinement. On his re-
lease he repaired to Westwood, Worcestershire, the seat of Sir John Packwood, where the remainder of his life was spent. He died in a very good state of health, the day of his death, in which time he had the disposal of great charitable reposes in his hands, as being the most zealous promoter of almstiving that lived in England since the change of religion. . . . He died after long suffering from a complication of disorders, April 25, 1660.

It is said that Charles II inquired for his death at the bishopric of Worcester. Hammond was a man of great learning, as well in the classics and general philosophy as in doctrinal and school divinity, and possessed great natural ability" (Jones, Christ. Biogr. p. 210). Of his writings the following are some of the most important: Practi-
cal Catechism (1644): — Paraphrase and Annotations on the New Testament (Lond. 1655, 8vo; often reprinted; last edition 1845, 4 vols. 8vo). It was translated into Latin by Leclerc (Amster. 1698), with observations and criticisms. Dr. Johnson was very fond of Hammond's Annotations, and recommended them strongly. The theology of the work is Arminian. Hammond's miscellaneous theological writings are reprinted in the Library of Anglo-Cath-
olic Theology (Oxford 1847–51, 4 vols. 8vo).

Ham-moth-dor (Heb. Chammahot-dor, כֵּמִּזָּה), prob. for כְּמִזָּהזָו, Hammath of Dor, but the reason of the latter part of the name is not clear; Sept. Ἀμματο-
ύφος, Vulg. Hamath Dor), a Levitical and refuge city of Naphtali (Josh. xxxi, 32); probably the same elsewhere called simply Hammath (Josh. xix, 35).

Hamon. See BAAL-HAMON; HAMON-GOG.

Hamon, JÉAN, a distinguished French moralist, was born at Cherbourg in 1618. He was a graduate

philosopher of the University of Paris. He had already established a great reputation, and offered a good charge by his pupil, M. de Harlay (afterwards presbyter of the Parliament); but, by the advice of his spiritual director, Singlin, he sold all his goods, gave the proceeds to the poor, and became a hermit of Port Royal in 1651. He nevertheless continued practicing medicine, visiting the poor in the neighborhood of Port Roy-
al, and administering to them both spiritual advice and remedies. The Néorolge de Port Royal says: "After a life as carefully guarded as though each day was to be the last, he ended it joyfully by a peaceful death, as he had wished to enter into eternal life," Feb. 22, 1687. He wrote Discours de la Prétention des Paris, 1675, 2 vols. 12mo: — Sur la Prière et les Devoirs des Pasteurs (Par. 1689, 2 vols. 12mo); — La Pratique de la Prière con-
tinue (Paris, 1702, 12mo); — Explication du Cantique des Cantiques, with an introduction by Nicole (Paris 1708, 4 vols. 12mo); — Instructions pour les Religieuses de Port Royal (1727 and 1730, 2 vols.); — Instruc-
tions sur les Sacraments, sur le Jubile, etc. (Paris, 1734, 12mo); — Explication de l'Oraison Dominicale (Par. 1735), besides other practical and controversial writings. See Néor-

Hamon'nah (Heb. Hamon'nah, חָמוֹןְנָה, multitude Sept. translates Πολυταύνυσαν, Vulg. Amon), a name fig-
uratively assigned to the sepulchral "city of the valley in which the slaughter and burial of the forces of Gog are prophetically announced to take place (Ezek. xxxix, 16), emblematical of the multitude of graves (compare Joel iii, 14). See HAMON-GOG.

Hamon-gog (Heb. Hamon'-Gog, חָמוֹן גְּג), multitude of Gog; fully with גְּג, valley, prefixed; Sept. τοῦ Γογ τῶν πολυταύνυσαν τοῦ Γαγ, Vulg. Πολυταύνυσαν Γγογ, the name prophetically ascribed to the valley in which the corpses of the slaughtered army of Gog are described as to be buried (Ezek. xxxix, 11, 15); repre-
sented as situated to the east of the Dead Sea, on the thoroughfare of commerce with Arabia (comp. the route of the caravans which were shown to Joseph by Jesecuwan, Gen. xix, 17, 25), probably the present Haj road between Damascus and Mecca, but scarcely referring to any particular spot. (See Havernick, Comment, ad loc.; Stuart's Com-
ment, on the Apocalypse, ii, 367.) See GOG.

Hamor (Heb. Hamor, חָמֹר, a he-cass; Sept. Ἑμωρ, Ν. T. Ἑμωρ, a Hivite, from whom (or his sons) Jacob purchased the plot of ground in which Joseph was afterwards buried (Gen. xxxiii, 19; Josh. xxxiv, 22; Acts vii, 15; in which last passage the name is Angli-
cized EMMON), and whose son Shechem seduced Dinah (Gen. xxxiv, 2), B.C. cir. 1905. As the latter appears to have founded the city of Shechem (q. v.), Hamor is also named as the representative of its inhabitants in Judges xix, 24. Josephus (Ant. vii, 29) gives the charac-
ter and influence are indicated by his title ("prince" of the Hivite tribe in that vicinity), and his judicious behavior in the case of his son; but neither of these saved him from the indiscriminate massacre by Dinah's brothers. See Jacob.

Hampden, Rev. R. Dickson, D.D., bishop of Here-
ford. England, a descendant of John Hampden, was born A.D. 1729, in the island of Barbadoes, where his family had settled in 1670. He entered Oriel College, Oxford, as a commoner, in 1810, and subsequently was admitted a fellow, appointed a tutor, and, in 1829 and 1831, was public examiner in classics. He delivered the Bamp-
tont lecture in 1832, choosing for his subject The Schola-
sitic Philosophy considered in its relation to Christian Theology (3d edit. Lond. 1848, 8vo), and in 1833 was ap-
pointed principal of St. Mary's Hall. In 1834 he was elected White's professor of moral philosophy (Oxford), and published a pamphlet entitled Observations on Regi-
enets of Political Economy; the publication of which work, and in his Bampton lecture were made the grounds of opposition to his confirmation in 1836 as regius professor of divinity (Oxford), to which Lord Melbourne, then premier, had appointed him. The controversy over this appointment in 1836 occasioned a change in the student government of the university, and is known as the First Hampden Case, ap-
ppears to have been based on political feelings as well as theological grounds. His principal opponents were To-
ty and High-Churchmen, among whom were Dr. Pu-
sey and J. H. Newman, now a Roman Catholic. A re-
monstrance against the appointment was sent to the archbishop of Canterbury, to be presented to the crown. A declaration, condemning Hampden's "mode of view-
ing the doctrines of the Bible and the Articles of the Church" was numerously signed by residents of the uni-
versity, and an effort was made in the House of Convo-
cillaries to have the same written expressing want of confidence in his views, which was only frustrated by the interpo-
sition of the proctors. The struggle was renewed in the Second Hampden Case, occasioned by Hampden's ap-
pointment to the see of Hereford by lord John Russell in 1847. Thirteen of the bishops remonstrated against the appointment, "appealing to the former controversy, and urging the inexpedience of placing over the clergy one whose opinions were rendered suspicious by the de-
cision of a body like the University of Oxford." Hamp-
den's friends replied that a change had taken place in the scholarship of the Conventicle of the University, reducing the proportions of 474 to 94 in 1836, to 380 to 219 in 1842, on the proposition to repeal the
HAMPDEN CASES

expression of censure; and further, that many who censured Hampden "objected to the university as an arbitri-
ator of doctrine in the case of Tract x, and of Mr. Ward's Ideal of the Church." The opposition, as in the former case, arose mainly from political and religious considerations.

The government refused to yield, and Dr. Hampden was installed as bishop of Hereford, and thence-
forth devoted himself to his episcopal duties, the attacks upon him gradually ceasing. He died April 23, 1806. His position was that of a moderate churchman, and the ex-
pression of his views at this day could hardly provoke so fierce an opposition as in 1806. A list of the most important pamphlets relating to the Hampden cases is given by Albemine, a. v. Hampden. Besides the works mentioned above, Dr. Hampden's most important writ-
tings are, Philosophical Evidence of Christianity, etc. (1827, 8vo);-Lectures on Moral Philosophy (8vo);-Parochial Sermons (1836, 8vo);-Lecture on Tradition (1841, 8vo);-
Sermons before the University of Oxford (1836-1847):
-a Review of the writings of Thomas Aquinas in the Encycl. Metropolitanae, which led Hallam to characterize
Hampden as "the only Englishman who, since the revival of learning, has penetrated into the wilderness of scholasticism;" and the articles on Socrates, Plato, and
Aristotle, in the Encycl. Britannica. See English Review, viii, 430; ix, 229; Blackie, Mag. No. 246 (April, 1886);
Brit. and For. Rev. xvi, 153; N. Brit. Review, vii, 206; Ed.
Rev. xi, 295; Fraser's Magazine, xvi, 206. See also:
Ber. 4th series, xxii, 221; Albemine, Dict. of Authors, i, 780; Chamber's Cyclop. of English Literature, ii, 738
(Philada. 1867); Rose, in Church Hist. from Thirteenth Century to Present Time, in crown 8vo edition of Encycl.
Metropolitanae, p. 383. (J. W. M.)

Hampden Cases. See HAMPDEN, R. D.

Hampton-Court Conference. See Conference.

Hamman. See HEMAN.

Hamut'el (Heb. Chammuoil, חּוֹמְעָל, heat (? anger or light) of Joram; Sept. Ἀμαθί, Vulg. Heman), the son of Minasha and (apparently) father of Zacchur, of the tribe of Simeon (1 Chron. i, 26). B.C. ante 1046.

Ham'uil (Heb. Cha'umel, חֹמֵעַל, sparrow; Sept. Ἐρημηλ, the second of the two sons of Pharez, son of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 5). He could not have been born, however, before the migration of Jacob into Egypt (as appears to be stated in Gen. xxvi, 12), since Pharez was not at that time grown up (Gen. xxxviii, 1). His de-
scent and family are called HAMULITES (Numb. xxvi, 21), B.C. between 1700 and 1856.

Hammulate (Heb. Chamal, חֶמֶל), a descendant of HAMAN (q. v.), the grandson of Judah (Numb. xxvi, 21).

Hamut'ael (Heb. Chammuoiel, חָמְמַעְל), the son of Shalum and cousin of Jeremiah, to whom, before the siege of Jerusalem, he sold a field which he possessed in Ana-
tioch, a town of the Levites (Jer. xxxii, 6-12). If this field be really a Levitical estate of 50, it would imply that an ancient law had fallen into disuse (Lev. xxxv, 34); but it is possible that it may have been the property of Hamanamel in right of his mother. Com-
pare the case of Harnahos, who was also a Levite; and the case of Gottius on Acts iv, 37. Henderson (on Jer. xxxii, 7) argues that the property of the Levitical estate might be sold within the tribe. Fairbairn (s. v.) sug-

HANANI

gest that as this was a typical act, the ordinary civil

rules do not apply to it. The transaction, however, was conducted with all the forms of legal transfer, at the special instance of Jehovah, and was intended to evince the certainty of restoration from the approaching exile and to show to the possessor from whose hands it could be established by document without yet be of future value to the pos-

Han'ani (Heb. Chanan'ei, חָנָנַי, merciful, or perhaps rather an abbreviation of חָנָנָי, later John [see ANANIAS; HAN-
NANTI, etc.]; Sept. Ἀνάβι, but in Jer. xxxxi, 4 'Avaniac),
the name of at least seven men. See also BAAL-HA-
NANTI; BEN-HANANI; ELON-BENI-HANAN.

1. One of the sons (or descendants) of Shashak, a chief of the tribe of Benjamin residing at Anathoth (1 Chron. viii, 23). B.C. apparently between 1612 and 1093.

2. Son of Maachah, and one of David's heroes (1 Chron. xi, 48). B.C. 1046.

3. Father of Igdaliah, "a man of God," in the cham-
ber of his sons Jeremiah tested the fidelity of the Rech-
ables (Jer. xxxv, 4). B.C. ante 656.

4. The last named of the six sons of Azel the Benja-
mite (1 Chron. viii, 38; ix, 44). B.C. cir. 588.

5. One of the Nethinim whose family returned from the captivity with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 46; Neh. vii, 49). B.C. ante 537.

6. One of the Levites who assisted Ezra in expounding the law to the people (Neh. viii, 7; comp. ix, 4, 5). He also subscribed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x, 10). From Neh. xii, 13, it appears that he was the son of Zacur, and, on account of his integrity, he was one of those appointed to distribute the Leviti-

7. One of the chiefs of the people who subscribed the solemn covenant drawn up by Nehemiah (Neh. x, 22). In ver. 26 his name appears to be repeated in the same list. B.C. cir. 410.

8. Another of the Nethinim who returned with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 46; Neh. vii, 49). B.C. ante 537.

9. One of the Levites who assisted Ezra in expounding the law to the people (Neh. viii, 7; comp. ix, 4, 5). He also subscribed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x, 10). From Neh. xii, 13, it appears that he was the son of Zacur, and, on account of his integrity, he was one of those appointed to distribute the Leviti-

10. The Levites who assisted Ezra in expounding the law to the people (Neh. viii, 7; comp. ix, 4, 5). He also subscribed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x, 10). From Neh. xii, 13, it appears that he was the son of Zacur, and, on account of his integrity, he was one of those appointed to distribute the Leviti-

11. Another of the Nethinim who returned with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 46; Neh. vii, 49). B.C. ante 537.

12. One of the Levites who assisted Ezra in expounding the law to the people (Neh. viii, 7; comp. ix, 4, 5). He also subscribed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x, 10). From Neh. xii, 13, it appears that he was the son of Zacur, and, on account of his integrity, he was one of those appointed to distribute the Leviti-

13. Another of the Nethinim who returned with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 46; Neh. vii, 49). B.C. ante 537.

14. One of the Levites who assisted Ezra in expounding the law to the people (Neh. viii, 7; comp. ix, 4, 5). He also subscribed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x, 10). From Neh. xii, 13, it appears that he was the son of Zacur, and, on account of his integrity, he was one of those appointed to distribute the Leviti-

15. Another of the Nethinim who returned with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 46; Neh. vii, 49). B.C. ante 537.

16. One of the Levites who assisted Ezra in expounding the law to the people (Neh. viii, 7; comp. ix, 4, 5). He also subscribed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x, 10). From Neh. xii, 13, it appears that he was the son of Zacur, and, on account of his integrity, he was one of those appointed to distribute the Leviti-

17. Another of the Nethinim who returned with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 46; Neh. vii, 49). B.C. ante 537.

18. One of the Levites who assisted Ezra in expounding the law to the people (Neh. viii, 7; comp. ix, 4, 5). He also subscribed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x, 10). From Neh. xii, 13, it appears that he was the son of Zacur, and, on account of his integrity, he was one of those appointed to distribute the Leviti-

19. Another of the Nethinim who returned with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 46; Neh. vii, 49). B.C. ante 537.

20. One of the Levites who assisted Ezra in expounding the law to the people (Neh. viii, 7; comp. ix, 4, 5). He also subscribed the sacred covenant with Nehemiah (Neh. x, 10). From Neh. xii, 13, it appears that he was the son of Zacur, and, on account of his integrity, he was one of those appointed to distribute the Leviti-

21. Another of the Nethinim who returned with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 46; Neh. vii, 49). B.C. ante 537.

22. Another of the Nethinim who returned with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 46; Neh. vii, 49). B.C. ante 537.
HANUNIAH probably along with his brother, and, together with one Hananiah, was appointed to take charge of the gates of Jerusalem, and see that they were opened in the morning and closed in the evening at the appointed time (Jer. xxxvi, 22). The circumstances of the time and place rendered this an important and responsible duty, not unattended with danger. B.C. 446.

Hananyahu (Heb. [and Chald.] Chananyahu, חַנַּעַנְי), also [1 Chron. xxv. 28; 2 Chron. xxvi. 11; Jer. xxxvi. 12] in the prolonged form Chananyahu, חַנַּעָנְיָה, whom Jehovah has graciously given, comp. Ananias, etc.; Sept. Ananias, Vulg. Vania. Hananyahu, the name of a number of men. See also Ananias; Annas, etc.

1. A "son" of Shashak, and chief of the tribe of Benjamin (1 Chron. viii. 24). B.C. apparently between 1612 and 1093.

2. One of the sons of Heman, who (with eleven of his kinsmen) was appointed by David to superintend the sixteenth division (blowers on horns) of Levitical musicians (1 Chron. xxx. 4, 23). B.C. 1014.


4. The father of Shelemiah and grandfather of Irijah, who was the guard of the gate of Benjamin who arrested Jeremiah (Jer. xxxvii. 13). B.C. considerably ante 589.

5. Father of Zelekiah, which latter was one of the "princes" to whom Michaiah reported Baruch's reading of Jeremiah's roll (Jer. xxxvi. 12). B.C. 590.

6. A false prophet Gibion, who, by opposing his prophecies to those of Jeremiah, brought upon himself the terrible sentence, "Thou shalt die this year, because thou hast taught rebellion against the Lord." He died accordingly (Jer. xxviii. 1 sq.). B.C. 586.

7. The high priest in the Temple that within two years Jeconiah and all his fellow-captives, with the vessels of the Lord's house which Nebuchadnezzar had taken away to Babylon, should be brought back to Jerusalem (Jer. xxxvii.): an indication that treacherous negotiations were already secretly opened with Pharaoh-Hophra (who had just succeeded Psammis on the Egyptian throne), and that strong hopes were entertained of the destruction of the Babylonian power by him. The preceding chapter (xxvii. 3) shows further that a league was already in progress between the Jews and the neighboring princes of Edom, Ammon, Moab, Tyre, and Zidon, for the purpose of organizing resistance to Nebuchadnezzar, in combination, no doubt, with the projected movements of Pharaoh-Hophra. Hananiah corroborated his prophecy by taking off from the neck of Jeremiah the yoke which he wore by divine command (Jer. xxxvi. 10). It was a token of the subjection of Judaea and the neighboring countries to the Babylonian empire, and breaking it, adding, "Thus saith Jehovah, Even so will I break the yoke of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, from the neck of all nations within the space of two full years." But Jeremiah was bid to go and tell Hananiah that for the wooden yokes which he had broken he should make yokes of iron, so firm was the dominion of Babylon destined to be for seventy years. The prophet Jeremiah added this rebuke and prediction of Hananiah's death, the fulfillment of which closes the history of this false prophet. In the history of Hananiah is of great interest, as throwing much light upon the Jewish politics of that period, this time, divided as parties were into the partisans of Babylon on one hand, and Egypt on the other. It also exhibits the machinery of false prophecies, by which the irreligious and the religious sought to govern by their own policy, in a very distinct form. At the same time, too, that it explains in general the sort of political calculation on which such false prophecies were hazarded, it supplies an important clue in particular by which to judge of the date of Pharaoh-Hophra's (or Apries') accession to the Egyptian throne, and the commencement of his ineffectual effort to restore the power of Egypt (which had been prostrate since Necho's overthrow, Jer. xlv. 2) upon the ruins of the Babylonian empire. The leading to Egypt indicated by Hananiah's prophecy as having been to Zedekiah, had only the faint shadow of his reign issued in open defection from Nebuchadnezzar, and in the guilt of perjury, which cost Zedekiah his crown and his life, as we learn from Ezek. xlvii. 12-20; the date being fixed by a comparison of Ezek. viii, 1 with xxvi, 1. The temporary success of the intrigue, which is described in Jer. xxxviii., was speedily followed by the return of the Chaldaean and the destruction of the city, according to the prediction of Jeremiah. This history of Hananiah also illustrates the manner in which the false prophets hindered the mission, and obstructed the beneficial effects of the ministry of the true prophets, and affords a remarkable example of the way in which they prophesied smooth things, and said peace when there was no peace (compare 1 Kings xxiii, 11, 24, 25). See Jeremiah.

7. The original name of one of Daniel's youthful companions and of the "three Hebrew chieftains" better known by his Babylonian name Shadrach (Dan. i; vi, 7).

8. Son of Zerubbabel, and father of Rephaiah; one of the paternal ancestors of Christ (1 Chron. iii. 19, 21).

9. See Zerubbabel, b. of Rephaiah; one of the patriarchal ancestors of Christ (1 Chron. iii. 19, 21).

10. The "ruler of the palace" (I Kings xxiv. 15), and the person who was associated with Nebemiah's brother Hanani in the charge of the gates of Jerusalem. See Hanani. The high eulogy is bestowed upon him that "he was a faithful man, and feared God above many" (Neh. vii. 2). His office seems to have been one of authority and trust, and perhaps the same as that of Eliahim, which means "God's house" in the name of Zelekiah. See Eliakim. The arrangements for guarding the gates of Jerusalem were intrusted to him with Hanani, the Tirshatha's brother. Pridaux thinks that the appointment of Hanani and Hananiah indicates that at this time Nehemiah returned to Persia, but evidently without sufficient ground. Nebemiah seems to have been continuously at Jerusalem for some time after the completion of the wall (vii. 5, 65; viii. 9; x. 1). If, too, the term נְבָעָנְיָה, as Gesenius supposes, and as the use of it in Neh. ii, 8, makes not improbable, not the palace, but the fortress of the Temple, called by Josephus αἰενοῦς, there is still less reason to imagine Nebemiah's absence from Jerusalem. Hananiah would have been a member of the families of the same family as the preceding. The rendering, moreover, of Neh. vii, 2, 3, should probably be, "And I enjoined (or gave orders to) Hananiah . . . . and Hananiah, the captains of the fortress . . . . concerning Jerusalem, and said, Let not the gates," etc. There is no authority for rendering נְבָעָן over Jerusalem." The passages quoted by Gesenius are not one of them to the point.

11. The son of "one of the apothecaries" (or makers of the sacred ointments and incense, Exxx. xxx, 22-38), who repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. iii, 8) possibly the same with No. 9. B.C. 446.

12. A son of Shelemiah, and one of the priests who repaired those parts of the wall of Jerusalem opposite their houses (Neh. iii, 30). B.C. 446.

13. A priest, apparently son of Jeremiah, after the captivity, "of the fifth course" (Neh. vii, 52), possibly the same with one of those who celebrated the completion of the walls of Jerusalem (ver. 41). B.C. 446.

Hanbury, Thomas, an English Wesleyan preacher, was born at Carlisle Dec. 16, 1783; was left an orphan at seven, apprenticed to a trade at twelve. He had little education, but had serious thoughts from infancy, and was confirmed at thirteen. Some time after, through
HANCOCK

Methodist influence, he was converted. In 1754 he be-
gan to preach, and, during his first year of work, was
often in danger of violent death from mobs. In 1758 he
was admitted into the itinerancy. He afterwards
preached in most of the cities of the kingdom. He died
at Nottingham Dec. 29, 1786. Mr. Hancock's labors tend-
greatly to the spread of vital religion among some
of the most abandoned and violent districts of England.
See Jackson, Lives of Early Methodist Preachers, i. 274.

Hancock, Thomas, a patron of Harvard College.
He left most of his property to his nephew, governor
Hancock, but yet bequeathed £2,000 for the establish-
ment of a professor of Hebrew and the Hebrew and Or-
iental languages at Harvard; £1,000 to the Society for
propagating the Gospel among the Indians, and £600 to
the town of Boston for the establishment of a hospital for
the insane. He died at Boston August 1, 1784.—Am.
Register, 1784.

Hand (γῆς, γῆς, the open palm; ἐπώπῃ, the hollow
of the partly-closed hand; Greek χεῖρ, χεῖρα, γάμινον,
the right hand, dēka, dekè, spemol, the left hand, dēka,
spemol; ἐνόπῃ, the principal organ of feeling, rightly
described by Cicero as the oriflamme of the instrument
of sciences, since this member is wonderfully adapted to the purposes
for which it was designed, and serves to illustrate the
wisdom and providence of the great Creator (The Hand,
its Mechanism and vital Endowments, as evincing Design,
by Sir Charles Bell, 1838). Consideration of the
facilities of the human hand, the control which it has
given man, the conquest over the external world which it
has enabled him to achieve, and the pleasing and useful
revolutions and improvements which it has brought about,
are not surprised to read the glowing eulogy in which Cicero
(Deor. ii. 100) speaks of the hand, and the subject, not
how important is the part which the hand performs in the
records of divine revelation.
The hand itself serves to distinguish man from other ter-
restrial beings. Of the two hands, the right has a prefer-
ence derived from natural endowment. See Leave-
Hand.

Hand are the symbols of human action; pure hands are
pure actions; unjust hands are deeds of injustice;
hands full of blood, actions stained with cruelty, and the
like (Ps. xc. 17; Job ix. 30; 1 Tim. ii. 8; Isa. i. 10).
Washing of the hands was the symbol of purification
(Prov. xxv. 11, xlvii. 18). Of this Pilate furnishes an
example (Matt. xxvii. 24). It was the custom of the Jews
to wash their hands before and after meat (see Mark vii. 4;
Matt. vi. 2; Luke xi. 38). Washing of hands was a
symbol of expiation, as might be shown by numerous
references in the Old Testament, as examples from several
passages (1 Cor. vi. 11; Isa. i. 16; Ps. xxiv. 3, 4). See
Washing of Hands. Paul, in 1 Tim. ii. 8, says, "I will
therefore that men pray everywhere, lifting up holy
hands," etc. (see Job, xi. 13, 14). The elevation or
expression of the right hand was also the ancient method
of voting in popular assemblies, as indicated by the
Greek term χειροτονίας (Acts xiv. 25; 2 Cor. viii. 19).
In Ps. lxxvi. 2, for "sore," the margin of our version
has "hand," and the correct sense is, "My hands in
the right were spread out, and ceased not.
To raise the hands together over the head was a ges-
ture of despairing grief (2 Sam. xvii. 19; Jer. ii. 87). The
expression in Jer. ii. 37, "Thy hands upon thy head,"
may be explained by the act of Tamar in laying her
hand on her head as a sign of her degradation and sor-
row (2 Sam. xvii. 19). The expression "Though hand
justified by law," in Prov. xi. 21, is simply "hand to hand,"
and signifies through all ages and generations, ever:
"through all generations the wicked shall not be unpun-
ished."

To the right hand signified to the south, the southern
quarter, as the left hand signified the north (Job xxiii. 
9; 1 Sam. xxiii. 19; 2 Sam. xxv. 6). The term hand
is sometimes used for a monument, a trophy of victory
(1 Sam. xv. 12); a sepulchral monument, "Ababolon's
Place," literally Ababolon's Hand (2 Sam. xviii. 18; see
Erdmann, Monumentum Ababoloni, Helmst. 1740). So in
Isa. i. 5, 6: "to them will I give a place within my walls
—a monument (or portion) and a name" (Genesius, The-
saur. Heb. p. 242). Hand signifies motion and is used to
strike hands as a pledge of suretship (Prov. xxvi. 18;
xxii. 26; 2 Chron. xxx. 8, margin). The right hand was
lifited up in swearing or taking an oath (Gen. xiv.
22; Deut. xxxii. 40; Ezek. xx. 28; Ps. cxxii. 11; Isa.
viii. 8); similar is the Arabic oath, "By the right hand
of Allah." (Gen. xii. 1, 27).

Hand in general is the symbol of power and strength,
and the right hand more particularly so. To hold by
the right hand is the symbol of protection and favor
(Psa. xxviii. 35). To stand or be on one's right hand is
to aid or assist any one (Psa. xvi. 8; cix. 31; cx. 5; 
xxvi. 5); so also, man of the right hand is, as thou
sustainst, achild (Psa. lxxx. 17): "my hand is with
any one," i.e. I aid him, am on his side (1 Sam.
xxii. 17; 2 Sam. xxiii. 12; 2 Kings xxiii. 19); and
to take or hold the right hand, i.e. to sustain, to aid
(Psa. lxxxi. 29; Isa. xili. 10; xiv. 1). So the pledge of
fellowship (Gen. xiv. 19) signifies a communication of
the same power and authority. To lean upon the hand
of another is a mark of familiarity and superiority (2 Kings
v. 17, 18). To give the hand, as to a master, is
the token of submission and future obedience. Thus,
in 2 Chron. xxx. 8, the words in the original, "Give the
hand unto the Lord," signify, Yield yourselves unto the
Lord. The like phrase is used in Ps. lxxvi. 31; Lam.
vi. 6, "Behold, as the eyes of servants look unto the
hand of their masters, and as the eyes of a maiden unto
the hand of her mistress, so our eyes wait upon the
Lord our God." (Ps. cxvii. 2), which refers to the
watchful readiness of a servant to obey the least sign
of command (Kittto's Daily Bible Illustr. ad loc.). To kiss
the hand is an act of homage (1 Kings xix. 8; Job
xvii. 27). To pour water on any one's hands signifies
to serve him (2 Kings ii. 11). "To seal up the hand"
(Job xxxvii. 26) signifies to make one in charge of any special
business, for which he will be held accountable. Marks
in the hands or wrists were the tokens of servitude, the
heathen being wont to imprint marks upon the hands
of servants, and on such as devoted themselves to some
false deity. Mark vi. 7, in the man, when chal-
dlenged for the scars visible on his hands, would deny
that he had proceeded from an idolatrous cause, and
pretend that they were the effects of the wounds he
gave himself for the loss of his friends. The right
hand stretched out is the symbol of immediate exertion
of power (Exod. xxv. 18); sometimes the exercise of
mercy (Isa. lv. 3; Prov. x. 24).

The hand of God is spoken of as the instrument of
power, and to it is ascribed that which strictly belongs
to God himself (Job xxvii. 11; Psa. xxxi. 16; xxv. 4;
Isa. lxxii. 8; Prov. xi. 14; Acts xxvii. 26; 2 Tim.
iii. 11). The hand of the Lord being upon or with any one
notes divine aid or favor (Ezra vii. 6, 28; viii. 18, 22;
Neh. ii. 8; Isa. i. 25; Luke i. 66; Acts xi. 21); fur-
ther, the hand of the Lord is upon or against thee, de-
notes punishment (Exod. ix. 5; Deut. ii. 15; Judg. ii.
15; 1 Sam. vii. 8, 13; Ezek. x. 5, 12; Ps. cvi. 37;
Acts xi. 11). In Job xxxiii. 7, "my hand shall not be
heavy upon thee," the original term is ἔριπη, sakph, and
the passage signifies "my dignity shall not weigh heavy
upon thee" (Genesius, s. v.). The hand of God upon
a prophet signifies the immediate operation of his Holy
Spirit on the soul or body of the prophet, as in 1 Kings
xviii. 46; 2 Kings ii. 13; 2 Chron. vii. 13; Ezek. xi. 3,
13; Ps. cxliii. 6; Prov. xvi. 22; Jer. iii. 18; 2 Tim.
xxxiii. 13; 1 Epp. iv. 13; 1 Cor. xiv. 30; 2 Epp. 
iv. 30; the hand, so also the finger of God denotes his
our Saviour cast out devils or demons by his bare command, whereas the Jews cast them out only by the invocation of the name of God. So in Exod. viii, 19, the finger of God is a work which none but God could perform. See Axt.

The hands of the high-priest were laid on the head of the scape-goat when the sins of the people were publicly confessed (Lev. xvi, 21). Witnesses laid their hands on the head of the accused person, as it were to signify that they charged upon him the guilt of his blood, and freed themselves from it (Deut. xii, 9; xvi, 7). The Hebrews, when presenting their sin-offerings at the tabernacle, confessed their sins while they laid their hands upon the victim (Lev. i, 4). To "fill one's hands," is to take possession of the priesthood, to perform the functions of that office; because in this ceremony those parts of the victim which were to be offered were put into the hand of the new-made priest (Judg. xvii, 5, 12; Lev. xvi, 52; 1 Kings xiii, 33). Jacob laid his hands on Ephraim and Manasseh when he gave them his last blessing (Gen. xlv, 14). The high-priest stretched out his hands to the people as often as he recited the solemn form of blessing (Lev. xix, 22). Our Saviour laid his hands upon the children that were presented to him and blessed them (Mark x, 16). (See Tiemeier, De χιτώνατι et χιτώλογι, Erford. 1734.)

Imposition of hands formed an early period a part of the ceremonial observed on the appointment and consecration of bishops, and held by the early Church. Numb. xxvii, 19, Jehovah is represented as thus speaking to Moses, "Take thee Joshua, the son of Nun, a man in whom is the spirit, and lay thine hand upon him, and set him before Eleazar the priest, and before all the congregation, and give him a charge in their sight," etc.; where it is evident that the laying on of hands did neither originate nor communicate divine gifts; for Joshua had "the spirit" before he received imposition of hands; but it was merely an instrumental sign for marking him out individually, and setting him apart from the congregation. Similar appears to be the import of the observance in the primitive Church of Christ (Acts vii, 15-17; 1 Tim. iv, 14; 2 Tim. i, 6). A corruption of this doctrine was that the laying on of hands gave itself of divine powers, and on this account Simon, the magician (Acts viii, 9, 13), obtained money, every one of whom gave me also this power, that on whomsoever I lay hands he may receive the Holy Ghost," intending probably to carry on a gainful trade by communicating the gift to others. See IMPOSITION OF HANDS.

The phrase "sitting at the right hand of God," as applied to the Messiah, is derived from the fact that with earthly princes a position on the right hand of the throne was accorded to the chief place of honor, dignity, and power: "a upon thy right hand did stand the queen" (Ps. civ, 9; comp. 1 Kings ii, 19; Ps. lxxx, 17). The immediate passage out of which sprang the phraseology employed by Jesus may be found in Ps. cx, 1: "Jehovah said unto my Lord, sit thou at my right hand until I make thine enemies thy footstool." Accordingly the Saviour declares before Caiphas (Matt. xxvi, 64; Mark xiv, 62), "Ye shall see the Son of man sitting on the right hand of power, and coming in the clouds of heaven;" where the meaning obviously is that the Jews of that day should have manifest proof that Jesus held the most eminent place in the divine favor, and that his present humiliation would be succeeded by glory, majesty, and power (Luke xxiv, 26; 1 Tim. iii, 16). So when this same figurative expression occurs in Col. i, 20; Rom. i, 3: 1 Pet. iii, 22; Heb. i, 1, 3: viii, 1) that Jesus "sits at the right hand of God," "as the right hand of the Majesty on high," we are obviously to understand the assertion to be that, as his Father, so he worketh always (John xvi, 17) for the advancement of the kingdom of heaven, and for the salvation of souls in the whole world.

In Col. ii, 13, 14, "the law of commandments contained in ordinances" (Ephes. ii, 15) is designated "the handmorizing of ordinances that was against us," which Jesus blotted out, and took away, nailing it to his cross; phraseology which indicates the abolition, on the part of the Saviour, of the Mosaic law (Wolffius, Curia Philolo. in N. T. iii, 16).

Hand-breath (Heb. נְפָח, te' phach, or נְפָחָה, to' phach), the palm, used as a measure of four fingers, equal to about four inches (Exod. xxv, 26; 1 Kings vii, 26; 2 Chron. iv, 5; Ezek. xx. 4, 5; Jer. lii, 21). In Ps. xxxix, 5, the expression "Thou hast made my days palm-breath," signifies very short.

Händel, Georg Friedrich, one of the greatest of musical composers and musicians, was born at Halle, in the Prussian province of Saxony, Feb. 24, 1684. He manifested in early youth an extraordinary passion for music, and at the age of eleven was a good player on the violin, and could sit down and play it as well as a master. In 1698 he was sent to Berlin, where he enjoyed the instruction of Attilio. An offer by the elector of Brandenburg was declined by his father, and in 1701 Händel went to Hamburg, where he played a violin in the orchestra of the opera, and composed his first opera, Almira. He next visited Italy, where he wrote operas for Florence, Venice, and Rome. On his return from Rome he was, in 1709, appointed chapel-master by the elector of Han- sard short violet, and in 1712 he took up his permanent abode in that country. He composed, in honor of the peace of Utrecht, his celebrated Te Deum and Jubilate, and numerous operas. A Royal Academy was established (1720) and placed under his management, but his violent temper involved him in many troubles; an opposition house was started, and soon both failed, with a loss to Händel of £10,000. Soon after he quitted the stage altogether, in order to devote himself wholly to the composition of oratorios. His oratorio Esther had appeared as early as 1720; in 1732 his Judas Maccabaeus was produced. He completed this and other oratorios, and in 1755 being repeated annually, brought to the Foundling Hospital, from 1749 to 1777, £10,800. In 1751 Händel became blind, but he still continued to compose and to play on the piano. He died, as he wished, on Good Friday, April 15, 1759, "in hopes," he said, "of meeting in his good God, his sweet Lord and Saviour, on the day of his resurrection." Among his works, which are in the queen's library, are 50 operas—2 German, 26 Italian, 16 English; 20 oratorios, a great quantity of Church music, cantatas, songs, and instrumental pieces. He was a wonder of the age; his compositions are often full of grandeur and sublimity. His operas are seldom performed, but his oratorios hold the same place in music that in the English drama is accorded to the plays of Shakespeare; and the Händel festivals, lasting several days, in which they are performed by thousands of singing-people, are always a great attraction with the public, and abundant seats are reserved for the Queen, and other members of the royal family for the performances at our own national theatre. See V. Scholcher, The Life of Händel (London, 1857); Chrysander, G. F. Händel (Lpz. 1808); Gervinus, Händel und Shakespeare (Lpz. 1868); Contemporary Review, April, 1869, p. 960. (A. J. S.)

Handful, a representative in the A. Vers. of several Heb. terms and phrases: prop. נְפָח, the fill of the hand (1 Kings xvii, 12), or נְפָחָה, to fill the hand
Handicraft, a general term (not occurring, however, in the Bible) for any manufacture. See Artificer. Although the extent cannot be ascertained to which these arts were carried whose invention is ascribed to Tubal-Cain (Gen. iv. 22), it is probable that this was proportionate to the nomadic or settled habits of the antediluvian races. Among nomad races, as the Bedouin Arabs, or the tribes of Northern and Central Asia and of America, the wants of life, as well as the arts which supply them, are few, and among the Hebrews both that of them are multiplied and make progress. The following particulars may be gathered respecting the various handicrafts mentioned in the Scriptures. See Craftsman.

1. The preparation of iron for use either in war, in agriculture, or for domestic purposes, was doubtless one of the earliest applications of labor; and, together with iron, working in brass, or, rather, copper alloyed with tin, bronze (יוֹקָר, Geeseus, Theb. Heb. p. 875), is mentioned in the same passage as practiced in antediluvian times (Gen. iv. 22). The use of this last is usually considered as an art of higher antiquity even than that of iron (Hammars and Deugs, p. 150; Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. ii, 132, abridgment), and there can be no doubt that metal, whether iron or bronze, must have been largely used, either in material or in tools, for the construction of the ark (Gen. vi. 14, 16). Whether the weapons for war or chase used by the early warriors of Syria and Assyria, or the arrow-heads of the archer Ishmael, were of bronze or iron, cannot be ascertained; but we know that iron was used for warlike purposes by the Assyrians (Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 194); and, on the other hand, that stone-tipped arrows, as was the case also in Mexico, were used in the earlier times by the Egyptians, as well as by the Semites and Greeks, and that stone or flint knives continued to be used by them, and by the inhabitants of the desert, and also by the Jews, for religious purposes, after the introduction of iron into general use (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. iii, 324, 354; ii, 163; Prescott, Macc. i, 118; Exod. iv. 22; Josh. v. 2; 1st Egypt. room, Brit. Mus. case 36, 37). In the construction of the tabernacle, copper, but no iron, appears to have been used, though the utility of iron was at the same period well known to the Jews, both from their own use of it and from their Egyptian education, while the Canaanitish inhabitants of Palestine and Syria were in full possession of its use both for warlike and domestic purposes (Exod. xx. 23; xxxv, 3; xxvii, 19; Numb. xxxv, 16; Deut. iii, 11; iv, 9; Josh. viii, 31; 16, 18). After the establishment of the Jews in Canaan, the occupation of a smith (גָּבֹּר) became recognised as a distinct employment (1 Sam. xxviii, 13). The designer of a higher order appears to have been called specially גָּבֹּר (Geeseus, p. 531; Exod. xxxv, 50, 55; 2 Chron. xvii, 15; Salehblut, Arch. Heb. c. 14, § 16). The smith’s work (including workers in the precious metals) and its results are often mentioned in Scripture (2 Sam. xii, 31; 1 Kings vi, 7; 2 Chron. xxvi, 14; Isa. xlix, 12; iv, 16). Among the captives taken to Babylon, Nebuchadnezzar were 1000 "craftsmen" and smiths, who were probably of the superior kind (2 Kings xxiv, 16; Jer. xxix, 2). See Charashim.

The workman in gold and silver (יוֹקָר, אֲרוּפָהָא), following the instructions and the examples sent by Abraha to Rebekah (Gen. xxvii, 22, 55; xxxiv, 4; xxviii, 18; Deut. vii, 25). But, whatever skill the Hebrews possessed, it is quite clear that they must have learned much from Egypt and its "iron-furnaces," both in metal-work and in the arts of setting and polishing precious stones; arts which were turned to account both in the construction of the Tabernacle and the making of the priests’ ornaments, and also in the casting of the golden calf as well as its destruction by Moses, probably, as suggested by Goguet, by a method which he had learnt in Egypt (Gen. xii, 42; Exod. iii, 29; xii, 35; xx, 4, 24, 25; xxviii, 17, 24; xxviii, 4; 24, 24, 25; xxxi, 6, 39; Neh. iii, 8; Isa. xiv, 12). Various processes of the goldsmiths’ work, including operations in the raw material, are illustrated by Egyptian monuments (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. ii, 106, 102, 162). See Goldsmith.

After the Jewish exiles, frequent notices are found both of moulded and wrought metal, including soldering, which last had long been known in Egypt; but the Phoenicians appear to have possessed greater skill than the Jews in these arts, at least in Solomon's time (Judg. viii, 24, 27; xvii, 4; 1 Kings v, 5, 46; 2 Chron. xv, 4; Ecclus. xxxviii, 28; Bar. vi, 50, 55, 57; Wilkinson, i, 162). See Zarephath. Even in the desert, mention is made of beating gold into plates, cutting it into wire, and also of setting precious stones in gold (Exod. xxxiii, 5, 6, etc.; Beckmann, Hist. of Int. ii, 414; Gesenius, p. 1290). See Metal.

Among the tools of the smith are mentioned tongs (יוֹקָר, 'לֹּזָפ, Foropa, Geeseus, p. 761; Isa. vi, 7), hammer (יהֶבֶר, 'סְפָא, malleus, Gesen. p. 1101), anvil (נָצֶפ, Geeseus, p. 1108), bellows (יַבָּרוֹר, παναρ, sufflatorium, Gesenius, p. 896; Isa. xii, 7; Jer. vi, 29; Ecclus. xxxviii, 28; Wilkinson, i, 316). See each word.

In the N. T. Alexander "the coppersmith" (ὁ χαλκωτής) of Ephesus is mentioned, where also was carried on that trade in "silver shrines" (Βασίλειας ἀργυραίας) which was represented by Demetrius the silversmith (ἄργυροποιος) as being in danger from the spread of Christianity (Acts xix. 24, 28; 2 Tim. iv, 14). See Coppersmith.

2. The work of the carpenter (יוֹקָר, רֹאשׁ, rīṣaw, תָּמִי) was probably a common occupation among the Jews from a very early time. "Carpenters" (Wilkinson.)

*yull, a hole in the seat of a chair; yull, a leg of a chair; yull, a nail; yull, a square; yull, man planing or polishing the leg of a chair.

The workman in gold and silver (יוֹקָר, אֲרוּפָהָא) is often mentioned in Scripture (e.g. Gen. vi, 14; Exod. xxxvii; Isa. xlix, 13). In the palace built by David for himself, the workmen employed were chiefly Phoenicians sent by Hiram (2 Sam. v, 11; 1 Chron. xiv, 1), as most probably were those, or at least the principal ones, who were employed by Solomon in the construction of the Temple, executed under Joash, king of Judah, and also in the rebuilding under Zerubbabel, no mention is made of foreign workmen, though in the latter case the timber is expressly said to have been brought by sea (2 Chron. xii, 7; Ezra iii, 7). That the Jewish carpenters must have been able to carve with some skill is evident from Isa. xii, 7; xlv, 13, in which last passage some of the im
HANDICRAFT

The Hebrew (2 Kings xii, 12) were probably master-masons (“builders,” ver. 11). Among their implements are mentioned the saw (ירש, p. 215), the plumb-line (סנה, Gesen. p. 215), the measuring-reed (ינון, Job xxxvi, 5; Zech. i, 16) and the axe (עקר, 1 Kings vi, 7). See each word. Some of these, and also the chisel and mallet, are represented on Egyptian monuments (Wilkinson, "Anc. Egyptians, 319, 314), or preserved in the British Museum (1st Egypt room, No. 6114, 6088). The large stones used in Solomon’s Temple are said by Josephus to have been fitted together exactly without either mortar or cramps, but the foundation stones to have been fastened with lead (Josephus, "Ant. viii, 3, 2; xxv, 11, 3). For ordinary building, mortar, כנה (Gesen. p. 182b), was used; sometimes, perhaps, bitumen, as was the case at Babylon (Gen. xvi, 3). The lime, clay, and straw of which mortar is generally composed in the East requires to be very carefully mixed and united so as to resist wet (Lave, "Mod. Eq. i, 27; Shaw, "Travels, p. 296). The wall “daubed with untempered mortar” of Ezekiel (xiii, 10) was perhaps a sort of cob-wall of mud or clay without lime (BM, Gesenius, p. 1516), which would give way under heavy rain. The use of whitewash on tombs is remarked by our Lord (Matt. xiii, 27; see also Mishnah, "Masser Shenai, v, 1). Houses infected

Tools of an Egyptian Carpenter. (Wilkinson.)


implements used in the trade are mentioned: the rule (יענית, mi'troso, norma), possibly a chalk pencil, Gesenius, p. 1387), measuring-line (סנה, Gesenius, p. 1201), compass (נגלת, παραγωγίς, cæculea, Gesenius, p. 490), plane, or smoothing instrument (יחל, kaila, rançina) (Gesenius, p. 1234, 1386) axe (עקר, Gesenius, p. 302, or וקר, Gesenius, p. 1236, ἀξίνη, secun-). See each of these words.

The process of the work, and the tools used by Egyptian carpenters, and also cooperers and wheelwrights, are displayed in Egyptian monuments and relics; the former, including dovetailing, veneering, drilling, gluing, varnishing, and inlaying, may be seen in Wilkinson, "Anc. Eq. ii, 111–119. Of the latter, many specimens, including saws, hatchets, knives, awls, nails, a hone, and a drill, also turned objects in bone, exist in the British Museum, 1st Egypt room, case 42–43, Nos. 6946–6188. See also Wilkinson, ii, p. 118, fig. 205. See Carpenter.

In the N. T. the occupation of a carpenter (τεκτόν) is mentioned in connection with Joseph, the husband of the Virgin Mary, and ascribed to our Lord himself by way of reproach (Mark vi, 3; Matt. xiii, 55; and Just. Mart. dial. Tryph. c. 88).

3. The masons (ברון, 2 Kings xii, 12 [18], wall-builders, Gesenius, p. 269) employed by David and Solomon, at least the chief of them, were Phoenicians, as is implied also in the word ברון, men of Gebal, Jebail, Byblus (Gesen. p. 258; 1 Kings v, 18; Ezek. xxvii, 9, Burchardt, "Syria, p. 179). Other terms employed are ברון, "workers of stone-wall" (2 Sam. v, 11; 1 Chron. xxii, 15); ברון, "stone-cutters or masons (1 Chron. xxii, 2, 15, "workers of stone;" Ezra iii, 7, etc.).
HANDICRAFT

Tyropeon probably derived its name from the occupation of the cheese-makers, its inhabitants (Josephus, War, v, 4, 1). Butchers, not Jewish, are spoken of in 1 Cor. ix, 25.

Trade in all its branches was much developed after the Captivity, and for a father to teach his son the trade was reckoned not only honorable, but indispensable (Mishna, Pirke Ab. ii, 2; Kiddush, iv, 14). Some trades, however, were regarded as less honorable (Jahn, Bibl. Arch. § 84).

Some, if not all, trades had special localities, as was the case formerly in Europe and is now in many cities (Jer. xxxvii, 21; 1 Cor. x, 25; Josephus, War, v, 4, 1, and 8; Mishna, E secor. v, 1; Russell, Aleppo, p. 20; Chardin, Voyages, vii, 274, 304; Lane, Mod. Eq. ii, 145). See BAZAR.

One feature, distinguishing Jewish from other workmen, deserves peculiar notice, viz. that they were not slavers, nor were their trades necessarily hereditary, as is and so often the case among other, especially heathen nations (Jahn, Bibl. Arch. c, v, § 81-84; Saalschütz, Hebr. Arch. c, 14). See MECHANIC.

Handkerchief or napkin (σωνάκια; Vulg. sudarium) occurs in Luke xix, 20; John xi, 44; xx, 7; Acts xix, 12. The Greek word is adopted from the Latin, and properly signifies a sweat-cloth, or pocket-handkerchief, but in the Greek and Syriac languages it denotes chiefly napkin, wrapper, etc. In the first of the above passages (Acts xix, 12) it means the handkerchief by which the "wicked servant" had laid up the pound entrusted to him by his master. For references to the custom of laying up money, etc, in σωνάκια, both in classical and rabbinical writers, see Wetstein's N. T. on Luke xix, 20.

In the second instance (John xi, 44) it appears as a handkerchief, or cloth attached to the corpse. It was perhaps brought round the forehead and under the chin. In many Egyptian mummies it does not cover the face. In ancient times, among the Greeks, it did (Nicolaus, De Gvoevo. Luctu, c. iii, § 6; Thiel, 1637). Maimonides, in his comparatively recent times, describes the whole face as being covered, and gives a reason for the custom (Tract Ṭaḥal, c, 4).

The next instance is that of the σωνάκων which had been "about the head" of our Lord, but which, after his resurrection, was found rolled up, as if deliberately, and put in a place separate from the linen clothes. It is the instance of the Biblical use of the word (and the only one in which it is rendered "handkerchief") occurs in the account of the "special miracles" wrought by the hand of Paul (Acts xix, 11): so that σωνάκα (handkerchiefs, napkins, wrappers, shawls, etc.) were brought together by the sick; and the diseases departed from them, and the evil spirits went out of them. The Ephesians had not unnaturally inferred that the apostle's miraculous power could be communicated by such a mode of contact; and certainly cures thus received by parties at a distance, among a people famed for their adders and widows, i.e. magical skill, etc., would serve to convince them of the truth of the Gospel by a mode well suited to interest their minds. The apostle is not recorded to have expressed any opinion respecting the reality of this intermediate means of those miracles. He had doubted sufficiently explained that these and all the other miracles "wrought by his hands," i.e. by his means, were really wrought by God (ver. 11) in attestation of the mission of Jesus. If he himself did not entertain exactly the same ideas upon the subject as they did, he may be considered as consenting to, or, rather, not opposing this unnecessary popular notion, rendered harmless by his previous explanation, and affording a very convenient medium for achieving much higher purposes. If the connection between the secondary cause and the effect was real, it reminds us of our Saviour's expression, "I perceive that virtue has gone out of me" (Mark v, 30); which is, however, regarded by many critics as a popular mode of saying that he
knew that a miracle had been wrought by his power and efficacy—a mode of speaking in nation at least with the belief of the woman that she should be healed if she could but touch the hem of his garment unperceived by him, and perhaps even conceded to, in accordance with the miracles wrought through the medium of contact related in the Old Testament (1 Kings xvii, 21; 2 Kings iv, 29, etc.), and in order, by a superior display, in regard both to speech and extensiveness, to demonstrate his supremacy by a mode through which the Jews were best prepared to perceive it (Luke vi, 19; see Schwartz, ad Olear. de Stylo N. T. p. 139; Soler. De Puteo, p. 17; Pierson, ad Mer. p. 348; Lydel. Flor. Spars. ad Pass. J. C. p. 5; Drusius, Quaest. Heb. c. 2; Rosenmüller and Kuinöö on the passage). See KERCHER; NAPKH; HOLY HANDKERCHIEF.

HANDLE (as a noun) occurs but once (Cant. v, 5) in the plural (יַעַשְּנֵיהוֹ, kappōth, lit. hands), for the thumb-pieces or knobs of the bolt or latch to a door (compare יַעַשְּנָה, arma of a throne, etc., 1 Kings x, 19). See LOCK.

Handmaid or HANDMAIDEN (יָעַשְנֵיהו, shiphakah, or יָעַשְנָה, amakh, Gen. xvi, 1, etc.; Ruth iii, 9, etc.; 1 Esd. ii, 48), a maid-servant (as both Heb. terms are often translated; the latter being rendered "handmaid" only in a metaphorical or self-depreciatory sense). We find on the paintings in the tombs of Egypt various representations of female domestics employed in waiting on their mistresses, sometimes at the bath, at others at the toilette, and likewise in bringing in refreshments and aliy rendered), a spear or javelin (Ezek. xxxix, 9). See ARMOR.

HANNAH

Handshuch, John Frederick, was the fifth of the earlier ministers sent from Halle to America to labor among the German population, and to build up the Re- deemer's kingdom in this Western hemisphere. He was born of honorable and pious parentage in Halle Jan. 14, 1714. He was educated at the university, and set apart to the work of the ministry in 1744. He commenced his duties in the large and laborious parish of Grab, and labored with great success. But when he heard of the spiritual destitution of his brethren in America, and that the earnest appeals of his sympathies were strongly awakened, and he earnestly desired to go to their relief. He landed in Philadelphia April 5, 1748, and was welcomed at the Trappe by Dr. Muhlenberg with the salutation, "They that sow in tears shall reap in joy." He was placed at Lancaster, Pa., where he labored for several years with great success. The congregation increased, and under his direction a flourishing school was established and sustained. "Our school," he says, "consists of English, Irish, and Germans, Lutherans and Reformed; and so anxious are the people to have their children instructed, that it is impossible to receive all who apply for admission." He subsequently took charge of the churches at New Providence and Hanover, and thence was transferred to Germantown, Pa., and subsequently to Philadelphia, where he died Oct. 9, 1764. (M. L. S.)

Ha'nes (Hebrew Chânâs, חַנָּה, doubtless of Egyptian etymology), a place in Egypt only mentioned in Isa. xxx, 4: "For his princes were at Zoan, and his messengers came to Hanes." The Septuagint renders the latter clause καὶ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ πονηροῖς, "And his ambassadors worthless." The copy from which this translation was made may have read רָכָּנִים instead of רָכָנִים; and it is worthy of note that the reading רָכָנִים is still found in a number of ancient MSS. (De Rossi, Varia Lectiones Vét. Test. iii, 29), and is approved by Lowth and J. D. Michie. The old Latin version follows the Sept., "Nuncius pessimi," but Jerome translates from a text similar to our own, rendering the clause as follows: "Et nuncii tui usque ad Hanes pervererunt." (Sabbattier, Biblio. Sacrorum Latin. Versa, ad loc.). Jerome adds, in his commentary on the verse, "Intelligimus ultimam juxta Ethiopias et Blemmianas esse Egyptiae civitates: et lingua Huruaria, qui heptamerum "Asvnicus" (Asvnicus) of Herodotus (ii, 137; compare Champollion, L'Egypte, i, 309; Quatremere, Mémoires, i, 500), which he, with Gesenius and others, supposes to be the same as Herculeopolis (City of Hercules) of Strabo (xxvii, 812), the ruins of which are now called Andez (Edrisi, Atlas, p. 512). The Coptic name was Hnes or Hunes, and it was one of the ancient royal cities of Egypt. Anaích stands on a high mound some distance west of the Nile, near the parallel of Benissa. The great objection to this theory is the distance of Anaích from Zoan, which stood in the eastern part of the Delta, near the sea. Gesenius remarks, as a kind of apology for the identification of Hanes with Herculeopolis Magna, that the latter was formerly a royal city. It is true that in Manetho's list the 9th and 10th dynasties are said to have been of Egyptian kings; but it has lately been suggested, on strong grounds, by Sir Gardner Wilkinson, that this is a mistake in the case of the 9th dynasty for Hermomithes (Rawlinson, Herod. ii, 348). If this supposition be correct as to the 9th dynasty, it must also be so as to the 10th; but the circumstance of Hero- cepolis being a royal city or not, a thousand years before Isaiah's time, is obviously of no consequence here.

Handing them round to visitors. An upper servant or slave had the office of handing the wine, and a black woman sometimes followed, in an inferior capacity, to receive an empty cup when the wine had been poured into the goblet. The same black slave also carried the fruits and other refreshments; and the peculiar mode of holding a plate with the hand reversed, so generally adopted by women from Africa, is characteristically shown in the Theban paintings (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg. i, 143 sqq.; abridg.) See BANQUET. It appears most probable that Hagar was given to Sarai as her personal attendant while she was in the house of Pharaoh, and that she permitted to retain her when she departed. Jewish tradition reports that Hagar was a daughter (by a concubine, as some say) of Pharaoh, who, seeing the wonders wrought on account of Sarai, said, "It is better that my daughter should be a handmaid in this household than a mistress in another," and therefore gave her to Sarai. She was, no doubt, a female slave, and one of those maid-servants whom Abram had brought from Egypt. These females among the Jews, as they still are in the East, are entirely under the control of the mistress of the family. See SLAVE; HAGAR.

Hand-mill. See MILL.

Hand-staff (מֶשֶׂנָה, makkel; a rod or staff) as usual a white and a black female slave waiting upon an ancient Egyptian lady at a party.
The prophecy is a reproof of the Jews for trusting in Egypt; and, according to the Masoretic text, mention is made of an embassy, perhaps from Hosea, or else from Ahas, or possibly Hezekiah, to a Pharaoh. As the king whose assistance is asked is called Pharaoh, he is probably not an Egyptian of the 25th dynasty, but a sovereign of the 22nd dynasty, which, according to Manetho, was of Tanite kings. It is supposed that the last king of the latter dynasty, Manetho’s Zeti, was the Seba of Herodotes, the king in whose time Sennacherib’s army perished, and who appears to have been mentioned under the title of Pharaoh by Rabshakeh (Isa. xxvi. 6; 2 Kings xxviii. 21), though it is just possible that Tahhakah may have been intended. If the reference be to an embassy to Zom, Sennacherib was probably his successor, and in any case then the most important city of the eastern part of Lower Egypt. Hames was most probably in its neighborhood; and we are disposed to think that the Chal. Parth. is right in identifying it with Tsupanes (ספואנה, ספואנה, once written, if the Ktob be correct, in the form דפאה, Daphne), a fortified town on the eastern frontier. Grorius considers Hanes a contraction of this name (Commentar. ad loc.). With this may be connected the remark of De Rossi—Codex meus 380 notat ad Marg. esse ספואנה (Jer. ii. 16 (Ver. Lect., l. c.). On the whole, this seems to be rather probable theory. Tahpanes was situated in the eastern part of the Delta, and was one of the royal cities about the time of Isaiah. See TAPANES.

Hanging (as a punishment, בְּנַחֲלִית, to impale with dissection of the limbs, Num. xxvi. 43; 2 Sam. xxii. 6, 9: בָּנַחֲלִית, to suspend, as among the Hebrews, Deut. xxi. 22; the Egyptians, Gen. xiii. 19; and the Persians, Esdr. vii. 10; v, 14: κρατέων, suspender). See CRUCIFIXION. Hanging on a tree or gibbet appears to have been a mark of infamy, inflicted on the dead bodies of criminals, rather than a punishment, as modern nations employ it. The person suspended was considered as a curse, an abomination in the sight of God, and as receiving this token of infamy at his hand. The body never was taken on the wall, or justly, was that which the law prescribed, was governed by the phrase, "He shall die the death," but without cause. See PUNISHMENT.

HANGING (as a curtain) is the rendering of three Heb. terms, two of them having reference to the furnishing of the tabernacle and Temple. 1. The "hanging" (בָּנַחֲלִית, suszakh; Sept. eternovra-ropoV, Vulg. eternum) was a curtain or covering (as the word means indeed, and as it is sometimes rendered) to close an entrance. It was made of variegated stuff wrought with needlework (compare Esth. i, 5), and in one instance, at least, was hung on five pillars of acacia wood (Esth. i, 14), and at least six are implied as supporting it; it was suspended before the successive openings of entrance into the tabernacle and its parts. Of these, the first hung before the entrance to the court of the tabernacle (Exod. xxvii. 16; xxxvii. 18; Num. iv. 26); the second before the door of the tabernacle (Exod. xxvi. 36, 37; xxxix. 38); and the third before the entrance to the Most Holy Place, called more fully בְּנַחֲלִית ("veil of the covering," Exod. xxxiv. 12; xxxix. 34; xxi. 21). See CURTAIN.

2. The hangings (בָּנַחֲלִית, kelaim; Sept. eieria, Vulg. eternorum) were used for covering the walls of the tabernacle, just as tapestry was in modern times (Exod. xxvii. 9; xxxvii. 17; xxxviii. 9; Num. iii. 26; iv. 26). The rendering in the Sept. implies that they were made of the same substance as the sails of a ship, i.e., as explained by Rashi) "meshy, not woven:" this opinion is, however, incorrect, as the material of which they were constructed was "fine twined linen." The hangings were carried only five cubits high, or half the height of the walls of the court (Exod. xxvii. 18; compare xxi. 16). They were fastened to pillars which ran along the sides of the court (xxviii. 18). See TABERNACLE.

3. The "hanging" (בָּנַחֲלִית, botim; 2 Kings xxiii. 7, margin house which is the lateral section of a doublet or double hood). The word implies two sorts of women: one that these women wore might be probably clothes for tents used as portable sanctuaries. See IDOLATRY.

Han’iel (1 Chron. viii. 39). See HANIEL.

Hammer, MEREDITH, an English Church historian, was born at Parklington, Shropshire, in 1845. He became chaplain of Corpus Christi College, Oxford, and afterwards rector of St. Leonard, at Shoreditch. Here he sold the brass ornaments which decorated the gravi of the church, which so displeased his parishioners that he was obliged to resign about 1853. He then went to Ireland, where he was finally made treasurer of the Church of the Holy Trinity, Dublin. He died in 1864, not without suspicion of suicide. He was a skilful Greek scholar, and well acquainted with Church history. He wrote Translantion of the ancient ecclesiastical Histories of the first six hundred Years after Christ, originally written by Eusebius, Socrates, and Eusebius (1754; reprinted in 1856 with the addition of The Lives of the Prophets and Apostles by Dorotheus, bishop of Tyre):—The Epiphania of the Saints of Ireland; and the Chronicle of Ireland (Dublin, 1853, fol.):—A Chronography (London, 1856, fol.). See Fuller, Worthies; Wood, Aikin, Encycl. vol.

Han’nah (Heb. Channah; הַנַּחֲנָה, graciosissimus; Sept. Ἀσψία; comp. ANNA, a name known to the Phoencians [igos, Men. Phoen. p. 400], and attributed by Virgil to Didio’s sister), wife of a Levite named Elkanah, and mother of Samuel (1 Sam. i. 11). She was very dear to her husband, but, being childless, was much aggrieved by the insults of Elkanah’s other wife, Peninnah, who was blessed with children. The family lived at Ramah-zin-zaphim, and, as the law required, there was a yearly journey to offer sacrifices at the sole altar of Jehovah, which was then at Shiloh. Women were not bound to attend; but pious females free from the cares of a family often did so, especially when the husband was a Levite. Every time that Hannah went there childless she declined to take part in the festivities which followed the sacrifices, being then, as it seems, peculiarly exposed to the taunts of her rival. At length, on one of these visits to Shiloh, while she prayed before returning home, Hannah vowed to devote all her offerings to the ministry the son which she so earnestly desired (Num. xxxi. 1 sq.). It seems to have been the custom to pronounce all vows at the holy place in a loud voice, under the immediate notice of the priest (Deut. xxi. 28; Psa. xxi. 14); but this vow was thus applied as a solemn promise, so that her lips only were seen to move. This attracted the attention of the high-priest, Eli, who suspected that she
HAVAH

HANUN

had taken too much wine at the recent feast. From this suspicion Hannah easily vindicated herself, and returned home with a lightened heart. Before the end of that year Hannah became the rejoicing mother of a son, to whom the name of Samuel was given, and who was devoted to a life of self-sacrifice under the condition of Nazariteiit to which his mother had devoted herself. B.C. 1142. Hannah went no more to Shiloh till her child was old enough to dispose with her maternal services, when she took him up with her to leave him there, as it appears was the custom when one was a Nazarite, unless the parents had been ordained under the obligations of Nazaritish. When he was presented in due form to the high-priest, the mother took occasion to remind him of the former transaction: "For this child," she said, "I prayed, and the Lord hath given me my petition which I asked of him." (1 Sam. i, 27). Hannah's greatness afterwards found vent in an exultant dance, which furnishes a remarkable specimen of the early lyric poetry of the Hebrews (see Schlosser, Cantica Hannei, Erlangen, 1801), and of which many of the ideas and images were in after times repeated by the Virgin Mary on a somewhat similar occasion (Luke 1:46-52). It is especially remarkable as containing the first designation of the Messiah under that name. In the Targum it has been subjected to a process of magniloquent dilution, for which it would be difficult to find a parallel even in the pompous vagracy of Eichhorn (Eichh. Hebr., 1808). After this Hannah failed not to visit Shiloh every year, bringing a new dress for her son, who remained under the eye and near the person of the high-priest. See Samuel.

Hannah. John, D.D., an eminent Wesleyan minister, was born at Lincoln, Eng., Nov. 5, 1792. After receiving a Christian education, he entered the Wesleyan ministry in 1814 at Bruton, Somersetshire. From 1815 to 1817, inclusive, he was on the Gainsborough Circuit; 1818 to 1820, Lincoln; 1821 to 1823, Nottingham; 1824 to 1826, Leeds; 1827 to 1829, third Manchester Circuit; 1830 to 1833, Liverpool; 1833 to 1838, he became theological tutor at the Wesleyan Training Institution at Hoxton. In 1842 he was removed to the college at Didsbury, where he remained as theological tutor till he became a supernumerary at the Conference of 1867. In the year that he was removed to Didsbury he was elected a member of the Convocation (Loudon), and he was again president in 1851, when the Conference met at Newcastle upon Tyne. He was Conference secretary in the years 1840, 1841, 1849, 1850, and 1854 to 1856. On two occasions he represented the Wesleyan Conference, once with the Rev. R. Reece, and the second time with Dr. J. F. Jobson, at the General Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church in the United States. His full term of service as a Methodist minister extended without interruption from 1814 to 1867—fifty-three years. After becoming supernumerary in 1867 he continued to reside at Didsbury, under an arrangement devised by Mr. Jowett and other prominent Wesleyan laymen. He died in Didsbury from congestion of the lungs, after a brief illness, Dec. 29, 1867. "For about thirty-three years he was a chief instructor of the young Wesleyan ministry, sending out such men as Arthurt, Harrison, Calvert, etc.; men who have attested their salutary power throughout the United Kingdom, and in the hardest mission fields of the Church. Nearly three hundred preachers were trained by him. His influence over the connection through these men has been beyond all estimation. As a religious writer as well, he was exceedingly ingenious and effective—not remarkably 'fanciful,' seldom rising into declamation, but full of entertaining and impressive thought, and a certain sweet grace, or, rather, graciousness andunction, which charmed all devotee listeners. He was singularly pertinent, and often surprisingly beautiful in Scripture citation; his discourses were mosaics of the finest gems of the sacred writings. He was a fond student of the imaginative, and could Amuseus of the book of poetry. In his vacation excursions, to make pilgrimages to their old churches and graves, and his sermons abounded in the golden thoughts of Hooker, South, and like thinkers. He was constitutionally a modest man, in early life nervously timid of responsibility; but, whether in the pulpit or in the parlour, the public was charmed by his cordiality and modesty, and his characteristic talent to kindle into a divine glow that rapt himself and his audience with holy enthusiasm. For fifty-three years his labors for Methodism had no interruption; they were unobtrusive, steady, quietly energetic, and immensely useful. With Thomas Jackson, he was one of the last of that second and mighty rank of Wesleyan preachers, headed by Bunting, Watson, and Newton, who, when Wesley's immediate companions were rapidly disappearing, caught the Methodist standard from their trembling hands, and kept the banner of the advance in the hands of the earth. He was, withal, a model of Christian manners—a perfect Christian gentleman; not in the sense deprecated by Wesley in his old Minutes, but in the sense that Wesley himself so completely exemplified. His humility and modesty, his kindliness and armless envy. No prominent man passed through the severe internal controversies of Wesleyan Methodism with less criticism from antagonists. The whole connection spontaneously recognised him as unimpeachable, amid whatever rumors or clamors. All instinc
tively turned towards him as an example of sincerity, purity, and assurance, in whatever doubtful exigency. The influence of Dr. Hannah's character, aside from his talents, on the large ministry which he educated, has been one of the greatest blessings Wesleyan Methodism has enjoyed in this generation.―Methodist (newspaper), Jan. 25, 1848; A Manual American Cyclopaedia for 1867, p. 601; Wesleyan Minutes, 1868, p. 14.

Han'nath: Heb., Cham'math, חָנְנָתָ, graciously regarded; Sept. Ἀνανᾶ, v. Ἀνανᾶς and Ἄνανας, a place on the northern boundary of Zebulun, apparently about midway between the Sea of Galilee and the valley of Jiphthah-Ei (Josh. xix. 14); probably among the range of Jebel Jermik, not far from el-Maghur.

Han'niel: Heb., Chan'ziel, חָנְצֵיל, grace of God; Sept. Ἀνάνιης, Vulg. Haniel and Haniei), the name of two men.

1. Son of Ephod and physhar of the tribe of Manass, appointed by Moses at the divine nomination as one of the commissioners to divide the promised land (Num. xxxiv, 23). B.C. 1618.

2. One of the sons of Ulla and chief of the tribe of Asher (1 Chron. viii, 9, where the name is less correctly Anglicised "Haniel"). B.C. ante 790.

Ha'noc'h (Gen. xxxv. 4; xlv. 9; Exod. vi. 14; Num. xxvi, 51; 1 Chron. v. 8). See Enoch 3, 4.

Ha'noc'thite: Heb. Chan'okhî, חָנְוקִיתָ; Sept. Ενώκη, Vulg. Ienoclitus, Eng. Vers. "Hanochite"), a descendant of Enoch or Hakon, the son of Reuben (Num. xxvi, 5).

Hana Sacs. See Sacs.

Ha'nun (Heb. Cham'un, חָנְעָן, favored), the name of three men.

1. (Sept. Ἀνανίης and Ἀνανία) The son and successor of Nahash, king of the Ammonites (2 Sam. x, 1-4; 1 Chron. xix, 2-6). David, who had in his troubles been befriended by Nahash, sent, with the kindest intentions, an embassy to console with Hanun on the death of his father, and to congratulate him on his own accession. B.C. cir. 1085. The rash young king, however, was led to misapprehend the motives of this embassy,
and to treat with gross and inexcusable indignity the honorable personages whom David had charged with this mission. Their beards were half shaven, and their robes cut short by the middle, and they were dismissed in this shameful trim, which can be appreciated only by those who consider how reverently the beard has always been regarded (Proverbs, iv. 20). When the news of this affront was brought to David, he sent word to the ambassadors to remain at Jericho till the growth of their beards enabled them to appear with decency in the metropolis. He vowed vengeance upon Hanun for the insult; and the vehemence with which he revealed his feelings to his courtiers is interesting from its antiquity, of the respect expected to be paid to the person and character of ambassadors. Hanun himself looked for nothing less than war as the consequence of his conduct; and he subsidized Hadarezer and other Syrian princes to assist him with their armies. The power of the Syrians was broken in two campaigns, and the Ammonites were left to their fate, which was severe even beyond the usual severities of war in that remote age. B.C. cir. 1084. See AMMONITES; DHUYAD.

3. (Sept. 'Avuy.) A son who repaired (in connection with the inhabitants of Zanoah) the Valley-gate of Jerusalem after the Captivity (Neh. iii. 13). B.C. 446.

Hanway, Jonas, an English philanthropist, was born at Portsmouth in 1712. He established himself as a merchant at St. Petersburg, and became connected, through his Russian dealings, with the trade into Persia. Business having led him into that country, he published in 1725 A Historical Account of the British Trade over the Caspian Sea, with a Journal of Travels from London through Russia into Persia (4 vols. 4to), "a work of no pretension to literary elegance, but containing much information on the commercial subjects of which he speaks, and on the history and manners of Persia. The latter part of his life was spent in supporting, by his pen and personal exertions, a great variety of charitable and philanthropic schemes; and he gained so high and honorable a name that a deputation of the chief merchants of London made it their request to goven-

ment that some substantial mark of public favor should be conferred on him. He was, in consequence, made a commissioner of the navy. The Marine Society and the Magdalene Charity, both still in existence, owe their establishment mainly to him; he was also one of the great promoters of Sunday-schools. He died in 1785. He published also The Importance of the Lord's Supper (London, 1782, 12mo) - Reflections on Life and Religion (Lud. 1761, 2 vols. 8vo). See Pugh, Remarkable Occurrences in the Life of Jonas Hanway (London, 1787, 8vo); English Cyclopedia; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i. 782.

Haphar'am (Hebrew Chapharah'm, כַּפָּרָה, two parts; Sept. Διαφαραί, Vulg. Hopharim), a place near the boundary of Bashan and Gilead (Josh. xix. 19). Eusebius (Onomast. s. v. Alpharim) appears to place it six Roman miles north of Le- gio: the Apocrypha also possibly speaks of the same place as Apularea (Apuliaea, 1 Mac. xi. 54; compare xvi. 30, 36). Schwarz (Palestine, p. 165) was unable to find it. Kiepert (Wandkarte von Palästina, 1857) locates it near the river Kishon, apparently at Tell el-Thurah (Robinson's Researches, new ed. iii. 110). Dr. Thomson (Land and Book, i, 592) imagines it may be the modern Shafe' Shema' (the Shafta of Robinson, Reseaux, new ed. i. 103 "on a ridge overlooking the plain of Megiddo"), which, he says, "in old Arabic authors is written Skephram." See ISHCHAR.

Hapharath, pl. HAPTAROTH (חפורת, dissimilation, ḫabhegh). This expression, which is found in foot-notes and at the end of many editions of the Hebrew Bible, denotes the different lessons from the prophetic books read in the synagogue every Sabbath and festival of the year. As these lessons have been read from time immemorial in conjunction with sections from the law, and as it is both "the reading of the law and the prophets" (Acts vii. 50), "the reading of the law and the prophets is the commandment of God" (Romans xix. 15, etc.), we propose to discuss both together in the present article.

1. Classification of the Lessons, their Titles, Significations, etc.—There are two classes of lessons indicated in the Hebrew Bible: the one consists of fifty-four sections, into which the entire law or Pentateuch (תנ"ך) is divided, and is called Parshah (תנ"ך פסוקים, plur. תן פסוקים, from תן פסוק, to separate); and the other consists of a corresponding number of sections selected from different parts of the prophets, to be read in conjunction with the former, and denominated Haphtaroth. As the signification of this term is much disputed, and is intimately connected with the view about the origin of these prophetic lessons, we must defer the discussion of it to section 4. The division of the Pentateuch into fifty-four sections is to provide a lesson for each Sabbath of those years which, according to Jewish chronology, have fifty-four Sabbaths (see sect. 2), and to read through the whole Pentateuch, with large portions of the different prophets, in the course of every year. It must be observed, however, that this annual cycle was not universally adopted by the ancient Jews. There were some who had a triennial cycle (comp. Megillah, 29 b). These divided the Pentateuch into one hundred and fifty-three or fifty-five sections, so as to read through the law in Sabbatical lessons once in three years. This was still done by some Jews in the days of Maimonides (compare Jos Ha-Chayyâb Ha-Rishôn of Rejchel Pexkhilah, xiii. 1), and Benjamin of Tudela tells us that he found the Syrian Jews followed this practice in Memphis (ed. Asher, i, 148). The sections of the triennial division are called by the Masorites Sehalim or Sedaroth (תנ"ך סיורים), as may be seen in the Masoretic note at the end of Exodus: "Here endeth the book of Exodus... it hath eleven Parshah (תנ"ך פסוקים, i.e. according to the annual division), twenty-nine Sedaroth (תנ"ך סיורים, i.e. according to the triennial division), and forty chapters (תנ"ך פרקים)." It is the Sabatian lessons of the law and prophets are also read on every festival and fast of the year. It must be noticed, moreover, that the Jews, who have for some centuries almost universally followed the annual division of the law, denominated the Sabbatical section Sidra (תנ"ך סידרא), the name which the Masorites give to each portion of the triennial division, and that every one of the fifty-four sections has a special title, which it derives from the first or second word with which it commences, and by which it is quoted in the Jewish writings. To render the following description more intelligible, as well as to enable the student of Hebrew exegesis to identify the quotations from the Pentateuch, we subjoin on the two following pages the chronological table of the Sabatian Festival and Fast Lessons from the Law and Prophets, and their titles. (See Clarke's Commentary, s. f. Deuteronomy.)

2. "The Reading of the Law and Prophets" as indicated in the Hebrew Bible, and practiced by the Jews at the present day.—As has already been remarked, this division into fifty-four sections is designed to provide a lesson for every Sabbath of those years which have fifty-four Sabbaths. Thus the intercalary year, in which New Year falls on a Thursday, and the months Marchesvan and Kislev have twenty-nine days, has fifty-four Sabbaths which require special lessons. But as ordinary years have not so many Sabbaths, and those years in which New Year falls on a Monday, and the months Marchesvan and Kislev have thirty days, or New Year falls on...
### Table of Sabbath Lessons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Masoretic Title of the Lesson</th>
<th>Portion of the Law</th>
<th>The Prophets</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Gen. i, 1—vi, 8.</td>
<td>vi, 9—xi, 29.</td>
<td>Isa. xiii, 5—xiii, 10, or* to Isa. xiii, 21.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>xiii, 1—xviii, 27.</td>
<td>xvii, 1—xxii, 24.</td>
<td>Isa. liv, 1—lv, 8, or to lv, 15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>xxviii, 10—xxviii, 13.</td>
<td>x, 11—xii, 9.</td>
<td>2 Kings iv, 1—vii, or to ve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>xxx, 4—xxxvi, 43.</td>
<td>xxx, 1—xii, 28.</td>
<td>1 Kings i, 1—i, 31.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>xxxvii, 1—xii, 17.</td>
<td>xii, 1—xiv, 17.</td>
<td>Malachi i, 1—i, 17.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>xiv, 18—xxviii, 27.</td>
<td>xiv, 28—xii, 26.</td>
<td>Hos. xi, 7—xii, 19, or to ve.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Exod. i, 1—vi, 1.</td>
<td>vi, 2—ix, 35.</td>
<td>Hos. xii, 18—xiv, 10, or Obad. i—xii.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Levit. i, 1—v, 26.</td>
<td>xii, 1—xiii, 16.</td>
<td>Amos ii, 6—iii, 8.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>xiii, 17—xvii, 16.</td>
<td>xiv, 11—xx, 32.</td>
<td>1 Kings iii, 19—iv, 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>xvi, 1—xvi, 18.</td>
<td>xxvi, 1—xxviii, 19.</td>
<td>Ezek. xxxviii, 15—xxvi.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>xxviii, 10—xxvi, 10.</td>
<td>xxxvii, 21—xxi, 44.</td>
<td>1 Kings ii, 1—ii, 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>xxxix, 1—xx, 38.</td>
<td>xxxix, 1—xx, 38.</td>
<td>Isa. xxvi, 6—xxviii, 13; xxi, 22, 23, or Jer. i, 1—ii, 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Numb. i, 1—iv, 90.</td>
<td>iv, 21—vi, 39.</td>
<td>Jer. xvi, 1—xiv, 14.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>vii, 1—xvi, 18.</td>
<td>vii, 1—xvi, 18.</td>
<td>Jer. vii, 21—viii, 1; ix, 22, 33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>viii, 1—xii, 41.</td>
<td>ix, 1—xiv, 17.</td>
<td>2 Sam. vi, 1—vii, 17, or vi, 1—19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>xvi, 1—xxviii, 32.</td>
<td>xiv, 1—xxvii, 1.</td>
<td>2 Kings vii, 1—xvi, 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>xix, 1—xxviii, 27.</td>
<td>xiv, 1—xxvii, 29.</td>
<td>2 Kings vii, 3—xx.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>xvi, 1—xxviii, 34.</td>
<td>xv, 1—xx, 33.</td>
<td>Ezek. xxvii, 1—ix.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>xxvi, 2—xxvii, 34.</td>
<td>xxvii, 1—xxvii, 34.</td>
<td>Amos ix, 7—xv, or Ezek. xx, 2—xx.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>xxxvii, 21—xxi, 44.</td>
<td>xxvii, 21—xxi, 44.</td>
<td>Jer. xxvii, 26—xxviii, 34.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>xvi, 10—xxvi, 10.</td>
<td>xvi, 1—xii, 16.</td>
<td>Jer. vii, 21—viii, 1; ix, 22, 33.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>xxvii, 1—xxviii, 32.</td>
<td>xiv, 1—xxvii, 1.</td>
<td>2 Kings vii, 1—xvi, 19.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>xxxv, 2—xxxvi, 43.</td>
<td>xxx, 1—xxxix, 9.</td>
<td>1 Kings xv, 46—xxix, 31 if it be before Tammuz 17, after this date Jer. i, 1—ii, 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>xxxvi, 1—xxxvi, 13.</td>
<td>xxxv, 2—xxxvi, 43.</td>
<td>Jer. i, 1—ii, 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Deut. i, 1—iii, 29.</td>
<td>iii, 33—vii, 11.</td>
<td>Jer. ii, 1—ii, 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>xvi, 12—xxviii, 34.</td>
<td>vii, 19—xii, 25.</td>
<td>Isa. i, 1—37.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>xxxviii, 2—xxviii, 19.</td>
<td>xvi, 19—xii, 17.</td>
<td>vii, 19—xii, 25.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>xxxvii, 1—xxviii, 34.</td>
<td>xvi, 1—xxviii, 9.</td>
<td>Isa. i, 1—xxxvi, 13.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>xxxviii, 1—xxvii, 34.</td>
<td>xxxvii, 1—xxvii, 34.</td>
<td>2 Sam. xiii, 1—xxvi, 21 in some places. Ezek. xvii, 29—xxvii, 33.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first reference always shows the Haphtarah according to the German and Polish Jews (דFindObject); the second, introduced by the disjunctive particle on, is according to the Portuguese Jews (דFindObject).

A Saturday, and the said months are regular, i.e. Marcheshvan having twenty-nine days and Kislev thirty, have only forty-seven Sabbaths. Fourteen of the fifty-four sections, viz. 22 and 23, 27 and 28, 29 and 30, 32 and 33, 39 and 42, and 43 and 51, and 50 have been appointed to be read in pairs either wholly or in part, according to the varying number of Sabbaths in the current year. Thus the whole Pentateuch is read through every year. The first of these weekly sections is read on the first Sabbath after the Feast of Tabernacles, which is in the month of Tisri, and begins the civil year, and the last is read on the concluding day of this festival, Tisri 23, which is called The Rejoicing of the Law (תירבעת יום הברית), a day of rejoicing, because on it the law is read through. See Tabernacles, Feast or. According to the triennial division of the reading of the law it seems to have been as follows: Gen. i, 1—Exod. xiii, 16, comprising history from the creation of the world to the Exodus, was read in the first year; Exod. xiii, 17—Num. vi, 27, embracing the laws of both Sinai and the tabernacle, formed the lessons for the Sabbath of the second year; and Num. vii, 1—Deut. xxxiv, 12, containing both history (i.e. the history of thirty-nine years' wanderings in the wilderness) and law (i.e. the repetition of the Mosaic law), constituted the Sabbath lessons for the third year (compare Megilla, 29b, b, and Volklehrer, ii, 209).

3. The manner of reading the Law and the Prophets.

—Every Sabbath lesson from the law (דFindObject) is divided into seven sections (evidently designed to correspond to the seven days of the week), which, in the days of our Saviour and afterwards, were read by seven different persons (דFindObject), who were called upon for this purpose by the congregation or its chief. Mishna, Megilla, iv, 2; Maimonides, Yad Ha-Chazakah, Hilkoth Tephitah, xiii, 7). Great care is taken that the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PLACES AND DAYS</th>
<th>THE LAW.</th>
<th>THE PROPHETS.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If falls on a Sabbath is read on a</td>
<td>Numb. xxviii, 5-10.</td>
<td>1 Sam. xx, 18-49.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANT OF DEDICATION.</td>
<td>Numb. vii, 19-23.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day iv.</td>
<td>Numb. vii, 36-44.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day vi.</td>
<td>Numb. vii, 56-60.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day viii.</td>
<td>Numb. vii, 64-68.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbath Parashah S出现.</td>
<td>Exod. xxii, 55—xxviii, 19-25 (Maph'tir).</td>
<td>1 Sam. xxv, 2-34, or xxv, 1-84.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbath Parashah Par.</td>
<td>Exod. xxii, 55—xxviii, 19-25 (Maph'tir).</td>
<td>Ezek. xxv, 16-58, or verse 56.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sabbath Parashah Ha-Shodesh</td>
<td>Exod. xxii, 55—xxviii, 19-25 (Maph'tir).</td>
<td>Ezek. xxv, 16—xxvi, 19, or xxv, 16—xxvi, 18.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANT OF PASOVER.</td>
<td>Numb. xxviii, 19-25.</td>
<td>Job. iii, 5-7; v, 2-15; vi, 27, or v, 2-15.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If Sabbath,</td>
<td>Exod. xxii, 55—xxviii, 19-25 (Maph'tir).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'Week day,'</td>
<td>Exod. xxii, 55—xxviii, 19-25 (Maph'tir).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PLANT OF TABERNACLES.</td>
<td>Exod. xxii, 55—xxviii, 19-25 (Maph'tir).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Year.</td>
<td>Exod. xxii, 55—xxviii, 19-25 (Maph'tir).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Week day.</td>
<td>Numb. xxviii, 5-10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shabbat, and all the other festivals</td>
<td>Numb. xxviii, 5-10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>of the year.</td>
<td>Numb. xxviii, 5-10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First section of the Sabbath lesson</td>
<td>Numb. xxviii, 5-10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>from the law.</td>
<td>Numb. xxviii, 5-10.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

whole nation should be represented at this reading of the law and prophets. Hence a Cohen ("72") or priest is called to the reading of the first portion, a Levi ("72") to the second, and an Israel ("72") to the third; and after the three great divisions of the nation have thus been duly represented, the remaining four portions are assigned to four others with less care. "Every one called to the reading of the law must unroll the scroll, and, having found the place where he is to begin to read, pronounces the following benediction—Bless ye the Lord, who is ever blessed; to which the congregation respond, 'Blessed be the Lord, who is blessed for evermore.' Whereupon he again pronounces the following benediction—Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast chosen us from among all nations, and hast given us thy law. Blessed art thou, O Lord, giver of the law, to which all the congregation respond 'Amen.' He then reads the seventh portion of the lesson, and when he has finished, rolls up the scroll, and pronounces again the following benediction—Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who hast given us thy law, the law of truth, and hast planted among us everlasting life. Blessed art thou, O Lord, giver of the law" (Neh. xii, 3-5). The other six, who are called in rotation to the reading of
the other six portions, have to go through the same formulas. Then the maphtir (מָפְחִית), or the one who finishes up by the reading of the Haphtarot, or the lesson from the prophets, is called. Having read the few concluding verses of the lesson from the law, and passed through the same formulas as the other seven, he reads the appointed portion from the prophets. Before reading it, he needs the following preface—

"Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, who has chosen good prophets, and delighted in their words, which were spoken in truth. Blessed art thou, O Lord, who has chosen the law, thy servant, and protected all the children of Israel, and the righteous, from among the wondrous prophets." And after reading, "Blessed art thou, O Lord our God, King of the universe, Rock of all ages, righteous in all generations, the faithful God who promises and performs, who decrees and accomplishes, for all thy words are faithful and just. Faithful art thou, Lord our God, and faithful are thy words, and not one of thy words shall return in vain, for thou art a faithful King. Blessed art thou, O Lord, thou art the faithful in thy words." "Have mercy upon Zion, for it is the dwelling of our life, and save speedily in our days the afflicted souls." Blessed art thou, O Lord, who will make Zion rejoice in her children. Cause us to rejoice, O Lord, our God, and let thy servants and the servants of thy house, the house of David thine anointed. May he speedily come and gladden our hearts. Let no stranger sit on his throne, and let others no longer inherit his glory, for thou hast sworn unto him by thy holy name that his light shall not be extinguished forever and ever. Blessed art thou, O Lord, the shield of David." "For the law, the divine service, the prophets, and for this day of rest" [or of memorial], this goodly day of holy convocation which thou hast given to us, O Lord, for sanctification and rest [on the Sabbath], for honor and glory; for all this, O Lord our King, we thank and praise thee. Let not the light of the moon, the moon of every living creature forever and ever. Thy word, O our King, is true, and will abide forever. Blessed art thou, King of the whole earth, who hast sanctified the Sabbath, and Israel, and the day of memorial." (Maimonides, ibid.).

After the Babylonian captivity, when the Hebrew language became an unknown tongue to the common people, an interpreter (עֲבָדֵי ה' בָּבֵל) stood at the desk by the side of those who read the lessons, and paraphrased the section from the law into Chaldee verse by verse, the reader pausing at every verse, whilst the lesson from the prophets he paraphrased three verses at a time (Mishna, Megilla, iv, 4); and Lightfoot is of opinion that this was the general custom so far as to this xii, 13 (see also, the Hanhavot, xii, 4, 5): The lesson from the law on these occasions rendered into Chaldee quite literally, owing to the fear which both the interpreters and the congregation had lest a free exposition of it might misrepresent its sense, whilst greater freedom was exercised with the lesson from the prophets. Hence loose paraphrases and lengthy expansions were tolerated and looked for both from the professional interpreter and those of the congregation who were called up to read, and who felt that they could do it with edification to the audience. The Sabbath lesson from the law was, as we have seen, divided into seven sections or chapters, each of which had at least three verses, according to the verses of those days, so that the whole consisted of at least twenty-one such verses. The lesson from the prophets was not portioned out to seven different individuals, but has also at least twenty-one verses (Mishna, Megilla, iv, 4), and therefore perhaps the division (baitzot, הביתות, in the Topkhiba, xii, 13). The lesson from the law for the Day of Atonement is divided into six chapters, for festivals into five, for new moon into four, and for Mondays and Thursdays into three chapters or sections. The number of persons called up to the reading of the law always corresponds to the number of sections. For Mondays and Thursdays, new moon, and the week days of the festivals (in the calendar), there are no corresponding lessons from the prophets (Mishna, Megilla, iv, 1-3).

4. The Origin of this Institution. — The origin of this custom may easily be traced. The Bible emphatically and repeatedly enjoins upon every Israelite to study its contents (Deut. iv, 9, xxxii, 46), Moses himself ordered that this should be done publicly at the end of every Sabbath year, xxxi, 10-13. And it does not seem that it should be studied day and night (b, comp. also Psa. i, 2 sq.). Now the desire to carry out this injunction literally, and yet the utter impossibility of doing it on the part of those who had to work for daily bread and support themselves and their families, necessarily required the invention of specially expensive scrolls, gave rise to this institution. On the Sabbath and festivals all were relieved from their labor, and could attend places of worship where the inspired writings were deposited, and where care could be taken that no private interpretation should be balm'd upon the Word of God. Hence both James (Acts xv, 21) and Josephus (Contra Apion, ii, 17) speak of it as a very ancient custom, and the Talmud tells us that the division of each Sabbath lesson into seven sections was introduced in honor of the Persian king (Megilla, 20), which shows that this custom obtained anterior to the sabbath rule. Indeed Maimonides quite freely asserts that Moses himself ordained the hebdomadal reading of the law (Hilchot Topkhiba, xii, 1). Equally natural is the division of the law into Sabbath sections, as the whole of it could not be read at once. The only difficulty is the question positively when the annual or the triennial division was the more ancient. A triennial division is mentioned in Megilla 29 b, as current in Palestine; with this agree the reference to 155 sections of the law in the Midrash, Esther 116 b, and the Masoretic division of the Pentateuch into 154 Stekarim. But, on the other hand, R. Simeon b. Eleazar, a Paltinum, declared that Moses instituted the reading of Lev. xxvi before the Feast of Pentecost, and Deut. xxviii before New Year, which most unquestionably presuppose the annual division of the Pentateuch into 54 Parshoth. This is, moreover, confirmed by the statement (ibid. 31 a) that the section יַעֲמֹר יְדֵי יְהוָה (Deut. xxxiii, 1-xxxiv, 12) was read on the ninth day of the Feast of Tabernacles, thus terminating the annual cycle, as well as by the fact that the annual festival of the rejoicing of the law נוֹרֵא נְשָׁר (i.e. Jonathan) which commemorates the annual finishing of the perusal of the Pentateuch [see Tabernacles, Feast of] was an ancient institution. We must therefore conclude that the annual cycle which is now prevalent among the Sopherim was one general division, for the Maimonides, whilst the triennial, though the older, was the exception. Usage, however, probably varied, for we find that our Saviour (Luke iv, 16-21), in accordance with this custom, on invitation read and expounded, apparently on a Sabbath in January, 1 a, a passage not contained at all in the present scheme of Haphtaroth.

It is far more difficult to trace the origin of the Haphtarot, or the lessons from the prophets, and its significance. A very ancient tradition tells us that the Syrians had interdicted the reading of the law, and carried away the sacred sections containing it, and that appropriate sections from the prophets were therefore chosen to replace the Pentateuch (Mishna, Gittin, ii, 9; Zunz, Gottesdienstliche Vor., p. 5). While Elias Levia traces the origin of the Haphtarot to persecutions of Antiochus Epiphanes. In his Leh. (s. בּוּד) he says, "The wicked Antiochus, king of Greece, prohibited the Jews to read the law publicly. They therefore began to interpret a certain number of chapters from the same import as the Sabbath lessons . . . and though this prohibition has now ceased, this custom has not been left off, and to this day we read a section from the prophets after the reading of the law," and we see no reason to reject this account. The objection of Vitringa, Frank, Hefter, etc., that Antiochus wished to exterminate Judaism, would not wage war against
the Pentateuch exclusively, but would equally destroy the prophetic books, and that this implies a knowledge on the part of the soldiers of the distinction between the Pentateuch and the other inspired writings, is obviated by the fact that there was an external difference between the rolls of the Pentateuch and the other sacred books that the Jews claimed to be their law and rule of faith, and that this was the reason why it especially was destroyed. (The law has two rollers, i.e. has a roller attached to each of the two ends of the roll on which it is written, and every weekly portion when read on the Sabbath is unrolled from the right roller and rolled back on the left; so that when the law is opened on the next Sabbath the portion appointed for that day is at once found. Whereas the prophetic books have only one roller, and the lesson from the prophecies has to be sought out on every occasion [compare Baba Bathra, b. 83, 3].) This is corroborated by 1 Mac. i, 35, where the law only is said to have been burned. Accordingly ḡeḇiṣ, from ḡib, to liberate, to free, signifies the liberating lesson, the portion from the prophets which is read instead of the portion from the law that could not be read, and which liberates from the injunction of reading the Pentateuch. For the other opinions about the significance of Ḥophakharai, we refer to the literature quoted below.


Ha'ara (Heb. Ha'ara, חֶּרָא, a local name of a province of Assyria. We read that Tiglath-pileser "brought the Reubenites, Gadites, and the half tribe of Manasseh unto Ha'ala, and Habor, and Ha'ara, and to the river Tigris" (1 Chron. vi, 26). The parallel passage in 2 Kings xviii, 11, omits Hara, and adds "in the cities of the Medes." Bochart consequently supposes that Hara was either a part of Media, or another name for that country. He shows that Herodotus (vii, 62) and other ancient writers call the Medes Arians, and their country Aria. He further supposes that the name Hara, which signifies mountainous, may have been given to that northern section of Media subsequently called by the Arabs El-gabal ("the mountains," see Bochart, Oppt., i, 184). The words Aria and Ha'ara, however, are totally different both in meaning and origin. The Medes were a very ancient and great Aryan family who came originally from India, and who took their name, according to Muller (Science of Language, p. 237 sqq., 2d ed.), from the Sanscrit word Arga, which means noble, "of a good family." Its etymological meaning seems to be "one who tills the ground," and it is thus allied to the Latin arane (see also Rawlinson's Herodotus, i, 401).

Hara is joined with Hala, Habor, and the river Gozan. These were all situated in Western Assyria, between the Tigris and Euphrates, and along the banks of the Khabur. We may safely conclude, therefore, that the region where the rivers have been far distant from that region. It is somewhat remarkable that the name is not given in either the Sept. or Peshito version. Some have hence imagined that the word was interpolated after these versions were made. This, however, is a rash criticism, as it exists in all Hebrew MSS., and also in Jerome's Latin version (see Robinson's Notes on Isaiah); and Grant's Notes on Jeremiah, p. 120. The conjecture that Hara and Haran are identical cannot be sustained, though the situation of the latter might suit the requirements of the Biblical narrative, and its Greek classical name (Carpes) resembles Hara. See Hara. The Hebrew words נַחֲרָא and חֶרָא are radically different. Hara may perhaps have been a local name applied to the mountainous region north of Gozan, called by Strabo and Ptolemy Mons Marixius, and now Karja Baghlar (Strabo, xvi, 23; Ptolemy, v, 18, 2).—Kittô, s. v.

Har'adah (Heb. with the article ha-Charadah, חַּרְדָּה, the height; Sept. Xarpados), the twenty-fifth station of the Israelites in the desert (Num. xxxvii, 24); perhaps at the head of the wady north-east of Jebel Araf in Nakhah, on the western brow of the high plateau east of Ain el-Mazen. See Exode.

Haram. See House.

Har'an appears in the Eng. Bible as the name of a place and also of three men, which, however, are represented by slightly different Hebrew words. See also Beth-Haran.

1. Haran (Heb. Haran', חַרְדָּן, mountainer; Sept. Ἀφίπαρος), probably the eldest son of Terah, brother of Abraham and Nahor, and father of Lot, Milcah, and Iscah. He died in his native place before his father Terah (an event that may in some degree have prepared the family to leave Ur), which, from the manner in which it is mentioned, appears to have been much a later case than the days that at the time of Gen 11, 27 sqq.). B.C. 2229–ante 2088.—Kitto. His sepulchre was still shown there when Josephus wrote his history (Ant. i, 6, 5). The ancient Jewish tradition is that Haran was burnt in the furnace of Nimrod for his waving conduct during the fiery trial of Abraham. See the Targum Pseudo-Jonathan, Jeroboam's Quelle, note on the notes thereto in the edition of Migne). This tradition seems to have originated in a translation of the word Ur, which in Hebrew signifies "fire." See Abraham.

2. Charan (Heb. Charan', חַרְדָּן, probably from the Arabic, parched; Sept. Xarpados, also Josephus, Ant. i, 16, 9, 5, where it is Anglicized and "Carrene" the name of the place where Abraham, after he had been called from Ur of the Chaldees, tarried till his father Terah died, when he proceeded to the land of Canaan (Gen. xi, 31, 38; Acts vii, 4). The elder branch of the family still remained at Haran, which led to the interesting journeys thither described in the patriarchal history (see Hauck, De profectibus Abrahami e Charris [Lips. 1754, 1770]—first, that of Abraham's servant to obtain a wife for Isaac (Gen. xxiv), and, next, that of Jacob when he fled to evade the wrath of Esau (Gen. xxviii, 10). It is said to be in Mesopotamia (Gen. xi, 10, or, more definitely, in Padan-Aram xxx, 20), which is the cultivated district at the foot of the hills (Staunley, Spr. and Pol, p. 129, note), a name well applying to the beautiful stretch of country which lies below Mount Masius, between the Khabour and the Euphrates. See Padan-Aram. Haran is enumerated among the towns which had been taken by the predecessors of Semancherib, king of Assyria (1 Kings xix, 12; Isa. xxxvii, 12), and it is also mentioned by Ezekiel (xxvii, 23) among the places which traded with Tyre. It is alluded to in the cuneiform inscriptions (q. v.). Jerome thus describes Haran: "Cvitana, a city of Mesopotamia beyond Eddessa, which to this day is called Charrwa, where the Roman army was cut off, and Crassus, its leader, taken" (Onomaix, s. v. Charran). Guided by these descriptions and statements, which certainly appear sufficiently clear, and in the geographical point of the most universally identified Haran with the Carra (Kaphrin) of classical writers (Herodian, iv, 18, 7; Ptol. v, 18, 12; Strabo, xvi, 747), and the Harrān of the Arabs (Schulten, Inde Geogr. in Vitam Salamini, s. v.). The plain bordering on this town (Ammian. Marc. xxiii, 9) is celebrated in the scene of a battle in which the Roman army was defeated by the Parthians, and the triumvir Crassus killed (Plin. v, 21; Dio Cass. xi, 25; Lucan. i, 104). Abulfeda (Tab. Sprir, p. 164) speaks of Haran as formerly a great city, which lay in an arid and barren tract of country in the province of Dair Modhar. About the time of the Christian era it ap-
pears have been included in the kingdom of Eueass (Mo. Chor. ii, 32), which was ruled by Argobus. Afterward it passed with that kingdom under the dominion of the Romans, and appears as a Roman city in the wars of Caracalla (Mo. Chor. i, 72) and Julianus (Io. Maj. l. p. 329). It is remarkable that the people of Harran remained to a late time the Chaldean language and the worship of Chaldean deities (Asemanni, Bibl. Or. i, 327; Chwolson’s ‘Sebrer und der Sebasinien’, ii, 39).

About midway in the district above designated is a town called Harras, which really seems never to have changed its appellation, and beyond any reasonable doubt is the Haran or Charran of Scripture (Bochart’s Thalag, i, 14; Edwald’s Geschichte, iii, 384). It is only peopled by a few families of wandering Arabs, who are led thither by a plentiful supply of water from several small streams. Its situation, by major Bennell as being twenty-nine miles from Orpha, and occupying a flat and sandy plain. It lies (according to D’Anville) in 36° 40’ N. lat., and 39° 2’ 45’’ E. long. (See Niebuhr, Travels ii, 410; Ritter, Erdk. x, 244; xi, 251; Cellier, Notiz ii, 728; Mannert, v, 280; Michaelis, Suppl. 39). The river, which stands on the few banks of a small stream called Belik, which flows into the Euphrates about fifty miles south of the town. From it a number of leading roads radiate to the great fords of the Tigris and Euphrates; and it thus formed an important station on the line of commerce between Central and Western Asia. The river was so named by the Greeks, because the Taurus came to it, and why it was mentioned among the places which supplied the flours of Tyre (Ezek. xxvii, 29). Cursus was probably marching along this great route when he was attacked by the Parthians. Dr. Beke, in his Origines Biblical (p. 122 sq.), remarks the somewhat startling statement that Haran must have been near Damascus, and that Aram-Naharah is the country between the Abana and Pharpar. After lying dormant for a quarter of a century, this theory was again revived in 1860. The Rev. J. L. Porter visited and described a small village in that plain, four hours east of Damascus, called Harran el-Awwamidt (‘Harran of the columns’). The description having met the eye of Dr. Beke (in Five Years in Damascus, i, 376), he at once concluded that this village was the site of the real ‘city of Nahor.’ He has since visited Harran el-Awwamidt, and travelled from it to Gilgal, and found that many remains in his way appear to stand alone. His arguments have not been sufficient to set aside the powerful evidence in favor of Harran in Mesopotamia. The student may see the whole subject discussed in the Athenaeum for Nov. 28, 30; Feb. 16, 1861; March 1, 22, 28; April 6, 19; and May 24, 1862; also in Stanley’s Lectures on the Jewish Church, i, 447 sq.

3. CHARAN (Heb. same as last, meaning here noble, according to Fürst; Sept. ἀριστής v. ἀριστός). The son of Caleb of Judah by his concubine Ephah, and father of Gazez (1 Chron. i, 46). I.C.C. between 1618 and 1085.

4. HANAN (Heb. same as No. 1; Sept. ἀριστής v. ἀριστός). One of the three sons of Shimee, a Levite of the family of Gershon, appointed by David to superintend the offices at the tabernacle (1 Chron. xxiii, 1). B.C. 1014.

HARARITE, the (Heb. always [except in 2 Sam. xxii, 11] with the art. ha-Ḥarari,חרארי, probably as natives of the mountains, but according to Fürst from some town of the name of Ḥaram). See David.

1. ἍΘΙΜΑ (ἐθίμα, the son of Agee) (2 Sam. xxiii, 11 [Sept. ἀριστής v. ἀριστός, Vulg. de Areari, A. V. ‘the Hararite’], 33 [Ἀριστήρα v. ἀριστοτήρα, ‘Aristotites’], which latter verse shows that it was a designation of the son and not of the father); a different person from the Harorite (q.v.) (1 Chron. xxi, 27), or ‘Shammah the Harorite’ (q.v.) (2 Sam. xxiii, 25). See Agee.

2. ‘JONATHAN [q.v.], the son of Shahage’ (1 Chron. xi, 34, Sept. ἄριστος, Vulg. Araritis), mentioned in the parallel passage (2 Sam. xxiii, 32) without any such distinction. See SHAAGE.

3. ‘AKIM of the son of Sacar’ (1 Chron. xi, 35, Sept. ἄριστος v. ἀριστής, ‘Ariap, Vulg. Arurites’), or, in the parallel passage (2 Sam. xxiii, 33), less accurately, ‘Ahiam, the [son of] Skurar [q.v.] the Ararite’ (Heb. with the art. ha-Ḥarari,חרארי, Sept. ἀριστήρα v. ἀριστός, etc., Vulg. Arorites, A.V. ‘the Hararite’). See SACAR.

Haraaeth. See KIB-HARASETH.

Harbaugh, Henry, a prominent minister and writer of the German Reformed Church in the United States, was born Oct. 28, 1817, near Waynesborough, Pa. He was descended from a German family, whose name was Her- mach, and which had come to this country in 1736 from Switzerland. His father was an elder in the German Reformed Church at Waynesborough. In early youth he manifested a desire to study for the ministry, but his father was unwilling to allow him to do so. He therefore found employment first with a carpenter, and subsequently on a farm. At the same time he became a teacher in a primary school. The money saved in these positions enabled him to enter in 1840 Marshall College, Mercersburg, which was at that time under the direction of Dr. Nevin. Both the students’ societies of Mercersburg College desired to have him a member. "We have no money to remit," the German students said, "but we want to help you; the others have no religion." For Harbaugh this was a reason to join the other society, that they might have one to do the praying for them. His financial means did not allow him to finish his course in the college and the Theological Seminary. He spent two years in the former, and one in the latter. After having passed his examination, became in 1843 pastor of the congregation in Lewisburg. In 1856 he accepted a call from the congregation in Lancaster, which he left again in 1860 for Lebanon. In 1868 he was elected by the synod of the Reformed Church in America (two votes). At the time of his death he was editor of the Mercersburg Review, and also a regular contributor to the columns of the Reformed Church Messenger, which latter relation he sustained during the last six years. He was likewise the originator of the Guardian, and editor for seventeen years, to the close of 1866, during four of which it was published under the direction of the Board of Publication of the German Reformed Church. In addition to this, he furnished the reading matter for several almanacs published by this board, and edited the Church Review for the first year. For all after he came under the direct control of the Church Board.

Dr. Harbaugh also contributed a number of biographical articles to this Cyclopaedia. While, for the works thus far mentioned, he used the English language, he is also the author of several excellent poems in the German language, which, like many diatonic tunes, Harbaugh belong among the best that have ever been written in this dialect. In his theological views Harbaugh...
HARBONA

was one of the foremost representatives of the school which emphasizes the efficiency of the sacraments, and the priestly character of the ministry. In the Order of Wardens of the German Reformed Church, which was published in 1866, the burial service was from the pen of Harbaugh.

(A. J. S.)

Harbo'na (Heb. Harbonah, נֵבָה, prob. Pers. for as-driver; Sept. Όαοβάνα v. r. Όαοβάνα), one of the seven eunuchs of king Ahasuerus or Xerxes, commanded by him to exhibit the beauty of Vashti (Esth. 1,10). He was probably the same with the one called Harbo'na (Heb. Harbonah, נֵבָה, ed.; Sept. changes to בָּרְדָות), who suggested to the king the idea of hanging Haman on his own gallows (chap. vili, 9). B.C. 498-473.

Harbo'nah (Esth. vii, 9). See Harbona.

Hardenberg, Albrecht, an eminent divine, was born at Hardenberg, in Overwesel, 1510. While studying theology at Louvain, he imbibed the reformed theology, and became a friend and follower of Melanchthon, who sent him to Cologne. The disturbances there drove him to Basle, and in 1542 he was laced in the University of Basle to 1574. He is noted in Church History for his attempt, in 1566, to introduce into the republic of Bremen Calvin's doctrine respecting the Lord's Supper. For the controversy to which this gave rise, see Herzog, Reiff-Encyklopädie, s. v.; also Mosheim, Ch. Hist. Compar., sec. iii, pl. ii, ch. ii; Planck, Hist. Prot. Theol. vo. v.

Hardenberg, Jacobus Rutsen, D.D., an eminent minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born at Rosendale, N. Y., in 1737. His early opportunities of education were limited, but by persevering industry he became a very creditable scholar. He was ordained by the "Gesellschaft in 1757, and in the long strife between that party and the "Conferenties" in the Dutch Church, he sided with the former. His talents and reputation gave him great influence in the final settlement of these disputes. In 1758 he became pastor of the church at Karien, N. J. Queen's College (now Rutgers) obtained its charter in 1770. It languished during the Revolution, but was resuscitated, with Dr. Hardenberg at its head as president, in 1786. He died Oct. 20, 1790. — Sprague, Amnals, ix, 28. See Reformed (Dutch) Church.

Harding, Stephen, a religious reformer of the 12th century, of a noble English family. After making a pilgrimage to Rome, he entered the Benedictine convent of St. Claude de Joux. He subsequently was chosen abbot of the monastery of Bèze, with a view to the reformation of its discipline. From Bèze he was transferred to Citéaux, of which monastery he was elected abbot in 1109, on the death of Alberic. In 1119 he drew up, conjointly with St. Bernard (of Clairvaux) and other members of the brotherhood, the constitution of the Cisterian order, entitled Carta Caritatis. He remained at the head of the order until his death in 1134. See Cartierans. (A. J. S.)

Harding, Thomas, Jesuit, was born at Comb-Martins, Devonshire, England, in 1585, was educated at Barnstaple and Winchester, whence he was removed to New College, Oxford, of which he became fellow in 1556. In 1542 he was chosen Hebrew professor of the university by Henry VIII; but no sooner had Edward VI ascended the throne, than Harding became a zealous Protestant. He seemed, indeed, merely to be restrained by prudence from proceeding to great extremes. In the country zealous Protestants were edified by his instructions. At Oxford, he himself received instruction from Peter Martyr. From St. Mary's pulpit he delivered the Trinitarian tracts, "polycytry," and inveighed against Romish peculiarities." On the accession of Queen Mary he became again a papist, and was made chaplain and confessor to Gardiner, bishop of Winchester. In 1555 he was made treasurer of the cathedral of Salisbury. "When Elizabeth came to the crown he could not muster face for a new recantation, and being deprived of his preferment, fled to Louvain, where it was opened to him. He died in 1567, and was buried in a warm controversy with bishop Jewel, against whom, between 1554 and 1567, he wrote seven pieces." He died in 1572. See Life of Jewel; Zürich Letters; Burnet, Reformation, i, 271; Wood, Aeneas Athanasio, vol. i; Dodd, Church Hist.; Prince, Worthies of Devon; Chalmers, General History; Mosheim, Eccl. Hist., vol. v.

Hardouin (Hardunus), Jean, a Jesuit, one of the most learned, but most eccentric members of his order, was born A.D. 1646, at Quimper, in Brittany. His paradoxes on ancient history are well known, and had their origin chiefly in the vanity which prompted him to obtain celebrity at any cost. He endeavored to prove that the chrisi ascended his eth, and they attacked to Horace, were really composed by some monks during the Middle Ages! He edited an edition of the Councils to the year 1714 (12 vols. fol.), which is much esteemed. See Concilia. This may appear singular, considering that Hardouin looked upon all councils preceding that of Trier as spurious. Father EMS of the Oratory, knowing the opinions of the Jesuit on that point, asked him one day, "How did it happen that you published an edition of the Councils?" Hardouin answered, "Only God and I know that." He died at the College of St. Louis, Paris, Sept. 3, 1729. His most noted work is his Chronologie ex Nuptiis in Roman Catholica, instituto Prouto de Nunnis Herodiacum (Paris, 1659, 4to), in which he labors to show that, with few exceptions, the writings ascribed to the ancients are wholly spurious. He wrote also Chronologiae Velt. Testamenti (Paris, 1697, 4to). — Commentaria in Nov. Test. (Amst. 1741, fol.) — De ino Paradisi Terraequorum Disputatio (in his edict of Pinye): — Plinius Historiarum Naturalis (in the classinum classis); — Opera selecta (1709, fol.). His Opera Omnia (Amsterdam, 1758, fol.) contains some curious pieces, among which are his Pseudo-Virgins, Pseudo-Havvans, and his Pseudo-Theists. See Hardin, Anourlie, Pascal, Quesiel, Des Cartes, etc. A posthumous work of his, Prolegomena ad Consenrum Scriptorum Veterum (1766, 8vo), contains his full theory of the production of the classics by the monks of the Middle Ages. See F. Oudin, Elégues de quelques auteurs français; H. Driot, Grand Dict., hist. et crit., vol. vii, autors cédex, xix, 109; Journ. des Savants, June, 1726, p. 296; March, 1727, p. 328; January-April, 1728, p. 579; La Croce, Diz. 5. hist. sur divers sujets, p. 231; Hoefer, Nouv. Biol. Générals, xxiii, 335.


Hardwick, Charles, a minister of the Church of England, was born at Slingsby, Yorkshire, September 22, 1821. At fifteen years of age he became pupil assistant teacher in Thornton Grammar-school, and in 1838 he was made assistant tutor in the academy at Malton. In 1840 he entered the University of Cambridge (Catharine's Hall), graduating in 1844 as first senior optime. In 1845 he obtained a fellowship in Catharine's Hall; in 1851 he was appointed Cambridge preacher at the Chapel Royal, Westminster, and in 1856, perpetual curate in Queen's College, Birmingham, where he held only for a few months. In 1855 he was made lecturer in divinity in King's College, Cambridge, and "Christian Advocate." In fulfilling the latter office, he prepared a work (incomplete, but yet of great value to the new science of Comparative Theology), under the title Christ and other Masters; An Historical Inquiry into some of the chief Parallelisms and Contrasts between Christianity and the Religious Systems of the Ancient World (London and Cambridge, 2d edit. 1855, 2 vols. fcp. 8vo). During a summer tour he was killed by a fall in the Pyrenees, Aug. 18, 1859. His literary activity was of the very great, and it was accompanied by thorough scholarship and accuracy. Besides editing a number of works for the University press and for the Percy Society, he pub-
lished the following, which are likely to hold a durable place in theological literature, viz., A History of the Thirty-nine Articles (Cambridge, 1851; 2d ed. revised, 1859; reprinted in Philadelphia, 12mo)—Twenty Sermons for Town Congregations (1853, 8vo)—A History of the Christian Church, Middle Age (Cambridge, 1853, 3d ed. revised, 8vo)—A History of the Christian Church during the Reformation (Cambridge, 1856, 3d ed. revised, 8vo).—Sketch prefixed to second edition of Christ and other Masters (1868).

**Hardy, Nathaniel, D.D.,** an English divinity, was born in London in 1635, and became a Master of Magdalen Hall, Oxford, and became rector of St. Dionis Biax, London. He was a decided Royalist, and yet remained a popular preacher during the Commonwealth. In 1660 he became archdeacon of Lewes and dean of Rochester. He died in 1670. His publications are, The first Epistle of John unfolded and applied (Lond. 1656, 4to)—Sermons on solemn Occasions (Lond. 1658, 4to)—Sermon on the Fire of London (Lond. 1666, 4to).—Darling, Cyclopa. Bibliographica, i, 1394.

**Hardy, Robert Spence,** an English Methodist missionary, was born at Preston, Lancashire, July 1, 1809, and was trained in the house of his grandfather, a printer and bookseller in York. In 1825 he was admitted to the British Conference, and appointed missionary to Ceylon, in which field he labored with great zeal for twenty-three years. In 1862 he was appointed superintendent of the South Ceylon Mission. To the ordinary labors of a missionary Mr. Hardy added an amount of literary activity sufficient to have occupied the whole life of an ordinary man. It is not too much to say that he and his colleague Gogerly (q. v.) have thrown more light upon the Buddhism of Ceylon, and upon Pali literature, than all other English writers. His culture, in the course of his studies, became wide; he read Latin, Greek, Hebrew, French, Portuguese, and Sinhalese; and his acquaintance with the Pali and Sanskrit was not only large, but accurate. Towards the end of his life he returned to England, and served as minister on several important circuits. He died at Heddingley, Yorkshire, April 16, 1866. At the time of his mortal seizure he was engaged upon a work entitled Christianity and Buddhism compared. His most important publications are Eastern Monachism, an Account of the Origin, Laces, Discipline, Sacred Writings, etc., of the Order of Monks, or Jesuit Order founded by Gotama Buddha (London, 1856, 8vo)—A Manual of Buddhism in its Modern Development, translated from Sinhalese MSS. (Lond. 1858, 8vo)—The Legends and Theories of the Buddhists compared with History and Science (1867, cr. 8vo).—Wesleyan Minutes, 1898, p. 25.

**Hardy, Samuel,** an English divinity, was born in 1729, and educated at Emanuel College, Cambridge, where he became fellow. He was for many years rector of Blakenham, Suffolk, and died in 1793. He published Nature and Ends of the Eucharist (London, 1784, 8vo)—Principal Prophecies of the O. and N. Test. compared and explained (London, 1770, 8vo)—Novum Testamentum cum scholii theologicae, etc. (3d ed. Lond. 1830, 2 vols. 8vo), the annotations in which are chiefly taken from Poodle's Synopsis.—Darling, Cyclopa. Bibliographica, i, 1395.

**Hare** ((gen. arneth; according to Bochart [Hieros. i, 994], from γαν, to crop, and κατά, fruit; Arab. ambëb and Syr. amnib, a hare; Sept. γαναριδας, vulgar. vulg. lagus and scaringulius, both versions interchanging it with cunremm) occurs in Lev. xi, 6, and Deut. xxv. 7, and in both instances it is prohibited from being used as food because it chews the cud, although it has not the hoof divided. But the hare belongs to an order of mammals totally distinct from the ruminants, which are all, without exception, herbivora, and whose hoof always offers a decided modification (Ehrenberg, Mammalia, pt. ii). The stomach of rodents is simple, and the motion of the mouth, excepting when they masticate some small portion of food re- served in the hollow of the cheek, is more that of the lips, when in a state of repose the animals are engaged in working the incisor teeth upon each other. This practice is a necessary condition of existence, for the friction keeps them fit for the purpose of nibbling, and prevents their growing beyond a proper length. As hares do not subsist on hard substances, like most of the genera of the order, but on tender shoots and grasses, they have more cause, and therefore a more constant craving, to shave their teeth; and this they do in a manner which, combined with the slight titration of the occasional contents of the cheeks, even modern writers, not zoologists, have mistaken for real ruminations.

**Hare of Mount Sinal.**

Physiological investigation having fully determined these questions, it follows that both with regard to the shaphan ("coney") and the hare, we should understand the original in the above passages, rendered "chewing the cud," as merely implying a second mastication, more or less complete, and not necessarily that faculty of true ruminants which derives its name from a power to draw up aliment after deglutition, when worked into a ball, from the first stomach into the mouth, and there to submit it to a second grinding process. The act of "chewing the cud" and "re-chewing" being considered identical by the Hebrews, the sacred lawyer, not being occupied with the doctrines of science, no doubt used the expression in the sense in which it was then understood (compare Michaelis, Anmerk. ad loc.). It may be added that a similar opinion, and con-
Hare, Francis, bishop of Chichester, was born at London about 1665. He studied at Eton and at King's College, Cambridge; and, having been employed as tutor to lord Blandford, son of the duke of Marlborough, the latter caused him to be appointed general chaplain of the army. In consequence of services rendered to the Whig party, he was successively made dean of Worcester in 1708, of St. Paul's in 1726, bishop of St. Asaph in 1731, and transferred in the same year to the see of Chichester. He died in 1740. He wrote a work on  The Difficulties and Discrepancies attending the Study of the Scriptures in the Way of private Judgment, which was condemned for its tendency to scepticism. He is chiefly famous for his Book of Psalms, in the Hebrew, put into the original poetical Metre (Psalmorum Liber in Versiculis metrice Divinis, Lond. 1736, 8vo), an attempt, now deemed hopeless, to reduce Hebrew poesy to metre, in which he was defended by Dr. Edwards, and assailed by Dr. Lowth. His Works were published in 4 vols. 8vo (Lond. 1746), containing, besides the writings above named, a number of Sermons. See Chalmers, General Bioy. Dict.; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, l, 788.

Hare, Julius Charles, one of the brightest ornaments of the Church of England in the present century, was born Sept. 13, 1795, at Hurstmonceux, Sussex, his father being lord of the manor. After a brilliant preparation at the Charter House, he went to Cambridge in 1812, where he graduated B.A. 1816, M.A. 1819, and became fellow of Trinity. He was instituted to the rectory of Hurstmonceux (the advowson of which was in his own family) in 1822; was called to a prebend at Chichester in 1851; was appointed archdeacon of Lewes by bishop Otter in 1840; and nominated one of her majesty's chaplains in 1855. He died at the rectory, Jan. 29, 1855.

In 1827 he published the first edition of Guesseis at Truth, but his name was first distinguished in the literary world as one of the translators of Niebuhr's History of Rome, in conjunction with Mr. Connon Thirlwall, the present bishop of St. David's. Their version was made from the second German edition, which materially differed from the first, and it was first published in the year 1828. It extends to the first and second volumes only of the standard English edition; the third and fourth were translated by Dr. William Smith and Dr. Leonard Schack. In 1829 Mr. Hare published at Cambridge, A Vindication of Niebuhr's History of Rome from the Charges of the Quarterly Review. Archdeacon Hare's published works extend over a period of nearly thirty years. The most important of them are, The Children of Light: a Sermon preached before the University of Cambridge, 1828, 8vo;—Sermons preached before the Universities of Cambridge and Oxford (Feb. 1839);—The Victory of Faith, and other Sermons (Cambridge, 1840, 8vo);—The Better Prospects of the Church: a Charge (1840);—Sermons preached at Hurstmonceux Church (1841, 8vo); 2d ed. 1849);—The Unity of the Church: a Sermon preached before the Chichester Diocesan Association (1845, 8vo);—The Mission of the Comforter, and other Sermons, with Notes (1846, 2 vols. 8vo); Amer. ed. Boston, 1854, 12mo);—The Means of Unity: a Charge, with Notes, especially on the Institution of the Anglican Bishopric at Jerusalem (1847, 8vo) — A Letter on the Apostles' Creed, written by the Archbishop of Canterbury to Dr. Hampden to the See of Hereford (1848, 8vo);—Life and Writings of John Sterling (1848, 2 vols. 12mo);—Guesseis at Truth, by two brothers (3d ed. 1848, 2 vols. 12mo);—The Conflict with Rome, especially in reply to Dr. Newman's Essay (Cambridge, 1852, 8vo);—Vindication of Luther (Lond. 1854, 8vo). This last is a book of vigorous controversy, and refutes, both on critical and moral grounds, the charges brought against the memory of Luther by Hallam, Newman, Ward, and Sir William Hamilton. These writers are handled by Hare with great, but not unjust severity. There are two admirable articles on Hare, giving a candid and judicious criticism of his career as philosopher, controversialist, and theologian, in
the Methodist Quarterly Review, April and July, 1856;| reprinted by the author, Rev. J. H. Rigg, in his Modern Anglican Theology (London, 1858, 12mo). See also Gentlemen's Magazine, April, 1835; Quarterly Review (London), July, 1855; Blackwood's Magazine, xliii, 267; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 785.

Harel (Heb. with the art. ha-Harel', הַחֲרֵל, the mount of God; Sept. Ῥαραή, Vulg. Arel, Engl. Vers. "the altar," marg. "Harel"), a figurative name for the altar of burnt-offering (Ezek. xliii, 15, first clause), called (in the last clause and in ver. 16) Arelt (Engl. Version also "altar")."  

Junius explains it of the leporia or hearse of burnt-offering, cared for by the network on which the sacrifices were placed over the burning wood. This explanation Gesenius adopts, and brings forward as a parallel the Arab. irveh, "a hearse or fire-place," akin to the Heb. זַנָּה, uz, "fight, flame." First (Handb. s. v.) derives it from an unused root נָרָה, darâ, "to glow, burn," with the termination -eth; but the only authority for the root is its presumed existence in the word Harel. Ewald (Die Propheten des A. L., i, 378) identifies Harel and Ariel, and refers them both to a root נָרָה, darâ, akin to זַנָּה, uz, "fight, flame."  

Harem. See HOUSE; POLYGAMY.

Haren, Jean de, a Belgian theologian, was born at Valenciennes about 1540. While yet a youth he went to Geneva, where he was well received by Calvin. He was present at the death-bed of the reformer (1564), and was for eighteen years a Protestant minister in several cities. He finally joined the Roman Catholic Church at Antwerp, March 3, 1586, and preached at Venlo, Cologne, Aix-la-Chapelle, Nancy, etc. He returned to Calvinism in 1610, and died about 1620. He wrote Brief Discours des causes justes et équitiés qui ont menées M. Jean Haren, jadis ministre, de quitter la religion protestante et se ranger au giron de l'Église catholique, etc. (Anvers, 1587, 12mo)—thirteen Catechismes contre Calvin et les calvinistes (Nancy, 1599, 12mo)—Profession catholique de Jean Haren (Nancy, 1599, 12mo)—Épitre et Demande chrestienne de Jean Haren à Ambroise Wille, ministre des étrangers veuils retirés en la ville d'Aix-la-Chapelle (Nancy, 1599, 12mo) —See Cambes, Bibl. de Lorraine, p. 479; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxiii, 380.

Hareth (Heb. Chäreth', הָרָאת, plucking off; Sept. ἀρπὶ, ἀρπίῳ, the "father" of Beth-Gader, and "son" of Caleb of Judah by one of his legitimate wives (1 Chron. ii, 51), B.C. cir. 1612. The patronymic " Harihite" (q. v.) seems to connect this with Harihite.

Hareseth. See Kir-Hareseth.

Hareesh. See Kir-Hareesh.

Hareesah. See Tel-Hareesah.

Hareth (Heb. Chërêth', חֶרֶת, the form נָרָה, Chârâ, is on account of the pause-accent; prob. i. q. נָרָה, a thickes; Sept. ἀρπὰ, ἀρπίῳ ἀπὸ [apparently reading יִנָּה; so Josephus, Ant. vi, 12, 4], Vulg. Harel), a wood (עֵץ) in the mountains of Judah, where David hid himself from Saul, at the instance of the prophet Gad (1 Sam. xxvii, 9); probably situated among the hills west of Socho. See FOREST.

Harhashah (Heb. Charchagah', חַרְחַגָּה, sot of Jehovah; Sept. ἀρπίας), the father of Uzziah of the goldsmiths,' which latter repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem after the Captivity ( Neh. iii, 11). B.C. ante 446.

Harhas (2 Kings xxii, 14). See Harhash.

Harbur (Heb. Chehrùr', חֶרּוֹר, ferer, as in Deut., xxviii, 22; Sept. ἀρπὶ), one of the Nethinim whose posteriority returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 51; Neh. vii, 58). B.C. 536.

Harid. See Harid.
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count all of the synos held by his predecessors. See
Legendre, Vie de Harlay (Par. 1720, 4to); Sévigné, Let-
tres (1818), x, 121, 128; Baussant, Hist. de Fénelon (2d ed.), i, 51, 58; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxii, 408.

Haret, whose, etc., are terms used somewhat promiscuously in the Auth. Vers. for several Heb. words of widely different import.

1. Properly יִמָּזְרוּ (yimzreu), participle from יִמָּזֵר (yimser), to play the harlot, Sept. ξανδρός, Vulg. meretricis, both these latter terms referring to prostitution for meretricious motives), which occurs from time to time in Greek literature, and is otherwise found only in the New Testament. The adjective is the first of the above English words, as in (Gen. xxxiv, 31, etc., and sometimes, without apparent reason for the change, by the second, as in Prov. xxiii, 27, and elsewhere. In Gen. xxxviii, 15, the word is the

"harlot," which, however, becomes changed to מִכּוּרָה, "harlot," in vers. 21, 22, which means, literally, a concubine, a female (perhaps priestess) devoted to prostitution in honor of some heathen idols. The distinction shows that Judah supposed Tamar to be a heathen, if the facts, therefore, do not prove that prostitution was then practiced between Hebrews.

That this condition of persons existed in the earliest states of society is clear from Gen. xxxviii, 15. From that account it would appear that the custom was a thing peculiar to harlots. Judah thought Tamar to be such "because she had covered her face." Mr. Buckingham remarks, in reference to this passage, that "the Turoman women go unveiled to this day" (Travel in Mesopotamia, ii, 77). It is contended by Jahn and others that in ancient times all females wore the veil (Joh. Archseol. p. 127). Possibly some peculiarity in the size of the veil, or the mode of wearing it, may have been (Prov. vii, 10) the distinctive dress of the harlot at that period (see New Translation, by the Rev. A. De Sola, etc., p. 116, 248-9). The priests and the high-priests were forbidden to take a wife that was a harlot (Lev. xxi, 14) a harlot. Josephus extends the law to all the Hebrews, and seems to ground it on the prohibition against obligations arising from prostitution, Deut. xxiii, 18 (Am. iv, 23). The celebrated case of Rahab has been much debated. She is, indeed, called by the word usually signifying harlot (Josh. ii, 1; vi, 11; Sept. first, Vulg. meretricis: and in Heb. xi, 31; James ii, 25; but it has been attempted to show that the word may mean an innkeeper. See Rahab. If, however, there were such persons, considering what we know of Canaanitish moral morality (Lev. xxii, 27), we may conjecture that they would, if anything, have been of this class. The next instance introduces the epithet of strange woman. It is the case of Jephthah's mother (Judg. xii, 2), who is also called a harlot (σεξπτή, meretricis; but the epithet θέρειν (acherei), strange woman, merely denotes foreign extraction. Josephus says Σωτος τύχη μερετριται, a stranger by the mother's side. The passage in Prov. vii, 6, etc., may possibly be that of an abandoned married woman (ver. 19, 20), or of the solicitations of a courtesan, fair speech," according to a certain pretension. The mixture of religious observances (ver. 14) seems illustrated by the fact that "the gods are actually worshiped in many Oriental broths, and fragments of the offerings distributed among the frequenters" (Dr. A. Clarke's Comment, ad loc.). The representation given by Solomon is no doubt founded upon facts, and therefore shows that in his time prostitutes plied their trade in the "streets" (Prov. vii, 12; ix, 14, etc. Jer. iii, 2; Ezek. xvi, 43, 25, 31). These conclusions are supported by the factious involved in the practise, similar outward marks seem to have attended its earliest forms to which we trace in the classical writers, e. g. a distinctive dress and a seat by the way-side (Gen. xxxix, 14; compare Ezek. xvi, 16, 25; Bar. vi, 43; Petenor. Arch. Sivi. xvi, Juv. vii, 8; Euseb. 16, 31, 31). Public singing in the streets occurs also (Isa. xxxii, 16; Ecclus. ix, 4). Those who thus published their infamy were of the worst repute; others had houses of resort, and both classes seem to have been known among the Jews (Prov. vii, 8-12; xxxii, 28; Ecclus. ix, 7, 8); the two women, i Kings iii, 16, lived as Greek hetaerae sometimes did, in a house together (Smith, Dict. Or. and Roman Ant. s. v. Hetera). The heathen and the harlot are described to them in Prov. vii, 21-23, may be compared with what Chardin says of similar effects among the young nobility of Persia (Voyages en Perse, i, 163, ed. 1711), as also may Luke xv, 30, for the sums lavished on them (ii, 162). In every instance the price of a kid is mentioned (Gen. xxviii, 18), and one great advantage of the doublet is sometimes ascribed to them (Ezek. xvi, 33, 39; xxii, 26). But lust, as distinct from gain, appears as the induce-
ment in Prov. vii, 14, 15 (see Douce's Anal. Sacra, ad loc.), where the victim is further allured by a promised sacrificial banquet. Hence in the Talmud it is said that the "harlot" are classed with "publicans," as those who lay under the ban of society in the N. T. (Matt. xxxii, 29). No doubt they multiplied with the increase of polygamy, and consequently lowered the estimate of marriage. The corrupt practices imported by Gentile converts into the Church occurred among most of the other heathen nations. As regards the false allusions to the subject there occur, I Cor. v, 1, 9, 11; 2 Cor. xii, 21; 1 Thess. iv, 3; 1 Tim. i, 10. The decree, Acts xxv, 39, has occasioned doubts as to the meaning of τυρπάσσα there, chiefly from its context, which may be seen at length in Day's Die Wissenschaft, Sacra ii, 470; sqq.; Schmoller, Alterth. ii, 489, 498. The prophetic allusions, esp. in 1 and 21, and Hammond, ad loc. The simplest sense, however, seems the most probable. The children of such persons were held in contempt, and could not exercise privileges nor inherit (John viii, 41; Deut. xxiii, 2; Judg. xii, 1, 2). The term "harlot" is not, however, applied to any illegitimate offspring born out of wedlock, but is restricted by the Rabbis to the issue of any connection within the degrees prohibited by the law. A mazmér, according to the Mishna (Yebamoth, iv, 13), is one, says R. Akiba, who is born of relations between whom marriage is forbidden. Since the Talmud says it is the same whose parents are liable to the punishment of "cutting off" by the hands of Heaven; R. Joshua, every one whose parents are liable to death by the house of judgment, as, for instance, the offspring of adultery. On the general subject, Michaelis's Laws of Moses, b. v. art. 268; Selden, De Lex. Hebr. i, 16; iii, 12; and De Jur. Natur., v, 4, together with Schiftgen, and the authorities there quoted, may be consulted.

The words בְּנֵיהֶּן (benēn) A. V. "and they washed his armor" (I Kings xxxii, 39), should be, "and the harlot washed," which is not only the natural rendering, but in accordance with the Sept. and Josephus.

Since the Hebrews regarded Jehovah as the husband of his people, by virtue of the covenant he had made with them (Jer. iii, 1), therefore to commit fornication is a very common metaphor in the Scriptures to denote defection on their part from that covenant, and especially by the practice of idolatry. See FORNICATION. Hence the depiction of Jerusalem is illustrated by the symbol of a harlot (Isa. i, 21), and even that of heathen cities, as of Nineveh (Nah. iii, 4). Under this figure the prophet Ezekiel delivers the tremendous invectives contained in chaps. xvi, xxiii. In the prophecy of Hosea the illustration is carried to a startling extent. The prophet seems compelled by the Lord to "take a wife of whoredoms and children of whoredoms" (i, 2), and "to love an adulteress" (iii, 1). It has, indeed, been much disputed whether these transactions were real, or passed in vision only; but the idea itself, and the diversified applications of it throughout the prophecy, render it one of the most effective portions of Scripture. See HOSHEA.

2. בְּנֵיהֶּנ (benehen), from בְּנֵי (bnei), to consecrate, occurs (Gen. xxxviii, 15, 21, 22; Deut. xxiii, 17; Hos. iv, 14). It has already been observed that the proper meaning of the word is consecrated prostitute. The very early
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harlot to such persons, in the first of these passages, agrees with the accounts of them in ancient heathen writers. Herodotes refers to the "abominable custom of the Babylonians, who compelled every native female to attend the temple of Venus once in her life, and to perform certain ceremonies of a disgraceful nature" (i. 19; Pau-

the transaction related in Numb. xxv, 1-15 (comp. Num. xxvi, 100); seems connected with idolatry.

with the deities of the worship of Jehovah (see other allusions, Job xxvi, 14; 1 Kings xiv, 24; xx, 12). The law forbids (Lev. xix, 29) the father's compelling his daughter to sin, but does not mention the case of a maid of fifteen as many.., a circumstance of the Dei, ii, 4, whose votaries, as idolatry progressed, would be recruited from the daughters of Israel; hence the common mention of both these sins in the Prophets, the one, indeed, being a metaphor of the other (Deut. xxii, 13, 29; Jer. ii, 20; Ezek. xxiii, 15; Jer. iii, 1, 2, 6; Hos. i, 2; ii, 4, 5; iv, 11, 13, 14, 15; v, 3). The latter class would grow up with the growth of great cities and of foreign intercourse, and hardly could enter into the view of the Mosiac institute.

3. "I will open thine eyes" (Heb. xx, 34, 35) from "I will open thine ears," the strange woman." (1 Kings xi, 2; Prov. vi, 24; viii, 3; xxii, 27; Song of Sol. ii, 4; Song of Sol. viii, 2; Prov. xxiv, 1, 2; Prov. xxvii, 13-15; I. 199; He-

14, and of particular portions of both. Harmonies of the Old Testament exhibit the books disposed in chronological order, as in the Life of the Author in his Introduction to the Old Testament, and by Townsend in his Old Testament arranged in historical and chronological order. Harmonies of the New Testament present the gospels and epistles distributed in like order, the latter being interspersed among the Acts of the Apostles. In this way Townsend has proceeded in his valuable work entitled The New Testament arranged in chronological and historical order. Books, however, of this kind are so few in number that the term harmony is almost appropriated by usage to the gospels. It is this part of the New Testament which has chiefly occupied the attention of those inquirers whose object is to arrange the Scriptures in their true order. The memoirs of our Lord written by the four evangelists have chiefly occupied the thoughts of those who wish to show that they all agree, and mutually auth-

itute one another. Accordingly, such compositions are called Concordances. The four generalists narrate the principal events connected with our Lord's abode on earth, from his birth to his ascension. There must therefore be a general resemblance between them, though that of John contains little in common with the others, being apparently compiled from the xv, 14. The description in Prov. xiv, 14, etc. illustrates the character of the female so designated. To this may be added דָּלָה (ra, wrong), "the evil woman" (Prov. v, 24).

In the New Testament פְּרָע occurs in Matt. xxii, 31, 32; Luke xv, 30; 1 Cor. vi, 15, 16; Heb. xii, 31; James ii, 25. In none of these passages does it necessarily im-

stream of evange-
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the difficulty of weaving the accounts of the four into a continuous and chronological history. Those portions of the gospels that relate to the resurrection of the Savour have always presented the greatest obstacles to the compilers of harmonies, and it must be candidly admitted that the accounts of this remarkable event are not easily reconciled. Yet the labors of West and Townson, especially the latter, have served to remove the apparent contradictions. In addition to them may be mentioned Cranfield and Hales, who have endeavored to improve upon the attempts of their predecessors. See Diatessaron.

In connection with harmonies the term diatessaron frequently occurs. It denotes a continued narrative selected out of the four gospels, in which all repetitions of the same or similar words are avoided. It is thus the result of a harmony, since the latter, properly speaking, exhibits the entire texts of the four evangelists arranged in corresponding columns. In popular language the two are often used synonymously. See DIATES-

1. Have all or any of the evangelists observed chronological arrangement in their narratives? It was the opinion of Osianer and his followers that all the evangelists had faithfully kept the true order. When, therefore, the same transactions are placed in a different order by the writers, they were supposed to have happened more than once. It was assumed that they took place as often as they were differently arranged. This principle is too improbable to receive refutation, for if even the best of the evangelists failed to solve difficulties, it boldly meets them with a clumsy expedient. Improbable, however, as the hypothesis is, it has been adopted by Macknight. It is our decided conviction that all the evangelists have not adhered to chronological arrangement.

2. When such arrangements have all neglected the order of time? Newcome and many others espouse this view. "Chronological order," says this writer, "is not precisely observed by any of the evangelists; John and Mark observe it most, and Matthew neglects it most." Bish-

3. Bishops Marsh supposes that Matthew probably adhered to the other time, but that the latter is imperceptible because he was blind to the facts of the truth, the facts he, therefore, neglected the succession of events. The reason assigned by the learned presbyter in favor of Matthew's order is of so weight as long as the inspiration of Mark, Luke, and John. If the events were infallibly directed in their compositions, they were in a condition equally favorable to chronological narration. A close inspection of Matthew's Gospel will show that he did not intend to mark the true succession of events. He gives us no definite expressions to assist in arranging his materials in their proper order. Very frequently he passes from one occurrence to another without any note of time; sometimes he employs a rōs, sometimes in ταίς ημέρας κείμενον, ἐν κείμενῳ τῷ καιρῷ, ἐν κείμενῳ ἐν τῷ φως. Rarely is he so minute as to use μὲν ἡμέρας ἐκ (xviii, 1). In short, time and place seem to have been almost forgotten to them as the principal object of his attention. Chronological order is not observed in his gospel, except as far so that gospel agrees with Luke's. Yet Cartwright, in his Harmony, published about 1850, makes the arrangement of Mark his rule for method. With regard to Luke, it is probable that he intended to arrange everything in its true place, because at the beginning of his work he employs the term καθηκόν. This word is frequently referred to as a term without involving time; but it seems clearly to imply chronological succession (compare Acts xi, 4). Although, therefore, Grotius and many others oppose the latter view, we cannot but coincide with Beza when he says: "In harmonia Evangelistarum scrinia, rectorem ordinem servavit, ut si in quibusque ejus scripturis reliquit ad Lucam potius accommodetur, quam Lucas ad ceteros" (comp. also Olshausen, Die Echtheit der vier Canon, Excav., etc., i, 82-3, 3d ed.). We may therefore conclude that this evangelist usually follows the chronological order, especially when such passages as iii, 1 and iii, 29, are considered, where exact notes of time occur. But as the gospel advances, those expressions which relate to time are as indeterminate as Matthew's and Mark's. Frequently does he pass from one transaction to another without any note of time; and again, he has μεν ραχα, ἐν μεν κείμενῳ τῷ καιρῷ. It is very difficult, if not impossible, to make out a complete harmony of the gospels according to the order of Luke, because we have no precise data to guide us in inserting the particulars related by Matthew and Mark in their proper places in the third gospel. All that can be determined is that the probability is that Luke's order seems to have been adopted as the true, chronological one. Whether the writer has deviated from it in any case may admit of doubt. We are inclined to believe that in all minute particulars chronological arrangement is not observed. The general body of facts and events seems to make a break of this character, not every special circumstance noticed by the evangelist. But we are reminded that the assignment of dates is distinct from chronological arrangement. A writer may narrate all his facts in the order in which they occurred, without specifying the particular time at which they happened; or, on the other hand, he may mark the dates without arranging his narrative in chronological order. But attention to one of these will naturally give rise to a certain opinion with regard to the other. The more indeterminate the notation of time, the less probable it is that time was an element kept before the mind of the writer. If there be a few dates assigned with exactness, there is a presumption that the true arrangement is observed in other parts where no dates occur. In the succession of events Luke and Mark generally agree.

With regard to John's Gospel, it has little in common with the rest except the last two chapters. It is obvious, however, that his arrangement is chronological. He carefully marks, in general, whether one, two, or three days happened between certain events. His gospel is therefore of great use in compiling a synopsis.

It thus appears that no one gospel taken singly is sufficient to form a guide for the Gospel harmonist; nor is he justified in selecting any one evangelist as a general guide, modifying that single narrative only as absolutely demanded by the statements of the other three. He must place them all together, and select from them the occurrences in each particular case may require. Of course he will take definite notes of time as a peremptory direction wherever they occur, and in the absence of these he will naturally follow the order of the majority of the Gospel narratives. Nor in this matter is he at liberty, as Stier has too often among others. (Words of Jesus, Am. ed., i, 31), to prefer one evangelist's authority to another, e.g. Matthew or John to Mark or Luke, on the ground that the former were apostles and the latter not, for they are all equally inspired. Again, the same liberty or discretion that is called for in arranging the oracles and journeys of our Lord must be exercised in adjusting his words and teachings; that is, the simple juxtaposi-
tion of passages is not absolute evidence of coincidence in time and immediate connection in utterance without some express intimation to that effect; so that incoherence, where palpable, or want of unanimity in this particular among the Gospel reports or summaries them- selves, is the strongest harmonizer that exercise the same judgment in the adjustment as in other particulars. (See the Meth. Quart. Review, Jan. 1864, p. 79.) With these points premised and duly observed, there is no greater difficulty in adjusting the four accounts of our Lord’s life and teaching with a reasonable degree of certainty than there would be in harmonizing into one consistent account the separate and independent depo- sitions of as many honest witnesses in any case of law. The real only questions of serious dispute in fact, aside from the main one presently to be mentioned, are those of a purely chronological character affecting the genuine- date of Christ’s ministry as a whole, and the particular spot where certain incidents or discourses transpired; the relative order and position of nearly everything is but little disturbed by the various theories or views as to even these points. Hence is evident the rashness of those who attempt to set Stier [Pref. to Matt. and Mark, in Words of Jesus], that the construction of a Harmony of the Gospels is impracticable; for in the very same work he forthwith proceeds to construct and publish one himself!

2. What was the duration of our Lord’s ministry? This is a question upon which the opinions of the learned have been much divided, and which cannot be settled with conclusive certainty. In order to resolve it, it is necessary to mark the different Passovers which Christ attended. Looking to the gospels by Matthew, Mark, and Luke, we should infer that he was present at no more than two: the first at the time of his baptism, the second immediately before his crucifixion. But in John’s gospel three Passovers at least are named during the period of our Lord’s ministry (ii, 13; vi, 4; xii, 55). It is true that some writers have endeavored to adapt the gospel of John to the other three by rectifying the Pass- overs mentioned in the former to two. So Priestley, Vossius, and Mann. In order to accomplish this, it was conjured that παραγη, in ch. vi, 4, is an interpolation, and then that ἱπποτήριον denotes some other Jewish festival. Bishop Pearce went so far as to conjecture that the enti- re period of the Passover was interpolated, but these rash speculations there is no authority. The received reading must now be followed (Litchte’s Commentar über Johannes, 3d ed. ii, 104). In addition to these passages, it has been thought by many that another Passover is referred to in the raising of Lazarus (John xi, 1); although, as Umbach does not occur, ἱπποτήριον is supposed to denote the same feast. But this is a subject of dispute. Ireneaus is the oldest authority for explaining it of the Passover. Cyril and Chrysostom, however, referred it to the Feast of Pentecost, an opin- ion approved of by Erasmus, Calvin, and Beza; but Luther, Chemnitius, Calovius, Scaliger, Grotius, and Lightfoot returned to the ancient view of Ireneaus. Kepl er seems to have been the first who conjectured that it meant the Feast of Purim immediately preceding the second Passover. He was followed by Petavi, Lamy, D’Orelli, Dacier, Succacius, followed by Kaiser, referred to it the Feast of Teepemades; while Kepl er and Pe- tau intim ated that it may possibly have been the Feast of Dedication. Bengel defended the opinion of Chry- sostom; while Hug, with much plausibility, endeavors to show that it alludes to the feast of Purim immedi- ately preceding the Passover. The latter view is adopted by Tholuck, Olschhausen, and Clasius, though Greswell and others maintain that the Passover is meant. It would occupy too much space to adumbrate the various considerations that have been urged for and against the two leading opinions, viz. the Passover and the Feast of Purim. The true account of the latter is negligently omis- sed the article from before it; see Tischendorf, Nov. Test. 7th ed. ad loc.), is still indeterminate (see especially Alford, Gr. Test. ad loc.). To us it appears most prob- able that the most ancient hypothesis is correct, al- though the circumstances urged against it are neither few nor feeble. The following arguments, however, seem to determine the question in favor of the Passover: 1. Had any less noted festival been meant, it would, as in other cases, have been named by Christ, or在他者 have been specified; but in the present case not even the article was required to distinguish it; whereas John in one instance only (vi, 4) uses παραγη to qualify a following ἱπποτήριον, when the latter is thus defined by ἱπποτήριον. 2. The en- suing Sabbath (John vii, 41), when Luke vii. 51, may be that which was second after the offering of the wave- sheaf, and first after the Passover-week, and, however interpreted, shows that a Passover had just preceded, for the harvest was just ripe. See Passover.

Sir Isaac Newton and Macknight suppose that free use has been made between our Lord’s ministry and the Passover. This assumption rests on no foundation. Perhaps the term ἱπποτήριον in John vii, 2 may have given rise to it, although ἱπποτήριον is explained in that passage by ἱπποτήριον.

During the first three centuries it was commonly be- lieved that Christ’s ministry lasted but one year, or one year and a few months (Routh, Reliq. Stor. iv, 218). Such was the opinion of Clemens Alexandrinus (Stro- mata, i, 21; vi, 11) and Origen (de Principii, iv, 5). Eusebius thought that it continued for about three years, which hypothesis became general. The ancient hypothesis is supported by the time to which the parables were attributed. These were vouched for by Mann and Priestley; but Newcome, with more judgment, defended the common view, and refuted Priestley’s arguments. The one-year view has found few late advocates except Jarvis (intro. to History of Church) and Browne (ordo Sacrorum). It has been well remarked by bishop Marsh that the Gospel of John presents almost insuperable obstacles to the opinion of those who confine Christ’s ministry to one year. If John mentions but three Passovers, its duration must have exceeded two years; but if he mentions four, it must have been longer than one. In any case, during the gospels of Matthew, Mark, and Luke with that of John, the intervals between the Passovers are filled up by various transactions. Were the number of these feasts determinate and precise, there would be a general agreement in the filling up of the times between them; but in consequence of the uncertainty attaching to the subject, Harmonies are found materially to differ in their modes of arrangement. One thing is evident, that the moderns, in their endeavors after a chronological disposi- tion of the gospels, adopt a far more rational course than the ancients. The latter strangely supposed that the first account of Christ’s ministry had been a period of Christ’s ministry prior to that with which the other three evangelists begin their accounts of the miracles. Thus John alone was supposed to narrate the events be- longing to the earlier part of his ministry, while Matthew, Mark, and Luke related the transactions of the last year.

The most ancient Harmony of the Gospels of which we have any account was composed by Tatian of Syria in the 2d century, but it is now lost (see H. A. Daniel’s Tattiani der Apologisten. Halle, 1867, 8vo). In the 3d century, Ambrose was the author of a Harmony supposed to be still extant. Eusebius of Cesarea also com- posed a Harmony of the Gospels about A.D. 315. In it he divided the Gospel history into ten canons or tables, according as different facts are related by one or more of the evangelists. These ancient Harmonies, however, differ in consequence of the uncertainty attaching to the subject. They are summaries of the life of Christ, or indexes to the four gospels, rather than a chronological arrange- ment of different facts, accompanied by a reconciliation of apparent contradictions. (See Scrivener, intro. to Hist. of the N. T. p. 60.) The oldest writer who published his Harmony of the Gospels in 1587. He adopted the principle that the evangelists constantly wrote in chronological order. Cornelius Jansenius’s Concordia
## COMPARATIVE TABLE OF DIFFERENT HARMONIES.

Note.—This Table comprises only a few of those adjustments of the Gospels (whether tabular or in full), which have become best known in America. The figures refer to the sections as they are numbered in Strong's Harmony, and their order in each column shows the relative position assigned by the several authors to the corresponding events. An asterisk [*] points out a marked difference from the arrangement of the same text in the particular Harmony. A double dagger [††] indicates a clear repetition of some of the prominent incidents in another place; a double dagger [*][*][*] is prefixed to those sections in the arrangement of which the majority of harmonizers coincide; and parallels [†] are set to those concerning the position of which there is little or no dispute.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Luke</th>
<th>Mark</th>
<th>Matthew</th>
<th>John</th>
<th>Acts</th>
<th>Thoma Bar</th>
<th>[1630]</th>
<th>[1550]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lake's Preface</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John's Introduction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John's birth predicted</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annunciation to Mary</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary visits Elizabeth</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth of John</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeshua's vision</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nativity of Jesus</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genealogies</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circumcision of Jesus</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presentation in the Temple</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit of the Magi</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flight into Egypt</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethlehem massacre</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit of Nicodemus</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boyhood of Jesus</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission of John</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disciples on providence</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temptation of Christ</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further testimony of John</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samaritan woman</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching in Galilee</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>32</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>...</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>156</td>
<td>Judas's daughter raised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>159</td>
<td>Blind men, etc., cured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>160</td>
<td>Second rejection at Nazareth</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>161</td>
<td>Message of the apostles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>162</td>
<td>John beheaded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>163</td>
<td>Five thousand fed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
<td>Walking on the water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>165</td>
<td>Discussion in the synagogue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>166</td>
<td>Third passover</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>167</td>
<td>Pharisees confounded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>168</td>
<td>Four thousand fed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>169</td>
<td>A sign demanded</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>170</td>
<td>Blind man cured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>172</td>
<td>Passion predicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>173</td>
<td>Transfiguration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>174</td>
<td>Demonic cured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>Passion again predicted</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>176</td>
<td>Tax-money provided</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>177</td>
<td>Exhortations to kindness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78</td>
<td>Mission of the seventy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79</td>
<td>Departure from Galilee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80</td>
<td>Festival of tabernacles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81</td>
<td>Adulteress pardoned</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Violence offered to Christ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83</td>
<td>Return of the seventy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84</td>
<td>Love thou one's neighbor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85</td>
<td>Visit to Bethany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86</td>
<td>The Lord's Prayer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>87</td>
<td>Blind man cured</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88</td>
<td>Investigation by the Sanhedrin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89</td>
<td>Festival of dedication</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90</td>
<td>Teaching at theJordan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>91</td>
<td>Lazarus raised</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>92</td>
<td>Resolution of the Sanhedrin</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>93</td>
<td>Teaching at Ephraim, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>94</td>
<td>Infirmity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>95</td>
<td>Sets out for Jerusalem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>96</td>
<td>Warning against Herod</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>97</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>98</td>
<td>The tower built, war made, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>99</td>
<td>The prodigal son, etc.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100</td>
<td>The faithless steward</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>101</td>
<td>Dives and Lazarus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>102</td>
<td>Messiah already come</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>103</td>
<td>Unjust judge, publican</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Died *
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last Supper</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entry into Jerusalem</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traders expelled</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The barren piece of bread</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>His authority demanded</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The tribute question</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The resurrection question</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The greatest commandment</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Messiah's parting</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hierarchy denounced</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The widow's gift</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interview with the Greeks</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Destruction of Jerusalem, etc</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plots against Jesus</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for Passover</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incidents of the trial</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agony, etc., in Gethsemane</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination before Annas</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arrest before the high priest</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accusation before Pilate</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taken before Herod</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sentence from Pilate</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suicide of Judas</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crucifixion incidents</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burial of Jesus</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seals guarded</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preparation for embalming</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Release from the tomb</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance to the women</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Report of the watch</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance to Mary</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance at Emmaus</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen by ten apostles</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen by eleven apostles</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seen by twenty-five apostles</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance to all the disciples</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ascension</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>114</td>
<td></td>
<td>114</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Evangelica was published in 1849. Martin Chemitz's Harmony was first published in 1555, and afterwards, with the continuations of Leyer and Gerhard, in 1628. Chemitz's Harmony was the first that class of harmonists who maintain that in one or more of the four gospels chronological order has been neglected, while Osiander is the head of those harmonists who maintain that all the gospels are arranged in chronological order. Other harmonies were published by Stephens (1553), Calvin (1558), Calix (1558), Osiander (1567), Cluster (1568), Lightfoot (1554), Cradock (1668), Calov (1690), Sandburg (1848), Bunting (1689), Lamy (1689), Le Clerc (1699), Toinard (1707), Whiston (1702), Burmann (1712), Russ (1727–8–30), Bengel (1756), Hauber (1757), Büsching (1766), Dodriddle (1789 and 40), Filkington (1747), Macknight (1756), Burting (1767), A. Eschbach (1776, 1789, 1809, 22), Newcome (1783), Priestley (1777 in Greek and 1780 in English), Michaelis (1788, in his Introduction), White (1789), Keller (1802), Mutschelle (1806), Sebastiani (1806), Planck (1809), De Wette and Lücke (1818), Hess (1829), Matthaei (1829), Kaiser (1829), Rodiger (1829), Clausen (1830), Nowack (1838), Carpenter (1838), Reischel (1840), Gehring (1842), Overbeck (1843), Robinson (Greek, 1845; English, 1846).*

Harms, Claus, a German revivalist, was born at Fahrstadt, in Holstein, May 25, 1778. He showed at an early age signs of a deep and devotional piety. He made rapid progress at school, and at eighteen entered the University of Kiel. Young and ardent, the skeptical spirit of the time could not but have some effect on him; its influence, however, was counteracted by Schleiermacher's Reden ib. d. Religion, which brought him back to the simple faith of childhood, from whence he never afterwards strayed. In 1802 he passed his examination in theology, and in 1806 was appointed professor in Lunden. The fame of his talent as a preacher, and of his devotion to pastoral labor, soon spread abroad. His first publication was Winter-Postille (Kiel, 1808), which was followed by Summer-Postille (Kiel, 1809). Two more postils, published byHamberg, and afterwards ran through many editions. In 1816 he was appointed archdeacon of St. Nicholas at Kiel. In this position he was at first highly esteemed, and afterwards bitterly opposed on account of his so-called Pietism. The opposition against him culminated at the occasion of the jubilee of the Reformation held in 1817. It became daily more apparent to him that the Church in Germany was steadily receding from the principles of the Reformation and of the Holy Scriptures. He therefore gave out that he was prepared at any time to sustain, demonstrate, and defend Luther's 95 theses, with 95 additional ones of his own, and to engage in controversy with him. His first point, "When our Lord Jesus Christ says 'repent,' he means that we shall conform to his precepts, not that his precepts shall be conformed to us, as is done in our days to suit the public mind," was striking at the very root of the then widely spread religious indifference. The discussions which ensued gave rise to a vast number of publications, many of which were very bitter. The effect, on the whole, was a deep awakening in the Church. The theological faculty of Kiel, with which, except the celebrated Kleuker and Zweiten, had bitterly opposed Harms, was in after years almost exclusively brought over to his side. His publications after this (showing his theological views more fully) include the following, viz., Predigten (1820, 1822, 1824, 1827, 1838, 1852) —Religionsanweisungen der Lutherschen Kirche (1809) —Christliche Gläube (1830—1834) —Vatervolk (1838) —d. Bergrede d. Herrn (1841) —d. O.Jennerung Johannis (1844) —Reden an Theologiestudenten (3 vols.; i, d. Prediger; ii, d. Priest; iii, d. Pastor, Kiel, 1830—34). Many beautiful hymns by Harms may be found in the Gesänge f. d. gemeine Unterricht in die Gemeinde Ausdacht (1841). In 1841, on the 25th anniversary of his entering on his pastoral duties at Kiel, a great jubilee was held there, and a fund having been formed to defray his travelling expenses, he was named "Oberconsistorialrath." His eyesight failed him a few years after, but he still continued writing, and published a revised edition of his works (1851). He died peacefully Feb. 1, 1855. See Harms' Selbst-biographie (Jena, 1818); Reuter's Repertorium (1849); Baumgarten's Ein Denkmal f. C. Harms (1855); Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, v, 567.

Harms, Louis, usually known as Pastor Harms, one of the most eminent among the Lutheran pastors in Germany.

He was born in Herrnsburg, in the kingdom of Hanover, March 1, 1748. His father was pastor of the church in Herrnsburg before him, and was remarkable for the strict discipline of his family.

As a boy, Louis excelled all his comrades in wrestling, boxing, and other athletic sports. He prepared for the university at the gymnasium of Celle, completing the course in two years. From 1827 till 1830 he studied at the University of Gottingen with signal arder and success. He was expelled from theology at this time partly on account of the most efficient advertisement of his motto: "I shall never in my life," said he, "know what fear was, but when I came to the knowledge of my sins, then I quaked before the wrath of God, so that my limbs trembled." A Christian hope soon took complete and ever-increasing possession of his mind, and in 1844 we find him engaged, in preaching at Herrnsburg, beginning his labors as an assistant to his father.

With the settlement of this young minister, a mighty influence began to go forth from the little German village, which soon changed the aspect of the country around, so that he who had been a hermit in the mist of the world, found himself to be virtually the pastor of a region ten miles square, containing seven villages, which in an incredibly short time he brought into a state of working religious activity.

And now, having regulated affairs immediately around him, this extraordinary man began to feel the care of the whole world upon his mind. He felt responsible even for Africa and the East Indies. But how to bring the moral force of his little German village to bear upon the continent of Africa was the problem. The result formed one of his most remarkable feats of spiritual enterprise ever recorded. Harms first worked through the North German Missionary Society. But he soon became dissatisfied, and resolved to have a mission which should carry out his own ideas and be under his own control. He proposed to select pious and intelligent young men, and to send them as missionaries to the heathen. Twelve young men presented themselves at once, but Harms had not the means of educating them. His best friends hinted to him that he was a little out of his senses. Then, to use his own expression, "knocked on the door in prayer." His mind had been powerfully impressed by the words of a courtier, spoken to duke George of Saxony, who had lain on his death-bed hesitating whether to flee for salvation to the Saviour or to the pope. "Your grace," said the courtier, "straightforward is the best runner." In a few moments the purpose of Harms was formed so completely that no doubt ever again occurred to him. His plan of action was struck out once. Without ever asking a single man, he prayed to God for the money. Funds poured in upon him. He built a large edifice for his missionary college. More students came than he could accommodate. He prayed for more money. It came to him from Germany, Russia, England, America, and Australia. He erected another building. The fact of his not asking any money at all became the most efficient advertisement of his cause which could be made. He called his mission school "Swimming Iron." Soon the first class of missionary candidates graduated and were ready for Africa, but the pastor had no means of sending them there. "Straitenlade," he prayed to God for counsel, and decided to build a ship. The project was rather original, as Herrnsburg
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was sixty miles from the sea, and most of the people had never seen a ship. Again Harms painted for the necessary money. Funds came as usual, and the ship was built and launched. As the day of sailing approached, the simple Herrmansburgers brought to the vessel fruits and flowers, grain and meats, ploughs, harrows, hoes, and a Christmas-tree, that the missionaries might have the means to plant a garden up on the hill. The day of sailing, Oct. 18, 1853, was held as a gala by the simple people; but soon news came that the ship was lost. "What shall we do?" said the people. "Humble ourselves, and build a new ship," said the minister. The report proved untrue, and that vessel is still plying her water trade to this day. The missionary work in Africa, and Harms' preachers have also penetrated to Australia, the East Indies, and our Western States.

In 1863 Harms felt the need of diffusing missionary intelligence among his own countrymen, and arousing a more universal interest in the cause. He desired to establish a journal devoted to missions, but his friends did not see how it could be published. "Let us have a printing-press upon the heath," said Harms. At once he asked God for the money, and it reached him as usual. The missionary journal was soon established, and soon issued a circuit in every place. Out of a thousand copies, only two periodicals in all Germany had a larger edition. It still abounds with pacy letters from the missionaries, and the stirring essays of Harms formed its chief attraction until his death. He also established a missionary festival, held annually in June. It continued for a longer time. Some years this festival was attended by six thousand people, including strangers from all parts of Europe. "How enchanting," said he, "are such Christian popular festivals, under the open sky, with God's dear Word, and accounts of his kingdom and prayer, and loud-sounding hymns, in a verdant field!"

The peculiar character and enormous amount of Pastor Harms' work can be better understood from the account of a traveller from our own country who spent a Sabbath with him in the autumn of 1863. The description which follows may be considered a specimen of his usual Sabbath-day's work. After speaking of his church edifice, which was nine hundred and seventy-five years old, and which Harms refused to have pulled down, considering its antiquity a means of influence, the writer proceeds: "Strangers were obliged to take seats at half past nine on Sabbath morning; in order that those who arrived later might commence at half past ten. When the pastor entered, the vast audience rose with as much awe as if he were an apostle. His form was bent, his face pale and inscrutable solemn. He appeared utterly ex- hausted, and leaned against the altar for support. In a low, tremulous tone, he chanted a prayer. Without looking at the Bible, he then recited a psalm, commenting upon every verse. He then read the same psalm from the Bible, by the inflections of his voice gathering up and impressing his previous comments. He next administered the ordinance of baptism to those infants who had been born since the previous Sabbath, and ad- dressed the sponsors. After announcing his text, he gave a rich exposition of it; a prayer followed, and he preached his sermon, which was very impressive and direct, though the voice of the preacher was often shrill. At another prayer, he administered the Lord's Supper to about one hundred communicants, which was the concluding part of the ordinance of every Sabbath day. The female communicants were dressed appropriately for the occasion. The people were dismissed after a service of three hours and forty minutes in length. After an hour's interval, the audience assembled again. The pastor recited a chapter from the New Testament, commen- tating upon each verse, and then read from the book before. After singing by the congregation, he cate- chized the audience, walking up and down the aisle, questioning children and adults. The audience seemed transformed into a vast Bible-class. This service of three hours lasted, closed with singing and prayer. At seven in the evening, the minister held his usual pulpit in the hall of the parsonage, and he preached to them in Low German, after which he held a missionary concert, reading letters from his missionaries, dated from Africa, Australia, and the United States. He seemed to have his hand upon all parts of the earth. Evidently conscientious, he carried the responsibility of the task. At the close of the service he shook hands with each one of the people in turn, saying, "May the Redeemer bless you." At ten in the evening the neighbors as- sembled at the parsonage to join with the pastor in family prayer. He recited from the Bible, commenting upon it as before, and then held a prayer which thrilled the listeners, though distressing to listen to, so great was his fatigue."

Besides these enormous labors on each Sabbath, Pastor Harms wrote incessantly for his missionary magazine, published a large number of books, and sent about three thousand letters a year, mostly to his missionaries. His method of keeping his missionary accounts was to take what money he got and pay what he owed; nor was he ever troubled, though the expense of his mission was about forty thousand dollars a year. He rec- ords a hundred instances of the exact amount of money he spent in reaching the time of the book. For four hours every day he held a levee for his parishioners, who consulted him freely, not only about religious sub- jects, but upon everything which interested them—the state of their health or the tillage of their land. So crowded were these levees, that often a stranger waited in the street for four days for the chance to see the pastor a few minutes. The religious doc- trine of Pastor Harms was singularly manifested. The king of Hanover, at one time, knowing that his eminent subject was in the city, sent a high officer of government, with one of the state carriages, to invite him to the palace. "Give my regards to the king," said Harms; "I would obey his order, if duty allowed; but I must go home and attend to my parish." The officer was indig- nant as he delivered the message; but the king said, "Harms is the man for me." Though a rigid monarch- ist, the pastor often preached against the government, and prepared his people to resist it. He often entered into sharp conflict with the government, especially in regard to the observance of the Sabbath, and was reported by them sixty-five times, but escaped un- hurt. With characteristic boldness, he warned the churches not to endure unbelieving ministers in the pul- pits, although the ministers held their own by the king. He defied the democracy as well as the court, and publicly advised them, if they were discontented, to go to Africa in a body. He was vehemently opposed to the popular amusements, declaring that men "acted themselves into hell from the theatre, and danced themselves into hell from the ballroom." The Calvinistic doc- trines and the Congregational polity were objects of his marked aversion. He declared that the Baptists who postponed the baptism of their children were robbers and murderers of those children's souls. Nor would he ever insure his seminary buildings, thinking that God would protect them, and he had an idea that insurance against accident involved a certain defiance of Jehovah. When he catechised the congregation, and children fail- ed in the exercise, he would sometimes punish them in public. He required his missionary students to perform a daily task of manual labor, not only for economical reasons, but also "that they might be kept humble, and not be ashamed of their work, any more than Paul was of his tent-making." As he never asked from any one but God, he had a violent antipathy to beggars, and none were ever found in his parish. Almost adored by his people as a species of rural pope, he maintained the utmost care and watchfulness to preserve his own hu- mility while breathing the atmosphere of their homage. He yielded not a particle of his activity to the very last. When he could no longer ascend his pulpit, he preached standing at the altar; when he could not preach stand- ing, he preached sitting; when he could no longer sit,
he prayed that God would take him away as a burden. He died on the 14th of November, 1866, at the age of fifty-seven, and was buried amid the tears of his people on his beloved Lüneberger Heath.

It is difficult to form a just estimate of this remarkable man. The keynote of Harnoch's character was his union with God. Yet so rare is any high degree of this union that the possession makes his character stand original and alone, and it seems as though "one of the prophets had risen again." Another world had laid hold with a strong grasp upon his mind, so real was it to him that he appeared to walk not by faith, but by sight. He lived among us like a being of another race detained here from other worlds, and acted with an air of directness which no human standard can comprehend. Yet this wonderful spirituality was often marred by bigotry; sometimes it bordered upon the superstitious; at times his apostolic fervor was tinged with self-will, and we are astonished at the absolute breadth and narrowness of his mind. He made his most opposite powers assist each other; to carry out the moral intention of an angel, he brought a worldly wisdom which no one could surpass; in comprehension of detail and fertility of expedients he could have taught the ablest men of business. His life was devoted upon the warfare of an unending, almost morbid activity. He saw nothing before him but a succession of duties, yet his mind found an unconscious delight in the extent and variety of its own efforts, and his zeal was doubtless enhanced by the continual joy of attempt and success. It is hard to acquire a conception of him. No one who sat in his presence could lift his eyes from the ground before him. His amazing spirituality, the closeness to another sphere with which he lived, would have elevated him beyond our sight; but the eccentricities which slightly marred so grand a character showed that he was human, and lowered him to a point nearer the sympathy of mankind. To the last, the world must stand astonished at the moral power of a man who could make a little country church in a remote part of Germany the circle of his life with its influence, and Harnoch alone is an answer to the Saviour's question, "When the Son of man cometh, shall he find faith on the earth?" At intervals God gives such a one to the Church, to show to the world the spiritual power of one soul which is really in earnest. Harnoch has lived, and Germany, Africa, and the East Indies have felt the consequence. He was one of those blocks from whom, in earlier ages, the Catholic Church would have hewn her saints and her martyrs; he was a Protestant Loyola; had he left the world a few centuries before, he would assuredly have been canonized as a Doctor or St. Francis; his remains would have performed miracles without end; romantic tradition would have sprung from and twined around his memory; orders of priests and stately cathedrals would have borne his name; and thousands of devotees might to-day be worshipping at shrines. (WCV; 7.)

Harnoch (Heb. Har-ôôkho, הַרַּנוֹךְ, perhaps mssor; Sept. Ἀραγόν, Vulg. Harnochus), one of the sons of Zophah, a chief of the tribe of Asher (1 Chron. vii. 36). B.C. between 1612 and 1058.

Harness occurs in several senses in the Eng. Vers., as the rendering of different Heb. words.

1. נְשִׁי (nashiy, prop. to bind, as it is generally rendered) is sometimes applied to the act of fastening animals to a cart or vehicle, e. g., skóing kine (1 Sam. vi, 7, 10, "tie") or horses (Jer. xlv, 4, "harness"), gearing a chariot (Gen. xlv, 29; Exod. xiv, 6); 2 Kings ix, 21, "make ready," or absolutely (1 Kings xviii, 44; 2 Kings ix, 21, "prepare"). From the monuments we see that the harness of the Egyptian war-chariots was composed of leather, and the trappings were richly decorated, being studded with a great variety of colors, and studded with gold and silver. See Chariot.

2. In the old English sense for armor (רָכָב כְּלָב, ne'shék, warlike equipments, elsewhere "armor," "weapons," etc.), 2 Chron. ix, 24. See Armor.

3. In a like sense for "vessels of the Lord" (הָרִים, חַוִּים, 1 Kings xxii, 34; 2 Chron. xviii, 33); a coat of mail (בְּשִׁירָת, "breastplate," Isa. lx, 17). See Armor.

4. "Harnessed" (מְחַבְּשֵׁם, chamashim, from השים, in the sense of being fierce for battle) is the expression used to represent the equipped condition of the Israelites as they passed out of Egypt (Exod. xiii, 18, "armed," Josh. i, 14; iv, 12, Judg. vii, 11), and seems to denote the state of full preparation and intrepid disposition, an insight and a foresight (the ancient versions interpret generally fully armed). (See Genesis, Lex. a. v.)

Harod (Heb. Charód, חָרֹד; Sept. Ἀρόδ t. v. Ἀραδός, a brook or place (ኢ syslog, spring or fountain, "well," Sept. ποταμός) not far from Jezreel and Mount Gilboa ("Gilead," Judg. vii, 3), by which Gideon and his great army encamped on the morning of the day which ended in the rout of the Midianites (Judg. vii, 1), and where the trial of the people by their mode of divination and the event itself took place. The name means "polli nation," and it has been suggested that it originated in consequence of the alarm and terror of most of the men who were here tested by Gideon (ver. 3, 5); but this supposition seems very far-fetched, and the name more probably arose from some peculiarity in the shape or color of the stream, or from the circumstance otherwise unknown. The word, slightly altered, recurs in the proclamation to the host—"Whosoever is fearful and trembling (יוֹרָד, charad), let him return" (ver. 3); but it does not follow that the name Charad was, as Prof. Stanley proposes, bestowed on account of the trembling, for the mention of the trembling may have been suggested by the presence of water, and the fountain: either would suit the paraphrastic vein in which these ancient records so delight. The word charad (A. V. "was afraid") recurs in the description of another event which took place in this neighborhood, possibly at this very spot—Saul's last encounter with the Philistines—when he "was afraid, and his heart trembled greatly" at the sight of their fierce hosts (1 Sam. xxviii, 5). It was situated south of the hill Mochr, where the Midianites were encamped in the valley of Jezreel (ver. 1), and on the brow of the hills overlooking that plain that on the south (ver. 9). As the camps were not far distant from each other (compare ver. 10-19), it must have been in a narrow part of the valley, and probably near its head (for the invaders came from the east, chap. vi, 3, and fled down the eastern defiles, chap. vii, 22). Hence the position of the present Ain Jezzial, south of Jezreel, is very probably that of the fountain in question (Stanley's Sinai and Palestine, p. 384-386). This spring, which gives rise to a small stream flowing eastward down the wady of the same name, is evidently the representative of the ancient name Gilead applied to this spot [see Gillead, 2], and has thus supplanted the other name Harod. Indeed it is probable that the latter was rather the name of a town in the neighborhood, since we find mention of its inhabitants (2 Sam. xxiii, 25). See Harodite. "The valley of Jezreel" referred to is an eastern arm of the great plain of Esdraelon, bounded on the south by Gilboa, and on the north by a parallel range (compare ver. 10-19). It is about three miles wide. See Jezreel. The Midianites were encamped along the base of Mochr, and probably near the town of Shunem. On the south side of the valley, at the base of Gilboa, and nearly opposite Shunem, is the fountain of Ain Edid. It is about a mile east of Jezreel, and hence it was also called the "fountain of Jezreel." The water bursts out from a rude grotto in a wall of conglomerate rock, which here forms the base of Gilboa. It first flows into a large but shallow pond, and then winds away through the rich green vale past the ruins of Bethshean to the Jordan. The
side of Gilboa rises over the fountain steep and rugged. Some have thought it strange that the Midianites should not have seized on this fountain: but, as many of the Israelites probably lurked in the mountain, the Midianites may have deemed it more prudent to encamp in the open plain to the north, where there are also fountains. The Jerusalemite Itinerary makes no mention of the Galian. Williams of Tyre calls it Tuhibius (Gesta Dei per Francos, 1037; Bohadin, Vita Suladini, p. 53). The valley of Jezreel still forms a favorite haunt of the wild Bedawin, who periodically cross from the east side of the Jordan, as in Judg. vi, 5: "They came up with their cattle and their tents, and they came as grasshoppers for multitude: both they and their camels were without number" (Porter, Handbook for Syr. and Pal. ii, 555; Robinson, Bib. Res. ii, 324).

Harodite (Heb. Chaqrô'dî, יָרָדִית, Sept. Ἀρόπος), an epithet of Shammah and Ella, two of David's heroes (2 Sam. xxiii, 25), probably from their being natives of Harod, a place near the fountain of the same name (Judg. vii, 1). See Harorite. 

Haro'ēth (1 Chron. ii, 82). See Rehaim.

Harorite (Heb. Chaqre'rî, יָרָרִית, prob. by errore- transcription for יָרָדִית, Harodite; Sept. Ἀρόπος, Vulg. Arorites), an epithet of Shammath, one of David's heroes (2 Sam. xxiii, 27; 1 Chron. ii, 37); for which the passage (2 Sam. xxiii, 25) more correctly reads Harodite (q.v.).

Harosheth (Heb. Cha'arosh'thêth) of the Gentiles (יוֹרְשָׁתָם, workmanship of the nations, i.e. city of handicrafts; Sept. Αρωσόθω τῶν ἱδρυῶν, Vulg. Haro- sheth gentium), a city supposed to have been situated near Hazor, in the northern parts of Canaan, afterwards called Upper Galilee, or Galilee of the Gentiles, from the mixed races inhabiting it. See Galilee. Haro- sheth is said to have been the residence of Sisera, the general of the armies of Jabin, king of Canaan, who signed in Hazor (Judg. iv, 2). Here the army and chariots of Jabin were marshalled under the great captain before they invaded Israel, and defied from the walls of Harosheth (ver. 16). The city is not again mentioned in the Bible, nor is it referred to by Josephus, Jerome, or any ancient writer. It was at the extreme of Jabin's territory, opposite the Kishon (ver. 13), and also at a good distance from Tabor (ver. 14). It is supposed to have stood on the west coast of the lake Merom (א-חלוף), from which the Jordan issues forth in one unbroken stream, and in the portion of the tribe of Naphtali. Jabin's capital, Hazor, one of the fenced cities assigned to the children of Naphtali (Josh. xix, 30), lay to the north-west of it. Probably from intermarriage of the conquerors with the natives, the name of Sisera afterwards became a family name (Exx. ii, 53). Neither is it irrelevant to allude to this coincidence in connection with the moral effects of this decisive victory: for Hazor, once "the head of all those kingdoms" (Josh. xi, 8), had been taken and burnt by Joshua. In kind, Joshua brought out to the sword; and the whole federation of the Canaanites of the north broken and slaughtered in the celebrated battle of the waters of Merom (Josh. xi, 5-14)—the first time that "chariots and horses" appear in array against the invading host, and summarily disposed of, according to divine command, under Joshua, but which subsequently the children of Joseph feared to face in the valley of Jezreel (Josh. xvii, 16-18), and before which Judah actually failed in the Philistine plain (Judg. i, 19). Herein was the great difficulty of subduing plains, similar to that of the Jordan, beside which Harosheth stood. It was not till the Israelites had asked for and obtained a king that they began "to multiply chariots and horses" (Judg. xii, 18), and to turn homage to themselves, contrary to the express words of the law (Deut. xvi, 18), as if to fight the enemy with his own weapons. (The first instance occurs 2 Sam. viii, 4: comp. 1 Chron. xviii, 4; next in the histories of Absa- lom, 2 Sam. xv, 1, and of Adonijah, 1 Kings i, 5; while David himself was touched with the same feeling, 2 Sam. xxiv, 25.) Then it was that the Hebrews' decedence set in! They were strong in faith when they hamstrung the horses and burned with fire the chariots of the kings of Hazor, of Madon, of Shimron, and of Achshaph (Josh. xi, 1). Yet so rapidly did they decline when their illustrious leader was no more that the city of Hazor had risen from its ruins; and, in contrast with the kings of Mesopotamia and Moab (Judg. iii), who were both foreign potentates, another Jabin, the territory of whose ancestors had been assigned to the tribe of Naphtali, claimed the distinction of being the first to revolt against and shake off the dominion of Israel, and raised itself in his own name to the dignity of a nation (Judg. i). 

The victory won by Deborah and Barak was well worthy of the song of triumph which it inspired (Judg. v, and of the proverbial celebrity which ever afterwards attached to it (Psa. lxxxiii, 9, 10: a passage which shows how little the fugitives were overawed as a whole by their defeat), and which the whole territory was Gregory was inclined to be held permanently, as it would seem (Judg. iv, 24); at all events, we hear nothing more of Hazor, Haro- sheth, or the Canaanites of the north in the succeeding wars. The etymology of the name Harosheth, q. d. "woodcutting," is not well fitted with the above texts, may justify us in localizing the city on the upland plains of Naphtali, probably on one of those ruined-crowned cemeteries still existing, from which the mother of Sisera, looking out from her latticed window, could see far along that road by which she expected to see her son return in tri- umph (Judg. v, 29). Deborah, in her beautiful ode, doubtless depicted the true features of the scene. Remnants of the old forests of oak and terebinth still wave here over the ruins of the ancient cities, and travellers may see the black tents of the Arabs—fit representatives of the ancient states (ver. 17)—pitch their tents within their shade (Porter, Handbook for Syr. and Pal. ii, 446; Stanley, Jewish Church, i, 389). Schwarzs (Palestine, p. 184) thinks it identical with the village Gîrîh, situated on a high mount one English mile west (on Zimmerman's map north-west) of Jacob's bridge across the Jordan, and nearly destroyed by an earthquake in 1857. Dr. Thomson (itineraries) gave a vivid description of the geographical features of Barak's victory (Land and Book, ii, 142 sqq.), regards the site as that of the present village Haravîk (a name, according to him, giving the exact Arabic form of the Hebrew), an enormous double mound or tell along the Jordan, about eight miles from Megiddo, covered with the remains of old walls and buildings.

Harp is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of the following terms in the original: usually נָעַר, kinner (whence the Greek κινάρι), the lyre or cithara (invariably rendered "harp"), N. T. εἰφίδα (1 Cor. xiv, 7; Rev. v, 8, 11, 9, 20, 16), whence the verb εἰφίδει (1 Cor. xiv, 7); Rev. xv, 2; with the compound εἰφίδον ("harp"), Rev. iv, 2; xviii, 22); elsewhere only of the Chal. מַכְרָה, kitharos (text of Dan. iii, 5, 7, 10, 15), or מַכְרָה, kitharos (margin), from the latter Greek term. See Music.

The "harp" was David's favorite instrument, on which he was a proficient (see Dreschler, De cithara David, Lips. 1712; also in Uogolina, xxxii). It probably did not essentially differ from the modern Arabic cithara (Niebuhr, Trav. x, 177; pl. 36; Descrit de l'Egypte, xvi, 866, pl. BB, fig. 12, 18). See David.
HARP

Modern Egyptian performer on the Cud or Lute.
(From Lane.)

Gesenius inclines to the opinion that "נַעַד is derived from "נַעַד, kinnor," an unused onomatopoetic root which means to give forth a tremendous and stridulous sound, like that of a string when touched." The kinnor was the national instrument of the Hebrews, and was well known throughout Asia. There can be little doubt that it was the earliest instrument with which man was ac-

African Egyptian Lyres. 1, In the Leydau Collection; 2, in the Berlin Collection.
quainted, as the writer of the Pentateuch assigns its inven-
tion, together with that of the בַּצָּא, נַעַד, incorrectly translated "organ" in the A.V., to the antedilu-
vian period (Gen. iv, 21). Kalisch (Hist. and Crit. Com. on the Old Test.) considers kinnor to stand for the whole class of stringed instruments (neopolo), as yaph, says he, "is the type of all wind instruments." Writers who connect the kinnor with כִּינְיָרָא יָדָם, kinnor me (to kinnor), conjecture that this instrument was only employed by the Greeks on occasions of sorrow and distress. If this were the case with the Greeks, it was far different with the Hebrews, amongst whom the kinnor served as an accompaniment to songs of cheerfulness and mirth, as well as of praise and thanksgiving to the supreme Being (Gen. xxxi, 27; 1 Sam. xxxi, 28; 2 Chron. xx, 28; Psa. xxxiii, 2), and was very rarely used, if ever, in times of private or national affliction. The Jewish bard finds no employment for the kinnor during the Babylonian captivity, but describes it as put aside or suspended on

the willows (Psa. cxxxvii, 2); and in like manner Job's harp "is changed into mourning" (xxx, 81) while the hand of grief pressed heavily upon him. The passage "my bowels shall sound like a harp for Moab" (Isa. xvi, 11) has impressed some biblical critics with the idea that the kinnor had a lugubrious sound; but this is an error, since כִּינְיָרָא נַעַד refers to the vibration of the chords, and not to the sound of the instrument (Gesen. and Hitzig, in Comment.).

Touching the shape of the kinnor, a great difference of opinion prevails. The author of Shilite Haggidborim (c. 6) describes it as resembling the modern harp; Pfeifer gives it the form of a guitar; and St. Jerome declares that it resembled in shape the Greek letter delta (quoted by Joel Brill in the preface to Mendelssohn's Psalms). Josephus records (Ant. vii, 12, 3) that the kinnor had ten strings (compare Theodoret, Quest. 34 on 1 Kings), and that it was played on with the plectrum; others assign to it twenty-four; and in the Shilite Haggidborim it is said to have had forty-seven. Josephus's statement, however, ought not to be received as conclusive, as it is in open contradiction to what is set forth in the 1st book of Samuel (xvi, 23; xviii, 10), that David played on the kinnor with his hand. As it is reasonable to suppose that there was a smaller and a larger kinnor, inasmuch as it was sometimes played by the Israelites whilst walking (1 Sam. x, 5), the opinion of Munk—"On jouait peut-être des deux manières, suivant les di-

Various Ancient Egyptian figures of Lyres. 1, 2, played without, and 3, 4, with the plectrum; 4 is supposed to be the Hebrew lyre.

The כִּינְיָרָא יָדָם—"harp on the Sheminith" (1 Chron. xv, 21)—was so called from its eight strings. Many learned writers, including the author of Shilite Haggidborim, identify the word "sheminith" with the octav; but it would indeed be rash to conclude that the
HARP

HARPHIUS

ancient Hebrews understood the octave in precisely the same way in which it is employed in modern times. See SIMMATRE. The skill of the Jews on the kinnor appears to have reached its highest point of perfection in the age of David, the effect of which can be traced even into our own day. The names of the "schools of the prophets" are described as truly marvellous (compare 1 Sam. v. 5; xvi. 23; and xix. 20). Two instruments of the lyre species are delineated on a bas-relief of the Assyrian monuments, representing the return of a monarch celebrated by the presence of musicians (Layard, Nineveh and Bab., p. 388 sqq.). The lyre of Harpdescribes a harp of ten strings. The distinct sounds uttered by these strings or chords are alluded to by Paul in 1 Cor. xiv. 7. Its soothing effect was exemplified in calming down the furious spirit of Saul (1 Sam. xvi. 17, 24; xviii. 9; xix. 9). The spirit of prophecy appears to have been excited by instrumental music of this kind (2 Kings iii. 15). Harpers held the instrument in the hand, or placed it on a pillar, or sat down by a river side (Ovid, Fasti, ii. 115). Sometimes they were even taught from the strings which are an allusion in Psa. cxxxvii. 1, 2. The harp was used in processions and public triumphs, in worship and the offices of religion, and was sometimes accompanied with dancing (Psa. cxlix. 9). They were also used after successful battles (see 2 Chron. xx. 39; 1 Macc. xiii. 51). Isaiah alludes to this custom in the text quoted above (22). So in the victory of the Lamb (Rev. xiv. 1, 2): "I heard the voice of harpers harping with their harps;" the Church in heaven being represented as composing a grand chorus, in celebration of the triumphs of the Redeemer. At solemn feasts, and especially of the type, harps were employed. To this the prophet Isaiah alludes (v. 11, 12). The use of harps in worship has already been adverted to, and that the heathen employed them on such occasions appears from Dan. iii. 5, 7, 15. "Harp of God" (Rev. xv. 2) are either a Hebraism to show their excellence, as the adjectives of God often signify (the most excellent things in their kind being in the Scriptures said to be of God), as a prince of God (Gen. xxiii. 6, in the original), the mountains of God (Psa. xxxvi. 6, in the original), cedars of God (Psa. lxxxi. 11, in the original), and the like; or else they mean harps given from God; or harps given from God, for they may be harps used in the service of God, in opposition to harps common and profane (1 Chron. xvi. 42; 2 Chron. vii. 6).

Harpnus, H. H., a Flemish mystic, was born at Erp (whence he is sometimes called also Erpius or Enpius), in Brabant, towards the beginning of the 15th century. He entered the order of St. Francis, in which he soon became distinguished for his learning, particularly in mystical theology. He attained the highest dignities of the order, and succeeded in restoring the discipline in several convents of grey friars where it had been relaxed. He died at Mechlin Feb. 29, 1476. The Franciscans count him among the blessed; yet Bossuet seems to have considered him only as an enthusiast and visionary. He wrote Le Directoire des Contemplatifst (first published in Low Dutch, then in Latin by Biomevert, under the title Directorium aurum Cordis: Modus legatus vastrum Virginis Mariae:—Remedia contra Distractiones. The Directorium aurum was republished with commentaries and corrections (Paris, without date, 12mo; Cologne, 1527, 12mo; 1611, 16mo; Antwerp, 1536, 12mo; Cologne, 1555, 4to; Rome, 1585, 4to; Brescia, 1601, 4to; translated into French by Mme. E. B., Paris, 1552, 16mo)”—Sermones, etc., with Trois Parties de la Penitence and Triple Avenement de Jezus Christ (these works, written in Flemish, were translated into Latin by Nuremberg, 1481, 4to; Spire, 1484, 4to)—Speculum aurum deem Præceptorum Dei, etc. (Mayence, 1474, 4to):—Speculum Perfectionis (Venice, 1524, 12mo; trans. into Italian, 1546, 12mo)—Explicatio succissa et perspectiva Novem Raptum (of Suso), written first in Latin, then trans. by Surinarius, and published in the Opera omnia of Henry Suso (Cologne, 1383, 1555, 1588, and 1615, 12mo; Naples, 1638, 12mo)—De Mortificatio

HARP

Lyre.

ancient Babylonian instrument is probably that represented in a single instance on the Assyrian monuments at Khorsabad, depicting three short-bearded performers on the lyre ushered into the greatest chamber, and a young eunuch. The musicians are clad in a short tunic held fast by a girdle, and their hair is drawn back, and terminates above the shoulders in a single row of curls. They proceed with measured step, singing and twangling their wires, which are suspended by a broad band passing over the right shoulder. The instrument itself somewhat resembles the Greek lyre: it has a square body and upright sides, the latter being connected by a crossbar, to which are fixed strings that have been called numer- ous, for we can count eight at least, and in the part that is corrododed away there is room for three or four more. Exactly similar instruments are now seen in Nubia and Dougolay; and the mode of playing is that the right hand holds a short plectrum to strike the intervals, while the left is used to stop and twang the cords (Bonomi’s Nineveh, p. 187).

Harp or guitar is constantly, in the Holy Scriptures, instruments of joy. They are mentioned in every ancient country, used both by Jews and Gentiles, and their employment in the Temple worship frequently occurs. Moses has named their original inventor in Gen. iv. 21, viz. Jubal; and in Gen. xxxi. 27, Laban says to Jacob, "Why did you not tell me, that I might have sent you away with mirth and songs, with tallow and with harp?" Even in that very ancient writing, the book of Job (xxii. 12), that patriarch, speaking of the prosperity of the wicked, says, "They take the timbrel and harp, and rejoice at the sound of the organ." So, when complaining of his own condition (xxiii. 30), he says, "My ear also is turned to mourn- ing, and my organ to the voice of them that weep." Isaiah speaks of the harp under the same character, as an instrument of joy (xxiv. 8). Divine subjects used to be brought forward with the accompaniments of the harp (Psa. xlii. 5), and the high praises of God were so celebrated (Psa. xxxii. 2; 2 Cor. iv. 4; Ivi. 8; see also Psa. lxii. 23; xxiv. 4; xxvii. 5; cxlii. 7; cl. 3). That harps are used to celebrate the praises of heroes is well known. Harps, in Solomon’s day, were made of the algum-trees; as our translators have it (1 Kings x. 12). They were often gilded, and hence called golden harps (Rev. v. 8). A harp of eight strings is mentioned (1 Chron. xv. 21), called in our version "harp on the Sheminith." But amongst the Greeks it had, for the most part, seven strings. Josephus (Ant. vii. 12)
HARPSFELD

Harpsfield, or Harpsfield, John, was born about 1510, and died in London in 1578. He was educated at Winchester School and New College, Oxford, where he was admitted fellow in 1534. He became chaplain to Bishop Bonner, whose bitter persecuting spirit he shared, and was collated to St. Martin's, Ludgate, in 1554, but resigned in 1558, on being presented to the living of Lyndon in Essex. Shortly before the death of Queen Mary he was made dean of Norwich, but on the accession of Elizabeth was deprived of that post, and committed to the Fleet Prison until he gave security for his good behavior. His published works are Concordia ad Clerum (London, 1558, 8vo) — Homilies (London, 1554-56); he wrote 9 of Bonner's Homilies) — Suppeditum temporum a diloario ad a. D. 1535 (London, 1590). He wrote also some Disputations and Epistles to be found in Fox's Acts and Monuments. — Rose, New Gen. Biog. Dict. viii, 212; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxii, 442; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 788; Wood, Athen. Oxon. i. (J. W. M.)

HARPSFELD, Nicholas, an English Roman Catholic historian, and brother of the preceding, was also educated at Winchester School and New College, Oxford; where he was admitted fellow in 1532. He was bachelor of arts in 1548. He was made principal of Whitehall in 1544, regius professor of Greek in 1546, archdeacon of Canterbury and prebendary of St. Paul's in 1554. He also received the living of Lyndon, but resigned it to his brother John in 1558. He was a very zealous Romanist, and on the accession of Elizabeth, refusing to acknowledge her supremacy, he was deprived of his prebends and imprisonment, or at least kept under restraint until his death in 1583. During his imprisonment (receiving every needful help from his custodian, bishop Parker) he composed his Historia Anglicana Ecclesiastica (Douay, 1622, fol.). To this there is appended, according to Nutt's catalogue (1837), a treatise entitled Brevis Narratio de Dicario Heresici V.V. . . . ab E. Campiun, which may be the "Treatise concerning Marriage" mentioned by Wood (see Appendix to Butler's Hist. of Reformation). His other works are Historia heresici Wickhifferae (published with Hist. Ang.); Chronicon a Dicario Noce ad annum 1559; and a very bitter attack upon the Protestant ecclesiastical historians, Fox in particular, which was conveyed secretly to the Netherlands, and published by his friend Alan Cope under his inspiration, to screen the real cause of the punishment at the hands of Elizabeth — the title in full in Alani Capi Dialogi et contra Summi Pontificatus, Monasticae Vita Sacramentorum, S. Imaginum oppugnatores et pseudo-Martires: in quibus Centumsevemto, Auctorium Apologia Anglicae, Pseudo-Martyrum defensio, sacrosanctae et sacrae officii, legum, usus, temporum minorum, suos uocatos, et ecclesiae veritatem Sanctorum, et nostrae catholicae, refutandos (Antwerp, 1556, 4to). He left also many MSS. — Rose, New Gen. Biog. Dict. viii, 212; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxii, 442; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 788. (J. W. M.)

Harris, John, D.D., F.R.S., an English divine, was born about 1687. He studied at St. John's College, Cambridge, and became successively rector of St. Mildred's, London, master of Queen's College, Oxford, curate of St. Margaret, Woolster, and fellow, secretary, and vice-president of the Royal Society. He died in 1719. Dr. Harris was the first compiler of a dictionary of arts and sciences in England (1708, 2 vols. fol.), and was a careful and able editor; but he was impatient and died completely destitute. He wrote A Refutation of the Character and Opinions against the Being and Attributes of God (London, 1698, 4to) — Sermon, John xvi, 2: — The Wickedness of the Pretext of Treason and Rebellion for God's sake (Nov. 4th) (London, 1715, 8vo); and compiled a Collection of Voyages and Travels (Lond. 1702; revised by Campbell, 1744, 2 vols. fol.) — Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, i, 1403; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 790.

Harris, John, D.D., an eminent Independent minister and scholar, was born at Ugborough, in Devonshire, March 8, 1802, and was admitted a student at the Hoxton Academy for the education of ministers belonging to the Independent denomination in 1821. In 1827 he settled as a minister among the Independents. His first literary work, entitled The Great Teacher, was favorably received; but he became most widely known as the successful competitor for a prize of one hundred guineas, offered by Dr. Conquest for the best essay on the subject of Covetousness. Mr. Harris's essay was entitled Mammon, and had a wide circulation, upwards of thirty thousand copies having been sold in a few years. He subsequently obtained two other prizes for essays — one entitled Britannia on the Condition and Claims of Sailors; the other on Missions, with the title The Great Commission. On account of the reputation thus brought to him, he was elected a fellow of Amherst College, and was also invited to fill the post of president in lady: Huntington's Theological College at Cheshunt. Here he remained till the union of the three Independent colleges of Highbury, Homerton, and Coward in New College, in which he was the office of principal, and conducted several of the theological courses in that institution. He filled this position with efficiency, and by his industry and amiable character contributed to the success which has attended this establishment. Whilst at Cheshunt, Dr. Harris published the first of a series of volumes which was intended to illustrate the history of man from a theological point of view. The first volume was entitled The Pre-Adamite Earth (1847). In it he displayed a great amount of learning, and especially an acquaintance with the nat-
ural sciences, which he brought to bear on his theological views. The second volume of the series was entitled *Man Primordial* (1849), in which the intellectual, moral, and religious character of man is discussed. A third volume, entitled *Patriarchy, or the Family*, appeared the same year. Harris completed the series, and to have been devoted to the 'State,' or the political condition of man, and the 'Church,' or his religious relations; but the plan was cut short by the death of Dr. Harris, Dec. 21, 1856. These writings evince careful study and a broad range of thought. Dr. Harris's practical writings have had an immense circulation both in England and America. See Fish, *Pulpit Eloquence* (1857); Gilliland, *Modern Masterpieces of Pulpit Oratory*; Hoefer, *Neue. Bibl. Génerale*, xxix, 450; *British Quarterly Review*, v, 387; *N. American Review*, lxxx, 391; Albion, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 791.

Harris, Robert, D.D., a pious and learned Puritan divine, was born in Gloucestershire, 1758, and was educated at Magdalen Hall, Oxford. He afterwards took orders, and obtained the living of Hanwell, near Banbury, Oxfordshire, where he was extremely useful in confirming the people's minds in the Protestant faith. On the commencement of the Civil War he removed to London, and became a member of the Assembly of Divines, which appears to have taken no active part in their proceedings. He officiated at the church of St. Botolph, Bishopsgate Street, until 1648, when he was appointed president of Trinity College, which office he retained until his death in 1638. His works include *The Way to True Happiness*, in twenty-four sermons on the Beatitudes; and *A Treatise on the New Covenant*, which, with other writings, were published in his *Works, revised and collected* (Lond. 1654, fol.).—*Hook, Hist. Bibl.*, v, 546.

Harris, Samuel, D.D., "was born in the county of Middlesex about the year 1633. He was educated in Merchant Taylors' School, of which he was head boy in 1657, and was admitted a pensioner of Peter House, Cambridge, May 15, 1700. Upon the foundation of the chair of Modern History in the University of Cambridge by George I in 1724, Harris was appointed the first professor. He died Dec. 21, 1733. He was the author of, 1. *Scripture knowledge promoted by catechising* (London, 1712, 8vo);—2. *A Commentary on the Fifty-third chapter of Isaiah, with an appendix of Queries concerning Divers Ancient Religious Traditions and Practices, and the sense of many texts of Scripture which seem to allude to or express them* (Lond. 1736 [not 1739, as frequently stated], 4to);—3. *A discourse on the first page, namely, Observations, Critical and Miscellaneous, on several remarkable Texts of the Old Testament, to which is added a Commentary, etc.*—Prefixed are three dissertations. 1. *On a Gazer or Advocate; 2. On a Dour or Generation; and, 3. On the ancient method of propounding important points by way of question. This work was published shortly after the death of the author by his widow. It exhibits much curious learning, and is several times referred to by Doddridge in his lectures."


Harris, Thaddeus Mason, D.D., a Unitarian divine, was born in Charlestown, Mass., in 1760, graduated A.B. at Harvard in 1784, and became pastor at Dorchester in 1788. He was librarian of Harvard College from 1791 to 1793, and afterwards librarian of the Massachusetts Historical Society till his death in 1842. His most important publication is a *Natural History of the Bible* (1795, 12mo; again in Boston, 1821, 8vo); also published in London 1795, and in the same year. *Miscellaneous Observations on the Natural History of the Bible, 1824*; new ed. by Conder, 1833, 12mo). This work received great praise for its accuracy and utility (see Horne, *Bibliographical Appendix*). Dr. Harris also published *Memorials of the Massachusetts Historical Society* (Boston, 1811, 8vo);—*Discourses on Freemasonry* (Charlestown, 1801 [1801], 8vo). See Allibone, *Dictionary of Authors*, i, 792.

Harris, Walter, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born in Lebanon, Conn., in 1761. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1787, was ordained pastor at Dunbarton Aug. 28, 1789, and died Dec. 25, 1843. Dr. Harris published *An Address before the Pastoral Convention of New Hampshire* (1834), and a number of occasional sermons.—Sprague, *Annals*, ii, 277.

Harris, William, D.D., an eminent English dissenting divine, is supposed to have been born at London about 1675. He became pastor of a church at Cruchted Friars, London, in 1698. He was also for some thirty years one of the preachers of a Friday evening lecture at the Westminster or Shrewsbury Mr. Tong and succeeded Dr. Salter at Salter's Hall. He died in 1740. "He was a concise, clear, and nervous writer; his works evince a strong sense joined to a lively imagination, and regulated with judgment." He was one of the continuators of Matthew Henry's Commentary (those on Philippians and Colossians). Besides a number of occasional sermons, he wrote *Funeral Discourses*, in two parts: (I) Consolations on the Death of our Frias; (II) Preparations for our own Death (London, 1736, 8vo).—*The Life and Character of Dr. Thomas Morton* (London, 1726, 8vo);—*A Practical Illustration of the Book of Job* (London, 1737, 8vo).—Darling, *Cyclopedia Bibliographica*, i, 1406; Bogue and Bennett, *History of Dissenters*, ii, 372.

Harris, William, D.D., a Protestant Episcopal minister, was born at Springfield, Mass., and passed A.B. at Harvard College in 1786. He was first licensed as a minister in the Congregational Church, but, on perusing a compend of Hooker's *Ecclesiastical Polity*, his mind and feelings were drawn to the Protestant Episcopal Church, in which he was shortly after ordained. He then took charge of St. Michael's Church, Marblehead, and in 1802 became rector of St. Mark's, New York. In 1811 he was made president of Columbia College, and in 1816 he resigned his rectorship, and attended thereafter exclusively to the presidency of the college. He died Oct. 18, 1829. He published several occasional sermons. —Sprague, *Annals*, v, 388.

Harrison, William Henry, D.D., was born Jan. 12, 1815, in Frederick County, Md. He entered the preparatory department of Pennsylvania College in 1838, and was graduated in 1843 with the valedictory of his class. He early developed a taste for literary research; and, while others were often engaged in recreation and amusement, he was in his room busyly engaged in the investigation of some question of interest, and in the acquisition of information in his especial line of study. In the latter, perhaps, he excelled all others was the moral influence which he exercised over his companions. His very presence, even when he kept silent, was felt. Immediately after his graduation in college he commenced his theological studies in the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg. On their completion in 1845 he was licensed to preach the Gospel by the Synod of Maryland. He was elected assistant professor of ancient languages in Pennsylvania College, and served for a season as general agent of the Parent Education Society. The following year he accepted a call to the English Church of Cincinnati, as he felt that he could be more useful and efficient in the pastoral work. Here he labored with great success to his death. His labors were unwearyed and abundant. His life was regarded as a sacrifice to the cause of humanity and religion. He died of Apolitical complaint. He was buried in Cincinnati, Nov. 3, 1866, and, although comparatively a young man, he was at the time of his death the senior pastor of the city. He was a good scholar, a sound theologian, and a clear, practical, and instructive preacher. He resided at Wittenberg College in 1861. (N. L. S.)

Harrow is the rendering in the Eng. Vers. of the following Hebrew words:  י"ע"ו, "charis" (lit. a cutting, hence a slice of curdled milk, "cheese," 1 Sam. xvii, 18),
HARSA

a tribulum or threshing (q. v.) sledge (2 Sam. xii, 31; 1 Chron. xx, 3); elsewhere only the verb ʿānūn, nudad’ (lit. to level off), to harrow a field (Job xxxix, 10; “break the cloths,” Isa. xxviii, 4; Hos. x, 11). See Kittto, Daily Bible Illustr., iii, 39, vi, 397. The form of the ancient Roman, their religion dyed in blood; their juggling and feigned miracles, of which he wrote a book against them, and their equivocations.” He concluded by proclaiming that in his view the Church of England came nearest to the primitive Church, and that its principles were not derived from Wickliff, Huss, or Luther, but from the four first centuries after Christ. This defense was considered valid, and in 1628 Dr. Harvett was translated to the archbishopric of York. He died in May, 1631. Among his works we notice *A Discovery of the fraudulent Practices of John Darrell, Bachelor of Arts, etc.* (London, 1599, 4to) — Declaration of egregious Popish Impositions, etc. (London, 1603, 4to), against an exorcist named Edmonds, alias Weston, a Jesuit. See Collier, Eccles. History; Strype, Memorials; Biog. Brit.; Hook, Eccles. Biography, v, 346 sq.

HART ( paginate, always masc., but in Ps. xiii, 1, joined with a fem. noun to denote a hind), a stag or male deer, but used by the Hebrews also to denote all the various species of deer and antelopes which resemble large rams. See Deer. The hart is reckoned among the clean animals (Deut. xii, 15; xiv, 5; xv, 22), and seems, from the passages quoted, as well as from 1 Kings iv, 23, to have been commonly killed for food. Its activity furnishes an apt comparison in Isa. xxxv, 6, though in this respect the hind was more commonly selected by the sacred writers. The proper name Aylon is derived from ayil, and implies that harts were numerous in the neighborhood. See Goat. The Heb. masc. noun ayil, which is always rendered ḥēbēs by the Sept., denotes, there can be no doubt, some species of Cervus (deer tribe), either the Damus vulgaris, fallow-deer, or the Cervus Barbarus, the Barbary deer, the southern representative of the European stag (C. elephas), which occurs in Tur- nias and the coast of Barbary. We have, however, no evidence that the Barbary deer ever inhabited Palest- nine, though it may have done so in primitive times.

Modern Egyptian Khnowad, or cloz-crushing machine after ploughing.

Hebrew harrow, if any instrument properly corresponding to this term existed, is unknown. Probably it was, as still in Egypt (Niebuhr, Trav. i, 151), merely a board, which was dragged over the fields to level the lumps. Among the Romans it consisted of a hurdle (craete) of rods with teeth (Pliny, xviii, 43; comp. Virg. Georg. i, 94). See generally Ugolini, Comm. de re rustica vet. Hebr. v, 21 (in his Theaurus. xxix, p. 332 sq.); Paulsen. Ackerb. p. 96. “In modern Palestine, oxen are sometimes turned in to trample the cloths, and in some parts of Asia a bush of thorns is dragged over the surface; but all these processes, if used, occur (not after, but) before the seed is committed to the soil.” See Agriculture.

HARSA. See Tel-Harasa.

Har’sha (Heb. Charsa’ha), ḥarṣāḥa, a Chaldaizing form, worker or enchanter; Sept. ἁρσάχα and ἁρσάος, one of the Nethinim whose descendants (or rather, perhaps, a place whose inhabitants) returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 62; Neh. vii, 54). B. C. ante 530. Schwarz (ibid. p. 116) thinks it may be identical with the ruins called by the Arabs Charsa (on Zimmerman’s map, Khuras), situated south of wady Sur, about half way between Beit-Jibrin (Eleutheropolis) on the W., and Jedur (Gedor) on the E.

Harnet, Samuel, archbishop of York, was born at Colchester in 1561; was educated as a sizar at King’s College, Cambridge; and was subsequently elected fellow of Pembroke Hall. In 1580 he took the degree of B.A., and in 1584 that of M.A. He then applied himself to theology, in which he soon made his mark by a sermon preached in 1584 at St. Paul’s Cross (first printed at the end of three of Dr. Stewar’s sermons in 1609), in which he boldly attacked the doctrine of unconditional predestination, then to some extent prevailing in the Church of England. He became successively proctor of the university in 1592, vicar of Chigwell, in Essex, in 1593, and archdeacon of Essex in 1602, but resigned all these offices on being appointed rector of Shenfield, in Essex, and of St. Margaret’s, New Fish Street, London, in 1604. He became master of Pembroke College in 1605, and bishop of Chichester in 1609. He was translated to Norwich in 1619. While in the latter see, the Dissenters prevailing in the House of Commons, he was accused before the last Parliament of James I of several misdemeanors, and of Romanist tendencies. He made a defense, in which, among other points, he says “that popery is a fire that never will be quiet; he had preached a thousand sermons, and nothing of popery can be imputed to him out of any of them. That there were divers obstacles to keep him from popery: among them, the usurpation of the pope of

Cerven Barbarum.
HARLEY

Hesselquist (Trans. p. 211) observed the fallow-deer on Mount Tabor. Sir G. Wilkinson says (Ann. Egypt. i, 227, abridgment), "The stag with branching horns figured at Beni Hassan is also unknown in the valley of the Nile, but it is still seen in the vicinity of the natron lakes, as about the oasis, though scarce in the desert between them and the Red Sea." This is doubtless the Cerbus Barbarus. See Stag.

Most of the deer tribe are careful to conceal their calves after birth for a time. May there not be some allusion to this circumstance in Job xxxix., 1, "Canst thou mark when he doth calve?" etc. Perhaps, as the Sept. uniformly renders aydal by ἀνασκός, we may incline to the belief that the Cerbus Barbarus is the deer denoted. The feminine noun ἀνασκή, aydalē, occurs frequently in the O. T. See HIND.

Hart, Levi D.D., a Congregational minister, was born April 10, 1738, at Southington, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1760, studied under Dr. Bellamy, was licensed June 2, 1761, and was ordained pastor at Gristfield, Conn., Nov. 4, 1762, where he labored until his death. During his long pastorate he trained many young men for the ministry. In 1784 he was made a member of Dartmouth College Corporation, and of Yale in 1791. He published several occasional sermons.—Sprague, Annals, i, 590.

Hart Oliver, a Baptist minister, was born in Watertown, Mass., July 5, 1725, joined the Baptist Church in 1741, was licensed to preach in 1746, and was ordained in 1748. In that year he became pastor of the Baptist church in Charleston, S. C., and remained in that office thirty years, with eminent success both as preacher and pastor. In the Revolution he espoused the Whig cause with great ardor, and had to flee from Charleston in 1790 to avoid falling into the hands of the British. He settled near the Baptist Church at Rocky Hill, N. H., where he died Dec. 31, 1795. He published a Discourse on the Death of W. Tumer—Dancing Exploited:—The Christian Temple:—A Gospel Church portrayed.—Benef. Hist. of the Baptists, vol. ii; Sprague, Annals, vi, 47.

Hartley, David, an English practitioner of medicine, and a philosopher of considerable, but transitory reputation. The Scotch school of metaphysics borrow-

ed much from his conclusions; and long posterior theory of Beauty, which was elaborated and amplified by Locke and D'Alembert, Principles of Taste, derived from them its cardinal doctrines. Dr. Hartley occupies a notable position in the history of speculation on other grounds. He presented a curious example of the partial conciliation of Descartes and Locke; he was insensibly to a popular system which transmitted the system of the last of these great men into the materialism of the French Encyclopaedists; he preceded Bonnet, of Geneva, in applying physiological observation to psychological discussion, and thus became the precursor of Cabanis and Brocauissis, of Mole-

schott and Hume. He was contemporary with Col-

lier, and Berkeley, and Hume, and Reid. While the two first were undermining the philosophy of Locke by questioning the credibility of the senses, and Hume was achieving a similar result by impugning the evidences of consciousness, to be imperfectly refuted by Reid's exaggeration of the reliability of external perception, Hartley was still further invalidating the authority of Locke by proposing a purely mechanical explanation of the processes of thought. He is thus even more note-

worthy for his relations to the revolutions of opinion in the eighteenth century, for the suggestive additions he is supposed to have made to the science of the human mind. He was one of the dominant spirits of that agita-

tion of the intellectual waters which heralded and produced the political convulsions of the last century. At the same time, he is the link between widely separated doctrines. He published works on ethics, on metaphysics and science; connecting Locke with Condillac and French sensationalism; reviving neglected positions of

Aristotle, and prefiguring many of the latest manifesta-

tions of scientific materialism.

Life.—The biography of Dr. Hartley is singularly devoid of salient incidents and of general interest. He belonged to that numerous class of very worthy men who run their eminently useful career without experiencing or occasioning any excitement of the first order. But for his philosophical productions, his epitaph might have been Virtus morumque firmitate. He was the son of a respectable clergyman, and was born Aug. 30, 1703, at Armley, Yorkshire, of which parish his father was vicar. He completed his education at Jesus College, Cambridge, and was designed for the paternal vocation. But he was induced to divert his attention to medicine, in consequence of scruples about subscribing the XXXIX Articles, for religious opinion within the bosom of the Anglican Church was much divided at the time by the recent issues of the "Bangorian Controversy." His experience was frequently repeated in other cases in the ensuing years. He retained, however, the fervent but simple piety appropriate to his meditated profession, and never withdrew his interest from the subjects which attract the intelligent theologian. He informs us that the seeds of his doctrine began to germinate when he was twenty-five years of age, though their elaboration was not completed till he was more than forty. His views were given to the world in 1749, in a work entitled Observations on Man, his Frame, his Duties, his Expectations. He survived its publication about eight years, and on the first of August, 1757, which was but a fortnight of completing his fifty-third year. His life had been expended in the diligent and kindly pursuit of his calling at Newark, Bury St. Edmund's, Loudon, and Bath.

Macintosh and Coleridge, while presenting diverse views of Hartley's doctrine, are lavish of encomiums upon his virtues and purity of character. A very brief and very dry biography was composed by his son, with filial regard and quaint delineation. A few fragments from this recondite production will present the philosopher "in the habit and manner as he lived." His person was of middle size, and well proportioned. His complexion fair, his features regular and handsome. His countenance open, ingenious, and animated. He was peculiarly neat in person and attire. He lived in personal intimacy with the learned men of his age, among whom was light, bishop of Durham; Butler, bishop of Durham; Warburton, bishop of Glouceces-
ter; Hoadley, successively bishop of Bangor, Hereford, and Winchester; Pope and Young; Dr. Jortin and Dr. Byron; Hawkins, Browne, and Hooke, the forgotten historian of Rome. The list is sufficiently heterogeneous. "His mind was formed to benevolence and uni-

versal philanthropy. His genius was penetrating and active, his industry indefatigable, his philosophical ob-

servations and attentions unremitting. His natural temper was gay, cheerful, and sociable. He was ad-

dicted to no vice in any part of his life, neither to pride, nor to sensuality, nor intemperance, nor ostentation, nor envy, nor to any sordid self-interest; but his heart was replete with every contrary virtue." Philosophy.—Hartley neither proclaimed nor pro-
duced any scheme of speculation, nor did he pretend to consciousness of that his views were characterized by the sig-

gle of originality. He investigated and endeavored to explain certain phenomena of the human mind, and to discover the machinery of thought. He has be-

queathed a doctrine which has been in part generally adopted, and which has been frequently exaggerated by admirers who have misunderstood, misrepresented, and have been ignorant of the characteristic ground-work on which it had been erected. The source and filiation of his tenets have been indicated by him with what Sir James Mack-

intosh conceives to have been extravagant generosity. Hartley's acknowledgments are, however, made in igno-

rance of his much larger, but more remote obligations to Aristotle. "About eighteen years ago," says he, in
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the preface of his work, "I was informed that the Rev. Mr. Gay, then living, asserted the possibility of deducing all our intellectual pleasures and pains from association. This put me upon considering the power of association, and my disquisitions foreign to the doctrine of association, or, at least, not immediately connected with it, intermixed themselves. "I think, however, that I cannot be called a system maker, since I did not first form a system, and then suit the facts to it, but was carried on by a train of thoughts from one thing to another, frequently without any express design, or even any previous suspicion of the consequences that might arise." Assuredly this is neither a systematic nor a philosophical method of procedure. But this easy dissertation of thought explains the instability, want of consistency, and partial incoherence of Hartley's musings. It also explains the suspected inconsequence with which a portion of the doctrine has been separated from its accompaniments for special acceptance and development.

The characteristic tenets of Hartley have been very clearly and concisely stated by Morell. "The objects of the external world affect in some manner the extreme ends of the nerves, which spread from the brain as a centre to every part of the body. This affection produces a vibration, which is continued along the nerve by the agency of an elastic ether until it reaches the brain, and sets up the phenomena of the sense of sensation. When a sensation has been experienced several times, the vibratory movement from which it arises acquires the tendency to repeat itself spontaneously, even when the external object is not present. These repetitions, or relics of sensations, are ideas, which in their turn affect the properties of the nerve by virtue of mutual association among themselves. . . . The subordinate effects of these principles are easy to be imagined. If all our ideas are but relics of sensations, and all excited spontaneously by the laws of association, it is abundantly evident that the power of the will is totally destitute of reality, that man really has no control of his own mind, that he is the creature of irresistible necessity. Hartley was accordingly a firm necessarian. Another natural effect of the theory of vibrations is materialism." The pernicious consequences of their dogmas are peregrinately displayed by Coleridge, who had at one time been so devoted to the teaching of the Church of England, that he bestowed the name of their author upon his son, Hartley Coleridge.

In this speculation there are three distinct but intimately connected doctrines. 1. The theory of the association of ideas. 2. The physiological and physical mode of producing for this association of perception by the vibrations of an elastic ether through the medullary substance of the nerves. 3. The assertion of the necessity of human actions. The last of these connects itself with the optimism of Leibnitz and the fatalism of Spinoza, through King's Origin of Evil. The second dogma was early abandoned, at least in the form in which it was presented by this author. It was not entirely novel, but it was the most original portion of Hartley's labors, and through it he mainly influenced the development of the French philosophy. It was suggested by one of the queries in Newton's Optics, and may be traced through the animal spirits of Locke and Des Cartes, and the vortices and elastic ether of Des Cartes to the earlier philosophers, and up to Epicurus and Leucippus. It may merit renewed consideration if the physiological psychology now in prospect should give it a new shape. The doctrine of the vibration is regarded as being peculiarly Hartley's own. It was not altogether novel: he himself ascribes its first suggestion to Gay. It is presupposed in many suggestions of Locke, and is descended from a more remote and illusory association, which runs back to the Stoics—"the reputed fountain of so much error, the father of so much wisdom. It received, however, such an ingenious and extensive development from Hartley that Sir James Mackintosh rightly disregards the claims of Gay, but wrongly neglects earlier origins. It is largely incorporated into recent schemes of metaphysics, ethics, and aesthetics, but severed from the mechanical hypothesis which it originated, and has become an integral part of the impossible and unanswerable problem of the nature of human action. In this mutilated form it possesses a unquestionable truth; but still it is only an imperfect explanation of a limited class of mental and moral phenomena, and is easily pressed, as it has often been pushed, to absurd and hazardous conclusions. Coleridge has forcibly signalized its danger, without any express declaration that, wherever it deviates from the simpler exposition of Aristotle, it declines into error and immoral courses.

Literature.—Hartley, Observations on Man, his Frame, his Duty, his Expectations, with Notes and Additions by Herman Andreas Paulus. (London 1791, 3 vols. 8vo.) An abridgment of the original edition had been published by Dr. Priestley (London 1775), with the omission of the doctrine of vibrations and vibratimules. It is from this mutilated presentation that the theory of Association has been principally derived. Hume, Inquiry concerning the Human Understanding, sec. ii. vii. Reid, On the Intellectual Powers. Essay ii., ch. iii. ed. Hamilton—unfortunately, Sir William never supplied the notes to Reid, which he indicates by numbers: Mackintosh, On the Progress of Ethical Philosophy; Dugald Stewart, On the Progress of Metaphysical, Ethical, and Political Philosophy in France, series 2. ed. W. Hamilton; Coleridge, Biographia Literaria, ch. v. viii. Morell, History of Modern Philosophy. (G. F. H.)

Hartlib, Samuel, an English writer of the 17th century, was born of Polish Protestant parents. He came to England about 1640, took an active part in the theological questions of the day, and endeavored to bring about a union of the different churches. He afterwards devoted himself to the improvement of agriculture, etc. Having spent all his fortune in these attempts, he received from Cromwell a pension of £300, which was suppressed at the Restoration. He spent the latter part of his life in retirement, and perhaps in want. The exact time of his death is unknown. He wrote A Relation of that which hath been lately attempted to procure Ecclesiastical Peace among Protestants (London 1641).—Considerations concerning England's Reformation in Church and State (1647, 4to) — Fiseua's doubting concern's proceed (1652, 8vo); some works on Husbandry, etc. Millington has edited his Essays on Agriculture and other subjects. See Gentleman's Magazine, lxxii; Cassius literaria, vol. iii; Chalmers, General Biographical Dictionary.

Hartmann, Anton Theodor, a German Protestant theologian and Orientalist, was born at Dusseldorf June 25, 1774. He studied at Osnabruck, Dortmunt, and Göttingen. After being successively co-rector of the gymnasium of Sest in 1797, rector of the gymnasium of Herford in 1799, and professor in that of Oldenburg in 1804, he was appointed professor of theology in the University of Rostock in 1811. He died at Rostock April 21, 1838. He is especially known for his works on antiquities, and Arabic and Hebrew literature, the principal of which are Aufklärung u. Arien f. Bibelforscher (Oldenburg 1806-7, 2 vols. 8vo) —Die Hebrew in der Putschfische u. des Braut (Ams 1809-1810, 3 vols. 8vo) — Supplement ad J. B. Buxtorf et W. Gesenii Lexic. (Rostock, 1813, 4to) — Thesaurus Linguae Hebraicae antiqui et moderni (Rostock, 1825-1829, 3 parts, 4to) — Lingue mittheilungen in d. Studien der Bücher des A. T. (Rostock, 1818, 8vo) — Histor. Crit. Forschungen über die Bildung, d. Zeitalter u. Plan d. fünf Bücher Moors (Rostock und Gneswold, 1811, 8vo) — Die neue Verbindung d. A. T. mit d. N. (Haute, 1824).—Geschichte d. Frühzeit d. Kriege (Leipsic, 1816, 8vo) — Reformen und Störungen (Dusseldorf, 1892, 8vo.) See Haag, La France Protestante; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxiv, 374.

Hartwig, John Christopher, came to America as chaplain to a German regiment in the service of England during the first French war, as it is called. He
was a member of the first Lutheran synagogue held in this country in 1748. His first regular charge combined several congregations in Huntingdon Co., N. J. He labored for a brief period in Pennsylvania, but the larger portion of his ministry was spent in the state of New York. He died in 1786. The manner of his death furnishes a remarkable instance of the power of the imagination. Forty years before, the impression from a dream on his birthday, that he would live just forty years longer, had become so strong that he felt persuaded the dream would be fulfilled, and his life protracted to the close of his eightieth year. On the day preceding its completion he came to the residence of the Hon. J. R. Livingston, and announced that he had come to his house to die. In the evening he conducted the family devotions, and the next morning arose in apparent health. He breakfasted with the family, and entered freely into conversation until the approach of the hour, as he supposed, for his departure, 11 o'clock A.M. A few minutes before the time, he requested permission to retire. Mr. Livingston, unobserved by him, followed, and noticed that he was undressing. Just as the clock tolled the hour, he was in the act of removing the stock from the neck; at that moment he fell back and expired. Notwithstanding his eccentricities, he possessed many noble qualities, and his name will ever be associated with the institution in Otego Co., N. Y., which bears his name, and of which he may be said to be the founder. The tract of land he received for his services as chaplain he bequeathed principally for the establishment of a theological and missionary institution for the instruction of pious young men for the Lutheran ministry, and for the education of Indians in the Christian religion as missionaries among their own tribes. (M. L. S.)

Harum (Heb. Harūm', חָרֻם, elevated; Sept. ʻı̇s̱̊i̇p), the father of Aharal, the "families" of which latter are enumerated among the posterity of Cox, of the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. iv. 8). B.C. post 1612.

Harumaph (Heb. Charumarph), חָרֻמָרָפ, mub-nosed; Sept. ʼē̂rmāph v. r. ʼē̂rmāph, "father" of Jedahah, which latter was one of the priests who repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. iii. 10). B.C. ante 446.

Haruphite (Heb. Charuphē, כָּרֻפֶּה, with the art.; for which the Masoretic margin more correctly reads ʼi̇r̄it, Haruphite; Sept. ʻārōphē v. r. ʻārōphē, Vulg. Haruphites), an epitaph of Shephardiah, one of the brave adventurers who joined David at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii. 5); so called, probably, as being a native of Haruph. "Jomada the Gederathite," of the preceding verse, was probably from the same place; and as he was so called from being a resident of Gedor (q. v.), it would seem that the epitaph "Haruphite" was an equivalent one, as a descendant from Hareph (q. v.), the founder of Gedor (1 Chron. ii. 51).

Haruz (Heb. Ḥaráz, Ḥáraz, eager, as in Prov. xxii. 27, etc.; Sept. Ἀροῦς, a citizen of Jothab, and father of Meshelemeth, who became the wife of king Manasseh, and mother of king Amon (2 Kings xxi. 19). B.C. ante 604.

Harvard, John, founder of Harvard College, Cambridge, Mass., was born in England, studied at Emanuel College, Cambridge, where he became A.M. in 1655, and entered into the ministry among the Dissenters. Emigrating to America, he became pastor of a Congregational society at Charlestown, Mass., where he preached but a short time, and died Sept. 14, 1658. In his will he left a legacy of nearly $2000 to the high-school of Cambridge. This bequest laid the foundation of the college, to which the trustees gave the name of its benefactor.

Harvest (חָרְסָה, kātser, L. e. reaping; ἀκρούς), the season of gathering grain or fruits. In general, this fell, as now in Palestine, in the middle of April or Abib (John iv. 35), although in many parts, e. g. at Jericho (whose inhabitants were the first to present the first-fruits, Mishnah, Pesach, iv. 8), it began as early as March (Shaw, Trav. p. 291). (See Gerdes, De tempore messis Hebrenorum, Utrecht, 1720.) Dr. Robinson says: "On the 4th and 6th of June, the people of Hebron were just beginning to gather their wheat; on the 11th and 12th, the threshing-flows on the Mount of Olives were in full operation. We had already seen the harvest in the same state of progress on the plains of Gaza on the 19th of May; while at Jericho, on the 12th of May, the threshing-flows had nearly completed their work" (Bib. Res. ii. 99, 100). On the sixteenth day of the first month, Abib or Nisan (Josephus, Ant. iii. 10, 5), a handful of ripe ears was offered before the Lord as the first-fruits; after which it was lawful to put the sickle to the corn (Lev. xxiii. 9-14). (See Schramm, De manipulo hordeaeo, Freiburg. a. O. 1706.) The harvest is described as beginning with the barley, and with the festival of the Passover (Lev. xxiii. 9-14; 2 Sam. xxi. 9, 10; Ruth ii. 23), and ending with the wheat (Gen. xxx. 14; Exod. xxxvi. 22), and with the festival of Pentecost (Exod. xxi. 16). (See Otho, Lex. Robb. p. 684.) In the most ancient times the corn was plucked up by the roots. When the sickle was used, the wheat was either cropped off under the ear, or cut close to the ground; in the former case, the straw was afterwards plucked up for use, and in the latter, the stubble was left and burnt on the ground for

Fig. 1. The harvest. 2, S. Ramper. 3, A woman gleaner; 6, carrying the wheat in the usual rope net. 7, The tithe. 8, Winnowers. 11, The thrashing. 18, 14, carrying the grain to the granary in sacks.
manuse (Isa. xvii, 5; Job xxiv, 34). The sheaves were collected into a heap, or removed to the threshing-floor (Gen. xxxvii, 7; Lev. xxiii, 10-15; Ruth ii, 7-15; Job xxiv, 10, Jer. ix, 22; Mic. iv, 12; Amos ii, 13). In Palestine at the present day, the grain is not bound into sheaves, but is gathered into two large bundles, which are carried home on either side of the backs of animals (Thomson, Land and Book, ii, 323). The reapers were the owners and their children, and men and women servants (Ruth ii, 4, 8, 21, 23; John iv, 36; James v, 4). Refreshments were provided for them, especially drink, of which the gleaners were often allowed to partake (Ruth ii, 12, 13, 14). Some of them were Egyptians; see reaper drinking, and the gleaners applying to share the draught. The time of harvest was a season of very great enjoyment, especially when the crops had been plentiful (Psa. cxxvi, 1-6; Isa. ix, 5). The harvest in Scripture is likewise put for a time of destruction (Hos. vi, 11), according to the word of the Lord, addressing the remnant of Israel in his anger (Jer. ii, 26). The reaper strips off the whole bulk of corn, and the remnant shall be no more in proportion than the scattered ears left to the gleaner. In Joel iii, 18, the last words explain the figurative language which precedes: they are ripe for excision. The same comparison is used in Rev. xiv, 14; xv, 18, where the person referred to as exercising vengeance is Jesus Christ himself, though angels assist in the execution. But harvest is also used in a good sense, as in Matt. ix, 37; Luke x, 2; John iv, 35. So in Jer. vii, 20, "The harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved;" i.e. the time in which we expected to be saved is past. The harvest, in agricultural reckoning, is considered to be the end of the season, being the time appointed for gathering in the fruits of the earth, and finishing the labors of the year. So, in Matt. xiii, 39, our Lord says, "The harvest is the end of the world, and the reapers are the angels." In Matt. ix, 36-38, according to multitudes coming to hear him, remarks, "The harvest truly is plentiful;" i.e. many are willing to receive instruction. See AGRICULTURE.

Harwood, Edward, a learned Unitarian minister, was born in 1729 in Lancashire. In 1754 he became master of a school at Congleton, in Cheshire, from whence he removed in 1763 to Bristol, where he was ordained over a Baptist congregation in 1771. He obtained his degree of D.D. from Edinburgh, through the interest of Dr. Chandler, whose daughter he married. His character, however, was so immoral that his congregation dismissed him; on which he came to London, where he supported himself by teaching the classics and mathematics. In 1782 he obtained the so-called "mystical" school of Stillig and Lavater. He also wrote against Semler and other rationalists, who feared his influence, and his publications were condemned as "unprofitable and pernicious." See U. die verduenkte Aufklarung (Duish, 1789) — Briefe uber Propheten (Duish, 1791), etc. He died in 1795.

Johann Heinrich, another brother, was born Sept. 19, 1760. After helping his parents until he was sixteen years old, he began his studies, was from 1776 to 1779 rector at Emmich, and, having been appointed pastor of a small congregation near Altona, remained there ten years. He returned to Berlin, and spent the last third of his life in the solitude of his remote parish influenced his character, yet he is the most genial of the three brothers, as is seen in his Christliche Schriften (Munster, 1816-19, 2 vols.). He died July 17, 1814.—Herrn, Real-Encyklop. : Pierer, Universal-Lezikon, s. v. (J. N.).

Hasenau, or rather Senehu (Senehu), a briefing [Gesen.] or hates [First], with the art. "aha, Senehu," the name of two Benjamites (but the name has the fem. termination).

1. (Sept. 'Aravvou, Eng. Ver. "Hasenau.") Father of Hodaviah and ancestor of Salli, which last was a chief resident of Jerusalem, apparently after the Captivity (I Chron. ix, 7). B.C. ante 586.

2. (Sept. 'Aravvou, Eng. Ver. "Senehu.") Father of
Joebah, which latter was "second over the city," after the return from Babylon (Neh. xi, 9). B.C. cir. 440.

Hashab'ah (Heb. Chaschabah), חָשְׂכֵּבָּה, and in 1 Chron. xxv, 3; xxvi, 29; 2 Chron. xxvii, 9, the prolonged form Chaschabahu, חָשְׂכֵּבָּה, regarded by Jeroboam; Sept. 'Aṣṣib, 'Aṣṣib, ו'אֶֽסַ֣יָּב, 'Aṣṣib, etc., the name of at least nine descendants of Levi.

1. Son of Amaziah and father of Malluch, of the family of Merari (1 Chron. vi, 45). B.C. long ante 1014.

2. A son of Jeduthun, appointed by David over the twelfth course of Levitical singers (1 Chron. xxv, 9, 19); B.C. 1014.

3. Son of Kemuel, of Hebron, appointed by David at the head of the officers to take charge of the sacred revenue west of the Jordan (1 Chron. xxviii, 30; xxvii, 17); B.C. 1018.

4. One of the chief Levites who made voluntary offerings of victims for the renewal of the Temple services under Josiah (2 Chron. xxx, 9). B.C. 623.

5. Son of Bunu and father of Azrikam, of the family of Merari (1 Chron. ix, 14; Neh. xi, 18). B.C. considerably ante 440.


7. One of the chief priests intrusted by Ezra with the bullion and other valuables for the sacred vessels at Jerusalem (Ezra viii, 24). He is probably the same whose father Hilkiah is mentioned in Neh. xii, 21. B.C. 488.

8. A descendant of Merari, who complied with Ezra's summons for persons to perform the proper Levitical functions at Jerusalem (Ezra viii, 19). B.C. 486.

9. A chief of the Levites (Neh. xii, 4), "ruler of the half part of Keilah," who repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem (iii, 17), and subscribed the covenant of fidelity to Jehovah (x, 11). B.C. 486-440.


Hashabnath (Heb. Chaschabnayku, חָשְׂכֵּבָּנַ֖יַּךְ, q. r. חָשְׂכֵּבָּנָּךְ, Hashabonah), Sept. 'Aṣṣib, "Son of the Levite, a Valley." The name of two men about the time of the return from Babylon.

1. Father of Hattush, which later repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. iii, 10). B.C. ante 440.

2. (One of the Levites appointed by Ezra to interpret the law to the people (Neh. ix, 5). B.C. cir. 410.

Hashbadana (Heb. Chaschhadanahu, חָשְׂכֵּבָּדָֽןָּה, consideration in judging, prob. q. d. considerate judge; Sept. 'Aṣṣib, Vulg. Hasebonana), one of those who stood at Ezra's left hand while he read the law to the people (Neh. vii, 4). B.C. cir. 410.

Hash-Baz. See MAHER-SHALAL-HASH-BAZ.

Ha'shem (Heb. Hashhem, הַשֵּׁם, prob. q. r. הַשֵּׁם, fud; Sept. 'Aṣṣib, Vulg. Asamem), a native of Gideon, and ancestor of two of David's heroes (1 Chron. xi, 94; the Jashen (q. v.) of 2 Sam. xxvii, 32). B.C. ante 1014.

Hashshim. See ASSASSINS.

Hashmannim (Hebrew Chaschmannim, חָשְׂכֵּמִים, probably from חָשְׂכֵּמֶל, Vulg. ignitum), a plural form occurring only in the Heb. of Ps. lxxviii, 31: "Hashmannim [A. V., princes] shall come out of Egypt, Cush shall make her hands to hasten to God." The word has usually been derived from the Arabic Mashkan, rich, hence influential or noble; but a derivation from the civil name of Hermon, "the great mountain in the Shephelah," preserved in the modern Arabic Aschmanan, "the two Ashmans," seems more reasonable. The ancient Egyptian name is Nosamon or Hashmonim, "the abode of eight," the sound of the sigil for eight, however, we take alone from the Greek, and Brugsch reads them Senen (Grec. Inschr. c, 219, 230), but hardly on conclusive grounds. If we suppose that Hashmannim is a proper name and signifies Hermopolites, the mention might be explained by the circumstance that Hermopolis Magna was the great city of the Egyptian Hermes, Thoth, the god of wisdom; and the meaning might therefore be that even the wisest Egyptians should come to the Temple, as well as the distant Cushites.—Smith, s. v. We may add that the name Hasmonean, which was given to the Maccabees or Jewish princes in the interval between the O. and N. T., was, it is supposed, derived from Hashmannim (Hengstenberg, Psalms, ii, 369).

Hashmona'nah (Heb. Chaschmona'nah, חָשְׂכֵּמְנָּה, father; Sept. 'Aṣṣimbetha, יְרֵא אֶשֶׁם בֵּית, Sepherim, a child-smotherer, and in 1 Chron. xxv, 29, 30; apparently near the intersection of wady el-Jerach with wady el-Jeib, in the Arabah. See EXODUS.

Ha'shub (Heb. Chaschab, חָשְׂכָּב, intelligent; Sept. 'Aṣṣib, in Neh. xi, 15 'Aṣṣib, in 1 Chron. ix, 14 'Aṣṣib; Vulg. Hasb, in 1 Chron. ix, 14 Hasb), the name of two or three men about the time of the return from Babylon.

1. A Levite of the family of Merari, son of Azrikam and father of Shemaiah, which last was one of those resident in the "villages of the Netophathites," and having general oversight over the Temple (Neh. xi, 15; 1 Chron. ix, 14, in which latter passage the name is more accurately anglicized Ha'shab). B.C. ante 410.

2. A person who repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem opposite his house (Neh. iii, 21); perhaps the same with the foregoing. B.C. 446.

3. "Son" of Pahath-Moab, and one of those who repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. iii, 11). B.C. ante 446. He is probably the same with one of the chief Israelites who joined in the sacred covenant of Nehemiah (Neh. x, 23). B.C. cir. 410.

Hash'sban (Heb. Chaschban, חָשְׂכֶּבָן, esteemed, a Chaldaizing form for לְשֻּׁבִּין, Lechobin), one of the five sons (exclusive of Zerubbabel) of Pedaiah, the descendant of David (1 Chron. iii, 20; not of Zerubbabel, as at first appears (see Strong's Hymnary and Expos. of the Gospels, p. 17). B.C. cir. 530.

Ha'shum (Heb. Chaschum, חָשְׂכָּם, opulent; Sept. 'Aṣṣib, 'Aṣṣib, 'Aṣṣib, 'Aṣṣib, 'Aṣṣib, the name apparently of two or three men about the time of the Captivity.

1. An Israelite whose posterity (or rather, perhaps, a place whose inhabitants), to the number of 223 males, or 328 in all, returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 19; Neh. vii, 22), some of whom were regarded as "descendants of the heads of the242.312; and a few occasional disconsolate. He also edited Mc Culloch's Geographical Dictionary, published by the Harpers (1843-44).—Sprague, Annals, ii, 526.

Hasmoneans. See ASMONAEAN.

Haspeya (חֵסְפְּיָא), a river and town of Palestine,
HASRAH
near Lebanon, mentioned in the Talmud (Demay, iii); according to Schwarz (Palest. p. 60), identical with the modern Arabic Korom, near the source of the Jordan; evidently the modern Hasbeia, an important place in that region (Robinson's Researches, new ed. iii, 880).

Has'tah (Heb. Chaštah, חַשְׁתָּה, poverty; Sept. 'Es'-hê, v.r. Ἀσάς, Vulg. Haaor), the father (or mother) of Tikhath, and grandfather of Shallum, which last was husband of Huldah the prophetess (2 Chron. xxiv, 22).

The parallel passage (2 Kings xxii, 14) gives the name, prob. by transposition, in the form HARIAS (חָרִיָּס, Sept. 'Athôs, Vulg. Arosas). Hasrah is said to have been "keeper of the wardrobe," perhaps the sacerdotal vestments; if, indeed, that epithet does not rather refer to Shalum. Hasrah is, consequently, ant. 629.

Hassan. See AASSASIN.

Hasse, FRIEDRICH RUDEL, a German theologian, was born at Dresden June 29, 1808. After studying at Leipzig and Berlin, he established himself, in 1834, at the university of the latter city as privatdozent; in 1838 he became extraordinary professor of Church History at the University of Greifswald, and in 1844 ordinary professor at the University of Bonn. Subsequently he was also appointed consistorial councillor. He died in 1862.

His principal work is the excellent monograph Ansat von Canterbury (Leips. 1843–52, 2 vols.), one of the best works of this class, and which had the merit of causing a more generous treatment of the subject of scholasticism. His Geschicthe des alten Bundes (Leips. 1863) is a course of lectures, and, as such, is meritorious. His Kirchengeschichte was published after his death by Köhler (Leips. 1864, 3 vols.). See Krafft, F. R. Hasse (Bonn, 1865); Studien u. Kirkritik, 1867, p. 823.

Hasse', (Neh. iii, 3). See HASSAH.

Has-shub (1 Chron. ix, 14). See HASHAH.

Hat (Heb. Chatshah, חַטְשָׂה, un covered; Sept. Ἀσάς, 'Aσάς; Vulg. Haresia), one of the Nethinim whose descendants returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Exra ii, 43; Neh. vii, 46, in which latter passage the name is less correctly Anglicized "Hasheupha"). B.C. ante 536.

Hat is the rendering of the Eng. Bille for the Chald. ܚܛܐ (karbela), according to Genesis from ܓܕܓܕ, to gird or clothe, as in 1 Chron. xv, 27, a mantle or pallium (Dan. iii, 21; marg. "turbans"). See DRUS.

Hat'ah (Heb. Hathok, חַתֹּכ, perhaps from Persic, herkyt; Sept. Ἀρχαστος, Vulg. Alhach), one of the eunuchs of the palace of Xerxes, appears to wait on Esther, whom she employed in her communications with Mordecai (Esth. iv, 5, 6, 9, 10). B.C. 474.

Hatamen, a word corrupted from achievement, and signifying, in heraldry, the armorial bearings of any person fully embazoned with shield, crest, supporters, etc. The word is used in England for the escutcheon hung up over a door after a funeral, and often in the church. Heraldry is thus supposed to have been formerly connected with religion. The coat was said to be assumed with religious feeling, and at length restored to the sanctuary, in token of thankful acknowledgment to Almighty God. Farrar, Eccles. Dictionary, s. v.

Hate (properly מַהֲרָה, ma'ürah), to regard with a passion contrary to love (Jer. xlix, 4). God's hatred is towards all sinful thoughts and ways. It is a feeling of which all holy beings are conscious in view of sin, and is wholly unlike the hatred which is mentioned in the Scriptures among the works of the flesh (Gal. v, 20), See Anger. When the Hebrews compared a stronger affection with a weaker one, they called the first love, and the other hate, meaning to love in a less degree—"Jacob have I loved, and Esau have I hated" (Rom. ix, 13); i.e. on Jacob have I bestowed privileges and blessings such as are the proofs of affection; I have treated him as one treats a friend whom he loves; but from Esau have I withheld these privileges and blessings, and therefore treated him as one is wont to treat those whom he dislikes. That this refers to the bestowment of temporal blessings, and the withholding of them, is clear, not only from this passage, but from comparing Mal. i, 2, 3; Gen. ix, 26; xxxii, 27; 27, 58. Indeed, as to hated, its meaning here is rather privative than positive. So, "if a man have two wives, one beloved and another hated" (Deut. xxx, 15); i.e. less beloved. When our Saviour says that he who would follow him must hate father and mother, he means that even these dearest earthly friends must be loved in a subordinate degree; so, in the same sense, the follower of Christ is to hate his own life, or be willing to sacrifice it for the love and service of the Redeemer (Gen. xxxix, 30; Deut. xxxi, 16; Prov. xiii, 24; Matt. vi, 24; x, 57; Luke xiv, 26, xxv, 39; see Love.

Hathath (Heb. Chatshah, חַתְשָׂה, terror, as in Job vi, 21; Sept. 'As'shah, son of Othniel and grandson of Kenaz, of the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. iv, 18), consequently also grand-nephew and grandson of Caleb, son of Jephunneh (see ver. 15, and comp. Judg. i, 18). B.C. post 1612.

Hath'ipha [many Hat'ipha], [Hebrew Chatshiphô, חַטְשִׁפֹּה, captured, Sept. Ἀσάπος, 'Aspôs], one of the Nethinim whose posterity returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 54; Neh. vii, 56). B.C. ante 536.

Hatt'ite [some Hatt'ite], [Hebrew Chatshitā, חַטְשִׁית, exploration; Sept. 'Aretâ], one of the "porters" (i.e. Levites, הַנְּפִלָיו, 'Nefilâ, who their posterity returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 42; Neh. vii, 45). B.C. ante 536.

Hatasi ham-Menuchoth (חַטָּסִי הַמֶּנַּעְחוֹת, Chat'zi, etc., midst of the resting-places; Sept. 'Asarim, Vulg. dimidium requisiitonem, Eng. Ver. "half of the Manahethites," marg. "half of the Menuchoth," or "Hatsbam-Menuchoth"), one of the two sons of Shobal, the father of Kiriath-jearim (1 Chron. ii, 52); whence the patronymic for his descendants, Hatasi-ham-Manuchothites (חַטָּסִי מְנַעְחוֹת, Sept. Ἀσάς τῆς Μανιδίου, Vulg. dimidium requisitiones, Eng. Ver. "half of the Manahethites," or "half of the Menuchoth"), in verse 54. B.C. between 1612 and 1098. See MENUCHITE.

Hat-Temarim. See IHAT-TEMARIM.

Hat-Taavah. See KIRBOTH-HAT-TAAVAH.

Hat-Ticon. See HAZAR-HAT-TICON.

Hattem, Pontian van. See HATTEMISTS.

Hattemists, a Dutch sect, named from Pontianus van Hattem, a minister in Zeeland towards the close of the 18th century, who imbibed the sentiments of Spinoza, and was degraded from the pastoral office. He wrote a treatise on the Heidelberg Catechism. The Verschoorists (q. v.) and Hattemists resemble each other. While Van Hattem tried in vain to unite the Verschoorists with his own followers. "The founders of these sects followed the doctrine of absolute decrees into its farthest logical results; they denied the difference between moral good and moral evil; they denied the corruption of man's nature from whence they further concluded that the whole of religion consisted, not in acting, but in suffering: and that all the precepts of Jesus Christ are reducible to this one—that we bear with cheerfulness and patience the events that happen to us through the divine will, and make it our constant and only study to maintain a perfect tranquillity of mind. Thus far they agreed; but the Hattcimists further affirmed that Christ made no expiration for the sins of men by his death, but had only suggested to us, by his mediation, that there was nothing in us that could offend the Deity: this, they say, was Christ's manner of justifying himself and of forgiving our sins before the tribunal of God. It was one of their distinguishing tenets that God does not punish men for their sins, but by their sins."—See MOEHEIM, CH. HISTORY.
HATTIL (Heb. Chattil', שַׁחֵל, weaving; Sept.'Arril, Εὐράκη), one of the descendants of "Solomon's servants" i.e. perh. Gibeonitish Temple slaves), whose posterity returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 57; Neh. vii, 58). B.C. ante 536.

Hatto, bishop of Basel, was born 763, made bishop in 835, and abbot of Reichenau in 865. He was employed by Charlemagne in an embassy to the Greek emperor Nicephorus, to settle the boundaries of both empires. Having, in 825, laid aside his titles and dignities, he died in 836 as a simple monk at Reichenau. Two of his works have descended to us: De visione Wetlinii (Visions of his disciple Wetlini on those suffering in Purgatory and on the Glory of the Saints, done into verse by Walfrid Strabo, and printed in Mahillon, Acta S. Benedicti, iv, 1, 273); 25 cupitata (D'Achery, i, 584).—Herzig, Real-Encyclopädie, s. v.; Clarke, Succession of S. Liter. ii, 471.

Hatton or Otho I, tenth archbishop of Mentz. The time and place of his birth are unknown. In 888 he succeeded Rudolf as abbot of Reichenau, then one of the richest monasteries in Germany. He was in such favor with king Arnulf—thanks to his skill and utter want of principle—that he is said to have held at the same time eleven other abbies. In 891 he was elected archbishop of Mentz: here he built a church to St. George, having obtained the head and another part of the body of the saint from pope Formosus! In August, 893, he presided at the Council of Tribur, where the emper and 22 bishops were present. They voted 58 canons, mostly for the repression of crime. The 8th canon gives an idea of the power Rome held even at that period over the German churches: Honorem sancti romani et apostolici sedem, ut quis nobis sacerdotalis maior dignitas, debeat esse magisra ecclesiasticae ratione quare. . . . . . In verticem ererarum ubi sancta ecclesiae sanctorum hostis adducatur, &c. After Louis's death, in October, 911, Hatto was retained in the council of his successor, Conrad. Hav- ing departed on a journey to Rome, March 13, 918, he died a few days after of fever, according to one account; but, according to others, he was killed at the battle of Hermansteyn by the Danish hero, Hoder. Norn. Rerum, General., xxiii, 539 sq.; Mahillon, Acta Sanct. Ord. Benedict., vii, 118. (J. N. F.)

Hatto or Otho II, surname Bonose, 15th archbishop of Mentz. He was abbot of Fulda, and, at the death of archbishop William of Saxony, March 2, 968, was appointed his successor by Emperor Otho I. Hatto died in 965. The Magdeburg Chronicles state that he was eaten alive by rats as a punishment for his avarice, and because he had, during a famine, compared the poor to these animals; and he is the subject of the well-known legend of the Rat Tower on the Rhine.—See Gallia Christiana, v, col. 456; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, xxiii, 541. (J. N. F.)

Haṭṭuṣ (Heb. Chattuṣ, כַּחַת, prob. assembled [Farn, contester]: Sept.'Ar'ṭā, but Xerōxog in 1 Chron. iii, 22, and v. Artaxō in Ezra viii, 2), the name of several men about or after the time of the return from Babylon.
1. A priest who returned to Jerusalem with Zerubbabel (Neh. xii, 2). B.C. 536.
3. Son of Ishahannah, and one of those who rebuilt the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. iii, 10). B.C. 446. He was possibly the same with No. 2.
4. One of the priests who united in the sacred covenant with Nebemiah (Neh. x, 4). B.C. cir. 410.
5. One of the sons of Neb-zai, among the posterity of
of Zerubbabel (1 Chron. iii, 29), and contemporary with the Nagge of Lake iii, 25 (seeStrong's Hts., and Exs. of the Gospels, p. 17). B.C. somewhat post 406. By some it is identified with No. 2 above, reading Ezra vii, 2 (after the Sept.) thus: "of the sons of David: Hattush, of the sons of Shekaniah." This, however, is not only forbidden by other chronological notices [see Dan., Zech. chs. 6, 7], but rests on the same obvious support for the genuineness of the text itself in question; where, as in vers. 5, we may suppose that a name is missing, or that the name Shekaniah itself has crept in from the latter verse, since it appears nowhere else than as that of a family head. See SIYAM (Heb. Shekhaniah) (Heb. Chavvaonna, Haan Nielsen Haune was born in Rennes, France, April 3, 1771. He had strong religious impressions in youth, which produced a gloomy state of mind. But in 1795 he passed through a change which filled him with joy. Ever after, amid all vicissitudes, he was a cheerful Christian. He soon began to preach, and made a powerful impression on the public mind. He travelled extensively in Norway and Denmark, wrote many tracts, and in 1804 established a printing-office in Christiansand to disseminate his sentiments. He obtained many followers, but finally, through the influence of the clergy, was punished with a heavy fine and imprisonment. In this he lived in Rennes until his death in 1824. In doctrine, Haune differed from evangelical Protestants in general in but few points: e.g. he held that the ministry is a common duty, and that specially ordained and separated ministers are unnecessary: also that Church creeds and Confessions are of no great account. He properly placed great stress upon faith and its effects, but it was in a one-sided way. Nevertheless, his labors contributed largely to the revival of evangelical religion. The party called Hauganeness is still numerous in Norway: they contend against the laxness of Church discipline and against Rationalism, and have much influence on the people. See Harper, p. 547; Gregoire, Hist. des Sectes Relig. t. v.; Stüsslin and Tschirner, Archiv f. Kirchengeschichte, ii, 534; Hagenhagen, Hist. of the Church in 18th and 19th Centuries, trans. by Hurst, ii, 389; Stud. u. Kritiken, 1849, p.749 sq.

Hau' ran (Heb. Charram') [7727]; Sept. Ἀναφάντις and Ἰμνικής, the Auranitis of Josephus and others, the Haoran of the Arabs, so called prob. from the multitude of caves, discovered there, which even at the present day deeply shadow the district or region of Syria, south of Damascus, east of Gaulonitis (Golan) and Bashan, and west of Trachonitis, extending from the Jabkob to the territory of Damascus-Syria; mentioned only in Ez. xlvii, 16, 18, in defining the north-eastern border of the Promised Land. It was probably of small extent originally, but received extensive additions from the Romans under the name of Auranitis. Josephus frequently mentions Auranitis in connection with Trachonitis, Batanea, and Gaulonitis, which with it constituted the ancient kingdom of Bashan (War, i, 29, 4, ii, 17, 4). It formed part of that "gigantior ymasas" referred to by Luke (iii, 1) as subject to Philip the tetrarch (comp. Joseph. Ant. xvii, 11, 4.). It is bounded on the west by Gaulo- nitis, on the north by the wild and rocky district of Trachonitis, on the east by the mountainous region of Batanea, and on the south by the great plain of Gilead. It is represented by Burckhardt (Travels in Syria, p. 51, 211, 285, 291) as a volcanic region, composed of porous tufa, pumice, and basalt, with the remains of a crater on the tell Shoba, which is on its eastern border. It produces, however, crops of corn, and has many patches of luxuriant herbage, which are frequented in summer;
HAURANNE

by the Arab tribes for pasturage. The surface is perfectly flat, and not a stone is to be seen save on the few low volcanic tells that rise up here and there like islands in a sea. It contains upwards of a hundred towns and villages, most of them now deserted, though not ruined. The buildings in many of these are remarkable for the great trees that grow around them, and the roofs and doors are of stone, evidently of remote antiquity (see Porter’s Five Years in Damascus, vol. ii.). According to E. Smith (in Robinson’s Researches, iii. Append. p. 130-157), the modern province of Hauran is regarded by the natives as consisting of three parts, called el-Menah, el-Lejah, and el-Abel. The first of these terms designates the plains of Hauran as above defined, extending through its whole length, from wady el-Ajam on the north to the desert on the south. On the west of it is Jeidur, Jaulan, and Jebel Ajlin; and on the east the Lejah and Jebel Hauran. It has a gentle undulating surface, is arable throughout, and, in general, very fertile. With the rest of Hauran, it is the granary of Damascus. The soil belongs to the government, and nothing but grain is cultivated. Hardy a tree appears anywhere. The region still abounds in caves, which the inhabitants have excavated partly as cellars for the collection of water, and partly for granaries in which to secure their grain from plunderers. Edhemisken is considered the capital of the whole Hauran, being the residence of the chief of all its sheiks. The inhabitants of this district are chiefly Muslems, who in manner of dress resemble the Bedouins, and there is sprinkling also of professed Christians, and latterly of the Druses (Murray’s Handbook, p. 499). The second division, or el-Lejah, lying east of the Nukrah and north of the mountains, has an elevation about the same as that of the Nukrah, but it is said to be almost a complete labyrinth of ravines among the rocks. The Lejah is the resort of several small tribes of Bedawin, who make it their home, and who continually issue forth from their rocky fastnesses on predatory excursions, and attack, plunder, or destroy, as suits their purpose. They have had the same character from a very remote period. The third division is the portion of Hauran, and appears from the north-west, as an isolated range, with the conical peak called Kelb and Kuleib Hauran (the dog), which is probably an extinct volcano, near it southern extremity. But from the neighborhood of Busrat it is discovered that a lower continuation exists according to our usual idea, the lower range stands the castle of Sulhadt, distinctly seen from Busrat. This mountain is perhaps the Aladsamas of Ptolemy. (See Lightfoot, Op. i., 316; ii. 474; Reland, Palest. p. 190; Journal of Soc. Lit. July, 1854; Graham, in Journ. Roy. Geol. Soc. i. 358, p. 354; Porter, Handbook, ii. 507; Stanley, Jewish Church, ii. 213.)

Hauranne. See DUVYGIER.

HAUSMANN, NICOLAUS, an intimate friend of Luther, and the reformer of the city of Zwiekaun and the duchy of Anhalt, was born in 1479 at Freiberg. He became at first preacher at Schneeburg, subsequently at Zwiekaun, where he had many and severe controversies with the adherents of Thomas Münzer. In 1532 he was appointed pastor of Dessau, having been warmly recommended by Luther. In 1538 he accepted a call as superintendent to his native town Freiberg, but while preaching his first sermon (Nov. 6) he was struck with apoplexy, which caused his immediate death. Luther deeply bemoaned his death, and praised him as a man of God. Two opinions are common on the reformation in Zwiekaun have been published by Pfeiler (Zeitschrift für die historische Theologie, 1852). See O. G. Schmidt, Nic. Hausmann, der Freund Luther’s (Lpz. 1860). (A. S.)

HAUETAGE, JEAN, a French Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Puy Morin, near Toulouse, in 1735. He was educated by the Jesuits, but left them, and became a Jansenist. Having been ordained priest, he became vicar in a country church of the diocese of Toulouse, but his opinions being suspected, he was suspended. In 1766 he became sublector of the college of Auxerre, and canon of that city, but his Jansenistic views caused him to be again prosecuted, and in 1773 he was condemned to be whipped, branded, and sent to hard labor for six years. In 1779 he was banished. Hauetage had travelled through Southern Europe in company with another abbot, Duparc de Bellegarde, preaching his doctrines everywhere. While at Lausanne in 1775 and the following years, they published l’Exvra d’Astone Arnaud (4 vols. 8vo., 1773). In 1776 Hauetage published an abridgment of the Institution et Instruction chrétiennes (1785, 12mo.), and the 3d part of the Nouvelles ecclésiastiques, 1761-1790 (1791, 4to.). During the Revolution, and until his death, Feb. 18, 1816, he devoted himself to teaching. See Silvy, Éloge de M. l’abbé Hauetage (Paris, 1816, 8vo.); Barher, Dict. des Anonymes; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, xxii., 574.

HAVELOCK, HENRY, an eminent English soldier and Christian, was born at Bishop Wearmouth, April 5, 1785. He was educated under the Rev. J. Bradley, curate of Dartford, Kent, until 1804, when he was sent to the Charterhouse. He afterwards became a pupil at the Bedowin school; there he was a special pleader of the day, to study law; but in the following year he followed his brother William into the army, and was appointed to the Rifle Brigade, where he became the 59th. After serving in England, Ireland, and Scotland, Havelock embarked for India in 1823. To serve in that part of the world was his own choice, for which he had qualified himself by studying Hindostanee and Persian before leaving England. During the voyage a great change passed on his religious views, and on arriving with his regiment in India, he determined to devote his attention to the spiritual welfare of his men, and to assemble them in public services, an opportunity that he met with during the Scriptures and devotional exercises, which he continued to do throughout the whole of his after career. In 1841 he was appointed Persian interpreter to general Elphinstone, and took part in the memorable defence of Jellalabad. On the completion of the works, Havelock suggested to general Sales to assemble the garrison and give thanks to Almighty God, who had enabled them to complete the fortifications necessary for their protection. "The suggestion was approved, and the command given. 'Let us pray,' said a well-known voice among the men. 'Let us pray.' Before the sun rose before the presence of the great God those soldiers reverently bowed, one and all of them, whilst the impulsive of a devout and grateful heart he poured forth supplication and praise in the name of the Great High-Priest." This incident is an illustration of Havelock's religious life during the whole of his military career. In the great Indian rebellion of 1857 he distinguished himself among a series of the most brilliant achievements in the annals of warfare; but still he was distinguished most by his personal piety, which shone resplendently amid the horrors of war. He died of dysentery at Alumbagh, Nov. 25, 1857, on the very day before the announcement of his elevation to the baronetcy under the title "Havelock of Lucknow," which was inherited by his eldest son, Henry Marshman Havelock (born 1805). He wrote, History of the Ava Campaigns (London, 1827)—Memoirs of the Afghan Campaign (Lond. 1841). See Brock’s Geographical Sketch of Havelock (Lond. 1858, 12mo.); Marshman, Memoirs of Sir Henry Havelock (Lond. 1868).

HAVEN (חֹוֶן, Choph, Gen. xlv. 13, a sea-side or "coast," as elsewhere rendered; בֹּאֵן, mabhasa', a refuge, hence a harbor, Ps. cvii. 90; λιμαναν, Acts xxvii. 12). The Phoenician part of the coast of Palestine had several fine harbors [see PHOENICIA], and some such were also in possession of the Hebrews: such were Cesarea and the others were Caesarea Philippi, which were afterwards used for coastwise communication (1 Macc. iv. 5, 34; Josephus, Ant. xx, 9, 6). The port (נְּבֵא נְבֵא) of Tyre
HAVEN

(q. v.) was the most famous on the whole Mediterranean shore (Ezek. xxvii, 8). A harbor is called the W. in Chaldee, also in Samaritan. See Navigation.

The Cretan harbor called Fair Haven (q. v.), Kaloai Amyntas, is incidentally mentioned in the N.T. (Acts xxvii, 8). See CRETE.

HAVENAS, James, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Mason Co., Ky., December 25, 1735. At eighteen he received license to preach, and in 1816 he entered the traveling ministry in the Ohio Conference. He served twelve years in circuits, and twenty-four as presiding elder. Possessing a strong constitutional and vigorous intellect, he taxed them both to the utmost in remedying the defects of his early education, and in making "full proof of his ministry." He became one of the most powerful preachers of his time, and contributed perhaps as much as any other man to build up the Church in the West, especially in Indiana, where the last forty years of his life were spent. He died in November, 1864. —Minutes of Conference, 1865, p. 190.

Hävernick, Heinrich Andreas Christoph, a German theologian, was born at Steinfurt, near Kevelaer, in 1805. He studied at Halle, and was one of the two students whose notes on the theological lectures of Wegscheider and Gesenius were used to institute a trial against those prominent champions of Rationalism. At the University of Berlin he closely attached himself to Heugenstengel. In 1834 he established himself as privatdozent at Rostock, and in 1841 he became ordinary professor of theology at Königsberg. He died in 1845 at New Strelitz. The exegetical works of Hävernick are counted among the most learned of the modern school. The most important of them are Commentarii über das Buch Daniel (Hamburg, 1832); —Mililungen de theologia reformata (Geneva, 1833); —Handbuch der krit. Einleitung in das A.T. (Erangen, 1836-39, 2 vols.; 2 ed. by Keil, 1849-54); —Neue Krit. Untersuchungen ü. das Buch Daniel (Hamburg, 1844); —Einleitung in das Buch Daniel (Leipzig, 1847); —d. Theologie des A.T. (ed. by Hahn, Frankf., 1848); 2d ed. by Schurz, Frankf., 1863). Translations: Gen. Introd. to G. T. (Edinb., 1852); —Introd. to the Pentateuch (Edinb., 1859).

HAVILAH (Heb. Chavilah', חַוֵ'לָה, signif. unknown; Sept. Χαβίλη, but Ewald in Gen. x. 29, Χαβίλα in Gen. ii. 11, and 1 Chron. i. 29; Vulg. Hevilia, but Heuita in Gen. ii. 11), the name of one of three regions; also perhaps of two men (B.C. cir. 2400).

1. A land rich in gold, bdellium, and shaham, mentioned in Gen. ii. 11, as flowed around (or through) by the river Pishon, in the geographical description of Paradise. Some identify this Havilah with one of those following; but others take it to be the Chwala, on the Caspian Sea, whence it seems to have said that it derived the name of Chalassiankyre (Sea of Chwala); and others suppose it a general name for India, in which case the river Pison, mentioned as surrounding it, would be identified with the Ganges, or even the Indus. Others again, who regard the Pishon as the Phasis, make Havilah to be Cockhis, for which some think there is the distinctive name in Scripture of the "Cardham" (q. v.). In Gen. ii. 11, 12, it is further described as the land where the best gold was found, and which was, besides, rich in the treasures of the bdellium and the stone shaham. That the name is derived from some natural peculiarity is evident from the presence of the article with all the terms. Whatever may be the true meaning of bdellium, be it carmuncula, or similar, balsamum, ebony, pepper, cloves, beryl, pearl, diamond, or emerald, all these detect its presence, under or one of these forms, which they select as the Havilah most appropriate to their own theory. As little difficulty is presented by the shaham: call it onyx, sardonix, emerald, sapphire, beryl, or sardius, it would be hard indeed if some of these precious stones could not be found in any conceivable locality to support even the most far-fetched and improbable conclusions. That Havilah is part of India through which the Ganges flows, and, more generally, the eastern region of the earth; that it is to be found in Susiana (Hopkinson), in Ava (Bottmann), or in the Ural region (Rauzer), are conclusions necessarily following upon the assumptions with regard to the Pison, Hartmann, Ficcarelli, and Rosenmüller, which are a sort of Colchis, the scene of the legend of the Golden Fleece. The Phasis was said to flow over golden sands, and gold was carried down by the mountain-torrents (Strabo x i, 2, § 19). The crystal (bdelloch) of Scythia was renowned (Sol. v. 13), and the emerald of this country were as far superior to other emeralds as the latter were to other precious stones (Pliny, Hist. Nat. xxxvii, 17), all which seems to prove that Havilah was Colchis. Rosenmüller argues, with much force, if the Phasis be the Pison, the land of Havilah must be Colchis, supposing that by this country the Hebrews had the idea of a Pontic or Northern India. In like manner Leclerc, having previously determined that the Pison must be the Chryssorhaxos, finds Havilah not far from Coele-Syria. Hasse (Entdeck. p. 49, 50, quoted by Rosenmüller) compares Havilah with the "Yasia of Herodotus (Strabo x i, 2). In the neighboring regions are Scythians, and the dragon which guarded the land of gold. Discussions about the site of Havilah will be found in all the chief Biblical commentators ancient and modern, as well as in Hottinger (Genesis Disserta.,) Huett (De Ist. Parad.,) Bochart (Pleynii, ii. ii, p. 493; Michaelis (Spicilegium, i. xiii, 298; Spenner (Parables, p. 105), Niebuhr and many other writers. The clearest and best account of any may be derived from Kalisch (Genesis, p. 239, 249, 267, etc.), who also gives a long list of those who have examined the subject (p. 109-102). The idea that the Phasis is not the Pison, and that the Phasis belong to the Fucurla has not been. Discussion HAS been made, but, in the light of the discoveries of the day, it is not at all probable that Havilah can be identified with either of those places mentioned, since they were evidently in or near Arabia; and the associated regions in the Elenic account are all in the neighborhood of Armenia or Ararat, near the sources of the Tigris and Euphrates. The most consistent conclusion, therefore, is that the Fucurla locates the Havilah in question at the north-eastern corner of Asia Minor, i.e. substantially Colchis. See PISON.

2. A district in Arabia Felix, deriving its name from the second son of Cash (Gen. x. 7); or, according to others, from the second son of Joktan (Gen. x. 29; compare xxxvii, 10). Some find in the other nameless son of that word occurs it is always used to designate a country, some doubt whether persons of this name ever existed; the more so as other names of countries (Ophir, Mizraim, Canaan, Sidon), and the collective names of tribes (Kittim, Dodanim), are freely introduced into the genealogy, which is undoubtedly arranged with partial reference to geographical distribution, as well as direct descent [see Sheba; Dedan, etc.] (see Kalisch, Genesis, p. 287). On this supposition it is not difficult to account for the fact that the people of Havilah appear as descendants both of the Hamites and of the Shemitic tribes. If they were originally of Shemitic extraction (and on this point we have no data which could enable us to decide), we must suppose that by peaceful emigration or hostile invasion they overflowed into the territory occupied by Hamites, or adopted the name and habits of their neighbors in consequence (as, e. v., Kittim, v), the name as a sign of mingled origin, and are therefore mentioned twice over by reason of their local position in two distinct regions. It would depend on circumstances whether an invading or encroaching tribe gave its name to, or derived its name from the tribe it was possessed, so that whether Havilah was originally Khitite or Dedanite might be a matter of mere conjecture; but by admitting some such principle as the one mentioned we remove from the book of Genesis a number of apparent perplexities (Kalisch, Genesis, p. 254). See UN. To regard the repetition of the name as due to carelessness or error is a method of ex-
Haweth-Jafr

planation which does not deserve the name of criticism. See H.A.M.

Assuming, then, that the districts indicated in Gen. x, 7, 29, were contiguous, if not in reality identical, we have to fix on their geographical position. Various derivations of the word have been suggested, but the modern Arabic form Halab (Gen. xxxii, 29), is too vague to give us any assistance. Looking for preciser indications, we find in Gen. xxxv, 18 that the descendants of Ishmael "dwelt from Haran unto Shur that is before Egypt as thou goest towards Assyria;" and in 1 Sam. xvi, 7 we read that Saul "smote the Amalekites from Haran until thou comest to Shur that is before Egypt." Without entering into the question why the Amalekites are represented as possessing the country which formerly belonged to the Ishmaelites, it is clear that these verses fix the general position of Havilah as a country lying somewhere to the southward and eastward of Palestine. Further than this, the Cushite Havilah in Gen. x, 7 is mentioned in connection with Seba, Sabathah, and Raamah; and the Joktanite Havilah (Gen. x, 29) in connection with Ophir, Jobab, etc. Now, as all these places lay on or between the Arabian and Persian gulfs, we may infer, with tolerable certainty that Havilah in both instances designates the same country, extending at least from the Persian to the Arabian Gulf, and on account of its vast extent easily divided into two distinct parts* (Kalsisch, Gen. p. 93). See Shur.

The only method of fixing more nearly the centres of these two divisions of Havilah is to look for some trace of the name yet existing. But, although Oriental names linger with great vitality in the regions where they have arisen, yet the frequent transference of names, caused by trade or by political revolutions, renders such indication very uncertain (Von Bohlen, on Gen. x, 7). We shall therefore leave out of consideration that Havilah in both instances designates the same country, extending at least from the Persian to the Arabian Gulf, and on account of its vast extent easily divided into two distinct parts (Kalsisch, Gen. p. 93).

The district of Khawan lies between the city of Sanaa and the Hijaz, i.e. in the north-western portion of Yemen. It took its name, according to the Arabs, from Khawan, a descendant of Khatib [see Joktan] (Marzabili, s. v.), or, as some say, of Kahlan, brother of Hinyer (Caussin, Essæi, i, 118, and Tab. ii). This genealogy says little more than that the name was Joktanite; and the difference between Khatib and Kahlan may be neglected, both being descendants of the first Joktanite settlement and the whole of these early traditions pointing to a Joktanite settlement, without perhaps a distinct preservation of Joktan's name, and certainly none of a correct genealogy from him downwards.

Khawan is a fertile territory, embracing a large part of myrrhiferous Arabia, mountainous, with plenty of water, and containing a large population. It is a trade of Arabia better known to both ancients and moderns than the rest of the Yemen, and the eastern and central provinces. It adjoins Najran (the district and town of that name), mentioned in the account of the expedition of Elia Galles, and the scene of great persecutions of the Christians by Dha-Nawas, the last of the Tubaabs before the Abyssinian conquest of Arabia, in the year 529 of our era (compare Caussin, Essæi, i, 121 sq.)

Ha'voth-Jafr (Heb. Chavoth' Yitv' "בַּהֲוֹת יִתְוָה לָעֲרָה", "the dwelling places of a desert", or possibly "the beautiful city", a title full of poetry). This place is probably the modern Fahwah, on the chief road between the Hadramaut and the coast, and it is mentioned as a notable place in the biblical history (see above).

Hawes, Thomas, an English theologian, was born at Truro (Cornwall) in 1734. He was first apprenticed to a druggist, but afterwards studied at Christ College, Cambridge, and took the degree of B.L. He soon after entered the ordination course, and became assistant preacher to the chaplain of Lock Hospital. The latter afterwards gave him the rectoryship of All-Saints (Northamptonshire); and the countess of Huntington gave him also the direction of several chapels she had erected, and of her seminary for theological students. He became director of the London Missionary Society at its foundation, and died Feb. 11, 1820. He published several books of practical, but not of scientific value; among them are History of the Church (Lond. 1800, 3 vols. 8vo) — Life of the Rev. William Romaine (Lond. 1798, 8vo) — State of the Evangelical Expositor, and the Evangelical Expositor, a Comment on the Bible (Lond. 1765, 2 vols. fol. of little value) — New Translation of the New Testament (Lond. 1765, 8vo) — Communicant's Companion (Lond. 1763, 12mo; often reprinted) — Fifteen Sermons (new ed. Oxford, 1855, 12mo). See Rose, New Gen. Eclog. Dict. i, 123; Rose, Essays, Gen. iii, 124; xxiii, 694.

Hawes, Jacob, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born in Medway, Mass., Dec. 22, 1789. His parents were poor, and his early opportunities of education were therefore limited. After his conversion in 1807, he gave all the time he could spare from his trade to study, and in 1809 he entered Brown University. During his college course he supported himself chiefly by writing books and by teaching school in vacation. He graduated A.B. with honor in 1813. After completing the theological...
Hawk course at Andover (1818), he was settled as pastor of the First Congregational Church of Hartford, in which he remained until 1862, when the Rev. G. H. Gould was instilled as pastor. Dr. Hawes, however, remained as pastor emeritus, preaching frequently, as his strength would admit. He died at Gilead, Conn., June 5, 1867. His long pastorate at Hartford was eminently successful: more than 1500 persons joined the Church under his ministry. The great Christian enterprises, such as the Foreign Mission cause, Home Missions, Bible and Tract Distribution, the Christian Press, Education for the Ministry, lay near his heart, and occupied a very large share of his time and labors. His writings were chiefly practical, and included Lectures to Young Men (1828, which had an immense circulation both in America and in Great Britain)—Tribute to the Pilgrims (1830)—Memoir of Normand Smith (1839)—Letters on Universalism (1840)—Character everything for the Young (1843)—The Religion of the East (1845)—An Offering for Home Missionsaries (a volume of sermons, of which he gave 800 copies to the Home Missionary Society for distribution).—Independent, June 13, 1867; Congregationalist, June 1867.

Hawk (♀, nēs, from its swift flight; Sept. Hāpā; Vulg. acipiter), an English name in an altered form of the old word fæc or fæk, and in natural history representing several genera of raptorial birds; as does the Arabic nās, and no doubt, also, the Hebrew nēs, a term expressive of strong and rapid flight, and therefore highly appropriate to the hawk: the similarity of the Latin name nāsus is worthy of notice. The hawk is noticed as an uncivil bird (Lev. xi, 16; Deut. xiv, 13), and as "stretching her wings toward the south" (Job xxxix, 36)—an expression which has been variously understood as referring either to the migratory habits of the bird, one species alone being an exception to the general rule in this respect (Pliny, x, 9); or to its mourning, and seeking the warmth of the sun's rays in consequence (Bochart, Hieroz. iii, 9); or, lastly, to the opinion prevalent in ancient times, that it was the only bird whose keen eye could bear the direct rays of the sun (Elian, II. A. x. 14). The hawk, though not migratory in all countries, is so in the south of Europe and in parts of Asia. It was common in Syria and the surrounding countries. In Egypt one species was regarded as sacred, and frequently appears on the ancient monuments. Western Asia and Lower Egypt, and consequently the intermediate territory of Syria and Palestine, are the habitations or transitory residence of a considerable number of species of the order Raptiformes, which, even including the shortest-winged, have great powers of flight, are remarkably enterprising, live to a great age, are migratory, or followers upon birds of passage, or remain in a region so abundantly stocked with pigeon and turtle-dove as Palestine, and affording such variety of ground to hunt their particular prey, abounding as it does in mountain and forest, plain, desert, marsh, river, and sea-coast. See Night-hawk.

Falcons, or the "noble" birds of prey used for hawking, have for many ages been objects of great interest, and still continue to be imported from distant countries. The Falco communis, or peregrine falcon, is so generally diffused as to occur even in New Holland and South America. As a type of the genus, we may add that it has the two foremost quills-feathers of almost equal length, and that when these quills are closed they nearly reach the end of the tail. On each side of the crooked point of the bill there is an angle or prominent tooth, and from the nostrils backwards a black streak passes beneath the eye and forms a patch on each side of the throat, giving the bird its congeners a whiskered and menacing aspect. Next we may place Falco Acreoris, the sacred hawk of Egypt, in reality the same as, or a mere variety of the peregrine. Immemorial representations of it occur in Egyptian monuments, in the character of Hor-hat, or bird of victory; also an emblem of Re, the Sun, and numerous other divinities (Sir J. G. Wilkinson, Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians, 24 series). The hobby, Falco subbuteo, is no doubt a second or third species of sacred hawk, having similar whiskers. Both this bird and the tractable merlin, Falco aquilon, are used in the falconry of the inferior Moslem land-owners of Asiatic Turkey. Besides these, the kestrel, Falco tinnunculus, occurs in Syria, and Falco tinnunculoides, or lesser kestrel, in Egypt; and it is probable that both species visit these two territories according to the seasons. To these we may add the gersalcon, Falco ger- falco, which is of third larger than the last, it is imported from Tartary, and sold at Constantinople, Aleppo, and Damascus. The great birds fly at antelopes, bustards, cranes, etc.; and of the genus Astur, with shorter wings than true falcons, the goshawk, Falco polambarus, and the falcon gentilis, Falco genalis, are either imported, or taken in their nests, and used to fly at lower and more game. It is among the above that the seven species of hunting hawks enumerated by Dr. Russell must be sought; though, from the circumstance that the Arabic names of the birds alone were known to him, it is difficult to assign their scientific denominations. The smaller and less powerful hawks of the genus Niaus are mostly in use on account of the sport they afford, being less fatiguing, as they are employed to fly at pigeons, partridges, quails, pternoles, katta, and other species of ganges. There are various other raptorial birds, not here enumerated, found in Syria, Arabia, and Egypt. See Eagle; Gladius; Kite; Osprey; Vultures.

The generic character of the Heb. word nēs appears from the expression in Deut. and Lev. "after his kind," as including various species of the Falconidae, with more especial allusion, perhaps, to the small diurnal birds, such as the kestrel, Falco tinnunculus, or the owlet, Falco peregrinus. These are peculiarly fitted for taking partridges, snail-grouse, quails, heron, gazelles, hares, etc. Dr. Russell (Nat. Hist. of Aleppo, i, 186; 2d ed.) has given the Arabic names of several falcons, but it is probable that some at least of these names apply rather to the different sexes than to distinct species. See a graphic description of the sport of falconry, as pursued by the Arabs of N. Africa, in the 1664, i, 284. No representation of the Monument of Aset, of ancient Egypt (see Wilkinson, Anc. of Egypt, i, 221), neither is there any definite allusion to falconry in the Bible.

Peregrine Falcon.
Hawker, Cicero Stephen, D.D., a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Newbern, N. C., in 1812. He passed A.B. at the University of North Carolina in 1839, and studied law, but never practiced. In 1834 he was ordained deacon, and in 1835 priest, in the Protestant Episcopal Church. His parish was Trinity Church, Sangert's, N. Y. (1856); in 1837 he removed to Buffalo, N. Y., and shortly afterwards to Christ Church, St. Louis, Mo. In 1844 he was consecrated bishop of the diocese of Missouri, in which office he labored diligently and successfully until his health gave way. He died at St. Louis April 19, 1860.

Hawks, Francis Lister, D.D., an eminent minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born at Newbern, N. C., June 10, 1798. He passed A.B. at the University of North Carolina in 1815; afterwards studied law, and was admitted to the bar in 1819. In 1823 he was elected to the Legislature of N. C., and at once distinguished for eloquence. After a few years of very successful practice as a lawyer, he determined to enter the ministry, and became a student under Dr. Green, of Hillsboro' (afterwards bishop Green). In 1827 he was ordained deacon; in 1829 became the assistant of Dr. Crowell, rector of Trinity Church, New Haven, Conn. In the same year he was called to be assistant to bishop White, then rector of St. James's Church, Philadelphia. In 1830 he was elected professor of divinity in Washington College (now Trinity), Hartford, Conn.; in 1831 he was elected to the presidency of the College. His name was recognised as among the chief pulpits orators of the city. In the same year he was called to the rectorship of St. Thomas's Church, N.Y. In 1835 he was elected missionary bishop of the South-west, but declined the appointment. In the same year the General Convention appointed him to collect documents on the history of the Church, and to act as conservator of the same. He spent several months in England in 1836, and returned with eighteenfolio volumes of manuscript, illustrative of the planting and early history of the Protestant Episcopal Church. From these materials he prepared his Contributions to the Ecclesiastical and History of the United States (vol. i, Virginia, 1836; vol. ii, Maryland, 1839). It is greatly to be regretted that Dr. Hawks did not continue this valuable work. In 1837, in connection with the Rev. C. S. Henry, he established the New York Historical Society, and became one of its first presidents; the character of which ten volumes were published. In 1839 he founded a school called St. Thomas's Hall, at Bushing, L. I., and made heavy outlays upon the buildings, grounds, etc., which involved him in serious financial embarrassments, ending in the ruin of the school in 1845. He was at this time threatened with extravagance, his character was compromised; but no one now believes the latter charge. However, he resigned his charge of St. Thomas's Church, and removed to Mississippi, where he established a school at Holly Springs. In 1844 he was elected bishop of Mississippi; objections were made on account of his troubles in connection with St. Thomas's Hall, but his vindication was so complete that the Convention adopted a resolution declaring his innocence. Nevertheless, he declined the bishopric, and accepted the rectorship of Christ Church, New Orleans, where he remained for five years, during part of which time he served as president of the University of Louisiana. In 1849 he accepted the rectorship of the Church of the Mediator, New York, which was afterwards merged in Calvary parish, of which he remained rector until 1862. His friends raised $30,000 to clear his church of debt, and adjust certain old claims from St. Thomas's Hall; they also settled upon him a liberal salary. Here he regained his old pre-eminence as a preacher, and at the same time devoted himself to active literary labors. In 1862 he was elected bishop of Rhode Island, but declined the office. In 1862, owing to differences of opinion between him and his parish concerning the Civil War, he resigned the rectorship of Calvary; and, after a short stay in Baltimore, he was called to take charge of the new par-
of Our Saviour in New York. His last public labor was a service at the laying of the corner-stone of the new church, Sept. 4, 1866; on the 26th of that month he died. Dr. Hawley's writings include, besides Law Reports, the following: Contributions to the Ecclesiastical History of the United States (1830-39, 2 vols. 8vo); — Contributions to the favourite insular and continental Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States (1841, 8vo): —Egypt and its Monuments (N. Y. 1849, 8vo): —Auricular Confession (1849, 12mo): —Documentary History of the Prot. E. Church, containing Documents concerning the Church in Connecticut (edited in connection with W. S. Parker, N. Y. 1849, 8vo); besides various historical and juvenile books. He also contributed largely to the New York Review, the Church Record, and other periodicals. —Amer. Quarterly Church Review, 1867, art. 1; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i. 804.

Hawley, Gideon, a Congregational minister, was born Nov. 5, 1727 (O. S.), in Bridgeport, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1749, and, having entered the ministry, went to Stockbridge in 1752 as missionary to the Indians. In May, 1753, in company with Timo-thy Woodbridge, he started through the wilderness, and reached the Susquehanna at Onohoghawgwe, where he planted a mission, but was compelled to leave it by the French War, May, 1756. Having returned to Boston, he went again under command of Gen. Crown Point; and April 10, 1758, was installed pastor over the Indians at Marshpee, where he remained until his death, Oct. 3, 1807. —Sprague, Amera, i. 495.

Hay, "flax", "chat", "grass", Job viii, 12; xl, 15; Psa. civ, 14; leeks, Num. xi, 13; also a court-yard, Isa. xxxiv, 13; xxxv, 7; Greek χαλκός, fiddle, i. e. grass or herbage, Matt. vi, 30, etc., or growing grain, Matt. xiii, 28, etc.). We are not to suppose that this word corresponds in the Bible, denotes what it does with us. The management of the grass by the Hebrews, as fodder for cattle, was entirely different from ours. Indeed, hay was not in use, straw being used as provender. The grass was cut green, as it was wanted; and the phrase mouz-grass (Psa. lxix, 6) would be more properly rendered grass that has just been fed off. So in Prov. xxv, 25, the word translated hay means the first shoots of the grass; and the whole passage might better be rendered, "The grass appeareth, and the green herb showeth itself, and the plants of the mountains are in their place." In Isa. xxxvi, 6 hay is put for grass. In summer, when the plains are parched with drought, and every green herb is dried up, the nodules proceed northwards, or into the mountains, or to the banks of rivers; and in winter and spring, when the rains have recoiled the plains with verdure, and filled the water-courses, they return. See Grass; Lenx; Fuel; Mowing.

Haydn, Joseph, one of the greatest composers of music in modern times, was born March 31, 1732, at Bohra, in Austria, the son of parents who were very fond of music, he showed from his earliest youth a remarkable talent for the art. He studied first with a relative in Hainburg; and, from his eighth to his sixteenth year, he was in the choir of St. Stephen's Cathedral at Vienna. After this, for a time, he supported himself by giving private instruction. The first six piano-sonatas of Em. Bach fell into his hands by accident, and filled him with enthusiasm. The celebrated Italian singer Porpora, whom he accompanied on the piano in musical circles, introduced him into the highest musical circles of Vienna. In 1750, he wrote several quartets (which, however, did not escape censure) and trios, and his first opera, Der hlende Triftel, for which he received 24 ducats. In 1759 he received from count Morzin an appointment as musical director, and soon after contracted a marriage, which, however, remained without children, and was, in general, not a happy one. In 1760 he was appointed by prince Esterhazy as chapel-master, which position allowed him for thirty years to give free play to his musical genius. During this time, which was mostly spent at Eisenstadt, Hungary, or (during winter months) in Vienna, he composed most of his symphonies, many quartets, trios, etc., 163 compositions for the baryton (the continuo of the violin), and 92 operas. He was one of the favorite composers for the court of Joseph II, and of the oratorio Il Ritorino di Tobia (1714), fifteen masses and other ecclesiastical works, music for Göthe’s Goethe von Berlichingen, and the composition of the Seven Words, which in 1795 was ordered from Cadiz as an instrumental composition to be played between the lessons of the 7th and 8th of the Seven Days of Creation. Having known the death of prince Esterhazy (1790), but retaining his title and his salary, he went as concert director to London, where he attained the zenith of his artistic career. During his two stays in London (1790-92 and 1794-95) he wrote the operas Orfeo and Euripides, his 12 so-called English symphonies, quartets, and other works. He was constantly employed as leader in concerts and societies, and was overwhelmed with marks of love and affection. After returning to Vienna, he composed, in 1797, his great oratorio The Creation, which was finished in April, 1798, and produced for the first time on April 19, 1799, in Vienna and soon after in all the large cities of Europe, with immense applause. It remains to this day the greatest of sacred oratorios, except Händel's Messiah. In the mean while he finished his last oratorio, The Four Seasons (text by Ven Swieten after Thomson), which was first produced for the first time in May, 1801. He died May 31, 1809. According to a list of his works, prepared by Haydn himself, they comprise 118 symphonies, 88 quartets, 24 trios, 19 operas, 5 oratorios, 163 compositions for the baryton, 24 concerts for different instruments, 15 masses, 44 piano sonatas, 42 German and Italian hymns, 30 church cantos, 10 songs in three or four parts, the harmony and the accompaniment for 365 old Scotch airs, and several smaller pieces. In the library of the Esterhazy family at Eisen-stadt, many unpublished manuscripts are said to be still extant. See Fronte, Notice sur J. H. (Paris, 1819); Pohl, Mozart und Haydn in London (Vienna, 1867, 2 vols.). (A. J. S.)

Haymo, Haimon, Haimo, or Aimo, a theologian of the 9th century, the place of whose birth (about A.D. 778) is uncertain. In his youth he embraced the rule of St. Benedict in the abbey of Fulda; afterwards he studied under Abbot, at St. Martin of Tours, with Rabanus Maurus. He then appears successively as teacher at Fulda, as abbot of Hirschfeld, in the diocese of Mentz, and finally bishop of Halberstadt (Saxony) in 841. He was present at the Council of Mentz in 847, and died March 23 (or 26), 865. His writings, which are chiefly compilations from the fathers, enjoy ed great reputation; they consist of, Glosses continua super Psalmiera (Col. 1523, 8vo; 1561, 8vo): — In Cantica Cantorum (Col. 1519, fol.; Worms, 1651, 8vo, etc.): —Glossa in Isaiam (Col. and Paris, 1531, 8vo): —Glossen in Jeremia, Ecclesiem, et Danieleam (so scarce that some doubt their having been printed at all): — In duodecim Prophetas minores (Col. 1519, et al.): —Homiliae super Evangelia totius anni (Col. 1531; Paris, 1533; Antw. 1559): —In Epistolas S. Pauli (now generally supposed, however, to be by St. Remy of Auvergne) (Col. and Paris, 1531, 8vo): —De Corpore et Sanguine Christi (D'Achery, Spicilegium, i, 42): —De varietate librorum tres libri (Paris and 1531, 8vo): —Breviarium Historie ecclesiasticae (Col. 1531, 8vo; often reprinted). Among his other works have been ascribed to him by Johannes Trithemius, but it is not certain that they were by him, and, at any rate, they are now lost. His writings are collected in Migne, Patrol. Latina, vol. cxvi, xvii, xviii. See Lelang, Bibl. Sacra; Trithemius, De eccles. Script.; Hist. litter. de la France, v, 111-126; Hoefer, Neue Bibl. (Göttingen, xiii, 121; Clarke, Succession of Soc. Interpreters, ii, 506; Mosheim, Ch. History, cent. xix, pt. ii, ch. ii, n. 56.
Haynes, Lemuel, a Congregational minister of New England, a mulatto. He was born at West Hartford, Conn., July 18, 1758, and was educated in the family of Mr. Rose, of Granville, Mass. In 1774 he enlisted in the Continental army, and in 1775 was in the expedition against Ticonderoga. Soon after this he commenced studying, and went to Pomfret, Conn., and thence to Vermont, and spent thirty years as pastor of a Congregational church at Rutland, whence he removed to Manchester, where he was involved in a very singular and noted trial for murder, not as accomplice, but as a defender of the accused. In 1822 he was called to the charge of the church in Granville, N.Y., an offshoot of the former in Massachusetts. Here he remained till his death in September, 1834. Mr. Haynes was characterized from early life by a swift and subtle intellect, and a restless thirst for knowledge. He read with critical attention. His wit was proverbial and refined. In Vermont he was very successful in opposing infidelity. Many anecdotes of his shrewd and sensible wit are on record. — Sherman, New England Divines, p. 267; Sprague, Amillas, ii, 176.

Hayti, a name sometimes given to the second largest island in the West Indies. The more usual name is San Domingo, under which head all that is common to the whole island will be treated. Hayti proper is the western and French-speaking part of the island, which in 1808 was organized as a separate commonwealth under president Christophe, who in 1811 had himself crowned emperor. The neighboring papal empire under the name of Henri I. In 1822 the French and the Spanish portions of the island were again united into one republic under general Boyer. This union lasted until 1844, when not only the Spanish portion became again an independent state, but the French part split into two, which were harassed by almost uninterrupted conflicts between the blacks and the mulattoes. The brief and beneficent administration of general Richer (1846 47) was followed by that of general Faustin Soulouque, who undertook an unfortunate campaign against the Dominicans, and in August, 1848, proclaimed a false idea of the doctrine of Henry I. He was in 1858 overthrown by general Geoffrard, who, as president, introduced many reforms, and was, in turn, overthrown in February, 1867, by Salavine, under whose administration the country was disturbed by uninterrupted civil wars, until his overthrow and execution, January, 1870.

The area of the republic is estimated at 20,203 square miles, the population at about 570,000. Nominaliy near the entire population belongs to the Roman Catholic Church; but even according to Roman Catholic writers, many of the population are even to-day more pagan than Christian. The religious, moral, and moral condition of the people is attributed by Roman Catholic writers to the habit of the French government of not establishing regular bishops, but of leaving the administration of ecclesiastical affairs in the hands of apostolic prefects, who had neither the influence nor the power of bishops, were more dependent upon the colonial government, and could not defend the interests of the Church and of religion against the secular power and the planters, who were chiefly intent on making the most out of slave labor. The care of the plantations, was, before the beginning of the rule, almost entirely in the hands of the Capuchins and Dominicans. In 1708 the Capuchins left their parishes, and were succeeded by the Jesuits, who took charge of the districts from Samana to the Atarabone, while the Dominicans assumed the administration of those from the Atarabone to Cape Tiburon. Secular priests were left only in the churches of Yaque Island. When the Jesuits were expelled in 1768, they were again followed by the Capuchins. During the war of independence nearly all the churches were closed, and the celebration of divine service was almost wholly suspended; but, the war being ended, the Constitution of 1807 declared the Catholic Church the only form of religion permitted by law. On Nov. 7, 1870, his credentials as a minister were granted. Soon afterwards he received a call to take charge of the Granville church. Here he labored five years with great acceptability. In 1878 he married Miss Elizabeth Bolidt, a white lady of good intellect and heart, and went to Pomfret, Conn., and thence to Vermont, and spent thirty years as pastor of a Congregational church at Rutland, whence he removed to Manchester, where he was involved in a very singular and noted trial for murder, not as accomplice, but as a defender of the accused. In 1822 he was called to the charge of the church in Granville, N.Y., an offshoot of the former in Massachusetts. Here he remained till his death in September, 1834. Mr. Haynes was characterized from early life by a swift and subtle intellect, and a restless thirst for knowledge. He read with critical attention. His wit was proverbial and refined. In Vermont he was very successful in opposing infidelity. Many anecdotes of his shrewd and sensible wit are on record. — Sherman, New England Divines, p. 267; Sprague, Amillas, ii, 176.
HAZAZIH

of God went; and when Hazael respectfully inquired the cause of this outburst, Elisha replied by describing the vivid picture then present to his mind of all the evils which the man now before him would inflict upon Israel. Hazael exclaimed, "But what is thy servant, the [not a] dog, that he should do this great thing?" The prophet answered, "The Lord hath showed it to his servant Elisha, saying, 'See, the Lord hath heard that thou hast smitten Ahab thy master, thy servant will do likewise.' And now, behold, thou seest what the Lord hath said. If it be peace, then prepare to meet the battle; but if it be Jehovah's sword, then prepare for it, for there the Lord will bring thee." Hazael then removed, and delivered to his master that portion of the prophetic response which was intended for him. But the very next day this man, cool and calculating in his cruel ambition, took a thick cloak, and, having dipped it in water, he rushed to the face of the king where, in his feebleness, and probably in his sleep, was smothered by its weight, and died what seemed to his people a natural death (2 Kings viii, 15). We are not to imagine that such a project as this was conceived and executed in a day, or that it was suggested by the words of Elisha. Discomposure at the earnest gaze of the prophet, and other circumstances, show that Hazael at that moment regarded Elisha as one to whom his secret purposes were known. (See Kicto's Daily Bible Illustr., ad loc.). He was soon engaged in hostilities with Ahaziah, king of Judah, and Jehoshaphat of Israel, for the possession of the city of Ramoth-gilead (2 Kings viii, 28). The Assyrian inscriptions show that about this time a bloody and destructive war was waged between the Assyrians on the one side, and the Syrians, Hittites, Hamathites, and Phœnicians on the other. See CHLOROS. Benhadad (q. v.) had recently suffered several severe defeats at the hands of the Assyrian king, and upon the succession of Hazael the war was speedily renewed. Hazael took up a position in the fastnesses of the Anti-Libanus, but was there attacked by the Assyrians, who defeated him with great loss, killing 16,000 of his warriors, and capturing more than 1100 chariots. Three years later the Assyrians once more entered Syria in force; but on this occasion Hazael submitted, and helped to furnish the invaders with supplies. After this, internal troubles appear to have occupied the attention of the Assyrians, who made no more expeditions into these parts for about a century. The Syrians rapidly recovered their losses, and towards the close of the reign of Jehu, Hazael led them against the Israelites (B.C. cir. 860), whom he "smote in all their coasts" (2 Kings x, 32), thus accomplishing the prophecy of Elisha (2 Kings ii, 13), who had told his master that "at that time shall there come a little green (Phoenician) vine out of Syria, and shall cover the mountain of Carmel." His main aim was to control the eastern provinces, where he ravaged "all the land of Gilead, the Gadites, and the Reubenites, and the Manassites, from Aroer, which is by the river Arnon, even Gilead and Bashan" (2 Kings x, 35). After this he seems to have abandoned all his conquests and to have become a subject of Assyria. (2 Kings xii, 3, 7, and 22), and towards the close of his life he even threatened the kingdom of Judah. Having taken Gath (2 Kings xii, 17; comp. Amos vi, 7), he proceeded to attack Jerusalem, defeated the Jews in an engagement (2 Chron. xxiv, 24), and was about to assault the city, when Jehoash induced him to retire by presenting him with "all the gold that was found in the treasures of the house of the Lord, and in the king's house" (2 Kings xii, 18). This able and successful, but unprincipled usurper left the throne at his death to his son Jehoahaz (2 Kings xiii, 24). B.C. cir. 835. Such was his prosperity and influence of his reign that the phrase "house of Hazael" occurs in prophetic declarations (Amos i, 4) as a designation of the kingdom of Damascus-Syria. See DAMASCUS.

HAZAZIH (Heb. Chasazah), חֶזָּזָּה, whom Jehoshaphat be suffix; Sept. 'O'Gia', son of Adahiah and father of Jehoshaphat, a descendant of Pharez (Neh. xi, 5). B.C. cir. 400 B.C.

HAZAR (also HAZON) is frequently prefixed to geographical names in order to indicate the geographical origin of villages ('כּתר, a hamlet, or town; see VILLAGE) upon some town or other noted spot, or in order to distinguish them from it; e.g. those following. "The word Hazar, when joined to places situated in the desert or on the outskirts of the inhabited country, as it frequently is, probably denoted a piece of ground surrounded by a rude but strong fence, where tents could be pitched, and cattle kept in safety from marauders. Such places are very common in the present day in the desert districts of Palestine. In other cases Hazar may denote a 'castle' or 'fortified town.'" Comp. HAZEL.

HAZAR-ADAR (Heb. Chatzer-'Adar), חַצֶּר-עָדָר, a village of Addar; Sept. Ἀσσύριαν Ἀράβα, v. r. Ἀδαρ and סְגָּרָה, a place on the southern boundary of Palestine, between Kadesh-Barnea and Azmon (Numb. xxxiv, 4); elsewhere called simply ADAR (Josh. xv, 3). See HAZEREM. It probably lies in the desert west of Kadesh-Barnea (q. v.), perhaps at the junction of wadys El-Fukreh and El-Madurah, east of Jebel Madurah. See TRIBE. Rev. J. Rowlands thought he discovered both this locality and that of the adjoining Azmon in the wadys which he calls Adeeirat and Aesinet, west of wady el-Arish (Williams, Holy City, i, 467); but the names are more correctly Kudeirat and Kussameh, and the locality is too far west.

HAZAR-ENON (Heb. Chatzer-'Enon), חַצֶּר-עָנֹן, a village of fountains, also [in Ezek. xlvii, 17] HAZAR-enon, חַצֶּר-עָנֹן, מָרַע, id.; Sept. Ἀσσυρική και ἄνθρωπος, a place on the boundary of Palestine, apparently at the north-eastern corner, between Ziphron and Shepham (Numb. xxxiv, 9, 10), but near from the district of Hamath, in Damascus Syria (Ezek. xlvii, 17; xlviii, 1). Schwarz (Palestine, p. 20, note) thinks it identical with the village Deir-Hanon, in the valley of the Jefeh or Amanah, near Damascus; but there is no probability that this was included within the limits of Canaan. "Porter would identify Hazar-enan with Kureytein=the two cities, a village more than sixty miles eastward of Damascus, the main ground for the identification apparently being the presence at Kureytein of 'large fountains,' the only ones in that 'vast region,' a circumstance with which the name of Hazar-enan well agrees (Damascena, i, 252; ii, 556). The great distance from Damascus and the body of Palestine in which this has no important relation to the reception of this identification" (Smith). We must therefore seek for Hazar-enan somewhere in the well-watered tracts at the north-western foot of Mount Hermon, perhaps the present Hasbeqen, near which are four springs (Air Kuneig, A. Tinta, A. Atas, and A. Herba). See HAZEREM.

HAZAR-GADDAH (Heb. Chatzer-Gaddah), חַצֶּר-גַּדַּדְתָּה, a city on the southern border of Judah, mentioned between Moladah and Heshbon (Josh. xv, 27). Modern writers (see Reland, Palest. p. 707), following the suggestion of Jerome (Onomast. a. v.; who, as suggested by Schwarz, Palestine, p. 100, has probably confused this place with En-Gedi), have sought for it near the Dead Sea; but the statement of Josephus appears to locate it nearer midway towards the Mediterranean. See HAZEREM. Mr. Grove suggests (Smith, Dict. a. v.) that it is possibly the modern ruined site marked as Jurana on Van de Velde's Map, west of el-Melh (Moladah), "by the change so often so frequent in the East (7) of D. to R." See JUDAH. TRIBE OF.

HAZAR-HAT'TICON (Hebrew Chatzer-'Tikdon), חַצֶּר-הַצִּיתִיכִון, hamlet of the midway, q. d. middle village; Sept. confusedly Elatxon και του Ελτασόν υ. τ. αὐλή του Σαυμου, Vulg. donum Tichen), a place on the northern boundary of Palestine, near Hamath, and in the confines of Hauran (Ezek. xlvii, 16); apparently, therefore, on the northern brow of Mount Hermon, which has given origin to the name as a point of division between Coele-Syria and Damascus Syria. It is possibly only an epithet of the HAZON (q. v.) of Nahalati.

HAZARMAVETH (Hebrew Chatzer-Ma'veth, חַצֶּר-מַאֲבֶתִּים, a village of fountains, also [in Ezek. xlvii, 17] HAZAR-enon, a village of fountains, asleep [in Ezek. xlvii, 17] HAZAR-enon, a village of fountains, asleep
court of death; Sept. Σαρμώδας and Ἄρωμώδας, Vulg. Asaromoth), the name of the third son of Joktan, or, rather, of a district of Arabia Felix settled by him (Gen. x, 26; 1 Chron. i, 20), supposed to be preserved in the modern province of Hadramaut, situated on the Indian Ocean, and abounding in frankincense, myrrh, and aloes; but (as intimated in the omissions) noted for the beauty of the climate of the ancient state (Abulafia, Arubin, p. 45; Niebuhr, Beschreibung der Arab. p. 283; Kitter, Erdk. XI, iii, 609). It was known also to the classical writers (Xαραμωφίται, vii, 708; Χαραμωφίται or Xαριμωφίται, Pol. vii, 7, 25: Atramedes, Dion. Perip, 351; Χαριμωφιτος, Steph. Byz. 755). Her. ii, 39. Has. (1 Sam. xxvii, 9.)

Hazar-ata'am (2 Chron. xx, 2). See HAZOR-TAMAR.

Hazel (').'t, त्र, of doubtful etymology [see Luz]; Sept. Υαζελ, Vulg. umgadolias), apparently a nut-bearing tree, which occurs in Gen. xxx, 37, where it indicates one of the kinds of rod from which Jacob peeled the bark, and which he placed in the water-troughs of the cattle. Authorities are divided between the hazel or oaknut and the almond-tree, as representing the त्र; in favor of the former we have Kimmich, Jarchi, Luther, and others, while the Vulgate, Sadius, and Gesenius adopt the latter view. The rendering in the Sept. is equally applicable to either. On the one hand is adduced the fact that in the Arabic we have louz, which is indeed the same word, and denotes the almond. Thus Abu-Fadil, as quoted by Celsius (Hierob. i, 254), says, "Louz est arbor notor, et magnis foliis mollibus. Species due, hortensia et silvestris. Hortensia quoque duntas species, dulcis et amara;" where reference is evidently made to the sweet and bitter almond. Other Arab authors also describe the almond under the name of louz. But this name was well known to the Hebrews as indicating the almond; for R. Sadius, in Ab. Ezra's Comment, as quoted by Celsius (p. 253), remarks, "Luz est amygdales, quia ita eam appellante Arabes; nam ha duae linguae, et syraciae, ejusdem sunt familias." It is also alleged that there is another word in the Hebrew language, agla (אַגְלָא), which is applicable to the hazel or

HAZAR-SHUAL 106 HAZEL

express statement that they existed before and up to the time of David" (Smith). Stanley suggests, "In Bethmarakoth, 'the house of chariots,' and Hazar-susim, 'the village of horses,' we recognise the dépôts and stations for the horses and chariots, such as those which in Solomon's time went to and fro between Egypt and Palestine" (Sin. and Pol. p. 160). "It is doubtful whether there was any such communication between these countries as early as the time of Joshua; but may not the rich grassy plains around Beersheba (Robinson, Bib. Res. i, 200) have been used at certain seasons by the ancient tribes of Southern Palestine for pasturing their war and chariot horses, just as the grassy plains of Jau- lian are used at the present day by the Druse chiefs of Lebanon, and the Turkish cavalry and artillery at Damascus?" (Kitto). "Still it is somewhat difficult to ascribe to so early a date the names of places sit- uated, as these were, in the Bedouin country, where a chariot must have been unknown, and where even horses seem carefully excluded from the possessions of the inhabitants—camels, sheep, oxen, and asses" (1 Sam. xxvii, 9).

HAZAR-SHUAL (Hebrew Chatserh-Shuail, חָצְרֶה שְׁעַל, "village of the jackal; Sept. Ασαροντέλα, Βασι- σονάδα and Ασαρονάδα"). a city on the southern border of Judah (Josh. xv, 28; Neh. xi, 26, where it is mentioned between Beth-palet and Beer-sheba), afterwards included in the territory of Simeon (Josh. xix, 3; 1 Chron. iv, 28, where it is mentioned between Moladah and Balah); hence probably midway between the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean. See HAZERIM. Van de Velde, on his Map, conjectures the site to be that of the ruins Sereel, which he locates nearly half way between Beer-sheba and Moladah. But see SHENA.

HAZAR-SUSAH (Hebrew Chatserh-Susah, חָצְרֶה שָׁעַה, "village of the horse, Josh. xix, 3; Sept. Ασαρονόια, Vulg. Hesareaus), or HA'ZAR-SU'SIM (CHAT- serh-Susim), כְּצֶר הָאֶכֶס, village of horses, 1 Chron. iv, 31; Sept. הָאֶכֶס, Vulg. Hesareaus), a city of the tribe of Simeon, mentioned between Beth-marcaboth and Beth-lebaoth or Beth-birei; doubtless, as thought by Schwarz (Palest. p. 124), the same as SANSANNAH, in the south border of Judah (Josh. xv, 31), one of Solomon's "chariot-cities" (2 Chron. i, 14). See HAZERIM. It is true that neither it nor its companion, HEBEL-MARCABOTH, the 'house of chariots,' is named in the list of the towns of Judah in chap. xv, but they are included in those of Simeon in 1 Chron. iv, 31, with the

Aymgdalos Communis.
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waist. See Nut. The strongest argument on the other side arises from the circumstance of another word, słaked (צחה), having reference to the almond; it is supposed, however, that the latter applies to the fruit exclusively, and the word under discussion to the tree; Rosenmiller identifies the słaked with the cultivated, and היע with the wild almond—tree. See Fruit.

The almond is diffused by culture from China to Spain, and is found to bear fruit well on both sides of the Mediterranean; but there is no region where it thrives better than Syria, or where it so truly at home. Accordingly, when Jacob was sending a present of all the products of the land which were likely to be acceptable to an Egyptian grandee, "the best fruits of the land," besides balm, myrrh, and honey, he bade his sons take "nuts and almonds" (Gen. xlii, 11); and the original name of that place so endeared to his memory as Bethel, originally called Luz, was probably derived from some well-known species of this tree. To this day "Jordania almonds" is the recognised market-name for the best samples of this fruit, in common with Telafite dates, Elmensa, etc. The name, however, is little more than a tradition. The best "Jordania almonds" come from Malaga. See Almond.

Hazelepno1, or rather Zelipmon (צליבפונ), slake looking upon me [or protection of the presence, so God. Fuss.], is a word, the article, היע, host, Telipmon, is a proper noun, rather an epithet, the Zelipmonite, q. d. vorehekehen, Sept. 'אנהלפפכ, Vulg. Seldelpho, the sister of Jezreel and others, of the descendants of Heron, son of Judah (1 Chron iv. 9). B.C. cir. 1612.

Haazelus, ERNEST LEWIS, D.D., was born in New- iberia, Prussia, Sept. 6, 1777. He was descended from a line of Lutheran ministers. His theological studies were in the university of Hesse Niesky, a Moravian institution under the superintendence of bishop Anders. In 1800 he was appointed teacher of the classics in the Moravian Seminary at Nazareth, Pa. The position he accepted in the wishes of his friends, and at once embarked for America. In this institution he labored with efficiency for eight years, and was advanced to be head-teacher and professor of theology. Differing from his brethren in their views of church government and discipline, he concluded to change his ecclesiastical relations, and to unite with the Luther Church, in whose service his fathers had so long lived and labored. In 1809 he removed to Philadelphia, and for a time had charge of a private classical school. For several years he labored as a pastor in New Jersey, and in 1815 was elected professor of theology in Hartwick Seminary, and principal of the theological department. In 1890 he was chosen professor of Biblical and Oriental literature, and of the German language, in the seminary at Gettysburg, Pa.; and in 1834 he accepted the appointment of professor in the theological seminary of the Synod of South Carolina. All these positions he filled with ability and great satisfaction to the Church. He died Feb. 20, 1853. As a scholar he occupied a high rank. The doctorate he received simultaneously from Union and Columbia Colleges, N.Y. His attainments in literature were varied and extensive. He published Life of Luther (1813); Materials for Catechismation (1825); Augustus Confession, with annotations—History of the Christian Church (1842); Hist. of the American Lutheran Church (1842); Life of J. H. Stillings (1831). (M. L. S.)

하서 (חזר, Chatzer, from של, to surround or inclose), a word which is of not uncommon occurrence in the Bible in the sense of a "court" or quadrangle to a palace or other building, but which topographically seems generally employed for the "villages" of people in a region, not an unsettled collection of dwellings described by travellers among the modern Arabs as consisting of rough stone walls covered with the tent-cloths, and thus holding a middle po-

sition between the tent of the wanderer—so transitory as to furnish an image of the sudden termination of life (Isa. xxxvii, 12)—and the settled, permanent town. See Topographical Terms.

As a proper name it appears in the A. V.: 1. In the plural, Hazereth, and Hazeroth, for which see below. 2. In the slightly different form of Hazeroth. 3. In combination with other words, giving a special designation to the particular "village" intended. Thus when in union with another word the name is Hazar (q. v.), it should not be overlooked that the place is not all in the wilderness, itself, or else quite on the confines of civilised country.

Hazerim [many Hazerim] (Hebrew Chatzerim, צֵּ֣רֶים, villages; Sept. Ἀσθρεῖον, Vulg. Hazerim), the name of a place, or, rather, a general designation of the temporary villages in which the nomad Avrams resided, especially between Gaza and "the river of Egypt" or el-Arish (Deut. ii, 23). Schwarz suggests (p. 93) that these "Hazerim" may be a general designation of the many towns by the name of Hazer and HAZAR found in this region; if so, these probably all lay near each other; and it is a singular fact that the sites of at least two of them, Hazara-goddah and Hazar-susah, seem to have been immediately adjoining each other.

Hazeroth [many Hazeroth] ( Heb. Chatzeroth, צֵּ֣רֶות, villages; Sept. Ἀσθρεῖον, but Ἀσθρίων in Deut. i, 1), the sixteenth station of the Israelites, their third after leaving Sinai, and either four or five days' march from that mountain towards Canaan (Numb. xi, 35; xii, 16; xxxiii, 17, 18; Deut. i, 1; comp. Numb. x, 38). It was also the first place after Sinai where the camp remained for a number of days. Here Aaron and Miriam attempted to excite a rebellion against Moses; and here the guilty Miriam was smitten with leprosy (Numb. xii). Burckhardt suggested (Travels, p. 495) that it is to be found in Ain el-Hudhera, near the usual route from Sinai to the eastern arm of the Red Sea; an identification that has generally been acquiesced in by subsequent travellers. It is described by Dr. Robinson as a fountain of tolerably good water, the only perennial one in that region, with several low palm-trees around it; he also remarks that the identification of this spot with Hazeroth is important as showing the route of the Israelites from the north to the Arabah, if, which it passed through this place, must have continued down the valley to the Red Sea, and could not have diverged through the high western plateau of the wilderness (Researches, i, 223). See EXOD. It's distance from Sinai accorded with the Sinai name, and would probably warrant us in identifying it with Hazeroth. There is some difficulty, however, in the position. The country around the fountain is exceedingly rugged, and the approaches to it difficult. It does not seem a suitable place for a large camp. Dr. Wilson mentions an unfortifying plain about fifteen miles north of Siwan, and remarks (p. 418) that "the long way to the eastward," called el-Hudherah; and here he would locate Hazeroth (Lords of the Bible, i, 256). Stanley thinks that the fountain called el-A'in, some distance north of the fountain of Hudherah, ought rather to be regarded as the site of Hazeroth, because 'Ain is the most important springing in this region, and it is possible that the Israelites may have been here, and the name may have been given to a wide district (Porter, Handbook for Siwan and Pal., i, 37 sq.).—Schwarz, however (Palast. p. 212), regards the site as that of 'Ain
el-Kudurrah, a large fountain of sweet running water at some distance beyond the ridge which bounds the western edge of the interior plateau of the desert et-Tih (Robinson's Researches, i, 286); a position far too northward.

Haṣzon-taʿmar (Hebrew Chatataoni-Tamar; זָזוֹן, Gen. xiv, 7; Sept. 'Aṣzon Tsamūr, or HAZZON-TAʿMAR (Heb. [precisely the converse of the root ṭ-m-r; see A.V. 1 Chronicles xxvii, 16; אַשָּׂזֹן; 2 Chron. xx, 2; Sept. 'Aṣzon Tsamūr), the name under which, at a very early period in the history of Palestine, and as known in belief by many to be the oldest of all these early records, we first hear of the place which afterwards became En-gedi (q. v.). The Amorites were dwelling at Haṣzon-Tamar when the four kings made their incursion, and fought their successful battle with the five (Gen. xiv, 7). This occurrence only once again—in the records of the reign of Hezekiah (2 Chron. xx, 2)—when he was warned of the approach of the horde of Ammonites, Moabites, Medunim, and men of Mount Seir, whom he afterwards so successfully destroyed, and with whom no doubt he was now pursuing, not at the appropriating and making known to the Saggars and the east, the place as the Amos refer to have done a thousand years before them. Here the explanation, which is En-gedi, is added. The existence of the earlier appellation, after En-gedi had been so long in use, is a remarkable instance of the tenacity of these old Oriental names, of which modern instances are frequent. See ACCHO; BETHSAIDA, etc. Schwarz, however, unnecessarily supposes (Pales, p. 21) the two passages to refer to different localities, the earlier of which he assigns (on Talmudical evidence) to Zoar (q. v.).

Haṣzon-tamar is interpreted in Hebrew to mean the "pruning or felling of the palm" (Gesen. Thes. p. 512), or perhaps better, "a row of palm-trees" (Furst, Lex. s. v.). Jerome (Quast. in Gen.) renders it urba palmarum. This interpretation of the name is borne out by the ancient reputation of the palms of En-gedi (Eccles. xxviii, 14), and the illustration of the same in the Psalms (ps. lxviii, 16). The Samaritan Version has זָזוֹן הַר, "the valley of Cadia", possibly a corruption of En-gedi. The Targums have En-gedi. Perhaps this was the "city of palm-trees" (Ir hat-lenamar) out of which the Kenites, the tribe of Moses's father-in-law, went up into the wilderness of Judah, after the conquest of the country (Judg. i, 16), the allusion to the ancient connexion between the Kenites (Numb. xxvii, 21) is at once explained. Standing as he was on one of the lofty points of the highlands opposite Jericho, the western shore of the Dead Sea as far as En-gedi would be before him, and the cliff, in the cliffs of which the Kenites had fixed their secure nest, would be a prominent object in the view. This has been alluded to by Prof. Stanley (Sinai and Pal, p. 225, n. 4). De Saulcy (Narratir, i, 149) and Schwarz (Palestines, p. 199) think that a trace of the ancient name is preserved in the tract and wady el-Hus-sush (Robinson's Researches ii, 243, 244), a little north of Ain-July.

Haʿziel (Hev. Chaziel, חַזְיֵיאל, vision of God; Sept. 'Aṣṭaf v. r. Ḥaṣzi, a "son of the Gershonite Shimei, and chief of the family of Laadan (1 Chron. xxiii, 9). B.C. 1014.

Haʿzm (Hev. Chazam, חַזָּמ, perhaps for Ḥaṣam; vision; Sept. Ṭāqam, Vulg. Asarum), one of the sons of Nahor by Milcah (Gen. xxii, 22). B.C. cir. 2040. The only clue to the locality settled by him is to be found in the identification of Chazam, and the other sons of Nahor; and hence he must, in all likelihood, have been in Ur of the Chaldees, or the adjacent countries. Bunsen (Bibelwerk, i, ii, 49) suggests Chatams by the Ephrathites (Stephen, Ryzant.), in Mesopotamia, or the Chazame (Xa-Qui) in Assyria (Strabo, xvi, p. 736).

Haʿzor (Hev. Chatser, חַצְצֵר, village [see Haʿzor-], Sept. 'Aṣor, but יָבַיֵר in Jer. xlix, 28, 30, 33), the name of several places. See also En-Hazor; Baal-Hazor; Hazor-Hadattah; Hazirim.

I. A city near the waters of the lake Merom (Huleh), the seat of Jabin, a powerful Canaanitish king, as appears from the narratives sent him by all the surrounding kings to assist him against the Israelites (Josh. xi, 1-5). He and his confederates were, however, defeated and slain by Joshua, and the city burned to the ground (Josh. xii, 10-13; Josephus, Ant. v, 5, 1); being only one of those northern cities which was unshaken by Joshua, doubtless because it was too strong and important to leave standing in his rear. It was the principal city of the whole of Northern Palestine, "the head of all those kingdoms" (Josh. x, 10; see Jerome, Onomast. s. v. Asor). Like the other strong places of that part, it stood on an eminence (Josh. xii, 13, A. V. "strength"), but the district around must have been on the whole flat, and suitable for the manoeuvres of the "very many" chariots and horses which formed part of the forces of the king of Hazor and his confederates (Josh. xi, 4, 6, 9; Judg. iv, 3). But by the time of Deborah and Barak the Canaanites had recovered part of the territory they had lost, had fortified it again, and were ruled by a king with the ancient royal name of Jabin, under whose power the Israelites were, in punishment for their sins, reduced. From this yoke they were delivered by Debora and Barak, after which Hazor remained in quiet possession of the Israelites, and belonged to the tribe of Naphtali, to whom Joshua allotted it (Judg. iv, 36). Solomon did not overlook so important a post, and the fortification of Hazor, Megiddo, and Gezer, the points of defence for the entrance from Syria and Assyria, the plain of Esdraelon, and the great maritime lowland respectively, were two of the chief pretexts for his levy of taxes (1 Kings x, 16). Later still it is mentioned in the list of the towns and districts whose inhabitants were carried off to Assyria by Tiglath-Pileser (2 Kings xv, 29; Josephus, Ant. ix, 11, 1). We encounter it once more in 1 Macc. xi, 67, where Jonathan, after encamping for the night at the "water of Gennesar", advances to the "plain of Asor" (Josephus, Ant. xii, 260); the Greek text of the Macceabees has prefixed an from the preceding word rēvōn; A.T. "Nazor") to meet Demeutrius, who was in possession of Kadesh (ib. 68; Josephus as above). See NAZOR. Raumer queries whether it may not have been the ancient Hozor of which King Baldwin IV passed on his way from Tiberias to Naphtali (Will. Trr., p. 1014); and his reason for this conjecture is that the Vulgate gives Nason for the Asor (Apostal) of Tobit i, 1 (Raumer, Palestin. p. 114, n.). See Asor.

The name Hazor still lingers in several places around the upper valley of the Jordan (Robinson, B. R. iii, 68, 81, 401). There is one Hazor by a commanding site above Cesarea Philippi, and close to the great castle of Subwchel. Here Keith (Land of Israel, p. 384) and Stanley (Sinai and Pal. p. 399) would place the ancient capital of Canaan. But the territory of Naphtali hardly extended so far eastward. Another Hazir is in the plain, a few miles west of the site of Dan; but neither does this site quite accord with the Scripture notices (Porter's Damascus, i, 304; Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 318). Strabo (Palestine, p. 91) thinks of a village which he calls Aalor, between Banias and Meshchela (Mejei), may be the ancient Hazor; he probably refers to the Ain el-Hazour marked on Zimmerman's Map a little north-east of Banias, which, however, is too far east. There is a place marked as Azur on Zimmerman's Map, a little north of the Kenite places (Kadesh), which may questionably lay in Naphtali; but M. De Saulcy (Narratir, ii, 406) denies that this can have been the seat of Jabin (which he distinguishes from the Hazor of Solomon), and in a long argument (p. 400-405) he contends that it was situated on the site of some extensive ruins, which he reports at a place called indefinitely el-Khom, on the hills skirting the north-eastern shore of the lake.
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e-Hulch, in the direction of Banias. Van de Velde (Memor, p. 318) likewise thinks the Hazor of Joshua different from that of Judges (although both were ruled by a Jabin, evidently a hereditary title), and inclines to regard En-Hazor (Josh. xix. 37) as identical with the latter, and with a ruined Hazor in the middle of the town of Tell el-Hulch (Bint后期); while he seems to acquiesce in the identification of the external Hazor with a Hazor (Porter, Domains, c. iii, 304) or Kuur Asar (Seetzen), or, as he himself calls it, Tell Hazor, covered with remains, and jutting out from Merj Ayun towards the Huleh plain. The Hazor of Judges, xix. 36, he identifies with Tell el-Hazur, southeast of Ramah. This, however, is vague and confused. Mr. Thomson, who visited this region in 1843, believed Hazor may be identified with the present castle of Junus, north of the Huleh (Bibl. Sacra, 1846, p. 202). The editor (Dr. Robinson), however, adds the arguments adduced more plausible than sound (ib. p. 212), and advocates the opinion of Rev. E. Smith, that Tell Kaurebeh, at the southeast end of the plain of Kedes, is better entitled to be regarded as the site of Hazor (Bibliotheca Sacra, 1847, p. 493). Accordingly, in the new ed. of his Researches, after noticing several other localities proposed (iii. 68, 81, 492), he at length fixes upon this as a best agreeing with the ancient notices of this city (ib. p. 363). There are, as the name Kaurebeh, "ruins," implies, some ancient ruins on the tell, but they are those of a village. There are still other ruins of an ancient town somewhat west and northwest of the south bank of wady Heniah, overlooking the valley and lake of Merom, and about six miles south of Kedesheh, which is not a improbable site for the ancient Hazor (Robinson, Bibl. Res. iii, 363, 365); and the plain beneath, stretching to the shore of the lake, might take the name of the sar, as Josephus seems to indicate (L. c.), as Ritter (Erdk. xvi, 260) accepts the Hazor proposed by Burchett (Tract. p. 44); apparently the inconsiderable ruin on the rocky declivity above Banias (Robinson, Res. new ed. iii, 402). Captain Wilson prefers the isolated Tell Harah, covered with ruins, about two miles south-east of Kedesheh (Jour. Sac. Lit., 1866, p. 245). But none of these last cited places retain the ancient name. Finally, Dr. Thomson is confident (Land and Book, i, 435) that the true spot is Hazor (the above Hazor of Van de Velde, east of a more northern Ramah), in the centre of the southern contiguous region around lake Huleh on the north-west, containing numerous ancient remains, and locally connected with tradition by the Israelitish victory; although Dr. Robinson (incorrectly) objects to this site (Bibl. Res. new ed. iii, 63) that it is too far from the lake, and within the territory of Asher.

2. A city in the south of Judah (but probably not one of those assigned to Simeon, since it is not named in the list, Josh. xix. 1-9), mentioned between Kedesh and Ithnaan (Josh. xvii, 23, where the Vet. MS. of the Sept. unites with the following name, Argotharias, Alex. Mus. omits, Vulg. Asor). We may reasonably conjecture that this was the central town of that name, the other Hazors of the same connection (Hazor-Halastath, and Kerioth-Hezron or Hazor-Amm) being probably so called for distinction sake; and in that case we may perhaps locate it at a ruined site marked on Van de Velde's map as Tell Eski el-Kesab (Robinson, Res. iii, Appendix p. 114), on a tell around the south-west base of which runs the wady ed-Dheib, emptying into the Dead Sea. See Nos. 3 and 4.

3. HAZOR-HADATTAH (for so the Heb. נַחֲצָר הַדַּתָּה, i.e., New Hazor, should be understood; since there is no article between the words, and the sense in verse 32 requires this condensation; Sept. omits, Vulg. Asor, more rarely). A city in the south of Judah (not the extreme Simeon portion), mentioned between Bealoth and Keriorth (Josh. xv, 25); probably, as suggested in Keil and Delitzsch's Commentary, ad loc. (Edinb. ed. 160), the ruined site א-ל-ד-ח-ה (Robinson's Researches, iii, Appendix p. 114), south of Hebron, in the immediate vicinity of el-Beydud (the Beiydud of Van de Velde's Map, about half way between Keritho and Arad). See Nos. 2 and 4.

4. HAZOR-AMM (to be so joined to find the same reasons as in No. 2), probably identified with the Chesheth Hezron (in the Heb, the four names stand چارسدل حضران which is Chateotheo Ammon, Sieg. loc. cit. "Asmōj, και Αμμόν, [v.r., Asmōjapha]; Vulg. Carioto, Hauron, hac est Asor, Amam), a town in the south of Judah (but apparently not in the Simeon territory), mentioned between Bealoth and Shema (Josh. xv. 24-26); no doubt (if thus combined) the modern Jebel Regen, as suggested by Robinson (Researches, iii, Appendix p. 114). See KEROTHI.

5. (Vat. MS. of Sept. omits; Vulg. Asor). A city inhabited by the Benjamites after the Captivity, mentioned among Ananiah and Ramah (Neh. xi, 38); possibly the modern Gazor, a short distance east of Jaffa (for others of the associated names, although likewise within the ancient territory of Dan, are also assigned to Benjamin), since Ezechieius and Jerome (Onomast. s. v. Asor) mention a Hazor in the vicinity of Ascalon, although they assign it to Judah, and confound it with those in the south of that tribe (Robinson's Researches, l, 370, note). From the places mentioned with it, as Anathoth, Nob, Ramah, etc., it would seem to have lain north of Jerusalem, and at no great distance therefrom. Schwarz thinks it is called Chazar (בֶּזֶר) in the Talmudic writers (Pilat. p. 162). Robinson suggests the identity of Hazor and the modern Tell Asur, a ruin on a little hill about six miles north of Bethel (Bib. Res. x. 264, note). This, however, appears to be too far from Ramah. Tobler mentions a ruin called Khurbet Aror, near Ramah, a little to the west, the situation of which would answer better to Hazor (Topogr. ii, 409; Van de Velde, Memor, p. 319). The place in question is probably the same with the Bala-Hazor (q. v.) of 2 Sam. xiii, 27.

6. A region of Arabia, spoken of as an important place, in the vicinity of Kedar, in the prophetic denunciations of desolation upon both by Nebuchadnezzar (Jer. xlix, 28-33). It can hardly be Petra, as supposed by Vitringa (en. Eut., p. 624), nor the Asor placed by Eusebius 8 miles west of Philadelphia (Histig. Jeosias, p. 190), but probably is a designation of the confines of Arabia with south-eastern Palestine, inhabited by nomad tribes dwelling in more encampments. See HAZOR.

Hazzurim. See HELKATH-HAZZURIM.

Head (properly שְׂנָה, rosh, שֵׁם, the) the topmost part of the body.

I. Anatomically considered, the general character of the human head is such as to establish the identity of the human race, and to distinguish man from every other animal. At the same time, different families of mankind are marked by peculiarities of construction in the head, which, though in individual cases and when extended to the other, to the entire loss of distinctive line, yet are in the general broadly contrasted one with the other. These peculiarities in the structure of the skull give rise to and are connected with other peculiarities of feature and general contour of face. In the union of cranial peculiarities with those of the face, certain clear marks are presented, by which physiologists have been able to range the individuals of our race into a few great classes, and in so doing to afford an unintentional corroboration of the information which the Scriptures add regarding the nation and descendants of the patriarchs. Camper, one of the most learned and clear-minded physicians of the 18th century, has the credit of being the first who drew attention to the classification of the human features, and endeavored, by means of what he termed the facial angle, to furnish a method for distinguishing different nations and races of men, which, be-
ING himself an eminent limner, he designed for application chiefly in the art of drawing, and which, though far from producing strictly definite and scientific results, yet affords views that are not without interest, and approximations at least prepared the way for something better (see a collection of Camper’s pieces entitled Oeuvres qui ont pour Objet l’Histoire Naturelle, la Physiologie, et l’Anatomie comparée, Paris, 1803). It is, however, to the celebrated J. F. Blumenbach, whose merits in the entire sphere of natural history are so transcendent, that we are mainly indebted for the accurate and satisfactory classifications in regard to cranial structure which now prevail. Camper had observed that the breadth of the head differs in different nations; that the heads of Asiatics (the Kalmucks) have the greatest breadth; that those of Europeans have a middle degree of breadth; and that the skulls of the African negroes are the narrowest of all. This circumstance was by Blumenbach made the foundation of his arrangement and description of skulls. By comparing different forms of the human cranium together, that eminent physiologist was led to recognize three great types, to which all others could be referred—the Caucasian, Mongolian, and Ethiopian. These three differ more widely from each other than any other that can be found; but to these three, Blumenbach, in his classification of skulls, and of the races of men to which they belong, added two others, in many respects intermediate between the three forms already mentioned. In this way five classes are established, corresponding with five great families, 1.


The Caucasian family, comprising the nations of Europe, some of the Western Asiatiques, etc., have the head of the most symmetrical shape, almost round, the forehead of moderate extent, the cheek-bones rather narrow, without any projection, but a direction downwards from the molar process of the frontal bone; the alveolar edge well rounded; the front teeth of each jaw placed perpendicularly; the face of oval shape, straight, features moderately prominent; forehead arched; nose narrow, slightly arched; mouth small; chin full and round. 2.

The second is the Mongolian variety. 3. Ethiopian. 4. Malay and South Sea Islanders. 5. American. The description of their peculiarities may be found in Pichard’s Recherches into the Physical History of Man, 2d ed. 2.

Buch der Physiologie. But the most recent, if not the best work on the subject before us is Pichard’s Natural History of Man (1843), a work which comprises and reviews, in the spirit of a sound philosophy, all that has hitherto been written and discovered on the origin, physical development, and historical progress of man. In this invaluable work full details may be found of the methods of studying the human head of which we have spoken, and of some others, not less interesting in themselves, nor less valuable in their results (see particularly p. 116 sq.).

II. Scriptural References.—This part of the human body has generally been considered as the abode of intelligence. In the head, or the parts peculiar to it, have been accounted the place where the affections lie (Gen. iii, 15; Psa. iii, 3; Eccles. ii, 14). The head and the heart are sometimes taken for the entire person (Isa. i, 5). Even the head alone, as being the chief member, frequently stands for the man (Prov. x, 6). The head also denotes sovereignty (1 Cor. xi, 8). Covering the head, and cutting off the hair, were signs of mourning and tokens of distress, which were enhanced by throwing ashes on the head, together with sackcloth (Amos viii, 10; Job i, 20; Lev. xxxvi, 5; Deut. xiv, 1; 2 Sam. xxii, 10; Exod. xix, 5). While accounting the head was practised on festive occasions, and considered an emblem of fertility (Eccles. ix, 8; Psa. xxiii, 5; Luke vii, 46). See ANOINT. It was not unusual to swear by the head (Matt. v, 56; Kitt, s. v.). The phrase to lift up the head of any one is, to exalt him (Psa. iii, s, cx, 7); and to return or give back upon one’s head, is to be requited, recompensed (Psa. vii, 16; Joel iii, 4; Ezek. ix, 10; xi, 21; xvi, 39; xvii, 19; xxii, 33). So, your blood be on your own head (Acts xvii, 6); the guilt of your destruction rests upon yourselves (2 Sam. i, 16; 1 Kings ii, 33, 37).

The term head is used to signify the chief, one to whom others are subordinate; the prince of a people or state (Jug. x, 18; xi, 8; 1 Sam. xv, 17; Psa. xviii, 43; Isa. vii, 8, 9); of a family, the head, chief, patriarch (Exod. vi, 14; Numb. vii, 2; 1 Chron. vii, 24); of a husband in relation to a wife (Gen. iii, i6; 1 Cor. xi, 3; Eph. v, 23). So of Christ the head in relation to his Church, which is his body, and its members his members (1 Cor. xii, 27; xi, 8; Eph. i, 22; iv, 15; v, 23; Col. i, 18; ii, 10, 19); of God in relation to Christ (1 Cor. xi, 3). Head is also used for what is highest, uppermost: the top, summit of a mountain (Gen. xvii, 5; Exod. xvii, 9, 10; xix, 20). The mountains of the Lord’s house shall be established at the head of the mountains, and shall be higher than the hills, i.e. it shall be a prince among the mountains (Isa. ii, 2). Four heads of rivers, i.e. four rivers into which the waters divide themselves (Gen. ii, 10). Headstone of the altar (Psa. xcvii, 22), either the highest, forming the top or coping of the corner; or lowest, which forms the foundation of the building. See CORNER.

III. Hair of the Head ("קְנֵי") was by the Hebrews worn thick and full as an ornament of the person (comp. Ezek. viii, 3; Jer. vii, 29): a bald head, besides exposing one to the suspicion of leprosy (Lev. xiii, 48 sq.), was always a cause of mortification (2 Kings ii, 23; Isa. iii, 17, 34; comp. Sueton. Caes. 45; Dion. 18; Homer, Head, ii, 219; Hariri, 10, p. 59, ed. Sacy) among the priests or order it therefore amounted to a positive disqualification (Lev. xx, 29; Mishna, Beorokoth, vii, 2); among the Egyptians, on the contrary, the hair was regularly shorn (Gen. xii, 14), and only allowed to go uncut in seasons of mourning (Herod. ii, 86). Hair as it ascends to the shoulders, however, seems only in early times to have been the habit, in the male sex, with youth (2 Sam. xiv, 6; Joseph. Ant. viii, 7, 3; Horace, Od. ii, 5, 21; ii, 20, 14). Men cropped it from time to time with shears ("קְנֵי", קְנָה; comp. Ezek. xiv, 20, and the ezkay pefit of the Babyloniens, Strabo xvi, 746). See, however, NAZARENE. Among the late Jews long hair in men was esteemed a weakness (1 Cor. xi, 12;
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comp. Plutarch, Quast. Rom. xiv; Clem. Alex. Ped. iii. 106; Epiphian. Hist. lviii. 6; Jerome ad Euseb. xlv.
but it was otherwise in Sparta (Aristot. Het. i. 9; Herod. i. 82; Xenoph. Luc. xi. 3); comp. Aristoph. An. 1287 sq.
and to the priests any curtailment of it was forbidden (Orto, comp. 424 sq.); but in the Persian period, remains, see Niebuhr, Trar. ii. 128; and for that of the Asiatic priests in general, see Movers, Phlaec. i. 682: on the Assyrian monuments it is always, in the case of natives at least, represented as long and elaborately curled; see Layard, passim. Only in cases of religious vows did males suffer it (Aristot. De vi. xvi. 18; see Kuniol, ad loc.). Females, on the contrary, set great value upon the hair (1 Cor. i. c.; compare Cant. iv. 1;Luke vili. 38; John xi. 2 [Rev. ix. 8]; Phile. Ep. 28; Plutarch, De vir. arei. iii. 1; Harner, iii. 31; Rosenmüller, Morgend. vi. 198; Kype, Obersen, ii. 29). There were various modes of putting up the hair (Ezek. xiv. 15; comp. Herod. iv. 175, 191); and it was a custom that men should not cut off the earlocks (1 Kings 15. 27, Lev. xiv. 27; A.V. "round the corners of the head"). Women, especially, were wont to curl the hair (Isa. iii. 24; see Gesean, ad loc.; comp. Serv. ad En. xiii. 90), and to braid it (2 Kings ii. 30; Judith xiii. 3; 1 Pet. iii. 3; Tim. i. 9; comp. Joseph. War. iv. 9, 10; Homer. Ili. iii. 185; xiv. 176; Harner, ii. 381: to go with dishevelled hair (homousia) was a mark of folly (1 Cor. x. 2; 2 Kings iv. 39); comp. Luke xii. 38; Lightfoot, Opp. p. 1801: but rustic maidens often let the hair fall in loose tresses (2 Sam. vii. 6; comp. Anacr. xxii. 7), merely bound with a ribbon, or even to interweave it with gems or other finery (Huid, xvii. 52), and in later times to ornament it most elaborately (see Lightfoot, Opp. p. 438; Hartmann, Hede, ii. 286 sq.). See HEAD-DRESS. Even men sometimes appear with curls (Joseph. War. iv. 9, 10; Philo, Opp. ii. 479; Plutarch, Lycurgus. 22), which, however, was generally disapproved (Philo, Opp. ii. 306, 479; Cicero, Suet. 8; Artemid. ii. 6; Martial, ii. 36; Phyl. Scent. 194 sq.): Clement Alexander. Ped. iii. p. 161. Both men and women are shown in the O.T. (other nations knew them, Ovid, Fast. i. 495; Petron. Sat. 122. Apul. Ap. ii. 213; comp. Huid, xiv. 76), although they, as well as hair-pins, are referred to in the Talmud (Hartmann, p. 224 sq.). Hair-powder was unknown to the ancients. On the other hand, they used to anoint the hair with oil (Joseph. War. iv. 122; Matt. vii. 14; Luke xvi. 23; 2 Peter vii. 17; Luke vii. 46; Joseph. Ant. xiii. 4, 1; comp. Plutarch, De sent. 91; Herod. ii. 11). Jewish nations, Plutarch, Tariceps conjig. 29; Horace. Od. ii. 11, 16; iii. 29; Ovid, Ars Am. i. 505; Tibull. i. 73; Suetonius. Cesar. 67; Apul. Metam. ii. 30, Bip.). and gave it a brilliant lustre by a mixture of gold-dust in these respects. Joseph. Ant. viii. 7, 4; comp. Lamprid. Comm. 17), as the hair of Orientals is generally black (Com. iv. 1; v. 11: David's rufous hair is named as pecu- lar, 1 Sam. xvi. 12). A common method of dressing the hair among many ancient nations (Pliny, xv. 24; xxi. 12; 24; xxi. 60; 38; xxi. 51; Athen. xii. 542; Val. Max. ii. 13; 25; Diol. Sic. vi. 28; but not among the Greeks, Plutarch, Aegopht. reg. p. 19, Tauchan), and one highly esteemed by modern Orientals, namely, to stain it reddish-yellow by means of henna (see CAMPBELL), but although perhaps not unknown to the Hebrews (see Cant. viii. 13), as an imitation of the generally prized golden-hued locks (Garr. of the famous of the best kumissi). John 13. 38; Virg. Ec. iv. 549; Ovid, Fast. ii. 783; Stat. Achil. i. 162; Petron. Sat. 105; Apul. Metam. ii. 23, Bip. See Boucicaut, ad Tibull. i. 6, 8), it was a practice, which does not appear to have prevailed in the East: and modern Asiatics are accustomed to dye the hair when grey (Niebuhr, Trar. iii. 303). Fall. viii. 197; ii. 164; Virg. Ec. iv. 549; Ovid, Fast. ii. 783; Stat. Achil. i. 162; Petron. Sat. 105; Apul. Metam. ii. 23, Bip. See Boucicaut, ad Tibull. i. 6, 8), it was a practice, which does not appear to have been prevalent in the East: and modern Asiatics are accustomed to dye the hair when grey (Niebuhr, Trar. iii. 303). Fall. viii. 197; ii. 164; Virg. Ec. iv. 549; Ovid, Fast. ii. 783; Stat. Achil. i. 162; Petron. Sat. 105; Apul. Metam. ii. 23, Bip. See Boucicaut, ad Tibull. i. 6, 8), it was a practice, which does not appear to have been prevalent in the East: and modern Asiatics are accustomed to dye the hair when grey (Niebuhr, Trar. iii. 303). Fall. viii. 197; ii. 164; Virg. Ec. iv. 549; Ovid, Fast. ii. 783; Stat. Achil. i. 162; Petron. Sat. 105; Apul. Metam. ii. 23, Bip. See Boucicaut, ad Tibull. i. 6, 8), it was a practice, which does not appear to have been prevalent in the East: and modern Asiatics are accustomed to dye the hair when grey (Niebuhr, Trar. iii. 303). Fall. viii. 197; ii. 164; Virg. Ec. iv. 549; Ovid, Fast. ii. 783; Stat. Achil. i. 162; Petron. Sat. 105; Apul. Metam. ii. 23, Bip. See Boucicaut, ad Tibull. i. 6, 8), it was a practice, which does not appear to have been prevalent in the East: and modern Asiatics are accustomed to dye the hair when grey (Niebuhr, Trar. iii. 303). Fall. viii. 197; ii. 164; Virg. Ec. iv. 549; Ovid, Fast. ii. 783; Stat. Achil. i. 162; Petron. Sat. 105; Apul. Metam. ii. 23, Bip. See Boucicaut, ad Tibull. i. 6, 8), it was a practice, which does not appear to have been prevalent in the East: and modern Asiatics are accustomed to dye the hair when grey (Niebuhr, Trar. iii. 303). Fall. viii. 197; ii. 164; Virg. Ec. iv. 549; Ovid, Fast. ii. 783; Stat. Achil. i. 162; Petron. Sat. 105; Apul. Metam. ii. 23, Bip. See Boucicaut, ad Tibull. i. 6, 8), it was a practice, which does not appear to have been prevalent in the East: and modern Asiatics are accustomed to dye the hair when grey (Niebuhr, Trar. iii. 303). Fall. viii. 197; ii. 164; Virg. Ec. iv. 549; Ovid, Fast. ii. 783; Stat. Achil. i. 162; Petron. Sat. 105; Apul. Metam. ii. 23, Bip. See Boucicaut, ad Tibull. i. 6, 8), it was a practice, which does not appear to have been prevalent in the East: and modern Asiatics are accustomed to dye the hair when grey (Niebuhr, Trar. iii. 303). Fall. viii. 197; ii. 164; Virg. Ec. iv. 549; Ovid, Fast. ii. 783; Stat. Achil. i. 162; Petron. Sat. 105; Apul. Metam. ii. 23, Bip. See Boucicaut, ad Tibull. i. 6, 8), it was a practice, which does not appear to have been prevalent in the East: and modern Asiatics are accustomed to dye the hair when grey (Niebuhr, Trar. iii. 303).
Head-dresses of Arabian and Turkish Females.

Modern Egyptian Head-dresses. (From Lane.)

Various Forms of the modern Turban.

Bedouin Head-dress, or Keffiyeh.

(Acts xix, 12, A.Vera. “apron”), as explained by Suidas

term used for putting on either the tannīf or the peēr is ὑπάρχειν, “to bind round” (Exod. xxi, 9; Lev. viii, 13); hence the words in Ezek. xvi, 10, “I girded thee about with fine linen,” are to be understood of the turban; and by the use of the same term Jonah (ii, 5) represents the weeds wrapped as a turban round his head. The turban, as now worn in the East, varies very much in shape (Russell’s Aleppo, i, 102). It appears that frequently the robes supplied the place of a head-dress, being so ample that they might be thrown over the head at pleasure: the radid and the tannīf, at all events, were so used [see Dress], and the veil served a similar purpose. See Vitt. The ordinary head-dress of the Bedouin consists of the keffiyeh, a square handkerchief, generally of red and yellow cotton, or cotton and silk, folded so that three of the corners hang down over the back and shoulders, leaving the face exposed, and bound round the head by a cord (Burckhardt, Notes, i, 48). It is not improbable that a similar covering was used by the Hebrews on certain occasions: the “kerchief” in Ezek. xiii, 18 has been so understood by some writers (Hamer, Observations, ii, 228), though the word more probably refers to a species of veil; and the στάμφλιον
to the description of a turban (Lueys obesidad, Gessnerina, Theaurus, p. 542). The associated term serachet expresses the flowing character of the Eastern head-dress, as it falls down over the back (Layard, Nineveh, ii, 308). The word rendered 'hats' in Dan. iii, 21 (םִּשְׁבָּשִׁים) properly applies to a cloak! The Heb. שְׁבָּשִׁים, shebshim (Isa. iii, 18), rendered in our version "cauls," or, as in the margin, "networks," were most probably some kind of reticulated head-dress, and so the word is understood in the Talmud. See CAUL.

A very peculiar kind of head-dress worn in some parts of Palestine, especially by the Druses of Mount Lebanon, and thought to be referred to by the כֶּרֶם, ke-re'm, or "horn" of 1 Sam. ii, 1, is the tannura. It is made of gold or silver, frequently of other metal either gilt or silver-plated, and sometimes of mere wood. The more costly ones are highly ornamented, and occasion-

The Tannura.

ally set with jewels; but the length and position of them is that upon which the traveller looks with the greatest interest, as illustrating and explaining a familiar expression of Scripture. The young, the rich, and the vain wear the tannura of great length, standing straight up from the top of the forehead; whereas the humble, the poor, and the aged place it upon the side of the head, much shorter, and spreading at the end like a trumpet. See Horns.

For other forms of royal head-dresses, see Crown. For military ones, see Helmet.

Head of the Church, a title which properly belongs only to Christ (Ephes. v, 23), as the Supreme Governor of the whole body of the faithful. It is applied to the sovereign of Great Britain as the ruler of the temporalities of the Church. "Some have imagined (the members of the Romish Church, for instance) that the Christian world is 'permanently,' and from generation to generation, subject to some one spiritual ruler (whether an individual man or a Church), the delegate, representative, and viceregent of Christ, whose authority should be binding on the conscience of all, and decisive on every point of faith." But, had such been our Lord's design, he could not possibly have failed, when promising his disciples "another Comforter, who should abide with them forever," to refer them to the man or body of men who should, in perpetual succession, be the depository of this divine consolation and supremacy. It is also incredible, had such been our Lord's purpose, that he himself should be perpetually spoken of and alluded to as the Head of his Church, without any reference to any supreme head on earth as fully representing him, and bearing universal rule in his name. It is clear, therefore, that the Christian Church universal has no spiritual head on earth (Eden, Churchman's Dictionary, s. v.). See Pope; Papacy; Primacy.

Heal (properly ἅξιος, ἱπποραίω) is used in Scripture in the wider sense of curing in general, as applied to diseases, and even to inanimate objects. It occurs also in the special sense of restoring from apostasy. See Disease; Cure.
HEAP

The Hebrew word תַּגָּדֶשׁ, tagdockh, rendered "tomb" in Job xxx, 32, and "heap" in the margin, properly signifies a stack; a heap, tumulus, a sepulchral mound that was made by a pile of earth or stones. The ancient tumuli were heaps of earth or stone, and probably such a pile was usually made over a grave as a monument. Travellers in the East have often seen heaps of stones covering over or marking the place of graves. The Hebrew word תַּגָּדֶשׁ, tagdockh, rendered "a great heap of stones," refers to the heaps or tumuli which were raised over those whose death was either infamous or attended with some very remarkable circumstances. Such was the monument raised over the grave of Achan (Josh. vii, 26); and over that of the king of Ai (Josh. xix, 29). The building of Absalom was distinguished by a similar erection, as a monument of his disgrace to future ages (2 Sam. xviii, 17). The same word תַּגָּדֶשׁ, tag, is commonly used in reference to the heaps or ruins of walls and cities (Job viii, 17; Isa. xxxv, 2; 2 Is, 37; Jer. ix, 10). Modern travellers abundantly testify to the accurate fulfillment of Scripture prophecy in relation to the sites of vanished cities, particularly such as were doomed to become desolate heaps (Bastow). See PILAR; STONE.

Other Heb. terms translated heap are: דֶּשֶׁת, sheker, a pile (Exod. viii, 14, elsewhere a homer, as a measure); דֶּשֶׁת, mei, a heap of rubbish (Isa. xxii, 11); דֶּשֶׁת, ned, a mound (Isa. xxi, 11; poet. of waves, Exod. xv, 8; Josh. iii, 11, 13; Psa. lxxxi, 7; lxxx, 13); דֶּשֶׁת, arenamh, a pile (e.g. of rubbish, Neh. iii, 34; of grain, Cant. vii, 3; of sheaves, Ruth iii, 7; Neh. viii, 13; Hag. li, 16, etc.); דֶּשֶׁת, a hill (Josh. xii, 13, espec. a mound of rubbish, Deut. xii, 17; Josh. viii, 28; Jer. xix, 2, etc.); with others of a more miscellaneous signification. See MOUNT.

Hearers (audientes), a name given to a class of men in the early Church who were admitted to hear sermons and scriptures read in the church, but were not allowed to share in the prayers. The Apostolical Constitutions (lib. viii, c. 5) orders the deacons to dismiss them with the words Νέες οйκίαν αὐθεντέων, Νέες οйκίαν αὐθεντέων ("Let none of the hearers, let none of the unbelievers, be present"), before the public liturgy began. See Bingham, Orig. Ecles. bk. viii, c. 4; bk. xi. ch. 2; bk. xvii. ch. 1.

Hearse or Horse (from Lat. heres, Low Lat. hercia, French herse, a hurdle). The Low Latin hercia also signified a candelabrum, shaped like a hurdle, which was placed at the head of a grave, a coffin, or a cenotaph. In the Middle Ages the name herse was applied to a canop- py (in Italian, catafald), which was placed over the cof- fins of the distinguished dead, while they were kept in the church previous to interment. Horses were also frequently prepared to receive the bodies of the dead in churches, at stations along the route, where they were being borne to a distance for final interment. Horses were often made with great magnificence. They were frequently adorned with illustrations of the last judg- ment, and other subjects taken from the Scriptures. Candles were set in sockets in great numbers, and were kept burning as long as the corpse remained in the horse. The name herse was also applied to a frame of wood or of metal that was placed over some of the re- clining statues which were so frequently put over the tombs of distinguished persons. Over this horse a pall was frequently hung. The modern use of the word hearse is confined to a frame-work or a wagon to bear the dead to the grave. The hearse varies greatly in form and ornamentation in different countries.—Dier, Etymologisches Wörterbuch (1861); Parker, Dic. of Architecture (1850); Migne, Dictionnaire des Origines (Paris, 1864). (G. F. C.)

Heart, in the Biblical sense (καρδία; בַּמֶּר or בַּמֶּר, often exchanged for בַּמֶּר, in a more extended sense, as in Psa. xxxix, 3, 4; cix, 22; 1 Sam. xxv, 37, the whole region of the chest, with its contents; see Delitzsch, System of Biblical Psychology, § 12, 18). According to Hupfeld, בַּמֶּר, in Psa. xvii, 10, and lxxiii, 7, means simply the heart, which is not very likely.

1. In the Biblical point of view, human life, in all its operations, is centred in the heart. The heart is the central organ of the physical circulation; hence the necessity for strengthening the body as a support for the heart (2 Sam. xvi, 5; Judges xix, 3; Psa. cvi, 15); and the exhaustion of physical power is called a drying up of the heart (Psa. cii, 5; xxii, 15, etc.). So, also, is the heart the centre of spiritual activity; for all spiritual aims, whether belonging to the intellectual, moral, or pathological spheres, are elaborated in the heart, and again carried out by the heart. In fact, the whole life of the soul, in the lower and sensual, as well as in the higher spheres, has its origin in the heart (Prov. iv, 23, "For out of it are the issues of life"). In order to follow this train of thought, and to establish in a clearer light the Biblical view of the heart, it will be best to consider the relation the heart bears to the soul (ψυχή, ψυχή). This is one of the difficult questions in Biblical psychology; Olschowski (in the Abh. der naturw. und kathol. freunde, opus. theol. p. 158) says, "Omnia longum difficillimum est accurate definire quidnam discrimi- nent in N. T. inter ψυχήν et καρδιαν intercedat." Never- theless, the task is facilitated by the fact that there is essential agreement on this point in the anthropologies of the Old and New Testament.

(1) We first note that, while, as before said, the heart is the centre of all the functions of the soul's life, the terms "heart" and "soul" are often used interchangeably in Scripture. Thus, in Deut. vi, 5 (compare Matt. xxii, 37; Mark xii, 30, 33; Luke x, 27), and xxi, 16, we are commanded to love God and obey his commandments with all our heart and all our soul (compare 1 Chron. xxxviii, 9); the union of the faithful, in Acts iv, 12, is designated as ἡν ἡ καρδια καί ἡ ψυχή μια ("in these passages, as in others, for instance, Deut. vi, 18; xxx, 2; Jer. xxxii, 41, there is, moreover, notice not that the heart is always named alone.

Thus the indecision and division of the inner life can be designated either by ἱλασθείς (James i, 8) or by καρδία ἑαυτοῦ (James i, 8) or by καρδία ἑαυτοῦ (James i, 8) or by καρδία ἑαυτοῦ. It is said of both ἱλασθείς καρ- δία (James i, 8) and ἱλασθείς ψυχή (1 Pet. i, 22); also καρδία ἑαυτοῦ (Psa. xiii, 5; comp. Job xxx, 16) and καρδία ἑαυτοῦ (Lam. ii, 10; Psa. liii, 9), the self-impelling to the love of God applies as well to the soul (Psa. ci) as to the καρδία, of which the heart is the centre, etc. But in the majority of passages, where either the heart or the soul are separately spoken of, the term "heart" or "soul" may or may not be exchanged at all for the term "soul," or else only with some modification in the mean- ing.

(2) Note also the following fundamental distinction: The soul is the bearer of the personality (i.e. of the ego, the property of man, in virtue of which a living spirit "soul," (Proverbs, 27, 1 Cor. ii, 11)), but yet is not itself the per- son of man; the heart, on the contrary (the γινώσκω, (Proverbs, 27, 22), is the place where the process of self-con- sciousness is developed, in which the soul finds itself, and thus becomes conscious of its actions and impressions as its own "in corde actiones animae humanae ad ipsam reducunt," as is concisely and correctly said by Roes in his "De insigne, expl.t, xii, 770, p. 99). Ac- cordingly the soul, not the heart, is spoken of when the
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whole human being as such, and his physical or spiritual welfare or perilment are meant. This is seen on comparing such passages as Job xxxii, 18, 22, 28; Psal. xxiv, 17; and the expressions of the New Testament poets (Heb. xii, 39; ἀπολοία τετυφυος Mark vii, 35; comp. Matt. x, 35; James i, 21; σωτηρία του φυσιον (1 Pet. i, 5); ἀπολοία τοις (Acts i, 24); nor could we substitute ‘heart’ for ‘soul’ regarding with the oath in 2 Cor. i, 29); neither can ἄχρηστος be said of the δύναμις (Psa. xxi, 30), instead of ἀτυχής ἢ ἁμαρτήσας, for ἄχρηστος δυνάμις (Psa. xxiii, 27; lxix, 35) has an essentially different meaning from ἄχρηστος (comp. Jer. xxxviii, 17, 20).

When Nabu lost consciousness in consequence of fear, his soul still dwelt in him (see Acts xx, 10); but yet, according to 1 Sam. xxxv, 37, his heart died within him. When fear suspends consciousness the heart fails (Gen. xiii, 26). On the other hand, ‘μυαλός, νοον’ (Cont. v, 6), which commentators combine with ἄνοιξις, has an entirely different meaning, namely, that the very self is affected by the love of the other man. When expressing inward contemplation, some feeling or action taking place within man, the elaboration of a plan or resolution, we find almost invariably the heart named, and not the soul (Roos, Fundam. psychol.); ‘Όμως ἐπεί ημὶ ἵνα καταλάβῃς ἀληθίνην μονήν, καὶ εἰς καθαρλόν ἅγιον σώματι τυλιγμόνα (Rom. vi, 14); πάντας τινας καταλαβόν (Rom. i, 17). When the passage Psa. cxix, 32, and the variously interpreted passage 2 Kings v, 26, are also to be understood in that manner. The Sept., therefore, often translates ὁρούσιον simply by νοος (Exod. vii, 23; Isa. x, 7, etc.). On the close connection between these two views, see Beck, Christl. Lehrbuch (s. vi, 233). There are, of course, exceptions. The soul is also presented as the subject of perception (Prov. xix, 2; Psa. cxxix, 14); the thoughts which influence man are also called the language and thoughts of the soul (Lam. iii, 20, 24; 1 Sam. xx, 4). The soul is the seat of imagination (Ezek. xi, 13), the place where counsel is taken (Psa. xii, 2 sqq). Yet such passages are comparatively few (comp. Delitzsch, § xii), and even in them the soul sometimes appears to be mentioned, as in the lust-named passage, only in consequence of the necessity of a second expression in the parallelisms. (4) On the other hand, the disposition of mind and passions are as often attributed to the soul as to the heart, according as they are considered either as pervading the whole personality of man, or a disposition governing the whole inner nature of man. It is said in Matt. xxxiv, 18, πρὸς τὸν ἁγιόν ὑμῶν τοῦ φυσιον, that in John xv, 6, it says ὁ λόγος ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ ὑμῶν καὶ καρδία ὑμῶν τοῦ φυσιον (comp. Rom. ix, 29: xi, 1, μὴ παρασκευάζον, ὑμῶν καρδία; 2 Cor. ii, 4, ἀρεταί καὶ καρδικά, etc.) We find also grief and care, fear and terror, joy and confidence, etc., attributed differently to the heart or to the soul in the O. T. (see Deut. xvii, 2; Prov. xlii, 6; Ezek. xii, 16; 1 Sam. ii, 1; Psa. lvii, 7; Exod. xiv, 9 (where Luther translates δύναμις by heart)); Psa. vi, 4; xlii, 6, 7; Isa. lxii, 10; Psa. lxii, 10; cxxxii, 6; cxvii, 7). Custom has here established arbitrary distinctions between the different expressions: thus ἄχρηστος and its derivatives are generally connected with ὁρούσιον, and νοος and its derivatives with καρδία. The passage Prov. xiv, 10 is of especial interest in this respect. On the contrary, we find ὁρούσιον instead of καρδία when speaking of those functions in which the subject is apprehended as acting on an object. A remarkable passage in this sense is found in Jer. iv, 19: the soul hears the noise of war, and the heart is pained and heavy (Jer. iv, 19). Even in such a passage as Jer. iii, 9: ἡ καρδία μου ἀκύρωσι τῆς ἁμαρτίας (Psa. i, Kings iii, 9). Here we must, however, notice that, as Delitzsch (p. 162) very correctly remarks, in the conception of καρδία, the idea of desire is evidently prevalent over all others. All the impulses by which human actions are governed (see Exod. xxxxxv, 5, 22, 29), the disposition of mind which regulates them, the wishes, desires, etc., originate in the heart (comp. Ezek. xii, 1; Deut. x, 16; Job xxxii, 7, 9, 27; Psa. lxvi, 18; Prov. vii, 2; Matt. v, 28); but as soon as the disposition of the will turns to an outward manifestation of the desires, the καρδία, comes into play. Yet the root καρδία and its derivatives are almost exclusively connected with καρδία (only in Psa. xxxi, 3 do we find καρδία; comp. ἵσυμα τῶν καρδιῶν, Rom. ii, 4; see other passages, like Psa. lxxxiv, 3; cxix, 20, 81; Isa. viii, 8, 9; Jer. xxii, 7). We even find καρδία used sometimes to signify the desire itself, as particularly in Exod. vii, 7, 9. Thus we can explain καρδία (Isa. v, 14; Hab. ii, 5, 20; Prov. xxxii, 2) and καρδία (Proverbs xxviii, 29); the latter is distinct from καρδία (Psa. ci, 5), which Ewald erroneously translates by "covetous heart," while in Prov. xxv, 4 it signifies the soul itself.

2. From the foregoing explanations we can deduce the ethical and religious signification of the word heart. (1) As the heart is the home of the personal life, the workshop where all personal appropriation and elaboration of spiritual things have their seat, it follows that the moral and religious development of man—in fact, his whole moral personality, is also centred in it. Only that which has entered the heart constitutes a possession, having a moral worth, while only that which comes from the heart is a moral product. From the nature and contents of the heart, by a law of natural connection—similar to that which exists between the tree and its fruits (Matt. xii, 33 sqq)—results the individual's course of life as a whole; and from them all his personal acts derive their character and moral signification. Hence καρδία is applied to whatever is of a real moral nature in contradistinction from mere outward appearance (Rom. vi, 17; comp. Matt. xv, 8; 1 Tim. iv, 5). Even in passages where we find it said, in order to express the distinction between what is essential to his nature and the appearance as perceived by man, "He doth not μεταφέρει willingly afflicte" (Lam. iii, 23). That the divine judgment on man will be directed by what he is, not by what he may appear to be, is described as a looking upon his heart (1 Sam. xvii, 7; Jer. xx, 12); a knowing or trying of the heart (1 Kings
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viii, 39; Luke xvi, 15; Prov. xvi, 8; Ps. viii, 10; xvii, 3; Jer. xi, 20). Therefore also man is designated according to his heart in all that relates to habitual moral qualities; thus we read of a wise heart (1 Kings v, 12; Prov. x, 8, etc.), a pure heart (Ps. lxxvii, 10; 1 Tim. ii, 3; 2 Tim. ii, 22), an upright and righteous heart (Gen. xx, 5, 6; Ps. xi, 2; lxiv, 72, q.e. 2), a single heart (Eph. v, 5; Col. iii, 22), a pious and good heart (Luke viii, 15), a lowly heart (Matt. xi, 29), etc. In all these places it would be difficult to introduce αὐλανηθή or ἄσθενος.

(2) We must also observe that the original divine rule of the heart for man was implanted in his heart, and therefore the heart is the seat of the ευφήλεια, or conscience, which has a mission to proclaim that rule (Rom. ii, 15).

All subsequent divine revelations were also directed to the heart (Deut. vi, 6); so the law demands that God should be loved with the whole heart, and then, as though by radiation from this centre, with the whole soul (comp. Deut. xii, 18; Ps. cxix, 11, etc.). The teaching of wisdom also enters into the heart, and from thence spreads its healing and vivifying influence through the whole organism (Prov. iv, 21–23). The prophetic consolations must spring from the heart (Isa. xi, 2), in contradistinction from such consolations as do not reach the bottom of human nature; thus also, in Matt. xiii, 9; Luke viii, 15, we find the heart described as the ground on which the seed of the divine Word is to be sowed. That which becomes assimilated to the heart constitutes the θυματικός τῆς ψυχής (Matt. xii, 30; John xiv, 22).

This, however, is not only λαμπρός, but also κοινή for the heart is not only a recipient of divine principles of life, but also of evil.

(3) In opposition to the superficial doctrine which makes man in regard to morals an indifferent being, Scripture presents to us the doctrine of the natural wickedness of the human heart, the ὑπερασπισμός (Gen. viii, 21), or, more completely, ὑπερασπισμὸς καὶ ὑπερασπισμός (vi, 5; compare 1 Chron. xxviii, 9), and considers man as having penetrated the centre of life, from whence it contaminates its whole course. “How can ye, being evil, speak good things? for out of the abundance of the heart the mouth speaks” (Matt. xxi, 44; comp. Eccles. viii, 11; Ps. lxxii, 7); and those things which come out of the heart defile the man (Matt. xv, 18). The heart is described as deceitful (or, more properly, ὑπερασπισμός, the opposite of ἀληθεία, straight) above all things, and desperately wicked (ὑπερασπισμός, John xxvi, 9); so that God alone can thoroughly sound the depths of its wickedness (compare 1 John iii, 20). Hence the prayer in Ps. cxxxx, 23.

In this natural state of unsatisfactory for good the heart is called uncircumcised, ἄπραματα (Numb. xxvi, 41; compare Deut. x, 16; Ezek. xxiv, 9). Man, frightened at the manifestation of divine holiness, may take within himself the resolution of fulfilling the divine commands (Deut. xiv, 24); yet the divine voice complains (v, 29), “Of that there were such a heart in them that they would fear me!” etc. Therefore the whole Revelation has for its object to change the heart of man; and its whole aim is to destroy, by virtue of its divine efficacy, the unsatisfied heart-restlessness, that constant anxiety, that restless agitation of the heart as Roos expresses it, p. 158) and the antagonism of the heart, and to substitute for them the fear of God in the heart (Jer. xxxii, 40), so that the law may be admitted (Jer. xxxii, 33). This is the effect of the operations of the Holy Spirit, whose workings, as shown in the O.T., produced the new nature, the operation of the heart, the new creation in Christ (Ezek. xxxvi, 26 sq.; xi, 19). Transforming the prophets into new creatures by means of a change of heart (1 Sam. x, 6, 9), and implanting a willingness to obey God’s Law in the pious (Ps. xii, 14–15).

(4) On the part of man, the process of salvation begins in the moment of his acknowledgment of his testimony revelation; which, as giving a new direction to the inner life, belongs entirely to the sphere of the heart, and is described as a fastening (according to the original meaning of εὐπήλεια), a strengthening (γαμογίας, Ps. xxvi, 14; xxxii, 24), a supporting of the heart (comp. particularly Ps. xxvi, 7) on the ground which is God himself, the Δυνάμεις (Psa. lxxiii, 26). The N. T. says in the same manner: καρδιά παρετήσεται (Rom. x, 9, 10), παρετθύνεται εἰς ἡδύναμιν καρδιάς; faith is a μιακίνησις (Matt. xii, 31). As also in the case of the heart by faith in Christ (Acts xv, 9), for by the sprinkling of the blood of atonement the heart is rid of the bad conscience (Heb. x, 22; compare 1 John iii, 19–21), and the love of God is shed in it by the Holy Ghost (Rom. v, 5). The same spirit also works in the heart in the assurance of being a child of God (2 Cor. vii, 17); the heart becomes the abode of Christ (Eph. iii, 16), is preserved in Christ (Col. iii, 15; Phil. iv, 7), and strengthened in sanctification (1 Thes. iii, 15, etc.).

When, on the contrary, man rejects the testimony of revelation, the heart becomes hardened, turns to stone (Ps. xvi, 8; Prov. xxviii, 14; Jer. xxiv, 2). As so many people do not only be διαφανές, but also παντοκράτορ of; for the heart is not only a recipient of divine principles of life, but also of evil.

5. Finally, the question of the position of the heart, as centre of the spiritual life of the soul, holds in regard to the heart considered as the centre of the organic (physical) life, cannot be fully treated except in a thorough investigation of the relations between the body and soul in general. We will only remark here that the Scriptures not only draw a parallel between the body and the soul, by virtue of which the bodily actions are considered as symbols of the spiritual, but also establish the position that the soul, which is the bearer of the personality, is the same which directs also the life and actions; and thus the bodily organs, in their higher functions, become its adjuncts. Now, in view of the well-known fact that emotions and sufferings affect the physical economy— for example, that the pulsations of the heart are affected by them—no one will consider it a mere figure of speech when the Psalmist says, “My heart was hot within me” (Psa. xxxix, 3), or Jeremiah speaks of a “burning fire shut up in his bones” (Jer. xx, 9; comp. iv, 19; xxiii, 9).

But still more worthy of consideration is the position in Biblical anthropology, namely, the specific relation the Bible establishes between certain parts of the bodily organism and particular actions (see what Delitzesch, Biblical Psychology, § 12, 15, deduces from the Biblical significance of the τῇ καρδιᾷ, the hear, the kidneys), and then the part attributed to the heart in knowledge and will, considered aside from the heart and brain. It is well known that all antiquity agreed with the Biblical views in these respects. In regard to Homer’s doctrine, see Nigelsbach’s Homer, Theologie, p. 332 sqq. We may also on this point recall the expressions cordatus, recordari, occrus, occrus, etc. (see especially Cicero, Tusq. i, 9, 18, and Plato, Phaed. c. 45, and the commentators on these passages). As Delitzesch correctly observes, the spiritual signification of the heart cannot be traced back to it from the mere fact of its being the central organ of the circulation. The manner in which that writer has made use of the phenomena of somnambulism to explain this is distinctly unsound, yet physiological science has far been unable to throw any light on the subject...thetis, in Herzog, Real-Encyclop., vi, 15 sq.

4. The heart expresses the middle of anything: “Tyre is in the heart,” in the midst, “of the sea” (Ezek. xxvii, 14). “We will not fear, though the mountains be carried by the waves of the sea” (Ps. lxxxii, 6). As Jonah was three days and three nights in the whale’s
bely, so shall the Son of man be three days and three nights in the heart of the earth" (Matt. xii, 40). Mos- saes speaking to the Israelites, says, "And the mountain lake shall rise up unto the heart of heaven," the flame rose as high as the clouds.

To "say in one's heart" is a Hebrew expression for thinking (Ps. x, 6; xlv, 1). See SOUL.

5. Of special religious importance are the following practical uses of the word: The heart is that state in which a sinner is inclined to and actually goes on the rebellion against God. This state evidences itself by light views of the evil of sin; partial acknowledgment and confession of it; frequent commission of it; pride and conceit; ingratitude; unconcern about the Word and ordinances of God; insensitivity to divine providences; stilted convictions of conscience; shunning reproof; presumption, and general ignorance of divine things.

Keeping the heart is a duty enjoined in the sacred Scriptures. It consists, says Flavel, in the diligent and constant use and improvement of all holy motions and duties to preserve the soul from sin, and maintain communion with God; and this, he properly observes, supposes a previous work of sanctification, which hath set the heart right by giving it a new bent and inclination. It includes frequent observation of the frame of the soul (Lev. x, 19). Under injuries received (Rom. iii, 26), the heart is ready for baking, a corner of the heart is swept, the bread is laid upon it, and covered with ashes and embers; in a quarter of an hour they turn it. Sometimes they use cozen plates of iron (Arabic atgez, whence the Gr. riyavou), which are most common among the nomadic tribes, as being the easiest way of baking and done with the least expense, for the bread is extremely thin and soon prepared. See BREAD.

This iron plate is either laid on, or supported on legs above the vessel sunk in the ground, which forms the oven. See OVENS. (See note on Bed. i, 18; P. della Valle, Viaggi, i, 436; Harmers, Obs. i, 477, and note; Rauwolf, Travels, ap. Ray, ii, 163; Shaw, Travels, p. 231; Niebuhr, Descr. de l'Arabie, p. 45; Schleusner, Lex. V. Testamenti, s. V. riyavou; Gesenius, s. V. הַרְשִׁו, p. 997). See FIRE.

He-Ass, מֵאָשׁ, chamár' (Gen. xii, 16; elsewhere simply "as"), the general designation of the donkey (Exod. xiii, 13, etc.) for carrying burdens (Exod. xiii, 26) and ploughing (Isa. xxx, 24), being regarded as a patient (Gen. xlix, 14) and contented animal for riding in time of peace (2 Sam. xix, 27; Zech. ix, 9); different from the proud (Exod. xiii, 5). As a beast of burden, it was eaten only in times of famine (2 Kings vi, 25). See Ass's HEAD.

The prohibition of the use of horses to Israel caused the "as" to be held in higher estimation than it holds in our times. It was, at least down to the days of Solomon, the principal beast of burden. But we must not attribute this election wholly to the absence or scarcity of the horse, for in Western Asia the ass is still largely used for the saddle. Though inferior in dignity to the horse, he is still, in his native regions, a very superior animal to the poor, weather-beaten, stunted, half-starved saddle horse of the West. In ancient times the Arabian ass as a really elegant creature. The coat is smooth and clean, the carriage is erect and proud; the limbs are clean, well-formed, and muscular, and are well thrown out in walking or galloping. Asses of this Arab breed are used exclusively for the saddle, and are imported into Syria and Persia, where they are highly valued, especially by the ballists or lawyers, the sheiks or religious teachers, and elderly persons of the opulent classes. They are fed and dressed with the same care as horses, the head-gear is highly ornamented, and the saddle is covered with a fine carpet. They are more spirited, and yet sufficiently docile. Other breeds are equally useful in the more humble labors of ploughing and carrying burdens. White asses, distinguished not only by their color, but by their stature and symmetry, are frequently seen in Western Asia, and are always more highly valued than those of more ordinary hue.

The editor of the Pictorial Bible says that these "are usually in every respect the finest of their species, and their owners certainly take more pride in them than in any other of their asses. They sell at a much higher price; and those hackney ass-men who make a livelihood by hiring their asses to passengers in a hired ride, always expect better pay for the white ass than for any of the others." After describing their more highly ornamented trappings, he observes, "But, above all, their white hides are fantastically streaked and spot-
Modern Egyptians mounted on asses.

The constitution of the ass is formed for a dry, rugged region, a rocky wilderness. Its hoofs are long, hollow beneath, with very sharp edges, a peculiarity which makes it sure-footed in ascending and descending steep mountain passes, where the flat hoof of the horse would be insecure. It prefers aromatic, dry, prickly herbs to the most succulent and tender grass; is fond of rolling in the dry dust; suffers but little from thirst or heat; drinks seldom and little; and seems to have no sensible perspiration, its skin being hard, tough, and insensitve. All these characters suit the arid, rocky wildernesses of Persia and Western Asia, the native country of this valuable animal. See Ass.

Heath (usually פּלָש, chôm, קְמָמָחְנ, chammakh'; or פּלָש, chemah'), besides its ordinary meaning, has several peculiar uses in Scripture. In Is. xliv, 10, and Rev. vii, 16, there is a reference to the burning wind of the desert, the zizim or samim, described by travellers as exceedingly pestilential and fatal. It is highly probable that this was the instrument with which God destroyed the army of Sennacherib (2 Kings xix, 7, 35). Its effects are evidently alluded to in Ps. ciii, 15, 16, and in Jer. iv, 11. Then the term mentions a wind, which in 1658 suffocated 20,000 men in one night, and another which in 1655 suffocated 4000 persons. It sometimes burns up the corn when near its maturity, and hence the image of "corn blasted before it be grown up," used in 2 Kings xix, 26. Its effect is not only to render the air extremely hot and scorching, but to kill it with poisonous and suffocating vapors. The most violent storms that Judea was subject to came from the deserts of Arabia. "Out of the south cometh the whirlwind," says Job (xxxvii, 9); "And there came a great wind from the wilderness" (Job i, 19). Zech. ix, 14: "And Jehovah shall appear over them, and his arrow shall go forth as the lightning; and the Lord Jehovah shall sound the trumpet, and shall march in the whirlwinds of the south." The 91st Psalm, which speaks of divine protection, describes the plague as arrows, and in those winds where there are observed flashes of fire. In Numb. xiii, 3, the place in which the plague was inflicted upon the Israelites is for that reason called Taborah, i.e., a burning. A plague is called קִרְצא, dicer, as a desert is called קְמָמָחְנ, mîlîbar-, because those winds came from the desert, and are real plagues. This hot wind, when used as a symbol, signifies the fire of persecution, or else some prodigious wars which destroy men. For wind signifies war; and

scorching heat signifies persecution and destruction. So in Matt. xxi, 6, 21, and Luke viii, 6-13, heat signifies persecution, and in 1 Pet. iv, 12, burning tends to temptation. A gentle heat of the sun, according to the Oriental interpreters, signifies the favor and bounty of the prince; but great heat denotes punishment. Hence the burning of the heavens is a portent explained in Lirev. (ii, 5) of slaughter. Thus in Ps. cxxxi, 6: "The sun shall not smite thee by day, nor the moon by night," is in the next place explained thus: "Jehovah shall preserve thee from all evil; he shall preserve thy soul." See Fire.

Heath (יוֹרָן, arar; Jer. xvii, 6; Sept. ὑπορμίσχυ, Vulg. myrrice; or נֶרֶן, aravah; Jer. xlviii, 6; Sept. ἱσχος ἵππος, persh, by reading יִרְמָה, a wild ass; Vulg. myrurca) has been variously translated, as myrrice, tamarisk; tamarus, which is an Indian tree, the tamarind; retama, that is the broom; and also, as in the French and English versions, bruire, heath, which is, perhaps, the most incorrect of all, though Hesychius mentions finding heath near Jericho, in Syria. Gesenius, however, renders it ruins in the latter of the above passages (see Jer. xlvii, 13, and severely in the former (as in Ps. cxxii, 18). As far as the context is concerned, some of the plants named, as the retam and tamarisk, would answer very well [see Tamarisk]; but the Arabic name, arar, is applied to a totally different plant, a species of which has been clearly shown by Chabas (Hierobot. ii, 195), who states that Arias Montanus is the only one who has so translated the Hebrew in the first of the passages in question (Jer. xlvii, 6): "For he shall be like the heath in the desert, and shall not see when good cometh, but shall inhabit the parched places in the wilderness, in a salt land, and not inhabited." Both the Heb. words are from the root נָרָה, to be naked, in allusion to the bare nature of the rocks on which the juniper often grows (comp. Ps. cxxii, 17, נָרָה, the prayer of the destitute, or ill-clad). Several species of juniper are no doubt found in Syria and Palestine. See Cedar; juniper.

Dr. Robinson went with some in proceeding from Hebron to wady Musa, near the romantic pass of Nemela: "On the rocks above we found the juniper-tree, Arabic arar; its berries bear the appearance and taste of the common juniper, except that there is more of the aroma of the pine. These trees were ten or fifteen feet in height, and hung upon the rocks even to the summits of the cliffs and needle." (Fibb. Researches, ii, 606). In preceding S.E. he states: "Lambiris, their juniper becomes more yellowish in the wadys and on the rocks." It is mentioned in the same situations by other travellers, and is no doubt common enough, particularly in wild, uncultivated, and often inaccessible situations, and is thus suitable to Jer. xlviii, 6: "Flee, save your lives, and be like the heath in the wilderness." This appears to be the Juniperus Sabina, or savin, with small scale-like leaves, which are pressed close to the stem, and which is described as being a gloomy-looking bush inhabiting the most sterile soil (see Exoah (Zeph. A. Hiat, iii, 311); a characteristic of which, so well suited to the dashed or destitute tree spoken of by the prophet. Rosenmuller's explanation of the Hebrew word, which is also adopted by Maurer, "qui destitutus versatur" (Schol. ad Jer. xlvii, 6), is very unsatisfactory. Not to mention the tameness of the comparison, it is evidently contradicted by the antiquities named, 8: "Cursed is he that trusts in the wood... he shall be like the juniper that grows on the bare rocks of the desert: Blessed is the man that trusteth in the Lord... he shall be as a tree planted by the waters." The contrast between the shrub of the arid desert and the tree growing by the waters is very striking; but Rosenmuller's interpretation appears to spoil the whole. Even more unsatisfactory is Michaelis (Supp. Lex. Heb. p. 1971), who thinks "Guinea-hens" (Numida melanoleuca) are intended! Gesenius (Thes. p. 1073 4) understands these two Heb. terms to denote
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"paritena, ediccia evera" (ruins); but it is more in accordance with the scriptural passages to suppose that some tree is intended, which explanation, moreover, has the sanction of the Sept. and Vulgate, and of the modern use of the word. Most modern travelers do not mention the species; but those which have been named as growing in Palestine are the Phoecian juniper, the common sabin, and the brown-berried juniper. The first of these is a tree of about twenty feet high, growing with its branches in a pyramidal form. Rosenmuller et al. think that Forskal found it frequently in the sandy heaths about Suez. The caravans use it for fuel." The species best known in America are the common red cedar (Jun. Virginiana) and the Bermuda cedar, from which the wood of lead-pencils is manufactured. They all have long, narrow, prickly leaves and bear a soft, pulpy berry, from which a carminative oil is extracted. The wood is light, highly odorous, and very durable. See JUNIPER.

Sanhe, Aza, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Hillsdale, N. Y., July 81, 1776. His parents were Congregationalists. At thirteen he was converted, under the minster of the Rev. F. Garretson (q. v.). He began to preach in 1797 on Cambrai Mission work, under the direc- tion of the Rev. Sylvester Hutchinson. In 1798 he was stationed at Pomfret, Conn., with Dan-iel Orrander. In 1799 he was sent to the province of Maine, and stationed on the Kennebec Circuit, embarking all the territory from Watervill to the Canaan line, making it two hundred miles to reach all the appointments. In 1800 Portland was his field of labor: 1801, Readfield; 1802, Falmouth; 1804-5, Scar- borou. In 1806 he located in consequence of body in- ferminities. In 1818 he re-entered the traveling connec- tion, and was appointed presiding elder of Portland dis- trict, which position he occupied for three years; 1821, 1822, Kennebec; in 1823 he again located, and removed to Monmouth, Me.; in 1827 he re-entered the travelling ministry again, and held an effective re- lation to the Conference fifteen years. In 1842 he be- came supernumerary, and this relation continued until Sept. 1, 1880, when he died in peace. As a preacher, he was noted in doctrine, clear in exposition, simple yet forcible in illustration, and impressive in delivery. Zim's Herald, Oct. 5, 1880.

Heathcothe, Ralph, D.D., an English divine, was born in 1721, and died May 28, 1795. He was educated at Jesus College, Cambridge; took degrees in 1748 was made vicar of Barkby, near Leicester; assistant preacher of Lincoln's Inn in 1753; succeeded his father as vicar of Sileby in 1755; became rector of Sawtry-all Saints, Huntingdonshire, in 1756; a prebend in the collegiate church in Southwell in 1758; and in 1778 vicar- general of Southwell Church. Besides works on other subjects, he wrote Cursory Animadversions upon the Midde- ltonian Controversy in general (1752); Remarks upon Dr. Chapman's Charge (1752); Letter to Rev. T. Fother- gill (1753); Sketch of Lord Bolingbroke's Philosophy (1756, 8vo); The Use of Reason asserted in Matters of Religion (1756, 8vo); and a defence of the same, in 1759, 8vo; Discourse on the Being and God, against Atheists, in two Sermons (being the only ones of his twenty-four Boyle sermons which he published, 1763, 4to.) Dr. Heathcote wrote several articles for the first edition of the General Biographical Dictionary, and assisted Nicho- las in editing a new edition of the same, published in 1784, 12 vols. 8vo.—Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 814; Rose, New Gen. Biog. Dict. viii, 241; Gentleman's Maga- zine, lx, lxi, lxii. (J. W. M.)

Heathen. The Hebrew word ṭ̄érən, goy (plur. כְּפָהֵים, goyim), together with its Greek equivalent ἐθνος (ethnos), has been somewhat arbitrarily rendered "nation," "people," and "gentiles." Nevertheless, the Heb. word will be interesting to trace the manner in which a term, pri- marily and essentially general in its signification, ac- quired that more restricted sense which was afterwards attached to it. Its development is parallel with that of the Hebrew people, and its meaning at any period may be taken as significant of their relative position with regard to the surrounding nations (2).

1) While among the Jewish nation had no political existence, goyim denoted generally the nations of the world, especially including the immediate descendants of Abraham (Gen. xvii, 18; compare Gal. iii, 16). The latter, as they grew in numbers and importance, were distinguished by the most marked manners and usages by which they were surrounded, and were pro- vided with a code of laws and a religious ritual which made the distinction still more peculiar. They were essentially a separate people (Lev. xxi, 23); separate in habits, morals, and religion, and bound to maintain their separate character by denunciations of the most terrible judgments (Lev. xxvi, 14-38; Deut. xxvii, 11-30). On their march through the desert they encountered the most obstinate resistance from Amalek, "chief of the goyim" (Numb. xxiv, 20), in whose sight the deliverance from Egypt was achieved (Lev. xxii, 25). During the conquest of Canaan the goyim were rapidly exterminated and the "people" of goyim never again there were to be found. The goyim were a nation of enemies to the Israelites on all occasions that the goyim were fighting, the fate of the nation of Ca- nan was constantly kept before their eyes (Lev. xvi, 24, 25; Deut. xvii, 12). They are ever associated with the worship of false gods and the foul practices of idol-aters (Lev. xxi, xxv), and these constituted their chief distinction, as goyim, from the worshipers of the Jehovah, the people of Jehovah (Num. xv, 4; Deut. xxvii, 10). This distinction was maintained in its full force during the early times of the monarchy (2 Sam. vii, 23; 1 Kings vi, 4-8; xiv, 24; 2 Sam. vii, 35). It was from among the goyim, the degraded tribes who submitted to their arms, that the Israelites were permitted to pur- chase their bond-servants (Lev. xxv, 34, 45), and this special enactment seems to have had the effect of giv- ing to a national tradition the force and sanction of a cloth (comp. Gen. xxi, 15). In later times this regulation was strictly adhered to. To the words of Eccles. xi, 7, "I bought men-servants and maid-servants of the Jews in the gowm adin, "sons of the children of Ham, and the rest of the foreign nations," not only were the Israelites forbidden to intermarry with these goyim, but the latter were virtually excluded from the possibility of becoming naturalized. An Ammonite or Moabite was shut out from the congregation of Jehovah even to the tennis genera- tion (Deut. xxiii, 3), while an Edomite or Egyptian was admitted in the third (verses 7, 8). The necessity of maintaining a separation so broadly marked is ever more and more pressing as we follow the Israelites through their history, and observe their constant recurring tendency to descend. Offence and punishment followed each other with all the regularity of cause and effect (Judg. ii, 12; iii, 6-8, etc.).

2. But, even in early Jewish times, the term goyim received by anticipation a significance of wider range than the national experience. (Lev. xxvi, 38, 39; Deut. xxi, 1); and, as the latter was gradually developed dur- ing the gradual subjugation of the monarchy, the goyim were the surrounding nations generally, with whom the Israelites were brought into contact by the expansion of their commerce, and whose idolatrous practices they readily adopted (Ezek. xxiii, 30; Amos v, 26). Later still, it is applied to the Edomites (Isa. v, 1; 6, 10), to the destroyers of Moab (Isa. vi, 8), and to the several nations among whom the Jews were scattered during the Captivity.
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(Ps. cvi. 47; Jer. xlvii, 28; Lam. i, 8, etc.), the practice of idolatry still being their characteristic distinction (Isa. xxxvi. 18; Jer. x. 2, 3; xiv. 22). This signification it retained after the return from Babylon, though it was used in a more limited sense as denoting the mixed race of colonists who settled in Palestine during the Captivity (Neh. v, 17), and who are described as foreign to the Israelites while serving their own gods (2 Kings xvi. 29; Ezra vi. 21).

Tracing the synonymous term ἱθνα through the apocryphal writings, we find that it is applied to the nations around Palestine (1 Macc. i, 11), including the Syro-Palestinian lineal descendants of the army of Gorgias (1 Macc. iii. 41, iv, 7, 11, etc.), as well as the nations of the Philistia, Tyre, and Sidon (1 Macc. v, 9, 10, 16). They were image-worshippers (1 Macc. iii. 48; Wind. xv. 15), whose customs and fashions the Jews seem still to have had an unconquerable propensity to imitate, but on whom they were bound by national tradition to take vengeance (1 Macc. ii. 68; 1 Esth. xvi. 8). Following the customs of the γαλαταί at this period denoted the neglect or concealment of circumcision (1 Macc. i, 15), disregard of sacrifices, profanation of the Sabbath, eating of swine's flesh and meat offered to idols (2 Macc. vi. 6-9, 18; xv. 1, 12), a feature of the Greek national games (2 Macc. iv. 12, 14). In all points Judaism and Hellenism were strongly contrasted. The "barbarous multitude" in 2 Macc. ii. 21 are opposed to those who played the man for Judaism, and the distinction now becomes an ecclesiastical one (comp. Matt. xxviii. 17). In 2 Esth. iii. 33, 34, the "gentiles" are thus defined with as much facility in aecule (comp. Matt. vii. 32; Luke xii. 30).

As the Greek influence became more extensively felt in Asia Minor, and the Greek language was generally used, Hellenism and heathenism became convertible terms, and a Greek was synonymous with a foreigner of any nation. This is singularly evident in the Syriac of 2 Macc. v, 9, 10, 13; comp. John vii. 35; 1 Cor. x. 22; 2 Macc. xi. 2.

In the N. T., again, we find various shades of meaning attached to ἱθνα. In its narrowest sense it is opposed to "those of the circumcision" (Acts x. 45; comp. Esth. xiv. 15, where ἱθνεῖς is implied), and is contrasted with Israel, the people of Jehovah (Luke iii. 82), thus representing the Hebrew דַעַן at one stage of its history. But, like γαλαταί, it also denotes the people of the earth generally (Acts xxii. 26; Gal. iii. 14). In Matt. vii, 7, Ἰησοῦς is applied to an idolater.

But in addition to its significance as an ethnographic term, γαλαταί had a moral sense which must not be overlooked. In Ps. ix. 5, 15, 17 (comp. 2 Sam. xxii. 17, 21, 21) the word stands in parallelism with ἀθρόον, ῥαδχός, the wicked, as distinguished by his moral obliquity (see Hupfeld on Ps. i. 1), and in verse 17 the people thus designated are described as "forgetters of God," that know not Jehovah (Jer. x. 25). Again, in Ps. lix. 5, it is to some extent synonymous in meaning with נְבָשִׁי, "iniquitous transgressor," and in these passages, as well as in Ps. xix. 15, it has but a deeper significance than that of a merely national distinction, although the latter idea is never entirely lost sight of.

In later Jewish literature a technical definition of the word is laid down which is certainly not of universal application. Elias Buber (quoted by Eisenmenger, Ein Irrlichter Judentum, i, 665) explains the as ἁθνεῖς denoting one who is not of Israelitish birth. This can only have reference to its after signification; in the O. T. the singular is never used of an individual, but a collective term, applied equally to the Israelites (Josh. iii. 17) as to the nations of Canaan (Lev. xx. 25), and denotes simply a body politic. Another distinction, equally unsupported, is made between ἱθνα, γαλαταί, and ἄνθρωπος, the former being defined as the nations who had served Israel, while the latter were those who had not (Jalalk Chaudas, fol. 20, note 20; Eisenmenger, i. 667). Abarbanel, on Joel iii. 2, applies the former to both Christians and Turks, or Ishmaelites, while in Sepher Jachan (fol. 148, col. 2) the Christians alone are distinguished by this appellation. Eisenmenger gives some very curious examples of the disabilities under which a γαλατας laboried. One who kept Sabbath, who lived according to the usages of death (ii. 206), and the study of the law was prohibited him to undergo the same penalty, but on the latter point the doctors are at issue (ii. 209). See Gentiles.

3. In modern use, the word heathen (probably a corruption of ἱθνα, ἱθναται, of which it is a translation; or derived from heath, that is, peculiar to the wilderness, as pagan from paga, a village) is applied to all nations that are strangers to revealed religion, that is to say, to all except Christians, Jews, and Mohammedans.

It is nearly synonymous with Gentiles (q.v.) and Pagan (q.v.). At the time of the Crusades the Moslems were also called heathen; but as they receive the doctrine of the one God from the O. T., they are not properly so called. On the relation of the heathen to Judaism, see above, and also the article Gentiles in the same article (vol. iii, p. 789) for their relation to Christianity at its origin. We add the following statements:

"The Oriental forms of heathenism, the religion of the Chinese (Confucius, about 550 B.C.), the Brahminism, and the later Buddhism of the Hindoo (perhaps as early as 1000 B.C.); the religion of the Persians (Zoroaster, 700 B.C.), and the Egyptians (the religion of Osiris), have only a remote and indirect connection with the introduction of Christianity. But they form to some extent the historical basis of the Western religions; and the Persian dualism, especially, was not without influence on the earlier sects (the Gnostic and the Manichean) of the Christian Church. The idea of paganism appears in the two great nations of classic antiquity, Greece and Rome. With the language, morality, literature, and religion of these nations these apostles came directly into contact, and through the whole first age of the Church most of the basis of these nationalities. These, together with the Jews, were the great nations of the ancient world, and shared the earth among them. The Jews were chosen for things eternal, to keep the sanctuary of the true religion. The Greeks prepared the elements of a new culture, of science and art, for the use of the Church. The Romans developed the idea of law, and organized the civilized world in a universal empire, ready to serve the spiritual universality of the Gospel. Both Greeks and Romans were unconscious servitors of Jesus Christ, the 'unknown God.' These three eras, in sum, are the at bitter enmity among themselves, joined hands in the superscription around the cross, where the holy name and the royal title of the Redeemer stood written, by the command of the heathen Pilate, 'in Hebrew, and Greek, and Latin' (Schafr, History of the Christian Church, i, 44).

4. As to the religion of heathenism, it is a 'wild growth on the soil of fallen human nature, a darkening of the original consciousness of God, a defacement of the rational and irrational creation, and a corresponding corruption of the moral sense, giving the sanction of religion to natural and unnatural vices. Even the religion of Greece, which, as an artistic product of the imagination, has been justly styled the religion of beauty, is deformed by this moral distortion. It lacks the true conception of sin, and consequently the true conception of holiness. It regards sin not as a perverseness of will and an offence against the gods, but as a folly of the understanding, and an offence against men, often entirely a transgression from the gods themselves; for 'infatuation is a daughter of folly, for these gods themselves are mere men, in whom Homer and the popular faith saw and worshipped the weaknesses and vices of the Grecian character, as well as its virtues, in immensely magnified forms. They have bodies and senses, like mortals, only in colossal proportions. They eat and drink, though only nectar and ambrosia. They are lim-
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Heaven, like men, to time and space. Though sometimes honored with the attributes of omnipotence and omniscience, yet they are subject to an iron fate, fall under delusion, and reproach each other with folly. Their heavenly happiness is disturbed by all the troubles of earth, and by their own sins. They consider themselves as born, as living, and as dying, and makes Olympus tremble when he shakes his dark locks in anger. The gentle Venus beams from a spear-wound on her finger. Mars is felled with a stone by Diomedes. Neptune and Apollo have to serve for hire, and are cheated. The gods are involved by their own sins, and are afflicted with the same things that befell men. Though called holy and just, they are full of envy and wrath, hatred and lust, and provoke each other to lying and cruelty, perfidy and adultery. Notwithstanding this essential apostasy from truth and holiness, heathenism was religion, a groping after the unknown God. By its superstition it betrayed the need of faith. Its polytheism rested on a dim monothetic background; it subjected all the gods to Jupiter, and Jupiter himself to a mysterious fate. It had at bottom the feeling of dependence on higher powers, and reverence for divine things. It preserved the memory of a golden age and of a fall. It knew the voice of conscience, the voice of nature, obscure though it was, of guilt. It felt the need of reconciliation with deity, and sought that reconciliation by prayer, penance, and sacrifice. Many of its religious traditions and usages were faint echoes of the primal religion which appeared in the Old Testament. Even Jews, with men of semidemigods, of Prometheus delivered by Hercules from his helpless sufferings, were unconscious prophecies and flaky anticipations of Christian truths. This alone explains the great readiness with which heathens embraced the Gospel, to the shame of the Jews. These elements of truth, morality, and deity in heathenism may be ascribed to three sources. In the first place, man, even in his fallen state, retains some traces of the divine image, a consciousness of God, however weak, conscience, and a deep longing for union with the Godhead, for truth, and for righteousness. In the second place, with Tertullian, we cannot be faithful to the true sentiments of the classics of a Socrates, a Plato, an Aristotle, of Pindar, Sophocles, Plutarch, Cicero, Virgil, Seneca, 'the testimonies of a soul constitutionally Christian, of a nature predestined to Christianity. Secondly, some account must be made of traditions and recollections, however faint, coming down to us from the remote and distant times since the alleged apostle of all nations, the apostle of heathendom. The Church, perhaps, of the majority of the latter.' He adds in a note: "The Presbyterian Confession of Faith (chap. x. § 4) uses language of remarkable boldness on this point, saying, 'Others not elect, although they may be called by the ministry of the Word, and have some commercial operations of the Spirit, yet they never truly come to Christ, and therefore cannot be saved; much less can men not professing the Christian religion be saved in any other way whatever, be they never so diligent to frame their lives according to the light of nature, or to the dictates of the God of nature, or to the apostles, or to any church, or to the ministers of Christ, or to any form of Christian worship, or to any form of Christian profession to assert and maintain that they may be very pernicious and to be detested.' This is sufficiently positive, especially as it contradicts both our Saviour and the apostle Paul. It represents heathen who live according to their light as 'much less' possible than the children of men who receive Christ, and reject it, thus directly contradicting our Saviour, who declared that those who rejected his words would receive a heavier condemnation than even the depraved, unrepentant inhabitants of Sodom and Gomorrah, or Tyre and Sidon (Matt. xi. 20-24). The 'Confession of Faith' declares the salvation of conscientious heathen to be 'much less' possible than that of unbelieving hearers of the Gospel; while Christ asserts that even the most flagrant sinners of the heathen shall find it 'more tolerable' in the day of judgment than such unbelievers. Equally at variance with the 'Confession of Faith' is the declaration of Paul in Rom. ix. 27, 28: 'He that had not the law sinned likewise, which shows how those 'having not the law may be a law unto themselves,' and how their 'uncircumcision shall be counted for circumcision.' ... "The facts of human history and the declarations of the Bible alike declare that mercy is a prominent feature in the character of the Father, and that this world is for some reason, known or unknown, under its care. We cannot, therefore, resist the conviction—it is an affirmation of the moral sense of all men—that, guilty though the human race may be, and deserving of destruction, yet every man lives under a dispensation of mercy, and has the opportunity and the capacity for salvation. To assert gravely, then, that the heathen who have never heard of Christ are shut out from
all possible hope of pardon, and are not in a salvable position in their present circumstances, is to offend the moral sense of the thoughtful men as well as that of the common multitude. It is worse than denying that an atonement has been made for all mankind, and restricting it to a few, for that denies the practical untruth, is saved from much of its practical evil by our inability to point out the elect in advance, so that our hopes are not cut off for any particular man. But this theory points to actual masses of men, to the entire population of whole countries, and dooms them to a hopeless existence without hope of deliverance, and it extends this judgment backwards to generations in the past who are represented as having had no share in that mercy which we have such reason to believe to be universal in its offers. Such a theory practically denies the divine grace by suspending its exercise, so far as the heathen (the majority of the human race) are concerned, upon the action of those already enlightened. It declares that there is no possible mercy for the heathen unless Christians choose to carry the Gospel to them. Does it seem rational, or in harmony with the universality and freedom of God's grace, that the only possibility of salvation for the mass of mankind should be suspended, not on anything within their control, but on the conduct of men on the opposite side of the globe? By such representations the minds of men are shocked, and a reaction takes place, which is unfavorable not only to heathenism, but to doctrine in religion, both new and old. They are led to think of evangelical religion as a severe, gloomy, remorseless system, which represents God as without mercy, or which confines that mercy within an exceedingly narrow compass. By describing the salvation of pagans as absolutely impossible, an influence is exerted in favor of universal and infinite benevolence. The writer further asserts that no passage in the Bible asserts this theory, nor does any doctrine of the Bible imply it. John Wesley's views on this subject are given in his sermon on *Living without God*, from which we extract the following: "I have no authority from the sacred page to judge of those that are without, nor do I conceive that any man has a right to sentence all the heathen and Mohammedan world to damnation" *(Works, N.Y. ed. ii, 105)*. Again, the *Minutes of Aug. 8, 1770*, declare that "he that feareth God and worketh righteousness, according to the light he has, is accepted of God." For this Wesley was attacked by Shirley and others, and defended by Fletcher, in his *First Check to Antinomianism* *(New York ed., i, 41)*. See, besides the works above cited, Watson, *Theol. Instituts*, ii, 449; Whately, *Future State*, p. 201; Constant, *De la Religion* *(Brussels, 1822)*; *Le Rongeur* *(Douv. 1857* 57, 3 vols., 8vo); *Pressense, Hist. des Trois Premiers Siecles de l'eglise, vol. 1*; translated under the title *The Religion before Christ* *(Edinb. 1862, 8vo)*; Sepp, *Das Heidenthum (Regensb. 1858, 3 vols.)*; Maurice, *Religions of the World* *(Boston, 1854, 18mo)*; Trench, *Hulsean Lectures* for 1846 *(Philad., 1850, 12mo)*; Wutke, *Gesch. des Heidenthumus*, etc. *(Bresl. 1853, 8vo)*; Hardwick, *Christ and other Masters* *(1855, 2 vols., 8vo)*; Schaff, *Apostol. Church*, p. 133 sq.; Scholten, *Gesch. d. Religion u. Philosophie* *(Elberf. 1868, 8vo)*; Pfeiffer, *Die Religion, der Wesen und ihre Geschichte* *(Leipz. 1869, 2 vols., 8vo)*; Dillmann, *Wahrheit, die Jue in der Geschichte* *(Lond. 1867)*; *The Religion of the People of Christ*, trans. by Darnell (Lond. 1862, 2 vols., 8vo); *N. British Review*, December, 1867, art. 1; Baring-Gould, *Origin and Development of Religious Belief* *(Lond. 1869-70, 2 vols., 8vo)*.

**Heathenism.** See PAGANISM.

**Heaven.** There is, says Daubuz, a threefold world, and therefore a threefold heaven—the invisible, the visible, and the political among men, which last may be either civil or ecclesiastical. We shall consider these in the inverse order.

A. Territorially and Figuratively regarded. Wherever the scene of a prophetic vision is laid, heaven signifies symbolically the ruling power or government; that is, the whole assembly of the ruling powers, which, in respect to the subjects on earth, are a political heaven, being over and ruling the subjects, as the natural heaven stands over and rules the earth. Thus, according to the subject, is the term to be limited; and therefore Artemidorus, in the time of the Cimmerian pirates, makes Italy to be the heaven: "As heaven," says he, "is the abode of gods, so is Italy of kings." The Chinese call their monarch Tienmu, the son of heaven, meaning thereby the most powerful monarch. And thus, in Matt. xxiv. 30, *heaven is synonymous to power and glory*; and when Jesus says, "The powers of the heavens shall be shaken," it is easy to conceive that he meant that the kingdoms of the world should be overthrown to submit to his kingdom. Any government is a world; and therefore, in Isa. li. 15, 16, heaven and earth signify a political universe, a kingdom or polity. In Isa. lxxv. 17, a new heaven and a new earth signify a new government, new kingdom, new people. See HEAVEN and EARTH.

B. Physically treated.—I. Definitions and Distinctions.

The ancient Hebrews, for want of a single term like the Greek *κόσμος*, and the Latin *mundo*, used the phrase *heaven and earth* (as Gen. i. 1; Jer. xxiii. 24; and Acts xvii. 24, where "H. and E." = "the world and all things therein") to indicate the universe, or (as Barrow, "Sermons on the Creed, Works" *(Oxford ed., iv. 556*, expresses it) "those two regions, superior and inferior, which are divided, and in which the whole creation is divided, together with all the beings that do reside in them, or do belong unto them, or are comprehended by them" *(compare Pearson, On the Creed, who, on art. i [*"Maker of H. and E."*], adds the Rabbinical names of a triple division of the universe, making the sea, *צָרָ Дан, distinct from the *כּלִים, יִבָּשָׂא, יִb

---

*Digitized by Google*
HEAVEN

this censure is premature: for (1) it is very doubtful whether this hebdomadial division is as old as Paul's time; (2) it is certain that the Rabbinical doctors are not unanimous about the number seven. Rabbi Judah (Chagig., fol. xii, 2, and Aboda Nathan, 37) says there are "two heavens," after Deut. x. 14. This agrees with Glossa's statement, if we combine his subiferum (ἡμέρα) and astriferum (ἡμέρας) into one region of physical heaven: (as indeed Moses does himself in Gen. i, 14, 15, 17, and reserve hisangeliferum for the ἑώρασθαι, "the heaven of heavens," the superem region of Spirit, Ps. lxxiii, 8 [P. L. viii, sup. fin.]). See bishop Pearson's note, On the Creed (ed. Chevallier), p. 91. The learned note of De Wette on 2 Cor. xii, 2 is also worth consulting. (3) The Targum on 2 Chron. vi. 18 (as quoted by Dr. Gill, Comment. 2 Corinth. l. c.), expressly mentions the triple distinction of supreme, mediæ, and lower heavens. Indeed, there is an accumulation of the threefold classification. Thus, in Targ. Hanoum, fol. i, 4, and iii, 2, and lxxiii, 3, three worlds are mentioned. The doctors of the Cabbala also hold the opinion of three worlds, Zechar. Numbl. fol. lxxvi, 3. And of the highest world there is a further distinction, of angels, ἄγγελοι; of souls, ânârê̂; and of spirit, πνεῦμα. See Buxtorf's Lex. Rabba, col. 160, which refers to D. Kimchi on Psax. xix, 9. Paul, the well-known 2 Cor. xii, 2, refers again, only less pointedly, to a plurality of heavens, as in Eph. iv. 10. See Osiusden (ed. Clark) on the former passage.

2. Accordingly, Barrow (p. 558, with whom compare Glossa and Drusius on 2 Cor. xii, 2) ascribes to the Jews the notion that there are three heavens: Calum subiferum, or the firmament; Calum astriferum, the starry heaven; Calum angeliferum, or "the heaven of heaven," where the angels reside, "the third heaven" of Paul. This same notion prevails in the fathers. Thus St. Gregory of Nyssa (Hexazel, i, 42) describes the first of these heavens as the limited space of the denser air (τοῦ ἀέρα τοῦ παραμύτιστου ἀέρα), within which range the clouds, the winds, and the birds; the second is the region in which wander the stars and the planets (ἐν τῇ πλανῆτα τῶν ἀστρων ἀπαραστατῶν), hence aptly called by Hesychius κατάραμμα τῶν ἀστρων, locum sideris; while the third is the very summit of the visible creation, εἰς τὸν ἀείσωμα, place of everlasting. Paul's third heaven, higher than the aerial and stellar world, cognizable [not by the eye, but] by the mind alone (ἐν σώματι καὶ νοητῇ φύσιν γενόμενον), which Damascus calls the heavens of heavens, the prime heaven be- yond all others (ἀπέως τοῦ ὁμοίου, ὁ πρῶτος ὁμοίως), Orthed. Subl, lxi, 2, xlvi, 83; or, according to St. Basil (In Jeanism, visione ii, tom. i, 818), the throne of God (τῶν Θεοῦ Θρόνοι), and to Justin Martyr (Quest. et Resp. ad Grecos, ad ult. Quest. p. 238), the house and throne of God (ἐυκαιρίας καὶ θρόνον τοῦ Θεοῦ).

II. Scripture Passages arranged according to these Distinctions. This latter division of the celestial regions is very convenient and quite Biblical. The first heaven, calum subiferum, the following phrases naturally fall—("owl" or "owls" of the heaven of the air,) see Gen. ii, 19; vii, 23; ix, 2; Deut. iv, 17; xxvii, 26; 1 Kings xxii, 24; Job xii, 7; 21, 26; xxxvi, 11; Ps. viii, 18; lxiii, 2; civ, 12; Jer. vii, 30 et passim; Ezek. xxv, 5 et passim; Dan. ii, 38; Hos. ii, 18; iv, 8; vii, 12; Zeph. i, 3; Mark iv, 3 (τὰ στῖνιον τῶν ὡρα- ρόιοι); Luke viii, 5; ix, 88; Acts x, 12; xi, 6— in all which passages the same original words are found in the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Greek Scriptures (ὑφηγεὶς, ὑφηγείς, ὑφηγαῖς). Here we have equal propriety rendered indiscriminately "air" and "heaven,"—similiarly we read of "the path of the heavens," (Ps. cxli, 3 [Prov. cxlvii, 19]) and "the steps of the heavens" (Lev. iv, 19): of "the stork of the heaven" (Jer. viii, 7): and of "birds of heaven" in general (Eccl. xii, 20; Jer. iv, 25). In addition to these zoological terms, we have meteorological facts included under the same original words: e. g. (b) "The dew of heaven" (Gen. xxvii, 28, 38; Deut. xxxiii, 28; Dan. iv, 15 et passim; Hag. i, 10; Zech. viii, 12): (c) "The clouds of heaven" (1 Kings xvii, 5; Ps. cxlviii, 8; Dan. vii, 13; Matt. xxvii, 50; xxxvi, 64; Mark xiv, 62): (d) "The frost of heaven" (Job xxviii, 29): (e) "The winds of heaven" (1 Kings xii, 34; Job xxxvii, 14; Ps. lvii, 5; Ez. viii, 1; Zeph. viii, 5 [see margin]); Matt. xxxii, 31; Mark xiii, 27): (f) "The rain of heaven" (Gen. vii, 2; Deut. xi, 11; xxxvii, 12; Jer. xiv, 22; Acts xiv, 17 [ἄνατικών ἀτακτών]; Jas. v, 18; Rev. xviii, 6): (g) "Lightning, with thunder" (Job xxxvii, 5, 4; Luke xvi, 24). (ii) Calum angeliferum. This vast space of which Manonon takes cognizance are frequently referred to: e. g. (a) in the phrase "hoát of heaven," in Deut. xvii, 3; Jer. viii, 2; Matt. xxiv, 29 [ἄνατικῆς τῶν ἀνατακτῶν]; a sense which is obviously not to be confounded with another signification of the same phrase, as in Luke ii, 13 [see ἀνατολή]. (b) Lights of heaven (Gen. i, 4, 15, 16; Ezek. xxxii, 8): (c) Stars of heaven (Gen. xxii, 17; xxxvi, 4; Exod. xxxiii, 13; Deut. i, 10; x, 22; xxvii, 62; Judg. v, 29; Neh. ix, 23; Isa. xiii, 10; Nah. iii, 15; Heb. xi, 12, (iii.) Calum angeliferum. We could exceed our limits if we were to collect the scripture phrases which give us of heaven in its sublimest sense; we content ourselves with indicating one or two of the most obvious: (a) The heaven of heavens (Deut. x, 14; 1 Kings viii, 27; 2 Chron. ii, 6, 18; Neh. ix, 6; Ps. cxv, 16; cxlviii, 4: (b) The third heaven (2 Cor. xi, 14 [saith Paul, nowhere trusted, yet at Ephes. iv. 10]; (c) The highest (Matt. xxii, 9; Mark xi, 10; Luke ii, 14, compared with Ps. lxxiii, 1). This heavenly sublimity was graciously brought down to Jewish appreciation in the sacred symbol of their Tabernacle and Temple, which they revered especially in the edifying of "the Holy of Holies" (as the place where God's honor dwelt) (Ps. xxxvi, 8), and amidst the sculptured types of his celestial retinue, in the cherubim of the mercy-seat (2 Kings xix, 15; Ps. lixx, 1: Isa. xxxvi, 16).

III. Meaning of the Terms used in the Origin. By far the most frequent designation of the heavens in the Hebrew Scriptures is אֹטַח (אָטַח), a name of the older lexicographers (see Cocceius, Lex. n. 4.) regarded as the dual, but which Gesenius and Furst have restored to the dignity, which St. Jerome gave it, of the plural of an obsolete noun, אָטַח as (םֵ֜אָטַח plfr. of מַוָּה and מַוָּה from פָּרֶ֝ל). According to these recent scholars, the idea expressed by the word is height, elevation (Gesenius, Theor. p. 1453; Furst, Hebr. Wort, ii, 467). In this respect of its essential meaning it resembles the Greek ἐξανάστημι [from the Greek radical denoting height] (Pott, Etymol. Forsch. l, 128, ed. 1). Pott's rendering of this root is, by "sich erheben," reminds us of our own beautiful word heaven, which thus enters into brotherhood of significance with the grand idea of the Hebrew, Chaldee, and Greek. Professor Bosworth, in his Anglo-Saxon Dict., under the verb ἔβλεπε, to raise or elevate, gives the kindred words of the whole Teutonic family, and deduces therefrom the noun hefen or hefen, in the sense of heaven. And although the primary notion of the Latin caelest (akin to κολλᾶν and our follow) is the sublum of one of a covered or vaulted space, the latter is still the same (see White and Riddle, s. v. Celim) and in the derived languages (comp. French ciel, and the English word ceiling).

2. Closely allied in meaning, though unconnected in origin with וָמַ֖ב, is the oft-occurring וָמַ֖ב, marâm. This word is never used of English church, but "heights," or "high places," a sense of elevation has prevailed, both in the original (see White and Riddle, s. v. Celim) and in the derived languages (comp. French ciel, and the English word ceiling).
"It was a common belief among all ancient nations that at the summit of the shadow of the earth, or on the top of the highest mountain of the earth, which reaches with its crest into heaven... the gods have their palace or hall of assembly," and he instances "the Babylonian Abarbakh, the chief abode of Ormuzd, among the heights and the convents of Mount Meru; and the Chinese Kulson (or Kan-en-lun); and the Greek Olympus (and Atlas); and the Arabian Caf; and the Parsee Terek." He, however, while strongly and indeed most properly censuring the identification of Mount Meru with Mount Moriah (which had hastily been conjectured from the 'accidental resemblance of the names'), adds that it seems improbable that the Israelites should have entertained, like other ancient nations, the notion of local height for the abode of his whom "glory the heaven and the heavens of heavens cannot contain," and this he supposes on the ground that such a notion rests essentially on polytheistic ideas. Surely the learned commentator is premature in both these statements. (1.) No such improbability, in fact, unhappily, can be predicates of the Israelites, who in ancient times (notwithstanding the divine prohibitions) exhibited a constant tendency to the ritual of their קֶדֶשׁ, or "high places." Gesenius makes a more correct statement when he says [Racov. Hebr., p. 395]: "The Sibyls, like most other ancient nations, supposed that sacred rites performed on high places were particularly acceptable to the Deity. Hence they were accustomed to offer sacrifices on mountains and hills, both to idols and to God himself (1 Sam. ix. 12 sq.; 1 Chron. xii, 29 sq.; 1 Kings iii, 41; 2 Kings xii, 2, 3; Isa. xiv, 7); and also to build there chapels, fanes, tabernacles (תֵּרוֹת [קֶדֶשׁ], I Kings xii, 32; 2 Kings xvii, 29, with their priests and other ministers of the sacred rites (תֵּרוֹת [קֶדֶשׁ], 1 Kings xii, 32; 2 Kings xvii, 32). So tenacious of this ancient custom were not only the ten tribes, but also all the Jews, that, even after the building of Solomon's Temple, in spite of the express law of Deut. xxi, they continued to erect such chapels on the mountains around Jerusalem. (2.) Neither from the character of Jehovah, as the God of Israel, can the improbability be maintained, as if it were of the essence of polytheism only to localize Deity on mountain heights. "The high and lofty One that inhabiteth eternity, whose name is Holy," in the proclamation which he is pleased to make of his own style, does not disdain to use the celestial symbols; in one of the finest passages of even Isaiah's poetry, God claims as one of the stations of his glory the shrine of "a con- trite and humble spirit" (Isa. lii. 15). His loftiest attributes, therefore, are not compromised, nor is the amplitude of his omnipresence compressed by an earthy residence. Accordingly, the same Jehovah who "walks on the high places, קֶדֶשׁ, of the earth" (Amos iv, 13); who "treadeth on the fastnesses, קֶדֶשׁ, of the sea" (Job ix, 8); and "who ascendeth above the heights, קֶדֶשׁ, of the clouds," was pleased to consecrate Zion as his dwelling-place (Ps. lxxxvii, 2), and his rest (Ps. cxxxiii, 18, 14). Hence we find the same word קֶדֶשׁ, which is often descriptive of the sublimest heaven, used of Zion, which Ezekiel calls "the mountain of the height of Israel," קֶדֶשׁ [קָדָשׁ], xviii, 23; xx, 40; xxxiv, 14. 3. קַדְשֵׁי, galgot. This word, which literally means a wheel, admirably expresses rotary movement, and is actually rendered "heaven" in the A.V. of Ps. lxxvii, 15, "The voice of thy wheel" and the window of the heavens. The Sept. agrees with the A.V. in Himmel; and Darthe renders per orbem, which is ambiguous, being as expressive, to say the least, of the globe of the earth as of the circle of heaven. The Tarqum (in Walton, vol. iii) on the passage gives קַדְשֵׁי (in rota), which is as inde-terminate as the original, as the Syriac also seems to be. De Wette (and after him Justus Olhausen, Die Ps. er-
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nus, T. s. v., we refer Ps. lxxxiv, 35 also to it. More probably in Deut. xxxii, 26 (where it is parallel with יָרֵא, and in the highly poetical passages of Isa. xlv, 8, and Jer. li, 9, our word יָרֵא may be best regarded as designating the empyreal heavens. 5. We have already noticed the connection between יָרֵא and our only remaining word יָרֵא, רָבִּי, from their being associated by the sacred writer in the same sentence (Job xxxvi, 18); it tends to corroborate this connection that, on comparing Gen. i, 6 (and other passages in the sense) with Deut. xxxii, 26, we find יָרֵא of the former sentence, and יָרֵא of the latter, both rendered by the Sept. στροφήμα and firmamentum in the Vulg., whence the word "firmament" passed into our A. V. This word is now a well-understood term in astronomy, synonymous with sky or else the general heavens, undivined by the discoveries of science of the special signification which it bore in the ancient astronomy. See FIRMAMENT. For a clear exposition of all the Scripture passages which bear on the subject, we may refer the reader to professor Dawson's Arkana, especially chap. viii, and to Dr. McCaul on The Mosaic Record of Creation (or what is substituted for the same in a more accessible form under the title Notes on the First Chapter of Genesis, sec. ix, p. 32-44). We must be content here, in reference to our term יָרֵא, to observe that, when we regard its origin (from the root יָרֵא, to spread out or expand by beating; Gesen. s. v.; Fuller, Misc. Sacr., i, 6; Fürst, Hebr.-ar. s. v.), and its connection with, and illustration by, such words as יָרֵא, יָרֵא, יָרֵא, the verbs יָרֵא (Isa. xlvi, 18), "My right hand hath spread out the heavens") and יָרֵא (Isa. xl, 22, "Who stretcheth out the heavens like a curtain; literally, like a net, (and spreadeth them out as a tent") we are astonished at the attempt to connect the meaning of an intelligible term, which fits in easily and consistently with the nature of things, by a few poetical metaphors, that are themselves capable of a consistent sense when held subordinate to the plainer passages of prose. The fuller expression is יָרֵא יָרֵא יָרֵא (Gen. i, 14 sq.). That Moses understood it to mean a solid expanse is clear from his representing it as the barrier between the upper and lower waters (Gen. i, 6 sq.), i.e. as separating the reservoir of the celestial ocean (Ps. civ, 3; xxiii, 3) from the waters of the earth, or those on which the earth was supposed to float (Ps. lxxvii, 6). Through its open plates (יָרֵא יָרֵא יָרֵא, Gen. vii, 11; 2 Kings vii, 2; Isa. x, 4; xxxiii, 19; compare κόσμον, Aristophanes, Nux nux 798) or doors (יָרֵא יָרֵא יָרֵא, Ps. lxxviii, 22), the dew, and snow, and hail are poured upon the earth (Job lxxviii, 27, 22, where we have the curious expression "bottles of heaven," "utes corii"). This firm vault, which Job describes as being "strong as a molten looking-glass" (xxxvii, 18), is transparent, like lucid sapphire, and splendid as crystal (Ps. xii, 3; Exod. xxiv, 10; Ezek. i, 22; Rev. iv, 6), over which the exalted and licentious of God (Isa. lxvi, 1; Ezek. i, 26) and which is opened for the descent of angels, or for prophetical visions (Gen. xxxvii, 17; Ezek. i, 1; Acts vii, 56; x, 11). In it, like gems or golden lamps, the stars are fixed to give light to the earth, and regulate the seasons (Gen. i, 14-19); and the whole mass of matter, and the complex structure (Jer. xxx, 37) is supported by the mountains as its pillars, or strong foundations (Ps. xviii, 7; 2 Sam. xxii, 8; Job xxiv, 11). Similarly the Greeks believed in an ὑπωρευτικὸς ὀρέως (Hom. Il. v, 504), or σφήμα (Hom. Od. xv, 220), or σφενία (Orph. Ημιοιτατον και Κεμιοτατον), which is the philosophers' αἰσθητική (Empedocles, pl. de Phil. phil. pl. ii, 11; Artemid. ap. Sen. Nat. Quaest. vii, 13; quoted by Gesenius, s. v.). It is clear that very many of the above notions were metaphors resulting from the simple primitive conception, and that later writers among the Hebrews had arrived at more scientific views, although, of course, they retained much of the old phraseology, and are fluctuating and undecided in their terms. Elsewhere, for instance, the heavens are likened to a curtain (Ps. civ, 2; Isa. xi, 22). See COSMOCOPY.

IV. Metaphorical Application of the Visible Heavens. — A door opened in heaven is the beginning of a new revelation. To ascend up into heaven signifies to be in full power. Thus is the symbol to be understood in Isa. xiv, 14, 14, where the king of Babylon says, 'I will ascend into heaven; I will exalt my throne above the stars of God.' To ascend into heaven with a sense of elevation, symbolically, to act by a commission from heaven. Thus our Saviour uses the word "descending" (John i, 51) in speaking of the angels acting by divine commission, at the command of the Son of man. To fall from heaven signifies to lose power and authority, to be deprived of the power to govern, to revolt or apostatize.

The heaven opened. The natural heaven, being the symbol of the governing part of the political world, a new face in the natural, represents a new face in the political. Or the heaven may be said to be opened when the day appears, and consequently shut when it is covered by night (Ps. xxvi, 1). "The gates of heaven unfolded," etc. Thus the Scripture, in a poetical manner, speaks of the doors of heaven (Ps. lxxviii, 23); of the heaven being shut (1 Kings viii, 35); and in Ezek. i, 1, the heaven is said to be opened.

Mists of heaven may be the air, or the region between heaven and earth; or the middle station between the corrupted earth and the throne of God in heaven. In this sense, the air is the proper place where God's threatenings and judgments should be denounced. Thus, in 1 Chron. xxxi, 16, it is said that David saw the angel of the Lord standing between heaven and earth, and the heaven was shut, and he was just going to destroy Jerusalem with the pestilence. The angel's hovering there was to show that there was room to pray for mercy, just as God was going to inflict the punishment: it had not as yet done any execution.

C. Spiritual and Everlasting Sense, i.e. the state and place of blessedness in the life to come. Of the nature of this blessedness it is not possible that we should form any adequate conception, and, consequently, that any precise information respecting it should be given to us. Man, indeed, usually conceives the joys of heaven to be the same as, or at least to resemble, the pleasures of this world; and with such hopes as to obtain with certainty, and to enjoy in full measure beyond the grave, that which he holds most dear upon earth — those favorite employments or particular delights which he ardently longs for here, but which he can seldom or never enjoy in this world, or in the enjoyment of which he is never fully satisfied. But one who reflects soberly on the subject will readily see that the happiness of heaven must be a very different thing from earthly happiness. In this world the highest pleasures of which our nature is capable satiate by their continuance, and soon lose the power of giving positive enjoyment. This alone is sufficient to show that the bliss of the future world must be of an entirely different kind from what is called earthly joy and happiness, if we are to be there truly happy, and happy for ever. But since we can have no distinct conception of those joys which never have been and never will be experienced by us, how can we in any extent, we have, of course, no words in human language to express them, and cannot therefore expect any clear description of them even in the holy Scriptures. Hence the Bible describes this happiness sometimes in general terms, designating its greatness (as in Rom. viii, 18-22; 2 Cor. iv, 18), and sometimes it is alluded to in the full images and modes of speech, borrowed from everything which we know to be attractive and desirable. The greater part of these images were already common among the Jewish contemporaries of Christ; but Christ and his apostles employed them in a purer sense than the great multitude of the Jews. The Oriental
are rich in such figures. They were employed by Moh-
ammad, who carried them, as his manner was, to an
exaggerated excess, but who at the same time said ex-
pressly that they were mere figures, although many of
his sayings are euphemisters, and are presented literally,
as has been often done in a similar way by many Christians.

The following are the principal terms, both literal
and figurative, which are applied in Scripture to the
condition of future happiness.

a. Among the literal appellations we find "Heaven, Lory aiónov," which, first coming to Hebrew usage, signifies
a happy life," or "eternal well-being," and are the words
rendered "life," "eternal life," and "life everlasting"
in the A. V. (e. g. Matt. vii, 14; xix, 16, 29; xxv, 46): ἀϊόνιον ἀῖον τοῦ κόσμου, "the glory of God" (Rom.
ii, 7; 10, v. 2); and εἰρήνη, "peace" (Rom. ii, 10). Also
ἀἰώνιον καιρὸν ἐρήμον, "an eternal weight of glory" (2
Cor. iv, 17); and σωτηρία, σωτηρία ἀἰώνιον, "salva-
tion," "eternal salvation" (Heb. v, 9), etc.

b. Among the figurative representations we may place
the word "heaven" itself. The abode of departed spir-
itus, to us who live upon the earth, and while we remain
here in the body, is but a foretaste of that glorious residen-
tial and material, of that real home of the children of
the visible world, and entirely separated from it. There
they live in the highest well-being, and in a nearer
connection with God and Christ than here below. This
place and state cannot be designated by any more fit
and appropriate name than that which is found in almost
every language, namely, "heaven"—a word in its pri-
mary and material signification denoting the region of
the skies, or the visible heavens. This word, in Heb.
_caption: 107
In Greek, the word αἰώνιον, therefore frequently em-
ployed by the sacred writers, as above exemplified. It is
there that the highest sanctuary or temple of God is
situated, i.e. it is there that the omnipresent God most
gloriously manifests himself. This is the place and
abode of God's highest spiritual creation. Thither Christ was
transported: he calls it the house of his Father, and
says that he has therein prepared an abode for his fol-
lowers (John xiv, 2).

This place, this "heaven," was never conceived of
in ancient times, as it has been by some modern writers,
as a particular planet or world, but as the wide expanse
of heaven, high above the atmosphere or starry heav-
ens; hence it is sometimes called the third heaven,
as being neither the atmosphere nor the starry heavens.

Another figurative name is "Paradise," taken from
the word that in the original state of the Garden of
Eden was the royal residence, and the seat of divine worship; the
"kingdom of heaven" (Matt. xxv, 1; Jas. ii, 5); the
"heavenly kingdom" (2 Tim. iv, 18); the "eternal
kingdom" (2 Pet. i, 11). It is also called an "eternal inher-
ance" (1 Pet. i, 4; Heb. ix, 15), meaning the posses-
sion and full enjoyment of happiness, typified by the
residence of the ancient Hebrews in Palestine. The
blessed are said to "sit down at table with Abraham,
Isaac, and Jacob," that is, to be a sharer with the sants
of old in the joys of salvation; "to be in Abraham's bos-
om" (Luke xvi, 22; Matt. vii, 8), that is, to sit near
on the right hand of the carnal Christ; "to be in the
bosom of Christ;" "to reign with Christ" (2 Tim. ii, 11), i.e. to be distinguished, honored,
and happy as he is—to enjoy royal felicities; to enjoy
"a Sabbath," or "rest" (Heb. iv, 10, 11), indicating the happiness of pious Christians both in this life and in the life to come.

All that we can with certainty know or infer from
Scripture or reason respecting the blessedness of the life
to come may be arranged under the following partic-
lars: I. We shall hereafter be entirely freed from the
sufferings and adversities of this life. II. Our future
blessedness will involve a continuance of the real happi-
ness of this life.

I. The entire exemption from suffering, and all that
causes suffering here, is expressed in Scripture by words
which denote rest, repose, refreshment, after performing
labor and enduring affliction. But all the terms which
are employed to express this literally, as has been
done in a similar way by many Christians.

The deliverance from the evils of our present life includes,

1. Deliverance from the body, the seat of the lower
principles of our nature and of our sinful corrup-
tion, and the source of so many evils and sufferings
(2 Cor. vi, 1, 2; 1 Cor. xiv, 42-50).

2. Entire separation from the society of wicked and
evil-disposed persons, who in various ways injure the
righteous man and embitter his life on earth (2 Thess.
iv, 18). It is hence accounted a part of the felicity even
of Christ himself in heaven to be "separate from sin-
ers" (Heb. vii, 26).

3. Upon this earth everything is inconstant and sub-
ject to perpetual change, and nothing is capable of
complete and final development; this is the life of hope-
lessly and expectantly waiting for the realization of
the promise. But in the world to come it will be different. The bliss of
the saints will continue without interruption or change,
without fear of termination, and without satiety
(Luke xx, 37; 2 Cor. iv, 16, 18; 1 Pet. i, 4; v. 10; 1 John iii, 2 sq.).

II. Besides being exempt from all earthly trials, and
having a continuance of that happiness which we had
begun to enjoy even here, we have good reason to ex-
pect hereafter other rewards and joys, which stand in
no natural or necessary connection with the present life;
for our entire felicity would be extremely defective and
deprive were it to be confined merely to what we carry
with us from the present world, to that peace
and joy of soul which result from reflecting on what we may
have done which is good and pleasing in the sight of
God, since even the best men will always discover great
imperfections in all that they have done. Our felicity
would also be incomplete were we compelled to stop short
with that meagre and elementary knowledge which we
take with us from this world—that knowledge so broken
up into fragments, and yielding so little fruit, and which,
poor as it is, many good men, from lack of opportunity,
and without any fault on their part, never here acquire.
Beside this the reward of general holiness, and even
therefore others which are positive, and dependent on
the will of the supreme Legislator.

On this point almost all philosophers are, for the
above reasons, agreed—even those who will admit of no
positive punishments in the world to come. But, for want of
accurate knowledge of the state of the soul or the
futuro world, we can say nothing definite and certain as to
the nature of the positive rewards. In the doctrine of the
New Testament, however, positive rewards are considered most obviously as belonging to our future fel-
icity, and as constituting a principal part of it; for it
always represents the joys of heaven as resulting stric-
tly from the favor of God, and as being undeserved by
those on whom they are bestowed. Hence there must
be something more added to the natural good conse-
quences of our actions here performed. But on this
subject we shall only consider the comfort that is given
that God will so appoint and order our circumstances,
and make such arrangements, that the principal facul-
ties of our souls, reason and affection, will be heightened
and developed, so that we shall continually obtain more
pure and distinct knowledge of the truth, and make con-
formal us to the image of Christ.

We may remark that in this life God has very
wisely allotted various capacities, powers, and talents,
in different ways and degrees, to different men, accord-
ing to the various ends for which he designs them, and
the business on which he employs them. Now there is
not the least ground to suppose that this will always
remain the same in the future world; it will rather com-
the image is taken from Oriental princes, to see whose face and to be in whose presence was esteemed a great favor (Matt. v, 8; Heb. vii, 14). "Without holiness, οὐδεὶς ὁμολογήσει τῷ Κυρίῳ. The opposite of this is to be removed from God and from His face. But Christ is represented as one who will be personally visible to us, and whose personal, familiar intercourse and guidance we shall enjoy. Herein Christ himself places a chief part of the joy of the saints (John xiv, xvii, etc.); and the apostles often describe the blessedness of the pious by the phrase being with Christ. To his guidance has God intrusted the human race, in heaven and on earth. And Paul says (2 Cor. iv, 6), we see "the brightness of the divine glory in the face of Christ:" he is "the visible representative of the invisible God" (Col. i, 15).

According to the representations contained in the holy Scriptures, the saints will dwell together in the future world, and form, as it were, a kingdom or state of God (Luke xvi, 38; Rom. viii, 10; Rev. vii, 9; Heb. xii, 22). They will there partake of a common felicity. Their enjoyment will doubtless be very much heightened by friendship, and by their continued intercourse with each other. We must, however, separate all earthly imperfections from our conceptions of this heavenly society. But that we shall there recognize our former friends, and shall be again associated with them, was uniformly believed by all antiquity. And when we call each other by the name of brother, and by the name of friend, and by the name of father, and by the name of mother, in the presence of Christ, it will be in company with our friends who died before us (αδελφοὶ καὶ μαθηταὶ, 1 Thess. iv, 17); and this presupposes that we shall recognize them, and have intercourse with them, as with Christ himself. See Eternal Life.

Heaven and Earth is an expression for the whole creation (Gen. i, 1). In prophetic language the phase often signifies the political state or condition of persons of different ranks in this world. The heaven of the political world is the sovereignty thereof, whose host and stars are the powers that rule, namely, kings, princes, counselors, and magistrates. The earth is the pleasantry, plebeians, or common race of men, who possess no power, but are ruled by superiors. Of such a heaven and earth we may understand that the greatest part of mankind will be made in Hagg. ii, 6; vii, 21, 22, and referred to in Heb. xii, 26. Such modes of speaking were used in Oriental poetry and philosophy, which made a heaven and earth in everything, that is, a superior and inferior in every part of nature; and we learn from Maimonides, quoted by Mede, that the Arabsians in his time, when they would express that a man was fallen into some great calamity, said, "His heaven has fallen to the earth," meaning his superiority or prosperity is much diminished. To look for new heavens and a new earth (2 Pet. iii, 13) may mean to look for a new order of the present world.

Heave offering (χορήγησις), a term including all that the Israelites voluntarily (Exod. xxv, 2 sq.; xxxvi, 24; xxxvi, 3) or according to a precept (Exod. xxx, 15; Lev. vii, 14; Numb. xv, 19 sq.; xviii, 27 sq.; xxi, 20 sq.; comp. Exek. xlv. 3) contributed of their own prop- erly or commodiously, whether it was (as an offering (θυσία), but) as a present (Isa. xl, 20), to be applied to the regular cultus, i.e. for the establishment and maintenance of the sanctuary and its accessories (Exod. xxxv, 2 sq.; xxxix, 13 sq.; xxxvi, 5 sq.; xl, 21 sq.; xxxiv, 5, 6; Ezra viii, 25, etc.), or for the support of the priests (Exod. xxxviii, 28; Num. xxviii, 15 sq.; xxxviii, 9). Presumably God's offering was made in addition to the annual temple-tax (see Temple), chiefly that share of the booty taken in war which be-
longed to the priests (Numb. xxii, 29 sq.), the yearly first-fruits (Numb. xv, 19 sq.; comp. 2 Sam. i, 21), and the tithes which the Levites were required to make over to the priests out of the natural tithes paid to them (Numb. xxiii, 21), and the Levites retained for their own use not being thus styled). The term הרווח seems to stand in a narrower sense in Neh. x, 37; xii, 44; xiii, 3 [see FIRSTLING], and the Talmudists so call only the agricultural first-fruits appropriate to human use, together with the Levitical tithes (see the tract Terumah in the Mishna, i, 6). Heave-offerings are coupled with first-fruits in Ezek. xx, 40, and with tithes in Mal. iii, 8. In Ezek. xlv, 1; xlviii, 8 sq., 12, 20 sq., the same word is applied to that portion of the Holy Land which is represented as set apart for the maintenance of the sanctuary and the priests. For the care of all such contributions, as well as for voluntary offerings and tithes in general, a special class of officers was (from the time of king Hezekiah) detailed, of whom a higher priest had the superintendence (2 Chron. xxii, 11, 12, 14; Neh. xii, 44; xiii, 5). Heave-offerings could be used or consumed only by the priests and their children (Neh. xxiii, 10). Later regulations are detailed in the Talmudic tract Terumah. Compare Wave-offering.

Heave-shoulder (יווח ים, Sept. βαρύχιον δομινικος) is the name applied to (the right) shoulder that fell to the priests in the presentation of animals as a thank-offering (Lev. vii, 34; Num. vi, 20; xviii, 18), which could be eaten only by such of their families as were in a ceremonially clean state (Lev. x, 1).—See OFFERING.

Hebard, Elias, a Methodist Episcopal minister. He was born at Cossackie, N.Y., Sept. 8, 1778; was converted at thirteen; entered the New York Conference in May, 1811; in 1819 was appointed to New Haven; in 1820 and 21 to New York; in 1834 was transferred to Genesee Conference, and stationed at Rochester; was presiding elder on Ontario District in 1837-40; in 1846 he superannuated; and died at Geneva, N.Y., Jan. 25, 1858. He was a diligent student, a sound theologian, and a good scholar in Greek and Hebrew.—Minutes of Conferences, vii, 205.

Heber, the name of seven men, with a difference of etymology in the original. See also EMMAN.

1. Ezechias, (Heb. יואש, in 2 Chron. xxxv, 22, or יואש, his signifier, i.e. of the river, q. d. immig. Sept. יאש and אסף, Vulg. Heber), son of Salath, who became the father of Peleg at the age of 54 years, and died at the age of 464 (Gen. x, 24; xi, 14; 1 Chron. i, 25). His name occurs in the genealogy of Christ (Luke iii, 35, אסף, Heber); Heber is mentioned in Matt. i, 18-19. There is a degree of interest connected with him from the notion, which the Jews themselves entertain, that the name of Hebrews, applied to them, was derived from this alleged ancestor of Abraham. No historical ground appears why this name should be derived from him rather than from any other personage that occurred in the catalogue of Shem's descendants; but there are so many other suggestions to every other hypothesis, that this, perhaps, is still the most probable of any which have yet been started. (See Gesenius, Geschichte der Heb. Sprache und Schrift, p. 11.) Hence "the children of Eber" (יואש ויהו, Gen. x, 21), and simply in poetry Eber (Yiias, Numb. xxiv, 34; Sept. EQUIP, Vulg. Hebrew), i. e. Hebrews (Yiias). Several other persons of this (Heb.) name occur, but no other person is where Anglicized "Heber," or "Eber." 2. "Ener" (same Heb. word as above; Sept. Ιαπή, Vulg. Heber), the last-named of the seven chiefs of the Gadites in Bashan (1 Chron. v, 13, where the name is Anglicized "Heber"). B.C. between 1612 and 1698.

3. "Ene" (same Hebrew word as above; Sept. Ιαπή, Vulg. Heber), a chief of one of the tribes of Bashan, and a chief of the tribe of Benjamin (1 Chron. viii, 22, where the name is Anglicized "Heber"). B.C. ante 598.

4. "Heber" (Hebrew, יואר, community, as in Hosea vi, 9; Prov. xxi, 9; or a spell, as in Deut. xvii, xi; Isai. xix, 12; Sept. Ἠρβωτα, Ἠρωπα, son of Beriah, and grandson of Asher (Gen. xli, 17; 1 Chron. vii, 32). B.C. apparently ante 1873. His descendants are called Hebrehtes (Heb. חָבָרֵה, Sept. Ἠρωπα, Numb. xxvi, 45, where the name of the progenitor is written יואר)."
Tweiss the offer was declined on account of his wife and child, but immediately after the second refusal he wrote (Jan. 12, 1823) stating his willingness to go to India. He congratulated himself upon the fact that no worldly motives led him to this decision. The prospects of usefulness in so grand a field as India overbore all pecuniary considerations, and they had no influence in determining the future path of his life. He would like to go to that country was first made to him. Besides, he had often expressed his liking for such a sphere of action, and he had “a lurking fondness for all which belongs to India or Asia.” On the 22d of April he saw Hodnet for the last time, and, after having heard the acceptance, he embarked for his diocese on the 16th of June, 1823. The diocese of Calcutta extended at this time over the whole of India, and embraced Ceylon, the Mauritius, and Australasia. In India the field of the bishop’s labors was three times larger than Great Britain and Ireland. The number of chaplains who constituted his staff at Bengal was fixed at twenty-eight, but this number was never completed, and of the number who were appointed several were on furlough. The bishop had no council to assist him, was required to act on his own responsibility, and to write almost every official document of the church on his own hand. On the 1st of June, 1823, bishop Heber began the visitation of his vast diocese. He visited every station of importance in the upper provinces of Bengal and north of Bombay, and after an absence from Calcutta of about eleven months, during which he had seldom slept out of his cabin or to his heart at Bombay. During which he kept during his visitation (published under the title Narrative of a Journey in Upper India, Lond. 1823, 3 vols. 8vo, since reprinted in Murray’s Home and Colonial Library) shows the extent of his observations on general subjects, and the rapidity with which he possessed of describing the novel scenes in which he was placed. From April to August he remained at Bombay to investigate and superintend the interests of the western portion of his diocese. On the 15th of August he sailed for Ceylon, and after remaining there two weeks he proceeded to Calcutta, which he reached on the 21st of October. If it had been possible to have educated his children in India, he was now prepared, he states, to end his days among the objects of his solicitude. In February, 1826, he left Calcutta for Madras to visit the southern provinces. On the 1st of April he arrived at Trincomalee, the capital of Ceylon, and on the 5th April, after investigating the state of the mission and confirming fifteen natives, on whom he bestowed the episcopal benediction in the Tamil language, he retired to use a cool bath, in which he found dead about half an hour after his arrival. He was less than thirty weeks he would have completed his forty-third year. The sudden, modest, and simplicity of bishop Heber’s manners, his unwaried earnestness, and his mild and steady zeal, combined with his talents and attainments, had inspired veneration and respect not only among the European, but the native population of India (English Cyclopaedia, s. v.). In theology he was an Armenian. His whole life, after his elevation to the episcopate, was devoted to its great duties. He had a profound faith in the fundamental doctrines of the Gospel, and of their adaptation to the heathen. His heart daily breathed the most earnest wishes for the diffusion of its precious truths. His tastes and pursuits were all subordinated to that grand object, and, had he been spared to the usual term of life, there is no doubt that a career, begun in the spirit and prosecuted on the system of itineracy he had adopted, would have yielded a rich harvest of spiritual fruit to the Lord of his vineyard. Besides the works above mentioned, his Poetical Works are printed in various editions. See Life of Heber, by his Widow (Lond. 1830, 2 vols. 8vo); Robinson, Last Days of Heber (Lond. 1830, 8vo); Memoir of Heber, abridged from the large ed. (Boston, 1835, 12mo); Kohl, H. Heber’s Leben u. Nachrichten über ihn—1

Heberite (Num. xxvi, 45). See HEBER, 4.

Hebrew (Heb. Heb., płur. בָּנָיִם, וּבָנָיָם or בְּנוֹי). Exod. iii, 18; fem. בָּנָתָהּ, Hebrewess, płur. בָּנָיתָהּ. Greek Ἐβραῖος, a designation of the people of Israel, used first of their progenitor Abraham (Gen. xiv, 19; Sept. τῷ Ἰσραήλ: this name is never in Scripture applied to the Israelites except when the speaker is a foreigner (Gen. xxxix, 14, 17; xii, 12; Exod. i, 16; ii, 6; 1 Sam. iv, 6, 9), or when Israelites speak of themselves to one of another nation (Gen. xi, 15; Exod. i, 19; Jonah i, 5, etc.), or when they are contrasted with other peoples (Gen. xxxii, 32; Exod. i, 8, 6, 17; Deut. xvii, 12; 1 Sam. iii, 3, 7). See Gesenius, Thes. Hebr. s. v. (The only apparent exception is Jer. xxxiv, 9; but here there is probably such an implied contrast between the Jews and other peoples as would bring the usage under the last case.) By the Greek and Latin writers this is the name by which the descendants of Jacob are designated when they are not called Jews (Pausan. v. 5, 2; vi, 24, 6; Plut. Sympos. iv, 6; 1 Tacit. Hist. v, 1); and Josephus, who affects classical peculiarities, constantly uses it. In the N. T. we find the same contrast between Hebrews and foreigners (Acts vi, 1; Phil. iii, 5): the Hebrew language is distinguished from all others (Luke xxiii, 38; John v, 2; xix, 13; Acts xxii, 40; xxvi, 14; Rev. ix, 11); while in 2 Cor. xi, 22 the word is used as only second to Israelites in the expression of national peculiarities. On these facts two opposing hypotheses have been raised; the one that Israelite or Jew was the name by which the nation designated itself (just as the Welsh call themselves Cymry, though in speaking of themselves to a Saxons they would probably use the name Welsh); the other that "Hebrew" is a national name, merely indicative of the people as a people, while Israelite is a sacred or religious name appropriate to them as the chosen people of God. This latter opinion Gesenius dismisses as "without foundation" (Lexicon by Robinson, s. v.), but it has received the deliberate sanction of Ewald (Auszführ. Lehrb. der Heb. Spr., p. 18, 5th ed.).

Derivation of the Greek from Arama. Abraham, Hebrew, by euphony Hebræi (August, Ambrose). Displaying, as it does, the utmost ignorance of the language, this derivation was never extensively adopted, and was even rejected by Augustine (Retract. 16). The euphony alleged by Ambrose is quite imperceptible, and there is no parallel in the languages of the Semitic family.

II. According to the sacred writer, בָּנָיִם, Hebrew, is a derivative from בֶּן, Eber, the ancestor of Abraham; at least the same persons who are called Hebrews are called בָּנִים, sons of Eber (Gen. x, 21); and בֶּן, Eber (Num. xxiv, 24); and this is tantamount to a derivation of the name Hebrew from Eber. In support of this, it may be urged that בָּנִים is the proper form which a patronymic from בֶּן would assume; according to the analogy of בָּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל, a Moabite, בָּנֵי דָם, a Damite, בָּנֵי כָּלָה, a Calebite, etc. (Hiller, Onomast. Sac. c. xiv, p. 231 sq.). What adds much force to this argument is the evident antithesis in Gen. xiv, 13, between בָּנִים and בָּנֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל; the former of these is as evidently a patronymic as the latter. This view is supported by Josephus, Suidas, Bochart, Vatablus, Drusius, Vossius, Buxtorf, Hottinger, Usuclid, Whiston, and Bauer. The odor of Questa (Gen. xvi, 13) is sufficiently strong to show that the Hebrews were not the only descendants of Eber, and, therefore, could not appropriate his name; and the objection has often been repeated. To meet it, recourse has been had to the suggestion, first adduced, we believe, by Ibn Ezra (Comment. ad Jon. 1, 9), that the descendants of Abraham retained the name Hebrew from Eber, because
they alone of his descendants retained the faith which he held. This may be, but we are hardly entitled to assume it in order to account for the fact before us. It is better to throw the same probandi on the objector, and to demand of him, in our ignorance of what determined the use of such patronymics in one line of descent and not in another, what he should show. Why is it inconceivable that Abraham might have a good and sufficient reason for wishing to perpetuate the memory of his descent from Eber, which did not apply to the other descendants of that patriarch. Why might not one race of the descendants of Eber call themselves by pre-eminence of Eber just as one race of descendants of Abraham called themselves by pre-eminence sons of Abraham. But Eber, it is objected, is a name of no note in the history; we know nothing of him to entitle him to be selected as the person after whom a people should call themselves. But is our ignorance to be the measure of the knowledge of Abraham and his descendants on such a point? Because we know nothing to distinguish Eber, does it follow that they knew nothing? Certain it is that he was of sufficient importance to reflect a glory on his father Shem, whose highest designation was the son of Jehovah (Gen. x, 21); and certain it is that his name lingered for many generations in the region where he resided, for it was as "Eber" that the Mesopotamian prophet knew the descendants of Jacob, and spoke of them when they first made their appearance in warlike force on the borders of the land of Ham (Num. xxiv, 20).

On the other hand, it is contended that the passage Gen. x, 21 is not so much genealogical as ethnographical; and in this view it seems that the words are intended to contrast Shem with Ham and Japheth, and especially with the former. Now Isael is plainly fixed as the extreme east limit of the posterity of Ham (ver. 10), from whose land Nimrod went out into Assyria (ver. 11, margin of A. Vers.): in the next place, Egypt (ver. 13) is mentioned as the western limit of the same great race; and these two extremes having been ascertained, the geography succeeds (ver. 15-19) to fill up his ethnographic sketch with the intermediate tribes of the Canaanites. In short, in ver. 6-20 we have indications of three geographical points which distinguish the posterity of Ham, viz. Egypt, Palestine, and Babylon. At the last-mentioned city, at the river Euphrates, their posterity were not affected by the national movement of Asshur, terminated, and at the same point that of the descendants of Shem began. Accordingly, the sharpest contrast that could be devised is obtained by generally classing these latter nations as those beyond the river Euphrates; and the words "father of all the children of Eber," i.e. father of the nations to the east of the Euphrates, find an intelligible place in the context.

It must also be confessed that in the genealogical scheme in Gen. xi, 10-26, it does not appear that the Jews thought of Eber as a source primary, or even secondary, of the national descent. The genealogy neither starts from him, nor in its uniform sequence does it rest upon him with any emphasis. There is nothing to distinguish Eber above Arphaxad, Peleg, or Serug. Like them, he is but a link in the chain by which Shem is connected with Abraham. Indeed, the tendency of the Inerellsic retrospect is to stop at Jacob. It is with Jacob that the history as a nation begins; beyond Jacob they held their ancestry in common with the Edomites; beyond Isaac they were in danger of being confounded with the Ishmaelites. The predominant figure of the emphatically Hebrew Abraham might tempt them beyond the visible unity with the rest of posterity, disunited, so dishonorable, so anti-national; but it is almost inconceivable that they would voluntarily originate and perpetuate an appellation of themselves which landed them on a platform of ancestry where they met the whole population of Arabia (Gen. x, 25, 30).

III. Hence others (as Jerome, Theodoret, Origen, Chrysost., Arian Montan., J. Bechai, Paul Burg, Munster, Grotius, Scaliger, Selden, Rosenm., Gesenius, and Eiehhorn) prefer tracing קָנָבָה to the verb קָנֵב, to pass over, or the noun קָנָב, the region or country beyond. By those who favor the former etymology, "Hebrew" is regarded as equivalent to "the man who passed over;" by those who favor the latter, it is taken to mean "the man from the region beyond;" and under both suppositions it is held to be applied by the Canaanites to Abraham as having crossed the Euphrates, or coming from the region beyond the Euphrates to Canaan. Of these etymologies the former is now generally abandoned; it is felt that the supposition that the crossing of the Euphrates was such an unparalleled achievement as to fix on him who accomplished it a name that should descend to his posterity and become a permanent appellation, is somewhat too violent to be maintained; and, besides, as the verb קָנֵב signifies to pass from this side to that, not from this side to this, it would not be the term applied by the Canaanites to designate the act of one who had come from the other side of the Euphrates to them. The other etymology has more in its favor. It is supported by the Greek transliteration (Sept. τὸ παραβρέσιον, Αραβοράβαν) it is in accordance with the usage of the phrase קָנָב יִשְׂרָאֵל, which was employed to designate the region beyond the Euphrates (Josh. xxiv, 2, 3; 2 Sam. x, 16; 1 Chron. xix, 16); and it is not improbable that Abraham, coming among the Canaanites from beyond the Euphrates, might be designated by them "the man from the region beyond," just as to Hebrews might well call an American "transatlantic." But, though Bleek very confidently pronounces this view "without doubt the right one" (Einleitung in A. T. p. 73), it is open to serious, if not fatal objections.

1. There is no instance of קָנָב by itself denoting the region beyond the Euphrates, or any other river; the phrase invariably used is קָנָב יִשְׂרָאֵל. Rosenmüller, following Hyde (Hist. Relig. Vet. Pers. p. 51), seeks to supply this desiderated instance by taking קָנָב as epe-ceptual of יִשְׂרָאֵל in Num. xxiv, 24 = the affluent As-syrian et totem transfusivem regionem. But the learned writer has in his zeal overlooked the second קָנָב, which might include his exposition avoids this error by simply taking קָנָב = Mesopotamia; but in this case it is the proper name קָנָב, Eber, and not the preposition קָנֵב, trans, which is in question. 2. If קָנָב was the proper designation of those who lived on the other side of the Euphrates, we should find that name applied to such as continued to dwell there, not to a race descended from one who had left that region never to return. 3. Though Abraham, as having been originally a transfluvian, might be so called by the Canaanites, it is improbable that they should have extended this name to his posterity, to whom it in no sense applied. No one would think of continuing the term "transatlantic" to persons born in Britain on the ground that a remote ancestor had come from across the Atlantic to settle in that country! As to the second, this etymology is confirmed by the Sept., no great weight can be attached to that when we remember how often these etymologies have erred in this way; and also that they have given βεσανως as the rendering of קָנָב in Num. xxiv, 24; "Plus vice simplici hallucinati sunt interpretes Greci eorum ut nos;" simum cadendum num non sit autoritate" (Carpozov, Crit., 21. 178, 179; V. T. p. 171). We may add that the authority of the Sept. and Aquila on such a point is mixed with a bad grace by those who wish to treat contempt the etymologies of the Hebrew text as resting on mere Jewish tradition; if a Jewish tradition of the time of Moses is subject to suspicion, it is for the one of the Polybius Læg and of Alexandrian origin. The vocalization of קָנָב pronunciation "quite uncertain." 4. This
HEBREW OF THE HEBREWS

In the Edeite this language is nowhere designated by the name Hebrew, but this is not surprising when we consider how rarely that name is employed to designate the nation. See Hebrew. If we except the terms "lip of Canaan" (יָדָ֣ה לֵ֑אָנָא) in Isa. xix, 18—where the diction is of an elevated character, and is so far no evidence that this designation was the one commonly employed—the only name by which the Hebrew language is mentioned in the Old Testament is "Jewish" (יִשְׂרָאֵל), used adverbially, Judaism, in Jewish, 2 Kings xviii, 29; Isa. xxvii, 11, 19; 2 Chron. xxxix, 18 (in Neh. xiii, 24, perhaps the Aramaic is meant), where the feminine may be explained as an abstract of the last formation, according to Ewald's Hebr. Gram., § 844, 457, or as referring to the us and gender of יִשְׂרָאֵל understood. In a strict sense, however, "Jewish" denotes the idiom of the kingdom of Judah, which became the predominant one after the through a course of Greek, Latin, French, and in the Greco-writings of the later Jews that "Hebrew" is first applied to the language, as in the β'ασιαρί of the prologue to Ecclesiasticus, and in the γνωσα των Ἑβραϊων of Josephus. (The β'ασιαρί διάλεκτος of the New Testament is used in contradistinction to the idiom of the Hellenist Jews, and does not mean the Jews, and does not mean the Jews, but the the vernacular Aramaic dialect of Palestine.) The title of all Hebrew language was therefore founded on the fact that the nation which spoke this idiom was properly distinguished by the ethnographical name Hebrews.

The Hebrew language belongs to the class of languages called Semitic—so called because spoken chiefly by nations enumerated in Scripture among the descendents of Shem. The Sanscrit, Persian, Greek, Latin, with the Germanic and Celtic languages, are the principal members of another large class of languages, to which we have already alluded the various names of Japhetic, Indo-European, Indo-Germanic, and Aramaic. This latter class embraces most of the languages of Europe, including course of our own. The student, therefore, who, besides mastering his own language, has passed through a course of Greek, Latin, French, and is an Englishman (and few of our students, except with a professional view, extend their linguistic studies further), has not, after all his labors, got beyond the limits of the same class of languages to which his mother tongue belongs, and of which it forms one of the most important members. But when he come to the study of the Hebrew language he enters a new field, he observes new phenomena, he traces the operation of new laws.

1. Characteristics of the Semitic Languages, and in particular of the Hebrew. 1. With respect to sounds, the chief peculiarities are the following:

(1.) The predominance of guttural sounds. The Hebrew language has four or (we may say) five guttural sounds, descending in the order of strength and position from laryngeal to throat-breathing represented by the first letter of the alphabet (א) through the decided aspirate ר, to the strong מ and gurgling ג. To these we must add ג, which partakes largely of the guttural character. Nor were these sounds sparingly employed; on the contrary, they were in more frequent use than any other class of letters. In the Hebrew dictionary the four gutturals Acts ii, 13 occupy considerably more space than the fifteen more common letters, or at least in the whole volume, the remaining eighteen letters occupying considerably less than three fourths. This predominance of guttural sounds must have given a very marked character to the ancient Hebrew, as it does still to the modern Arabic.

(2.) The use of the very strong letters ג, פ, which may be represented by ג or פ, in pronouncing which the organ is more compressed and the sound given forth with greater vehemence. These letters, especially the last two, are also in frequent use. When the Greeks borrowed their alphabet from the Phoenicians, they softened or dropped these strong let-
The Semitic languages do not admit, like the Indo-European, of an accumulation or grouping of consonants around a single vowel sound. In such words as craft, crush, grind, strong, stretch, we find four, five, and six consonants clustering around a single vowel. The Semitic alphabet, on the other hand, usually interposes a vowel sound more or less distinct after each consonant. It is only at the end of a word that two consonants may stand together without any intermediate vowel sound; and even in that case various expedients are employed to dispense with a combination which is evidently not in accordance with the genius of the language.

The vowels, although thus copiously introduced, are nevertheless kept in strict subordination to the consonants; so much so that it is only in rare and exceptional cases that any word or syllable begins with a vowel. In Hebrew we have no such syllables as ab, ag, ad, in which the initial sound is a pure vowel; but only ba, ga, da. If Sir H. Rawlinson is correct, it would appear that the Assyrian language differed from the other Semitic languages in this particular. In his syllabic alphabet a considerable number of the syllables begin with a vowel.

If we endeavor to calculate the effect of the foregoing peculiarities on the character of the language, we cannot avoid the conclusion that the Semitic languages are of a more primitive type than the European; much less refined and developed, connected with a natural utterance of a mind vehement and passionate, impulsive rather than calmly deliberate.

2. With respect to roots and words, the Semitic languages are distinguished in a very marked manner:

(a) The consonants of the main root. This is one of the most striking characteristics of these languages, as it does not appear that there is any language not belonging to this class in the formation of whose roots the same law has been at work. It is very difficult to ascertain the origin of this singular phenomenon. It may possibly be regarded as a kind of equivalent for the compound roots of other languages (which are altogether wanting in the Semitic); an original two-letter root being enlarged and expanded into a greater or less number of three-letter roots, for the purpose of giving expression to the various modifications and shades of the primitive root idea. The formation of these roots is not a mere addition of an added root, the Semitic indicates by a sign, by simply laying additional stress on one of the root letters. And thus again the observation made under the heading sound recurs, viz., that in the formation of the Semitic languages the dominant influence was that of instinctive feeling, passion, imagination—of the nature of activity, while the e and o sounds are the symbols of rest and passiveness. In the Arabic verb this characteristic is very marked, many of the roots appearing under three forms, each having a different vowel, and the significance being modified in accordance with the nature of the vowel. The same law appears in the formation of the passives. Thus kutala—pass. kutela.

(b) Doubling of consonants, usually of the middle letter of the root. By means of this most simple and natural device, the Semitic languages express intensity or repetition of action, and also such qualities as repeated action, as righteous, merciful, etc. By comparing this usage with the expression of the corresponding ideas in our own language, we observe at once the difference in the genius of the two languages. We say merciful, sinful, i.e. fully of mercy, full of sin. Not so the Semitic, for we express them more formally by adding to the root an added root, the Semitic indicates by a sign, by simply laying additional stress on one of the root letters. And thus again the observation made under the heading sound recurs, viz., that in the formation of the Semitic languages the dominant influence was that of instinctive feeling, passion, imagination—the hand of nature appearing everywhere, the voice of nature heard in every utterance: in this, how widely separated from the artificial and highly organized languages of the Indo-European family (Adelung, Mährheiten, 1, 361).

(4) The influence of the imagination on the structure of the Semitic languages.

(a) The further growth and expansion of the three-letter root itself into a variety of what are called conjunctive forms, expressing intensity, reflectiveness, causation, etc. A similar formation may be traced in all languages; in some non-Semitic languages, as the Turkish, it is very largely and regularly developed (Max Müller, Lectures on Science of Language, p. 318, etc.). In English we have examples in such verbs as set and set, lie and lay, set being the causative of sit, lay of lie, or we may say sit is the reflexive of set, and lie of lay. So in Latin sedo and sedes, jacio and jacet, etc., in which latter root the conjunctive formation is still farther developed into jacto and jactio. But what in these languages is fragmentary and occasional, in Hebrew and the cognate languages is carried out and expanded into a regular process, and regularity occupies a large space in the Semitic grammar. The conjunctives are of three sorts: (a) Those expressing intensity, repetition, etc., which are usually distinguished by some change within the root; (b) those expressing reference, causation, etc., which are usually distinguished by not returning to the root, the present being distinguished by the presence of the u or o sound in the first syllable.

(3) A prominent distinction of the Semitic languages is the extent to which modifications of the root idea are indicated, not by additions to the root, but by changes within the root. "The Semitic roots," says Bopp (Comparative Grammar of the Indo-European Tongues, i, 90), "on account of their construction, possess the most surprising capacity for indicating the secondary ideas of grammar by the mere internal moulding of the root, while the Sanscrit roots at the first grammatical movement are compelled to assume external additions." These internal changes are principally of two sorts:

(a) Vowel changes. Nothing is more remarkable in the Semitic languages than the significance of their vowel sounds; the sharp a sound, formed by opening the mouth to its widest capacity, is associated with the idea of a great flow of activity, while the e and o sounds are the symbols of rest and passiveness. In the Arabic verb this characteristic is very marked, many of the roots appearing under three forms, each having a different vowel, and the significance being modified in accordance with the nature of the vowel. The same law appears in the formation of the passives. Thus kutala—pass. kutela.
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The Hebrew language is a complex and ancient language, with a rich history and a unique structure. In the Old Testament, the Hebrew language is often described as being 'divine' or 'sacred', reflecting its importance in the religious and cultural life of the Israelites. The Hebrew language has influenced many other languages, and its principles of grammar and syntax have been studied by linguists and scholars for centuries.

3. In the syntax and general structure of the Semitic languages and related languages, we observe the same principles, the same tendencies of mind which manifest themselves in the structure of words. In this respect the Hebrew language exhibits a more simple and primitive type than any of the sister tongues. The simplicity of the Hebrew composition is very obvious, even to the reader of the English Bible, or to the scholar who compares the Greek Testament, the style of which is formed on the model of the Old Testament, with the classical Greek writers. We observe at once that there is no such thing as the building up of a lengthened period, consisting of several propositions only superadded and connected as they stand. The Hebrew composition consists rather of a succession of co-ordinate propositions, each of which is for the moment uppermost in the view of the speaker or writer, until it is superseded by that which follows. This results at once from the character of the Semitic mind, which was more remarkable for rapid movements and vivid glances than for large and comprehensive grasp. Such a mind would give forth its thoughts in a rapid succession of independent utterances rather than in sustained and elaborated sentences.

The Hebrew language is also extremely pictorial in its character—not the poetry only, but also the prose. In the history the past is not described, it is painted. It is not the ear that hears, it is rather the eye that observes. The course of events is made to pass before the eye; the transactions are all acted over again. The past is not a fixed landscape, but a moving panorama. The reader of the English Bible must have remarked the constant use of the word behold, which indicates that the writer is himself, and wishes to make his reader feel also, a spectator, and to participate in the events. The use of the tenses in the Hebrew historical writings is especially remarkable. To the young student of Hebrew the constant use of the future tense in the description of the past appears perhaps the most striking fea-
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culiarity of the language. But the singular phenomenon admits of an easy explanation. It was because the Hebrew viewed and described the transactions of the past, not as all past and done, but as in actual process and progress of evolution, that he makes such frequent use of the so-called future. In imagination he quite often goes beyond the time, and anticipates the future. With his reader he sails down the stream of time, and traces with open eye the winding course of history. It is impossible always to reproduce exactly in English this peculiarity of the Hebrew Bible.

Further, in writing even of the commonest actions, as that one went, spoke, saw, etc., the Hebrew is not unthinking as to the simple fact that the thing was done, he must describe also the process of doing. We are so familiar with the style of our English Bibles that we do not at once perceive the pictorial character of such expressions as these, recurring in every page: he arose and went; he opened his lips and spoke; he put forth his hand and took; he lifted up his eyes and saw; he lifted up his voice and wept. But what we do not consciously perceive we often unconsciously feel; and doubtless it is this painting of events which is the source of part at least of the charm with which the Scripture narrative is invested to all pure and simple minds.

The same effect is also produced by the symbolical way of representing mental states and processes which distinguishes the Hebrew writers. Such expressions as to bend or incline the ear for to hear attentively, to set on the neck for to be stubborn and rebellious, to uncover the ear for to reveal, are in frequent use. Even the acts of the Divine Mind are depicted in a similar way. In the study especially of the Old Testament we must keep this point carefully in view, lest we should err by giving a symbolical expression a literal interpretation. Thus, when we read in xxxiii. 19 that the Lord spake unto Moses face to face as a man speaketh unto his friend, we must remember that it was a Hebrew who wrote these words, one who was accustomed to depict to himself and others the spiritual under material symbols, and thus we shall be guarded against irreverently attaching to them a meaning which they were never intended to bear. But, though such modes of expression are open to misapprehension by us, whose minds are formed in so very different a mould, nevertheless, when rightly understood, they have the effect of giving us a more clear and vivid impression of the ideas which they embody than could be conveyed to us by any other mode of representation or expression.

The simplicity and naturalness of the language further appears in the prominence which is constantly given to the word or words embodying the leading idea in a sentence or period. Thus the noun stands before the adjective, the predicate stands before the subject, unless the latter be specially emphatic, in which case it is not only put first, but may stand by itself as a nominative absolute without any syntactical connection with the rest of the sentence.

The constant use of the oratio directa is also to be specially noted, as an indication of the primitive character of the language. The Hebrew historian does not usually inform us that such and such a person said such and such things; he actually, as it were, produces the parties and makes them speak for themselves. To this device (if it may be so called) the Bible history owes much of its freshness and power of exciting and sustaining the interest of its readers. No other history could be so often read without losing its power to interest and charm.

Lastly, in a primitive language, formed under the predominating influence of imagination and emotion, we may expect to meet with many elliptical expressions, and also with many redundancies. Not a little which we think it necessary formally to express in words, the Hebrew allowed to be gathered from the context; and, conversely, the Hebrew gave expression to not a little which we omit. For example, nothing is more common in Hebrew than the omission of the verb to be in its various forms; and, on the other hand, a very striking characteristic of the Hebrew style is the constant use of the forms יִהְיֶה yihye, יֵהָיָה yehaya, and it came to pass— and it shall come to pass, which, in translating into English, may be altogether omitted without any serious loss. In the Hebrew prose, also, we often meet with traces of that echoing of thought and expression which forms one of the principal characteristics of the poetic style; as in Gen. vi. 22, "And Noah did according to all that God commanded him—so did he;" and similar passages, in which the verb is repeated twice, recording the same fact combined into one, thus: "And Noah did according to all that God commanded him;" "According to all that the Lord commanded him, so did he."

II. History of the Hebrew Language. I. Its Origin. — The extant historical notices on this point carry us back to the age of Abraham, but no further. The best evidence as to the formation of the Hebrew language prior to its first historical period tend to show that Abraham, on his entrance into Canaan, found the language then prevailing among almost all the different tribes inhabiting that country to be in at least dialectical affinity with his own. This is gathered from the following facts: it is manifestly nearly all the names of the persons relating to those tribes admit of Hebrew etymologies; that, amid all the accounts of the intercourse of the Hebrews with the nations of Canaan, we find no hint of a diversity of idiom; and that even the comparatively recent remains of the Phoenician and Punic languages retain the same affinity to the Hebrew.

But whether the Hebrew language, as seen in the earliest books of the Old Testament, is the very dialect which Abraham brought with him into Canaan, or whether it was the common tongue of the Canaanites, nations which Abraham only adopted from, and which was afterwards developed to greater fulness under the peculiar moral and political influences to which its posterity were exposed, are questions which, in the absence of conclusive arguments, are generally discussed with some dogmatical presuppositions. Almost all those who support the former view also that Hebrew was the primitive language of mankind. S. Morinus (Ling. Primerae, i. 399) and Lischner (De Canitis Lingeb.) are among the best champions of this opinion; but Hänsernic has more recently advocated it with such modifications as make it more acceptable (Einleitung, in den Alten Text, 1, 1, 148 sq.). The question is founded on two points: first, Hebrew is the name of the most important proper names in the first part of Genesis (as Cain, Seth, and others) are evidently founded on Hebrew etymologies, the essential connection of these names with their etymological origins involves the historical credibility of the records themselves, and leaves no room for any other conclusion than that the Hebrew language is coeval with the earliest history of man. The evidence on the other side is scanty, but not without weight. (1.) In Dcut. xxvi, 5, Abraham is called a Syriac or Aramean (אֲבָרָהָם), from which we naturally conclude that Syriac was his mother tongue, especially when we find, (2.) from Gen. xxxii, 47, that Syriac or Chaldee was the language spoken by Laban, the grandson of Nahor, Abraham's brother. Moreover, it has been remarked (3.) that in Isa. xix, 18, the Hebrew is actually called the language of Canaan; and (4.) that the language itself furnishes internal evidence of its Palestinian origin in the word וַאֲנָה, which means also the west, and has this meaning in the very earliest documents. (5.) Finally, Jewish tradition, whatever we may attach to it, is in accordance with the same conclusion (Genesich, Geschicht, sect. vi, 71.)

If we inquire further how it was that the Canaanites, of the race of Ham, spoke a language so closely allied to the languages spoken by the principal members of
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the Semitic family of nations, we shall soon discover that the solution of this difficulty is impossible with our present means of information; it lies beyond the historic period. It may be that long before the migration of Abraham a Semitic race occupied Palestine; and that, as Abraham adopted the language of the Canaanites, the so-called Canaanite language, the present scholars have adopted the language of that earlier race whom they gradually dispossessed, and eventually exterminated or absorbed. However this may be, leaving speculation for fact, it is not possible to discover a wise purpose in the selection of the language of the Hebrews. The great consciousness of antiquity—as the language in which was to be embodied the most wonderful revelation of himself and of his law which God made to the ancient world? When we remember the constant intercourse which was maintained by the Phoenicians with the most distant regions both of the East and of the West, it is impossible to doubt that the sacred books of the Hebrews, written in a language almost identical with the Phoenician, must have exercised a more important influence on the Gentile world than is usually acknowledged.

The Canaanitish language, when adopted by the Hebrews, did not remain unchanged. Having become the instrument of the Hebrew mind, and being employed in the expression of new and very peculiar ideas, it must have been modified considerably thereby. How far that modification may possibly have occurred, is beyond the power of the present scholar to determine. Still it is evident that the more ancient monuments of the Phoenician nation, which may still have survived the entombment of centuries.

2. Influence modifying the Form of the Hebrew Language, and the Style of the Hebrew Writings—(a) Time. The history of the Hebrew language, as far as we yet know its course by the changes in the dictionary of the books in which it is preserved, may here be conveniently divided into that of the period preceding and that of the period succeeding the Exile. If it be true, which is a matter of surprise, that the thousand years which intervened between Moses and the Captivity should not have produced sufficient change in the language to warrant its history during that time being distributed into sub-divisions, the following considerations may excuse this arrangement. It is one of the signal characteristics of the Hebrew character that the whole of the books prior to the Exile, that, notwithstanding the existence of some isolated but important archaisms, such as in the form of the pronoun, etc. (the best collection of which may be seen in Havemann, c. 2, p. 183 sq.), it preserves an unparalleled general uniformity of structure. The extent to which this uniformity prevails, this may be estimated either by the fact that it has furnished many modern scholars, who reason from the analogies discovered in the changes in other languages in a given period, with an argument to show that the Pentateuch could not have been written at so remote a date as is generally believed (Gessner, Gesch. der Heb. Sprache, § 8), or by the conclusion, ä fortiori, which Havemann, whose express object is to vindicate its revered antiquity, candidly concedes, that "the books of Chronicles, Ezra, and Nehemiah are the earliest in which the language differs sensibly from that in the historical portions of the Pentateuch" (Einl. I, 180). Even those critics who endeavor to bring down the Pentateuch as a whole to a comparatively late date allow that a portion at least of its contents is to be assigned to the age of Moses (Ewald, Lehrbuch, sec. 5, c); and indeed it can be shown that this most ancient portion bears in its language and style the stamp of high antiquity, and is distinguished in a very marked manner from the other portions of the Pentateuch (which has not been shown), the phenomenon still remains unexplained. But, indeed, the phenomenon is by no means unexampled. It does not stand alone. It is said, for example, that the Chinese language displays the same tenacity and aversion to change still more decidedly, the books of the great teacher Confucius being written in language not essentially different from that of his commentators fifteen hundred years later. So we are informed by a writer of the 16th century that the Greeks, at least the more cultivated class, even in his day spoke the language of Homer. It may be that the same and similar conditions have been influenced in the ancient standard of elegance and purity (Gibbon, viii, 106). Or, to take another example more closely related to the Hebrew, it is well known that the written Arabic of the present day does not differ greatly from that of the ancients after the Muhammad. In each of the cases just mentioned, it is probable that the language was as it was stereotyped by becoming the language of books held in highest esteem and reverence, diligently studied by the learned, frequently committed to memory, and adopted as a model of style by succeeding writers. Now, may not the sacred writings of the Mosaic age have had a similar influence on the written Hebrew of the following ages, which continued undisturbed till the Captivity, or even later? We know how greatly the translations of the Bible into English and German have affected the language and literature of England and Germany, since many other countries all over the world. But among a people like the ancient Hebrews, living to a certain extent apart from other nations, with a literature of no great extent, and a learned class specially engaged in the study and transcription of the sacred writings, we may well suppose that the influence of these circumstances on the Hebrew original language must have been much more decided and permanent. The learned men would naturally adopt in their compositions the language of the books which had been their study from youth, and large portions of which they were probably able to repeat from memory. Thus the language of these compositions would differ in some respects from that spoken by the common people, would naturally become the language of the learned and of books, especially of those books on sacred subjects, such as have alone come down to us from ancient Israel. In explanation of the fact under discussion, appeal has also been made (a) to the permanence of Eastern customs, and (b) to the simple structure of the Hebrew language, which rendered it less liable to change than other more largely developed languages (see Ewald, Heb. Gram., § 7). It has also been remarked that some of the archaisms, which may be concealed from view by the uniformity of the system of punctuation adopted and applied to the Scriptures by the Hebrew grammarians.

In the canonical books belonging to the first period the Hebrew language thus appears in a state of mature development. Although it still preserves the charm of freshness and simplicity, yet it has attained great regularity of formation, and such a precision of syntactical arrangement as insures both energy and distinctness. Some common notions of its laxity and indeliteness have no other foundation than the very inadequate scholarship of the persons who form the middle-class, to which the language is to be assigned. When the details in the language which is spoken in the historical portions of the Pentateuch (which has not been shown), the phenomenon still remains unexplained. But, indeed, the phenomenon is by no means unexampled. It does not stand alone. It is said, for example, that the Chinese language displays the same.

The Babylonian Captivity is assigned as the com-
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cementation of that decline and corruption which mark the second period in the history of the Hebrew language; but the Assyrian deportation of the ten tribes, in the year B.C. 720, was probably the first means of bringing the Aramaic idiom into injurious proximity with it. Henceforward, however, for a time, during which the language shows evident signs of encroachment of the Aramaic on its integrity, which afterwards ended in its complete extinction. The dicton of the different books of this period disclosures various grades of this Aramaic influence, and in some cases approaches so nearly to the type of the first period that it has been ascribed to mere imitation.

The writings which belong to the second age—that subsequent to the Babylonian Captivity—accordingly differ very considerably from those which belonged to the first; the influence of the Chaldee language, acquired by the Jewish exiles in the land of their captivity, having gradually corrupted the national tongue. The historical books belonging to this age are the books of Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther. In the prophetic books which preceded during and after the Captivity, with the exception of Daniel, the Chaldee influence is by no means marked; and we may fairly assume that they having evidently formed their style on that of the older prophets. It is important, however, to observe that the presence of what appears to be a Chaldaic is not always the indication of a later age. Chaldee words and forms occur at all ages in even the most ancient Hebrew compositions, especially the poetical, the poet delighting in archaic and rare words, and substituting these for the more usual and commonplace. But between the Chaldaic archaisms and the Chaldeism of the later Scriptures there is marked distinction, that the former are only occasional, and lie scattered on the surface; the latter are frequent, and give a peculiar color and character to the whole language.

A still more corrupt form of the language appears in the Mishna and other later Jewish writings, in which the foreign element is much more decided and prominent.

(2.) Place.—Under this head is embraced the question as to the existence of different dialects of the ancient Hebrew. Was the Hebrew language, as spoken by the several tribes of Israel, of uniform mould and character? or did it branch out into various dialects corresponding to the reading divisions of the nation? In attempting to answer this question, there is no direct historical testimony of which we can avail ourselves. From Neh. xiii, 23, 24, we learn nothing more than that the language of Ashdod differed from that of the Jews after their return from captivity, which is only what we might have anticipated. The notices in Judges, xii, 6 and xviii, 3, which are more to the purpose, refer rather to a difference in pronunciation than in the form of the language. Notwithstanding it seems prima facie probable (a) that the language of the trans-Jordanitic tribes was in course of time modified to a greater or less extent by the close contact of these tribes with the Syr-rians of the north and the Arab tribes of the great eastern desert; and (b) that a similar dialectic difference would gradually be developed in the language of Ephraim and the other northern tribes to the west of the Jordan, especially after the political separation of these tribes from the tribe of Judah and the family of David. Possibly in the Jewish language of 2 Kings xxvii, 28 we may discover the trace of some such difference of dialect; for we can scarcely suppose the name Pious was to have been introduced in the very brief period which interceded between the taking of Samaria and the trans- action in the record of which it occurs; and, if in the language of the ten tribes, it must have been restricted to the form of the Hebrew language prevailing in Judæa, which, being thus distinguished from some of the language of the northern tribes, was probably distinguished in other respects also. It is not improbable that some of the lin-

guistic peculiarities of the separate books of Scripture are to be accounted for on this hypothesis.

3. When the Hebrew Language ceased to be a living Language.—The Jewish tradition, credited by Kimchi, is to the effect that the Hebrew language ceased to be spoken by the body of the people during their captivity in Babylon and Persia; but the opinion is not held by all scholars also, among whom are Buxtorf and Walton. Others, as Pfeiffer and Lösch, argue that it is quite unreasonable, considering the duration and other circumstances of the Exile, to suppose that the Jews did not retain the partial use of their native tongue for some time after their return to Palestine, and may have even retained it at a low degree at least. There can be no doubt that the Hebrew was never spoken in its purity after the return from captivity; but that it ceased altogether to be the language of the people after that period, and was retained only as the language of the learned, and has not been established. The principal evidence relied on by those who hold this opinion is derived from Neh. viii, 8: "So they read in the book, in the law of God, distinctly, and gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading." Distinctly, כֹּלְכָּהָה, i.e. says Hengstenberg, "with the addition of a translation" (Griovinass of Daniel, cii, sec. 5). But, though this gloss is marked in the Jewish translation, it is a variance both with Hebrew and with Chaldee usage. כֶּדְכָּה means made clear or distinct, as is evident from Numb. xv, 34 (the meaning of כֶּדְכָּה, in Ezra iv, 18, is disputed); and כֶדְכָּה נַפְּלֵית can scarcely be otherwise rendered than "they read distinctly" (see the Lexicons of Cocceius, Gesenius, and First; Buxtorf and Gesenius render by explain, explicate). This, indeed, is evident from the context, for if we should render with Hengstenberg, "They read it with the addition of a translation," to what purpose the clause which follows, "and gave the sense," etc.? At the same time, though this passage does not furnish sufficient evidence to prove that in the time of Nehemiah Hebrew had ceased to be the language of every-day life, it does seem to point to the conclusion that at that time it had considerably degenerated from its ancient purity, so that the common people had some difficulty in understanding the language of their ancient sacred books. Still we believe that the Hebrew element predominated, and, instead of a Greek lexicon () and a Latin lexicon (24), the language of the Jews on their return from exile as "Chal- dea with a certain admixture of Hebrew," we should rather describe it as Hebrew with a large admixture of Chaldee. Only on this hypothesis does it appear possible satisfactorily to account for the fact that Hebrew continued even after this period to be the language of the prophets and preachers, historians and poets, while there is no trace of any similar use of the Chaldee among the Jews of Palestine (compare also Neh. xiii, 24).

At what time Chaldee became the dominant element in the national language it is impossible to determine. All political influences favored its ascendency, and with these coincided the influence of that large portion of the nation still resident in the East, and maintaining constant intercourse with a Chaldee-speaking population. To these influences we cannot wonder that the Hebrew has been losing the ascendancy which it possessed, with the Jews of Babylonia. The coins of the Maccabees, indeed, the ancient language still appears; but we cannot conclude from this circumstance that it maintained its position as a living language down to the Maccabean period (Rénan, Langages Séri-ques, p. 83, 84). We may, however, regard one of the popular language which we find in the New Testament are all Aramaic, and even since the Hebrew has been preserved and cultivated as the language of the learned and of books, and of not common life. On the history of the post-Biblical Hebrew we do not now enter.

III. Of the Written Hebrew.—The Semitic nations have been the teachers of the world in religion; by the
Mention of the alphabet they may likewise lay claim to the honor of having laid the foundation of the world's literature. The Schemitic alphabet, as is well known, has no signs for the pure vowel sounds. All the letters are consonants; some, however, are so weak as easily to pass into vowels, and these letters we accordingly find in manuscripts of Babylonia and Syria marked with a dot above, or a short horizontal stroke of ι, and other calligraphical minutiae.

The characters in use before the Babylonian exile have been preserved by the Samaritans even to the present day without material change (Gesenius, Monum. Phen. sect. ii, 1; comp. on this subject also Kopf, Bilder und Schriften, ii, sect. 60-101; Zwald, Lehrbuch, sect. lxvi; Geschichtliche Geschichte der Hebräischen Sprache u. Schrift, sect. 41-43).

2. As to the origin and authority of the punctuation, the controversy which raged so fiercely in the 17th century may be said now to have ceased; and the views of Ludovicus Cappellus, from the adoption of which the Buxtorfs anticipated the most dangerous consequences, now meet with almost universal acquiescence. The two following conclusions may now be regarded as established: (1.) That the present punctuation did not form an original part of the inspired record, but was introduced by the Jewish doctors into the sacred Scriptures after the canon had been closed, for the purpose of preserving, as far as possible, the true pronunciation of the language; and (2.) That the present pointed text, notwithstanding its comparative recency, presents us with the closest possible approximation to the language which the sacred writers actually used. Jewish doctors of a later age, of course, would be able to arrive at a correct knowledge of the language by the use of theSeptuagint and the Talmud. Keeping these conclusions in view in interpreting the ancient Scriptures, we see neither, on the one hand, to neglect the traditional text, nor, on the other hand, servilely to adhere to it when a change of the points would give a better sense to any passage.

The origin of the vowel-points is to be ascribed to the effort which the Jewish learned men made to preserve the pronunciation of their sacred language at a time when its extinction as a living tongue endangered the loss of the traditional memory of its sound. Every kind of evidence renders it probable that these signs for the pronunciation were first introduced about the 7th century of the Chaldee era, from a desire to fix the pronunciation of the Talmud, and that the minute and complex system which we possess was gradually developed from a few indispensable signs to its present elaborateness. The existence of the present complete system can, however, be traced back to the 11th century. The skilful investigation of Hupfeld (in the Studien und Kritiken for 1830, p. 549 sq.) has proved that the vowel-points were unknown to Jerome and the Talmud; but, as far as regards the former, we are able to make a high estimate of the degree to which the traditional pronunciation, prior to the use of the points, accorded with our Masoretic signs; for Jerome describes a pronunciation which agrees wonderfully well with our own vocalization. We are thus called on to avail ourselves thankfully fully of the Masoretic punctuation, on the double ground that it represents the Jewish traditional pronunciation, and that the Hebrew language, unless read according to its laws, does not enter into its full dialectal harmony with its Syro-Arabian sisters. See Massorah.

Although it may be superfluous to enforce the general advantages, not to say indispensable necessity, of a sound scholarly study of the Hebrew language to the systematic student, yet it is also allowed to suggest some of those particular reasons, incident to the present time, which urgently demand an increased attention to this study. First, the English-speaking race have an ancient honorable name to retain. Selden, Castell, Lightfoot, Pocock, Walton, Spencer, and Hyde,
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were once contemporary ornaments of its literature. We daily see their names mentioned with deference in the writings of German scholars; but we are forcibly struck with the fact that, since that period, Great Britain has hardly, with the exception of Lowth and Kennicot, produced a single Hebrew scholar who has signally advanced Biblical philology; while America, although possessing some well-qualified teachers, has produced but little that is original in this direction. Secondly, the bold inquiries of the German theologians will force themselves on our notice. It is impossible for us to ignore so much evidence, for the grounds on which they have not yet been brought to bear, with such force, on the most important Biblical queries. The grounds which they deal in the ancient traditions cannot be healed by reference to commentators whose generation knew nothing of our doubts and difficulties. The cure must be sympathetic; it must be effected by the same weapon that caused the wound. If the monstrous disproportion which books relating to antiquity and criticism bear, in almost every theological bookseller's catalogue, over those relating to Biblical philology, be an evidence of the degree to which these studies have fallen into neglect, and if the few books in which an acquaintance with Hebrew is necessary, which do appear, are a fair proof of our present small stock of Germans with Hebrew weapons, then there is indeed an urgent necessity that theological students should prepare for the increased demands of the future.

III. History of Hebrew Learning.—It is not till the closing part of the 9th century that we find, even among the Jews themselves, any attempt at a formal study of their ancient tongue. In the Talmudic writings, indeed, grammatical remarks frequently occur, and of these some indicate an acute and accurate perception of the usages of the language; but they are introduced incidentally, and are to be traced rather to a sort of living sense of the language than to any scientific study of its structure or laws. What the Jews of the Talmudic period knew themselves of the Hebrew they communicated to Origen and Jerome, both of whom devoted themselves with much zeal to the study of that language, and the latter of whom especially became proficient in all that his master had taught him concerning its vocabulary and its grammar (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl.); Jerome, Adv. Rufino, i. 363; Epist. ad Damas.; Prof. ad Joahum, ad Paradisum, etc.; Carpuzio, Crit. Soc. vi, 2). As represented by Jerome, the Church was quite on a par with the synagogue in acquaintance with the language, and the spirit which had imparted to it was in many respects may be seen from the strange etymologies, which even Jerome adduces as explanatory of words, and from his statement that from the want of vowels in Hebrew "the Jews pronounce the same words with different sounds and accents, pro evoluta lectorum us varietate nominum" (Ep. ad Evagium).

Stimulated by the example of the Arabians, the Jews began, towards the end of the 9th century, to bestow careful study on the grammar of their ancient tongue; and with this advantage over the Arabian grammarians, that they did not, like them, confine their attention to one science, but took into account the whole of the Semitic tongues. An African Jew, Jehuda ben-Karish, who lived about A.D. 880, led the way in this direction; but it was reserved for Saadia ben-Joseph of Fuyum, gaon (or spiritual head) of the Jews at Sora in Babylonia, and who died A.D. 942, to bring to the utmost power of Hebrew grammar and philology. To him we are indebted for the Arabic version of the O.T., of which portions are still extant [see ARABIC VERSIONS]; and though his other works, his commentaries on the O.T., and his grammatical works, have not come down to us, we know of them from references to them, and have still some of their contents in, the citations of later writers. He was followed by R. Jehuda ben-David Chajug, a native of Fez, who flourished in the 11th century, whose services have procured for him the honorable designation of "chief of grammarians." From him the succession of Jewish grammarians embraces the following (for details, see separate articles) :—

Salomo Issaki (ירסא), a native of Troyes in France, d. ab. 1105; Abul Walid Mervan ibn-Ganach, a physician at Cordova, d. 1120; Moses Gikatilla, ab. 1100; Ibn-Esra, d. 1194; the Kimchis, especially Moses and David, who flourished in the 13th century; Saen ben-Mose (Ephodheus, so called from the title of his work work), who flourished in the 12th century; and Jarchi (Yochanan ben Zakkai), which has for the seven conjunctures of verbs as now usually given; Abraham de Balmez of Lecce; and Elias Levi (1472-1549). The earliest efforts in Hebrew lexicography with which we are acquainted is the little work of Saadia Gaon, in which he explains seventy Hebrew words; a codex containing this is in the Bodlician library at Oxford, from which it was printed by Dukes in the Zeitschrift für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, V, i, 115 sq. In the same codex is another small lexicographical work by Jehuda ben-Karish, in which Hebrew words are explained from the Talmud, the Arabic, and other languages; extracts from this are given in Wilken, Histor. der Bibl. Litt., iii. 591-590. More copious works are those of Ben-Ganach, where the Hebrew words are explained in Arabic; of R. Menahem ibn-Saruk, whose work has been printed with an English translation by Herschell Philopougos (Lond., 1864); of R. Samael Porouch (about 1160), specimens of whose work have been given by De Rossi in his collection of Various Readings, and in a separate work entitled Lexicon heb., select, quo ex antiquo et inedito R. Poruchonis Lexico novis et diversarum variorum et difficiliorum vocum significaciones astit, d. B. De Rossi (Farm., 1865); of David Kimchi, the second part of his commentary on the Pentateuch, אפרים, often printed; best edition by Biesenrath and Leberecht, 2 vols. Berl. 1883-47); and of Elias Levi (Talhà, Bas. 1527, and with a Latin translation by Bagtus, 4to, 1541). The Concordance of Isaac Nathan (1437) also belongs to this period.

The study of the Hebrew language among Christians, which had only casually and at intervals occupied the attention of ecclesiastics during the Middle Ages, received a new impulse from the revived interest in Biblical exegesis produced by the Reformation. Something had been done to facilitate the study of Oriental literature and to call attention to it by the MSS. Hebrew and Arabic, which the emperor Frederick II brought into Europe after he had crossed the 1225, de Gemmata, p. 419; Bochart, Hist. Univ. p. 779); and a few men—such as Raymund Martini, a native of Cata- lonia (born 1256), Paulus Bugensis, Libertas Comitunctis, who is said to have known and used fourteen languages, etc.—appeared as lights in the otherwise beclouded horizon of Biblical learning. But it was not until the beginning of the 16th century that any general interest was awakened in the Christian Church for the study of Hebrew literature. In 1506 appeared the grammar and lexicon of Reuchlin, which may be regarded as the first successful attempt to open the gate of Hebrew learning to the Christian world; for though the work of Conrad Pellican, De Modo legendi et intelligendi Hebrae (Basel, 1503), had the precedence in point of time, it was too imperfect to exert much influence in favor of Hebrew studies. A few years later, Santius Pagnini, a Dominici- can of Lucca, issued his Instiitum Hebraicarum Literarum, in (1526), and his Theussarum Loci, Sanct. (ibid., 1529); but the former of these works is inferior to the Grammar of Reuchlin, and the latter is a mere collection of excerpts from David Kimchi's Book of Roots, often erroneously understood. No name of any importance until, in the history of Hebrew learning in this till we come to those of Sebastian Müntzer and the Buxtors. The former translated the grammatical works
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of Elias Levi, and from these chiefly he constructed his own Dictionarium Hebr., adj. Chald. vocabulli (Basel, 1823), and his Opus Grammaticum ex variis Elieris libris concinnatum (Basel, 1842). The latter rendered most important service to the cause of Hebrew learning. See Rixtor. The grammars and lexicons of the older linguists were of course the starting point of the study of Hebrew in the Christian Church, and one of them, his Lexicon Chald. Talmud. et Rabbinicum (Basel, 1640), is still indispensable to the student who would thoroughly explore the Hebrew language and literature. The names also of Förster and Schindler may be mentioned as having been important in the early studies. Previous to them scholars had followed almost slavishly in the track of rabbinical teaching. By them, however, an attempt was made to gather materials from a wider field. Förster, in his Diet. Hebr. Non. (Basel, 1857), sought to determine the meaning of the words from the comparison of the different passages of Scripture in which they occur, and of allied words, words having two consonants in common, or two consonants of the same organ. Schindler added to this the comparison of different Semitic dialects for the illustration of the language, and also the use of the Chaldee, which has a history of its own (pp. 615, following). The example thus set was carried forward by Sam. Böhle, a Rostock professor (Disertt., pro formali Signif. S. S. erundum, 1637), though by his fondness for metaphysical methods and conceits he was often betrayed into mere trifling; by Christian Nolke, professor at Coppenhagen, the author of this book (Christian Nolke und seine Schule. P. Hamb. 1769); by Joh. Coccieus (Coch.), professor at Leyden (Lex. et Comment. s. Hebr. Lond. 1669); by Castell (Lex. Heptaglot. Lond. 1669); by De Dieu in his commentaries on the O. Test.; and by Hottinger in his Synopsis heb. sive lexicon hebraicum heptaglot. (Frankf., 1661). Sol. Glass also, in his Philolaus Suecicus, 1636, rendered important service to Hebrew learning and O.-T. exegesis.

Meanwhile a new school of Hebrew philology had arisen under the leading of Jakob Alting and Johann Matth. Danz. The former in his Fundamenta punctum linguæ sactæ sive Grammat. Hebr. (Grin. 1654), and the latter in his Nucifragibulum (Jena, 1686), and other works, endeavored to show that the phenomena which the Hebrew exhibited in a grammatical respect, the flexions, etc., had their basis in essential properties of the language, and not in arbitrary rules or ex-principles. Peculiar to them is the "systema morum," a highly artificial method of determining the placing of long or short vowels, according to the number of more appertaining to each or to the consonant following a metrical unit which led to endless dialectics, and no small amount of learned trifling. The fundamental principle, however, which Alting and Danz asserted is a true one, and their assertion of it was not without results. Nearly contemporary with them was Jacques Gouset, professor at Gröningen, who devoted much time and labor to the preparation of a work entitled Commentarius Ling. Heb. (Amst. 1702), in which he follows strictly the method of deducing the meanings of the Hebrew words from the Hebrew itself, excluding all aid from rabbinus, versions, or dialects. The chief merit of Goesset and his followers, of whom the principal is Ch. Steck (Chossea Linguæ S. V. sive Lexicon Lips. 1725), consists in the close attention they paid to the usus loquendi of Scripture, and Havernick thinks that adequate justice has not been done to Gouset's services in this respect (Intro. to O. T. p. 221. Eng. trans.).

Gouset had not much attention had been paid to etymology as a source for determining the meaning of the Hebrew words. This defect was partly remedied by Caspar Neumann and Valentin Löschner, the former of whom in different treatises, the latter in his treatise De Consonis Ling. Heb. (Frankf. and Leipzig, 1706), set forth the theory that the Hebrew roots are built upon these "characteres significationis,"as he was designated by Löschner, and that from them the trillitets, of which the Hebrew is chiefly composed, were formed. They contended also that the fundamental meaning of the biliterals is to be ascertained from the meaning of the letters composing each, and for this purpose they assigned to each letter what the former called "signifi-
catio hieroglyphica," and the latter "poetic" (pp. 7 and 18). This last is the most dubious part of their system; but, as a whole, their views are worthy of respect and consideration (see Hupfeld, De emendanda lexico. Semit. ratione, p. 9).

A great advance was made in the beginning of the 18th century by the rise almost simultaneously of two rival schools of Hebrew philology—the Dutch school, headed by Albert Schultens, and the school of Halle, founded by the Michaelis family. In the former the predominating tendency was toward the almost exclusive use of the Arabic for the illustration of Hebrew grammar and lexicography. Schultens himself was a thorough Arabic scholar, and he carried his principle of appealing to that source for the elucidation of the Hebrew to an extent which betrayed him into many mistakes and extravagances; nevertheless, to his labors we are indebted for an important contribution. Besides his commentaries on Job and Proverbs, which are full of grammatical and lexicographical disquisition, he wrote Origines Hebraeae sive Heb. Ling. antiquissima natura et iudices ex Arabice penetrabulissimae revo-
centa (Frankfort, 1725), and Institutiones ad fundamenta Ling. Heb. (Halle, 1744), the Supplement ad lexicon Hebraicum pondus (Leiden, 1744), professor at Gröningen, who published in 1776 a Hebrew grammar of great excellence, and which has passed through many editions, under the same title as the second of the works of Schultens above noted; and Robertson, professor at Edinburgh (Grammaticæ Hebr. Edinb. 1798, 2d ed.), who undertook these works with the object of Schultens in clearness and simplicity, and in neither is the Arabic theory so exclusively adhered to. Venema, as a commentator, was also one of the luminaries of this school.

The school of Halle was founded by Johann Heinrich and Christian Benedikt Michaelis, but its principal ornamen in its earlier stage was the son of the latter, John David, professor at Göttingen. See Michaelis. The principle of this school was to combine the use of all the sources of elucidation for the Hebrew—the cognate dialects, especially the Arabic, the Talmud, the rabbinical writings, etymology, and the Hebrew itself, as exhibited in the sacred writings. The valuable edition of the Hebrew Bible, with exegetical notes, the joint work of J. H. and Christ. B. Michaelis, some grammatical essays by the latter, and the Hebræische Grammatik (Halle, 1744), the Supplement ad lexicon Hebraicum (parts, Gott. 1785-92), and several smaller essays of John David, comprise the principal contributions of this illustrious family to Hebrew learning. To their school belong the majority of recent German Hebraists—Moser (Lex. Mon. Heb. et Chald. Ulm, 1795), Vater (Hebr. Sprachlehre, Lpz. 1797), Hartmann (Anfangsgründe der Heb. Sprachlehr, Marburg, 1798), Jahn (Grammatica Ling. Heb. 1809), and the faciles priscopos of the whole, Ge
niuss (Hebr. Deutsches Handwörterbuch, Lpz. 1810-12, and later; Heb. Grammatica, Halle, 1813, and often since; Ge
niuss. Geenius has been followed closely by Moses Stuart in his Grammar of the Hebrew Language, of which many editions have appeared. Under the Halle school may also be ranked Joh. Simonis (Onomast. V. Test. Halle, 1714; Lexicon Man. Heb. et Chald. 1756; re-edited by Eichhorn in 1759, and with valuable improvements by Winer in 1829); but, though a pupil of Michaelis, Si
mön. He shows a strong leaning towards the school of Schultens.

Among recent Hebraists the name of Lee (Grammar
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of the Heb. Lang. in a Series of Lectures, Lond. 3d edit. 1844; Lexicon Heb. Chald., and Eng. 1840, Ewald (Kritis, Gramm. der Heb. Spr. Ausführlich bearbeitet, Lpz. 1827; 7th ed. 1853, under the title of Ausführliches Lehrb. der Heb. Spr. des Ab. E.), and Husfeld (Ezecratismus aethiopicae, 1829; Theologie, Jena, 1829). See also Rychner's Hebrew Comment, 1830, and works of the Heb. Grund in Theol. Studien und Kritiken for 1828: Ausf. Hebr. Gram. 1841), are the most prominent. Each of these pursues an independent course, but all of them incline more or less to the school of Alting and Dantz. Lee avows that the aim of his grammatical labor is to "study the language as it is, that, as its own analogy collected from itself and its cognate dialects exhibits it" (Grammar, Pref. p. iv, new ed. 1844). Ewald has combined with his philological analysis of the language, as it exists in its own documents, a more extended use of the cognate dialects; he contends that, to do justice to the Hebrew, one must first be at home in all the branches of Semitic literature, and that it is by combining these with the old Hebrew that the latter is to be called from the dead, and piece by piece endowed with life (Grammatici, Pref. p. ix). Husfeld's method is eclectic, and does not differ essentially from that of Lee, except that the latter attaches a larger influence to the philosophic element, and aims more at basing the grammar of the language on first principles analytically determined; by him also the Japhetic languages have been called in to cast light on the Semitic, a course to which Gesenius too, after formally repudiating it, has since returned. Among the Jews, the study of Hebrew literature has been much faster through rabbinical and traditional prejudices. Many able grammarians, however, of this school have appeared since the beginning of the 16th century, among them, the names of the brothers David and Moses Poromenza, Loew, Nathan, and Hirsch, Schick, Solomon, and Lemberg are especially to be mentioned. A more liberal impulse was communicated by Solomon Cohen (1709-62), but Mendelssohn was the first to introduce the results and methods of Christian research among his nation. From (1843) A. Ramm, Idumea mit Ephraim auf die Indo-Germ. Spr. I. Chald. Gram. 1855; Churcz Feininger, 1836; Concordizanz Lex. Vet. Test. 1840; Hebr. und Chald. Handwörterbuch über der A. T. 2 vols. 1887) seeks to combine the historical with the analytical method, taking note of all the phenomena of the Hebrew grammar, and applies to it even to a large extent, the same kind of work as those of the Indo-Germanic class, and at the same time endeavoring on philosophic grounds to separate the accidental from the necessary, the radical from the ramified, the germ from the stem, the branch from the branches, as to arrive at the laws which actually rule the language. All his works are of the highest value. Mr. Horwitz has also published an excellent Heb. Grammar (Lond. 1834). We especially notice the philosophical method pursued by Nordeheimer (Hebr. Gramm. N. Y. 1888-42, 2 vols. 8vo). The latest Jewish production in English is Kaish's Hebrew Gramm. (Lond. 1863, 8vo). See generally Wolf, Biblioth. Hebr. 1713-58; Locher, De Consul. Ling. Ebr. (1706); Hezel, Gesch. der Hebr. Spr. und Litter. (1776); Gesenius, Gesch. d. Hebr. Spr. (1815); Delitzsch, Jesurun, Isogoge in Gramm, et Lexicograph. logi Hebr. (1888); First, Biblisch, Judaicum, passim also appears on Jewish Lexicography to his Lex. Hebr.; Steinschneider, Jewish Literature, per. ii, § 16; per. iii, § 27; Bibliograph. Handbuch f. Hebr. Sprachk. (Lpz. 1859, 8vo). See Semitico LANGUAGES.

HEBREWS, THE EPISTLE TO THE, the last of the Pauline Epistles, according to the arrangement of the Revised English New Testament. I. ITS CANONICITY.—The universal Church, by allowing it a place among the holy Scriptures, acknowledges that there is nothing in its contents inconsistent with the rest of the Bible. But the peculiar position which is assigned to it among the epistles leads to a more of doubts as to its authorship or canonical authority, two points which were blended together in primitive times. Has it, then, a just claim to be received by us as a portion of that Bible which contains the rule of our faith and the rule of our practice, laid down by Christ and his apostles? Was it regarded as such by the primitive Church, to whose clearly expressed judgment in this matter all later generations are referred? Do we ourselves possess a declaration by our Lord and Master that this Epistle is canonical? If all discussion would be superfluous. But the interpretation (by F. Spanheim and later writers) of 2 Pet. iii, 15 as a distinct reference to Paul's Epistle to the Hebrews seems scarcely tenable. For, if the "youth" to whom his address is all Christians (see 2 Pet. i, 1), the reference cannot be limited to the Epistle to the Hebrews; or if it include only (see 2 Pet. iii, 1) the Jews named in 1 Pet. i, there may be special reference to the Galatians (vi, 7-9) and Ephesians (ii, 5-7), but not to the Hebrews. Was it, then, received and transmitted as canonical by the immediate successors of the Western Church this book underwent a somewhat singular treatment. The most important witness here, Clement of Rome (A.D. 70 or 95) refers to this epistle in the same way as, and more frequently than, the book given by its name. Its introduction was called "wholly transfigured," says Mr. Westcott (On the Canon, p. 82), into Clement's mind. After his time it seems to have come under some doubt or suspicion in the West. It is not cited or referred to by any of the earlier Latin fathers except Tertullian, who ascribes it to Barnabas, and seems to have considered it as "apt the purpose of the pastor moschuror," that is, the pastor of Hermas (De Pudicit. c. 20). Irenaeus is said by Eusebius to have made deductions from it in a work now lost (Hist. Eccl. vii, 26), but he did not receive it as of Pauline authorship (Phot. Bibl. Cod. 252, p. 984, cited by Lardner, ii, 182; 1 Tim. iii, 16) that is, the Widen of Solomon with the Epistle to the Hebrews, as cited by Irenaeus, it is probably the latter viewed the two as on the same footing. It is omitted by Caius, who only reckons thirteen Pauline epistles (Euseb. Hist. Eccl. vii, 26; Jerome, De Vir. illust. c. 59); Hippolytus expressly declares it not to be Paul's (Phot. p. 301); it is omitted in the Muratorian fragment; and by the Roman Church generally it seems to have been suspected (Euseb. H. E. iii, 3; vii, 20). Victorinus has one or two passages which look like quotations from it, but he does not mention it, and other copies predating his time contain it (Lardner, iii, 300). In the 4th century it began to be more generally received. Lactantius, in the beginning of the century, apparently borrows from it; Hilary of Poitiers, Lucifer of Cagliari, Faustus, and Marcellinus (who cites it as divinos Scripturos); Victorinus of Rome, Ambrose, Philaster (though admitting that some passages were added to the epistle); Gaudentius, Jerome, and Augustine, in the latter half and the end of the century, attest its canonicity, and generally its Pauline origin.

In the Eastern churches it was much more generally, and from an earlier date, received. It is doubtful whether any citation from it is made by Justin Martyr, though in one or two passages of his writings he seems to have had it in his eye. Clement of Alexandria held it to be Paul's, originally written by him in Hebrew, and translated by Luke (Eusebius, E. H. vi, 14). Origen wrote homilies on this epistle, which he regarded as canonical, and as the work of Paul, and he tells us he had intended to write a treatise to prove this (Lardner, ii, 472 sq.). Origen further attests that the ancients handled it down as Paul's (Euseb. E. H. vi, 23), by which, though he cannot be understood as intending to say that it had any less authority than the others were, it was esteemed as canonical, and as the work of Paul, and he tells us he had intended to write a treatise to prove this (Lardner, ii, 472 sq.). Origen further attests that the ancients handled it down as Paul's (Euseb. E. H. vi, 23), by which, though he cannot be understood as intending to say that it had any less authority than the others were, it was esteemed as canonical; and as the work of Paul, and he tells us he had intended to write a treatise to prove this (Lardner, ii, 472 sq.). Origen further attests that the ancients handled it down as Paul's (Euseb. E. H. vi, 23), by which, though he cannot be understood as intending to say that it had any less authority than the others were, it was esteemed as canonical; and as the work of Paul, and he tells us he had intended to write a treatise to prove this (Lardner, ii, 472 sq.).
in one place among the ἀποκρύφια, in deference to the custom of mentioning it in the Roman Church, nevertheless asserts its apostolic authority, and includes it among the books generally received by the churches.

In public documents of the Eastern Church also, such as the Epistle of the Synod at Antioch, the Apostolical Constitutions, the Catalogue of the Councils, its canons, documents recognized by the Church everywhere, and professedly received, as was received; it is found in the Peshito version; it is quoted by Ephrem as Paul's; and it is included among the canonical Scriptures in the catalogue of Ebedjesu (Lardner, iv, 430, 440). To this uniform testimony there is nothing to oppose, unless we accept the somewhat dubious explanations of the Canons of the Lateran, or suppose that it was rejected by the heretical teacher Basilides (Proem. in Ep. ad Tit.; but compare Lardner, ix, 305).

At the end of the 4th century, Jerome, the most learned and critical of the Latin fathers, reviewed the conflicting opinions as to the authority of this epistle. He considered that the prevailing, though not universal, view of the Latin churches was of less weight than the view not only of ancient writers, but also of all the Greek and all the Eastern churches, where the epistle was received as canonical and read daily; and he pronounced that in the latter day which the Church everywhere, the great contemporary light of North Africa, St. Augustine, held a similar opinion. And after the declaration of these two eminent men, the Latin churches united with the East in receiving the epistle. The third Council of Carthage, A.D. 397, and a decretal of pope Innocent, A.D. 416, gave a final confirmation to their decision.

Such was the course and the end of the only considerable opposition which has been made to the canonical authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews. Its origin has not been ascertained. Some critics have conjectured that the Montanist or the Novatian controversy that was then in progress, and that the Arian controversy dissipated so much opposition as proceeded from orthodox Christians. The references to Paul in the Clementine Homilies have led other critics to the startling theory that the author of the epistle is so nearly contemporaneous with the epistle of Paul that the former was written by the apostle himself. The former of these positions does not, it is true, necessarily depend upon the latter, and the book may be canonical, yet not be the production of any individual whose name we know; but, as the case stands, the external evidence for the canonicity of this book is so nearly contemporaneous with that of the Pauline authorship that we cannot make use of the one unless we admit the other. This gives immense importance to the question on which we now enter; for if it could be shown that this epistle is not Paul's, the entire historical evidence for its canonicity must be laid aside as incredible.

1. History of Opinion on this Subject. In this epistle the superscription, the ordinary source of information, is wanting. Its omission has been accounted for, since the days of Clement of Alexandria (apud Euseb. H. E. vi, 14) and Origen, by supposing that the author held his name lest the sight of it should repel any Jewish Christians who might still regard him rather as an enemy of the law (Acts xxii, 21) than as a benefactor to their nation (Acts xxiv, 17). Panteleus, or some other predecessor of Clement, adds that Paul would not have written to the Jews an apostle because he regarded the Lord himself as their apostle (see the remarkable expression, Heb. iii, 1, twice quoted by Justin Martyr, Apol. i, 12, 63).

It was the custom of the earliest fathers to quote passages of Scripture without naming the book which supplied them. But there is no reason to doubt that at first, everywhere, except in North Africa, Paul was regarded as the author. "Among the Greek fathers," says Olshausen (Opuscult, p. 90), "no one is named either in Egypt, or in Syria, Palestine, Asia, or the farthest parts of Greece, who supposes that this epistle proceeds from Paul." The Alexandrian fathers, whether guided by tradition or by critical discernment, are the earliest to note the discrepancy of style between this epistle and the other thirteen. They received it in the same sense that the speech in Acts xxii, 1-21 is received as Paul's. Clement ascribed to Luke the translation of the epistle into Greek from a Hebrew original of Paul. Origen, embracing the opinion of those who, he says, preceded him, believed that the thoughts were Paul's, the language and composition Luke's or Clement's of Rome. Tertullian, knowing nothing of any connection of Paul with the epistle, names Barnabas as
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the reputed author according to the North African tradition, which in the time of Augustine had taken the less definite shape of a denial by some that the epistle was Paul's, and in the time of Isidore of Seville appears as a Latin opinion (founded on the dissension of style) that it was written by Barnabas or Clement. At Rome Clement is the author, as of the other epistles which he quoted; and the writers who follow him, down to the middle of the 4th century, only touch on the point to deny that the epistle is Paul's.

The view of the Alexandrian fathers, a middle point between the Eastern and Western traditions, won its way, and has been adopted as the most probable opinion by Eusebius (Blunt, On the Right Use of the Early Fathers, p. 439-444); and its gradual reception may have led to the silent transfer, which was made about his time, of this epistle from the tenth place in the Greek Canon to the fourteenth, at the end of Paul's epistles, and before those of other apostles. This place it held everywhere till the time of Luther; as if to indicate the deliberate and final acquiescence of the Universal Church in the opinion that it is one of the works of Paul, but not in the same full sense as the other ten epistles addressed to particular churches.

In the last three centuries every commentary and phrase in the epistle have been scrutinized with the most exact care for historical and grammatical evidence as to the authorship. The conclusions of individual inquirers are very diverse, but the result has not been any considerable change in the general tradition. The only new kind of difficulty has been discovered; no hypothesis open to fewer objections than the tradition has been devised. The laborious work of the Rev. C. Forster (The Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews), which is a storehouse of grammatical evidence, advocates the opinion that Paul was the author of the language as well as the thoughts of the epistle. Professor Stuart, in his Introduction to his Commentary on the Epistle to the Hebrews, discusses the internal evidence at great length, and agrees in opinion with Mr. Forster. Dr. C. Wordsworth (On the Canon of the Scriptures, Lect. ii) leans to the same conclusion. Dr. S. Davidson, in his Introduction to the New Testament, gives a very careful and minute summary of the arguments of all the principal modern critics who reason upon the internal evidence, and concludes, in substantial agreement with the Alexandrian tradition, that Paul was the author of the epistle, and that, as regards its phraseology and style, Luke co-operated with him in making it what it now appears. The tendency of opinion in Germany has been to ascribe the epistle to some other author than Paul. Luther's conjecture that Apollo was the author has been widely adopted by Le Clerc, Bleek, De Wette, Tholuck, Bunsen, Alford, and others. Barnabas has been named by Wieseler, Thiersch, and others. Luke by Grotius, Silas by others. Neander attributes it to "some apostolic man" of the Pauline school, whose training and method of stating doctrinal truth differed from Paul's. The distinguished name of H. Ewald has been given recently to the hypothesis (partly anticipated by Wetstein) that it was written neither by Paul nor to the Hebrews, but by some Jewish teacher residing at Jerusalem to a church in some important Italian town, which is supposed to have sent a deputation to Palestine.

2. What can be said of the different Author proposed, other than the Apostle Paul.—Most of these guesses are quite destitute of historical evidence, and require the support of imaginary facts to place them on a seeming equality with the traditioinal account. They cannot be expected to rise out of the real probability into that of probability, but they are such as any man of leisure and learning might multiply till they include every name in the limited list that we possess of Paul's contemporaries.

(1.) Silas.—The claims of this companion of Paul to the authorship of one epistle find no support from the testimony of antiquity. The suggestions of them are entirely modern, having been first advanced by Böhme in the introduction to his commentary on this epistle (Lips. 1825), and by Mynster in the Studien und Kritiken, ii, 944; but they have added nothing in support of these claims which might not with equal plausibility have been urged on behalf of any other of the apostle's companions as of the other epistles which he quoted; and the writers who follow him, down to the middle of the 4th century, only touch on the point to deny that the epistle is Paul's.

(2.) Clement of Rome.—Origen tells us that the tradition which had reached him was that some held this epistle to have been written by Clement, bishop of Rome, while others said it was written by Luke the evangelist (ap. Euseb. Hist. Eccl. vi, 25). Erasmus espoused the same view. Chrysostom and Cyril of Alexandria held the same view. Some evidence in favor of this hypothesis has been thought to be supplied by the resemblance of some passages in Clement's first epistle to the Corinthians to passages in one epistle; but these have much more the appearance of quotations from the former, or reminiscences of it on the part of the author of the latter, than such similarities of thought and expression as would indicate a community of authorship for the two. A close comparison of the one with the other leaves the impression very strongly that they are the productions of different minds; neither in style nor in the general cast of thought on any previous passage of Scripture. Clement also was in all probability a convert from heathenism, whereas the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews was undoubtedly by birth and education a Jew. Perhaps what Origen records means nothing more than that Clement had reduced the epistle to writing, leaving the question of the authorship, properly so called, untouched. His whole statement is—"not needlessly (oikei) had the ancients handed it down as Paul's; but who wrote the epistle God truly knows. But the story which has come down to us from certain among the ancients, who, as bishop of Rome, wrote the epistle; from others, that it was Luke who wrote the Gospel and the Acts." Jerome also, in referring to the tradition, explains it thus—"quem [Clementem] aiunt ipsi adjunctum sententias Pauli propriam ordinane et ornasse sermonem" (De Viris illust., c. 9).

(3.) Luke.—The claims of Luke apparently rise a degree higher from the circumstance that, besides being named by Origen and Jerome as dividing with Clement the honors which, as these writers testify, were in certain quarters assigned to the latter, there is a character of similarity in respect to language and argument between this epistle and the acknowledged productions of the evangelist. This has led several eminent scholars to adopt the hypothesis that, while the thoughts may be Paul's, the composition is Luke's. But against this conclusion the following considerations may be urged. Where there is no other evidence, or at least none of any weight, in favor of identity of authorship, mere general similarity of style cannot be allowed to possess much force. Luke, however, is known to have been in such a connection with Paul as to justify in some sort the assumption of his having written on the apostle's behalf. 2. Assuming the epistle to be the production of Paul, it is easy to account for the resemblance of its style to that of Luke, from the fact that Luke was for so many years the companion and disciple of Paul; for it is well known that when persons for a long time associated closely with each other, and especially if one of the parties is an individual of powerful intellect whose forms of thought and modes of speech imperceptibly impress themselves on those with whom he associates, they fall insensibly into a similarity of tone and style both of diction and thought; and that even in the best of hands, as quoted by Forster, Apostolical Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews, p. 648). The resemblances, however, in this case (see them pointed out by Alford, vol. iii, passim) are too striking and minute to be fully explained in this general manner. 3. It is not in the Epistle to the Hebrews alone that a resemblance to the style of Luke may be detected: the same feature pervades all Paul's
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epistles, especially those of a later date, as has frequently been observed by critics. In fine, while there are such resemblances of style, etc., as have been referred to between this epistle and the writings of Luke, there are "dienses of a nature so weighty as to completely to overbalance these resemblances, and authorize the conclusion that the author of the latter could not also be the author of the former. Or, take the 'Epistles of London, 1828' and Eichhorn (Eisn. iii. 465) justly lay stress on the greater predominance of Jewish feelings in the Epistle to the Hebrews than in any of Luke's writings, and still more on the marked familiarity with the person and labors of Paul. We hold the Pauline authorship of the writer of the epistle, but of which no traces are apparent in any of the writings of the evangelist. Both writings display the combined influence of the Palestinian and the Hellenistic character on the part of their author; but in the Epistle to the Hebrews the former so decidedly predominates over the latter, while the reverse is the case with the writings of Luke, that it seems to the last degree improbable that the same person could have written both. Luke, moreover, was a convert from heathenism, whereas the author of the Epistle to the Hebrews evidently a Jew. It appears, therefore, that the man who, though Luke had no share in the composition of this epistle to Luke as of his own dictation, there is no evidence of any kind which will bear examination, but, on the contrary, not a little against it. 4. Nevertheless the association of Luke with Paul, and the many marks of style which this epistle did, is so strong as to give to the thought of the author of this epistle, a strongly color of probability to the supposition the evangelist had something to do with its authorship, doubtles as assistant or under another's authority; for it cannot be presumed that he would have personally assumed the responsibility of a work of so weighty a character as Paul such a share in the writings of Luke himself—what is the share of the "eye-witnesses and ministers of the word" (Luke i, 2), or what is the share of Paul himself in that gospel which some persons, not without conventionalism from tradition, conjecture that Luke wrote under his master's eye in that prison at Caesarea; or who shall assign to the following the seven characteristic portions respectively in those characteristic sections of Antichrist, Lystra, Athens, Miletus, Jerusalem, and Caesarea? If Luke wrote down Paul's Gospel, and condensed his missionary speeches, may he not in this afterwards take a very important share in the composition of this epistle? (4.) Barnabas.—The hypothesis which claims the authorship of this epistle to Barnabas has in its support the testimony of Tertullian (De Prud. c. 20), with whom, as we learn from Jerome (Epist. 129, ad Dardan.) and others, the epistle itself was not unmixed. For this opinion Tertullian, in the passage referred to, assigns no reasons, and Jerome appears to have treated it as a mere conjecture resting upon Tertullian's authority alone; for, in his catalogue of ecclesiastical writers (c. 5), he refers to this opinion as one "juxta Tertullianum," while he says that the opinion that Luke was the author was one "juxta quodam." Hug is of opinion (Intro d. p. 596, Foedelck's transl.) that in this passage we have not Tertullian's own view so much as a concession on his part to those who he was opposing, and who, because of the very passage he is about to quote from the Epistle to the Hebrews (vi. 4-8), were inclined to reject the claims of that epistle to be esteemed the production of Paul. This conjecture is of use, as it tends to show that Tertullian did not have any part in inscribing this epistle to Barnabas than his total ignorance that it had ever been imputed to Paul, as has been confidently inferred by several writers from the fact that it was obviously to the interest of his argument to uphold the Pauline authorship of the epistle. It is the origin of this. In recent times the ablest defender of this hypothesis is Ullmann, who has devoted to it an article in the first volume of his journal, the Studien und Kritiken; but the evidence he adduces in favor of it is very feeble. After enlarging on the testimony of Tertullian, he proceeds to the internal evidence in favor of Barnabas; but of the six reasons he assigns for ascribing the epistle to him, none possesses any force. The first, viz. the traces in the epistle of an Alexandrian education on the part of the author, supposing it granted, would not apply particularly to Barnabas, who was a native of Cyprus, and could not, therefore, have had the advantage of the Alexandrian, for about we know had never seen that seat of allegorical learning. The second, viz. that Barnabas, being a Levite, was more likely, on that account, to understand the Jewish ritual, as we see the author of this epistle did, is very probably; but it is not a reason why the author of this epistle on the head which any intelligent Jew might not have known, whether a Levite or not. The third, viz. that the author of this epistle says concerning the law, divine revelation, faith, etc., is very Pauline, and such as we might expect from a companion of Paul's, viz. Barnabas was; the fourth, viz. that the tenor of the epistle is worthy such a man as Barnabas; the fifth, viz. that the writer of this epistle speaks of the Saviour very frequently by the appellation ό Προφητε, which Dr. Ullmann thinks indicates that the writer must have known our Lord during his personal ministry, which was probably the case with Barnabas; and the sixth, viz. that the names of persons mentioned in this epistle are names which Barnabas might have referred to had he written it—are reasons such as it would be idle to refute, and such as fill us with surprise that a point of Ullmann's reasoning can have so easily been adduced against him. With regard to the fifth also, Oehler has justly observed (Ops. Theol. p. 115) that if it were certain that Barnabas had enjoyed the advantage of our Lord's personal ministry, it would clearly prove that he was not the author of this epistle, for the latter distinctly marks himself with those his advantage had not been enjoyed (ch. ii. 3). Stuart and some others have laid great stress on the contrast afforded by this epistle to the extant epistle which passes under the name of Barnabas, with respect to style, tone, and general character, as supplying indubitable evidence that the former is the production of a different and a far superior mind. Of this there can be no question, and, were we quite certain that the epistle ascribed to Barnabas was really his production, the argument would be conclusive. But, though some very distinguished names may be cited in support of its authenticity, the greater weight, both of authority and evidence, is against it. See Barnabas, Epistle of. The total absence of any reason in favor of imputing the authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews to Barnabas affords sufficient ground for rejecting this hypothesis without our attempting to adduce dubious and untenable evidence. (5.) Some Alexandrians Christian.—This hypothesis rests on certain features of the epistle which are said to betray Alexandrian culture, habits, and modes of thought on the part of the writer. These have been much insisted upon by Eichhorn, Schulz, Bleek, and others; but they are not such, we think, as carry with them the weight which these writers have allowed to them. The
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standard of comparison by which the supposed Alexandrian tone of this epistle is evinced is supplied by the writings of Philo, between which and this epistle it is affirmed that there is so close a resemblance that it can be accounted for only on the supposition that the author of the latter was, like Philo, an Alexandrian Jew. Now, before this reasoning can be so much as looked at, it becomes those who use it to point out clearly how much of Philo's peculiar style and sentiment was owing to his Jewish, and how much to his Alexandrian education or habits of thought; because, unless this can be done, it will be impossible to show that any alleged peculiarity necessarily belongs to an Alexandrian writer, and not possibly have appeared in the writings of a pure Jew of Palestine. No attempt, however, of this sort has been made; on the contrary, it has been assumed that whatever is Philoian is therefore Alexandrian, and hence all resemblances between the writings of Philo and the Epistle to the Hebrews have been urged as certain proofs that the latter must have been written by a converted Jew of Alexandria. Such an assumption, however, we would by no means concede; and we feel confirmed in this by an examination of the evidence adduced in support of the Alexandrian character of this epistle. As Stuart has, we think, clearly shown (1, 321), and as even Tholuck, though obviously inclining the other way, has candidly admitted (Comment. on the Hebrews, 1, 68, § 7), there is nothing in this evidence to show that this epistle might not have been written by a Jew who had never been in the heart of Alexandria. Notice that several of the points on which Eichhorn chiefly insists as favoring his view, such as the prevalence of typical expositions of the Mosaic ritual in this epistle, and the greater elegance of its language and style (Eisler, ii. 46 sq.), are given up by Blass and that of the two chief enemies upon the latter, viz., the close affinity between this epistle and the writings of Philo, and the alleged mistake in regard to the furniture of the tabernacle which Bleek charges upon the author of this epistle in chap. ix, 3, 4, and which he thinks no Jew of Palestine could have committed, both are relinquished by Tholuck as untenable (comp. the valuable remarks of Hug, Introd., p. 584, note, Fosdick's transl.). With regard to the latter, it may be remarked that, even supposing it proved that the writer of this epistle had erred in asserting that the pot containing the manna and Aaron's rod, was placed in the ark of the tabernacle as a token that, supposing byvapaporov to denote the altar of incense, and not the censer, he had fallen into the mistake of placing this within instead of without the vail, nothing could be thence deduced in favor of the Alexandrian origin of the author. For, with regard to the former of these, it was a matter on which the Jews of Palestine had no means of information than those of any other place, since, in the Temple as then standing, none of the furniture of the Holy of Holies had been preserved; and with regard to the latter, as it could not be the result of ignorance either in a Jew of Palestine or in a Jew of Alexandria, but must have been a piece of mere inadvertence on the part of either, it seems rather too much to conclude that it was such as the latter alone was capable of committing. That, however, there is no blunder in the case, has, we think, been very satisfactorily shown by Deleying (Misc. Soc. tom. ii, No. 47) and others (comp. Stuart, Tholuck, and Delitzsch, ad loc., (6)). A. pollos.—The first to suggest Apollos as the probable author of this epistle was Luther (Werke, ed. Walch, iii, 294, 1906, etc.). He has been followed by the majority of recent German scholars, many of whom have supported his conjecture with much and undoubtedly been shown by them that Apollos may have been the writer; and they have, we think, proved that of all Paul's companions this one was the one who was most fitted by education, life-circumstances, modes of thought, and political position, to have accomplished such a task had it fallen to his lot. Beyond this, however, their arguments seem to us signal to fail. What weight they have is derived almost entirely from the supposed Alexandrian tone of the epistle; so that in setting aside this we of necessity invalidate what has been built on it. But it may be permitted us to remark that, even supposing the former established, the latter would by no means follow, any more than because a work produced in Germany in the present day is decked out with Hegelianism, it would follow from that alone that it must be the production of some certain individual rather than of any other disciple of Hegel's school. The adoption of this theory by Tholuck, after his exposure of the unhappiness of Bleek's conclusions, is matter of surprise. "Still," says he (i, 69), "one cannot but wonder how a man of such an originally tolerant disposition as Paul could have entertained the idea of any distinguished person having intercourse with Paul were an Alexandrian, and of Alexandrian culture, we might, with the greatest appearance of truth, regard him as the author of the epistle. Now such a one is found in the person of Apollonius. We are thus inclined to say, "The arguments for the Alexandrian origin of this epistle, I must confess, prove nothing; but show me an end to be gained by it, and I will admit them to be most conclusive." Such a statement affords, we think, very clear evidence that the disposition to ascribe the epistle to an Alexandrian origin, is the result of a constraining force of evidence, but exclusively to what Olshausen, in his strictures on Bleek (Opusc. p. 92), justly denotes as the main source of that able writer's errors on this question—"Quod non ab omni partim studio alium animum servare ipsis contigit." It may be added, it may be added finally, that the theory of Apollos standing as the convert of an other Alexandrian convert, is it very strange that no tradition to this effect should have been preserved in the church at Alexandria, but, on the contrary, that it should be there we find the tradition that Paul was the author most firmly and from the earliest period established. 3. We now pass on to the question of the Pauline origin of this epistle. Referring our readers for particulars to the able and copious discussion of this question furnished by the works of Stuart (Commentary, Introd.), Forster (The Apostol. Authority of the Epistle to the Hebrews, etc.), and Hug, we shall attempt at present a condensed outline of the evidence both for and against the Pauline authorship of this epistle. a. Internal evidence, i. In favor of the Pauline origin of the epistle. (1) A person familiar with the doctrines and usages of Christianity in the days of apostolic tradition, and the Christian churches of any order of the time, could readily perceive that there is such a correspondence in this respect between these and the Epistle to the Hebrews as supplies good ground for presuming that the latter proceeded also from his pen. That Christianity as a system is superior to Judaism with respect to cleanness, simplicity, and moral efficiency, is a fact that the former is the substance and reality of what the latter had presented only the typical adumbration; and that the latter was to be abolished to make way for the former, are points which, if more fully handled in the Epistle to the Hebrews, are familiar to all readers of the epistles of Paul (comp. 2 Cor. iii, 6-18; Gal. iii, 22; iv, 1-5, 21-31; Col. ii, 16, 17, etc.). The same view is given in this epistle as in those of Paul of the divine glory of the Mediator, specifically as the reflection or manifestation of Deity to man (compare Col. i, 15-20; Phil. ii, 6; Heb. i, 3, etc.). Hebrews 2:9 is as having consisted in an impoverishing, and lessening, and lowering of himself for man's behalf (2 Cor. viii, 9; Phil. ii, 7, 8; Heb. ii, 9); and his exaltation is set forth as a condition of royal dignity, which shall be consummated by all his enemies being put under his footstool (1 Cor. xv, 25; Gal. iii, 21). "When he had by his own blood discharging the office of a 'mediator,' a word which is never used except by Paul and the writer of this epistle (Gal. iii, 19, 20; Heb. viii, 6); his death is represented as a sacrifice for the sins of man; and the peculiar idea is announced in connection with this, that he was honored by the sacrifices of the Mosaic dispensation (Rom. xii, 22-26; 1 Cor. v, 7; Eph. i, 7; v, 2; Heb. vii, 4)."
adultery to Paul and the author of this epistle is the phrase "the God of peace" (Rom. xv. 38, etc.; Heb. xii. 20); and both seem to have the same conception of the spiritual "gifts" (1 Cor. xii. 4; Heb. ii. 4). It is worthy of remark, also, that the momentous question of a man's personal acceptance with God is answered in this epistle to the Hebrews, as it is in the other epistles of Paul. All is made to depend upon the individual's exercising what both Paul and the author of this epistle call "faith," and which they both represent as a realizing apprehension of the facts, and truths, and promises of the gospel. The method of his making them bear on the point under discussion (comp. Rom. iii. 10–18; ix. 7–33, etc.; Heb. i. 5–14; iii. 5–17) both are fond of linking quotations together by means of the expression "and again" (compare Rom. v. 9–12; 1 Cor. iii. 19, 20; Heb. v. 5; ii. 15, 16; iv. 4; Heb. vi. 12; Gal. iv. 30). On the other hand, another passage, and that occasionally in a sense not naturally suggested by the context whence they are quoted (1 Cor. xiv. 27; Eph. i. 22; Heb. ii. 8; Rom. i. 17; Gal. iii. 11; Heb. x. 38); and both, in one instance, quote a passage in a peculiar way (comp. 2 Cor. iii. 19; Heb. vi. 17; Heb. iv. 13); inexperienced Christians are children who need milk, and must be instructed in the elements, whilst those of maturer attainments are full-grown men who require strong meat (1 Cor. i. 1, 2; xiv. 20; Gal. iv. 9; Col. iii. 14; Heb. v. 12, 13; vi. 1); redemption through Christ is a new and another thing altogether (Rom. v. 2; Eph. ii. 18; iii. 12; Heb. x. 19); affictions are a mister or a trial, a δαίμον (Phil. ii. 30; Col. ii. 1; 1 Cor. xii. 32); the Christian life is a race (1 Cor. ix. 24; Phil. iii. 14; Heb. xii. 1); the Jewish ritual is a λατρεία (Rom. x. 5; Gal. iv. 10); the law has the constraint of some unworthy feeling or principle is "the bond of the flesh" (Gal. v. 1; Heb. ii. 15, etc.). (3) Certain marked characteristics of Paul's style are found in this epistle. This department of the internal evidence has more, perhaps, than any other been canvassed by recent critics, and the most of the long lists which have been drawn from the same phenomena. Thus the occurrence of ὀρθὸν λόγον in this epistle has been adduced by the German scholars against the Pauline origin of it, whilst Stuart and Forster have both rested on this fact as strongly in favor of that conclusion; and as it appears to us with justice, for it if be made out from Paul's acknowledged writings the use of unusual words is a characteristic of his style (and this has been placed by these writers beyond all question), it is obvious that the occurrence of the same characteristic in this epistle, so far from being an argument against is, as far as it goes, an argument for our ascription to T. V. G. V. a translation or revision, however, based on such minute phenomena, we are not disposed to rest much weight on either side. Every person must be aware that an author's use of words is greatly modified by the circumstances under which he has written, or the design he has been called on to serve. Hence caution; and the literature of every country presents us with the numerous cases of authors whose works, written at different periods, and with different designs, present far greater diversities of expression than any which have been pointed out between the Epistle to the Hebrews and the acknowledgments which are made of it. The critics have declined to rest much in questions of literary precedence upon what Bentley calls (Dissert. on Philo-
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duced; the materials are arranged in the strictest order, and carefully wrought out according to this disposition, and conclusion follows conclusion with the greatest regularity; the language also is rotund and choice, and the representation unusually clear. All this is unlike "Paul" (Ecclesiast. 4:6). The object, then, is to make respecting the author of the Epistle to the Romans, a production characterized most eminently by these traits, excepting, perhaps, a less degree of calmness, which the special object of the present epistle may have more peculiarly called for. (3.) While we occasionally keep in mind, then, the leading ideas of the epistle a terminology different from that of Paul" (Tholuck, i, 39, English transl.). The instances specified by Tholuck are the use of ἔργῳ, ποιήμα, and σώματος, as designations of Christ; of ἀληθής, which he says is confined to this epistle; of οὐκ ἴτις τῷ θεοί; and of τῆς κοινωνίας, with its derivatives of the sense in which it is used, Heb. vii. 11. Now, with regard to this objection, it may be observed, 1st, That supposing all the instances adduced by Tholuck to be unimpeachable, and supposing no reason could be assigned why we should not use such instances from Hebrews as Tholuck does in Tholuck as Tholuck does in Hebrews, though when he did not use them in writing to others, still the objection cannot have much weight with any person accustomed to weigh evidence, because not only is the number of Pauline terms found in this epistle far greater than the number of termini which, according to Tholuck, are peculiar to the apostle to the gentiles: besides, it is always less likely that the peculiar phrases of a writer should be borrowed by another, than that a writer noted for the use of peculiar words and phrases should, in a composition of a character somewhat different from his other productions, use terms not found elsewhere in his writings. But, 2dly, let us examine the instances adduced by Tholuck, and see whether they bear out his reasoning. "Paul nowhere calls Christ priest." True; but though Paul, in writing to churches composed more or less of Gentile converts, whose previous ideas of priest and priestly rites were anything but favorable to the receiving under sacrificial terms right notions of Christ and his work, never calls Christ a priest, is that any reason for our concluding that in writing to Jews, who had amongst them a priesthood of divine organization, and writing for the express purpose of showing that Jewish priestages in that typical sense (see Heb. vii., 18) is it incorrect to suppose that the apostle should have applied the term priest to Christ? To us the difficulty would rather seem to be to conceive how, in handling such a topic, he could avoid calling Christ a priest. "Paul nowhere calls Christ a shepherd and an apostle, as the writer of this epistle does for Paul, and based upon the whole weight of the evidence to the Pauline origin of this epistle must rest on the assumption that Paul never uses figurative appellations of Christ in his writings; if he does, why not here as well as elsewhere? Now it could only be the grossest unacquaintedness with the apostle's writings that could lead any to affirm this. The very opposite tendency is characteristic of them. Thus we find Christ termed τομος γονος (Rom. x. 4), δικαιους περιπτωμας (xv. 8), τω πατη των (1 Cor. v. 7), η περιπτωμα (x. 4), οπτερως (xv. 28), εις την (2 Cor. xi. 2), περιουσιας (Eph. ii. 20), etc. Was it before we knew why should it be deemed so utterly incredible that Paul could have called Christ οαντοανας and ποιημα, that the occurrence of such terms in the epistle before us is to be held as a reason for adjudging it not to have been written by him? With regard to the use of ἀληθής in the sense of reserved, the reader may compare the passages in which it occurs in this epistle with Rom. x. 2; 2 Cor. ix. 13; 1 Tim. vi. 12, and judge for himself how far such a usage is foreign to the apostle. The phrase γινεται τῳ θεῳ occurs once in this epistle (vii., 19), and once in Jas. iv. 8; Paul also once uses the verb actively (Phil. ii. 15); the case here, then, in this epistle, once uses it intrinsically (x. 25). As there is thus a perfect analogy in the usage of the verb between the two, why it should be supposed improbable that Paul should use it in reference to God, or why a phrase used by James should be deemed too Alexandrian to be used by Paul, we feel ourselves utterly at a loss to conceive. With regard to the use of τῆς κοινωνίας, Tholuck himself does not make any special objection. The assumption that this epistle retains the idea of completing; but he cannot understand how Paul could have contemplated the work of redemption under this term in this epistle, since in no other of his epistles is it so used. This difficulty of the learned professor may, we think, be very easily removed, if we move the objection directly in the way Paul himself does in his other epistles, and show that this has been the design elsewhere, so fully at least as here, to represent the superiority of Christianity over Judaism, as that arises from the former being sufficient, whilst the latter was not sufficient to complete men in a religious point of view, i.e., to supply to them all they need, and advance them to all of which they are capable. That this is the theme of the writer, the passages in which the word in question occurs show; and we see no reason why such an idea might not have occurred to Paul as well as to any other man. Arguments drawn from the use of τῆς κοινωνίας are far from conclusive. It is curious when urged as objections, because they are not only indefinite, but are mostly negative in their character. A minute examination shows that they are not of much force in the present case; for if the expressions referred to do not occur in the same form in Paul's other writings, they are of such a character that the variation here is sufficiently accounted for by the different character and object of this epistle. See this and all the other questions connected with this epistle amply reviewed by Dr. Davidson (Intro. to the N. T. iii. 163-295), who, however, inclines to the opinion that these peculiarities indicate the influence of other hands upon Paul in the composition of the epistle.

b. It yet remains that we should look at the external evidence bearing on this question. Passing by, as somewhat uncertain, the alleged testimony of Peter, who is supposed (2 Pet. iii. 16) to refer to the Epistle to the Hebrews as the composition of Paul, we turn also to the testimonies of the apostolic fathers, which, though very decisive as to the antiquity and canonical authority of this epistle (see Förster's Inquiry, sec. 18), yet say nothing to guide us to the author, we come to consider the testimony of the Western, or as we may call it, the churches upon this subject. As respects the former, there are two facts of much importance. The one is, that of the Greek fathers not one positively ascribes this epistle to any but Paul; the other is, that it does not appear that in any part of the Eastern Church the Pauline origin of this epistle has been suspected (compare Olshausen, Opusc. Theolog., p. 95).

In the Western Church this epistle did not, as we have seen, meet with the same early and universal reception. But of what value is the state of opinion in the early churches of the West in the question of evidence now before us? To judge of this, we must bear in mind that the sole amount of evidence arising from the testimony of the Latin churches is negative; all we can conclude from it, at the most, is that they had no sufficient evidence in favor of this epistle being Paul's; they do not seem to have had a shadow of evidence against its being his. The claims of Barnabas, Clement, and Luke rest upon mere individual conjectures, and have no historical support. Supposing, then, that the rejection of this epistle by the Latins cannot be accounted for by circumstances peculiar to the m, still the evidence of the Western churches and the testimony of the unanymity of the Greeks and Asiatics. Had the Latins been as unanimous in favor of Apollos or Clement as the Eastern churches were in favor of Paul, the case would have been different. The value of Paul's claims would in that case have been equal to that of the Western churches; the case would have been decided in favor of the composition and the value of the Western. This would have furnished a somewhat puzzling problem; though ever
is that the superiority of the Eastern witnesses to the Western would have materially advanced the claims of the apostle. As the case stands, all the positive external evidence extant is in favor of the Pauline authorship of this epistle; and the only thing against it is that in the Latin churches there appears to have been no common use of it before the Latin, or those who have generally, formed a great Jewish-Christian Church in the proper sense; the other is, that for the loosening of these from their religious sense of the Temple-worship there was an immediate and pressing necessity (Apostol. Zeit. 64, 176). We know of no purely Jewish-Christian community such as that addressed in this epistle, out of Palestine, while the whole tone of the epistle indicates that those for whom it was intended were in the vicinity of the Temple. The inscription of the epistle, πρὸς Ἑβραίους, which is of great antiquity, favors the same conclusion (Roberts, Discussions on the Gospels, pp. 215 sqq.). Ezra limits the primary circle of readers even to a section of the Church at Jerusalem. Considering such passages as v, 12; vi, 10; x, 32, as probably inapplicable to the whole of that church, he conjectures that Paul wrote to some neophytes whose conversion, though not mentioned in the Acts, may have been partly through the influence of the style of the epistle in the time of his last recorded sojourn in Jerusalem (Acts xxi, 22). This, however, is unnecessary.

V. In what Language was it written?—Like Matthew's Gospel, the Epistle to the Hebrews has afforded ground for considerable dispute concerning the language in which it was originally written. The earliest statement is that of Clement of Alexandria (preserved in Euseb. H. E. vi, 14), to the effect that it was written by Paul in Hebrew, and translated by Luke into Greek; and hence, as Clement observes, the identity of the style of the epistle and that of the Acts. This statement is repeated, after a long interval, by Eusebius, Theodoret, Jerome, and several later fathers; but it is not noticed by the majority. Nothing is said to lead us to regard it as a tradition, rather than a conjecture suggested by the style of the epistle. No person is said to have used or seen a Hebrew original. The Aramaic copy, included in the Peshito, has never been regarded otherwise than as a translation. Among the few modern supporters of an Aramaic original, the most distinguished are Joseph Hallet, an English writer in 1727 (whose knowledge is more of rabbinical than of Greek), and a Latin translation in Wolf's Curia Philologica, iv, 803-837). The same opinion has found in Michaelis a strenuous defender (Intro. iv, 221). The arguments he adduces, however, are more specious than sound; and it has been abundantly shown by Lardner, Hug, Eichhorn, and others, that this opinion is untenable. Bleek (1, 23) argues in support of a Greek original on the grounds of (1) the purity and easy flow of the Greek; (2) the use of Greek words, which could not be adequately expressed in Hebrew without long prepositions; (3) the use of paraphrases,—under which head he dismisses the inference against an Aramaic original which has been drawn from the double sense given to ἐκθέμενος (ix, 15); and (4) the use of the Sept. in quotations and references which do not correspond with the Hebrew text. Why Paul should have written in Greek to persons residing in Judea is purely a matter of conjecture. (Intro. p. 326 sqq.) and Diodati (De Christo Graeco loquenti exercitato, etc., edited by O. T. Dobbin, LL.B., London, 1843, and republished in the Biblical Repository for Jan. 1844) have adduced to show that Greek was at that time well known to the mass of the Jews (compare Tholuck, i, 455).

VI. Some have doubted whether this composition be justly termed an epistle, and have proposed to regard it rather as a treatise. The salutations, however, at the close seem rather to favor the common opinion, though it is of little moment which view we adopt.

VII. Condition of the Hebrews and Scope of the Epistle.—The numerous Christian churches scattered throughout
out Judæa (Acts ix, 31; Gal. i, 22) were continually exposed to persecution from the Jews (1 Thess. ii, 14), which would become more searching and extensive as churches multiplied, and as the growing turbulence of the nation ripened into the insurrection of A.D. 66. Persecution was directed against persons and places, the synagogue, and domestic strife were the universal forms of persecution. But in Jerusalem there was one additional weapon in the hands of the predominant oppressors of the Christians. Their magnificent national Temple was the pride of every Jew. Its ancient historical and by gentler personal recollections, with its irresistible attractions, its soothing strains, and mysterious ceremonies, might be shut against the Hebrew Christian. And even if, amid the fierce factions and frequent oscillations of authority in Jerusalem, this affliction was not often laid upon him, yet there was a secret burden which every Hebrew Christian bore within him—the knowledge that the end of all the beauty and awfulness of Zion was rapidly approaching. Paralyzed, perhaps, by this consciousness, and enfeebled by their attachment to a lower form of Christianity, they became stationary in knowledge, and in faith, void of energy and even in danger of apostasy from Christ. For, as afflictions multiplied round them, and made them feel more keenly their dependence on God, and their need of near, and frequent, and associated approach to him, they seemed, in consequence of their Christianity, to be receding from the Temple, its glory, and losing all the charm of covenant union with him which they used to enjoy. Angels, Moses, and the high-priests—their intercessors in heaven, in the grave, and on earth—became of less importance in the creed of the Jewish Christian; their glory waned as he grew in Christian experience. Already he felt that the Lord's day was superseding the Sabbath, the New Covenant the Old. What could take the place of the Temple, and that which was behind the veil, and the Levitical sacrifices, and the holy city, when they should cease to exist? What compensation could Christianity offer him for the loss which was pressing the Hebrew Christian more and more?

James, the tushop of Jerusalem, had just left his place vacant by a martyr's death. Neither to Cephas at Babylon, nor to John at Ephesus, the third pillar of the Apostolic Church, was it given to understand all the greatness of his own person, and speak the word in season. But there came from Rome the voice of one who had been the foremost in sounding the depth and breadth of that love of Christ which was all but in comprehensible to the Jew—one who, feeling more than any other apostle the weight of the care of all the churches, was his own people's pastor, and ready to break out in impassioned words, and unsought and ill-required deeds of kindness. He whom Jerusalem had sent away in chains to Rome again lifted up his voice in the hallowed city among his countrymen: but with words and arguments suited to their capacity, with a strange, borrowed accent, and a tone in which reigned no apostolic authority, and a face veiled in very love from whatsoever children who might refuse to hear divine and saving truth when it fell from the lips of Paul.

It meets the Hebrew Christians on their own ground. His answer is, "Your new faith gives you Christ, and in Christ all seek, you all your fathers sought. In Christ, the Son of God, you have an all-sufficient Mediator, nearer than angels to the Father, eminent above Moses as a benefactor, more sympathizing and more present—in him high-priest, in him intercessor: his Sabbath awaits you in heaven; to his covenant the old was intended to be subservient; his atonement is the eternal reality of which sacrifices are but the passing shadow; his city heavenly, not made with hands. Having him, believe in him with all your heart—with a faith in him as the best assurance of things as yet unseen, of old, patient under present and prepared for coming woe, full of energy, and hope, and holiness, and love."
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existed in the time of David, serve, with other circumstances, to identify the modern with the ancient site (Gen. xxxvii, 14; 2 Sam. iv, 12). Much of the life-time of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob was spent in this neighborhood, where they were all entombed, and it was from hence that the patriarchal family departed for Egypt by the way of Beersheba (Gen. xxxvii, 14; xlv, 1). The site of the Israelites' valley was taken by Joshua and given over to Caleb, who expelled the Anakim from its territories (Jos. x. 36, 37; xiv; 6-15; xv, 13-14; Judges i, 20). It was afterwards made one of the cities of refuge, and assigned to the priests and Levites (Jos. xx, 7; xxxi, 13). David, on becoming king, removed to Hebron his royal residence. Here he reigned seven years and a half, here most of his sons were born, and here he was anointed king over all Israel (1 Sam. ii, 8, 11; 1 Kings ii, 11; 2 Sam. v, 1, 3). On this extension of his kingdom Hebron ceased to be sufficiently central, and Jerusalem then became the metropolis. It is possible that this step excited a degree of discontent in Hebron which afterwards encouraged Absalom to raise in that city the standard of rebellion against his father (2 Kings xv, 9, 10). Hebron was one of the places fortified by Reoboam (2 Chron. xi, 10) and afterwards, the Temple, the house of the Lord, was removed to Jerusalem. The occupied Hebron and the surrounding villages (Neh. xi, 15). Hebron is not named by the prophets, nor in the New Testament; but we learn from the Apocalypse, and from Josephus, that it came into the power of the Edomites, who had taken possession of the south of Judah, and who had carried them off by judaeo-macedonians (1 Macc, v, 65; Josephus, Ant. xii, 8, 6). During the great war, Hebron was seized by the rebel Simon Giorides, but was recaptured and burnt by Cerealis, an officer of Vespassian (Joseph. War, iv, 9; vii, 9). Josephus describes the tombs of the patriarchs as existing in his day; and both of them, Abraham and Jacob, are in the city itself, till in the time of the Crusades the names of Hebron and Castle of Abraham were used interchangeably. Hence, as Abraham is also distinguished among the Moslems by the appellation of el-Khull, "the Friend" (of God), this latter epithet is applied to the tomb of the patriarchs in the city; and they now know Hebron only as el-Khull (Robinson's Researches, ii, 456). Soon after the Crusaders had taken Jerusalem, Hebron also appears to have passed into their hands, and in 1100 was bestowed as a fief upon Gerhard of Avennes; but two years after it is described as being in ruins (Wilken, Gesch. der Kreuz, ii, 44; Sasuwel, Pergrina, p. 269). In 1167 Hebron was raised to the rank of a bishopric (Will. T. xx, 8), and the title of bishop of Hebron long remained in the Romish Church, for it occurs so late as A.D. 1365. But it was merely nominal; for after the capture of Jerusalem by Saladin in 1187, Hebron also reverted to the Moslems, and has ever since remained in their possession. In the modern history of Hebron, the most remarkable circumstance is the part which the inhabitants of the town and district took in the rebellion of 1884, and the heavy retribution which it brought down upon them. They held out for some time, but were finally and gavel over to the Khedive Pasha near Solomon's Pools. They were defeated, but retired and entrenched themselves in Hebron, which Ibrahim carried by storm, and gave over to sack and pillage. The town has not yet recovered from the blow it then sustained. In the 14th century pilgrims passed from Sina to Jerusalem direct through the desert by Beersheba and Hebron. In the following century this route seems to have been abandoned for that by Gaza; yet the pilgrims sometimes took Hebron in their way, or visited it from Gaza. The travellers of that period describe as existing here an immense charitable establishment, or hospital, where 1200 loaves of bread, besides oil and other confections, were daily distributed to all comers, without distinction of age or religion, at the annual expense of 20,000 ducats. Hebron continued to be occasionally visited by European travellers down to the latter part of the 17th century, but from that time till the present century it appears to have been little frequented by them. In the 18th century it was taken by Turko-Persian invaders. Recently there are Sezized, Ali Bey, Irby and Mangles, Poujoulat, Monro, Stephens, Paxton, Lord Lindsay, Russégger, Schubert, Dr. Robinson, Dr. Olin, de Saulcy, Stanley, etc.

The site of Hebron lies on the sloping sides of a narrow valley (of Mamre), surrounded by rocky hills. This is thought to be the "valley of Eschol," whence the Jewish spies got the great bunch of grapes (Num. xiii, 23). Its sides are still clothed with luxuriant vineyards, and its grapes are considered the finest in Southern Palestine. Groves of grey olives, and some other fruit-trees, give variety to the scene. The valley runs from north to south; and the main quarter of the town, surmounted by the lofty walls of the venerable Haram, lies partly on the eastern slope (Gen. xxxvii, 14; comp. xxiii, 19). The houses are all of stone, solidly built, flat-roofed, and open at the rear to the Palestine landscape. The road has no walls. The streets are narrow, seldom more than two or three yards in width; the pavement, where one exists, is rough and difficult. The shops are well furnished, better indeed than those of towns of the same class in Egypt, and the commodities are of a very similar character. The manufacture of glass, which is the produce of the glass-works, for which the place has long been celebrated in these parts. Gates are placed not only at the entrance of the city, but in different parts of the interior, and are closed at night for the better preservation of order, as well as to prevent communication between thedifferentquarters.

There are nine mosques in Hebron, none of which possess any architectural or other interest, with the exception of the massive structure which is built over the tombs of the patriarchs. This is esteemed by the Moslems one of their holiest places, and occurs rigorously excluded from it. The only Europeans who, until a late period, have found their way to the interior, were Ali Bey and Giovanni Finati, the Italian servant of Mr. Bankes. The best account of it is that furnished by the Rev. V. Monro, who states that the "mosque, which covers the cave of Machpelah, and contains the tombs of the patriarchal tombs, is a square building, with little external decoration, at the south end of the town. Behind it is a small cupola, with eight or ten windows, beneath which is the tomb of Esau, excluded from the privilege of lying among the patriarchs. Ascending from the street, at the corner of the mosque, you pass through an arched way by a flight of steps to a wide platform, at the end of which is another short ascent; to the left is the court, out of which, to the left again, you enter the mosque. The dimensions within are about forty paces by twenty-five. Immediately on the right of the door is the tomb of Sarah, and beyond it that of Abraham, having a passage between them into the court. Corresponding with these, on the opposite side of the mosque, are those of Isaac and Rebekah, and behind them is a recess for prayer, and a pulpit. These tombs resemble small basilicas, with a window on each side, square doors in front, the lower parts of which are of wood, and the upper of iron or bronze bars plated. Within each of these is an imitation of the sarcophagus that lies in the cave below the mosque, which no one is allowed to enter. Those seen above resemble coffins with pyramidal tops, and are covered with green silk, lettered with verses from the Koran. The doors of these tombs are left constantly open; but no one enters those of the women—at least men do not. In the mosque is a baldaquin, supported by four columns, over an octagonal figure of black and white marble inlaid, around a small hole in the pavement, through which a chain passes from the
top of the canopy to a lamp continually burning to give light in the cave of Machpelah, where the actual sarcophagi rest. At the upper end of the court is the chief place of prayer; and on the opposite side of the mosque are two larger tombs, where are deposited the bodies of Jacob and Leah." (Summer's Ramble, i. 245).

The cave itself he does not describe, nor does it appear that the vaulted chamber is of stone (a Spaniard travelling as a Moslem) does not even mention the cave below while describing the shrines of the mosque. John Sanderson (A.D. 1601) expressly says that none might enter, but that persons might view it, as far as the lamp allowed, through the hole at the top, Mackensie (1829) describes the construction of the tombs of Isaac, Jacob, Joseph, and Abraham in one set of coffin-like structure, about six feet high, built up of plastered stone or marble, and hung with three carpets—green embroidered with gold. Within the area of the church or mosque were shown the tombs of Isaac and Rebekah. They are placed under separate chapels, in which are windows with mosaics of green which the gates are grated, not with silver, but iron bars. Their situation, planted as they are in the body of the mosque, may indicate their Christian origin. In almost all Mussulman sanctuaries, the tombs of distinguished persons are placed, not in the centre of the building, but in the corners. To Rebekah’s tomb the same decorous rule of the exclusion of male visitors naturally applied as in the case of Sarah’s. But on requesting to see the tomb of Isaac, we were entreated not to enter. The chapel, in fact, contains nothing of interest; but I mention it for the sake of the observation it expresses, and because it well illustrates the peculiar feeling which has tended to preserve the sanctity of the place—an awe, amounting to terror, of the great personages who lay beneath, and who would, if it were not for the intervention of the Arab guard, and the strong sensation of the place, which the guardians of the shrine of Jacob and Leah were shown in recesses, corresponding to those of Abraham and Sarah, but in a separate cloister opposite the entrance of the mosque. It will be seen that up to this point no mention is made of the tombs of Isaac and Rebekah; namely, the sacred cave itself, in which one at least of the patriarchal family may possibly still repose intact—the embalmed body of Jacob. It may well be supposed that to this object our inquiries throughout were directed.

One indication of the cavern beneath was visible. In the interior of the mosque, at the top of the shrine of Abraham, was a small circular hole, about eight inches across, of which one foot above the pavement was built of strong masonry, but of which the lower part, as far as we could see and feel, was of the living rock. This cavity appeared to open into a dark space beneath the pavement of the mosque believed to extend under the whole platform (can hardly be anything else than the ancient cavern of Machpelah). This was the only aperture which the guardians recognised. Once, they said, 2500 years ago, a servant of a great king had penetrated through some other entrance. He descended in full possession of his faculties and of remarkable corpulence; he returned blind, deaf, withered, and crippled. Since then the entrance was closed, and this aperture alone was left, partly for the sake of suffering the holy air of the cave to escape into the mosque, and be breathed by the faithful; partly for the sake of allowing a lamp to be lighted by a chain, which we saw suspended at the mouth, to burn upon the sacred cave. We asked whether it could not be lighted now. "No;" they said, "the saint likes to have a lamp at night, but not in the full daylight." With that glimpse into the interior, we were satisfied, and the world without must for the present be satisfied. Whether any other entrance is known to the Moslems themselves must be a matter of doubt. The original entrance to the cave if it is now to be found at all, must probably be on the southern face of the mountain, between the mosque and the gallery containing the shrine of Joseph, and entirely obstructed by the ancient Jewish wall, probably built across it for this very purpose." This account is somewhat at variance with the results of the researches of M. Pierotti, who states, in a letter to the London Times, April 30, 1862, "The true entrance to the patriarchs’ tomb is seen close to the western
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wall of the enclosure, and near the north-west corner; it is guarded by a very thick iron railing, and I was not allowed to go near it. I observed that the Mussulmans themselves did not go very near it. In the court opposite the entrance-gate of the mosque there is an opening, through which I was allowed to go down for three steps, and I was allowed to ascend by daylight and touch that the rock exists there, and to conclude it to be about five feet thick. From the short observations I could make during my brief descent, as also from the consideration of the east wall of the mosque, and the little information I was able to obtain from the chaldean, who jealously guards the sanctuary, I consider that a part of the grotto exists under the mosque, and that the other part is under the court, but at a lower level than that lying under the mosque." See MACHPELAH.

The court in which the mosque stands is surrounded by an extensive and lofty wall, formed of large stones, and strengthened by square buttresses. This wall is the greatest antiquity in Hebron, and even Dr. Robinson supposes that it may be substantially the same which is mentioned by Josephus (Ant., i, 14; War, iv, 9, 7), and by Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s. v. Arboch), as the scene of the murder of Absalom. A common tomb in the neighborhood of Hebron passes as the tomb of Abner, He was certainly interred in this city (2 Sam., iii, 32), and the head of Ishbosheth, after his assassination, was deposited in the same sepulchre (2 Sam., iv, 12); but there is slight evidence in favor of the tradition which places the burial out this locality to the western traveler. Besides this venerable wall, there is nothing at Hebron bearing the stamp of antiquity save two reservoirs for rain-water outside the town. One of these is just without the southern gate, in the bottom of the valley. It is a large basin 138 feet square, and 21 feet 8 inches deep. It is built of hewn limestone of very solid workmanship, and obviously of ancient date. The depth of water of course varies at different times of the year: in May it is 14 feet. The descent is by flights of steps at the four corners, by which the water is brought up in vessels and skins, and poured out into troughs for the flocks, or carried away for domestic uses. Just at the north end of the main part of the town is another and smaller pool, also occupying the bed of the valley, and measuring 85 feet by 56, with a depth of 18 feet, containing (in May) 7 feet of water. These cisterns, which are numerous, and have no perennial supply, are fed which are filled only by the rains, seem (at least in summer) to be the main dependence of the inhabitants for water, although that of the larger pool is neither clear nor clean. As these pools are doubtless of high antiquity, one of them is in all likelihood the "pool of Hebron" over which David hanged up the assassins of Ishbosheth (2 Sam., iv, 12).

The present population of Hebron has not been clearly ascertained, but is probably about 5000. Most of the inhabitants are Moslems, of fierce and intolent character. There are no resident Christians. The Jews amount to about 50 families, mostly natives of different countries of Europe, who have emigrated to this place for the purpose of having their bones laid near the sepulchres of their illustrious ancestors. They have two synagogues and several schools. As usual, they have a quantity of the clay to themselves, where the streets are narrow and filthy, and the houses mean. In a few instances, however, they are in tolerable repair, and whitewashed. The environs of Hebron are very fertile. Vineyards and plantations are the capital, is instead of trees, covering the valleys and arable grounds; while the tops and sides of the hills, although stony, are covered with rich pastures, which support a great number of cattle, sheep, and goats, constituting an important branch of the industry and wealth of Hebron. The hill-country of Judea is by itself productive, and under a paternal government would be capable of sustaining a large population. That it did so once is manifest from the great number and extent of ruined terraces and dilapidated towns. It is at present abandoned, and cultivation ceases at the distance of two miles north of the town. The hills then become covered with prickly and other stunted trees, which furnish Bethlehem and other villages with wood. About a mile from the town there are large stunted trees in Palestine. It stands quite alone in the midst of the vineyards. It is 23 feet in girth, and its branches cover a space 30 feet in diameter. This, say some, is the very tree beneath which Abraham pitched his tent; but, however this may be, it still bears the name of the patriarch (Porter's Handbook, p. 67 sq.). See OAK.

2. The third son of Kohath the Levite, and hence the uncle of Moses (Exod. vi, 18; 1 Chron. vi, 2, 18; xv, 9; xxiii, 12, 19). B.C. ante 1738. His descendants are called HEBREW HOUSES (Numb. iii, 27, etc.).


4. (Heb. Ebron', Ἱσσὼν, prob. for Ἱσσών, ABDON, as many MSS. read; Sept. Esipwov, Vulg. Abram.) A town on the northern border of Asher (Josh. xix, 28); possibly the same (Keil, Comment. in loc.) elsewhere (Josh. xxii, 39) called ABDON (q.v.).

Hebron (Heb. 'Cherithron', Ἱσσὼν, Sept. Xiipwov, and Xiipwov, Vulg. HEBRONITE), a designation of the descendants of HEBRON, the third son of Kohath, who was the second son upon Levi the youngest brother of Aaron, father of Moses and Aaron (Exod. vi, 18; Numb. iii, 19; 1 Chron. vi, 2, 18; xxiii, 19). The immediate children of Hebron are not mentioned by name (comp. Exod. vi, 21, 22), but he was the founder of a family (misipuchad) of HEBRONITES (Numb. iii, 27; xxvi, 61; 1 Chron. xxiv, 23, 30, 31; 2 Chron. i, 12; 1 Chron. vi, 9; xxii, 19), who are often mentioned in the enumerations of the Levites in the passages above cited. JERAH was the head of the family in the time of David (1 Chron. xxiii, 19; xxiv, 31; xxiv, 20; 1 Chron. xxvii, 19); in the last of these passages the name of Hebron does not now exist in the Hebrew, but has been supplied in the A.V. from the other lists. In the last year of David's reign we find them settled at Jazer, in Gilead (a place not elsewhere named as a Levtical city), "mighty men of valor" (יִשְׁמָעֵל), 2700 in number, who were superintendents for the king over the two and a half tribes in regard to all matters sacred and secular (1 Chron. xxvi, 31, 82). At the same time 1700 of the family of Jashobeam held the same office on the west of Jordan (ver. 30).

Heckewelder, JOHN GOTTLIEB ERNESTUS, a distinguished Moravian missionary among the Indians of North America, born at Bedford, England, Mar. 12, 1748, where his father, who had fled from Moravia for the sake of religious liberty, was engaged in the service of the Church. On the 2d of April, 1754, young Heckewelder came to America with his parents. At the age of nineteen years (1762) he accompanied Christian Frederick Post, an Indian teacher and colonial agent, to the Tuscarawas Valley, in Ohio, where they attempted to establish a mission among the natives. This enterprise proving a failure, Heckewelder labored for some time as the assistant of David Zeisberger, on the Susquehanna. In the spring of 1771 he joined this illustrious evangelist at Friedenstadt, on the Beaver Creek, Pa., and for the next fifteen years shared all the hardships, sufferings, and triumphs of the Indian mission, at the head of a mission station at Zeisberger, David. In the course of this period he married Miss Sarah Ohnberg (July 4, 1780), at Salem, Ohio, which was probably the first wedding ever solemnized in that state. Having severed his connection with the mission (October, 1786) on account of his wife's feeble health, and the necessary reduction of the fee's of the United Brethren for propagating the Gospel among the Heathen" [see ETWEB, JOHN], and made
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repeated but unsuccessful attempts, in consequence of the Indian War, to survey a tract of land in the Tuscarawas Valley, granted to the Christian Indians by Congress as an indemnification for their losses in the Revolution. In 1792 and 1793 he was twice appointed as a justice of the peace commissioner by the United States government, and was active in aiding the other commissioners to bring about a pacification. These humane efforts, however, proved abortive, and the war continued, ending in the total defeat of the Western tribes. In 1801 he settled at Gnadenhutten, Ohio, and devoted himself to the duties of his agency until 1810, when he resigned. The rest of his life he spent at Bethlehem in literary labors, producing two works, namely, *An Account of the History, Manners, and Customs of the Indian Nations who once inhabited Pennsylvania and the neighboring States* (Philadelphia, 1818); and *Narratives of the Mission of the United Brethren among the Delaware and Mohican Indians* (Philadelphia, 1830). He died January 31, 1823. General Casue criticized his writings in the *North American Review*, vol. xxvii. See also Rondthaler, *Life of the Rev. David Casue* (Philadelphia, 1871), 1st ed. 1818.

HARRIET ELIJAH, a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born at Pine Plains, N.Y., June 7, 1788. Trained religiously by a pious mother, he was converted on the Vergennes Circuit, Vermont, in 1788, and in 1800 was licensed to preach. His early labors in the itinerant ministry were full of toil and privation; and he offered his services with sincere purpose of heart for religious revivals followed his ministry, especially in Vermont and New Hampshire. On the 16th of June, 1801, he was admitted on trial in the New York Annual Conference, and appointed to Plattsburg Circuit; in 1802 to Fletcher; in 1803 to Bridgewater Circuit, New Hampshire; after which he served as a preacher in what is now the New York Annual Conference. In 1807 he was made presiding elder of the New Hampshire District. The country was mountainous, newly settled, and poor; and Mr. Heddings' whole receipts for the first year were $4 25, besides his travelling expenses. In 1829 he was elected a delegate to the General Conference held at Baltimore. A plan for a "delegated" General Conference was discussed by this body, and at first rejected; a rupture seemed imminent, but a reconsideration was brought about, largely through Heddings' influence, and the plan was finally adopted. In 1832 he was appointed to the London District, and in 1810 he married. In the ten years before his marriage he travelled 3000 miles a year, and preached nearly every day. His pay for this time averaged $45 per annum. "The circuits were large, often requiring three to five hundred miles to complete one round, and this round was completed in from two to six weeks, during which a sermon was to be preached and a class met daily; and often three sermons and three classes to be attended on the Sabbath. The journeys, too, were performed ... on horseback, through rough and miry ways, and through wildernesses where no road as yet had been cast up. Rivers and swamps were to be forded. Nor could the journey be delayed. On, on, must the itinerant press his way, through the drenching rains of summer, the chilling sleet of spring or autumn, and the driving blasts or piercing cold of winter; and often amid perils, wearing weather, and almost nakedness, he carried the Bread of Life to the lost and perishing. And then, when the day of toil was ended, in the creviced hut of the frontier settler, the weary itinerant, among those of kindred hearts and sympathies, found a cordial though humble place of repose." ... For twenty years before his appointment to the episcopacy he received his annual appointments at Conference, and prosecuted the duties assigned him on circuits, and stations, and presiding elders' districts. The fields of his labor lay, after the first few years, wholly in the New-England States; and when the New-England Conference was separated from New York, he became identified with that work. In the introduction and establishment of Methodism in New England—itself one of the most romantic, as it is perhaps the best recorded portion of Methodist history—he was an active and most efficient agent, and in its stirring scenes and forlorn but heroic labors he spent the flower of his manhood; and upon it, no doubt, he left the impress of his genial spirit, which remains his noblest and most enduring monument." From 1808 to 1824 he was a delegate to every General Conference, and was always eminent in influence and power at the sessions of that body. In the "Presiding Elder Question" at the Conferences of 1820 and 1821 stood, with the other episcopal nominees, in the election of presiding elders by the Conferences; but his zeal in the cause never degenerated into rashness, or became liable to the charge of disloyalty. In 1824 he was elected bishop. He accepted the office with great reluctance, and filled it with the most distinguished ability and acceptance for 26 years. "In the exercise of the episcopal functions he developed rare qualifications as a presiding officer, and especially as an expounder of ecclesiastical law. The soundness of his views upon the disciplines and discipline of the Church was so fully and so universally conceded, that in the end he became almost an oracle in these respects, and his opinion was regarded with profound veneration. As a theologian and divine, his views were comprehensive, logical, and well matured. Not only had they been elaborated with great care, but the analysis was very distinct; and the successive steps were not only clearly defined in the mind, but they were so clear and distinct even in the minutiae of their detail. His discourses were after the same pattern—an example of neatness, order, perspicuity, and completeness. From the year 1844, age and increasing infirmities compelled him to seek relief from the heavy burden of labor he had previously sustained, and his vocation in the Church Annual Conferences became less frequent. Yet his labors and responsibilities are very great. He has been very accustomed to undertake the major duties of a presiding bishop, and has held the office in a manner which has brought him great honor and glory, and the glorious triumph of his abiding faith. The Rev. M. Richardson came in, and inquired whether his prospect was clear; he replied with great emphasis, 'Oh yes, yes, yes! I have been wonderfully sustained of late, beyond the usual degree.' After a pause, he added, 'I trust in Christ, and he does not disappoint me. I feel him, I enjoy him, and I look forward to an inheritance in his kingdom.'" A full account of the labors of this great and good man will be found in the *Life and Times of the Rev. E. Heddins, D.D.* by W. H. Clark, D.D. (New York, 1854; reviewed by B. M. Anderson of the Quarterly, Oct. 1855); see also Stevens, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*; Sprague, *Annals*, vii, 504; *North American Review*, xxxii, 349.

Hedge, the rendering in the A. V. (besides derivatives from הָנַךְ and הָנָךְ, rendered as a verb), I, of three words from the same root (הָנַךְ), which, as well as their Greek equivalent (φημάρχης), denotes simply that which surrounds or encloses, whether it be a stone wall (הָנַךְ, pe'cher, Prov. xxiv, 31; Ezek. xiii, 10) or a fence of other materials. "Hedger", "gader", and הַנָּךְ, gederah, are used of the hedge of a vineyard (Num. xxiii, 24; Isa. xxxix, 40, 1 Chron. iv, 29); and the latter is employed to describe the wide walls of stone, or fences of thorn, which
served as a shelter for sheep in winter and summer (Num. xxxii, 16). The stone walls which surround the sheepfolds of modern Palestine are frequently crowned with sharp thorns (Thomson, Land and Book, i, 299), a custom at least as ancient as the time of Homer (Od. xiv. 547). One of prickly pear (Arctocereus) was used for that purpose, as well as for the fences of cemeteries at a later period (Arist. Eclog. 355). In order to protect the vineyards from the ravages of wild beasts (Psal. lxxx, 12), it was customary to surround them with a wall of loose stones or mud (Matt. xxv, 30; Mark xii, 1), which was a favorite haunt of serpents (Eccles. xvi, 8), and a retreat for locusts from the cold (Nah. iii, 17). Such walls are described by Maundrell as surrounding the gardens of Damascus. "They are built of great pieces of earth, made in the fashion of brick and hardened in the sun. In their dimensions they are only two yards long, somewhat more than one broad, and half a yard thick. Two rows of these, placed one upon another, make a cheap, expeditious, and, in this dry country, a durable wall" (Early Travels in Pal., p. 487). A wall or fence of this kind is clearly distinguished in Isa. v, 5 from the tangled hedge, 2, 732, 2, 735, men'okh' (מְנַוְּכָה, Mic. vii, 4), which was planted as an additional security by the foreigner (Lam. iv, 29). The thorns and was composed of the thorny shrubs with which Palestine abounds. The prickly pear, a species of cactus, so frequently employed for this purpose in the East at present, is believed to be of comparatively modern introduction. The aspersion of the comparison of a tangled hedge of thorns to the difficulties which a slothful man conjures up as an excuse for his inactivity will at once be recognized (Prov. xv, 19; comp. Hos. ii, 6). The narrow paths between the hedges of the vineyards and gardens, "with a fence on this side and a fence on that side" (Num. xxii, 24), are distinguished from the "high" or "more frequented tracks" (Lk. xvi, 23) (Hackett, Illust. of Scripture, p. 106; Trench, On the Parables, p. 198).—Smith, s. v.

Hedge, Levi, LL.B., a professor in Harvard University, was born in 1777 at Hardwick, Mass. He graduated at Harvard University in 1792. "His whole life, from his childhood, may be said to have been connected with the University. In 1795 he was appointed tutor, and subsequently received the appointment of permanent tutor; in 1810 he was made college professor of logic and metaphysics; and in 1827 he was transferred to the Alford professorship of natural religion, moral philosophy, and politics. In 1831 he was compelled by an attack of paralysis to resign his position. He died Jan. 3, 1844. He is remembered by many pupils as a faithful instructor and kind friend." He published a "System of Logic" (1818, 1820), which passed through several editions, and has been translated into German. He was the father of Dr. F. H. Hedge, an eminent Unitarian minister.—Christian Examiner, xxxvi, 299.

Hedio, Gaspar or Caspar, one of the early German Reformers, was born at Ettlingen, Baden, in 1494. He studied theology at Freiburg and Basle, where in 1519 he sustained, in presence of Capito, the theses afterwards printed under the title Conclusiones ex Evangelio, Scriptura et veteri traditione (Zurich, 1519). They are 24 in number, treating on the attributes of God and predestination, and evince a decided tendency towards the Reformations. In 1520 he began to correspond with Luther on the question of Grace; in the same year he was called to Mentz on the recommending of Gomarus, and was made court preacher and vicar to the archbishop. He resigned his offices in 1523, and retired to Strasbourg. The chapter of that city offered him the pallium of the cathedral, but the bishop refused to confirm the offer until Hedio was prepared to confine himself to preaching the Word of God. His preaching was very popular, because it was simple and Biblical. He was naturally timid, and incapable of taking a leading part in the religious movement then going on; but his services as coadjutor to Bucer and Capito in consolidating the Reformation in Strasbourg were very great. In 1561 he was sent, with Lenglin and Soll, to confer with the German theologians on the subject of the Confession of Faith. He died at Strasbourg Oct. 17, 1562. All his works, except Chronicon Germanicum, oder Beschreibung aller alien christlichen Kirchen bis auf Jahr 1545 (Strasb., 1580, 3 vols. fol.)—Smaragdi abbatis Commentarius in Evangelia Et Epistolae, which he translated himself into German:—Chronicon abbatis Ursprungsbergis correctum, et Paralipomena addita ab anno 1562 ad annum 1587, translated also into German by himself:—Sententia Phil. Melanchthonis, Mart. Buceri, Gamp. Hedelioni et aliorum de pace Ecclesiae, ann. 1584 (1607, 8vo). Melchior Adam considers him also as the transator of the histories of Eusebius, Hegesippus, and Josephus, and was worst. See Melchior Adam, Vita Germanorum Philosophorum (Heidelberg, 1615-1620, 4 vols. 8vo), i, 115; Haag, La France Protestante; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxii, 718. (J. N. P.)

Hedascha or Hedjra. See Hegira.

Hedaschaon. See Mint.

Hedwig, Sr., was the daughter of Agnes and Berthold, duke of Carinthia. She married Henry, duke of Bohemia, by Polack, Archbishop of Prague, xxviii, 34, 35, and bore him three daughters. They afterwards made a vow of chastity, Henry becoming priest and subsequently bishop, while Hedwig entered a Cistercian convent near Trebnitz, without, however, taking the veil. She died there October 15, 1453, and was buried in the convent. She was canonized by pope Clement IV in 1267 (or 1269). She is commemorated on the 17th of October. See Arnaud d'Andilly, Vie des saints illustres; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxii, 728.

Heerbrand, Jakob, a Lutheran theologian, was born at Giengen Aug. 12, 1921. After studying at Ulm and Wittenberg, he was ordained at Tubingen, from where he was expelled for objecting to the liturgy; but he was soon recalled, and made pastor of Herrenberg. In 1554, duke Christopher sent him as one of the theological delegates to the Council of Trent. Charles, prince of Baden, employed him in reforming the churches in his dominions, and in 1560 he was chosen professor of divinity at Tubingen, where he died May 22, 1600. Of his works, which are numerous both in German and Latin, the principal is Compendium Theologiae (Tubingen, 1578, fol., often reprinted), a work which long held its place as a text-book. The negotiations between the Tubingen theologians of that time and the patriarch of Constantinople, in which this compendium was inserted into Greek (by M. Crusius), and is to be sent to Constantinople. The Greek translation was published, together with the original, at Wittenberg in 1782. His opponents used to call him, on account of his polemical zeal, Huldbrand ("hell-fire"). See Melchior Adam, Vit. Theologorum, i, 137; Hook, Eccl. Biography, vol. v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. v, 627.

Heermann, Johann, a Silesian Protestant pastor and hymn writer, was born at Rauten, Silesia, Oct. 11, 1855. At school he displayed early talent. In 1611 he became pastor at Koben. During the Thirty Years' War Silesia was the scene of war and plunder, and Heermann was often obliged to conceal himself to save his life. He gave up his pastoral charge at Koben in 1638, and died Feb. 17, 1647. In the height of his troubles in 1608, he published a volume of hymns under the title Deseri Musica Cordis, and his productions afterwards were numerous. He selected and published from Capito, and was made court preacher and vicar to the archbishop. He resigned his offices in 1623, and retired to Strasbourg. The chapter of that city offered him the pallium of the cathedral, but the bishop refused to confirm the offer until Heermann was prepared to confine himself to preaching the Word of God. His preaching was very popular, because it was simple and Biblical. He was naturally timid, and incapable of taking a leading part in the religious
of the life of Heer mann. Others are given in Miss Winkworth, Lyra Germanica, and in Schaff, Christ in Song (N.Y., 1899). A selection from his hymns, in German, may be found in Wackernagel, Heer mann's psittaculide Lieder (Stuttgart, 1856). Of his other works we mention Heptolayos Christi (on the cross), Brussail, 1819, new edit. Berlin, 1856.

Hegel (Heb. Hegyaj, "phil. eunuch, Esth. ii, 8; Sept. Tal., Vulg. Euph.) or Hegesippe (Heb. id. 373, "law, Esth. ii, 3; Sept. omits, Vulg. Euph.), the eunuch having charge of the harem of Xerxes, and the preparation of the females sought as concubines for him. B.C. 479. Winer (Worterb. s. v.) thinks he may be the same with Hegiai (Hysias), who is mentioned by Ctesia sus (Perseus, 34) as present at the check of the Persian army at Thermopylae.

Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich, the greatest of modern German metaphysicians. The following sketch of his life is modified from the English Cyclopaedia. He was born at Stuttgart Aug. 27, 1770, and was educated at the gymnasium of his native city. From 1786 to 1788 he studied at Tubingen, where he had for his teachers Schelling and Hegelian philosophy, and in 1790 he acquired not only a knowledge of the history of philosophy, but also a thorough acquaintance with the natural and political sciences. Upon being admitted doctor in philosophy, he accepted an engagement as private tutor, in which capacity he lived for some years, first in Berlin, and then at Frankfort-on-Main, until, on the death of his father in 1800, he was enabled, by the inheritance of a small patrimony, to devote himself to the study of philosophy. He accordingly proceeded to Jena, where Schelling was teaching his system of "Absolute Identity," in which Hegel was at this period one of the warmest partisans. "Here he composed his first philosophical work, entitled Uber die Herkunft der Fichte'schen und Schelling'schen Philosophie (On the Difference of the Systems of Fichte and Schelling); which treatise, notwithstanding the sincerity with which Hegel then advocated the views of the latter, contained the germ of that dissent which was afterwards expanded into a peculiar theory. He was also associated with Schelling in conducting the Kritische Journal der Philosophie (Critical Journal of Science); and among the most important of the articles contributed by Hegel to this periodical was one which contains a luminous review of the doctrines of Kant, Jacobi, and Fichte, whose several systems are represented as nothing more than so many forms of a purely subjective philosophy. In 1806, when Schelling went to Wurzburg, Hegel was appointed to supply his place as lecturer. Now for the first time Hegel opened the "philosopher's chase," and from that period of his life one can trace his dissatisfaction with the system of Schelling. The difference between the ideas of the master and disciple was marked still more strongly in the Phaenomenologie des Geistes (Phenomenology of Mind), which was published at Bamberg, whither Hegel had retired after the battle of Jena. This work he used to call his "Voyage of Discovery," as indicating the researches he had passed through in order to arrive at a clear knowledge of the truth. It contains an account of the several grades of development through which the "self," or "ego," proceeds: first of all from corporeal to the self-consciousness; next into reflective and active reason, from which it becomes philosophical reason, self-cognizant and self-analyzing, until at last, rising to the notion of God, it manifests itself in a religious form. The title 'Phaenomenology' points out the limits of the work, which is confined to the phenomena of mind as displayed in the elements of its immediate existence, that is, in experience. It traces the course of mind up to the point where it recognizes the identity of thought and substance, of reason and reality, and where the opposition of a rational essence and mind develops itself as pure thought or simple science, and the several forms it successively assumes, which differ only in their subject-matter or contents, are the objects of logic, or 'dialectic.' In 1808 he was called to preside over the gymnasium of Nurnberg. In 1812 he published his Logic (Wissenschaft der Logik), which was designed, with the 'Phenomenology,' to complete the whole body of science. Hegel employs the term logic in a very extended sense, and it does not conform, as is usually the case, to the account of the abstract forms of thought and the laws of connection of ideas, but understand by it the science of the self-sufficient and self-determining idea—the science of truth and of reality. From this fundamental principle that thought and substance are one and identical, it followed that whatever is true of the former is true also of the latter, and consequently the laws of logic become ontological. From this point of view Hegel describes in this work the progress of reason; how, by virtue of a peculiar and inherent impulse, it passes constantly onwards, until it returns into itself. The general merits of this work were at once admitted, and the high powers of philosophical reflection which it evinced were acknowledged by the offer of a professorship at Heidelberg in 1817. His first course of lectures was attended by a numerous class, attracting universal attention, and establishing the originality of his views, notwithstanding the great obscurity of his style. By the publication of the Ency clopédie der phil. Wissenschaften (Encyclopedia of Philosophical Sciences) in 1817, his reputation as a philosopher was established, and Hegel was invited by the University of Berlin to fill the Chair of Philosophy, which had remained vacant since the death of Fichte in 1814. This work, being designed as a manual for his class, takes a general view of his whole system, and exhibits in the clearest manner the ultimate tendency of his views as a consideration of the base of all ontology, and starting from the idea in itself or potentially, he considers it as the essence and primary substance. He then examines thoughts as at first existing in itself, then in other or in nature; next in the mind of the individual, in a purely subjective point of view; and then objectively, in its outward realization; and, lastly, as it terms it, absolutely, that is, as manifesting itself in art, religion, and philosophy. From 1817 until death terminated his career there is nothing to relate in the life of Hegel beyond the constantly increasing celebrity of his lectures and the publication of several works. He successively elaborated in the Phaenomenologie des Geistes two new editions of the Encyclopaedia, the first volume of the second edition of his Logic, and several articles in the Annals of Scientific Criticism, which he had established as an organ of his system, and of its application to every branch of art and science (Enc. Cyclopedia.). He died Nov. 14, 1831, of cholera.

Hegel's influence upon the philosophy and theology of Germany has been very great. It is impossible, in brief space, to give a full idea of the Hegelian system. "The transcendental idealism of Kant formed the transition from the empiricism of the 18th century, and effected, as it were, a compromise between the ancient realism and the scepticism of Hume. To the system of Kant succeeded the pure and absolute idealism of Fichte, destined to be displaced in its turn by Schelling's system of absolute identity and intellectual intuition, which was itself to be further modified and displayed in the diaphanic momentum of Hegel. Essentially the systems of Hegel and Schelling are both founded upon the same principle, namely, the absolute identity of thought and being; for there is evidently but little difference between the doctrine of Schelling, which supposed that the human mind contained within it the fulness of reality and truth, the consciousness of which it may attain to simply by contemplating its own nature, and that of Hegel, according to whom the concrete notion, or the reason, comprises within itself all verity, and that, in order to arrive at the science through which it can itself employ logical thought, or dialectic. The difference is purely a difference of method. For the rigorous for-
malsion of Fichte, Schelling had substituted a sort of poetical enthusiasm, and, banishing from philosophy the scientific form it had received from Wolff, had introduced into it the rapturous mysticism of the intellectual intuition. Hegel, however, insisting that the scientific system is the only form under which truth can exist, re-established in himself the fundamental and authoritative utility of the doctrine of the dialectical momentum, or development of the idea. Indeed, with Hegel the method of philosophy is philosophy itself. This he defines to be the knowledge of the evolution of the concrete. The concrete is the idea, which, as a unity, is diversely determined, and the act of this diversity is the idea of its own nature. The origin of the activity, the action itself, and the result are one, and constitute the concrete. Its movement is the development by which that which exists merely potentially is realized. The concrete in itself, or virtually, must become actual; it is simple, yet different. This inherent contradiction of the concrete is the spring of its development. Hence arise differences, which, however, ultimately vanish into unity. There is both movement, and repose in the movement. The difference scarcely becomes apparent before it disappears, whereupon the whole becomes a full and complete unity. Of this he gives the following illustration: the flower, notwithstanding its many qualities, is one; no single quality that belongs to it is wanting in the smallest of its leaves, and every portion of the leaf possesses the same properties as the entire leaf. He then observes that all thinking and acting substances in the world of objects is in a degree admitted, is denied in immaterial objects, and held to be irreconcilable. Thus it is said that man possesses liberty, but that freedom and necessity are mutually opposed; that the one excluding the other, they can never be united so as to become concrete. But, according to Hegel, the mind is, in reality concrete, and its properties are liberty and necessity. It is by necessity that man is free, and it is only in necessity that he experiences liberty. The objects of nature are, it is true, subject exclusively to necessity; but liberty without necessity is an arbitrary abstraction, a purely formal liberty (English Cyclopedia, s. v.).

Hegel "rejected the intellectual intuition of the philosophy of nature, and studied to make philosophy an intelligible science and knowledge by means of dialectics. He called philosophy the Science of Reason, because it is the consciousness of the necessity of its own necessary development. It is his principle to include all particular principles in it. Now as the Idea is reason identical with itself, and as, in order to be cognizant of itself, or, in other words, as, in order to be self-existing (für sich sein), it places itself in opposition to itself, so as to appear something else, without, however, ceasing to be one and the same thing; in this case philosophy becomes divided: 1. Into logic considered as the science of the Idea in and for itself. 2. Into the philosophy of nature considered as the science of the Idea representing itself externally (reason thrown out in nature). 3. Its third division is that of the philosophy of mind, expressing the return of the Idea within itself, after having thrown itself without externally. All logic, according to Hegel, presents three moments: 1. The abstract or intelligible moment, which seizes the object in its purest, most distinct and determinate features, and distinguishes it with precision. 2. The dialectic or negative rational moment consists in the annihilation of the determinations of objects, and their transition to the opposite determinations. 3. The speculative momentum perceives the unity of the determinations in their opposition. Such is the method of philosophy. Hegel, it is said, "was more influenced by his immediate surroundings than his predecessors; all his system tended to a lower, more empirical, and mechanical result (St. John)."

Hegel's view of the philosophy of religion is thus stated by Schwegrer: "All religions seek a union of the divine and human. This was done in the crudest form by (a). the natural religions of the Oriental world. God is, with them, but a power of nature, a substance of nature, in comparison with which the finite and the individual disappear as nothing. (b.) A higher idea of God is attained by the religions of spiritual individuality, in which the divine is looked upon as subject—a transcendental subjectivity, full of power and wisdom in Judaism, the religion of sublimity; as a circle of plastic divine forms in the Greek and Roman religions of beauty; and as the absolute end of the State in the Roman religion, the religion of the understanding or of design. (c.) The revealed or Christian religion first establishes a positive reconciliation between God and the world by beholding the actual union of the divine and the human in the person of Jesus Christ. The God of the philosophies is again as triumphant, I. e., as himself, as incarnate, and as returning from this incarnation to himself. The intellectual content of revealed religion, or of Christianity, is thus the same as that of speculative philosophy; the only difference being that in the case of Christianity the content is represented in the form of the representation, in the form of a history, while in the other it appears in the form of..."
the conception" (Schwegler, *Hist. of Philosophy*, transl. by Seelye, N.Y., 1864, p. 364).

If, now, after having acquired a general idea of Hegel's philosophical system, we ask what solution that system gives to the questions which most interest humanity: what becomes in it of a just and merciful God, of the individuality and agency and morality of his acts, his hopes of another life, of a brighter future, we shall find no satisfactory answer. The system claims to agree completely with true Christianity, yet its tendencies seem to be pantheistic and anti-Christian. For himself he confesses that his philosophical system is in no way contradictory to the Christian religion, and only differs from it in its forms and expressions. Yet in his system the absolute idea, whose evolution constitutes both the spiritual and the material world, becomes, in its last development, the universal mind, the absolute and infinite subject; and this absolute subject is put in the place of God, who therefore can have no self-conscious existence except in finite and individual subjects. And since this system has no substance but the idea, no reality but the development of the idea, and no absolute reality except the mind of the individual agent, because finite and individual subjects themselves are but fleeting forms of the universal mind, which is their substance. What becomes, then, of the immortality of the soul, which presupposes in it an independent substantiality, a true personality, an essential individuality? If the mind of the human soul is to be but the local manifestation of finite minds, without other consciousness than what it finds in individuals, it follows that pantheism can only be avoided by falling into atheism; our personality can only be saved at the expense of that of God himself. Hegel's moral system seems to float between two extremes such as are dangerous as the other. In either case free agency and morality appear equally endangered. While actually destroying all distinctions—which, it is true, he considers as continually reproduced by universal motion, the single existing actually—does not Hegel at the same time obliterate all distinction between good and evil, and destroy one of the surest pledges of a future life? If all is but evolution, the evolution of a given content, then all is virtually determined; and freedom, though proclaimed by the very essence of the mind, becomes necessity, in finite beings: all that they consider as their own work, the fruit of their own actions, becomes really but a part of the universal work, an effect of the eternal activity of the general and absolute mind.

The essence of Hegel's religious philosophy is found in the doctrine that the world, including nature and human life, is only the realisation of the Absolute. The system, presented with the wonderful dialectical skill that Hegel possessed, could not fail to exert a great effect upon the theology of his age. Soon after he commenced the publication of *The Journal for Scientific Criticism* (1817), the Hegelian philosophy began to show its power. This magazine was at first exclusively devoted to the external propagation of Hegelianism, and it added greatly, during Hegel's lifetime, to the number of proselytes. Immediately after the death of Hegel his orthodox followers effected the publication of all his works (G. W. F. Hegel's *Werk: durch einen Verweis von Vorlesungen über Naturphilosophie, Berlin, 1830*). Disputes soon arose in the Hegelian school concerning the Person of God, the Immortality of the Soul, and the Person of Christ, which terminated in the division of the school into two camps. Daumer, Weisse, Gneis, Rosenkranz, Schaller, and others (called the right wing), attempted to connect the-theistic idea of God with the common notion of the divinity contained in the Hegelian philosophy, and to prove the former from the latter; whilst Michelet, Strauss, and others (the left wing), maintained that the pantheistic idea of God, the immortality and the divinity of the Hegelian philosophy, and represented God as the universal substance or the eternal universe, which becomes first absolutely conscious of itself in humanity. Göschel, Heinrichs, Rosenkranz, Marheinecke, and others, attempted, besides, to justify the ecclesiastical idea of Christ, as specifically the only God-man, on philosophical grounds, whereas Bauer, Conradi, Michelet, Strauss, and others, maintained that the unity of the divinity and of humanity was not realized in one individual, but in both worlds of humanity, so that the latter in reality is the God-man. Finally, Strauss and Feuerbach (the extreme left) developed Hegelianism into full-blown atheism and infidelty. "The Hegelian school pretended to find an equivalent for the God of the orthodox religion, a higher manifestation of the ideas of Christian theology in the dogmas of their system. The latter were said to be the pure and final rendering of that which Christianity presents in a popular form. The substantial contents of both were avowed to be identical. The Trinity, the Atomeon, and the other doctrines of the orthodox creed had now—so it was claimed—received a philosophical vindication, and the vulgar rationalism which had flippantly impugned those high mysteries was at length laid low. These sounding pretensions could only mislead the undiscerning. A philosophy which denies the distinct personality of God, and a God-man in particular, must, if it would not be accepted for nothing, be supported by arguments which, if they can by no legienderman be identified with Christian doctrine. The appearance of the *Life of Christ* by Strauss, and the subsequent productions of Baur and his school, through the applications which they made of the Hegelian tenets in New Testament criticism and the teaching of the apostles, placed this conclusion under a 'doubt' (*Fisher, Essays on the Supernatural*, p. 587).

It is not to be understood that Hegel's system is now universally held to be pantheistic or even anti-Christian in tendency. An analysis and translation of Hegel's *Phenomenology of Spirit*, also *Outlines of the Philosophy of Right*, were given in the *Journal of Spec. Philos.* vols. i, ii, iii (St. Louis, 1868-9), by the editor, W. T. Harris, which journal demands the careful study of all who profess to judge of Hegelianism. The points made in the *Journal* are also summed up by a writer in the *Amer. Quart. Church Revue*, Oct. 1869, who maintains not only that Hegel's system is not pantheistic, but that it is the widest and deepest system of thought yet offered to mankind, and that, too, in full harmony with Christianity. We cite from this article the following passages: "To help us to the highest education of our works, the aim of Hegel, and this help is the inestimable gift he offers to us all who shall stand him. To his philosophy is not philosophy unless it 'stands up for all those great religious interests to which alone we virtually live.' Every step of his system is towards the deep truths of the faith; these systems are not mere intellectual abstractions, but the logical results of the most logical systems" (*Journal of Speculative Philosophy*, i, 266).

"In the Christian religion," says Hegel, "God has revealed himself, that is, he has given us to understand what he is; and the possibility of knowing him thus afforded us renders such knowledge a duty. God wishes no narrow-hearted souls or empty heads for his children, but those whose spirit is of itself, indeed, poor, but rich in the knowledge of him, and who regard this knowledge as their only valuable possession" (*Am. Ch. Rev.*, Oct. 1869, p. 415). "They who regard God as negative unity, and the creature not as self-determined, but as a result unmotivated, unjust to the Wight, that God which God should only seem to be; we should only be 'modes' of that substance.' But man, being a self-determining creature, is his own negative unity, and hence his immortality. 'He cannot be a mere phase of a higher being, for he is essentially a real substance, and are made in God's image, and in him spiritually we see ourselves: who does not see, then, that the highest thought in Hegel's philosophy is only an elucidation of the central dogma of the Christian faith, God is this ideal unity, and each person of the Holy Trinity is that one God in the consciousness of the universe and of the persons of this comparison: We have found that Hegel's doctrine of Being is the direct converse of the pantheistic
theory; for whereas the latter considers pure being identical
with the All, Hegel regards it as equivalent to non-
entity. Secondly, pantheism has always held fast to
the abstractions of the understanding; and hence it has
attacked all forms of Becoming; but Hegel’s inductive
method has opposed this strong position, and led us
up to the higher ground of the concrete notion. Thirdly,
the pantheistic view of the Negative is abstract.
Being alone is, and non-being is not.” But with He-
gel the ultimate form of the negative is immanent con-
tradiction; the negative is not a form of positive but
out of positive, the negative. (This leads to the view
of the Universal as the only real, independent individu-
al, the I Am that I Am.) Fourthly, the true panthe-
ists held Distinction to be impossible, while the theory
of the materialistic pantheists was Atomism, the ab-
stantial separate identity of Identity and being. But
Hegel leaves both theories far behind him when he per-
meates to the inmost depths of the subject, and ar-
rives at Self-determination as the origin and principle
of all distinction whatever. (This again, leads to the
self-determination of the Absolute—the spirituality of
God.) Hegel’s unity of pantheism is Hegel’s ‘negative
unity,’ which annuls the independence of multiple fac-
tors; but with Hegel the true unity, the unity of the
Absolute, is purely affirmative, subsisting through the
very independence of its members. (And here we reach
a development of the great Christian idea of the Tri-
inity.) Pantheism taking a new dress, but pantheism
receiving a flat contradiction upon its cardinal
principles” (ibid. p. 403–4).

Literature.—For an able article on Hegel’s philoso-
phy, and its influence on religion and theology in Ger-
many, see Ulrici, in Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, v. 628–
666. See also, besides the works cited above, Kahnis,
History of German Protestantism, p. 196, 244; Saintes,
History of Rationalism, chap. xiii, xviii; Schaff, Aposto-
litic Church, § 84; Princeton Review, Oct. 1848, art. iv;
Morell, History of Modern Philosophy, chap. v.; Bib-
l litheca Sacra, vol. iii; Ver. Kyle Jansen, de la Philo-
sophie de Hegel (Paris, 1855); Haym, Hegel und seine Zeit
(Berlin, 1858); Chalybas, History of Philosophy from
Kant to Hegel; Sibree, translation of Hegel’s Philosophy
of History (London, Bohn); Sloman and Wallon, trans-
lation of Hegel’s Subjective Logic (Lond. 1855); Lewes,
History of Philosophy. unity of philosophy, 4th edit. London
1874, p. Negligent, 321 sq.; Stirling, Secret of Hegel, giving a
translation of portions of Hegel’s Logic (London, 1865, 2 vols. 8vo); Sauvay,
11 sq.; Rosenzweig, Hegel als deutscher Naturalphilosoph (Leipp. 1870).

Hegesippus, one of the earliest historians on Church
History, about A.D. 150 and 180, was originally a
Jew, born near the beginning of the 2nd century.
He was converted to the Christian faith, and came to Rome
about A.D. 168, where he died, according to the Alexan-
drian Chronicle, in the reign of Commodus, about A.D.
190. He wrote a collection of Trypoyygraro, or Memo-
rials of the History of the Church, in five books, from
the birth of our Lord to the time of Eusebius, bishop of
Rome, who succeeded Anictites in A.D. 170. This
work is all lost except a few fragments preserved by
Eusebius, and one in the Bibliotheca of Photius. Sev-
eral passages of this work, which have been translated
by Larcher (Sociol. vol. ii). All that remains of Hegesippus is
given by Routh (Reliquiae Sacrae, 2d edit. i, 205 sq.), and also
by Grabe (Spicilegium, i, 203 sq.) and by Galland (Bibl. Patr. ii, 59).
“The reports of Hegesippus on the charac-
ter and martyrdom of St. James the Just, Simeon of Jersom, and other Christian martyrs, the
and the preservation of the orthodox doctrine in Cor-
thin and Rome, as embodied in the history of Eusebius,
command attention for their antiquity; but, as they
show that his object was apologetic and polemical rath-
er than historical, and as they bear a somewhat Juda-
istic tone (this is far from being an objection), must be received with critical attention” (Schaff, Church
History, vol. i, § 123).

The Socinians of the 17th cen-
tury use his brief statements as evidence of the general
spread of Judaizing tendencies in the 1st and 2d centu-
ries, and Baur, of Tubingen, and his school, have recent-
ly reproduced this view. Bishop Bull answered the
charges in his Times of Christ, and Dr. Johnn Christ, in
219 (Edinburgh trans., i, 139 sq.), has replaced the latter.
“The evidence tends to prove that he was not even a
Hebrew Christian in the sense of observing the law,
and there is the most complete proof that he did not regard
the observance of the law as essential to salvation.
With the above Atonism, has come out of the two
theories of the early Unitarians and of Baur is
utterly destroyed. The Unitarians maintained that
Hegesippus was an Ebionite or Nazarene, and that
consequently the whole Church was in his day Ebionitic,
though, unfortunately, the few Platonizing writers, who
form a misleading exception to the facts, have been
only writers that a subsequent corrupt age has preserved
to us. Baur finds in Hegesippus a most determined
antagonist of Paul, and his testimony is appealed to as
proof that the Petrine faction had gained the predomi-
nance not only in the churches of the East, but even in
those of the Western Church. But the facts are not con-
temporary to the repeated testimony of Eusebius, and to
all the information which we have in regard to the
Western churches, and they both fall to pieces unless it be
proved that Hegesippus insisted upon the observance of the
laws as essential to salvation. (Dom. Christian. Literature, i, 188 sq.) See also Clarke, Suc-
cession of Sacred Literature; Neander, Church History, i, 675, 676; Lardner, Works, vol. ii; Cave, Hist. Lit. i, 265; Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. vii, 156; Dupin, Ecles.
Writers, cent. ii; Ilgen, Zeitschrift, 1865, pt. iii; Hegg.
An Address of the Day, 1865, 2d ed., now used to designate the epoch from which the Mo-
hammedans compute time. The flight of Mohammed
from Mecca to Medina is fixed by the Mohammedans
on July 15, A.D. 622. The process of converting the years
of the Hegira into the date after the birth of Christ
is as follows: Divide the given number of years in the
Hegira, an A.D. date, by 10, and the quotient
expresses the intercalary cycles elapsed since
the Hegira, the remainder represents the number of
years elapsed in the current intercalary cycle); multiply
the quotient by 10,531 (the number of days contained
in an intercalary cycle), adding to the product the sum
of the days contained in the egregular months of the
cycle, the cycles of the elapsed months of the
cycle, the days of the elapsed months of the
cycle, the days of the current year up to the time of reckoning, and to the
result add again, 227,015 (the number of days elapsed
between Jan. 1 of the year 1, and July 15, 622, the date
of the Hegira). The sum of this date and the
number of the Hegira, converted into Julian years by dividing it by
1461 (the number of days in a Julian intercalary period),
then multiplying the quotient by four, and adding to the
product the number of whole years contained in the
remainder of the division, which is obtained by dividing
this remainder by 365. The number of days still
remaining shows the day of the month in the current
Julian year. Or else the following proportion may be
made use of (T representing any date in the Turkish calendar, and C the corresponding date in the Julian
calendar): C = 0.970923 T + 0.03156785, and T = 1.030712 C
- 0.635745. If the date is subsequent to the Gregorian
reform in the calendar, which can only be the case
for modern times, then the Turkish date must first be con-
verted into the Julian, which is then altered to the
Gregorian by adding ten days to it for the period extending
from Oct. 5, 1582, to the end of February, 1700; eleven
days to it for the period extending from March 1 of the
year of our Lord, 1583, to the end of February, 1701;
twelve days for all subsequent dates. In making this
reduction, the difference between the time at which
the day begins in the Turkish and in the Christian
calendar must be taken into consideration whenever the time
day of the month is calculated, as it may make
a difference of one, or even of two, days. Then, the
Turkish year begins at the end of July. The year 1859
A.C. is in their calendar 1275-76. A simpler mode of
reduction, but not strictly accurate, is as follows: The
Mohammedan year = a lunar year of 354 days, and there-
fore 33 Mohammedan years = 82 Christian. To reduce
years of the Hegira, therefore, to years of the Christian
era, subtract 1343. In the year 1667 A.D. the date would
be 622. Thus A.D. 1861 = 1277 of the Hegira.—Pierer,
Universal Lexikon, vii, 721.

Hegius, Alexander (the name, according to some
accounts, being Latinized from the name of his native
village, Heck), a German humanist of the 16th century,
was born in 1498, and died in the year 1543 (the exact
date is undetermined), and died at De-
venter, Holland, in the latter part of 1498. He claims
notice here because of his influence in reviving classical
learning, especially by means of the celebrated college
which he established at Deventer. This school is named
by Hallam (Life of Erasmus, 1, 109, Harpers' ed.) as one
of the three schools thus early established in Western
Europe, outside of Italy, for instruction in the classic
languages, "from which issued the most conspicuous orna-
ments of the next generation." Hegius is said to have
been a friend of Rudolph Agricola, and to have himself
received instruction in classical literature from Thomas à
Kempis. Among his pupils may be named Erasmus,
Hermann von dem Busche, Murmellius, and others,
whose labors and success in literature added lustre to the
teacher's fame. Hegius' writings were but few, and
those main for the form of poetry, in an practical and
philosophical treatises; one of a theological type is found in a miscellaneous collection of writings by
him, published at Deventer, 1580, 4to, and entitled De
Institutione Mystegio Dialogus duo, quibus additionem de
Paucke et Celebiratione et inventione. Hallim (i.e. note)
attributes to him a small tract entitled Conjugationes
Verborum Graecae, Davenstius Noviter extrema la-
ure collocate impressa, "without date or printer's name,
and which he regards as the first book printed this side
of the Alps in Greece.—Herzog, Real-Enzyklop. xiii, 616;
Hallim, Nov. Biog. Générale, xxxii, 768. (J. W. M.)

He is also called Aegidius, Gesualdo. (Adolphe, Ges-
ualde, sous le nom de Gesualdo, and Seghers, sous le
nom de Seghers.) His real name is Jacobus ou Ge-
adult: also "v. x. &c. te EQUIX", so called from leaping, 2
Chron. xiii, 21; Ezra viii, 33; Dan. viii, 5, 8 [Ezra vi, 17]; v. t. ga'ish, a buck, Gen. xxx, 35; xxxii, 14; 2
Chron. xi, 31; Prov. xxx, 31). See GOAT.

Heidus abraham, professor of theology at Ley-
den, was born at Frankenthal, in the Palatinate, Aug.
10, 1567. He was educated at Amsterdam and Leyden,
and in 1627 was appointed to a pastoral charge in the
latter city. He is said to have been ordained to the minis-
tery of theology, and to have been a professor in the uni-
versity of Leyden. Heidus held a mild view of the doctrine of predestination, and adopted the Cartesian
philosophy, of which he became a strong advocate. This
involved him in various controversies, in which he bore
himself admirably. Yet, when nearly eighty years old,
he was dismissed from his professorship by the curators
of the University. He died at Leyden Oct. 15, 1678.
His Corpus Theologiae Christianae was posthumously
published (1666, 2 vols. 4to).

Heidegger, Johann Heinrich, D.D., a Swiss Prot-
estant theologian, was born near Zurich July 1, 1635.
He studied at Heidelberg and Göttingen, and was pro-
nounced, and soon after became extraordinary professor of
Hebrew, and then professor of theology. In 1659 he
went to Steinfurt as professor of t eology and ecclesi-
astical history, "War having disturbed the people of
Steinfurt, Heidegger returned to Zurich in 1665, and was
professor of theology in that city until 1667. He died at Zurich Jan. 18, 1698. He was the compiler of the famous Formula Consensus, adopted by the Synod of Zurich in 1675. See Helveti-
conferences. His writings are chiefly polemical; the
most important are Disputatio theologica de fide
(Georg, 1667, 4to) — De tile decreturarum Consenti
Triamenti questiones theologicae (Steinfurt, 1662, 8vo) —
De Articulis fundamentaliis Judaicae Religionis (Stein-
furt, 1664, 4to) — De Hist. sacrae Patriarcharum (Amst.
1667-1671, 2 vols. 4to; Zurich, 1729, 2 vols. 4to) —
Anatome Concilii Tridentini (Zurich, 1672, 2 vols. 8vo) —
Disertationes selecta sacram theologiam dogmaticam,
icc. Illustr. (Zur, 1660, 4to; Zurich, 1740, 4to) — Encyclo-
dicum succinctum (Zurich, 1681, 8vo; Amsterdam, 1688,
Jena, 1723, 8vo) — Histor. Papatatus, novissimae Historiae
Lutheranorum et Calvinitarum Fabro opposita (Amst., 1684,
1/2 ed. 1698, 4to; French, Amst., 1685, 2 vols. 12mo) —
Mysteriorum Babilonij, seu in Dici Jocanni theologorum
sacrae et apologicae De Bethanae Studia (Amst., 1672,
1/2 ed. 1687, 2 vols. 4to) — In eis Concordium ecclesi-
asticarum Testamentum Manuductio (Amst., 1687, 8vo) —
Tumulus Concilii Tridentini, etc. (Zurich, 1690, 2 vols.
4to) — Labores exegetici in Josam, Mattheum, Roman-
num, Coroniam et Hebræos (Zurich, 1700, 4to) — Corpus
Theologum christanum (Zurich, 1728, 4to) — Medals. Medit.
theol. Christi, in graecam et romanum tyrannum, etc. His
autobiography was published by Hofmeister under the
title Histor. Vita J. H. Heideggeri, cui non secus historia
Ecclesiae temporis iussum, nec non literarum concernantia,
insinuatur (Zurich, 1689, 4to).—Nicera, Memoires pour
sccur, xiv, 14 Hist. (ed. prec. as xiii, 766 sq.); Schweizer, in Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, v, 652.

Heidelberg Catechism, one of the symbolic books
of the Reformed Church. Its name is derived from the
city in which it was compiled and first printed. It also
sometimes styled the Palatinate Catechism, from the
territory (the Palatinate) of the princes of Heidel-
berg and the Palatinate under whose auspices it was prepared. The original German title of the (évito princeps) is Catechizm, or Christlicher Underricht, wie der in Kirchen
und Schulen der Christlichen Pfalz getrieben wird. It
was the result of the ancient and ancient and ancient
Orthodox Church of the Church. Johannmayer, 1553 (Catechism, or Christian In-
struction, according to the Usages of the Churches and
Schools of the Palatinate).

I. History. — Soon after the introduction of Protas-
tianism into the Palatinate in 1546, the controversy bet-
ween Lutherans and Calvinists broke out in this territory;
and thus, especially under the elector Otto Heinrich (1556-69), it
raged with great violence in Heidelberg. Frederick
Iii, who came into power in 1559, adopted the Calvinist
view on the Lord's Supper, and favored that side with all his princely power. He reorganized the Sa-
pier College (formerly by the elector's will in the theo-
ological school, and put at its head (1662) Zacharias Ur-
sinus, a pupil and friend of Melancthon, who had adopted
the Reformed opinions. See URSINUS. In order to put
an end to religious disputes in his dominions, he deter-
ned to separate the divinity faculty of the university
into three parts (as distinguished from the five parts in
the Catechism of Calvin and the previous draft of
Ursinus), and the genial warmth and union of the
whole work, are chieflly due to Olevianus" (Schaaf, in

When the Ursinus draft was completed, Frederick laid
it before a synod of the superintendents of the Palat-
inate (December, 1652). After careful examination it
was approved. The first edition, whose full title is
given above, appeared in 1653. The preface is dated
January 19 of that year, and runs as in the name of the
elector Frederick, who probably wrote it. A Latin ver-
ion appeared in the same year, translated by Johannes
Lagius and Lombertus Pithopeus. The German version
is the authentic standard. Two other editions of the
German version appeared in 1563. What is now the eightieth question (What difference is there between the Lord's Supper and the Roman Mass?) is not to be found in the first edition; part of it appears in the second edition, but that is necessary to give the revision in full as follows: What difference is there between the Lord's Supper and the Popish Mass? The Lord's Supper testifies to us that we have full forgiveness of all our sins by the one sacrifice of Jesus Christ, which he himself has once accomplished on the cross; and that by the Holy Communion we are affixed to a cony who has his true body is now in heaven at the right hand of the Father, and is to be there worshipped. But the Mass teaches that the living and the dead have not forgiveness of sins through the sufferings of Christ, unless Christ is still daily offered for them by the priest; and that Christ is invisibly under the form of bread and wine, and is therefore to be worshipped in it. (And thus the Mass at bottom is nothing else than a denial of the one sacrifice and passion of Christ, and an accursed idolatry.)

The occasion for the introduction of this eightieth question appears to have been the decree of the Council of Trent concerning the Mass, the 17th of September, 1562. This declaration, and the anathemas pronounced at Trent against the Protestant doctrine of the sacraments, had not time to produce their effect before the issue of the first edition of the Catechism. But in 1564 the necessity for a declaration on the Protestant side, and such a declaration is furnished in this eightieth question, which was added to the Catechism in 1563. The first edition of 1563 was for a long time lost; that given by Niemeyer (Collectio Confessiorum, p. 390) is the third of that year. But in 1564 Pastor Wulff found a copy and reprinted it, with a history of the text. (Der Hein. Katechismus in seiner ursprünglichen Gestalt, Bonn, 1864, 4to.) This cleared up all doubt as to the various editions of 1563.

In 1865 Professor Schaff published a very valuable edition, revised after the first edition of 1563, with an account of the origin of the church of Christ, which was published in parallel columns. The Introduction gives an admirable account of the literature and history of the Catechism. The text used is that given by Niemeyer, and not that of the first edition of 1563, which, as has been stated above, was reprinted in 1864. See also Dr. Schaff's edition of the Heidelberg Catechism as it is by him in the form of a public church confession and the instruction of youth. (American Review, June, 1863, p. 571.)

The 300th anniversary of the formation and adoption of the Heidelberg Catechism was celebrated in 1863. One of the most important and permanent fruits of this celebration was the publication of The Heidelberg Catechism, Tercentenary Edition (New York, 1863, sm. 4to). This noble volume gives a comprehensive Introduction (by Dr. Nevin), and a critical edition of the Catechism in four texts—Old German, Latin, Modern German, and English. The text of the English version is that of 1563, with the minor corrections of 1566. The permanent fruits of this celebration was the publication of The Heidelberg Catechism, Tercentenary Edition (New York, 1863, sm. 4to). This noble volume gives a comprehensive Introduction (by Dr. Nevin), and a critical edition of the Catechism in four texts—Old German, Latin, Modern German, and English. The text of the English version is that of 1563, with the minor corrections of 1566. The introduction gives an admirable account of the literature and history of the Catechism. The text used is that given by Niemeyer, and not that of the first edition of 1563, which, as has been stated above, was reprinted in 1864. See also Dr. Schaff's edition of the Heidelberg Catechism as it is by him in the form of a public church confession and the instruction of youth. (American Review, June, 1863, p. 571.)

The Latin text (with the German of the 3rd ed. of 1653) is given in Niemeyer, Collectio Confessiorum, p. 390 sq.; also in an edition by Dr. Steiner, Catechesis Christianae seu Catechismus Heidelbergerensis (Baltimore, 1862). Another valuable edition in English is The Tercentenary Monument (Chamburgh, 1863, 8vo), containing twenty essays by eminent Reformed theologians of Germany, Holland, and America, on the Catechism, its origin, history, its special relations to the German Reformed Church. For an account of its spread abroad see Alting, Historia Ecclesiae Palatinatae (Franke, 1701); Struve, Fälische Kirchengeschichte (Frankfort, 1721); Munting, Grundriss der pfälzischen Kirchengeschichte bis 1742 (Heidelberg, 1788); Köcher, Katechetische Geschichte der Reformirten Kirche (Jena, 1760); Planck, Geschichte d. prot. Theologie, ii, 2, 475-491; Van Alpen, Geschichte u. Litteratur d. Heidel. Katechismus (Frankfort, 1800); Augustin, Einleitung in die beiden Haupt-Katechismen d. Evang. Kirche (Elberfeld, 1824); Ersch und Gruber's Allg. Encycl. ii, 4, 386 sq.; Nevin, Hist. and Gens. of the Heidelberg Catechism (Chamburgh, 1847); Schaff, The Heidelberg Catechism (Philada., 1851); and Struve, Heidelberg Catechism (N. York, Sheldon and Co., 2 vols. 12mo.), an admirable practical commentary, with a valuable historical introduction. Among the other commentators are Ursinus, Explicationes Catechesis Palatinae (Opera, 1012, vol. 1); Ursinus, Apologia Catechismi Palatinici (Opera, vol. 2), that it is Reformed. The Heidelberg Catechism (N. York), Sheldon and Co., 2 vols. 12mo.), an admirable practical commentary, with a valuable historical introduction. Among the other commentators are Ursinus, Explicationes Catechesis Palatinicae (Opera, 1012, vol. 1); Ursinus, Apologia Catechismi Palatinici (Opera, vol. 2), that it is Reformed.
HEIDENHEIM 161

HEINICKE


Heidenheim (Heidenheim), WOLF, or BENJAMIN SPINOZA, a Hebrew scholar and typographer, is distinguished in Hebrew literature by his exertions to provide editions of the Pentateuch free from the errors which marred preceding copies. Indeed, the city in which he lived, Rodolcin, near Frankfurt on the Main, became in his day the centre of attraction for Hebrew typography. But he has also left us works of his own which betoken a thorough acquaintance with Hebrew philology. Just even assigns him a place by the side of Mendelssohn. Heidenheim died in 1692, at a very old age. His most important works are: the Hebrew grammar (Rödelheim, 1690, 12mo)—השלמ לב אנקדדס,—a treatise on different parts of Hebrew grammar (Rödelheim, 1692, 12mo)—השלמ לב אנקדדס,—the Pentateuch, with a Hebrew commentary, etc. (Rödelheim. 1818-1821, 8vo). We have also from him a catalogue of his works, containing 800 in number, under the title of Heidenheim (Rödelheim, 1833, 8vo).—Furst, Bibl. Judaica, i, 369; Eidehoffer, Introduct. to Hebr. Lit. p. 422; Steinschneider, Bibliogr. Heb. p. 69; Jost, Gesch. des Judenth. p. 361; Kittro, ii, 267. (J. H. W.)

Heifer (הָאָלֶף, eglah, fem. of בַּשֵׁל, calf). The name of the “heifer” is, in the Moab. and Par. texts, applied to the female of the ox, and in the Vulg. to the female of the bull. The Hebrew language has no expression that exactly corresponds to our “heifer,” for both eglah and parah are applied to cows that have calved (Isa. vi. 7-12; Job xxxi. 10; Isa. vii. 21); indeed, eglah means a young animal of any species, the full expression being נְבִיקָה, a "heifer of kind," (Deut. xxii. 3; 1 Sam. xvi. 2; Isa. vii. 21). The heifer or young cow was not commonly used for ploughing, but only for treading out the corn (Hos. xi. 1; but see Judg. xiv. 18), when it ran about without any headstall (Deut. xxii. 4); hence the expression "do not smite the heifer in the "backside," (Deut. xii. 20, 21). To which Israel is compared. A similar sense has been attached to the expression "calf of three years old," (Deut. xii. 20, 21), i. e. unweaned, in Isa. xv. 5. Jer. xlviii, 34; but it has by some been taken as a proper name, Eglah Shelachiyah, such names being not very uncommon. The sense of "distaste" is conveyed undoubtedly in Amos iv. 1. The comparison of Egypt to a "fair heifer" (Jer. xlvii. 20) may be an allusion to the well-known form under whichApis was worshipped (to which we may also refer the words in ver. 15, as understood in the Sept. "Why is the bullock (μουρος καλυπ- της) exempt away?"), the "destruction" threatened being the bite of the gad-fly, to which the word keros would aptly apply. "To plough with another man's heifer" (Judg. xiv. 18) implies that an advantage has been gained by unfair means. The proper names Eglah, Enqa'il, and Parah are derived from the Hebrew terms at the head of this article. See RED HEIFER.

Heilmann, JOHANN DAVID, a learned German theologian, was born at Osnabrick Jan. 18, 1727. He studied at Halle, became rector of Hameln in 1764, and professor of theology at Göttingen in 1754, where he died Feb. 28, 1780. He was the author of several pious works, the Specimen obser. ad illustr. N. T. (Halle, 1748, 4to)—Parrallele entw.rsp. irrijion d'evbngiualitb und die ancien adver.-I-V.--- 

soïres de la religion Chrétienne (Halle, 1750, 8vo)—Compendium theologian dogmatica (Göttingen, 1761 and 1774, 8vo)—Opuscula theolog. Argumenti (ed. Danovius, Jena, 1747-77, 2 vols. 8vo).—G. G. Heyne, Heimarl Memmo Memoria (Halle, 1764); Jocher, Allm. gelehr. Lexikon, continued by Schliemann, 1797. His chief work is the Heidelb. Cat. (Halle, 1760, 4to). Heilepfn, JACOB, a distinguished Jewish philologist and historian, flourished in the first part of the 18th century. He is said to have been born at Minden in 1728, but the time of his death is unknown. He wrote a History of the Jews, divided into three parts: Chronicles of Historic Events, from the Creation to his own time. 2. Alphabetical Catalogue of the 3. Miscellanies and Addenda. The Doctor's Index of Jewish Literati (Karlsruhe, 1769, and Zollikon, 1806, folio). Also a Hebrew Rabbinic Dictionary adapted to the Rabbot, Sifra, Meikilna, Yitkut, and the works of the Calalists (Dresden, 1806, fol). Furst commends the excellency of Heilepfn's work and believes that it was an able contribution to Hebrew literature.—Furst, Bibl. Jud., i, 372; Eierdender, Introduction to Heb. Literature, p. 440. (J. H. W.)

Heineccius, JOHANN MICHAEL, a Lutheran divine, was born at Eisenberg Dec. 12, 1674, and was educated at Jena, Frankfort, and Giessen. After a visit to Holland and Hamburg, he settled for a time in Heimsstadt as tutor (1695), but in 1699 he took up a benefice at Goslar. In 1709 he removed to Halle as pastor, and in 1720 was appointed consistorial counsellor and ecclesiastical inspector of the circle of the Saal (Staakkreis). He died Sept. 11, 1722. His chief work, Eigentliche und wahrhaftige Abildung der alten und neuen griechischen Kirche nach ihrer historischen und geschichtlichen Gliederung (Leipzig, 1711), presents historically the doctrines, government, liturgy, and morals of the Greek Church, ancient and modern. It is still a work of great value. Besides works in the departments of antiquities and history, Heineccius wrote Prüfung der sogenannten neuen Propheten und ihres ausserordentlichen Aufstandes (Halle, 1715), against the French prophet (q. v).—Send schreiben an Thomas Itig wegen des Termin Graft, on the Terminist controversy: —De Jurisconsult. Christianis prissorum sacrorum eorumque in ecclesiis meritis (Halle, 1720); Colloquiae religiosa et civils prae conservatione inter bina hea sacculo habita (Halle and Magdeburg, 1719, 4to).—Hercog, Real-Encyclop. xix, 624; Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Générale, xxxii, 782; Sax, Omomation literature, pt. vi, p. 45. (J. H. W.)

Heinricke, SAMUEL, a German philanthropist, "the most distinguishing mark of the clergy of the Protestants in Germany," was born April 10, 1729, at Nautschitz, near Wissenfelde, in Prussia, and died at Leipzig April 30, 1770. He passed his early life as a farmer and soldier, then pursued a course of study in the University of Jena, was subsequently for ten years a tutor of the children of count Schimmelmann at Hamburg, and then removed to Eppendorf. In this latter place, as early as 1754, he became much interested in a deaf and dumb child, and devised a system of instruction for it, which proved so successful as to attract other deaf mute to him for instruction, and led to the establishment by the elector of Saxony in 1772 of a school at Leipzig for the education of deaf mutes. This school, "the first ever established or supported by the civil government," was placed under Heinricke's charge, was continued after his death under the charge of his widow, and is still existing and prosperous. The "method of instruction" was by articulation and repeating "lip," and is said to have been superior in some respects to that of the abbé de l'Epee. Heinricke's labors and noble character gained for him deservedly the affection of the German people, though his method of treatment was much ridiculed by the rabbinical schools. Some of his writings were marred by coarse and ill-natured criticisms of opinions differing from his own. He wrote upon the
Heinsius, Daniel, ein eminenter Scholar, wurde 1580 in Ghent. Er studierte für einige Monate an den Universitäten Franeker, aber, trotzdem, zu determinieren, ihn selbst zu richten, er kam zu Leyden, wo er unter Joseph Scaliger studierte. In 1599 begann er mit Lehre in der Universität, und Historiographier der Epoche. Es war seine Aufgabe, diejenigen, die dem Mythos Rechnung trugen, und das, was die Schriften von 1700 bis 1800 veröfentlichten, deutschen Schriftsteller (1802-16). (J.W.M.)

Heinsius, Daniel, ein eminenter Scholar, wurde 1580 in Ghent. Er studierte für einige Monate an den Universitäten Franeker, aber, trotzdem, zu determinieren, ihn selbst zu richten, er kam zu Leyden, wo er unter Joseph Scaliger studierte. In 1599 begann er mit Lehre in der Universität, und Historiographier der Epoche. Es war seine Aufgabe, diejenigen, die dem Mythos Rechnung trugen, und das, was die Schriften von 1700 bis 1800 veröfentlichten, deutschen Schriftsteller (1802-16). (J.W.M.)

Heir (some form of the verb ἡρί, to possess; Gr. ηρίων, a receiver by lot). The Hebrew institutions relative to inheritance were of a very simple charac-

ter. The patriarchal system, in which the property was divided among the sons of the legitimate wives (Gen. xxii, 10; xxiv, 36; xxxv, 5), a larger portion being as-
signed to one, generally the eldest, on whom devolved the duty of maintaining the females of the family. See Bertho. The sons of concubines were portioned off with presents (Gen. xlix, 1 sq.), but this may have been restricted to cases where the children had been adopted by the legitimate wife (Gen. xxx, 3). But Ja-
ocab made the sons whom he had by his concubines heirs, as well as the others (Gen. xlix, 12-27). Moses laid no restrictions upon the choice of heirs in this respect, and we may infer that the sons of concubines, for the most part, received an equal share with the other sons, from the fact that Jephthah, the son of a concubine, complained that he was excluded from his father's house without any portion (Judg. i, 1-7). Daughters had no restrictions upon the choice of heirs, for...; a marriage property, consisting of a maid-servant (Gen. xxiv, 24, 29) or some other property. As a matter of special favor they sometimes took part with the sons (Job xiii, 15). The Mosaic law regulated the succession to the property of women. It was to be divided among the sons, the eldest receiving a double portion (Deut. xxii, 17), the others equal shares: if there were no sons, it went to the daughters (Numb. xxvii, 8), on the condi-
tion that they did not marry out of their own tribe (Numb. xxvii, 6 sq.; Tob. vi, 12; vii, 13), otherwise the patrimony was forfeited (Josephus, Ant. iv, 7, 5). If there were no daughters, it went to the brother of the deceased; if no brother, to the paternal uncle; and, failing these, to the next of kin (Malachi, chap. iv, 9-11). In the case of a widow being left without children, the nearest of kin on her husband's side had the right of marry-
ing her, and, in the event of his refusal, the next of kin (Ruth iii, 12, 13): with him rested the obligation of redeeming the inheritance. If it had been either sold or mortgaged: this obligation was termed ἱερὸν ἀνατίθημα ("the right of inheritance"), and was exercised in other cases besides that of mar-
riage (Jer. xxxi, 7 sq.). If none stepped forward to marry the widow, the inheritance remained with her until her death, and then reverted to the next of kin. See Wawaw. The object of these regulations evidently was to prevent the alienation of the land, and to retain it in the same family: the Mosaic law enforced, in short, a strict entail. Even the assignment of the double por-
tion, which under the patriarchal regime had been at the disposal of the father (Gen. xlviii, 22), was by the Mo-

Oasis, into the hands of the eldest son (Gen. xlviii, 17). The case of Achenas, to whom Caleb presented a field (Josh. xvi, 18, 19; Judg. i, 15), is an exception; but per-
haps even in that instance the land reverted to Caleb's descendants either at the death of Achenas or in the year of Jubilee. The land being thus so strictly tied up, the notion of a temporal enjoyment being understood, it would be known to the Jews: succession was a matter of right, and not of favor—a state of things which is embodied in the He-
brew language itself, for the word ἱερόν (A.V. "to inher-
it") implies possession, and very often forcible possession (Deut. ii, 12; Judg. i, 29; xx, 24), and a similar idea lies at the root of the words ἱερός and ἱερίων, generally translated "inheritance." Testamentary dispositions were, of course, generally superstitious: the nearest ap-
proach to the idea is the blessing, which in early times conveyed temporal as well as spiritual benefits (Gen. xxvii, 19, 37; Josh. xvi, 19). It appears, however, that eventually the father had at least the right of expressing his last wishes or will in the presence of witnesses, and probably in the presence of the heirs (2 Kings xx, 13). The wills in the apostle Paul's writ-

tings are borrowed from the usages of Greece and Rome (Heb. ix, 17), whence the custom was introduced into Judaea: several wills are noticed by Josephus in connection with the Herods (Ant. xiii, 10, 16; xviii, 2, 3; War, ii, 3, 2). With regard to personal property, it may be presumed that the owner had some authority over it, at all events during his life-time. The admission of a slave to a por-
tion of the inheritance with the sons (Prov. xviii, 2), prob-
ably applies only to the personalty. A presentation of half the personally formed the marriage portion of To-
bit's wife (Tob. viii, 21). A distribution of goods during the father's life-time is implied in Luke xvi, 11-13: a distinction may be noted between ὀικία, a general term applicable to personality, and Ἐπώκοιος, the landed property, which could only be divided after the father's death (Luk. xiv, 17). There is a striking resemblance between the Hebrew and Athenian customs of heirship, particularly as regards heiresses (ἱηθηγορος), who were, in both nations, bound to marry their nearest relation: the property did not vest in the females even for his life-time, but devolved upon the son of the deceased, and their sons, who also bore the name, not of his father, but of his mat-
ternal grandfather. The object in both countries was the same, viz. to preserve the name and property of ev-
ey family (Smith, Dict. of Class. Ant. a. v. Epicerius).

In Col. i, 15, Christ is called the "first-born of every creature," i.e. "the heir of the whole creation," as in Heb. i, 2 he is called the "heir of all things." Believers
HELAL

are called "heirs of the promise," "of righteousness," "of the kingdom," "of the world," "of God," "joint heirs with Christ," i.e. so-called partners of the blessings which God bestows upon his children, implying admission to the kingdom of heaven and its privileges (Gal. iii, 29; Heb. vi, 17; xi, 7; Jas. ii, 5; Rom. iv, 13; viii, 17), and finally possession of the heavenly inheritance (John xvii, 22-24; Rev. vii, 22). See ADOPTION.

Hel'ah (Heb. Chele'ah, תַּלָּא, "place of abundance," 2 Sam. x, 16; but in ver. 17, Chele'ah, תַּלָּא, with hé "directive," תַּלָּא המ at the end, Josephus Χελαώνας), for which the margin prefers תַּלָּא (Sept. Ablhá, Vulgate Helana), a place "beyond the river" (i.e. either east of the Jordan or west of the Ephraimites, although Josephus, Ant. viii, 6, 3, understands it to "near the Euphrates"). But it is better to accept the view of the Samaritans who put a city so named on the north side of the Euphrates), where David gained a victory over the combined forces of the Syrians under Hadadezer, apparently between Damascus and the country of the Ammonites. Edward (Isr. Geen, ii, 629) compares the Almahata (Ἀλμαχώτα) of Ptolomy (iii, 15, 29), on the west bank of the Euphrates near the mouth of the Phraates, but this is not probable.

Hel'bah (Heb. Chele'bah, תַּלָּב, "flatness; Sept. Ἐλ- βα in r. Χηλβα and Χιλβα), a town in the tribe of Asher, from which the Canaanites were not expelled. It is so named between Achzib and Aphihek (Judg. i, 31), but not (as Gesenius suggests) identical with Alalah, which is also mentioned in the same verse. Perhaps it was situated in some fertile tract (as the name implies) in the valley of the Kishon, possibly at the east.

Hel'bon (Heb. Chele'bon, תַּלָּבון, פַּי, i. e. fertile; Sept. Ἐλβόν in r. Χαλβόν), a name which occurs only in Ezek. xxi, 18, where "the wine of Helbon" is named among the commodities brought from Damascus to the great market of Tyre. The Syriac, Symmachus, the Chaldee, and the Vulgate, all regard the word as an appellative descriptive of the quality of the wine as piscus ramosus or vinum distinctum. But it is better to accept the indication of the Sept., which, by giving the proper name Χαλβόν, must be supposed to have had in view a place which has hence generally been inferred to be the same with that old city of Syria that appears under the form of Halab (Χαλβόν) in Ptolomy (Geo. v, 15) and Strabo (xv, 560). The latter authority assigns this Halabony as a place famous for wine; and in describing the luxury of the kings of Persia, he says they would have wheat brought from Assos in Zelia, Chalbonian wine out of Syria, and water from the Enlatus (the river Ula of Dan, viii, 2), which was the lightest of any. Both Hesychius and Plutarch (Vit. Alex. ii) speak of this famous wine. It has generally been thought that the name was derived from Halbon, where it was supposed the wine was produced. But it is not strange that Damascus should be represented as supplying the wine of Helbon to the marls of Tyre, if we consider that the native merchants themselves carry it thither. A passage which Bochart quotes from Athanasius (i, 51) throws light on this point: "The king of the Persians drank Chalbonian wine alone; which, says Poseidonius, was also produced in Damascus" (Bochart, Opp. ii, p. 496). We are thus led, both by the testimony of the Arabians and by that of Poseidonius, who was himself a native of Syria, to look for a Helbon or Halbon at or near Damascus. Senecus Nicator is said to have changed the name to Berea (Niceph. Callist. xiv, 39), but the old name, as we see from Plutarch, was not forgotten, and on the capture of the city by the Arabs in the 7th century it was again resumed (Schultens, Index Geogr. in vitam Saladiuin, i. e. Halemba). The city referred to has usually been identified with the modern Aleppo, a large city of Syria, called Helb by the Arabs; but Russel states (Natural Hist. of Aleppo, Lond. 1794, i, 80) that but little wine is made there, and that the white wines especially are poor and thin, and difficult to keep; nor has this place any pretension to celebrity for its vintages. Hence Prof. Hackett is inclined to adopt the suggestion made to him while visiting this region in 1852 by Dr. Paulding, one of the American missionaries there, that the Biblical Helbon should rather be sought in the ruins of one of the principal villages of the same name lying in the waste of Antipatris on the eastern slope of Anti-Lebanon, north of the Baramda. He was informed by those who had visited the place that the grapes produced there are remarkable for their fine quality, and that the wine obtained from them is regarded as the choicest wine of that part of Syria (Illustrations of Scripture, N. York, 1855, p. 214). Dr. Robinson, to whom he mentioned this suggestion, visited the place in his last journey to Palestine, and fully accords with the identification. He thus describes the valley and town: "Wady Helbon is a valley an hour or more in length, shut in by high and rugged sides. The bottom is a strip of level ground, everywhere well cultivated. Throughout the whole extent of the valley there are well-kept vineyards. Even places so steep that the vine-dresser can approach them with difficulty are made to produce an abundance of grapes. In Damascus the grapes are sold by estate proprietors and obtained flavor, and from them is made the best and most highly-priced wine of the country. The village of Helbon is nearly midway up the valley. There are many ruins in and around it, but mostly dilapidated; and hewn stones, capitals and pilasters, and broken columns are built into the walls of the modern dwellings. On the west of the village is an extensive ruin, supposed to have once been a temple. On some of the blocks are fragments of Greek inscriptions no longer legible" (new ed. of Researches, iii, 471, 472).

Helch'ia (Χαλκείας, 1 Esd. vii, 1) or Helchi'as (Χαλκίας, 2 Esd, i, 1), the Greek and Latin forms of the name of the high-priest Hilkiah (q. v.).

Hel'dai (Heb. Cheldai, צֶלֶדַי, worldly; Sept. Xekal, but οἶκος τοῦ Ἱλιασα in Zech. vi, 10; Vulg. Holida), the name of two men.

1. A Netophathite and descendant of Othniel, chief of the twelfth division (24,000) of David's forces (1 Chron. xxvi, 15). B.C. 1014. In 1 Chron. xi, 30 (where he is called Heldeo) his father's name is said to be Baanah; and in the parallel passage (2 Sam. xxii, 29) he is called Heldai.

2. One of those lately returned from the Captivity whom the prophet Zechariah was directed to take with him when he went to crown the high-priest Joshua, as a symbol of the future Messiah's advent (Zech. vi, 10). B.C. 530. In ver. 14 the name is written Hellem.

Hel'dua, the first station mentioned in the Jerusalem Itinerary south of Berytus and north of Phophyreton; now probably khan el-Khudra (Robinson, Bib. Res. ii, 453).—Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 320.

Hel'eb (Heb. Chele'eb, תַּלָּב, "flatness; Sept. Ἐλεά, Vulg. Helaoz), son of Baanah the Netophathite, and one of David's warriors (2 Sam. vii, 30); elsewhere more correctly Helked (1 Chron. xi, 30), or, still better, Heldei (1 Chron. xxvi, 15).

Hel'ed (Heb. Che'ed, תַּלָּד, "this world, as thrasir; Sept. Ἐλεάς, Vulg. Helaoz, son of Baanah, a Netophathite, and one of David's warriors (2 Sam. vii, 30); called in the parallel passage (2 Sam. xxii, 29) Heldei, but more accurately Heldei in 1 Chron. xxvi, 15.

Hel'ek (Heb. Chele'ek, תַּלָּא, a portion, as Sept. Χαλβεὶς and Χαλβα, Vulg. Helaoz), the second son of Gilead of the tribe of Manasseh (Jos. xvii, 28), whose descendants were called Helkites (Hebrew Cheleki, תַּלָּכֵי, etc., Num. xxvi, 30; Sept. Xalekai). B.C. cir. 1612.

Hel'ekite (Num. xxvi, 30). See HELEK.
HELEN

He\'lem, the name of one or two men, variously written in the Hebrew.

1. He\'lem (הצֵּלֶם, a stroke; Sept. 'Ελαμ, Vulg. He\'lem), a brother of Shemer (or Shemiram) and great-grandson of Judah. The number of sons of whose are enumerated in 1 Chron. vii. 35; perhaps the same with Hotham, ver. 32. B.C. prob. cir. 1608.

2. Che\'lem (כְּלֶם), in Chaldæa a dream, as often in Dan.; or robust; Sept. או כְּפַרוֹנְתָּא כִּרֹת, Vulg. Helen), one of those associated with Zechariah in the typical crowning of the high-priest, or, as it appears, himself also crowned (Zechar. vi. 14, "Heled," prob. by emendation of Heled or Helvel, ver. 10), he was actuated by deep earnestness, a childlike piety, and a kindly spirit. He preached in both the German and English languages. (H. H.)

HELEN

He\'len(a)\'na, a minister of the German Reformed Church, and son of Rev. J. C. A. He\'lenstein, was born March 29, 1781. He spent his youth as a printer, and afterwards studied theology with Rev. Dr. Becker, of Baltimore, Md. He was licensed and ordained in the German Reformed Church in May, 1801, and was pastor successively at Allemang, Berks County, Pa.; Goshenhoppen, Montgomery County, Pa.; Ephrata, Lancaster County, Pa.; Hanover and Berlin, York County, Pa.; Lockingham County, Pa.; and Mechanicsburg, Cumberland County, Pa. He died Oct. 18, 1842, leaving a large family, with which many innocent eccentricities, he was actuated by deep earnestness, a childlike piety, and a kindly spirit. He preached in both the German and English languages. (H. H.)

HELENSTEIN, John Conrad Albert, one of the fathers of the German Reformed Church in the United States, was born at Mönchengladbach, Germany, Oct. 27, 1748. He studied theology at the University of Heidelberg, and was sent by the Synod of Holland, in company with Rev. J. H. Helferich and Rev. J. G. Gebhard, as missionaries to America. He arrived in New York Jan. 14, 1772, and soon after took charge of the congregation at Germantown, Pa., and remained there until 1778, when he returned to his native country, and labored there until his death, May 17, 1790. He was an eloquent and successful preacher, and his ministry, both at Lancaster and Germantown, proved a great blessing. Several small volumes of his sermons have been published. (Harbaugh, Fathers of the Reformed Church, ii. 222 sq.)

HELENSTEIN, John Henry, a minister of the German Reformed Church in the United States, was born at Mosbach, Palatinate, Oct. 22, 1739. After studying theology, he was licensed Sept. 22, 1761, and labored for a time in his own country. In January, 1772, he arrived in New York as a missionary, together with Rev. J. C. A. He\'lenstein and Rev. J. G. Gebhard, and remained after the Revolution at Westober, Lehigh County, Pa., where his labors comprehended as many as seven congregations at one time. Here he remained, declining all calls from other churches, and labored faithfully until his death, Dec. 5, 1810. "During his ministry Mr. Hel\'enstein baptised 5630, and confirmed 4000 souls. He may be regarded as the father of the German Reformed Church in the field over which his labors extended. Though that part of the Church did not escape the general stagnation of a later period through German rationalism and indifference, yet the vestige-ground upon which it was placed, by means of his labors, has been a blessing to it down to our day."—Harbaugh, Fathers of the Reformed Church, ii. 241 sq.)

HELFERICH, John, a son of Rev. John Henry Hel\'ferich, was born in Weissenberg, Lehigh County, Pa., Jan. 17, 1755. He completed his theological studies with Rev. Dr. Samuel He\'lenstein in 1801. He was licensed and ordained in 1819. He became pastor of the same congregations in Lehigh County, Pa., which his father had served for many years, in which field he continued to labor with much zeal and success to the end of his life. He died suddenly, April 8, 1832. During his ministry he baptised 4501, and received into full communion with the Church, by confirmation, be-
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between two and three thousand persons. He preached out of the German language. (H. H.)

He'li, or rather Eli (Eli', in some ed. 'Hali) or Ha'li, Heb. נֶאֶל, a name that occurs once in the N. T. and once in the Apocrypha.

1. The third of three names inscribed between Achitob and Amarias in the genealogy of Ezra, in 2 Esd. i, 2, for which there is no corresponding name in the Heb. list (Ezra vii, 2, 3).


Hell'as, the Latin form (2 Esd. vii, 89) of the name of the prophet ElijaH.

HeiIo'dorus (Ἡλιόδορος, i. e. gift of the sun, not unfrequent Greek name), the treasurer (Ο ἵδι τῶν ἱερομαντών) of Seleucus Philopator, who was commissioned by the king, at the instigation of Apollonius (v. c), to carry away the private treasures deposited in the Temple at Jerusalem. According to the narrative in 2 Macc. iii, 9 sq., he was stayed from the execution of his design by a "great apparition" (τινάς ανάμονας), in consequence of which he fell down "hidden in great darkness," and speechlessness. He was afterwards restored at the intercession of the high-priest Onias, and bore witness to the king of the inviolable majesty of the Temple (2 Macc. iii. i). The full details of the narrative are not supported by any other evidence. Josephus, who was acquainted with 2 Macc., takes no notice of it (Ant. xi, 3, 8) ; and the author of the so-called iv Macc. attributes the attempt to plunder the Temple to Heliordus, and differs in his account of the miraculous interposition, though he distinctly recognizes it (De Macc. 4, πέφυγω στὴν ἑορτάσαν έλεγχον . . . κατασκεύαζον ετί ἔφασεν ο Απόλλωνις . . .). Heliordus afterwards murdered Seleucus, and made an unsuccessful attempt to seize the Syrian crown (App. Syr. 46). B.C. 173. Comp. Wernsdorf, De fide Lbr. Macc. § lv. Raffles's great picture of "Heliordus" has often been copied on the engraving.

HeiLo'dorus of Emeza, in Syria, flourished in the latter part of the 4th century after Christ. He was the author of the celebrated romance entitled Αθηνόποικ, or account of the love and adventures of Theogenes and Charicles, the oldest and best of the Greek romances, and the model of many subsequent ones. A letter attributed to Heliodore afterwards Heliordus became a Christian, and was made bishop of Tricosa, in Sicily, where he introduced the regulation that every married priest should, upon his ordination, separate from his wife or be divorced (Socrates, Hist. Eccl. v, 22). Nicophorus states (Hist. Eccl. v, 54) that a provincial synod, because of the injurious tendency of the Αθηνόποικ upon the minds of the young, decreed that Heliordus should either condemn and disown it, or resign his bishopric. This statement is generally rejected as improbable, since it is made by no other author, and the Αθηνόποικ contains nothing of a corruptive tendency. The best edition of the Greek text is that by Corcos (Paris, 1804, 2 vols. 8vo).—Smith, Diet. Grk. and Rom. Bioog. and Mythology, ii, 373; Dunlop, Hist. of Fiction (London, 1845, 1 vol. 8vo), p. 18-24; Phoebus, Cod. 73; Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, v, 699. (J. W. M.)

Helio'galabauus (Ela'galabauus), emperor of Rome, was born at Emesa about A.D. 295. His name was va'rus Auitus Bassianus, but he was made priest of Elagabalus (El-Gabal), the Syro-Phoenician Sun-god, about A.D. 217, and took that name. In May, 218, through the intrigues of his mother, Julia Messa, with the soldiers, he deposed the proclaimed emperor; and, soon after, Marcinia, who was marching to put down this usurpation, was defeated. His reign, which lasted not quite four years, was characterized by superstition, licentiousness, and cruelty to a degree hardly rivalled by the worst Roman emperors. He introduced the worship of the Sun-god into Rome, and even passed a decree that no other celestial power should be worshipped. The praetorius slew him in camp, A.D. 222. As he himself introduced a new religion into Rome, it was not his policy to persecute, and so, during that time, the Christians had "rest."

Hel'ki'as (Heb. Chelok'ay), יְהוֹשֵׁעׁ, for יְהוֹשֵׁעׁ, Jehohra in his portion; Sept. Ἰφαὶ, son of Merioth, and one of the chief priests in the time of the high-priest Joia'kim (Neh. xii, 15). B.C. post 588.

Hel'kath (Heb. Chelatkit'h, יְהוֹשֵׁע'ת,' יְהוֹשֵׁע'ת, Josh. xix, 55, but יְהוֹשֵׁע'ת, even without pause-accent, Josh. xxi, 31; "construct of יְהוֹשֵׁע'ת, smoothness, as in Gen. xxvii, 16, or por'tion, as in Gen. xxxiii, 19, etc.; Sept. Xeïl(e)52), a town of Asher, on the eastern border, mentioned as the starting-point in the direction (apparently southward) to Achealph (Josh. xix, 25); assigned as one of the Levitical cities (Josh. xxi, 31). In 1 Chron. vi, 75, it appears to be erroneously written Hukok. See HUKKOK. In the Onomasticon it is simply mentioned by Eusebius as Ελικάν, by Jerome as Elocath; but neither seems to have known it. De Sauly claims to identify it with a village called Kerkhe, which he reports not far south-east of Akka (Narratives, l, 68) ; and Schwarzs (Palestine, p. 191) thinks that it may be the modern El-rak, about seven miles north-east of Akka; but neither of these positions is in the neighborhood indicated by the text, which rather requires a locality nearer the north-eastern angle of the tribe, not unlikely at the ruined village Ukrit, about twelve miles S.E. of Tyre, as proposed by Van de Velde (Memoir, p. 220). See HELKAT-HUKKOK.

Hel'kath-has'urim (Heb. Chelkath's hate-Turim', יְהוֹשֵׁע'ת הַהַטַּעְרִים, plot of the rocks), a designation of the plain just below the pool of Gibeon, on the east, acquired from the deadly combat between twelve of Ishbosheth's men and as many of David's, which formed a prelude to the general engagement (2 Sam. ii, 16). See HUKKOK. As to the name, "Ewald approves the reading which the Sept. seem to have followed, Ἰάολος τίνος σπηλαίων, apparently from their reading Σπήλαις, as that which alone gives a suitable meaning to the name (Gesch. ii, 1, 275, note 1).GENENUS renders 'the field of swords,' which can hardly be admitted; for, though ἱμερός is used in the sense of an 'edge,' it is never used simply for 'sword.' First gives Φεσελακάθητη, 'rock—smoothness,' as the meaning, the place being smooth and level as a surface of rock. Aquila gives ἄλαος τῶν σπηλαίων, and the Vulg. 'Ager roburatorum, takingUNC in a figurative sense, of which, however, there is no other instance.

Hel'ki'as (Xa'kius), a still different Greek form (1 Esd. i, 8) of the name of the high-priest HILKIAH.

Hell, a term which originally corresponded more exactly to Hades, being derived from the Saxon hailen, to cover, and signifying merely the covered, or invisible place—the habitation of those who have gone from this visible terrestrial region to the world of spirits. But it has been so long appropriated in common usage to the place of future punishment for the wicked, that its earlier meaning has been lost sight of. In the English Bible it is used in the wider sense.

1. Hebrew and Greek Terms.—The three words, which all but monopolize the subject, are ΥΔΝ, Sheol, in the O. T.; and Αύη, Hades, and Πάνω, Gehenna, in the N. T. ΥΔΝ occurs 63 times; in 61 of these it is rendered in the Sept. by Αύη; twice by θέλων (2 Sam. xxii, 14); and twice once by θέλω in the common text (Job xxvi, 19; Ezek. xxxix, 21). In the Vulg. ΥΔΝ is translated 48 times by Infernus, and 17 times by Infernus[a mostly Inferi (plur.)]. In our A. V. it is represented 31 times by Grave, 31 times by Hell, and 8 times by Pit. In the N. Test. our word Hell occurs 28 times; 12 times it stands for Infernus, and in the other 3 has been translated, as Tischendorf and Bruder (Concord.) on Rev. iii, 7) for Αύη. The Vulg.
allows the learned authors of Liddell and Scott’s Greek Lex. [s.v. *Ἀδησ*] throw some doubt on this view of the origin of the word, because of its aspirated beginning, in Attic Greek. But surely this is precarious ground. Is it certain that even in the Hellenistic period *ἀδησ* was invariably aspirated? Ἐφεσιος [Sept. c. Theb. (Paley) 810] has ἀδησ προίφασις [with the loan], according to the best editing. It is true that this is in a chorus, but in the ἄγμα, 1605, also a chorale line, we read μην ἐν Ἀδω μεταλιθησθεν [with the aspirate], as if the usage were uncertain. Possibly in the elliptical phrase *ἐν Ἀδω* [soil ἀδησ] the aspirate occurs because the genitive is really the name of the God [not of the region, which might, for distinction, have been then unaspirated]. Phthisar accordingly explains it by αἰσθε καὶ ἀδησον [De Ind. et Ost. p. 382], and in the Ἕβρων Ἀδησ ἄγμα is defined as χωμάτων ἀδησ, στερεάν αὐκίνων ἀδησ *φοινικιοι*. Ἀδων is thus "the invisible place or region?" *Locus invisus nostris subterraneus,* as Grotius defines it.

3. Ἐφεσιος (Ἐφεσία) is composed of the two Heb. words הַוָּשְׁא (valley) and בַּיִלְת (Himmon, the name of the proprietor of the valley). In the Sept. Παρασεία is used in Jos. xliii. 6, to account for the valley mentioned as Παρασεία ἄγμα, the full expression of which is ἡ Παρασεία ἄγμα. The shorter appellation ἄγμα occurs in the same verse. The Rabbinical writers derive ἄγμα from ἄγγος, *quarire* [zu grom or morn, in Ezek. xxiv. 33], as if indicative of the cries of the children in the horrid rites of the Moch-boat worship (see Buxtorf, Lex. Rab. p. 108; Glassiaw [ed. Dathan], Philolog. Sacii, i. 806). The etymological remarks have paved our way to the next section of our subject.

(11.) Biblical Meaning of these Three Terms.—1. Meanings of ἄγμα, Sheol.—(1.) The "Grave." Much controversy has arisen whether within the meaning of Sheol should be included "the grave," indeed this is the only question of difficulty. The fact, which we have already stated, that our A.V. translates ἄγμα quite as often by "grave" as by the general term "hell," supplies a prima facie reason for including it. Without, however, insisting on the probability that polemical theology, rather than Biblical science, influenced our translators, at least occasionally, in their rendering of the word, we may here adduce on the other side the telling fact that the other of all the ancient versions not one translates in any passage the Hebrew Sheol by the equivalent of grave. The other of the ancient versions, like the versions in the midst of the fragments show (see Origin, Hexaplia, passim), everywhere give ἄδησ for ἄγμα (sometimes they use for the locative case the older and better phrase σιγ., in Ἀδων, sometimes the more recent and vulgar σιγ. τον Ἀδων, in τον Ἀδω), The Samaritan text in the seven passages of the Pentateuch has either בַּיִלְת (Sid) or בַּיִלְת. Onkelos and Jonathan everywhere, except in five passages, retain בַּיִלְת. The Peshito everywhere in both Testaments renders the Hebrew Sheol and the Greek Ἰδαιος by בַּיִלְת [Sheol]; and, as we have already seen, the Vulg. translates the same words in both the O.T. and the N.T. by infernum (plur. Inferni mortalium) and, above all, Infernus (see above for particulars). It is to the later Targumists (the pseudo-Jonathan and the Jerusalem Targum), and afterwards to the Rabbinical doctors of the Middle Ages, that we trace the version of the "sepulchre" and "the grave" (thus in Gen. xxxvii. 85; xliii. 38; xlviii. 79. 31), these Targumists rendered Sheol by בַּיִלְת [the house of burial]; similarly did they render Πειλις, 7; Job vii. 9; xlv. 13; xviii. 14; 13, 16; xxi. 13; Eccles. ix. 10, and other passages, in which it is observable how often they have been followed by our translators). See, for more information on this point, archbishop Usher, Works [by Elrington], iii. 310-321; see also, to fully, Böttcher (p. 158), who cites, sec. 184 (149), who quotes Kashi and Aban Ezen [on Gen. xxvii, 2].
or digging down in the earth; but every place besides a man's body lieth either entire or as parts; otherwise they which are not committed to burial, nor laid in graves, but have ended their life in shipwrecks, deserts, and such like ways, should not seem to be reckoned among those which are said to be raised from the grave'.

(167)

We have here, then, the first meaning of the Hebrew בְּנֵי נֶבֶל, largely applied, as we have seen, in our A. V. to "the grave," considered as a universal sense of the grave, as in the last note), commensurate with death itself as to the extent of its signification. (Comp. "the grave and gate of death" of the English Liturgy, Collect for Easter Even.) Though we carefully exclude the artificial grave, or בְּנֵי נֶבֶל, from this category, there is no doubt, as bishop Lowth has well shown (De Sacra Poesi Hebr. Proli. vii. ed. Oxon. with notes of Michaellis and Rosenmüller, 1821). p. 65-69), that the Hchrewe poets drew all the imagery with which they describe the state and condition of the dead from the funeral rites and pomp, and from the vaulted sepulchres of their great men. The bishop's whole treatment of the subject is quite in the worth perusal; he only uses his final summary: "You will see this transcendent imagery better and more completely displayed in that noble triumphal song which was composed by Isaiah (xiv. 4-27) ... previous to the death of the king of Babylon. Ezekiel has also grandly illustrated the same sense by the machinery of the last prophecy concerning the fall of Pharaoh (xxxii. 18-29)."

For an excellent vindication of the A. V. in many of its translations of the grave, we refer the reader to the treatise of archbishop Usher (Answer to the Jesuit's Challenge, Works [ed. Ellington], iii. 319-342 and 329-340). We doubt not that, if grave is an admissible sense of בְּנֵי נֶבֶל, our translators have, on the whole, made a judicious selection of the passages that will best bear the sense: their purpose was a popular one, and they accomplished it, in the instance of uncertain words and phrases, by giving them the most intelligible turn they would bear, as in the case before us. We undertake not to decide whether it would be better to leave the broad and generic word Sheol, as the great versions of antiquity did, everywhere; whether, e. g., Jacob's lament (Gen. xxxvi. 35; xlii. 38) and like passages would be more suitably, if not correctly, rendered by the simple retention of the original word. The question is equally involved in the force in the observation often made (see Corn. a Lapide, on Gen. xxxvii. 35; Bellarmine and others, aduced by Leigh, Crit. Sacra, i. 299) that it was not the grave of Joseph which Jacob meant, for he thought indeed that his son was devoured of wild beasts, and not buried." See more on this passage in Pearson, Creed [ed. Chevalier], p. 437; Fulke, Translations, etc., p. 814; both of whom writers defend the version of grave. Ainsworth ad loc. (among the older commentators) and Knobel (among the moderns) contend for the general word של in [Knobel, Schottentrich]. Rosenmüller learnedly states both views, and leans in favor of שֶׁׁמֶל muti moriuminar star devastum (Schol. i. 576).

(2) The other meaning of בְּנֵי נֶבֶל, "Hell," so rendered in thirty-one passages of A. V., according to the more ancient and, as it seems to us, preferable opinion, makes it local, i.e. the place of disembodied spirits. (orious & tius hēmis mere διώκειν ἀμφότεροι καὶ ἀνώτατος, o τὸς μακρὸς ημῶν ἁμαρτίας τεταρτάς ἵδονας, Ἀπόκ. Cesareus in Apocal. c. 63.) A later opinion surpasses the word to indicate "not the place where souls departed are, but the state and condition of the dead, or their permission in death," as bishop Pearson calls it (Cred [ed. Chevalier], p. 495). On this opinion, which that the great divine "not admit" of a full "loci definitio," we shall say nothing more than that it is at best only a deduction from the foregoing local definition. That definition we have stated in the broadest terms, because in reference to Dr. Barrow's enumeration (Serm,
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on the Creed [Art. "He descended into Hell"], Works [Oxford, 1880], p. 416, 417] of the questions which have arisen on the subject before us, we believe that Holy Scripture warrants the most ample of all the positions suggested by that eminent writer, to the effect that the Shoel of Hades is "the place of good and happy souls," or that of bad and miserable ones, but "indifferently and in common of both those.

We propose to arrange the Biblical passages so as to describe, first, the state of the occupants of Shoel, and, secondly, the locality of it, in some of its prominent features. As to the first point, Shoel is (a) the receptacle of the spirits of all that depart this life. (Among the scriptural designations of the inhabitants of Shoel is מַּיְצֵל (in Prov. xxvi, 16) is rendered "congregation of the dead" (or "departed") in the A. V. This is better than the Sept. rendering συναγωγή γειώντων, and Vulg. "coetus gignantum." There is force in the word מַיְצֵל thus applied, derived from the use of the word to designate the great "congregation" of the Jewish nation; see CONGREGATION.

For the use of the word מַיְצֵל, as applicable to the dead, see especially Böttcher, De Int., p. 348, etc. The word מַיְצֵל also occurs in the grand passage of Isa. xiv. [In ver. 9 "Shoel stirs up its Riphaim on the entrance of the spirit of the king of Babylon." ריפאים is met with in six other places in the same sense of departed spirits. It is connected withINED, "weak," which occurs in Numm. xiii, 18, and other passages [see Firsts, Hebr. W.-b, i, 388]. The gentile noun [mentioned in Gen. xiv, 5 and elsewhere, and rendered Riphaim and Giants] is of the same form, but probably of a different origin [see Gesenius, Thes. p. 1309.]. This general signification appears from Psa. lxxxix, 47, 48, and Isa. xxxviii, 18, 19 (in which latter verse the opposition in its universal sense between Shoel and the state of life in this world is to be observed). We do not hesitate, with archbishop Usher (Works, iii, 319), to translate לְיֵצְל in these passages "hell" or "sheol," instead of "grave," as in the A. V. Shoel, therefore, is (b) the abode of the wicked, Num. xxxii, 18; Job xxiv, 19; Psa. ix, 17 (Hebr. 18); xxxii, 17 (18); Prov. v, 5; ix, 18; Isa. lvi, 9; and (g) of the good [both in their "embodied" condition] in Psa. xvi, 10, comp. with Acts ii, 27, 31; Psa. xxx, 3 (4); xlix, 15 (16); lxxvi, 13; Isa. xxxv, 17, compared with Job, xxx, 14; Hos. xi, 14; with 1 Cor. xv, 55. With regard to the second point, touching some local features of Shoel, we find it described as very deep (Job xi, 8); dark (Job x, 21, 22); (yet confest and open to the eye of God, Job xxvi, 6); with "valleys" (Gesenius, Thes. p. 1549) or depths of various gradations (Psa. lxxvi, 18; compared with Deut. xxxii, 22); Prov. ix, 18; with bars (Job xvi, 17, comp. with Jon. ii, 6) and gates (Isa. xxxviii, 10); minister before us; hence the dead are said "to go down" יֵלֵד to Shoel, Num. xvi, 30, 33; Ezek. xxxi, 15, 16, 17 (compared with Job vii, 9; Gen. xii, 30). Comp. Josephus (Ant. xvii, 1, 9), who, when describing the tenets of the Jewish sects, attributes to the Pharisees the belief of a future state, in which "rewards and punishments" are to be dealt out "to men in their disembodied state" (רַחֲבָא צַעַדְתֵּא) "under the earth" (יוֹם צוֹרָהָא דַּעַסִיָּאָאָא נאֶא הָאָא דַּעַסִיָּאָא נאֶא הָאָא דַּעַסִיָּאָא נאֶא הָאָa לוֹא נאֶא הָa הָa הָa הָa הָa הָa הָa הָa הָa הָa הָa הָa הָa הָa הָa הָa הָa הָa הָa הָa הָa הָa הָa הָa הָa הָa Hades (in Greek) is devoted to the happy happiness of Hades, but embraces in certain passages the ultimate blessedness of heaven, so there is no violence in supposing that Геенна (from the final signification which it possibly bears in Matt. v, 29, 30; xxiii, 15, equivalent to the Тηράσος referred to by Peter, 2 Epist. ii, 4, as the place where the fallen are reserved unto judgment, or "until sentence," comp. Jude v, 6) goes on to mean, in perhaps most of its occurrences in the N. T., the final condition of the lost, as in Matt. xxxiii, 33, where the expression ἡ κρίσις τῆς γέινσις probably means the condemnation [or sentence] to Gehenna as the ultimate doom. See GEHENNA.

IV. Synonymous Words and Phrases.—Most of these are given by Eisenmenger, Entdeckte Juden, i, 294, and Galatians, De Arcanis, vi, 7, 345.) 1. טּוֹבֶד, Dumah, in Psa. cxxv, 17, where the phrase הָיֵצִכֶל "all that go down into silence," in the Sept. παντὸς ὁ αἰματρικοῦ ἡ τίνις γέινσις, while the Vulg. has omnes qui descendunt in infernum (comp. Psa. cxxv, 17). 2. אֲבַדְדָּה, in Job xxvi, 5, is in poetical apposition with לְיֵצְל.
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(comp. Prov. xxvii. 20 [Kethib], where ה is in conjunction with ב, forming an hendiadys for destructive hell; Sept. אֲדֹנָי וּאֱלֶהוֹ; Vulg. Infernus et persidio; A.V. "hell and destruction"). 3. הָרָעָץ, Beir Shadon, Psal. iv. 24; A.V. "pit of destruction;" Sept. פּוֹרִי לְהַר שָׁדְוָה; Vulg. Patet interita (see also passages in which הָרָעָץ and הָרָעָץ occur separately). 4. הָרָעָץ, Tadmor, with or without בּ, in Ps. cvi. 10, and other passages; Sept. Σατια Σατία, Vulg. Umbra mortis; A.V. "shadow of death." 5. הָרָעָץ, Tachyphyl Eres, in Is., xlii. 23; A.V. "lower parts of the earth" [Shod or Hades, Gesen.]; Sept. Τού ταύτης τῆς γης τρόχαν. 6. loc. cit., 20, 26, etc., where the phrase is inverted, הָרָעָץ הָרָעָץ, of similar meaning is הָרָעָץ הָרָעָץ; Ps. cxxxvii. 6 (7). 7. הָרָעָץ, Topothè, in Is., xxx. 33 [according to Eisenhenger]; for another application of this word, see Genesis, Thee, s.v.; and Rosenmuller, ad loc. The phrase first used of Abraham, Gen. xxxv. 8 (where it occurs, in the solemn description of the holy patriarch's end, when between death and burial), "He was gathered to his fathers;" it expresses the transition of the soul to Hades to the company of those who preceded him thither (see Cajan, ad loc., and Gesen. Thees. s.v. נֵפֶשׁ [Niphal], p. 131, col. 1). 8. To σκότως το τι ζωήν, the "outer darkness" of Matt. viii. 12, and pass.; refers probably to what Josephus (War, iii. 25) calls φύλακες κοιλωσίας, "the darker Hades." 9. Ecclesiastical Statements as to the Condition of Those in Hell. The dreadful nature of the abode of the wicked is implied in various figurative expressions, such as "outer darkness," "I am tormented in this flame," "furnace of fire," "unquenchable fire," "where the worm dieth not," "the blackness of darkness," "torment in fire and brimstone," "the ascending smoke of their torment," "the lake of fire that burneth with brimstone," etc. (Matt. xi. 12; xiii. 42; xxi. 13; xxx. 30; Luke xvi. 24; comp. Matt. xvi. 4; Mark ix. 43-48; Jude 13; comp. Rev. xiv. 10, 11; xix. 20, xx. 14, xxi. 8). The figure by which hell is represented as burning with fire and brimstone is probably derived from the fate of Sodom and Gomorrah, as well as that which describes the smoke as ascending from it (comp. Rev. xiv. 10, 11, with Gen. xix. 24, 28). To this coincidence of description Peter also most probably alludes in 2 Pet. ii. 6. See Fines.

The names which in many of the other instances are given to the punishments of hell are doubtless in part figurative, and many of the terms which were commonly applied to the subject by the Jews are retained in the New Testament. The images, it will be seen, are generally taken from death, capital punishments, tortures, prisons, etc. And it is the obvious design of the sacred writers, in using such figures, to awaken the idea of something terrible and fearful. They mean to teach that the punishments beyond the grave will excite the same feelings of distress as are produced on earth by the objects employed to represent them. We are so little acquainted with the state in which we shall be hereafter, and with the nature of our future body, that no strictly literal representation of such punishments could be made intelligible to us. Many of the Jews, indeed, and many of the Christian fathers, took the terms employed in Scripture in an entirely literal sense, and supposed there would be actual fire, etc., in hell. But from the words of Christ, who, as the apostles nothing more can with certainty be inferred than that they meant to denote great and unending miseries.

The punishments of sin may be distinguished into two classes: 1. Natural punishments, or such as necessarily follow a life of servitude to sin. 2. Positive punishments, or such as God shall see fit, by his sovereign will, to inflict.

1. Among the natural punishments we may rank the privation of eternal happiness (Matt. vii. 21, 28; xxii. 18; xxxv. 41; compare 2 Thess. i. 9); the painful sensations which are the natural consequence of committing sin, and of an impendent heart; the propensities to sin, the evil passions and desires which in this world fill the human heart, and which are doubtless carried into the world to come. The company of fellow-sinners, and of evil spirits, as the natural results of such conditions, may be accounted among the natural punishments, and must prove not the least grievous of them.

2. The positive punishments have already been indicated. It is to these chiefly that the Scripture directs our attention. "There are but few men in such a state that the mere nature of the natural punishments will appear to them terrible enough to deter them from the commission of it." Experience also shows that to threaten positive punishment has far more effect, as well upon the cultivated as the uncultivated, in deterring them from crime, than to announce, and lead men to expect, the merely natural consequences of sin, be they ever so terrible. Hence we may see why it is that the New Testament says so little of natural punishments (although these, beyond question, await the wicked), and makes mention of them in particular far less frequently than of positive punishments; and why, in those passages which treat of the punishments of punishment, and images are constantly employed as suggest and confirm the idea of positive punishments" (Knapp's Christian Theology, § 156.

As the sins which shut out from heaven vary so greatly in quality and degree, we should expect from the justice of God a corresponding variation both in the natural and the positive punishments. This is accordingly the uniform doctrine of Christ and his apostles. The more knowledge of the divine law a man possesses, the more his opportunities and inducements to avoid sin, the stronger his incentives to faith and holiness set before him, the greater will be his punishment if he fails to make a faithful use of these advantages. "The servant who knows his lord's will and does it not, deserves to be beaten with many stripes." "To whom much is given, of him much will be required" (Matt. x. 15; 21, 22, 24; xxi. 15, 16; Luke xii. 48). Here Jesus says that the heathen who acted against the law of nature would indeed be punished; but that the Jews would be punished more than they, because they had more knowledge (Rom. ii. 9-29). In this conviction that God will, even in hell, justly proportion punishment to sin, we must rest satisfied. We cannot now know the precise degree; the precise degrees, as well as the precise nature of such punishments, are things belonging to another state of being, which in the present we are unable to understand. For a naturalistic view of the subject, with a copious review of the literature, see Alger, Doctrine of a Future Life (Bost. 1860). For the theological treatment of this topic, see HELL. PUNISHMENTS.

HELL, CHRIST'S DESCENT INTO (descensus ad inferos; κατάβασις εἰς ᾠδῶν), a phrase used to denote the doctrine taught, or supposed to be taught, in the fifth article of the Apostles' Creed.

1. History of the Clause.—The clause is not found in the Nicæo-Constantinopolitan Creed (A.D. 381), nor in any creed before that date. Pearson states that it was not "so anciently used in the Church" as the rest of the Apostles' Creed; and that it first appears in the Creed of Aquileia, 4th century, in the words of the Apollinarist Theodoret, in the Insermo, King, in his Histor. Symbol. Apost. c. iv, asserts that it was inserted as a testimony against Apollinarianism; but this view is controverted by Whenge in his Commentatio on this article of the Creed (1836). It is certain, however, that the clause was afterwards used by the orthodox as an argument against the Apollinarian heresy which denied to Christ a rational human soul (see Neander, Church History, Torrey's ed., ii, 438). Rufinus (+ 410), while stating that it is found in the Creed of Aquileia, denies that it existed before that time in the Creed as used in the Roman or Eastern churches. Rufinus adds that "though the Roman and
Oriental churches had not the words, yet they had the sense of them in the word buried," implying that the words "he descended into Hades" are equivalent to "he descended into the grave." Socrates, Hist. Eccl. ii, 37, 41, gives it as stated in the Arian church to have been recited at Sinope in 390. It is given in the Athanasian Creed (8th century). It fails to be found, except in the Arian church and in a few MSS., before the 6th century, but became quite common in the 7th, and is universal after the 8th century (Pearson, The Creed, 271). It is also found in the Apostles' Creed as used in the Greek and Roman churches, the Lutheran Church, and the Church of England. It is also retained in the Creed as used by the Protestant Episcopal Church, with a note in the rubric to "any churches may omit the words He descended into hell, or may, instead of them, use the word present in the place of departed spirits, which are considered as of the same meaning in the Creed." The clause was omitted by the Convention of 1785, but the English bishops objecting, it was replaced, with the qualification named, after a great deal of discussion in 1786, 1787; and 1792, when White, "He descended into Hades," was added, at Ottawa, in 1792, of the Protestant Episcopal Church (Munnscher, in Bib. Sac. April, 1850). It is omitted in the Creed as used by the Methodist Episcopal Church.

II. The Doctrine.—I. Scripture.—There is no passage in which it is expressly stated that Christ descended into hell, but there are expressions which, in some sense or other, imply his descent. After his death, into the "place of departed spirits." (1) Thus David says (Ps. xcvii, 9, 10): "Therefore my heart is glad, and my glory rejoiceth; my flesh also shall rest in hope. For thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." (2) And Peter applies this passage to Christ (Acts ii, 22-25): "For David speaketh concerning him, I foresaw the Lord always before my face; for he is on my right hand, that I should not be moved: therefore did I set my heart rejoice, and my tongue was glad; moreover also my flesh shall rest in hope: because thou wilt not leave my soul in hell, neither wilt thou suffer thine Holy One to see corruption." (3) (2 Peter iii, 5-8) ("Now he ascended," etc.), is supposed by some writers to imply the descent into Hades, but the better interpreters apply it to the incarnation. (3) Paul, in Rom. vi, 23 ("Who shall descend into the deep, etc."—"who shall descend into Hades"), speaks of the descent of Christ into the abyss. (4) 1 Pet. iii, 18-20: "For Christ also hath once suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the Spirit: by which he was also made partaker of the glory in promise, and because he suffered and was put to death in the flesh, that in the days of Noah, while the ark was a preparing, wherein few, that is, eight souls were saved by water." This passage is relied on by many, not only as strongly asserting that Christ descended into Hades, but also as explaining the object of that descent. But the weight of interpretation, from Augustine downwars, seems to be against this view. Dr. A. Schweitzer, in a recent monograph (Hinwendung zur Hölle als Mythos, etc., Zurich, 1898, p. 43), interprets the passage to mean that the preaching of the word was "addressed to the spirit imprisoned in the days of Noah, while they were yet in the flesh; and this preaching consisted, to a great extent, in the building of the ark. By this work, undertaken at the command of the Spirit of Christ, and prosecuted, through many years, to completion in the sight of the people, they were warned to remove themselves in the ark, in the days of Noah, while the last flood swept them away" (Quarterly Review, July, 1893, p. 384). This view accords with that held by Augustine, Aquinas, Scaliger, Beza, Gerhard, Hammond, Leighton, and others, and which has of late been adopted by Dr. Hofmann (Schriftenwerke, ii, 1, 335), of the influence of the pre-existent Spirit of Christ at the time of the Deluge. It is also the interpretation of the passage given by Dr. A. Clarke (Comm. on 1 Pe. 170 HELL)

So also Dr. Bethune: "Christ, in Noah, by his Spirit, preached to them before the Flood, just as in his ministers he preaches to us by his Spirit now" (Lectures on the Heidelberg Catechism, i, 400). Alford (Comment. ad loc.) refers to the passages (e.g. Meyer) of the view of various commentators, ancient and modern, on the passage, and subjoins his own view. as follows: "I understand these words to say that our Lord, in his disembodied state, did go to the place of detention of departed spirits, and did there announce his work of redemption to the disembodied spirits of those who refused to obey the voice of God when the judgment of the Flood was hanging over them. Why these rather than others are mentioned—whether merely as a sample of the like gracious work on others, or for some special reason unimaginable to our understanding, I do not pretend to determine. I only add that the plain words of Scripture, and to accept its revelations so far as 
vouchsafed to us. And they are vouchsafed to us to the utmost limit of legitimate inference from revealed facts. That inference every intelligent reader will draw from the fact here announced; it is not purgatory, it is not universal restitution, but it is one which throws blessed light on one of the darkest enigmas of the divine justice—the cases where the final doom seems infinitely out of proportion to the lapse which has incurred it; and as we cannot say to what other cases this ex nihilo may be appropriately applied, it is perfectly consistent with the divine will to limit its occurrence or its efficacy. The reason of mentioning here these sinners above other sinners appears to be their connection with the type of baptism which follows. If so, who shall say that the blessed act was confined to them?" (Comm. on N. T. vol. iv, pt. 1, p. 968).

3. The Fathers.—In several of his homilies, he says that the fathers find the doctrine that "Christ descended into Hades to announce to the souls of the patriarchs and others there the accomplishment of the work of redemption, and to conduct them to his kingdom of glory." So Justin Martyr (167?); Diod. cum Tyrkh. § 72, cites a passage from Jeremiah (cut out to deal with the plain words of Scripture, and to accept its revelations so far as vouchsafed to us). Therefore, Irenæus (200?), Adam. Her. iv, 27, 2: "The Lord descended into the regions beneath the earth, preaching his advent there, and declaring the same to be accomplished by those who believe on him" (see also v, 81, 2). Clement of Alexandria (c. 220) devotes chap. vi of book vi of the Stromata to the preaching of the Gospel to Jews and Gentiles in Hades. See also Tertullian, De Anim., vii, 4; Origen, Cels. vii, 19; Gregory, Hist. Egl. iv, 26: "Christ, in the beginning of his kingdom, in a certain sense, denied the descendens ad inferos; but Marcion (21st century) regarded it as intended to benefit the heathen who were in need of redemption. The later fathers were still more distinct in their utterances; see Cyril, Catech. iv, 11; xiv, 19; Ambrose, De Inerr. 37, 42; Augustine, Epist. cliv et al.; Jerome, Epist. xxii et al.; the latter fathers generally adopted the notion that, till Christ's death, the patriarchs and prophets were in Hades, but afterwards (from the time that Christ said to the thief on the cross that he should be with him in Paradise) they passed into Paradise, which, therefore, they distinguished from Hades. Indeed, the latter fathers looked on as a place of rest to the just, but Paradise as far better. Here, of course, we begin to perceive the germ of the doctrine of the Limbus Patrum. Yet the notion entertained by the fathers was vastly different from that of the medieval Church. Another opinion, however, prevailed in the church in the earliest centuries; Christ not only translated the pious from Hades to more joyous abodes, but that even some of those who in old times had been disobedient, yet, on hearing Christ's preaching, believed, and so were saved and delivered from torment and had a place of rest. This is the prevailing opinion of Augustine. He was evidently puzzled as to the meaning of the word Hades, and doubted whether it ever meant a place of rest and happiness (although at
times he appears to have admitted that it did); and, thinking it a place of torment, he thought Christ went thither to save some souls, which were in torment, from thence. Some, indeed, went so far as to think that hell was cleared of all souls that were there in torment, and that all were taken up with Christ when he rose from the dead and ascended to heaven, but this was reckoned as a heresy. . . . One principal reason why the fathers laid great stress on the belief in Christ's descent to Hades was this. The Arians and Apollinarians denied the existence of a natural human soul in Jesus Christ. 'Nor the time of our Lord's humanity, namely, that he was perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting,' was most strongly maintained by asserting the article of his descent to Hades. For whereas his body was laid in the grave, and his soul went down to Hades, he must have had both body and soul. Accordingly, the fathers with one consent maintain the descent of Christ's soul to hell' (Brown, *On the Thirty-nine Articles*, p. 98). Nevertheless, it was not opposition to Apollinarianism that originally led to the adoption of the clause into the Creed; the Gnostic, long before, had denied the descensus ad inferos, but Apollinarianism was the first to make an issue of it. (Hagenbach, *Hist. Aquinas, to *De Doctrina*; *Summa Theol.*, III, 3, 3.)

What may be called the mythology of Christendom, the "descensus into hell" has always played an important part. The apocryphal Gospel of Nicodemus contains a vivid description of it, very highly colored. A voice like that of Moses is heard crying: "Lift up your gates, and be ye lifted up," etc. But the act of descent is not performed on a repetition of the call were opened, "and the King of glory entered, in form as a man, and all the dark places of Hades were lighted up." And straightway Hades cried out (ch. xxii.), 'We are conquered. Woe unto us!' But who is this that hath such power and privileges? And what art thou, that comest hither without sin, small in seeming but excellent in power, the humble and the great, slave at once and master, soldier and king, wielding power over the dead and the living, sailed to the cross, and the destroyer of our power? Truly, the grace of whom the patriarch Rebekah spake to us, that by thy cross and death thou shouldst purchase the universe!' Then the King of Glory, holding Satan by the head, delivered him to the angels, and said, 'Bind his hands and feet, and neck and mouth, with irons.' And giving him over to Hades, he said, 'For they were hid in the darkness of the abyss, and my hand did not touch them.' (ch. xxiv.) Then the King of Glory stretched out his right hand, and took the forerather Adam, and raised him up, and turning to the rest also, he said, 'Come with me, all of you, as many as have died by the wood which this place - the earth; for I. I upraise you all by the aid of the cross, and raise them up in whose hands he has these things that he has done and all the fathers Adam, filled with exceeding joy, said, 'I render thee thanks, O Lord, that thou hast brought me up from the depths of Hades. Thus, too, were all the prophets and saints: 'We thank thee, O Christ, Saviour of the world, that thou hast redeemed our life from corruption.' And while they were saying these things, the Saviour blessed Adam in the wilderness with the sign of the cross, and did the like to the patriarchs and the prophets, and the martyrs and forefathers, and taking them with him, he rose up out of Hades. And, 'Laetis, in mundum, the holy Father accompanying him, sang, 'Praised be he who hath come in the name of the Lord. Hallelujah!' (Thilo, *Cod. Apocryph. i, 667 n. 6. *Forbes, On the Thirty-nine Articles*, i, 52 sq.) A dramatic representation of the "descensus into hell," in imitation of the above picture in Nicodemus, is given in the *Adventus et communio sancti Joannis Baptist*, ep. *Epistoles*, commonly ascribed to Eusebius of Emesa (c. 300); see Augustus' edition of Eusebius of Emesa, p. 1 sq. (Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, § 184).

3. Middle Age.—These images took possession of the popular accent and were even given pictures by many of the clergy. In the medieval mysteries, the "battering of hell" was one of the most popular representations. Death and hell were pictured as dismayed at the loss of their victims, as Christ was to set all the captives free. So the *Vision of Pieri Floreman* declares that Christ "Would come as a Kyng, Crowned with auriol, As haveing ascended into heaven, and this world, and Alle mennees souls."

The subject was also a favorite one in the religious art of the 14th and 15th centuries.

The scholastic divines divided Hell into three different apartments or regions: (1) The Limbus of Hades, where souls are kept, where the devils and the damned are confined; (2) Those suherranean regions which may be regarded as the intermediate states between heaven and hell, and be again subdivided into (a) Purgatory, which lies nearest to hell; (b) The limbus infirmitum (psororum), where all those children remain who die unbaptized; (c) The limbus patrum, the abode of the Old Testament saints, the place to which Christ went to preach redemption to the souls in prison. The limbus last mentioned was also called Abraham's bosom; different opinions obtained concerning its relation to heaven and hell* (Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines*, § 185.) Therefore, the limbus of souls in prison was becoming a more and more popular theme. The limbus patrum (Summa Speul. qu. 69, art. 5).

4. Modern.—(1) The Greek Church holds that the descensus was a voluntary going down into Hades of the human soul of Christ united to his divinity; that he remained there a period between his death and his resurrection, and devoted himself to the work he had performed on earth: i.e. that he offered redemption and preached the Gospel to those who were subject to Satan's power in consequence of original sin, releasing all believers, and all who died in Christ under the O. T. dispensation, from Hades (Conf. Orthodox. i, 49, ed. Kummel, 1840, p. 118).

(2) The Roman Church rests its doctrine in tradition alone. It teaches that Christ, in his entire personality, including his divine and human natures, descended voluntarily, for the sake of the Saints of Israel, into the limbus patrum, or into the ignus purgatorius (fire of purgatory), and there demonstrated himself Son of God by conquering the demons, and by granting to the souls of the ancients who dwelt in Hades their freedom from the limbus, and admission to felicity in heaven. "His soul also was put to death. After he had suffered and been put to death, he entered into Hades, where those who were in prison he had purchased, etc. (Cf. Conc. Trid. art. x.)"

(3) Lutherana.—Luther himself did not speak positively on this topic. He agreed at first with Jerome and Gregory in supposing a limbus patrum whither Christ went. But whenever he mentioned the subject after 1538, he was accustomed to remark that Christ destroyed the power of the devil and of hell, whither he went with soul and body. The later Lutheran theology recognised the descent as a real descent into hell. Christ, the God-man, after the resurrection and the reunion of his soul with his body, immediately before his reappearance on earth, i.e. early on Easter morning, went, body and soul, to the hell of the damned, the time which elapsed between his death on the cross and the resurrection having been spent in Paradise. The "descent into hell" was the first act accomplished by the God-man after his entrance into his divine unlimited power, and is therefore considered as the first degree of the state of exaltation. It thus constitutes also his first entering into possession of the kingdom of his power, and in the revelation of his victory over the devil, and the consequent inability of the latter to prevail against believers, whereas the "descent into hell" is also designated as "the triumph over the devil and his angels." His preaching in hell is designated as condemnatory (legalis and damnatoria,
to see corruption, so he left not his soul in hell, and thereby gave sufficient security to all those who belong to Christ of never coming under the power of Satan, or suffering in the flames prepared for the devil and his angels. And this is the fruit of Christ's descent into hell, but to that of humiliation, his soul suffering the punishments of hell while his body remained in the grave. He denied that I Pet. iii, 18 refers to the "descent into hell" at all.

(4.) Reformed.—In the Reformed theology in general, the doctrine of the "descent into hell" has been interpreted metaphorically, or as meaning simply either the burial of Christ or his sufferings. So Calvin: "It was necessary for Christ to contend with the powers of hell and the horror of eternal death." ... He was treated as a criminal himself, to sustain all the punishments which would have been his if he had descended into hell, only with this exception, that it was not possible that he should be held of the pains of death. Therefore it is no wonder if he be said to have descended into hell, since he suffered that death which the wrath of God inflicts on transgressors" (Institutes, bk. ii, ch. xvi, § 10).

The Heideggerian interpretation substantiates follows Calvin: "Quest. 44. Why is there added 'he descended into hell'? That in my greatest temptations I may be assured, and wholly comfort myself in this, that my Lord Jesus Christ, by his inexpressible anguish, pains, torments, and hellish agonies, in which he was plunged during his suffering, but especially on the cross, hath delivered me from the anguish and torments of hell." Dr. Nevin remarks on this answer that it gives the words of the Creed a "signification which is good in its own nature, but, at the same time, notoriously at war with the historical sense of the clause itself." The doctrine is stated in the Westminster Catechism (Larger), answer to question 50, as follows: "Christ's humiliation after death consisted in his being buried and continuing in the state of the dead, and under the power of death, until the third day, which has been otherwise expressed in the words 'he descended into hell.'" Thus, Nevin maintains that the descent into Hades simply meant the burial of Christ; and in this opinion he was followed by Drusius, by Dr. Barrow, and other English divines; and so Fiscator, and several of the Remonstrants (Arminius, Carrolianus, Limborch), refer it to the state of death being part of Christ's humiliation to which the Prince of Life was subjected.

Church of England.—The third article of religion runs as follows: "As Christ died for us, and was buried, so also is it to be believed that he went down into hell." In the 39 articles of 1563 it is more fully stated as follows: "The body of Christ lay in the sepulchre unuttered to his resurrection; but his ghost departing from him, was with the ghosts which were in prison, or in hell, and did preach to the same, as the place of St. Peter doth testify." And in the Creed in Metre, given at the end of the old version of the Psalms in the Prayer-book, it is stated as follows:

"His body then was buried
As is our use and right;
His spirit after this descent
Into the lower parts,
Of them that long in darkness were,
The true light of their hearts.

Pearson, after an elaborate but not always luminous examination of the clause, sums up his own view of the doctrine as follows: "I give a full and undoubted assent unto this as to a certain truth, that when all the sufferings of Christ were finished on the cross, and his soul was separated from his body, though his body were dead, yet his soul died not; and though it died not, yet it underwent the condition of the souls of such as die; and being he died in the similitude of a sinner, his soul went to the place where the souls of men are kept who died for their sins, and so did wholly undergo the law of death; but because there was no sin in him, and he had fully satisfied for the sins of others which he took upon him, therefore, as God suffered not his Holy One
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Iffros (Dresden, 1802); Pearson, On the Creed, art. vi.; Edwards, History of Redemption, notes, p. 351, 377; Stu-
art, Esquela Essays on Future Punishment; Plumptre, Christ and Christendom, p. 342; Burnet, Hardwicke, 
Brown, On the Thirty-nine Articles, art. iii.; Neale, Hist. of the Puritans (Harper's ed.), i, 210; König, die Lehre 
von Christi Wohlfahrt (Freiburg, 1858), vol. i.; Job, funerals, mortems futuris, etc. (Dresden, 1846, 2 
vol.); Gülden, Lehre v. d. Erscheinung Christi u. d. Tool-
tos (Berlin, 1853); Gülden, in Herzog, Real-Encyklop. vi. 
178; Zeitschrift für die Lutherische Theologie, 1868, No. 4; Biblical Repository, April, 1843, p. 470; Bibliotheca 
Scribentum Christianorum; Sermones de corpore dei in, ex missionem ad. 
Under World (Boston, 1854); Bp. Hobart, On the 
State of the Departed; Bethune, Lectures on the Heidel-
berg Catechism, lect. xix; Christian Examinier, i, 401; 
Martensen, Christian Dogmatik, § 171; Dorner, Person 
of Christ (Index, s. v. Hell); Church Review, July, 1857; 
Muenzer, in Bibliotheca Sacra, April, 1859. For old 
monographs on the subject, see Volbeding, Index Pro-

HELL PUNISHMENTS, Nature of.—The term Hell (Hölle), as stated above, originally denoted the 
'sether world,' the 'place of departed spirits.' It came to be associated with the idea of fire and the 
idea of suffering. The phrase 'the place of torment for the wicked' is a scholastic 
division distinguished between the Limbo, or place of 
the souls of departed spirits, and Hell, properly so 
called, where the damned suffer their punishment (Aquinas, 
Summa, q. 1). The nature of the punishments of hell has been very 
variously understood in different times. In the early 
Church the fire of hell was generally considered as a real, 
material fire. So Justin Martyr, Clement of Alexandria, 
Tertullian, and Cyprian. Orig. however, observed, 'believed 
that the fire of hell to be the punishment which is inflicted by 
God, the remorse of conscience, etc. (De Princ. ii, 10, 
opp. 1, 192).' The eternal fire is neither material nor 
kinded by another person, but the combustibles are our 
selves, of which conscience reminds us: thus the 
fire of hell resembles the fire of passions in this 
world. The separation between the soul and God may 
be compared with the pain which we suffer when all the 
members of the body are torn out of their joints. By 
'outer darkness' Orig. does not so much understand a 
place devoid of light as a state of complete ignorance; 
he thus appears to adopt the idea of black bodies only 
by way of description to explain popular notions. It should 
also be borne in mind that Orig. imagined that the 
design of all these punishments was to heal or to cor-
correct, and thus finally to restore the sinner to the favor 
of God' (Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, § 78).

From the latter part of the 3d century onward to the 
rise of scholasticism, the punishments of hell were gener-
ally described by material images, and, indeed, were 
considered, to a large extent, as material punishments. 
Gregory of Nazianzus († 389?) supposed the pun-
ishment of the damned to consist essentially in their separ-
am from God, and in the consciousness of their own 
material destination (Orat. xvi, 9, p. 306: Tοιοi δε ει ματά 
των αδιαλειας, μαλλον δε ποι των αδιαλεια 
των αδιαλειας, και ον τω των αδιαλειας αδιαλειας 
αει έροτα). Basili, on the contrary, gives a more vivid 
description of that punishment (Hom. in Ps. xxiii, 
Orat. cxxvii, 7). In 1679, the Council of Trent presented 
the torments of the damned in a variety of horrid pictures 
in Theol. Iursum, i, c. 6, Opp. iv, 560, 561). Neverthe-
less, in other places (e. g., his Ep. ad Rom. hom. xxxii, 
Opp. x, 380) he justly observes that it is of more impor-
tance to know how to escape hell than what it is and what 
is its nature. Gregory of Nyssa (Orat. Cate-
cek, 40) endeavors to divest the idea of hell of all that 
is sensuous (the fire of hell is not to be looked upon as 
a material fire, nor is the worm which never dies an őri-
mas ουρα). Augustine imagines that separation from 
God is in the first instance to be regarded as the 
most sennuous (De mort. et non.

HELL
regard these expressions as figurative representations of the positive penalties of hell. Doddridge remarks that, "On the whole, it is of very little importance whether we say there is an external fire, or only an idea of such pain as arises from burning; and should we think both doubtful, it is certain God can give the mind a sense of a fiery nature of hell, which should answer all. And even on the terrors of those descriptions; and care should certainly be taken so to explain Scripture metaphors as that hell may be considered as consisting more of mental agony than of bodily tortures" (Lect. on Deuc. cxxxiii).

Of similar tenor are the following remarks by Dr. Watson: "On the nature of hell (Acts xix.); and even the thought of it is vain for us to attempt to conjecture. It has been conceived that if we suppose clear apprehensions of God and sin in the understanding; an unshimmering conscience; an unceasing conflict between full, irresistible convictions of all that is awful in truth, and an eminence of heart remaining in all its virulence; passions raging in their unmitigated violence; regrets as unavailing as they are torturing; conscious desert and unavailing hopelessness; with the entire removal of all, in whatever form, that on earth enabled the sinner to banish that conviction, to indulge his materials, or to substitute a sufficient hell. I will not deny it. . . . I cannot but think, therefore, that there must be something more than conscience, something of the nature of positive punitive infliction: conscience attesting its justice, certifying its being all deserved. What shall be the products of this infliction is another question. It may surely be something of the nature of punitive infliction without adopting the theory of literal fire, of a lake of fire, a lake burning with brimstone. I have no more belief, as I have just said, in a literal fire than in a literal worm; and no more belief in either than in the existence, for that reason of the Bible, of a literal and not a spiritual, in the centre of which grows the tree of life, or of a literal city, of which the length, and breadth, and height are equal, of which the foundations are precious stones, the gates of pearl, and the streets of gold, with a pure river of living water flowing through the midst of it. But the mind of fallen man is in love with sin, and in selfish hatred of God and holiness. In a mind of this character the difficulty may amount to impossibility of awakening any adequate sense of future suffering, or any salutary alarm in the anticipation of it, by any representations of a directly spiritual kind, however mentioned. In these circumstances, then, if an impression of extreme suffering is to be made, it seems as if figure, taken from what is still in the midst of all the perversions of depravity felt to be fearful, were almost, if not altogether, indispensable for the purpose. The figures of Scripture on this subject are felt, and felt powerfully, by every mind. The very mention of the "worm that dieth not" awakens a more thrilling emotion, undefined as it is (perhaps, indeed, the more thrilling that it is undefined), than anything you can say to an unregenerate man about the operations of conscience, and the "fire that never shall be quenched" than any representation you can ever make to him of sin, and the absence of God, and the sway of evil passions, and the pangs of remorse, and horribleness of sin-loving and God-hating company. Such images have the full effect intended by them, as the impression of extreme suffering; although what proportion of that suffering shall be the native and necessary result of the constitution of human nature when placed in certain circumstances, and what proportion of more direct penal infliction, the Scriptures do not tell us, there is not much discussion. And it would be useless for us to conjecture, or to attempt the adjustment of such proportions" (Systematic Theology, Edinburgh, 1857, iii, 700). For a copious list of books on the subject, see Abbot's bibliographical appendix to Alger, History of the Doctrine of a Future Life, iii, 3, 5.

On the duration of the punishment of hell, see Univer-

HELL 174 HELLENIST

Hellenist (Ἑλληνιστής, A. V. "Grecian", comp. Ἑλληνισμός, 2 Macc. iv. 13). In one of the earliest notices of the first Christian Church at Jerusalem (Acts vi, 1), two distinct parties are recognised among its members, "Hebrews" and Hellenists, who appear to stand towards one another in some degree in a relation of jealous hostility. It was a national distinction, and even after his conversion, he spoke and disputed with the Hellenists (Acts ix, 29), as if expecting to find more sympathy among them than with the rulers of the Jews. The term Hellenist occurs once again in the N. T. according to the common text, in the account of the foundation of the church at Corinth (1 Cor. i, 12). The possible sense of the context, as well as the form of the sentence (καὶ πρὸς τοὺς Ἐ., though the καὶ is doubtful), seems to require the other reading "Greeks" (Ἑλληνες), which is supported by great external evidence as the true antithesis to "Jews" (=Iouiois, not Ἰουθαίως, v. 19). See HEBREWS.

The name, according to its derivation, whether the original word (Ἑλληνιστής) be taken, according to the common analogy of similar forms (μυθικός, ἀρχομένος, Φιλιππικός), in the general sense of adopting the spirit and characteristics of those, the party is regarded as limited, especially in the sense of using the Greek language (Xenophon, Anab. vii. 3, 25), marks a class distinguished by peculiar habits, and not by descent. Thus the Hellenists as a body included not only the proselytes of Greek (or foreign) parentage (οἱ σημειούμενοι Ἑλληνες, Acts xvii. 14; ὁ Ἕλληνες προσελκυόμενος, Acts xiii. 16), but also (1) those who, by settling in foreign countries, had adopted the prevalent form of the current Greek civilization, and with it the use of the common Greek dialect, to the exclusion of the Aramaic, which was the national representative of the ancient Hebrew Hellenism was thus Chrished out of origin. Hellenists might be Greeks, but when the latter term is used (Ἑλληνισμός, John xii. 2), the point of race and not of creed is that which is foremost in the mind of the writer. (See Jour. Soc. Lit. Jan. and April, 1857.) See GREECE.

1. As to the particular class in question, referred to in the Acts, the following are the different opinions that have been held: 1. That the distinctive difference between them was simply one of language, the Hebrews speaking the Aramaic of Palestine, the Hellenists the Greek language. 2. That the distinction was one of race, country, partly of language: the Hebrew being a native of Judea, and using the Aramaic language; the Hellenist born among the Gentiles, and using the speech of the country of which he was a native. So Erasmus, Lightfoot, Bengel, Wahl, De Wette, Davidson, Alford, Baumgarten, etc.

3. That the difference was one of religious history, the Hebrew being a born child of the covenant, the Hellenist a proselyte from heathendom. So Beza, Salmasius, Pearson, Bunsen, Pfannkuche, etc.

4. That the difference was one of principle, the Hebrew adhering to one set of beliefs or modes of thought, the Hellenist adopting another. According to some, this difference had the effect of constituting the Hellenists into a distinctive sect among the Jews, such as the Essenes; whilst others, without going this length, regard the two classes as standing to each other very much in the relation of the partisans in the party desiring different political views, or parties in the same Church having different aims and modes of regarding religious truth in modern times, may stand to each other; the Hebrews being like the Conservative or High-Church party, while the Hellenists advocated a more progressive, unfettered, and comprehensive scheme of thinking and acting. This latter view, in its substance, has recently found an able
advocate in Mr. Roberts (Discussions on the Gospels, p. 148 sq.). According to him, "the Hellenists were those Jews, whether belonging to Palestine or not, who willingly yielded to the influence of Gentile civilization and habits, and were thus distinguished by their free and liberal spirit; the Hebrews, again, were the rigid adherents of Judaism, who, in spite of the providential agencies which had been long at work, endeavored to keep up those peculiar and exclusive usages by which the Jews had for so many centuries been preserved distinct from all other nations."

We are not in a position to reject entirely any of these opinions. Each of them seems to have an element of truth in it, though the contributions they make to the whole truth on this subject are by no means of equal importance. The last alone points to what must be regarded as the fundamental and formative characteristic of Hellenism among the Jews. There can be no doubt historically that some such distinction as that to which it refers did subsist in the Jewish nation (see Josh, Gesch, des Judenthums, i, 99 sq., 545 sq.), and had to come to a height at the commencement of the Christian era; and nothing can be more probable than that the existence of such a distinction as has been indicated, in the way in which the distinction between the Hebrews and the Hellenists is asserted to have shown itself in Acts vi,1 sq. It is in agreement with this, also, that Paul should have entered into discussion chiefly with the Hellenists. It is not improbable that as his early Hellenic culture pointed him out as the person most fitted to meet them on their own ground, he may have been specially set upon this work by the other apostles. - Kitto, s. v.

Still different views could hardly of itself have constituted so marked and obvious a distinction as is noticed in the various texts above cited, unless it had been exhibited in some outstanding characteristic; and no external sign could have been more certain, natural, and palpable than that familiar use of the Greek language which at once betrayed a foreign Jew, to whom it was vernacular, in contrast with the Palestinian Jew, by whom Greek, although too prevalent in that age everywhere to have been unknown to any, was nevertheless always spoken with a Hebrew coloring and accent. See Dispersion.

II. It remains to characterize briefly the elements which the Hellenists contributed to the language of the N. T. and to ascertain the objects which they produced upon the apostolic teaching:

1. The flexibility of the Greek language gained for it in ancient times a general currency similar to that which French enjoys in modern Europe; but with this important difference, that the natural and native language of education and literature, and also the language of the great centres of commerce. The colonies of Alexander and his successors originally established what has been called the Macedonian dialect throughout the East; but even in this the prevailing power of Attic literature made itself distinctly felt. Peculiar words and forms adopted at Alexandria were undoubtedly of Macedonian origin, but the later Attic may be justly regarded as the real basis of Oriental Greek. This first type was, however, soon modified, at least in common use, by contact with other languages. The vocabulary was enriched by the addition of many implied in the vayatsa with new constructions. In this way a variety of local dialects must have arisen, the specific characters of which were determined in the first instance by the conditions under which they were formed, and which afterward passed away with the circumstances that had produced them. But one of these dialects has been preserved after the ruin of the people among them it arose, by being consecrated to the noblest service which language has yet fulfilled. In other cases the dialects persisted together with the communities who used them in the countries in which they were born, but the Jews, as the Alexandrine version of the O. Test., acting in this respect like the great vernacular versions of English, and Germany, gave a definiteness and fixity to the popular language which could not have been gained without the existence of some recognized standard. The style of the Sept. itself is, indeed, different in different parts, but the same general character runs through the whole, and the variations which it presents are not greater than those which exist in the different books of the N. T.

The functions which this Jewish-Greek had to discharge were of the widest application, and the language itself combined the most opposite features. It was essentially a fusion of Eastern and Western thought; for, disregarding particularities of inflections and novel words, the characteristic of the Hellenistic dialect is the combination of a Hebrew spirit with a Greek body, of a Hebrew form with Greek words. The conception belongs to one race, and the expression to another. Nor is it too much to say that this combination was one of the most important preparations for the reception of Christianity, and one of the most important aids for the adequate expression of its teaching. On the one hand, by the spread of the Hellenistic Greek, the deep, theocratic aspect of the world and life, which distinguishes Jewish thought, was placed before men at large; and, on the other, the whole truths which are gained from the analysis of mind and action, and enshrined in words, were transferred to the service of revelation. In the fulness of time, when the great message came, a language was prepared to convey it; and thus the very day of the N. T. forms a great lesson in the true philosophy of history, and becomes the monument of the providential government of mankind.

This view of the Hellenistic dialect will at once remove one of the commonest misconceptions relating to it. For it will follow that its deviations from the ordinary laws of classical Greek are the result of a change by some common law, and that irregularities of construction and altered usages of words are to be traced to their first source, and interpreted strictly according to the original conception out of which they sprung. A popular, and even a corrupt dialect is not less precise, or in other words, is not less human than a polished one, though its interpretation may often be more difficult from the want of materials for analysis. But in the case of the N. T., the books themselves furnish an ample store for the critic, and the Sept., when compared with the Hebrew text, provides him with the history of the language which has made itself visible to us. 2. The adoption of a strange language was essentially characteristic of the true nature of Hellenism. The purely outward elements of the national life were laid aside with a facility which history offers few examples, while the inner character of the people remained unaltered. In every respect, the thought, so to speak, was clothed in a new dress. Hellenism was, as it were, a fresh incorporation of Judaism according to altered laws of life and worship. But, as the Hebrew spirit made itself distinctly visible in the new dialect, so it remained undestroyed by the new conditions which regulated its action. While the Hellenistic Jews followed their natural instinct for trade, which was originally curbed by the Mosaic law, and gained a deeper insight into foreign character, and with this a truer sympathy, or at least a wider tolerance towards foreign opinions, the same time they found means of adapting their knowledge of the principles of their divine faith, and to gain respect and attention even from those who did not openly embrace their religion. Hellenism accomplished for the outer world what the Return accomplished for the Palestinian Jews: it was the necessary step between a religion of form and a religion of spirit, the necessary step against Judaism as final and universal, and it witnessed for it as the foundation of a spiritual religion which should be bound by no local restrictions. Under the influence of this wider instruction, a Greek body grew up around the new life, and was fitted into the Jewish Church, and yet held a recognized position with regard to it-which was able to apprehend the apostolic
teaching, and ready to receive it. The Hellenists them-
selves were at once missionaries to the heathen and
prophets to their own countrymen. Their lives were
an abiding protest against polytheism and pantheism,
and they retained with unshaken zeal the sum of their
ancient creed, when the preacher had popularly occu-
pied the place of the priest, and a service of prayer, and
praise, and exhortation had succeeded in daily life to
the elaborate ritual of the Temple. Yet this new de-
development of Judaism was obtained without the sacri-
fice of national ties. The connection of the Hellenists
with the Temple was not broken, except in the case of
some of the Egyptian Jews. Unity coexisted with dis-
ension; and the organization of the Church was fore-
shadowed, not only in the widening breadth of doctrine,
but even externally in the scattered communities which
looked to Jerusalem as their common centre.

In another aspect Hellenism served as the prepara-
tion for a catholic creed. As it furnished the language
of Christianity, it supplied also that literary instinct
which counteracted the traditional reserve of the Pales-
tinian Jews. The writings of the N. Test., and all the
writings of the apostolic age, with the exception of the
original Gospel of Matthew, were, as far as we know,
Greek; and Greek seems to have remained the sole ve-
hicle of Christian literature, and the principal medium
of Christian worship, till the Church of North Africa
rose into importance in the time of Tertullian. The
Canon of the Christian Scriptures, the early creeds, and
the liturgies are the memorials of this Hellenistic pre-
dominance in the Church, and the types of its working;
and if in later times the Greek spirit descended to the
investigation of painful subtleties, it may be questioned
whether the fulness of Christian truth could have been
developed without the power of Greek thought temper-
ed by Hebrew discipline.

The general relations of Hellenism to Judaism are
well treated in the histories of Ewald and Jost; but the
Hellenistic language is as yet, critically speaking, al-
most unexplored. Winer's Grammar (Gramm. d. N. T.
Sprachtdienst, 7th ed. 1869) has done great service in
establishing the idea of law in N. T. language, which
was obliterated by earlier interpreters, but even Winer
does not investigate the origin of the peculiarities of
the Hellenistic dialect. The idioms of the N. T. cannot
be discussed apart from those of the Sept., and no ex-
planation can be considered perfect which does not take
into account the origin of the corresponding Hebrew
idioms. For this work even the materials are as yet
deficient. The text of the Sept. is still in a most unsat-
sactory condition; and while Brunner's Concordance
leaves nothing to be desired for the vocabulary of the
N. T., Trem's Concordance to the Sept., however use-
ful, is quite untrustworthy for critical purposes. See
GREEK LANGUAGE.

Heller, Yom Tov Lipman B.-Nathan, a distinguis-
ished Rabbi of the Polish school, born at Wallenstein, duchy of
Anspach, Germany, in 1578. He filled the appoint-
ment of Rabbi to the great synagogues at Vienna,
Prague, and Krakau. While at Prague (1629) he was
prosecuted by the government upon a charge that he
had written in praise of the Talmud to the injury of the
Christian religion, was imprisoned, and fined 10,000 flor-
inas. After his release he went to Poland, where, in
1644, he became Rabbi of the synagogue at Krakau.
Here he died in 1654. Heller wrote his autobiography
(הנויה וקנעם), printed in 1836, which contains a com-
plete list of all his works. Among the most important of
them are his glossaries to the Mishna (ם-
 varargin "ם" "ם")

These are considered by Oriental scholars as very val-
able. — Jost, Gesch. d. Juden. iii, 248; Etheridge, Intro-
to Heb. Literature, p. 448.

Helm, פִּינָה, the rudder of a ship (Jar. iii, 4).
See Rudder.

Helmet (םֶבֶּל or רֹטֶב, kodai, παραμυθανίο), a
military cap for the defence of the head in battle (1 Sam.
ing was characterized by great unction and overwhelming pathos, and often produced wonderful results. During the prevalence of the yellow fever he visited the sick and dying without fear. He buried 626 of his members.

He died in the 80th year of his age, Feb. 5, 1824. He was the author of a work on Baptism and the Sacred Scriptures, published in 1798; also of a practical treatise on Communion with God; numerous devotional books for children, and a volume of Hymns. He edited likewise the Evangelical Magazine, published for some years in Philadelphia in the German language. (M. L. S.)

Holy. See Abelard.

Hel'ion (Heb. Cheleon', הליון, strong; Sept. Χαλύων), the father of Eliab, which latter was phylarch of the tribe of Zebulon at the Exode (Num. 1, 9; ii, 7; vii, 24, 29; x, 16). B.C. ante 1658.

Help, besides its ordinary signification of assistance in general, has in two passages of the N. T. a technical application.

1. Help (Βοήθεια), nautical apparatus for securing a vessel, when leaking, by means of ropes, chains, etc., which were passed around the "underwater" of the ship, in the emergency of a storm (Acts xxvii, 17). See SHIP.

2. Help (ἀντιληψις; Vulg. opulatioines; 1 Cor. xii, 28). This Greek word, signifying aids or assistance, has so a meaning, among others, corresponding to that in this passage, in the classical writers (e. g. Diod. Sic., i, 87).

In the Sept. is answered to יָזָא (Ps. xxii, 19), to יָזָא (Ps. cxxiii, 19), and to יָזָא (Ps. lxxxiii, 8). It is found in the same sense, Ezek. iv, 12; 2 Mac., xi, 26; and in Josephus (War, iv, 5, 1). In the N. T. it occurs once, viz. in the enumeration of the several orders or classes of persons possessing miraculous gifts among the primitive Christians (ut supra), where it seems to be used by metonymy, the abstract for the concrete, and mean help, τονομάζεσθαι, "miracles," i. e. workers of miracles; κυριονι, κυριονios, "governments," i.e. governors, etc., in the same enumeration. Many persons in this country, by a similar idiom, call their servants "help." Great difficulty attends the attempt to ascertain the nature of the office so designated among Christians. Theophylact explains αντιληψις by αντιληψις των δοσινων, helping or supporting the infirm. So also Gennadius, in Ecumenius. But this seems like an inference from the etymology (see the Greek of Acts xx, 35). It has been assumed by some eminent modern writers that the several "orders" mentioned in verse 29 correspond respectively to the several "gifts" of the Spirit enumerated in verse 8, 9. In order, however, to make the two enumerations tally, it is necessary to make "divers kinds of tongues" and "interpretation of tongues" in the one answer to "diversities of tongues" in the other, which, in the present state of the received text, does not seem to be a complete correspondence.

The result of the collation is that αντιληψις answers to "prophecy;" whence it has been inferred that these persons were such as were qualified with the gift of "lower prophecy," to help the Christians in the public devotions (the kubernéses). Bishop Wordsworth has adopted this classification of the gifts and office-bearers, and points out as "helps," i. e. persons gifted with "prophecies or predictions," such persons as Mark, Tychicus, Onesimus. Vitringa, from a comparison of ver. 28, 29, 30, infers that the αντιληψις denote those who had the gift of interpreting foreign tongues (De Synag. et ii, 505, Franque, 1696); which, though certainly possible, as an arbitrary use of a very significant word, stands in need of confirmation by actual instances. Dr. Lightfoot also, according to his biographer, adopted the same plan and arrived at
HELP-MEET

the same conclusion (Strype's Life of Lightfoot, prefixed to his Works, p. 4, Lond. 1684). But Lightfoot himself
explains the word "persons who accompanied the apostles, baptized those who were converted by them, and
were sent to places to which they, being employed in other things, could not come, as Mark, Timothy, Titus." He
observes (ii, 781) that the Talmudists sometimes
call the Levites מ handwritten כותרים, "the helpers of the
priests." Similar catalogues of miraculous gifts and of
officers occur Rom. xii, 6-8, and Eph. iv, 11, 12; but they
ever correspond in number nor in the order of enum-
eration. In the former, "prophets" stands first, and
in the latter "teachers"; and in the former many of the
terms are of wide import, as "ministering," while minute
distinctions are made between others, as between "teach-
ing" and "exhortation," "giving" and "showing mercy.
" Other writers pursue different methods, and ar-
rive at different conclusions. For instance, Hammond,
arguing from the etymology of the word, and from pas-
sages in the early writers, which describe the office of
relieving the poor as peculiarly connected with that of
the apostles and bishops by the deacons, infers that εὐ-
δρομος, "denotes a special part of the office of those men
which are set down at the beginning of the verse." He
also explains εὖδρομος as another part of their office
(Hammond, Comment., ad loc.). Schleusner understands
"deacons who had the care of the sick." Rosenberg,
"Diaconi qui pauperibus, peregrinis, agrois, mortuis, pro-
curandis preceant." Bishop Pearce thinks that both
these words may have been originally put in the margin
to explain διάμωσης, "miracles or powers," and urges
that εὐδρομος is nowhere mentioned as a gift of the Spirit,
and that it is not recapitulated in ver. 29, 30. Certain-
ly the omission of these two words would nearly produce
exclusiveness to the recapitulation. Bower adopts the
same conjecture, but it is without support from MSS.
or versions. He also observes that to the end of ver. 28
some copies of the Vulgate add "interpretationes sermo-
norum," εὐμαρκήσεις γιανωσία; as also the later Syriac,
Hilary, and Ambrose. This addition would make the
recapitulation perfect. Chrysostom and all the Greek,
interpreters consider the εὐδρομος and εὐδρομος as import-
ing the same thing, namely, functionaries so called with
reference to the two different parts of their office: the
εὐδρομος, superintending the care of the poor, sick, and
strangers; the εὐδρομος, the burial of the dead and the
effectiveness of their offices, including the care of their
widows, or rather managers than governors (Blomfield's Recensio Synopt.). After all, it must be con-
fessed, with Doddridge, that "we can only guess at the
meaning of the words in question, having no principles
on which to proceed in fixing it absolutely." (Family
Expositor, on 1 Cor. xii, 28). (See Alberti, glossar., p.
123; Suicer, Thesaurus, in voc.; Salmassius, De Fideis,
Trapesico, p. 409, Wollii Curia Philolog., Basil. 1741.)
Stanley remarks (Comment., ad loc.) that the word
"εὐδρομος, used in the Sept., is not (like διάμωσης)
help ministered by an inferior to a superior, but by an
inferior to an superior (comp. Ps. lxxxix, 18; Ecclus.
xxi, 12, ii, 7), and thus is inapplicable to the minis-
trations of the deacon to the presbyter." Probably it
is a general term (hence the plur.) to include those occa-
sional labors of evangelists and special laborers, such as
Apollos in ancient times and eminent revivats in mod-
eran days, who have from time to time been raised up as
powerful but independent promoters of the Gospel. See
GIFTS, SPIRITUAL.

HELP-MEET (or rather, as the best editions of the
Bible now punctuate it, HELP MEET for him, ?122 ?72
? cter, be-negado; a help as his counselsepart, i.e. an aid suit-
able and supplementary to him), a delicate and beauti-
ful designation of a wife (Gen. ii, 18-20), which exactly
expresses her relation. See MARRIAGE.

HELVE (?2, etc., wood, as often elsewhere), the han-
dle or wooden part of an axe (Deut. xix, 5). See AXE;
TREE.
was called to this revised Confession as a standard under which they could all agree. By the year 1578 the Confession had received the sanction of the Swiss cantons, and had also been approved by the Reformed churches of Poland, Hungary, Scotland, and France (the latter receiving it in Beza's translation). It adopts Calvin's doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and the Roman Catholic doctrine of election in a mild form, far behind Calvin" (Gieseler, Church History, ed. H. B. Smith, iv, 422). No Reformed Confession has been more widely diffused. The title of the Confession is Confession et Expositio Dre- rie et Simplex Sinceri Religiosi Christiani, i.e., a compendium of the tenets and teachings of the Scriptures, Tradition, etc., iii, of God and the Trinity; iv and v, of Idols or Images of God, Christ, and the Saints, and of the Worship of God through Christ, the sole Mediator; vi, of Providence; vii, of the Creation of all Things, of Angels, Devils, Man; vii, of Sin and the Fall of Man; ix, of Free Will. The condition of man after the fall is thus stated: Non sublatus est quidem hominis intellectus, non eretis ea voluntas, et prorsus in lapidem redundum est commutatus (The intellect of man was not taken away by the fall, nor was he robbed of will, and completely turned into a stone). Article xii, of the Church, of the Sacraments; xxi and xxiv, of Assemblies, Worship, Feasts, and Fasts; xxv- xxix, of Catechism, Rites, Ceremonies, etc.; xxx, of the Civil Magistracy. This Confession is given in Latin in the Cyphose Confessiones (Oxen, 1872, 8vo); by Nie- meyer, Collectio Confessionum, p. 402 sq.; by Augusti, Collectio Confessionum, p. 474; 2nd edition, 1878, 8vo; by Beza, 2nd edition, 1890, 8vo; and finally by Helvetius, A. S. R., ed. J. A. F. v. 2, 1869, 8vo. This chapter has been the subject of much controversy, both Calvins- tins and Arminians finding their own doctrine in it. Chap. xi of Treatise of Christ as God-man, the only Saviour; xii and xiii, of the Law and the Gospel; xiv-xvi, of Repentance and Of Justification by Faith; xvii-xviii, of the Church, the Ministry, the Sacraments; xxii and xxiv, of Assemblies, Worship, Feasts, and Fasts; xxx- xxxix, of Catechism, Rites, Ceremonies, etc.; xxx, of the Civil Magistracy. This Confession is given in Latin in the Cyphose Confessiones (Oxen, 1872, 8vo); by Nie- meyer, Collectio Confessionum, p. 402 sq.; by Augusti, Collectio Confessionum, p. 474; 2nd edition, 1878, 8vo; and finally by Helvetius, A. S. R., ed. J. A. F. v. 2, 1869, 8vo. See Gieseler, Church History, l. c.; Shedd, History of Doctrines, ii, 468; Hagen-bach, History of Doctrines, § 221; Fritzsche, Conf. Hel. Posterior, Zürich, 1839; Augusti, Algo. christl. Symbolics, 1860; and references there.

Helvetius, Claude Abriem, a French infidel, was born in Paris in January, 1715, and was educated by the Jesuits at the College of Louis-le-Grand. He afterwards studied law and finances in Paris, and the influence of queen Maria Leszczinska became a farmer-general. His life was disorderly up to the time of his marriage in 1751. In 1758 he published his De l'esprit, which was a summary of the doctrines of the Encyclopedie. The work was quickly denounced; and, to re- gain the favor of the court, Helvetius successively pub- lished three letters of apology which gradually advanced in humility and submission. Notwithstanding the confession which they contained of a Christian faith, and his disclaimers of all opinions inconsistent with its spirit, the doctors of the Sorbonne drew up a formal condemnation of the work, which they declared to be a compendium of all the evil contained in all the bad books that had yet appeared. It was publicly burned, according to a decree of the Parliament of Paris. The style of the book is vicious and declamatory. Helvetius died at Paris Dec. 26, 1771, leaving for d. H. S. (1766), 122; Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, ed. H. B. Smith, § 229, and references there.

Helvetius, Claude Abriem, a French infidel, was born in Paris in January, 1715, and was educated by the Jesuits at the College of Louis-le-Grand. He afterwards studied law and finances in Paris, and the influence of queen Maria Leszczinska became a farmer-general. His life was disorderly up to the time of his marriage in 1751. In 1758 he published his De l'esprit, which was a summary of the doctrines of the Encyclopedie. The work was quickly denounced; and, to re- gain the favor of the court, Helvetius successively published three letters of apology which gradually advanced in humility and submission. Notwithstanding the confession which they contained of a Christian faith, and his disclaimers of all opinions inconsistent with its spirit, the doctors of the Sorbonne drew up a formal condemnation of the work, which they declared to be a compendium of all the evil contained in all the bad books that had yet appeared. It was publicly burned, according to a decree of the Parliament of Paris. The style of the book is vicious and declamatory. Helvetius died at Paris Dec. 26, 1771, leaving for d. H. S. (1766), 122; Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, ed. H. B. Smith, § 229, and references there.

Niemeyer (Collectio Confes., p. 729). Within a year from its promulgation it was adopted by the magistrates of Bâle, Zurich, Berne, etc., but it was not received at Geneva until 1769. It was finally made authorita- tive throughout Switzerland: all ministers, teachers, and professors were bound to subscribe to it; and it was ordained that no candidate for the ministry should be admitted except upon declaration that he received it ex amino (Augusti, l. c. p. 464). But these strong mea- sures, together with the influence of the French clergy, and especially the intercession of Frederick William of Brandenburg, produced a reaction; and in 1686 the magistrates of Bâle allowed the adoption of another without subscription to the Formula. By 1706 its strict obligation had fallen into disuse at Geneva. In the other cantons it was still retained, but gave rise to less con- flicts. In 1722 the kings of Prussia and England sent letters to the Swiss Cantons, for the sake of the unity and peace of Protestantism, to drop the use of the Formula as a binding creed. In 1728 they renewed these letters to the same purpose. By 1740 the Formu- la had fallen entirely into disuse. "It never ac- quired authority outside of Switzerland. Within about fifty years in the Diocese of Zürich, the Formula was disused by the advocates of this last measure was Turrettin's own son, Alphonsus Turrettin, who was as zealous in opposing as his father had been in advocating it. If there was ever a creed which deserves to be called the manifesto of a theological party rather than a confession of faith or the expression of the mind of the church, it is that of the Formula" (Fish, in New Englander, July, 1868, p. 502). See Hottinger, Formula Consensuum Historia (1729, 4to), in favor of the Consensus; Pfaff, Scheitsmaa theol.de Form, Consensus, Helvet. (Tubingen, 1728, 4to), on the Lutheran side; Schrott, Kirchen-Briefe, viii, 650 sq.; Barnard, Mémoires pour servir à l'histoire des troubles à l'occasion du Consensus (Amst. 1726, 8vo); Mosheim, Ch. History, cent. xvii, ii, iii, ch. iii; Trechsel, in Herzog, Real-Encyclop. v, 719 sq.; Shedd, Hist. of Doctrines, ii, 472; Augusti, Algo. christl. Symbolics, 1861, p. 169; Schweitzer, in Schweitzer's Hist. Theol. 1869, p. 122; Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, ed. H. B. Smith, § 222, and references there.

Helvetius, Claude Abriem, a French infidel, was born in Paris in January, 1715, and was educated by the Jesuits at the College of Louis-le-Grand. He afterwards studied law and finances in Paris, and the influence of queen Maria Leszczinska became a farmer-general. His life was disorderly up to the time of his marriage in 1751. In 1758 he published his De l'esprit, which was a summary of the doctrines of the Encyclopedie. The work was quickly denounced; and, to re- gain the favor of the court, Helvetius successively pub- lished three letters of apology which gradually advanced in humility and submission. Notwithstanding the confession which they contained of a Christian faith, and his disclaimers of all opinions inconsistent with its spirit, the doctors of the Sorbonne drew up a formal condemnation of the work, which they declared to be a compendium of all the evil contained in all the bad books that had yet appeared. It was publicly burned, according to a decree of the Parliament of Paris. The style of the book is vicious and declamatory. Helvetius died at Paris Dec. 26, 1771, leaving for d. H. S. (1766), 122; Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, ed. H. B. Smith, § 229, and references there.

Helvetius, Claude Abriem, a French infidel, was born in Paris in January, 1715, and was educated by the Jesuits at the College of Louis-le-Grand. He afterwards studied law and finances in Paris, and the influence of queen Maria Leszczinska became a farmer-general. His life was disorderly up to the time of his marriage in 1751. In 1758 he published his De l'esprit, which was a summary of the doctrines of the Encyclopedie. The work was quickly denounced; and, to re- gain the favor of the court, Helvetius successively published three letters of apology which gradually advanced in humility and submission. Notwithstanding the confession which they contained of a Christian faith, and his disclaimers of all opinions inconsistent with its spirit, the doctors of the Sorbonne drew up a formal condemnation of the work, which they declared to be a compendium of all the evil contained in all the bad books that had yet appeared. It was publicly burned, according to a decree of the Parliament of Paris. The style of the book is vicious and declamatory. Helvetius died at Paris Dec. 26, 1771, leaving for d. H. S. (1766), 122; Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, ed. H. B. Smith, § 229, and references there.
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there is consequently nothing which is either absolutely good, or absolutely evil. The happiness and enlightenment of the people he makes to be the true end of all human government; and, denying a divine Providence in the government of the world, he declares all religion to be a cheat and a prejudice" (Eng. Cyclopaedia, a. v.).

His system is the boldest form of materialism. There have been several editions of his complete works (Lond. 1777, 2 vols. 4to; 1794, 5 vols. 8vo; Paris, 1795, 14 vols. 18mo, ed. by Lefebvre; Paris, 1818, 3 vols. 8vo). See St. Lambert, Essai sur la Vie et les Oeuvres d'Helvétius; English Cyclopaedia, a. v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Fond. Général, xxiii, 885; Morell, History of Modern Philosophy, p. 110, 337; Remusat, in Recue d. deux Mondes, Aug. 15, 1858; Farrar, Critical History of Free Thought, lect. v.

Helveticus (Helveticus) Christopher, was born Dec. 25, 1581, at Sprelingen, Darmstadt, where his father was minister. He studied at Marburg, and was able to teach Hebrew at twenty. It is said that he spoke Hebrew as freely as his mother tongue. In 1605 he was made professor of Greek and Hebrew at the School of Giessen, which in 1606 was erected into a university by the landgrave. In 1610 he was made professor of divinity. He died Sept. 10, 1617. His most important work was Grammatic et Philologorum ac Chirologorum ac Chronologiae Systema novum (1610, often reprinted, and translated into English); also a Chronologia Universalis (1612).

Helvidius, a so-called heresarch of the 4th century, a layman who opposed the growing superstitions of the Church, and especially the nascent worship of the Virgin Mary. He was a pupil of Auxentius, bishop of Milan, and the precursor of Jovinian (q. v.). Jerome was at the time preaching the "gospel of celibacy," and Helvidius opposed this tendency also. He maintained that Mary had other children besides Jesus, and supported his opinion by the N. Test., and by the authority of Helvidius. "He had also advanced that by this opinion he in no wise infringed on the honor of Mary. He attacked also the exaggerated undervaluation of married life. He quoted the examples of the patriarchs, who had maintained a pious life in wedlock; while, on the other hand, he referred to the examples of such virgins as had by no means lived up to their calling. These opinions of Helvidius might lead us to conclude that the combating of a one-sided ascetic spirit was a matter of still more weight with him than the defence of his views with regard to Mary. Perhaps, also, he had been led into these views simply by exegetical inquiries and observations, and so had been drawn into this opposition to the overvaluation of celibacy merely for the purpose of defending his opinion against an objection on the score of propriety" (Neander, Ch. Hist., Torrey's ii, 340). Augustine (De haeres. c. 84) calls his followers Helvidianus. Jerome wrote a treatise against him (ad Helvidium), in which we find some passages of Helvidius's writings. See Epiphanius, Haeres. c. 70, 78; Augustine, Haeres. c. 56, 94; Neander, 1, c.

Helyot, Pierre, a Franciscan monk of great learning (known also as father Hippolytus), was born at Paris in 1699, and died in 1716. He went twice to Rome on business of the order, and travelled through the whole of France. He is chiefly distinguished as the author of the Histoire des ordres monastiques religieux et militaires (Paris, 1714-21, 8 vols. 4to), of which he gathered the materials during his travels, and which is to this day the most complete of its kind, though several of the orders are not treated in it. He died during the publication of the fifth volume, and the work was finished by Bullo. A new edition by Migno appeared at Paris in 1847-50 (4 vols. royal 8vo). See Lefebvre, Hist. de la France; Querard, La France littér. ; Hoefer, Nouv. Bush, Général, xxiii, 893.

Hem of a Garment (הֵם, ἑβά, Exod. xxviii, 33, 34; xxxix, 24-26; elsewhere the "skirt" of a robe; בּוֹרֵד, Matt. ix, 39; xiv, 30; elsewhere "border"). The importance which the later Jews, especially the Pharisees (Matt. xxiii, 5), attached to the hem or fringe of their garments was founded upon the regulation in Numb. xv, 38, 39, which ascribed a symbolical meaning to it. We must not, however, conclude that the fringe owed its origin to that passage; it was in the first instance the ordinary mode of finishing the robe, the ends of the threads composing the woof being left in order to prevent the cloth from unraveling, just as in the Egyptian cilastiris (Herod. ii, 81; see Wilkinson's Anc. Egyptians, ii, 90), as such a fringe was presented in the bas-reliefs of Nineveh, the blue ribbon being added to strengthen the border. The Hebrew word תָּשׁ, τασιθ , "fringe" (Numb. xv, 38, 39), is expressive of the fivetted edge: the Greek εἰσίτεσι (the etymology of which is uncertain, being variously traced to κωστίς, ἄκρας τινός, and ἄρητος) applies to the edge of a river or mountain (Xenoph. Hist. Gr. Gr. iii, 2, § 15; iv, 6, § 8), and is explained by Hesychius as τὸ ἀνὰ τὸν ἄκρας πετάλωμα ρυμιᾶ καὶ τὸ ἀκρον αὐτοῦ. The beaded or outer robe was a simple quadrangular piece of cloth, and generally so worn that two of the corners hung down in front: these corners were ornamented with embroidered scenes and names. There is another fragment in the Chronologia Systema nova (1610, often reprinted, and translated into English); also a Chronologia Universalis (1612).

Hemdan (Heb. Chemdum, נַפְחַד, pleasanl; Sept. Αὐραά, Vulgate Hemdum), the first named of the four "children" of Dishon, which latter was a son of Seir and one of the Horite "dukes" antecedent to the supremacy of the Edomites in Mt. Seir (Gen. xxxvi, 20). B.C. cir
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In 1 Chron. i, 41, the name is, by an error of in-scribers, written Haman (Heb. Chamran, יַמְרָנ, Sept. correctly יַמְרָא, Vulg. Hamron, Eng. Vers. "A-man"). The name Hemdian is by Knobel (Genesis, p. 236) compared with those of Humidy and Hamadly, two of the five families of the tribe of Omran or Ammon, who are reckoned, the most learned of E. and S. E. of Syria, in the "Decem, i, 268); also with the Beu-Hausage, who are found a short distance S. of Kerek (S.E. corner of the Dead Sea); and from thence to El-Busairah, probably the ancient Buraah, on the road to Petra. (See Burck-

Hemerobapstes (ὑμεροβαπτιστής). Eusebian (Euseb., Euseb. Vita Euseb., cap. vi, cap. vii. Mosheim (Commentaries, Intr. chap. ii, § 9, en- deavors to show that the so-called "Christians of St. John" are descended from these ancient Hemerobapstes. See Suicer, Theosaurus (A.D. 1728), i, 1531; and the ar- ticles Christians of St. John, Meyers Lex. of HEMING. See HEMING.

Hemlock appears in the Author. Vers. as the render- ing of two Heb. words in some of the passages where they occur.

1. Rosh (rush) and (seem) is thought originally to sign- ify "poison," and is therefore supposed to indicate a poisonous, or, at least, a bitter plant. This we may infer from its being frequently mentioned along with launah or "womwood," as in Deut. xxii, 18, "Let there should be among you a plant that beareth wormwood with it as a sign of the vine of Sodom, and their grapes" be grapes of "womwood" (launah); so also in Jer. ix, 15; xxiii, 15; and in Lam. iii, 19, "Remembering mine affliction and my mis- ery, the wormwood and the gall." That it was a berry- lying plant has been inferred from Deut. xxxii, 52, "For their vine is of the vine of Sodom, and their grapes are grapes of" "womwood" (rosh); their clusters are bitter. In Jer. viii, 14; ix, 15; xxiii, 15, "water of" "gall" (rosh) is men- tioned, which may be either the expressed juice of the fruit or of the plant, or a bitter infusion made from it. That it was a plant very evident from Hosea x, 4, where it is said that their judgment springeth up as hem- lock (rosh) in the furrows of the field; also in Amos vi, 12, "For ye have turned judgment into gall (launah, 'wormwood'), and the fruit of the earth into hemlock (rosh)." The only other passages where it occurs are speaking of the "poison" (Job xx, 16) or "venom" of the dragon (Ex. lix, 33), or "gall" in a figurative sense for sorrow (Lam. iii, 5), or as food (Ps. lix, 21). See GALL; PoISON.

Though rosh is generally acknowledged to indicate some plant, yet a variety of opinions have been entertained respecting its identification: some, as the Author. Vers. in Hosea x, 4, and Amos vi, 12, consider cedrus or hemlock to be the plant intended. Tremellius adopts this as the meaning of rosh in all the passages, and is followed by Celsius (Hieron, ii, 49). The cicuta of the Romans, the κωπούς of the Greeks, is generally acknowl- edged to have been what we now call hemlock, the name of "wormwood" of botanists. There can be no doubt of its poisonous nature (Pliny, Hist. Nat. xxv, 13). Celsius quotes the description of Linnaeus in support of its growing in the furrows of fields, but it does not appear to be so common in Syria. Celsius, however, adds Bocchius, who, in his continuation of Balsamius, is of the opinion that rosh was conium or hemlock. But there does not appear any necessity for our considering rosh to have been more poisonous than launah or "womwood, with which it is associated so frequently as to appear like a proverbial expression (Deut. xxii, 18; Jer. ix, 15; xxiii, 15; Amos vi, 12); nor is it possible that the translators render it agrimont, intending some species of grass. Hence some have concluded that it must be a mandium, the zizania of the ancients; while others have thought that some of the solanum or lurida of Linnaeus, as the belladonna or the solanum nigrum, common nightshade, or still, again, the henbane, is in- cluded. But no proof appears in fact of the connection of this tribe, and their sensible properties are not so remarkably disagreeable as to have led to their being employed in what appears to be a proverbial expression. Hiller, in his Hortophyctum (ii, 54), adds the centaury as a bit- ter plant, which, like others of the tribe of gentians, might answer all the passages in which rosh is mentioned, with the exception of that of Deut. xxxii, 32 where it is supposed to have a berried fruit. Dr. Harris, quoting Blayney on Jer. viii, 14, says, "In Ps. ixxix, 21, which is justly considered as a prophecy of our Saviour's suf- ferings, it is said, 'They gave me rosh to eat,' which the Sept. have rendered xalóv, gall. Accordingly, it is recorded in the history, Matt. xxxii, 34, 'They gave him vinegar to drink, mingled with gall,' ἐξεσπέραζεν μεθί χολᾶς. But in the parallel passage (Mark xv, 23) it is said to be 'wine mingled with myrrh,' a very biter ingredient.

From whence I am induced to think that χολᾶς, and perhaps rosh, may be used as a general name for whatever is exceedingly bitter: and, consequently, when the sense requires, it may be put specially for any bitter herb or plant, the infusion of which may be called ' wa- ters of rosh.' See Myrrh.

2. Laasaxi (τηλασασχ) occurs in the passages above cited and in a form of it is translated "womwood" (Deut. xxiii, 18; Prov. v, 14; Jer. xxii, 13; xxiii, 15; Lam. iii, 19; Amos v, 7); and only in a single passage it is rendered "hemlock" (Amos vi, 12). See WORMWOOD.

Hemmenway, Moses, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born in 1735 at Framingham, Mass. He graduated at Harvard College in 1756, and was ordained in the Congregational Church, at Westfield, Aug. 25, 1759, and continued in that pulpit until his death, April 5, 1811. He published Seven Sermons on the Obligation and Encouragement of the Unregenerate to labor for the Meat which endureth to everlasting Life (1767) — Vindication of the Power, Obligation, etc., of the Unregenerate to attend the Means of Grace, against the Exceptions of Samuel Hopkins in his Reply to Mills (1772) — Remarks on Rev. Mr. Hopkin's Answer to a Tract entitled "A Vindication," etc. (1774) — A Discourse concerning the Divine Institution of Water Baptism as a standing Ordinance of the Gospel (1781) — A Discourse on the Nature and Subjects of Christian Baptism (1781) — Discourse on the Constitution of the Church, in which the several Acceptations of the Word are explained, etc. (1792) — Remarks on the Rev. Dr. Ennemos' Dissertation on the Scriptural Qualifications for Admission and Access to the Christian Sacraments, and on his Discourses on Besler's Church (1793); and several occasional sermons — Sprague, Ammaile, l, 541.

Hemmerlin or Hämmerlein, Felix (Mollers- bo), a Swiss theologian, was born at Zurich in 1809. After studying the canon law at the University of Er- furt he went to Rome. On his return to Switzerland in 1421 he was appointed canon at Zofingen, and the year after he was made provost of St. Ursus, in Solothurn. With the revenues of these livings he collected a large library. He took part in the Council of Basle (1441-3), and was conspicuous there for his zeal in forming ecclesi- astical discipline. He made many bitter enemies, and in 1439 they made an attempt on his life, and wounded him seriously. This did not, however, deter him from continuing his work of the destruction of the ancient canons, and the general kof discipline. After long continued disputes with his colleagues at Zurich, he was stripped, through their influence, of all his emoluments. He also drew upon himself the hatred of a party of his country- men by the thirteenth chapter of his treatise De Nobilita- tate, in which he inveighed against the professions of canonesses, who in 1442 made war on his native city. Some mem- bers of this party, who attended the Carnival at Zurich
in 1554, seized Hemmerlin and carried him to Constance, where he was thrown into prison, and treated with great cruelty. He was unwilling to retract any of his writings, and was condemned to perpetual imprisonment in a convent. He was taken to a monastery of bare-footed monks at Lucerne, and died there in 1457, a martyr to his devotion, not, indeed, to evangelical, but to ecclesiastical discipline. Many of his writings are collected in *Variae Objectiones Opuscula et Tractatus* (Basel, 1497, fol.).—Hoefer, *Nova. Bibl. Gen. fol. xxiii, 209; Reber, *Patr. Hamburg.* (Zurich, 1746); Herzog, *Real-Encyklopädie,* v. 732.

**Hemming** (Hemmingius), Nicolas, an eminent theologian of Denmark, was born in the isle of Lolland in 1518. He studied four years at Wittenberg under Melanchthon, and imbibed his mild spirit. Returning to Denmark, he became preacher, and afterwards professor of Hebrew and theology at Copenhagen. In 1557 he became professor of theology and vice-chancellor. He was a voluminous writer in exegetical, dogmatical, and practical theology, and his Latin style is highly praised. Opposing the Lutheran doctrine of ubiquity, he was greatly reproached by the Lutherans as a Crypto-Calvinist. (See *Jesuit, Cal. 1474*) He expressed himself on the Eucharist in a conciliatory way; but this so-called recantation has been interpreted in accordance with the Calvinistic doctrine, as well as with the Lutherans. In 1579 he was made canon of Roskilde, where he died in peace in 1600. His *Opuscula Theologica,* including his shorter treatises, were edited by Gouart (Geneva, 1866, fol.).

**Hemsen, Johann Tychsen,** a German theologian, was born at Bolsilixum (Schleswig) Oct. 15, 1792. He studied at Copenhagen and Göttingen, where he graduated in 1821. In 1823 he became extraordinary professor of theology in the University of Göttingen, and died there May 14, 1874. He wrote *Aurea aureae Aureum* (Leips., 1824); *Die Authenticität der Schriften des Evangelisten Johanneae* (Schleswig, 1823); against Breitschneider's *Probabilism:*—De Christologia Joannis Baptistae (Götter, 1824);—Der Apostel Paulus, sei Leben, Wirken, und seine Schriften, posthumous (Götter, 1830, 8vo), etc. He also wrote in the *_telete Ausagein of Göttingen, and the Neue Kritik, Bibliothek of Seebold;* and edited Statullin's *Gesch. u. Literatur der Kirchengesch.* (Hanover, 1827), and *Berenjanya Turonensis Liber de sacra Cana, adaeros Laurinianus* (Leips., 1830). See *Newer Neukritik* and *Theologen* (1800; 1832).—9th, 357, x, 219, *B. G.* (1824).—*Xt, 219, *B. G.* (1824).—9th, 357, x, 219, *B. G.* (1824).

**Hen** (Heb. *'en,* 'a bird, especially the domestic fowl, Matt. xxiii, 37; Luke xiii, 34). We have no evidence that the ancient Hebrews were accustomed to the breeding of poultry, but that the later Jews were acquainted with it (Chald. *תנינא* is evident from 2 Esdras i, 29; Matt. xxiii, 37; Luke xiii, 34; xxii, 60, 61. Michal. is of his head the 1. The location of the common hen is referred to in Jer. xvii, 11. The original country of the common poultry fowl is India, where it is called the jungle bird. See *Cock.* The metaphor used in the passages of the Gospels where the term "hen" occurs has always been admired for its beauty.

When the hen sees a bird of prey coming, she makes a noise to assemble her chickens, that she may cover them with her wings from the danger. The Roman army, as an eagle, was about to fall upon the Jews; our Lord expresses a desire to guard them from threatened calamities, but they disregarded his invitations and warnings, and fell as a nation into captivity. The word "hen" is used in the same specific sense in classical Greek (Aristoph. *Afr. 102, Vesp. 811.* That a bird so intimately connected with the household, and so common in Palestine, as we know from Rabbinical sources (Otho, *Lex. Robb.* p. 256), should receive such slight notice, is certainly singular (see Reland, *De gallis canv. Hier. au- dio,* Rotterd. 1709; Detharding, 2d. Ross. 1723); it is almost equally singular that it is nowhere represented in the paintings of ancient Egypt (Wilkinson, i. 234). See *Fowl.*

He'na (Heb. *Hena,* 'a bird; signif. unknown; Sept. *'Awi,* but in Isa. xxvii, 13, blends with the following name into *Avavyyouqua,* q. d.; *Avat-ara*; Vulg. *Ama,* a city (apparently of Mesopotamia) mentioned in connection with Avaraim and Ivah as one of those overthrown by Sennacherib before his invasion of Ju- dea (2 Kings xxvii, 34; xix, 18; Isa. xxxvii, 13). Ac- cording to the conjecture of Busching (*Erdbeschri.* xi, 283, 757), it is the town which is still called by the Arabs *Awaq.* It lies on the Euphrates, amid gardens, which are rich in dates, citrons, oranges, pomegranates, and other fruits. The modern site is on the right bank of the stream, while the name also attaches to some ruins a little lower down upon the left bank; but between them is a string of islands* (Cheyne's *Eupha- rtes Expedition,* i, 180), upon one of which stands a castle. Perhaps it is the ancient *Avath,* perhaps the ancient *Avat,* or, in ancient times, the city lay, for the most part, or entirely, upon this island, for Abufelde says that "Avat is a small town on an island in the middle of the Euphrates" (see Assemanni, *Bell. Orient. III, iii, 717; Mi- chaelis, *Suppl. p. 562.* The inhabitants are chiefly Arabs and Jews. Conjecture further identifies *Awaq* with a town called *Awaq* († merely the feminine termina- tion), which is mentioned in the Assyrian inscriptions as situated on an island in the Euphrates (Fox Talbot's *Assyrian Texts,* p. 21; *Layard's Nineveh and Babylon,* p. 355), at some distance below its junction with the Cha- bour, and which appears as Anatho (Avatho) in Isidore of Charax (*Mansi. P. P.* p. 4). Hititaw, however (*Com- ment. on Isa. Lc.* 67), is a more probable appellation, equivalent to "the Lowland," and in this signification *Furst* (Heb. *Leckion,* s. v.) concurs (q. d. 722; see *Canaan.* Comp. *Sepharvaim.*

Hēnadād (Heb. *Chenadād,* probably for *hē- nēdād,* fuvor of Hodiad; Sept. *'Ha'ad,* a Levite whose sons were active in the enterprises of the restoration after the captivity (Ezra iii, 9); two of the latter, Bavi and Binnui, are named (Neh. iii, 18, 24; x, 9). B.C. ante 585.

**Hendel, William, D.D.,** one of the pioneers of the German Reformed church, born in N. Y., in the Palatinate in the first half of the 18th century. Having completed his theological studies, he came to America in 1764, and in Jan. 1765 became pastor of the German Reformed congregation at Lancaster, Pa. During the years 1769-1782 he had charge of the congregation at Tulpehocken, and neighboring congregations. Indeed, he served as many as nine at a time, besides making frequent missionary excursions. In Sept. 1782, he accepted a call to return to his Lancaster congregation. He was made D.D. by the College of New Jersey in 1788. In February, 1794, he removed to Philadelphia, which was the last station. Shortly before his death, yellow fever broke out the second time, and while faithfully ministering to the sick and dying, he died of the fever Sept. 29, 1798. Dr. Hendel was a good scholar, and a man of great public talents.—Harbaugh, *Fathers of the Reformed Church,* ii, 129 sq.

**Henderson, Alexander,** a minister of the Church of Scotland, was, in 1765, an appositor in Fifeshire about 1583. He studied at St. Andrew's, where he passed A.M. in 1603, and where, about 1610, he was professor of philosophy. About 1615 (according to *McCrie*) he was presented to the parish of Leuchars by archbishop Gladstanes. As the episcopal government employed every means to secure with the people, they resisted Mr. Henderson's settlement, even to the extent of closing the church doors against him. In a few years, however, Henderson became convinced
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that "episcopacy was unauthorized by the Word of God, and inconsistent with the reformed Constitution of the Church of Scotland." He entered into the strife against presbytery with great vigor. In 1619 he was called before the High Commission at St. Andrew's, but defended himself successfully. When the episcopal liturgy was restored to the Church of Scotland, he joined the resistance made to it. He was one of the writers of the renewed "League and Covenant," sworn to by thousands at Grayfriars' Church, Edinburgh, March 1, 1638. He was moderator of the famous General Assembly of that year, and he executed the functions of his office with great ability. At the nineteenth session Henderson preached a powerful sermon, and at its close pronounced the sentence of deposition (against the bishops) which had been adopted by the Assembly. He was removed, much against his will, in 1638, from the church at Leuchars to Edinburgh. In 1640 he was made master of the University of Edinburgh. During 1642 he was employed in managing the correspondence with England regarding reform and union of the churches. In 1643 he was again moderator of the General Assembly; and in that year he was put to sea and carried to the Scilly Islands as a minister, Assembly, and he resided in London for three years. In 1645 he was appointed to assist the commissioners of Parliament to treat with the king at Uxbridge, and also at Newcastle in 1646. In the papers on episcopacy delivered by him in these conferences he displayed great eloquence and ability. He was moderator of the Assembly of Divines in Germany in his time. He was not an elegant writer, and his translations of Scripture are not always in good taste; but most persons competent to judge will agree to Dr. W. L. Alexander's judgment that "his contributions to Biblical literature are among the most valuable... he has produced, either by his lectures on inspiration, and his commentaries on Isaiah and the Minor Prophets." His writings include *Iceland, Journal of a Residence in that Island* (Edinb. 1818, 2 vols, 8vo); — Biblical Researches and Travels in Russia, with Observations on the Rabindral and Corish Jews (Lond. 1826, 8vo); — A translation of M. F. Boss, *Exposition of Daniel* (1811, 8vo); — The Mystery of Godliness, on 1 Tim. iii, 16 (Lond. 1830); — Divine Inspiration (Lond. 1836, often reprinted, 8vo); — Commentary on Isaiah, with a new translation (Lond. 1840, 8vo); — Comm. on Jeremiah, with tr. (Lond. 1853, 8vo); — Comm. on Ezekiel (Lond. 1855, 8vo). He edited, with additions, Stuart's translation of Ernesti, *Elements of Interpretation* (1827, 12mo), Agell. Guttini *Lexicon Sacri* (1836, 24mo), and a new edition of Buck, *Theological Dictionary* (Lond. 1843). His life of Dr. Henderson has recently been issued (1869).

Henderson, John, a Scotch merchant and philanthropist, was born in 1782 at Borrowstoun — was bred to business, and was eminently successful in trade. His religious life was even more eminent than his mercantile zeal, and he devoted a large part of his time to benevolence. He took especial interest in the observance of the Lord's Day, and offered prizes to working-men for essays on Sabbath observance (St. Louis). He was one of the most active promoters of the Evangelical Alliance (q. v.), and contributed largely to its funds. The Waldensian churches, as well as Foreign Missions, received large benefactions from him; while at home, he was a constant and liberal contributor to the churches, and for all works of benevolence. It is said that for years his charitable outlays amounted to more than £43,000 a year. He died at his residence, The Park, near Glasgow, May 1, 1867. — *Evangelical Christendom*, June, 1867.

Hengstenberg, Ernst Wilhelm, a German theologian was born Oct. 20, 1802, at Fröndenberg, in Westphalia, and was prepared for the ministry under the instruction of his father, who was at an early age to determine his life to foreign missions, and went to Denmark, in order to sail thence for India. But he found work in the north of Europe in the circulation of the Bible, which occupied him for twenty years. After several years spent in this way in Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, he was deputed by the British and Foreign Bible Society in 1814 to proceed to Iceland on a similar mission; and in 1819 he was sent through Russia on the same errand. In 1826 he was appointed president of the Missionary College at Hoxton; and in 1830 he was made professor of theology and Biblical literature at the Highbury College. His student, the Bible and its literature in his youth, and the resistance made to it. He was one of the writers of the renewed "League and Covenant," sworn to by thousands at Grayfriars' Church, Edinburgh, March 1, 1638. He was moderator of the famous General Assembly of that year, and he executed the functions of his office with great ability. At the nineteenth session Henderson preached a powerful sermon, and at its close pronounced the sentence of deposition (against the bishops) which had been adopted by the Assembly. He was removed, much against his will, in 1638, from the church at Leuchars to Edinburgh. In 1640 he was made master of the University of Edinburgh. During 1642 he was employed in managing the correspondence with England regarding reform and union of the churches. In 1643 he was again moderator of the General Assembly; and in that year he was put to sea and carried to the Scilly Islands as a minister, Assembly, and he resided in London for three years. In 1645 he was appointed to assist the commissioners of Parliament to treat with the king at Uxbridge, and also at Newcastle in 1646. In the papers on episcopacy delivered by him in these conferences he displayed great eloquence and ability. He was moderator of the Assembly of Divines in Germany in his time. He was not an elegant writer, and his translations of Scripture are not always in good taste; but most persons competent to judge will agree to Dr. W. L. Alexander's judgment that "his contributions to Biblical literature are among the most valuable... he has produced, either by his lectures on inspiration, and his commentaries on Isaiah and the Minor Prophets." His writings include *Iceland, Journal of a Residence in that Island* (Edinb. 1818, 2 vols, 8vo); — Biblical Researches and Travels in Russia, with Observations on the Rabindral and Corish Jews (Lond. 1826, 8vo); — A translation of M. F. Boss, *Exposition of Daniel* (1811, 8vo); — The Mystery of Godliness, on 1 Tim. iii, 16 (Lond. 1830); — Divine Inspiration (Lond. 1836, often reprinted, 8vo); — Commentary on Isaiah, with a new translation (Lond. 1840, 8vo); — Comm. on Jeremiah, with tr. (Lond. 1853, 8vo); — Comm. on Ezekiel (Lond. 1855, 8vo). He edited, with additions, Stuart's translation of Ernesti, *Elements of Interpretation* (1827, 12mo), Agell. Guttini *Lexicon Sacri* (1836, 24mo), and a new edition of Buck, *Theological Dictionary* (Lond. 1843). His life of Dr. Henderson has recently been issued (1869).

Henderson, John, a Scotch merchant and philanthropist, was born in 1782 at Borrowstoun — was bred to business, and was eminently successful in trade. His religious life was even more eminent than his mercantile zeal, and he devoted a large part of his time to benevolence. He took especial interest in the observance of the Lord's Day, and offered prizes to working-men for essays on Sabbath observance (St. Louis). He was one of the most active promoters of the Evangelical Alliance (q. v.), and contributed largely to its funds. The Waldensian churches, as well as Foreign Missions, received large benefactions from him; while at home, he was a constant and liberal contributor to the churches, and for all works of benevolence. It is said that for years his charitable outlays amounted to more than £43,000 a year. He died at his residence, The Park, near Glasgow, May 1, 1867. — *Evangelical Christendom*, June, 1867.

Hengstenberg, Ernst Wilhelm, a German theologian was born Oct. 20, 1802, at Fröndenberg, in Westphalia, and was prepared for the ministry under the instruction of his father, who was at an early age to determine his life to foreign missions, and went to Denmark, in order to sail thence for India. But he found work in the north of Europe in the circulation of the Bible, which occupied him for twenty years. After several years spent in this way in Denmark, Sweden, and Norway, he was deputed by the
he became earnestly interested in religion and theology. In 1824 he became privatscienent in theology at Berlin; in 1826, professor extraordinary; in 1828, ordinary professor; and in 1829, doctor of theology. For many years his organ was the Evangelische Kirchenzeitung, begun in 1827, which he conducted during its active and often stormy career, has rendered great service against Rationalism, but has also been noted for its violent polemical spirit in favor of Lutheranism, and, of late, even of Idealism, as well as of absolutism in Church and State. He was, after 1834, a bitter opponent of the union of the Lutheran and Reformed churches in Prussia, so much desired by Frederick William III, and by Neun der and other leading theologians, against whom Hengstenberg’s severity of language was often inexcusable. His contributions to the Kirchenzeitung, during his four or five years’ connection with it, are noticeable to make many volumes; but he was, besides, a laborious writer, especially in exegetical theology. He died June 3, 1869.


Henhöfer, Alloys, a German divine, was born at Völkenbach, near Ettingen, of Roman Catholic parents, July 11, 1789. His mother destined him for the Roman Catholic priesthood, and hoped that he would become a missionary. He studied at the University of Freiburg, and at the Roman Catholic Seminary of Meersburg. After his ordination as priest, he was tutor for some years in a noble family, and in 1818 became pastor at Mühlhausen. Here he soon found the need of a deeper personal religious life, and was greatly edified by the conversation of Fink, one of Salder’s disciples, and by reading the Life of Martin Boos. His preaching became earnestly evangelical, and crowds flocked to hear him. He orthodoxy was soon questioned, and, on examination, he avowed his doubts as to the Romanist doctrine of the Mass. His excommunication followed (Oct. 16, 1822), and gave occasion to his book Christisches Glaubenber- kennniss d. Pfarers Henhöfer’s. A flock of his converts speedily gathered around him, and in 1823 he was installed as its Evangelical Protestant pastor. In 1827 he was called to Speck, near Carlsruhe, where he labored as pastor for thirty-five years. His influence was felt widely in the revival of evangelical religion throughout Baden. He died December 5, 1862. Besides numerous pamphlets on the Roman Catholic controversy, and on practical questions, he published Der Kampf des Un- glaubens mit Aberglauben u. Glauben (Leipzig 1833). — Zeit (Heidelberg, 1861). — Predigten (posthumous), Heidelberg, 1863. See also Frommel, Aus dem Leben des Dr. Alloys Henhöfer (Carlsruhe, 1855, 8vo).

Henke, Heinrich Philipp Konrad, a German theologian, was born at Hehlen, in Brunswick, July 3, 1792. His early proficiency was so great that before he went to the university he was employed as a gymnasium teacher (1771–72). After studying philosophy and theology at Helmstadt, he was made professor of philosophy there in 1777, and in 1780 professor of theology. In 1787 he became a canon at Helmstadt, where he remained thirty years. After a very successful career, both as teacher and writer, he died May 2, 1809. In theology he belonged to the rationalistic school of Semler, and his Church History is written in a spirit of bitter hatred of ecclesiastical authority. His Life by Bollmann appeared at Helmstadt in 1791, and has made great merits, but his rationalistic views have made his writings shortlived. His reputation chiefly rests on his Allgemeine Geschichte der Christlichen Kirche (Brunsw. 1799–1808, 6 vols. 8vo; finished by Vater, 1813–20, 20 vols. vii and viii). It is "a clever and spirited work; but the Church appears in it, not as the temple of God on earth, but as a great immorality or bedlam" (Schaaf, Ch. History, i, 22; see also Kahnis, German Protestantism, p. 177). He wrote also, Lociamenta institutionum fidei christianae historic-criticarum (Helmstadt, 1788; 2d ed. 1793; German, 1803). — Magazin für d. christlichen Bibliothek, etc. (Berlin, 1806, 2 vols.). See F. A. Lubowitz, Aloris einer Lebenvegetz. Henke; Hoeft, Nov. Biog. Générale, xxiii, 933.

Henkel, Charles, was descended from a long line of ministerial ancestors in the Lutheran Church. He was born May 18, 1796, in New Market, Va. He studied theology under the direction of his father, the Rev. Paul Henkel, who was licensed to preach in 1790, and became pastor in 1818, and immediately commenced his ministry in Mason County, Va. In 1820 he removed to Columbus, Ohio, and in this field continued, amid many deprivations and toils, till 1827, when he took charge of the Somerset par- torate. His health, however, gradually failed, and he died Feb. 2, 1841. He was a man of high moral worth, and a diligent student. Several of his sermons were published. On one occasion he engaged in a public controversy with a Roman Catholic priest, and was very successful in exposing the absurdities of that false sys- tem. (M. L. S.)

Henkel, Paul, a divine of the American Lutheran Church, was born in Rowan County, N. C., Dec. 15, 1754. In 1776 he was awakened under the preaching of Whitefield. At that time was exciting deep interest throughout the country. He commenced a course of study under the direction of pastor Krich, of Frederick, Md., with a view to the Lutheran ministry. He was licensed to preach by the Synod of Pennsylvania, and in 1792 became pastor at New Market, Va. His labors extended to Augusta, Madison, Pendleton, and Wythe counties. His position was very much that of an itinerant missionary, visiting destitute portions of the Church, gathering together the scattered members, instructing and confirming the youth, and administering the sacra- ments. In 1800 he accepted a call to Rowan, his native county, N. C.; but, the location being unfavorable to the health of his family, he removed in 1805 to New Mar- ket, and labored as an independent missionary, preaching wherever his services were required, and depending for his support solely upon the good-will of the people. He was a popular tourist, and in the following years visited Tennessee, Kentucky, Indiana, and Ohio. In 1809 he wrote a work on Christian Baptism in the German lan- guage, which he subsequently translated into English. In 1810 he published a German hymn-book, and in 1816 one in English. He died in 1823, in Hanover, on his own composition. In 1811 he published his German, and, so in after, his English Cat. chism. He also published a German...
Man work in rhyme, entitled Zeitschriften, designed to satirize the fanaticism, the folly, and vices of the day. Mr. Henkel adhered with great tenacity to the standards and usages of his Church. In the earlier part of his ministry he approved of some of the alterations made by Melanchthon in the Augsburg Confession, but at a later period his doctrinal position returned to the Confession. As a preacher he had more than ordinary power. He educated a large number of candidates for the ministry, who have occupied responsible positions in the Lutheran Church. His habits of life were plain and simple, and, although opposed to everything that looked like excitement in the discharge of his official duties, he invariably wore his clerical robes. In person he was large and well formed, measuring nearly six feet in height. Five of his sons became ministers in the Lutheran Church. Towards the close of his life he was attacked with paralysis, and died November 17, 1825. (M. L. S.)

Hennepin, Louis, a Recollect missionary and traveler, was born in Flanders about 1640. In 1675 he was sent to Canada, and in 1678 started to accompany the traveler Lasalle. He founded a convent at Fort Carillon, and with two other monks followed Lasalle in his tour among the Indians. In 1680, he returned to France, and in 1689, with another person named Dacan, to find the sources of the Mississippi. They followed the stream up to the 46° lat. north, but were stopped by a fall which Hennepin called Sault de St. Antoine de Padoue. He was then for eight months a prisoner among the Sioux, but was liberated by the French, and returned to Quebec April 5, 1682. After his return to Europe he was for a while keeper of the convent of Renty, in Artois, and finally retired to Holland. The date of his death is not ascertained. Hennepin disparaged the Jesuits as missionaries, and was, in turn, disparaged by the Jesuits. He wrote Description de la Louisiane, etc., with the carte du pays, les mœurs et la manière de vivre des savages (1688 and 1688, 12mo; 1688, 4to):—Nouvelle Découverte d'un très grand pays situé dans l'Amérique, entre le Nouveau Mexique et la mer Glaciale, avec cartes, etc., and the advantages which one can profit from this establishment of the colonies (Utrecht, 1697, 12mo); and in the Recueil des Voyages au Nord, vol. 11, etc.:—Recueil des voyages dans le Nord, etc., 1678, 12mo. Also:—Mémoires de la Nouvelle France; Dinaux, Archives hist. du Nord, Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxii, 940 sq. (J. N. P.)

Henninger, John, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Washington Co., Va.; was converted while young; entered the Western Conference in 1807; was made presiding elder in 1816 on French-Broad District, located in 1816, and yet labored with zeal until he entered the itinerancy in Holston Conference in 1825, and so labored until his death, Dec. 3, 1829. Mr. Henninger was a faithful, popular, and successful minister, and a consistent and devout Christian. During the latter part of his life he was very efficient as presiding elder, and as agent for Holston College—Ministerial Conference, 1823: 56; Radford, Methodism in Kentucky, iv, 57.

He'noch (1 Chron. i. 3, 33). See ENOCH.

Henoticon (Gk. ἕνοτικον, unifying into one), the name given to a "Decree of Union" issued by the Greek emperor Zeno, A.D. 482, by the advice of Acacius, bishop of Constantinople, with a view to reconcile the Monophysites and the orthodox to the profession of one faith. It recognised the Nicene and Constantinopolitan creeds, but did not name the decrees of Chalcedon. It thus required a sacrifice of opinion on the part of the Monophysites; but, at the same time, it deprived the orthodox of the advantages they had gained at the Council of Chalcedon. The Roman patriarch, Felix II, condemned it in 462, and in 518 it was suppressed.—Moebius, Church Hist. cent. v, pt. ii, ch. v, § 19. The Henoticon is given, in Greek, in Gieseler, Ch. Hist. i, § 106. See Monophysites.

Hierarchians. See HENRY OF LAUSANNE.

Henry of Ghent (Henricus de Gandavo; proper name Gothael), a theologian of the 18th century. He was born at Ghent in 1217, studied at the University of Paris, and was a pupil of Albertus Magnus. Admitted to lecture at the latter's faculty, he was required to become, in addition to his work as a teacher of philosophy and theology, and obtained the surname of Doctor Scolenius. "He was endowed with great sagacity of understanding, attached to the system of the Realists, and blended the ideas of Plato with the formularies of Aristotle; attributing to the first a real existence of the divine Intellect, and, to the second, a true knowledge of the divine Intelligency. He suggested some new opinions in the philosophy of natural theology, and detected many speculative errors, without, however, suggesting corrections for them, owing to the faultiness of the method of the philosophy of his time" (Tennemann). Henry became canon, and afterwards archdeacon of Tourna, and died there A.D. 1283. His writings are, Quaestiones in lib. Sententiarum (Paris, 1518, fol. reprinted, with commentary by Zucolli, 1613, 2 vols. fol.);—Summa Theologiae (Paris, 1520, fol.);—De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis (in Fabricius, Bibl. Ercl.). See Duppl., Eccles. Writers, cent. xiii; Ritter, Greek, d. Philosophus, xi, ii, p. 138; Mommsen, Monumenta Graec., ii. 97; etc.

Henry of Gorcum (Henricus Gorcumensis), so named from his birthplace, Gorcum, in Holland, a philosopher and theologian of the 15th century, vice-chancellor of the Academy of Cologne. He wrote commentaries on Aristotle, Aquinus, and Peter Lombard; also Tract. de ceremoniis Ecclesiasticis:—De Celebrat. Festorum:—Contra Hussitae.

Henry of Huntingdon, an early English historian, was born about the end of the 11th century. He became archdeacon of Huntingdon before 1123. At the request of Alexander, bishop of Lincoln, he wrote a general history of England, from the landing of Julius Caesar to the death of Henry I (1154), in eight books. It is to be found in Savin's Scriptores post Bedam procati (Lond. 1596, fol.; Franc. 1601); also in English, The Chronicle of Henry of Huntingdon, etc., edited by T. Forester (Lond. 1863, sm. 8vo).—Warton (Anghia Sacra, ii, 694) gives a letter of Henry of Huntingdon to the abbot of Ramsey, advising Waldensians not to be contemptuous, which contains many curious anecdotes of the kings, nobles, prelates, and other great men who were his contemporaries. It is given at o. in D'Achery, Spicilegium, iii, 503.—English Cyclog. adiut. Darling, Cyclog. Bibliographica, 1613; Wright, Biog. Brit. Lit. (Anglo- Norman Period).—Henry of Lausanne (frequently called Henry of Cluny), founder of the sect of Henriicans in the 12th century. He is represented by Papal writers as a heretic and fanatic, but the truth seems to be that he was one of the "reformers before the Reformation." He is said to have been an Italian by birth, and a monk of Cluny. Disgusted with the corruptions of the times, he left his order, and became "a preacher of repentance." At first he was held in high honor even by the clergy. The field of his labor was the South of France; the time between A.D. 1116 and 1148. His first efforts were made at Lausanne and its neighborhood (hence his surname). His piety, modesty, and eloquence soon gained him a wide reputation. He preached vigorously against that "sham Christianity which did not prove its genuineness by the fruits of good living; and warning against the prevalent vices. This led him next to warn men against their false guidance, whose example and teaching did more to promote wickedness than to put a stop to it. He restated the clergy as they actually were with what they ought to be: he attacked their vices, particularly their unchastity. He was a zealot for the observance of the laws of celibacy, and against this, in his time, a promoter of the Hildebrandian reformation. It was
to the contrary. His practical, restless activity, and the opposition that he met with on the part of the higher clergy, which led him to proceed further, and, as he traced the cause of the corruption to a deviation from the primitive apostolic teaching, to attack errors in doctrine. He must have possessed extraordinary power as a speaker, and he was an enthusiastic and strict moralist. Many men and women were awakened by him to repentance, brought to confess their sins, and to renounce them. It was said a heart of stone must have melted under his preaching. The people were struck under such conviction by his sermons, which seemed to lay open to them their own hearts, that they attributed to him a sort of prophetic gift, by virtue of which he could look into the very souls of men (Neander, Church History, Torrey's, iv, 599).

He was invited to Mrs., where Hildebert, the bishop, favored him at first; but his preaching soon excited the people against the priests to such a degree that even the monasteries were threatened with violence. Hildebert drove him from Mans; and, after various wanderings, he joined the disciples of Peter of Bruys, in Provence. The archbishop of Arles arrested him, and at the second Council of Pisa, 1134, he was declared a heretic, and condemned to be expelled from the kingdom. Subsequently, however, he was set at liberty, when he betook himself again to South France, to the districts of Toulouse and Alby, a principal seat of anti-churchly tendencies, where also the great lords, who were striving to make themselves independent, freed him from their enmities from hatred to the innovations of the clergy. Among the lower classes and the nobles Henry found great acceptance; and, after he had labored for ten years in those regions, Bernard of Clairvaux, in writing to a nobleman and inviting him to put down the heretics, could say, 'The churches are without flocks, the flocks without priests; the priests are nowhere treated with due reverence, the churches are levelled down to synagogues, the sacraments are not esteemed holy, the festivals are no longer celebrated.' When Bernard says, in the words just quoted, that the communities are without priests, he means that the priests had gone over to the Huguenists, so far as he complains in a sermon, in which he speaks of the rapid spread of this sect: 'Women forsake their husbands, and husbands their wives, and run over to this sect. Clergymen and priests desert their communities and churches; and they have been found sitting with long beards (to mark the libri apostolici) among weavers' (Neander, l. c.).

Bernard of Clairvaux opposed him earnestly. Pope Eugene III sent Bernard, with the cardinal of Ostia, into the infected district. Henry was arrested, and condemned at the Council of Rheims, A.D. 1148, to imprisonment for life. He died in prison A. H. 1171, of hunger, M. E. (1171, in prison at Rheims, Neander, Ch. Hist, iv, 601 sq.; Neander, Heilige Bernard, 294 sq.; Hahn, Geschichte der Konzer, cent. xii; Gieseler, Church History, period iii, § 84.

**Henry of St. Ignatius, a Flemish theologian, was born at Ath in the 17th century. He joined the Carthusian community at Arras city, and for many years taught theology in their schools. During a tour he made to Rome in 1701-1709, he acquired great influence with pope Clement XI. On his return he wrote a number of books of Jansenist tendency, and in which he showed himself especially severe on the Jesuit casuists. He died about 1729. The most important of his writings are, Theologiae vetus, fundamentalis (Liege, 1677, fol.).—Molitoris professiorum (Liege, 1715, 2 vols. 8vo):—Artis Jesu- listica (Bras, 3d ed. 1710; 4th ed. 1717, 12mo):—


**Henry of Zütphen. See Moller.

**Henry IV, king of France and Navarre, son of Antoine de Bourbon and Jeanne d'Albret, was born at Pau, in Bearc, Dec. 15, 1553. He was carefully educated in Protestant principles by his excellent mother, who recalled him to her home at Pau from the French court in 1566. In 1569 he joined the Huguenot army at La Rochelle, and was acknowledged as their leader, the actual commander in chief being his father (see Henry IV, v.). The peace of St. Germain (1570) allowed him to return to court, and in 1572 he married Margaret, sister of Charles IX. The massacre of St. Bartholomew followed soon after, and Henry's life was only spared on that awful night on his promise to become a Roman Catholic. The Gallican faction, however, suspected his sincerity, and in 1588 all France was peaceably subject to him. "Henry was censured for his change of religion, and by none more earnestly than by his faithful friend and counselor, Duplessis Mornay. On the other hand, many of his enemies charged him with insincerity to be sincere. But the truth probably was, that Henry, accustomed from his infancy to the life of camps and the hurry of dissipation, was not capable of serious religious meditation, and that he knew as little of the religion which he forsakes as of that which he embraced. In his long conferences at Chateau in September, 1589, with Duplessis Mornay, which took place after his abjuration, he told his friend that the step he had taken was one not only of prudence, but of absolute necessity; that his affections remained the same towards his friends and subjects of the Reformed communion; and he expressed a hope that he should one day be able to bring about a union between the two religions, which, he observed, differed less in essentials than was supposed. To this Duplessis replied that no such union could ever be effected in France unless the pope's power was first entirely abolished (Mém. et Correspondance de Duplessis Mornay depuis l'an 1571 jusqu'en 1625, Paris, 1824-34)" (English Cyclopedia, s. v.).

His reign was a very successful one, but we are concerned here only with its relations to the Church. On the 18th of April, 1598, Henry signed the Edict of Nanterre (April 6). See Duplessis Mornay, Hist. et Con- sens, and liberty of conscience. During Henry's life no public persecution of Protestants was possible, but the ignorant intolerance of the rural functionaries and priests often frustrated his good wishes and commands. On the 14th of May, 1619, he was assassinated in his carriage by one Ravailliac, supposed to have been a fool of the Jesuits.

**Henry VIII, king of England, was born in Green- wich June 28, 1491. He was second son of Henry VII and queen Elizabeth (of York). His elder brother Arthur, prince of Wales, dying in 1502, Henry became heir-apparent. At 15, a dispensation was granted by Pope Julius II (pope) to allow Henry to marry his brother Arthur's widow (Catharine of Aragon) —a match which turned out sadly enough. Henry came to the throne April 22, 1509. The early years of his reign were comparatively peaceful. He married Catherine in 1509, and governed, for about fifteen years, with a view to his own ambition as well as to the passions of his master; but, on the whole, England prospered under his administration. See Wolsey. Henry was at this time an ardent advocate of Roman views; in 1521 he published his Adversus septem Sacramentorum adversus Martinum Lutherum (4to), for which service
the pope conferred on him the title of Defender Fidei, which the sovereigns of England still retain. (See, for
details of the controversy between Henry and Luther, Waddington, History of the Reformation, ch. xxi.) In
a few years Henry began to grow weary of his queen. His male children died, and he fancied that Provence
deprived of his heir was more valuable than the gratification of his passions. Moreover, the Spanish queen was
unpopular in England. Henry had recourse to an expe-
dient suggested by Cranmer, "namely, to consult all the
universities of Europe on the question 'whether the
papal dispensation for such a marriage was valid,
and to act on their decision without further appeal to
the pope.' The question was accordingly put, and de-
cided in the negative by the universities of Oxford,
Cambridge, Paris, Bologna, Padua, Orleans, Angiers,
Bourges, Toulouse, etc., and by a multitude of theologians and canonists" (Palmer, Ch. History, p. 159). Henry
vaguely repudiated purposes and policies. The proceed-
s as soon as the divorce from Catharine could be accom-
plished. "Anne was understood to be favorably dis-
posed towards those new views on the subject of reli-
gion and ecclesiastical affairs which had been agitating
all Europe ever since Luther had begun his irrepres-
sable career, and he now prepared to act as soon as pos-
sible years before. Queen Catharine, on the other hand, was a
good Catholic; and, besides, the circumstances in which she
was placed made it her interest to take her stand by the
Church, as, on the other hand, her adversaries were
dressed in like manner by their interests and the course of
events. A new dispensation was accordingly granted, and all
errors, heresies, and abuses in the Church: and ordering
first-fruits and tenth of all spiritual benefices to be
paid to the king. After this, various persons were execu-
ted for refusing to acknowledge the king's supremacy;
among others, two illustrious victims, the learned Fish-
er, Archbishop of Winchester, and the melancholy
began the dissolution of the monasteries, under the zeal-
ous superintendence of Cromwell, constituted for that
purpose visitor general of these establishments. Lati-
nator and other friends of Cranmer and the Reformation
were now also connected with the king's party, so that not
only in matters of discipline and polity, but even of doctrine,
the Church might be said to have separated itself from
Rome. One of the last acts of the Parliament under
which all these great innovations had been made was to
petition the king that a new translation of the capit-
atures might be made by authority and set up in church-
es. It was dissolved on the 18th of July, 1536, after
having sat for the then unprecedented period of six
years. The month of May of this year witnessed the
trial and execution of queen Anne—in less than six
months after the death of her great rival, Catherine of
Aragon—and the marriage of the brutal king, the very
next morning, to Jane Seymour, the new beauty, his
passion for whom must be regarded as the true motive
that had impelled him to the deed of blood. Queen
Jane dying on the 14th of October, 1537, a few days af-
er giving birth to a son, was succeeded by Anne, sister
of the duke of Cleves, whom Henry married in January,
1540, and put away in six months after—the subservient
Parliament, and the not less subservient convocation of
the clergy, on his mere request, pronouncing the mar-
rriage to be null, and the former body making it high
treason 'by word or deed to accept, take, judge, or be-
lieve the said marriage to be good.' Meanwhile the ec-
clesiastical changes continued to proceed at as rapid
rate as ever. In 1536 Cromwell was constituted a sort
of lord lieutenant over the Church, by the title of vicar
general, which was held to invest him with the king's
authority over the spirituality. The dissolution of the
monasteries in this and the following year, as carried
forward under the direction of this energetic minister,
produced a succession of popular insurrections in differ-
ent parts of the kingdom, which were not put down
without great destruction of life, both in the field and
afterwards by the executioner. In 1538 all incumbents
were ordered to set up in their churches copies of the
newly-published English translation of the Bible, and
to teach the people the Creed, the Lord's Prayer, and
the Ten Commandments, in English; the famous image
of our Lady at Wasingham, and other similar objects
of the popular veneration, were also, under Cromwell's order, removed from their shrines and burnt" (English Cyclopaedia, s. v.).

But Henry never abandoned the special Romanist opinions in which he had committed himself personally by controversy. "When, in 1538, the princes of the League of Smalcald offered to place him at its head, and even to alter, if possible, the Augsburg Confession so as to make it a common basis of union for all the elements of opposition to Rome, Henry was well inclined to accept the political advantages of the position tendered him, but hesitated to accept it until all doctrinal questions should be settled. The three points on which the Germans insisted were the communion in both elements, the worship in the vulgar tongue, and the marriage of the clergy. Henry was firm, and the ambassadors of the Holy Roman Empire were asked to make him a conference with the English bishops and doctors without result. On their departure (Aug. 5, 1538) they addressed him a letter arguing the subjects in debate—the refusal of the cup, private masses, and sacerdotal celibacy—to which Henry replied only with a defense of his position on these topics with no little skill and dexterity, and refusing his assent finally. The Reformers, however, did not yet despair, and the royal preachers even ventured occasionally to debate the propriety of clerical marriage freely before them in his sermons, but in vain. Aug. 1538, and later. Mar. 1539. The court of Maranthon addressed him in April, 1539, arguing the same questions again, had no better effect. Notwithstanding any seeming hesitation, Henry's mind was fully made up, and the consequences of endeavoring to persuade him against his prejudices soon became apparent. Confirmed in his opinions, he proceeded to enforce them upon his subjects in the most arbitrary manner; 'for, though on all other points he had set up the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession, yet on these he had committed himself as a controversialist, and the worst passions of polemical authorship—the true cudgel theology—acting through his irresponsible disposition, rendered him the most cruel of persecutors. But a few weeks after receiving the letter of Melanthon, he answered it in his own savage fashion' (Lea, Sacerdotal Celibacy, p. 481). In 1539, under the ascendency of bishop Gardner (q. v.), the "Six Articles" were enacted, in favor of transubstantiation, communion in one kind, celibacy, private masses, and auricular confession. See ARTICLES, SIX, vol. I, p. 442. Cromwell endeavored to mitigate the severity of the government in its cruel persecutions of all who would not accept these articles, and lost his own head for his temerity in 1540. In the same year Henry married Catherine Howard, who, in 1541, was herself repudiated and executed for adultery. He then married his sixth wife, Catharina Parr, who survived him. The licentious monarch died Jan. 28, 1547.

Much has been made by Roman Catholic controversialists of the bad life of Henry VIII as an argument against the Reformation. On this point we cite Palmer, as follows: "The character of Henry VIII, or of any other temporal or spiritual promoters of reformation, is a subject of controversy (even when not exaggerated) no proof that the Reformation was in itself wrong. Admitting, then, that Henry and others were justly accused of crimes, the Reformation which they promoted may in itself have been a just and necessary work: and it would have been irrational and wrong in the Reformation to have reduced the system of the church to refusal to re-form themselves laudable, merely because the character of the king or his ministers were unsuitably, and his or their private motives suspected to be wrong. Such conduct on the part of the Church would have been needlessly offensive to temporal rulers, while it would (in the supposed case) have been actually injurious to the cause of religion, and an uncharitable judgment of private motives. It must be remembered that although Henry and the protector Somerset may have been secretly influenced by avarice, revenge, or other evil passions, they have never made them public. They showed no desire for supporting the Church in the desire of removing usurpations, establishing the ancient rights of the Church and the crown, correcting various abuses prejudicial to true religion, and therefore the Church could not refuse to take into consideration the specific object of reformation proposed by them to her examination of the questions tendered. The judgment of the Church of England in any degree depend on the question of the lawfulness of Henry's marriage with Catharine of Aragon or with Anne Boleyn; such matters, as Bossuet observes, "are often regulated by mere probability," and there were at least abundant probabilities that the marriage with Catherine of Aragon was null ab initio; but this whole question only affects the character of Henry VIII and of those immediately engaged in it; it does not affect the reformation of the Church of England" (Palmer, On the Church, part II, chap. i). See ENGLAND, CHURCH.

Henry, Matthew, a celebrated English nonconformist divine and commentator, was born at the farmhouse of Broad Oak, Flintshire, the dwelling of his maternal grandfather, Oct. 18, 1662. His parents had retired to that place because his father, Rev. Philip Henry (q. v.), had been ejected from his living in April, 1660, and the family's influence in 1662. His early education was obtained in the school of Mr. Doddellt at Elington. In 1685 he entered Gray's Inn as a student of law; but his religious life had been settled at an early age, and his bent of mind was towards the ministry. While at Gray's Inn he devoted much of his time to religious studies. In 1688 he returned to Broad Oak, and soon began to preach, by the invitation of his friend, Mr. Killighe, at Nantwich. The fame of his discourses having spread, he was invited to Chester, where he preached in the house of a Mr. Hen- thorne, a squire, or, to a small audience which formed the nucleus of his marriage congregation. But in 1687 King James granted license to dissenters to preach. Mr. Henry accepted a call to a dissenting congregation in Chester, where he remained twenty-five years. During this period he went through the Bible more than once in exppository lectures. In 1712 he accepted the charge of a chapel in Hackney, London. "At the commence- ment of his ministry, therefore, he began with the first chapter of Genesis in the forenoon, and the first chapter of Matthew in the afternoon. Thus gradually and steadily grew his 'Exposition' of the Bible. A large portion of his explanation of the parables of our Lord was written there. Not only was the fruitfulness of the quaint sayings and pithy remarks with which it abounds, and which give so great a charm of raciness to its pages, were the familiar extempore observations of his father at family worship, and noted down by Matthew in his boyhood." He suffered much from the stings in his later years, but his labors continued unabated. It was his habit to make a visit to Chester once a year. In 1714 he set out on this journey, May 31. On his return he was taken ill with paralysis at Nant- wich, where he said to his friend, Mr. Killighe, "You have seen me--you thought you had seen me--I am more, I am more--a life spent in the service of God, and communion with him, is the most pleasant life that any one can live in this world." He died June 22, 1714. Mr. Henry was a faithful pastor, a discriminating preacher, and a laborious, versatic, and original author. Although possessed of a genius for abstractive definition, in a literary point of view, than do the works of many who are justly designated 'fine writers,' they possess a vigor which, without the least endeavor to arrest, awakens and sustains the attention in an uncommon degree. In a single sentence he often pours upon the reader a flood of words, but he never gives to the wonders contained in God's law occasions excitement not unlike that which is produced by looking through a microscope. The feelings, too, which his
Henry, Philip, an English dissenting divinity, was born Aug. 24, 1631, at the palace of Whitehall, where his father was page to James, duke of York. He was educated at Westminster School, and at Christ Church, Oxford, where he obtained a scholarship in 1648. He was ordained as a Presbyterian minister in 1657, and settled at Werbourn, Flintshire. He married Miss Mathews, a lady of fortune, and became possessed of the estate of Broad Oak, Shropshire. He was driven out of his church by the Act of Uniformity in 1662. He was imprisoned in Newgate, and while there was sentenced to transportation to Georgia. After the year 1664, the saddest day for England since the death of Edward the Sixth, but even this for good." By the Convocation and Five-mile acts he was driven from his house, and compelled to seek safety in concealment. In 1667, when king James proclaimed liberty of conscience, Mr. H., who had already immediately put up part of his own house for worship. His labors were not confined to Broad Oak, but it was his habit to preach daily at different places in the neighborhood. But his labors hastened his rest; for, when writing to a friend who anxiously inquired after his health, he says, "I am always habitually weary, and expect no other till I lie down in the bed of spices." He died June 24, 1696, expressing, "O death, where is thy sting?" An account of his Life of Henry, to which a new introduction and other improvements have been added, and has often been reprinted (see Henry, Miscellaneous Works, vol. i; N. York, Carters, 1855, 2 vols. 8vo). A volume of his Sermons, with notes by Williams, was first published in 1810 (London, 8vo), and has since been reprinted in the Miscellaneous Memoirs of Henry, above cited. See Life by Matt. Henry; Jones, Christian Biography; Bogue and Bennett, History of the Dissenters, i, 433.

Henry, Thomas Charlton, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Philadelphia Sept. 22, 1750, and educated at Middlebury College, Vt., where he graduated in 1814. After studying theology at Princeton, he was ordained in 1816; became pastor of a Presbyterian church in Columbia, S. C., 1818; and removed to the Second Church, Charleston, in 1824. In 1826 his health failed, and he spent several months travelling in Europe. He died in Charleston of yellow fever, Oct. 4, 1827. He published "For the West (1814) and an Inquiry into the Consistency of Popular Amusements with Christianity" (Charleston, 1825, 12mo) — "Eigitings from the Religious World" (Charleston, 1825, 8vo) — "Letters to an Anxious Inquirer" (1826, 12mo; also London, 1829, with a memoir of the author). — Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 826; Sprague, Annals, iv, 538.

Henschenius, Godfrey, a Dutch Jesuit and ecclesiastical historian, was born at Venrui, Flanders, Jan. 21, 1601. In 1635 he was appointed assistant to Bolandus in compiling the Acta Sanctorum (q. v.). After the death of Bolandus in 1665, when only five volumes of that work had made their appearance, father Daniel Paperbarch was charged with a very great part of completing it. Henschenius continued the work until his death in 1681.—Alegambe, Script. Soc. Jesu, s. v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Bioi. Générale, xxv, 231.

Henshaw, John K., D.D., a bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Middletown, Conn., June 17, 1832, and passed A.B. in Middlebury College in 1858. He was ordained a deacon of D. D. was conferred upon him by Middlebury College. In 1848 he was elected bishop of Rhode Island, and made rector of Grace Church, Providence. He was alike energetic and successful in his parish and in his diocese, and during his administration the Church grew not only in numbers, but in power. In 1852 he was called to perform episcopal functions in the diocese of Maryland during bishop Whittingham's absence; and on the 19th of July, 1852, he died of apoplexy, near Frederick, Maryland. Bishop Henshaw was a man of clear, sound, and vigorous intellect; he was trained to the patient labor of a Congregationalist, but, under the influence of Rev. Dr. Kewley, then of Middletown, he became religious, and entered the Protestant Episcopal Church. Bishop Griswold appointed him a lay reader, and by his zealous labors several congregations were established in different parts of Vermont. On his twenty-first birthday he was ordained a priest. After he was called to St. Ann's Church, Brooklyn, N. Y., where, on his twenty-fourth birth-day (June 13, 1816), he was ordained priest. In 1817 he was called to St. Peter's, Baltimore, where he served as pastor with uninterrupted success for twenty-six years.
HEPHA
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HEPHA (Heb. Cheaphaph, חֵפָּפָה, in the Talmud, Schabazz, P. 197; mentioned by several ancient writers [Reland, Palest, p. 699] as lying on the Phoeni-
can coast of Palestine; the Sycharmos of the Onomast.,
the Jerusalem Itin., and Josephus [Ant. xiii, 12. 3]), the modern Hajja, a place of considerable trade at the
foot of Carmel, on the bay of Acre (Robinson, Researches, iii. 194), situated between Sycharmos and west of the
present town (Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 320).

He'pher (Heb. Chepher, חֵפֶר, a well, or shama;Sept. Ṭepā or Ṭepah, Ἐπτᾶ and Ἀπα, but Ὁπᾶ in 1
Chron. i, 6), the name of a city of and three men. See also GATH-HEPEREHE.

1. A royal city of the Canaanites captured by Joshua (Josh. xii, 17); probably the same district as “the land of
Hepher,” in the land of Gershon and Araroth, as
signed to Ben-Hosea, one of Solomon’s table-purveyors
(1 Kings iv, 10). The locality thus indicated would
seem to be in the vicinity of Um-Burj, south of Suwei-
chen.

2. The youngest son of Gilead, and great-grandson of
Manasseh (Numb. xxvi, 82). He was the father of
Zelophhehad (Numb. xxvii, i; Josh. xvi, 3, 3), and his
descendants are called HERHERITES (Numb. xxvi, 82).
B.C. ante 1618.

3. The second son of Ashur (a descendant of Judah)
by one of his wives, Naharah (1 Chron. iv, 6). B.C. cir-
1612.

4. A Mecherathite, one of David’s heroes, according
to 1 Chron. xi, 36; but the text is apparently corrupt,
so that this name is either an interpolation, or identical
with the ELIPHALET of 2 Sam. xxiii, 34. See UR.

He'pherite (Heb. Chephrite, חֵפֶרִי, Sept. Otepē, a
descendant of HEPHER 2 (Numb. xxvi, 82).

Hep'zi-bah (Heb. Chephzī-bah, חֵפֵצִי בָּה, my
delight is in her), a (fem.) real and also symbolical name.

1. (Sept. Ἔψαβα, Vulg. Hephzibah.) The mother of
king Manasseh, and one of the concubines of
king Hezekiah (2 Kings xxii, 1). Notwithstanding the
piety of her husband, and her own amiable name, her
irreligion may be inferred from the character of her son.
B.C. 709-696.

2. (Sept. Θησάμα Ιωάννης, Vulg. Valentus maior in ea.) A
figure recently described to Zion in toke of Jehovah’s
favor (in the return from the Captivity, and especially
in the Messiah’s advent), in contrast with her predicted
desolation (Isa. liii, 4).

Heracles, ST., patriarch of Alexandria, was a
brother of Philarch, who was martyred about A.D. 204,
under Septimius Severus. They had both been heathen,
but were converted by Origen, who was then teaching
at Alexandria. After escaping from the persecution
to which his brother fell victim, Heracles became an
ascetic, but still continued to study Greek philosophy
under Ammonius Saccas. He was next associated with
Origen as a catechist, and when the latter was com-
pelled to leave Egypt on account of his difficulty with
Demetrius of Alexandria, Heracles remained alone in
charge of the theological school of that city. He
retained this position until he became himself patriarch.
He died in 246. The Roman martyrlogy commemor-
ates him on the 14th of July. See Eusebius, Hist. Ec-
cles. vi, 15; Tillemont, Mémoires Écclés. vol. iii; Baillet,
Vie des Saints, July 14th.

Heracleon. See HERACLEONITES.

Heracleonites, a Gnostic sect of the 3rd century,
so named from Heracleon (a disciple of Valentinus), who
was distinguished for his scientific bent of mind. "He
wrote a commentary on the Gospel of St. John, consider-
able fragments of which have been preserved by Origen;
and physical world is also the law of the individual; whatever, therefore, is, is the wisest and the best; and it is not for man's welfare that his wishes should be fulfilled; sickness makes health pleasant, as hunger does gratification, and labor rest.

Heracleus formed no inconsiderable portion of the ecclesiastical system of the later Stoics, and in times still more recent there is much in the theories of Schelling and Hegel that presents a striking though general resemblance thereto. Hegel declared that the doctrine of Heracles, that all things are "perpetual flux and reflux," was an anticipation of his own dogmas. "Being is the same with non-being." The fragments of Heracles that have been collected from Plutarch, Stobaeus, Clemens of Alexandria, and Sextus Empiricus, and explained by Schleiermacher in Wolf and Böttmann's "Museum der Athentischenwissenschaft," vol. 1 (English Cyclopaedia. Prof. Bernays, of Bonn, gathered from Hippocrates a series of quotations from Heracles, and published them under the title Heracles (1848). The "Epistles which bear the name of Heracles are spurious, growing up and, with values (Gen. ii, 11, 12, 129), the physical doctrines of Heracles, as certain to be added in support of other interpretations, and as there are fruits, such as that of the egg-plant, which are used as articles of diet, and for which the fruit of the plinkyth, or wild gourd, might have been mistaken by an ignorant person" (Kirk's "Greek Mythology," 181). If this be of great famine, the suffering went out to gather any green vegetable likely to contribute towards the savoir" and nutritiveness of the broth, and his mistake may have arisen not so much from any resemblance between the plinkyth and any particular kind of oroth of which he was told but rather from seeing whatever vegetable he met with, without knowing its noxious properties. Thus we may regard oroth in both passages as a general designation of esculent plants, in this case wild ones. See Gourd.

The "bitter herbs" (πιππουρία, merorim) with which the Israelites were commanded to eat the Passover bread (Exod. ii, 8; Numb. ix, 11; the Heb. πιππορία, merorim), sec. iii. occur also in the LXX. He has filled me with bitterness, he hath made me drunken with wormwood" (Job vii, 15)." He hath filled me with bitterness, he hath made me drunken with wormwood" (Job vii, 15). The Group of the nightshade (Kniph.) is used in the LXX. to render the Heb. words in Isaiah xxvi, 19, viz. green herbs. The future restoration of the Hebrew people is there announced under the type and figure of a revival of the dead. "Thy dew is a dew of green herbs," says the prophet, i.e. as by the dew the green herbs are revived, so shall thou, being revived by God's strengthening power, flourish again. The other passage, however, appears an obscure one with respect to the meaning of oroth. Celsius has, with his usual learning, shown that mallows were much employed as food in ancient times, and that there can be no doubt, but there is no proof adduced that oroth means mallows; there are many other plants which were and still are employed as articles of diet in the East, as purslane, goosefoot, chenopodiums, lettuce, endive, etc. But oroth should be considered in conjunction with plinkyth; for we find in 2 Kings iv, 39, that when Elisha came again to Gilgal, and there was a dearth in the land, he said unto his servant, 'Set on the great pot, and seethe pottage for the sons of the prophets; and one went out into the field to gather herba (oroth), and found a wild vine, and gathered thereof wild gourds (plinkyth) his lap full, and came and shewed them into the pot of pottage, for they knew them not.' As plinkyth is universally acknowledged to be the fruit of one of the gourd tribe, it is not unreasonable to conclude that oroth also was the fruit of some plant, for which the plinkyth had been mistaken. This may be admitted, as the use of green herbs has been adduced in support of other interpretations, and as there are fruits, such as that of the egg-plant, which are used as articles of diet, and for which the fruit of the plinkyth, or wild gourd, might have been mistaken by an ignorant person" (Kirk's "Greek Mythology," 181). If this be of great famine, the suffering went out to gather any green vegetable likely to contribute towards the savoir" and nutritiveness of the broth, and his mistake may have arisen not so much from any resemblance between the plinkyth and any particular kind of oroth of which he was told but rather from seeing whatever vegetable he met with, without knowing its noxious properties. Thus we may regard oroth in both passages as a general designation of esculent plants, in this case wild ones. See Gourd.

The "bitter herbs" (πιππουρία, merorim) with which the Israelites were commanded to eat the Passover bread (Exod. ii, 8; Numb. ix, 11; the Heb. πιππορία, merorim), sec. iii. ocure also in the LXX. "He hath filled me with bitterness, he hath made me drunken with wormwood" (Job vii, 15)." He hath filled me with bitterness, he hath made me drunken with wormwood" (Job vii, 15). The Group of the nightshade (Kniph.) is used in the LXX. to render the Heb. words in Isaiah xxvi, 19, viz. green herbs. The future restoration of the Hebrew people is there announced under the type and figure of a revival of the dead. "Thy dew is a dew of green herbs," says the prophet, i.e. as by the dew the green herbs are revived, so shall thou, being revived by God's strengthening power, flourish again. The other passage, however, appears an obscure one with respect to the meaning of oroth. Celsius has, with his usual learning, shown that mallows were much employed as food in ancient times, and that there can be no doubt, but there is no proof adduced that oroth means mallows; there are many other plants which were and still are employed as articles of diet in the East, as purslane, goosefoot, chenopodiums, lettuce, endive, etc. But oroth should be considered in conjunction with plinkyth; for we find in 2 Kings iv, 39, that when Elisha came again to Gilgal, and there was a dearth in the land, he said unto his servant, 'Set on the great pot, and seethe pottage for the sons of the prophets; and one went out into the field to gather herba (oroth), and found a wild vine, and gathered thereof wild gourds (plinkyth) his lap full, and came and shewed them into the pot of pottage, for they knew them not.' As plinkyth is universally acknowledged to be the fruit of one of the gourd tribe, it is not unreasonable to conclude that oroth also was the fruit of some plant, for which the plinkyth had been mistaken. This may be admitted, as the use of green herbs has been adduced in support of other interpretations, and as there are fruits, such as that of the egg-plant, which are used as articles of diet, and for which the fruit of the plinkyth, or wild gourd, might have been mistaken by an ignorant person" (Kirk's "Greek Mythology," 181). If this be of great famine, the suffering went out to gather any green vegetable likely to contribute towards the savoir" and nutritiveness of the broth, and his mistake may have arisen not so much from any resemblance between the plinkyth and any particular kind of oroth of which he was told but rather from seeing whatever vegetable he met with, without knowing its noxious properties. Thus we may regard oroth in both passages as a general designation of esculent plants, in this case wild ones. See Gourd.
Herbert, Johann Friedrich, an eminent German philosopher, was born at Oldenburg May 4, 1776. He became professor of philosophy in the University of Göttingen in 1805, afterwards at Königsberg in 1809, and finally returned to Göttingen in 1810. He died there, Aug. 14, 1841.

Herbert's most important works are: 

- Kurze Darstellung eines Pflanzen, z. Philosoph. Vorlesungen (Götting, 1804).
- Allgemeine Physik der Wissenschaften (Königsburg, 1824, 2 parts).
- Abhandlungen der Königlichen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Königsburg, 1829, 2 vols.).

Herbert's philosophical and pamphlets were published by Hartenstein (Lpz. 1841-43, 3 vols.), who also published a complete collection of his works (Stämmliche Werke, Lpz. 1850-52, 12 vols.).

Herbert was at first a Kantian, but afterwards, influenced by the study of ancient Greek philosophy, he created a philosophical system of his own, which is distinguished by ingenuity above all the other post-Kantian systems. Although Herbert occasionally professed to be a Christian, he is absolutely immaterial. That Kant's Critique of Pure Reason is almost without any objective value, and that its method must be entirely abandoned if metaphysics are to be founded on a secure and permanent basis, is Herbert's realistic tendency further removed from the ideas of the German philosophers. According to Herbert, there is no secure scientific subject which is of its own accord to its own preservation. The last subject is the principal question in Herbert's psychology, and he endeavours to deduce and calculate the whole life of the soul, with the aid of mathematics, from those mutual disturbances, and its reactions against them. Hence he is obliged to deny man's moral or transcendental freedom, although he allows him a certain free character. He maintains the immortality of the soul, because the simple principles of all things are eternal; but he denies the possibility of acquiring any knowledge whatever of the Deity. (English Cyclopedia, v. v.) On the whole, it may be said that Herbert was a careful observer of psychological phenomena; but that speculation, in the proper sense, was not congenial to him. See also Thilo, Die Wissenschaftlichkeit der modernen, specul. Theologie, etc. (Leipsic, 1851, 5vo); Tenmann, Geschichte der Philosophie, p. 452; Morell, History of Modern Philosophy, p. 482-489; Schweikert, Geschichte der Philosophie, p. 450; Phän., transl. by Seelwe, p. 304 sq.; Hollenbeck, in Herzel, Real-Encyclopädie, xix, 630 sq.

Herbelot, Bartholomew D' (or D'Herbelot), a distinguished French Orientalist, was born at Paris Dec. 4, 1625. He studied at the University of his native city, where he acquired a good knowledge of Hebrew, Chaldees, Syriac, Persic, and Turkish. He then visited Italy, in order to establish relations with the po
ple of the Oriental countries, of which there were a large number at Genoa, Leghorn, and Venice. At Rome he became acquainted with Lucas Holstenius and Leo Al-latius, and was highly esteemed by the cardinala Barberini and Grimoldi, as well as by queen Christina of Sweden. On his return to France he received a pension of 1500 francs from Fouquet, and was appointed royal secretary and interpreter of Oriental languages.

On a second journey to Italy in 1666, the grand duke of Tuscany, Ferdinand II, endeavored to persuade him to remain, and presented him with a number of Eastern MSS. He returned to Paris, and in 1673, where Colbert granted him again a pension of 1500 francs, and Louis XIV appointed him professor of Syrian at the College of France, after the death of James d'Auvergne in 1692. Herbelot died Dec. 8, 1695. He wrote

Bibliothèque Orientale, ou dictionnaire universel contenant tout ce qui fait connaître les peuples de l'Orient. It was published after his death by Ant. Galland (Paris, 1697, fol.; Maestricht, 1776, fol.; supplement, 1781, etc.; best ed. Paris, 1782, 8vo).

The title of this work gives a good idea of its character: it is a storehouse of whatever belongs to Oriental literature. The book, however, is meant very much more as a manual of life, than an ordinary encylopedical work, from Haiji Khalifa's bibliographical dictionary, and of some hundred and fifty MSS. Herbelot did not take the trouble to compare their statements with those of other writers, so that it contains only the views of the Mohammedans on themselves and their neighbors. Yet it is a very useful book to a person who can understand, one of its kind, is still highly considered. Des ossars has given a popular abridgment of it (Paris, 1782, 6 vols., 8vo); it was translated into German by Schultz (Halle, 1785-1790, 4 vols., 8vo). Herbelot also wrote also a catalogue of part of the MSS. contained in the Palisen Library at Florence, which was translated into Italian and, is to be found in Schellhorn's Ammaeuta literaria. See Cousin, Éloge de D'Herbelot (in the Journal des Scéultes, Jan. 3d, 1696); Perrault, Histoire litteraire de l'Orient, ii, 154-158; Goujet, Mem. sur le Collège de France, iii, 136-138; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxv, 293. (J. P. F.)

Herbert, Edward (Lord Herbert of Cherbury), a distinguished English Deist, was born at Eton, Shrewsbury, in 1581 or 1682. He was educated at Oxford, served with great credit in the war in the Netherlands, and was one of the council of war composed gentlemen at the court of James I, who made him a knight of the Bath, and sent him minister to France in 1618. On a second mission to France he published a work expressing the principles of deism, entitled Travels in Flanders, and Prussia. On a Revolution. etc. (Paris, 1624, 4to). In 1631 he was on a diplomatic mission, and in 1643 he published a new edition of the Travels, adding to it De Religione Gentilium (also published separately at Amsterdam, 1683, 4to; and in an English translation, by Lewis, The Ancient Religion of the Greeks and Latins, London, 1705, 8vo.). He died at London Aug. 20, 1654. His Life, written by himself, and continued to his death, was published by Horace Walpole (London, 1764; new edition, with additions, London, 1826, 8vo).

"Herbert of Cherbury was the contemporary of Hobbes of Malmesbury, to whose principles of philosophizing he was directly opposed, not without the striking coincidence of many of the results at which they respectively arrived. He maintained the theory of innate ideas, and made a certain instinct of the reason (rationalis instinctus) to be the primary source of all human knowledge. Accordingly he did not, with Aristotle and the Stoics, compare the mind to a tabula rasa of the schoolmen, but to a closed volume which opens itself at the solicitation of outward nature acting upon the senses. Thus acted upon, the mind produces out of itself certain general or universal principles (com- munes naturales) by which all debatable questions in theory and philosophy may be determined, since upon these principles, at least all men are unanimous. Consistently with these views, he does not, with Hobbes, make religion to be founded on revelation or historical tradition, but on an immediate consciousness of God and of divine things. The religion of reason, therefore, resting on such grounds, is, he argues, the criterion of every positive religion which claims a foundation in revelation. No man can accept revelation as an immediate evidence of the reasonableness of his faith, except those to whom revelation has been directly given; for all others, the fact of revelation is a matter of mere tradition or testimony. Even the receipt of a revelation may himself be easily deceived, since he possesses no means of convincing himself of the reality or authenticity of his admitted revelation. Herbert made his own religion of reason to rest upon the following grounds: There is a God whom man ought to honor and reverence; a life of holiness is the most acceptable worship that can be offered him; sinners must repent of their sins, and strive to become better; and after death every one must expect the rewards or penalties befitting the acts of this life. Lord Herbert is one of the numerous instances on record of the little influence which speculative opinions exercise upon the conduct of life. He was a nobleman, and which is imparted to a portion only of mankind, he nevertheless claims the belief of his hearers when he tells them that his doubts as to the publication of his work were removed by a direct manifestation of the divine will." (English Cyclopedia.) He states the phenomena of this revelation, following only fully when the light was, on a bright summer day, sitting in my room; my window to the south was open; the sun shone brightly, not a breeze was stirring. I took my book On Truth into my hand, threw myself on my knees, and prayed devoutly in these words: 'O thou one God, thou author of this light which now shines upon me, and gives me, and thou giver of all inward light which now shines upon me, thou giver of all inward light, I implore thee, according to thine infinite mercy, to pardon my request, which is greater than a sinner should make. I am not sufficiently convinced with what effect I may publish this book or not. This publication shall be for thy glory. I beseech thee to give me a sign from heaven; if not, I will suppress it.' I had scarcely finished these words when a loud, and yet, at the same time, a gentle sound came from heaven, not like any sound on earth. This comforted me in such a calm manner, and gave me such satisfaction, that I thought to have said, my prayer as having been heard." His style is very obscure, and his writings have been but little read, in spite of the talent and subtility of thought which they evince. He is properly regarded as the founder of the school of English Deists, although he was himself a sceptic of the very high and pure sect rather than an infidel. Herbert did not profess, in his writings, to oppose Christianity, but held that his "five articles" embraced the substance of which is taught in the Scriptures. "The ideas which his writings contributed to Deistical speculation are two, viz. the examination of the universal principles of religion, and the appeal to an internal illuminating influence superior to revelation, the inward light," as the test of religious truth. This was a phrase not uncommon in the 17th century. It was used by the Puritans to mark the appeal to the spiritual instincts, the heart, to the feeling of divine perfections, like the founder of the Quakers, to imply an appeal to an internal sense. But in Herbert it differs from these in being universal, not restricted to a few persons, and in being intellectual rather than emotional or spiritual" (Farrar, Critical History, p. 138). For an examination and refutation of his theory and writings, see Deistical Writers, letter i, and Halyburton, Nat. Religion (Works, 1835, 8vo, p. 233). See also Kortholt, De Tribus impostoribus (Herbert, Hobbes, Spinoza; Hamb. 1701, 4to); Van Mildert, Boyle Lectures, 1838; Remusat, Revue des deux Mondes, 1854, p. 692; Farrar, Critical Hist. of Free Thought, lect. vi; Sheldon, Hist. of Doctrines, bk. ii, ch. iv, § 2; Contemporary Review, July, 1869.
But it was introduced directly from Phenicia by Ahab (marriage with the Sidonian princess Jezebel (1 Kings, xvi, 31)). In like manner, the establishment of this idolatry in Judah is ascribed to the marriage of the king with a daughter of Jezebel (comp. Josephus, Ant., viii, 15, 1; ix, 6, 6).

The worship of Moloch, which was worshipped under the form of the Tyrian Hercules, Melkart, Baal, Adonis, Moloch, and whatever his other names are, was that which originates, sustains, and destroys life. These functions of the Deity, according to the Phenicians, were represented, although not exclusively, by the sun, the hereditary god, which animates vegetation by its genial warmth, and scorches it up by its forvor (see Davis, Carthage, p. 276–9).

Almost all that we know of the worship of the Tyrian Hercules is preserved by the classical writers, and relates chiefly to the Phenician colonies, and not to the mother state. The eagle, the lion, and the thorn-dish were sacred to him, and are often found on Phenician coins. Pliny expressly testifies that human sacrifices were offered up every year to the Carthaginian Hercules (Hist. Nat., xxxvi, v, 12), which coincides with what is stated by Josephus (Ant., viii, 15) as to his worship of Moloch. Mention is made of public embassies sent from the colonies to the mother state to honor the national god (Arrian, Alex. ii, 24; Q. Curt. iv, 2; Polyb., xxxi, 30), and this fact places in a clearer light the offense of Jason in sending envoys to his festival (2 Macc., xix, 26). Movers endeavors to show that Herakles and Heracles are not merely Greek and Latin synonyms for this god, but that they are actually derived from his true Phenician name. This original name he supposes to have consisted of the syllables *nαν, liōn, and in other words*, meaning **strong, and ἱλιόν, to conquer; so that the compound means Ἀριστόκρατος. This harmonizes with what he conceives to be the idea represented by Heracles as the destroyer of Typhonic monsters *(e. p. 430). Melkarth, the Molokos, king of Sanchoniathon, occurs on coins only in the form *Μωλοκέας*. We must in this case assume that a κυπριακὸν has been absorbed, and resolve the word into μωλοκέας, *king of the city, χωροκέας*. The bilingual inscription renders it by *Αριστόκρατος*, and it is a title of the god as the patron of the city. See Baal.

**Herd** (prop. *νικίλη*, of neat cattle; *νικίλης*, a flock of smaller animals; *κόκκιλη*, as property; *δαβην*, a drove). The herd was greatly regarded both in the patriarchal and Mosaic period. Its multiplying was considered as a blessing from the Lord (Gen. xxvii, 17, 18; Deut. vii, 14; xxviii, 4; Ps. lxxvii, 38; cxlv, 14; Jer. ii, 28). The ox was the most precious stock next to horse and mule, and (since those were rare) the thing of greatest value which was commonly possessed (1 Kings xviii, 5). Hence we see the force of Saul's threat (1 Sam. xix, 7). The herd yielded the most esteemed sacrifice (Num. vii, 8; Ps. cxix, 31; Isa. lxvi, 3); also flesh-meat and milk, chiefly converted, probably, into butter and cheese (Deut. xxxiii, 14; 2 Sam. xxvii, 29), which such milk yields more copiously than that of small cattle (Arist. Hist. Anim., iii, 20). The full-grown ox is hardly ever slaughtered in Palestine except for sacrificial or ceremonial purposes, the young animal was preferred (Exod. xxix, 1)—perhaps three years might be the age up to which it was so regarded (Gen. xv, 9)—and is spoken of as a special dainty (Gen. xvii, 8; Amos vi, 4; Luke xi, 41). The case of God's sacrifice, which was given in place of expiary (Judg. vi, 26), and exceptional. So that of the people (1 Sam. xiv, 32) was an act of wanton excess. The agricultural and general usefulness of the ox in ploughing, threshing, and as a beast of burden (1 Chron. xiii, 40; Isa. xlvi, 1), made such a slaughtering seem wasteful; nor, owing to difficulties of grazing, fattening, etc., is beef the product of an eastern climate. The
animal was broken to service probably in his third year (Isa. xv, 5; Jer. xlviii, 34; comp. Pliny, H. N. viii, 70, etc.). In the moist season, when grass abounded in the waste lands, especially in the "south" region, herds grazed there; e.g. in Carmel, on the west side of the Dead Sea (1 Sam. xxv, 2; 2 Chron. xxvi, 10). Dothan also, Mizpah, and Sharon (Gen. xxxvii, 17; comp. Rob- inson, iii, 122; Stanley, S. and Pal. p. 247, 290, 484; 1 Chron. xxvii, 29; Isa. lxv, 10) were favorite pastures. For such purposes Uzziah built towers in the wilderness (2 Chron. xxvi, 19). Not only grass, but foliage, is accep-
table to the ox, and the woods and hills of Bashan and Gilead afforded both abundantly; on such upland (Psa. lxv, 12) pastures cattle might graze, as also, of course, by river sides, when driven by the heat from the regions of the "wilderness." Especially was the eastern table-land (Ezek. xxix, 18; Num. xxxii, 4) a "place for cattle," and the pastoral tribes of Reuben, Gad, and half Manasseh, who settled there, retained something of the nomadic character and handed down some image of the patriarchal life (Stanley, S. and Pal. p. 234, 325). Herdsmen in Egypt were a low, perhaps the lowest, caste; hence, as Joseph's kindred, through his position, were brought into contact with the highest

Jordan to share the toils of conquest (Deut. iii, 19), i.e. probably in some pastures closely adjoining, like the "suburbs" appointed for the cattle of the Levites (Num. xxxv, 2; Josh. xxvi, 2). Cattle were ordinarily allowed as a prey in war to the captor (Deut. xx, 14; Josh. viii, 2), and the case of Amaelek is exceptional, probably to mark the extreme curse to which that people was devoted (Deut. xxv, 14; Josh. x, 24; 1 Sam. xxxi, 10; 1 Chron. xxviii, 19). The occupation of herdsmen was honorable in early times (Gen. xlvii, 6; 1 Sam. xi, 5; 1 Chron. xxvii, 29; xxviii, 1). Saul himself resumed it in the interval of his cares as king; also Doeg was certainly high in his confidence (1 Sam. xi, 7). Pharaoh made some of Joseph's brethren "rulers over his cattle." David's seven sons were among his chief officers of state. In Solomon's time the relative importance of the pursuit declined as commerce grew, but it was still extensive (Eccles. ii, 7; 1 Kings iv, 20). It must have greatly suffered from the inroads of the enemies to which the country under the last kings of Judah and Israel was exposed. Uzziah, however (2 Chron. xxvi, 10), and Hezekiah (xxiii, 28, 29), resum-
ing command of the open country, revived it. Josiah also seems to have been rich in herds (xxix, 7-9). The prophet Amos at first followed this occupation (Amos i, 1; vii, 1). A goad was used (Judg. iii, 31; 1 Sam. xiii, 21, 25; 2 Sam. 17, 7), being, as mostly, a staff armed with a spike. For the word Herd as applied to swine, see SWINE. On the general subject, Ugolini, xxxix, De Re Rust. vett. Hebr. c. ii., will be found nearly exhaustive. See CATTLE.

Herder, Johann Gottfried von, one of the most variously gifted of German writers, was born August 23, 1744, at Mogreningen, in East Prussia, where his father kept a little girls' school. His early training was strict and religious. A preac-
cher named Treschau taught him Greek and Latin: and the pastor's books of theology were devoured by the young student. A complaint in the eyes brought him under the notice of a Russian sur-
geon, who offered to instruct him in surgery gra-
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An Egyptian deformed Oxhead, so represented on the Monu-
ments to mark contempt. (Wilkinson.)

castes, they are described as "an abomination," but of the abundance of cattle in Egypt, and of the care there bestowed on them, there is no doubt (Gen. xliv, 6, 17; Exod. iv, 4, 20). Brands were used to distinguish the owner's herds (Wilkinson, iii, 8, 195; iv, 123-131). So the plague of hail was sent to smite especially the cattle (Psa. lxxviii, 48), the firstborn of which also were smit-
ten (Exod. xii, 29). The Israelites departing stipulated for (Exod. x, 26) and took "much cattle" with them (xii, 35). See EXOGEN. Cattle formed thus one of the traditions of the Israelization nation in its greatest period, and became almost a part of that greatness. They are the subject of providential care and legislative ordinance (Exod. xx, 10; xxxii, 28; xxxiv, 19; Lev. xix, 19; xxv, 7; Deut. xi, 15; xxii, 1, 4; 10; xxv, 4; Psa. civ, 14; Isa. xxxv, 22; Joel, iv, 11), and the Levites, though not holding land, were allowed cattle (Num. xxxv, 2, 3). When pasture failed, a mixture of various grains (called, Jb. vi, 5, 25, rendered "fodder" in the A. V., and, Isa. xxx, 24, "provender," compare the Roman farrago and organism, Pliny, xviii, 10 and 42) was used, as also (Gen. xxiv, 26) "chopped straw" (Gen. xxiv, 25; Isa. xi, 7; lxv, 25), which was torn in pieces by the threshing-machine, and used probably for feeding in stalls. These last formed an important adjunct to cattle-keeping, being indispens-
able for shelters at certain seasons (Exod. ix, 6, 10). The herd, after its harvest duties in the field, would naturally cause it to be in high condition, was especially worth caring for; at the same time, most open pas-
tures would have failed because of the heat. It was then probably stalled, and would continue so until vege-
tation returned. Hence the failure of "the herd" from "the stales" is mentioned as a feature of scarcity (Hab. iii, 17). "Caves of the stall" (Mal. iv, 2; Prov. xv, 17) are the objects of watchful care. The Reubenites, etc., bestowed their cattle "in cities" when they passed the

tis. Herder accepted the offer, but at Königsberg fainted at the first dissection which he attended, and thereupon resolved to study theology. He gained the acquaintance of persons who appreciated him, and pro-
cured him a place as instructor in the Frederick's Col-
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"The stabbing of the cattle" (Mal. iv, 2; Prov. xv, 17) are the objects of watchful care. The Reubenites, etc., bestowed their cattle "in citie"s when they passed the

As a theologian, Herder is noted not for science or system so much as for his freedom of thought and his general spirit. In some respects he was the precursor of Schleiermacher, and his rationalism, though low enough, was of a totally different school from that of Semler, Paulinus, and the neologists generally. He sought especially the religious truth, and thereby rendered it profitable by making them more free, and by investing them with a human and scientific interest. In his work on the Geist der ehrbäumen Poesie (1782; translated by Dr. Marsh, of Vermont, under the title Spirit of Hebrew Poetry, 1688, 2 vols. 12mo), he dwelt especially on the aesthetic and humanitarian aspects of the Bible, which, instead of weakening its claims to divine authority, greatly strengthens them. He was the first to show critically the poetical beauties of the Bible, which he did not consider as mere ornaments, but rather as being grounded in the inner nature of the revelation, and not to be separated from a correct view of the inspiration of the contents of the O.T. Though others, Lowth for instance, had already treated this subject of the poetry of the Hebrews, none had seen so deeply into its nature, or shown so plainly the true spirit which pervaded it. By this poetical consideration of the O.T. history, and of the religious principles on which it is founded, Herder discharges the Biblical Church from the mistakes of such interpreters as Melchior and others. His älteste Urkunde d. Menchenkechts, eine nach Jahrhunderten entfaltte heilige Schrift, which appeared in 1774, revolutionized the system of O.T. criticism by showing the influence of Hellenism on the Hebrews, and the Jewish influence of the O. T. from a different stand-point from the one which generally prevailed. In his Erläuterungen z. N. T. aus einer neuer eröffneten morgenländischen Quelle (the Zend Avesta), which he published in 1775, he also endeavored to render the exegesis of the N. T. more accurate by showing the influence of Hellenism on the Hebrews during the Christian age. He worked especially on the books of James and Jude, under the title of Briefe über Bruder Jesu in unserm Kanon (1776), and on the Apocalypses in Das Buch der Zukunft des Herrn (Riga, 1779). In the former work he considers James and Jude as the real brothers of the Lord according to the flesh, while in the second he maintains that the predictions of the Apocalypse were fulfilled at the destruction of Jerusalem. Herder also wrote on various points of the history of the New Testament revelation and of Biblical dogmatics, especially in his Christliche Schriften. In these he treats of the gift of tongues on the first Christian Pentecost; of the resurrection as a point of faith, history, and dogma; of the Redeemer as presented in the three gospels; of the Son of God, the Saviour of the world; of the spirit of Christianity; of religion, doctrinal meanings, usages, etc. "One of the chief services of Herder to Christianity was his persistent labor to elevate the pastoral office to its original and proper dignity. He held that the pastor of the church should not be solely a learned critic, but the minister of the common people. In his day the pastor was considered the mere instrument of the state, a sort of theological policeman—a degradation which Herder could hardly permit himself to think of without violent indignation. In his Letters on the Study of Theology, published in 1780, and in subsequent smaller works, he sought to evoke a generation of theologians, who, being imbued with his own ideas of humanity, would betake themselves to the edification of the human mind. He would reject scholasticism from the study of the Bible, and show to his readers that simplicity of inquiry is the safest way to happy results. He would place the modern pastor, both in his relations to the cause of humanity and in the respect awarded him by the world, close to the patriarch and prophet of other days; and that man, in his opinion, was not worthy the name of pastor who could neglect the individual requirements of the soul. According to Herder, the theologian should be trained from childhood in the knowledge of the Bible and of practical religion. Youth should have ever before them the example of pious parents, who were bringing them up with a profound conviction of the doctrines of divine truth. To choose theology for a profession from mercenary aims would preclude all possibility of pastoral usefulness. Let prayer and reading the Bible be your first study; and learning more and more is not profitable by preaching. Some of the most eloquent words from his pen were written against the customary moral preaching which so much afflicted him. "Why don't you come down from your pulpits," he asks, "for they cannot be of any advantage to you in preaching such things? What is the use of all the words of God's word always, anywhere, and in all matters? No, indeed! Religion, true religion, must return to the exercise of its original functions, or a preacher will become the most indefinite, idle, and indifferent thing on earth. Teachers of religion, true servants of God's word, what have you to do in our century? The harvest is plenteous, but the laborers are few; pray the Lord of the harvest that he will send out laborers who will be something more than bare teachers of wisdom and virtue. More than this, help yourselves! The counsel given by Herder to others was practised first by himself. He lived among critical minds, who sneered at the obscurity of the Biblical history, and scoffed at the idea of the nature and fate of the Messiah. He did not disapprove of the popular discussion, but corrected their ideas of the Messiah, and endeavored to render the study of the Holy Scriptures more comprehensive, more digestible, and more persons, those gifted men who thought with him arose from their seats profoundly impressed with the dignity and value of the Gospel. A witty writer of the time, Sturz, gives an account of Herder's preaching that throws some light upon the manner in which the plain, earnest exposition of the words of God's word always affected the indifferent auditor. 'You should have seen,' says this man, 'how every rustling sound was hushed and every curious glance was chained upon him in a very few minutes. We were as still as a Moravian congregation. All hearts opened themselves spontaneously; every eye hung upon him and was wont unawares to shed a tear from every breast. My dear friend, nobody preaches like him! ' (Hurst, History of Rationalism, ch. vii.) See Herzog, Reit-Encyclop. v. 747; Erinnerungen aus d. Leben Herder's (Tübingen, 1820, 8vo); Quinet, Ideen z. Ges. 19 (1844); Herder, Briefe (Leipzig, 1816, 4 vols.); medieval; and German Literature (American translation, ii. 419); review of Marsh's translation, Christian Examiner, xvii. 167; Hagenbach, History of the Church in the 18th and 19th Centuries, translated by Hurst, vol. ii. kn. hios t. 

Herderman (prop. והדר, a tender of oxen; in distinction from וֹּהֶר, a feeder of sheep; but practically the two occupations were generally united). From the earliest times the Hebrews were a pastoral people. Abraham and his sons were masters of herds and flocks, and were regulated in their movements very much by a regard to the necessities of their cattle, in which their wealth and prosperity consisted. In Egypt the Israelites were known as keepers of cattle. When they left Egypt, they, notwithstanding the oppressions to which they had been subjected, took with them "flocks and herds" (Exod. xii. 39); and though during their wanderings in the wilderness their stock was small, all probability greatly reduced, before they entered Canaan, they had so replenished it by their conquests in the pastoral regions beyond Jordan that they took with them a goodly number of animals wherewith to begin their new life in the land that had been promised them. Of that time the manual labor of all the Israelites was almost exclusively devoted to pastoral occupations; and traces of a nomadic life among other tribes than those settled on the east of the Jordan are found even as late as the time of the monarchy (compare 1 Chron. iv. 48).
The pastoral life has always had a charm for the Semitic peoples; and among them, as well as among other nations, it has always been held in honor. In the open and spacious fields bordering on the Jordan and in the hill country of Palestine it is a life of comparative ease and of great independence even in the present day; men possessed of flocks and herds become quietly and gradually rich without any severe exertion or anxiety; and but for feuds among themselves, the oppression of superiors, and the predatory tendency of their less respectable neighbors, their life might flow on in an almost unbroken tranquillity. The wealth of sheikhs and emirs is measured chiefly by the number of their flocks and herds; and men who would count it an intolerable indignity to be constrained to engage in any handicraft occupation, or even in mercantile adventure, fulfill with pride and satisfaction the duties which their pastoral life imposes upon them. It was the same in ancient times. Job’s substance consisted chiefly of cattle, his wealth in which made him the greatest of all the men of the East (1, 3). The first two kings of Israel, Saul and David, came from “following the herd” to ascend the throne (1 Sam. ixi: xi, 5; Psa. lixviii: 70). Men “very great,” like Neba, derived their riches from their flocks, and themselves superintended the operations connected with the care of them (1 Sam. xxv: 2 sq.). Absalom, the prince of Israel, had a sheep-farm, and personally occupied himself with its duties (2 Sam. xxi: 23).

Neha, king of Moab, was “a sheepmaster” (נער הצאן, 2 Kings iii: 4). The daughters of chiefs and wealthy proprietors did not think it beneath them to tend the flocks and herds of their family (Gen. xxix: 9; comp. xxiv, 15, 19); Exod. ii: 16; comp. Homer, H. vi: 429; Odys. xii: 121; xiii: 221; Varro, De Re Rust. ii: 1). The proudest title of the kings of Israel was that of shepherds of the people (Jer. xxviii: 4; Ezek. xxiv: 2, etc.; comp. σπουδαῖος ἱερεύς in Homer and Hesiod, posain, and Plato, De Rep. ii: 15, p. 440, D.), and God Himself condescended to be addressed as the Shepherd of Israel (Psa. lxv: 1), and was trusted in by his pious servants as their shepherd (Psa. xxiii: 1). In later times the title of shepherd was given to the teachers and leaders of the synagogue, who were called βασιλιάς (Lightfoot, Hor. Hebr. in Matt. iv: 23); but this was unknown to the times before Christ.

By the wealthy proprietors their flocks and herds were placed under the charge of servants, who bore the designation of בזריאן (Bazriyan), אבזריאן (Abazriyan), or בזריאן (Bazriyan). These were sometimes armed with weapons, to protect themselves and their charge from robbers or wild beasts; though, if we may judge from the case of David, their furniture in this respect was of the simplest description. Usually they carried with them a staff (כְּרָכָה, ke'rah) furnished with a crook, which might be used for catching an animal by the foot; those who had the charge of oxen carried with them a sharper instrument (Judg. iii: 31; 1 Sam. xiii: 21). See GOAT. They had also a wallet or small bag (ņepi, ṇep) in which to carry provisions, ammunition, or any easily portable article (1 Sam. xvii: 40, 48; Psa. xxxiii: 4; Micah vii: 14; Matt. x: 10; Luke ix: 3, 10). Their dress consisted principally of a cloak or mantle (the burqa of the modern Arabs) in which they could wrap the entire body (Jer. xiii: 12). For food they were obliged to content themselves with the plainest fare, and often were reduced to the last extremities (Amos vii: 14; Luke xvi: 15).

Their wages consisted of a portion of the produce, especially of the milk of the flock (Gen. xxx: 5 sq.; 1 Cor. ix: 7). That they cultivated music is not unlikely, though it hardly follows from 1 Sam. xvi: 18, for David’s case may have been exceptional; in all countries and times, however, music has been associated with the pastoral life. When the servants belonging to one master existed in any number, they were placed under a chief (רֹאשׁ צאן, Ṝašṭān, Gen. xlvii: 6; ἔρφυρομαι, 1 Pet. v: 4); and under the monarchy there was a royal officer who bore the title of βασιλιάς, “chief of the herdsmen” (1 Sam. xvi: 7; compare 1 Chron. xxvii: 29, and “magister regi pecoris,” Livy, i: 4).

The animals placed under the care of these herdsmen were chiefly sheep and goats; but besides these there were also neat cattle, asses, camels, and in later times swine. It would seem that the keeping of the animals last named was the lowest grade in the pastoral life (Luke xvi: 15); and probably the keeping of sheep and goats was held to be the highest, as that of horses is among the Arabs in the present day (Niebuhr, Arabes, i: 226). The herdsmen led his charge into the open pasture-land, where they could freely roam and find abundant supply of food; the neat cattle were conducted to the richer pastures, such as those of Bashan, while the sheep, goats, and camels found sufficient sustenance from the scantier herbage of the more rocky and arid parts of Palestine, provided there was a supply of water. While in the fields the herdsmen lived in tents.

Ancient Egyptian herdsmen giving an account of the cattle. (Wilkinson.)

Fig. 1. Herdmen giving an account to the scribal, 3. Another doing obedience to the master of the estate, or to the scribal. 4. Other herdsmen. 5. The driver of the cattle, carrying a rope in his hand. 6. Bowing and giving his report to the scribal, 7, over whom is the usual scabbard, and two boxes.
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(Ἑρεσις, Song of Sol. i, 8; Isa. xxxviii, 12; Jer. vi, 9), and there were folds (Ῥωμᾶς, Numb. xxxxi, 16; 2 Sam. vii, 8; Zeph. ii, 6), and apparently in some cases tents (Ῥωμᾶς 2 Chron. xiv, 15) for the cattle. Watch-towers were also erected, whence the shepherd could discern any coming danger to his charge; and vigilance in this respect was one of the shepherds' chief virtues (Mic. iv, 8; Nah. iii, 18; Luke ii, 8). If any of the cattle wandered he was bound to follow them, and leave no means untried to recover them (Ezech. xxxiv, 12; Luke xv, 5); and harsh masters were apt to require at their servants' hands any loss they might have sustained, either by the wandering of the cattle or the ravages of wild beasts (Gen. xxxi, 38 sq.), a tendency on which a partial check was placed by the law, that if it was torn by beasts, and the pieces could be produced, the person in whose charge it was should not be required to make restitution (Exod. xxii, 13; comp. Amos iii, 12). To assist them in both watching and defending the flocks, and in recovering any that had strayed, shepherds had dogs (Job xxx, 1), as the modern Arabs; not, however, “like those in other lands, fine, faithful fellows, the friend and companion of their masters ... but a mean, sinister, ill-conditioned generation, kept as a dog, kicked about, and half-hungry, with nothing noble or attractive about them” (Thomson, Land and Book, i, 301), a description which fully suits Job’s disparaging comparison. The flocks and herds were regularly counted (Lev. xxvii, 32; Jer. xxxiii, 15), as in Egypt (Wilkinson, ii, 177).

The pastures to which the herdsmen conducted their flocks were called ἁράκι, the places without, the country, the desert (Job xi, 10; xviii, 17; Prov. viii, 36; comp. 10: ἀράδινα, Mark i, 43; see also 10: ἀράδινα, Jer. xxvi, 57; Amos i, 2); ἡράδινα (Psa. lxv, 13; Jer. ix, 9, etc.), ἱεραία (Psa. lxv, 13; Isa. xlii, 11; Jer. xxiii, 10; Joel ii, 22, etc.). In summer the modern nomads seek the northern and more hilly regions, in winter they betake themselves to the south and to the plain country (D’Arvieux, iii, 315; v, 428); and probably the same usage prevailed among the Hebrews. In leading out their flocks, the shepherd went before them, and they followed him obedient to his call; a practice from which our Saviour draws a touching illustration of the intimate relation between him and his people (John x, 4). The young and the sickly of the flock the shepherd would take in his arms and half-hungry careful to adapt the rate of advancement to the condition and capacity of the feeder or burdened portion of his charge, a practice which again gives occasion for a beautiful illustration of God’s care for his people (Isa. xi, 11; comp. Gen. xxxii, 13). These usages still prevail in Palestine, and have often been described by travellers; one of the most graphic descriptions is that given by Mr. Thomson (Land and Book, i, 301 sq.; compare Wilson, Lands of the Bible, ii, 322).

As the Jews advanced in commercial wealth the office of shepherd diminished in importance and dignity. Among the later Jews the shepherd of a small flock was precluded from bearing witness, on the ground that, as such, then their flocks on the pastures of others, they were infected with dishonesty (Maimon. in Deut. ii, 9, 8). See SHEPHERD.

HERES, part of the name of two places, different in the Hebrew. See also KIR-HERES; TIMATHI-HERES.

1. Har-Cheres (חרחרים, mountain of the sun; Sept. τὸ ἱππὸν ὕπαρχος, Vulg. montes Iheres, quod interterpretatur testatoris, i. e. of titles; Auth. Vera, "mount Heres," Iheres, in the valley, according to the text, but in a part of Mount Ephraim, according to the name) of Dan, near Ajalon, of which the Amorites retained possession (Judg. i, 35). It was probably situated on some eminence bordering the present Merj Ibn-Omeir on the east, possibly near the site of Emmaus or Nicopolis. We may even hazard the conjecture that it was identical with Mt. Jearim (q. d. Ir-Shenesh, i.e. sun-city); i.e. Chesalon (q. v.).

2. In Na-Heres (נהריה, city of destruction; Sept. ἁράκις) in the valley of Aroer; Vulg. civitas solis, evidently reading נויה, city of the sun, a name that occurs only in the disputed passage Isa. xix, 18, where most MSS. and editions, as also the versions of Aquila, Theodotion, the Syriac, and the English, read, one (of these five cities) shall be called The city of destruction, i.e. in the promised city of Isaiah, one of these cities shall be destroyed, a signification (from נויה, to tear down) for which Iken (Disser. phil. crit. 16) contends. The Jews of Palestine or of the parapet, referred it to Leontopolis and its temple, which they abhorred, and the destruction of which they supposed to be here predicted. But instead of נויה, heres, the more probable reading is נויה, cheres, which is read in sixteen MSS. and some editions, and is expressed by the Sept. (Complut.), Symmachus, Vulgate, Saadia, and the margin of the English version, and has also the testimony of the Talmud in fol. 110. A. (T. Dærer, comm. ad loc.) Whichever interpretation may be chosen, this reading is to be preferred to the other.

See IR-HA-HERES.

Heresh (Heb. חֵרֶשׁ, חֵרֶשׁ, εἰρήνη, εἰρήνη, Sept. Αἰρής), one of the Levites that dwelt in the "villages of the Netophathites" near Jerusalem, on the return from Babylon (1 Chron. xxv, 26). See HERESARCH.

Heresy, in theology, is any doctrine containing Christian elements, but along with them others subversive of Christian truth.

1. Origin and early Use of the Word. — The word αἵρεσις (heresias) originally meant simply choice (e. g. of a set of opinions); later, it was applied to the opinions themselves; last of all, to the sect maintaining them. "Philosophy was in Greece the great object which divided the opinions and judgments of men; and hence the term heresy, being most frequently applied to the adoption of that or that part which he had been longed, and to give their system the preference over every other system of Judaism, both with regard to soundness of doctrine and purity of morals. In the Epistles the word occurs in a somewhat different sense. Paul, in Gal. v, 20, puts αἵρεσις, heresies, in the list of crimes against the church, with the words διαφθοράς (Διαφθοράς, etc.) in 1 Cor. xi, 19 (though there also may be heresias among you), he uses it apparently to denote schisms or divisions in the Church. In Tit. iii, 10 he comes near to the later sense; the "heretical person" appears to be one given over to a self-chosen and divergent form of belief and practice. John Wesley says: — "Heresy is inherently evil. It is taken for an 'error in fundamentals' or in anything else, nor schism for any separation made from the outward communion of others. Both heresy and schism, in the modern sense of the words, are sins that the Scripture knows nothing of" (Works, N. Y. ed. vii, 286). In the early
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**Heresy and Schism. -** Near akin to heresy is the idea of schism or Church division, which, however, primarily means a separation from the government and discipline of the Church, and does not necessarily include departure from her orthodoxy. Thus the Ebionites, Gnostics, and others were heretics, while the Arians, Donatists, and Modalists, schismatics. By the standard of the Roman Church, the Greek Church is only schismatic, the Protestant both heretical and schismatic. Of course, in different branches of the Church there are different views of heresy and truth, heterodoxy and orthodoxy, schism and schismatics, and the like. The Church, § 165). "Heresy, as distinguished from schism, consists in the adoption of opinions and practices contrary to the articles and practices of any particular church, whereas schism is secession from that church, the renouncing allegiance to its government, or forming a church with its own leaders, and ceasing to give cash to the divisions who did not openly renounce allegiance. Neither schism nor heresy, then, is properly an offence against the Church universal, but against some particular church, and by its own members. Of the two, schism is the more properly called either heretic or schismatic; for churches, being independent establishments, may indeed consult with each other, but if they cannot agree, the guilt of that Church which is in error is neither schism nor heresy, but corrupt faith or bigoted narrowness. Accordingly, our best churchmen, of the Church, regard heresy and schism in every state; and in the same sense, the Church as one that has erred, have very properly avoided the misapplication of the terms 'schismatic' and 'heretic' to it. Nevertheless, if a Church has been formed by the secession of members from another Church, on disagreement of principles, each seceder is both a schismatic and a heretic because of his separation from the Church; but the crime does not attach to the Church so formed, and accordingly is not entailed on succeeding members who naturally spring up in it. If the Church was founded in error, the guilt of error would always attach to it and its members, but not that of schism or heresy. He who is convinced that his Church is essentially in error is bound to secede; but, like the circumstances which may be supposed to justify the subject of any realm in renouncing its country and withdrawing his allegiance, the plea should be long, and seriously, and conscientiously urged; but when a Church, or a group of churches, as they can form alliances, so they can secede from this alliance without being guilty of any crime. So far from the separation between the Romish and Protestant churches having anything of the character of schism or heresy in it, the Church of England (supposing the names of Rome or Hilder to be changed) has been the only way to bring the Churches, as they can form alliances, so they can secede from this alliance without being guilty of any crime.

(Hinds, Early Christian Church).

**III. List of the principal Early Heresies.** - The following list includes the chief heresies of the first six centuries; each will be found in its alphabetical place in this Cyclopaedia: Century I. Nazarenes, who advocated the observance of the Jewish law by the worshippers of Christ. Simonians, followers of Simon Magus, who prided themselves in a superior degree of knowledge, and maintained that the world was created by angels, denied the resurrection, etc. Nicolaitans, followers of Nicolas of Antioch. Cerinthians and Ebionites, followers of Cerinthus and Ebion, who denied the divinity of Christ, and adopted the principles of Gnosticism. Many of them were Millenarians. Century II. Elecennians, the followers of Elias of Eleasa, who was reputed to have discovered the Christian religion, and whose tenets were mostly of philosophic origin. Gnostics, so called from their pretences to γνωσία, superior knowledge: this seems to have been the general name of all heretics. (1.) Among Syriac Gnostics were the followers of Saturninus, who adopted the view of the two principal beings of the world, supposed the evil nature of matter, denied the reality of Christ's human body, etc. Bardeanians: their
principles resemble those of Saturninus, Tattianists and Eucratists, who boasted of an extraordinary continence, condemned marriage, etc. Apatactici, who, in addition to the opinions of the Tattianists, renounced property, etc., and asserted that any who lived in the manner of priests were eligible for holy orders of Asia Minor. Cerdonians, who held two contrary principles, denied the resurrection, despised the authority of the Old Testament, and rejected the Gospels. Marcionites, who resembled the Cerdonians, and in addition admitted two Gods, asserted that the Saviour’s body and soul were crucified. The followers of Apelles may be classed among the Marcionites. 

(3.) Among Egyptian Gnostics were the Basilidians, followers of Basilides, who espoused the heresies of Simon Magus, and admitted the fundamental point on which the whole of the hypotheses then prevalent may be said to hinge, namely, that the world had been created not by the immediate operation of the divine being, but by the agency of aons. Carcopolitans, Antitacaet, Adamites, Prodicians, the followers of Secundus, Potlemus, Marcus, Colobarnas, and Heracleon. (4.) Inferior sects of Gnostics are Cainites, Camachites, Ophites.

Heresies not of Oriental origin: Patrissipians, whose principal leader was Praxais; Melchizedechians, under Theodotus and Artemon; Hermogoniens, Montanists, Chilicians or Millennials. Century III. The Manicheans, the Hieracites, the Patrissipians, under Nolius and Sacy, the Marcionites under Plutarus, the Basilidians under J. of Samosata, Novatians, under Novat and Novatian; the Monarchici, the Arabici, the Aquarions, the Originalians. Century IV. The Arians, Colliothians, Macedonians, Agnosites, Apollinarism, Collyridians, Seleucians, Anthropomorphites, Jovinianists, Messalians, Timotheus, Valentinianists, Postilionists, Donatists, Novationists, Nestorians, Eutychians, Theopiscites. Century V. The Pelagists, Nestorians, Eutychians, Theopiscites. Century VI. The Aphthardocetes, Severianists, Corrupticos, Monotheolists.

IV. Punishment of Heresy. — Soon after the triumph of Christianity over paganism, and its establishment by the State, there arose a very severe and ageten heresies. Those of the State, made by the Christian emperors from the time of Constantine, are comprised under one title, De Hereticiis, in the Theolosian code. (See below.) The principal are the note of infamy affixed to all heretics in common; commerce forbidden to be held with them; privation of all offices of dignity and public disqualification to dispose of their property by will, or to receive property; pecuniary multas; proscription and banishment; corporal punishment, such as scourging. Heretics were forbidden to hold public disputations; to proclaim their opinions; their children to inherit patrimony, unless they returned to the Church, etc. The laws of the Church consisted in pronouncing formal anathema, or excommunication, against them; forbidding them to enter the church, so much as to hear sermons or the reading of the Scriptures (this was but partially observed); the prohibition of all person, under pain of excommunication, to join with them in any religious exercises; the enjoining that none should eat or converse familiarly with them, or contract affinity with them; their names were to be struck out of the dipychy; and their testimony was not to be received in any judicial cause. (Bingham.) Augustine's view of heresy is deserving of special notice, as it forms the basis of the doctrine and practice of the Middle Ages. In De Civ. Dei, xix, 51, he says: "Qui ergo in ecclesia morbidus aliquod praevaricante saeculo, sicut corrupt, saeptum rectumque reipublicam, restitutus contumaces, suasse pestifera et mortifera dogmatas emendare nonult, sed defensor perpetuorum, heretici fuit, et forte exsecutus habeatur in eversantibus inimicis." The earlier fathers of the Church had steadily refused using force in opposing heresy (Hilarian, Victor, ad Constant., vii, 18; ib. infra, Hilar., Ad Arian., § 33), and at most permitted the secular powers to interfere to prevent the organization of heretical communities (Chrysost. Homil. 29, 46, in Matth.), and even this was often censured (see Socrates, Hist. Ecces, vi, 19, where it is said that the misfortunes which befall Chrysostom were by many considered as a punishment for his having caused churches belonging to the Quarrodecim inedias, &c. (A.D. 372) to be erected without the permission of the ecclesiastics and the citizens); Augustine, on the contrary (Retract. ii, c. 5; ep. 98, ad Vincentianum, § 17; ep. 185, ad Hes. Epist. 21; Opp. imperf. 2, 2), basing himself on the passage Luke xiv, 23 (cogite et recurre, etc.), completely reversed his former opinion that heretics and schismatics were not to be associating with the faithful, or of using secular power, and stated explicitly, as a fundamental principle, that "damnata heresia ad episcopem non advac erudimincendo, sed corredenda est potestas Christian." He only rejects the infliction of capital punishment, yet more on account of the general opposition of the ancient Church to this mode of punishment than from lenity towards heresy. It is, consequently, not strange if even this protest against the execution of heretics came subsequently to be disregarded, and the punishment even approved (see Leo M. ep. 15, ad Turribiam; Hieronymus, ep. 87, ad Bishops in the Middle Ages we find the Roman Church, on the one hand, condemning capital punishment by its canon law, and at the same time demanding the application of this punishment to heretics from the secular law. Julian the Apostate had long before reproached the Christians of his time for persecuting their heretics, which, he said, ought to be less scrupulous. As to the principles which guided the conduct of the secular powers towards heretics, we find that it wavered long between an entire liberty in establishing sects, submitting them to mere police regulations, restricting them in the carrying out of their system of worship, depriving them of their property, formally prohibiting them, and finally punishing them as criminals. Through all these variations the fundamental principle was adhered to that the secular power possesses in general the right to punish, repress, or extirpate heresy. Hesitation is shown only in the mode of applying this principle, not in the principle itself. Moreover, the exercise of this right was in no way subject to the decision of the Church, and the secular power could by itself decide whether and how far a certain heresy should be tolerated—a right which the states retained without opposition until the Middle Ages. The numerous laws against it are in the Code Theodosianus, Codex Theodosianus, to which we may add xvi, tit. i, 2, 3, are the principal sources for the history of the laws concerning sects in antiquity. History shows us that in the use of compulsion and punishments against heretics the secular princes did not in any way take part, and that doing more than the latter was at first disposed to approve. Julian the Apostate granted full freedom to heretics with a view to injure the Church. Augustine first succeeded, in the 5th century, in establishing an agreement between Church and State on this question, yet without contesting the right of the State to use its independent authority. This is proved by Justinian's Institutes (compare cod. i, tit. 5), which interfere directly with the private rights of heretics; and in case of mixed marriages, they order, regardless of the patria potestas, that the children shall be brought up in the orthodox faith (ih. infra, Hilar., ad Arian., § 18).

In the Middle Ages the notion of heresy and of its relations to the Church and the State acquired a further development. At one time, in view of the authority of the pope in matters of faith and of the doctrine of filius inspirata, the notion of heresy was so extended that the act of disobedience to the pope in refusing to accept or reject some distinction according to his command, was considered almost as its worst and most important feature. The Scholastics treated the doctrine concerning heresy scientifically. Finally the Church, instead of seeking to make the Scholastics repeat the errors it had condemned. It even compelled the secular powers to repress and extirpate heresy according to its
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dictates by threats of ecclesiastical censure, by inviting invasion and revolution in case of resistance, and by compelling the application of secular punishments, such as the sequesterment of property, and the deprivation of all civil and political rights, as was especially done by Innocent III. Nevertheless, the Church continued in the practices, whenever it handed over condemned heretics to the secular power for punishment, recommending to all countries that they should be punished, which might endanger their lives; but this was a mere formality, and so far from being made in earnest that the Church itself made the awfulness of such punishment one of its dogmas. Thus Leo X, in his bull Sacra et inviolata, declares that such sentence, that which says that heretics can be condemned as condemned spirits (Spiritus, art. 38), and recommended the use of such punishment himself. About the same time, a special form of proceedings was adopted against heretics, and their persecution was rendered regular and systematic by the establishment of the Inquisition (q.v.). Thus, in course of time, a number of secular penalties came to be considered as inevitably connected with ecclesiastical condemnation, and were even pronounced against heretics by the Church itself without further formalities. The Church, whenever any individual suspicion of heresy was made known to it, would, in the first instance, declare him (in full court, after a public abjuration released either partially or fully from the ecclesiastical and secular punishment he had ipso facto incurred. This implied the right of still inflicting these punishments after the revocation of the sentence, especially in cases of sequestration of property, deprivation of civil or ecclesiastical offices, and degradation, while a return to heresy after cantemation was to be punished by death). See the provisions of the Canon Law as found in X. de hereticis, tit. 7; c. 49; X. de mot. ecclesiasticis, v. 39; tit. de Heret., v. 2; De heret., in Clement, v. 3; De heret., in Extravag. comm. v. 3; and comp. the Liber septimus, v. 5, 4, and the laws against heretics of the emperor Frederick II, which are connected with the ecclesiastical laws (in Pertz, Monum. ii, 244, 287, 298, 327, 328); and the regulations concerning mixed marriages and the marriage of heretics. All these are yet considered by the Roman Catholic Church as having the force of law, though, under present circumstances, they are not enforced (comp. Benedict XIV, De synod. Dioc. vi, 5; ix, 13, 3; xiii, 24, 21).

Even in the 18th century Muratori defended the assertion that the Church has a right to enforce the most severe secular penalties against heretics (De ingenn. moderatione in religiosis negotiis, ii, 7 sq.). In the beginning of the 19th century, pending the negotiations for the crowning of Napoleon I, pope Pius VII declared that he could not set foot in a country in which the law recognized the freedom of worship of the different religions. The same pope wrote in 1805 to his nuncio at Vienna, "The Church has not only sought to prevent heretics from using the properties of the Church, but has also established, as the punishment for the sin of heresy, the sequestration of private property, in c. 10, X. d. heret., (v. 7), of principalities, and of feudal tenures, in c. 16, cod.; the latter law contains the canonical rule that the subjects of a heretical prince are free from all usury of faith as well as from all fidelity and obedience to him; and there is none at all acquainted with history but knows that the council of Constance establishes the councils against obstinately heretical princes. Yet we find ourselves now in times of such misfortune and humiliation for the bride of Christ that the Church is not only unable to enforce these, its holiest maxims, against the obstinate heretics, with whom they should be, but it even cannot compel them openly without danger. Yet, if it cannot exert its right in depriving heretics of their estates, it may," etc. With this may be compared the permission granted in anticipation, in 1724 (Bullar. Propagandae, ii, 54, 56), to the Rhenishen, in case of conversion, to take possession of the properties they had lost by her apostasy; the satisfaction manifested by the Church on the expulsion of the Protestant bishop, on German soil, by the Emperor, in 1648; and many things happening every day in strictly Roman Catholic countries, under the eyes of the Roman See. Quite recently, Philippi, in his Canon Law, honestly acknowledged the validity of the old laws against heretics, and asserted their correctness. Even now, in every country, not only in the old, but even in the new, the laws of heretics are firmly and actively applied; and the bishops, now as heretics, promise, in taking the oath of obedience to the pope, heretics, schismatics, et rebelles edem Dominio nostro vel successoribus predicti pro posse persecurari et impugnandum. Yet the Roman See has re- nounced, since 1767, 1783, 1784, the use of the expression of "Protestant heretics" in its official acts; and it has even admitted that, under the pressure of existing circumstances, the civil powers may be forgiven for tolerating heretics in their states! Still, as soon as circumstances will permit, the Roman See is prepared to apply again the old laws, which are merely temporarily suspended in some countries, but in nowise repealed.

Governments, however, naturally take a different view of these laws. The secular power, even while it freed itself from its absolute subjection to the Church, still continued to persecute in various ways the Protestants whom the Church announced as heretics; but they deprived them under Louis XIV of the right of emigration; while, in refusing to recognize the validity of their marriage, the civil authorities showed themselves even more severe than the Church. But, becoming wiser by experience, and taught by the general reaction which its measures produced in the 18th century, the State has confined itself to interfering with heresy so far only as is necessary to promote public order and the material good of the State; thus claiming only the right to repress or exel those whose principles are opposed to the existence of a national or, or might endanger the State. This right, of course, has been differently understood in different countries according to local circumstances, and has even become a pretext for persecutions against denominations which a milder construction of it would not have deprived of the toleration of the State, as in some parts of Sweden.

Let us now compare this practice of the Romish Church and of Roman Catholic states with the dogmatic theory of the Middle Ages. Thomas Aquinas treats heresy as the opposite of faith, connecting it with infidelitas in communi et apostasia a fide. He treats schism, against the Church, as infidelitas species pertinens ad eos, qui fidei Christi profrentur, sed ejus dogmata corrumpunt (1, q. ii, art. i), yet (art. ii) he remarks at the same time that some holy fathers themselves erred in the early times of the Church on many points of faith. In art. iii he comes to the question whether heretics are to be tolerated. He asserts that they also have their use in the Church, as serving to prove its faith, and inducing it diligently to search the Scriptures, yet their usefulness in these respects is involuntary. Considered for themselves only, heretics are not only deserving of being cut off from communion with the Church, but also with the world, by being put to death. But the Church must, in her mercy, first use all means of converting heretics, and only when it desairs of bringing them back must cut them off by excommunication, and then deliver them up to secular jurisdiction which frustrates them by condemnation to death." He only admits of toleration towards heretics when persecution against them would be likely to injure the faithful. In this case he advises sparing the tares for the sake of the wheat. He further maintains that heretics, on their first offense, be entirely pardoned, and all ecclesiastical and secular punishment remitted, but asserts that those who relapse, though they may be reconciled with the Church, must not be released from the sentence of death incurred, lest the bad example of their inconstancy might prove injurious to others.
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The Reformation protested against these doctrines. Luther, from the first, denounced all attempts to overcome heresy by sword and fire instead of the Word of God, and held that the civil power should leave heretics to be dealt with by the Church. On this ground he opposed Calvin. Yet it was clear with all the Reformers, that governments are bound to prevent blasphemy, to see that the people receive from the Church built on the Word of God the pure teaching of that word, and to prevent all attempts at creating sects. This led to the adoption of preventive measures, in the shape of the formerly permitted confessions, censure, excommunication, banishment, and death. These preventive measures confined the heresy to the individual, and extended as far as banishment, when no other means would avail. Luther admitted the use of secular punishment against heretics only in exceptional cases, and then not on account of the heresy, but of the resulting disorders. Even then he considered banishment sufficient, except when incitations to revolution, etc., required more severe punishment, as was the case with the Anabaptists; yet he often declared against the application of capital punishment to such heretics. Zwingle took nearly the same stand on this point, but was more inclined to the use of forcible means. The Anabaptists were treated in a summary manner in Switzerland. Calvin went further, and with his theocratic ideas considered the state as bound to treat heresy as blasphemy, and to punish it in the severest manner. His appendices, and their interpretation of the execution of Servetus gave rise to a controversy on the question whether heresy might be punished with the sword (compare Calvini Defensatis orthodoxy fidei, etc.). Calvin's views were attacked not only by Böseck, but also by Castet. A history of heretics by Bellièrs wrote on this occasion his De hereticis (Mâcon, 1554), quoting against Calvin the opinions of Luther and of Bretonius. Lâlius Socinus, in his Disputas inter Calvinum et Vaticanam (1574), also advocated toleration. Among all the German theologians, Melancthon alone sided with Calvin, consistently with the views (Corpus, Ref. I, 18, an. 1530; and III, 195, an. 1535) which he had long previously defended against the more moderate views of Bretonius (see HARTMANN AND JÄGER, JAHRESBÚND., 1, 299 sq.).

In England, in the first year of queen Elizabeth, an act of Parliament was passed to enable persons to try heretics, and the following directions were given for their guidance: "And such persons to whom the queen shall by letters patent under the great seal give authority to execute any jurisdiction spiritual, shall not in any wise be bound to adjudge any matter as heresy, but only such as heretofore have been adjudged to be heresy, by the authority of the canonical Scriptures, or by some of the first four general councils, or by any other general council wherein the same was declared heresy by the express and plain words of the said canonical Scriptures, or such as hereafter shall be judged or determined to be heresy by the high court of Parliament, with the assent of the clergy in their convocation."

This statute continued practically in force, with certain modifications, till the 29 Charles II, c. 5, since which time heresy has been left entirely to the cognizance of the ecclesiastical courts; but, as there is no statute defining in what heresy consists, and as, moreover, much of the jurisdiction of the ecclesiastical courts has been withdrawn by the various toleration acts; and, above all, as the effect of various recent decisions has been to widen almost indefinitely the construction of the doctrinal formulæ of the English Church, it may now be said that the jurisdiction of these courts in matters of heresy is practically limited to preventing ministers of the Established Church from preaching in opposition to the doctrine and the articles of the establishment from which they derive their emoluments, and that, even in determining what is to be considered contrary to the articles, a large toleration has been judicially established. See the recent trial of Dr. Rowland Williams, and the judgment given by Dr. Lushington in the Court of Arches (Chambers, Cyclopædia, n. v.). The Protestant churches generally, in the 19th century, deny the power of the State to punish heresy. The Roman Church retains its old theory that the subject is of the utmost importance, and the progress of civilization is limited by the Toleration. The history of the various heresies is given, with more or less fulness, in the Church histories. Walch's Entw. einer vollst. Geschichte d. Ketzereien, etc. (1762-1785, 11 vols.), gives a history of doctrines and heresies (see also church to the sixth synod). Historical and religious controversies, it is still indispensable. Walch is free from polemic zeal, and bent upon the critical and pragmatic representation of his subject, without sympathy or antipathy" (Schauf, Apost. History, § 31). See also LARDNER, HISTORY OF THE HERETICS OF THE FIRST TWO CENTURIES, with additions by Hogg (Loud, 1780, 4to; and in Lardner, Works, 11 vols. 8vo); Fussler, Kirchen-u. Ketzerhistorien d. mittleren Zeiten (Freib. 1770-1774, 3 vols.); Baumgarten, Geschichte der Religionsparteien (Halle, 1766, 4to). Professor Oehler commenced in 1856 the publication of a Corpus Haereticorum, which has already appeared a, and the first volume contains a number of works on heresies, with notes and prolegomena. See also BURTON, Inquiry into the Heresies of the Apostolic Age (Hampton Lecture for 1829, 8vo); Campbell, Preliminary Discourses, etc. on Four Gospels; Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, v. 408; Elliott, Definition of Romanism, 2 vols. 4to; idem, iii, 413, b. ii, 438; idem, iii, 442; idem, 3, 480; Dorner, Person of Christ (Edinb. transl., i.), 344; NEWTON, HISTORY OF DOGMAS (Ryland's transl.), 10. See also HERETICO COMBURENDO; PERSECUTION; TOLERATION.

Heretic. See HERESY.

Heretics, Baptism by. When the line between the orthodox and the heretics [see HERESY], was clearly drawn in the early Church, the question whether baptism performed by heretics should be regarded as valid by the orthodox began to be mooted. It afterwards became of great moment, especially with regard to the claims of the Church of Rome.

1. As early as the 3d century heretical baptism was pronounced invalid. Clemens Alexander calls it false (畜牧, i. 357). Tertullian declared that it was of no value (De Baptismo, cap. xv). "Cyprian, whose epistles afford the clearest information on this subject, followed Tertullian in rejecting baptism by heretics as an ineptive mock baptism, and demanded that all heretics coming over to the Catholic Church be again baptized, on the ground that it is caused by the Schism of the Church. A heresy there was due to his High-Church exclusivism and his horror of schism. As the one Catholic Church is the sole repository of all grace, there can be no forgiveness of sins, no regeneration or communication of the Spirit, no salvation, therefore no valid sacraments, out of her bosom. So far he had logical consistency on his side. But, on the other hand, he departed from the objective view of the Church, as the Donatists afterwards did, in making the efficacy of the sacrament depend on the subjective holiness of the priest. How can one consecrate water? he asks, who is himself unholy, and has not the Holy Ghost given him his position in the North African Church, which, in several councils at Carthage in the years 255-6, rejected heretical baptism; and by the Church of Asia Minor, which had already acted on this view, and now, in the person of the Cappadocian bishop Firminus, a disciple of him, he extolled the great merits of Origen, for having stood against the intolerance of Rome. The Roman bishop Stephen (253-257) appeared for the opposite doctrine, on the ground of the ancient practice of the Church. He offered no argument, but spoke with the consciousness of authority, and followed the practice of his see. This is the objective nature of the sacrament, the virtue of which depended neither on the officiating priest nor on the
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receiver, but solely on the institution of Christ. Hence he considered heretical baptism valid, provided it had been administered in the right form, to wit, in the name of the Trinity, or even of Christ alone; so that heretics coming into the Church needed only confirmation, or the ratification of baptism by the Holy Ghost. 'Heresy,' says he, 'produces children and exposes them; and the Saviour was not afraid of being reproached with the name of a heretic, when sent them as her own, though she herself has not brought them forth.' The doctrine of Cyprian was the more consistent from the churchly point of view, that of Stephen from the sacramental. The one preserved the principle of the exclusiveness of the Church, the other that of the endurance of another tribe, or rather, of the growth of the Churches to the borders of the opus-opus operatio theory. Both were under the direction of the same hierarchal spirit, and the same hatred of heretics; but the Roman doctrine is, after all, a happy inconsistency of liberty, an inroad upon the principle of absolute exclusiveness, an involuntary concession that baptism, and, with it, the remission of sins, and regeneration, therefore salvation, are possible outside of Roman Catholicism. The controversy itself was conducted with great warmth. Stephen, though advocating the liberal view, showed the genuine papal arrogance and intolerance. He would not even admit to his presence the deputies of Cyprian, who brought him the decree of the African Synod, and called this bishop, who in every respect far excelled Stephen, and whom the Roman Church now venerates as one of her greatest saints, a 'pseudo-Christus, pseudo-apostolus, et obdamnum operatio.' He himself broke off all intercourse with the African Church, as he had already done with the Asiatic. But Cyprian and Firmilian, nothing daunted, vindicated with great boldness, the latter also with bitter vehemence, their different view, and continued in it to their death. The Alexandrian bishop Cyprian endeavored to bring about a peace between the two parties, but with little success. The Valerian persecution, which soon ensued, and the martyrdom of Stephen (257) and of Cyprian (258), suppressed this internal discord. In the course of the 4th century, however, the Roman practice gradually gained on the other, was raised to a degree of importance by the Council of Nicæa, in 325, although without the consent of the East, and was afterwards confirmed by the Council of Trent, with an anathema on the opposite view" (Schaff, History of the Christian Church, ch. vi, § 104).

2. The decrees of the Council of Trent as to baptism by heretics is as follows: "If any man shall say that the baptism which is given by heretics in the name of the Father, and of the Holy Ghost, with the intention of doing what the Church doth, is not true baptism, let him be anathema" (sess. vii, can. iv). This, at first view, may appear liberal; but the indirect intention of it is to claim all baptized persons as under the jurisdiction of Rome. Canon vii affirms that the baptized are bound "by all the precepts of the Church, whether written or transmitted." Canon xiv declares that any one who shall say "that those who have been baptized when infants are to be left to their own will when they grow up, and are not meantime to be confirmed to a Christian life by any voluntary seclusion from the Eucharist and the other seven sacraments till they repent," is to be anathema.

3. Luther admitted the validity of Romish baptism, and in this he is followed by Protestants generally, who do not repudiate from Rome. The Protestant churches (except the Baptist) admit the validity of each other's baptism to be Heretic, Real-Party, and with the consent of the Eucharist and the other seven sacraments till they repent, it is to be anathema.

Heriger. See LIBER.

Heritage, denoted by several Heb. words: בֵּיתָן, "a possession;" בֵּיתָן, nachalah, or בֵּיתָן, nachalath, "heritage, etc.;" also בֵּיתָן, yerrushkah; בֵּיתָן, morahkah; only sons (compare Gen. xxi, 10; xxxii, 14 sq.), and, indeed, only those of regular wives (comp. Gen. xxi, 10; xxxii, 36; xxxv, 5 sq.). Joseph (as no exception, Judg. xii, 7; see BASTARD), had any legal title to the paternal inheritance, according to ancient usage among the Israelites; and amongst these the first-born, who might be of the favorite or a less favored wife, enjoyed a double portion (Deut. xxil, 15 sq.).

Harry. See Duggleby, 113; Selden, De successionibus in bona pat. c. 18; so as not to interrupt the regular transmission of the estate (see Wachsmuth, Hellen. Abkhr. ii, 206; Selden, De successionibus in bona pat. c. 18); it is the Hebr. רְכָב, רַכָּב, and the hebr. is a testamentary disposition of the inheritance, to the exclusion of any more formal method of bequest (Gen. xvi, 1, 60 sq.; for the passage in Tobit viii, 29 does not refer to a devise by will, and Prov. xxv, 2 only shows that slaves might become heirs by a special arrangement of their masters (see Rosenmuller in loc.; Geneshuis, Thes. Heb. i, 480), while Gen. xv, 8 refers to an earlier period. But in later times the regular testaments must have obtained among the Jews (Gal. iii, 15; Heb. ix, 17; comp. Josephus, Ant. xiii, 16, 1; xvii, 3, 2; War, ii, 2, 3), in imitation of the Greeks and Romans (see Smith's Dict. of Class. Antiq. s. v. Heres, Testamentum); and in the Talmudical law of heritage they became of effect (Gen. xvi, 6, 171), although the extensive sense of the Roman law. Sometimes the parent divided the inheritance (i. e. a portion of it) among his children during his lifetime (Luke xv, 12; comp. Tobit viii, 28; see Rosenmuller, Morganl. v, 197). (On the subject generally, see Michaelis, Moses Recht, ii, 76 sq.; J. Selden, De Successione in bona paterna, London, 1656; also in his Uxor. Ebr. and in his Works, ii, 1 sq.) See INHERITANCE.

Hermann of Cologne (prince archbishop), son of Frederick I, count of Wied, was educated for the priesthood, elected archbishop in 1516, and confirmed by pope Leo X as Hermann V. Having imbued the principles of the Reformation, he first attempted a Roman Catholic reform in Cologne, but, finding it, as he imagined, too late assumed a Protestant position, and invited Bucer and Melancthon, in 1542, to assist him. Had he succeeded in his plans, the whole Rhine country would probably have become Protestant; but he was excommunicated by the pope, removed by the emperor, and expelled by his estates. He finally resigned his office in 1547, and retired to his estates in Wied, where he died Aug. 15, 1552. He was belied by his people, honored by the emperor Charles V, and esteemed by the great leaders of the Reformation. An account of Hermann's relation to his times is given in Dechamps' History of Wied (Cologne, 1840). His Form of Service was made use of in the framing of the English "Book of Common Prayer." See Hase, Church History, § 337-340; Hardwick, History of the Reformation, p. 65, 218. See COMMON PRAYER.

Hermann of Fritzlar, a mystic, was born at Fritzlar, in Hesse, towards the middle of the 14th century. Nothing certain is known of his position or so-
eternal relations: it is probable, however, that he was a rich layman, like Nicholas of Basle, who retired from the world to devote himself to reading and writing theological works. One of his earlier works, to which he refers himself, Die Blume der Schauung (doubtless of speculative tendency), appears to have been lost. We have, however, Heiligenkreuz. In 1688 he became a member of Pfeiffer's Deutscher Mystiker des 14. Jahrh., i, 1-298, from the Heidelberg MS. executed under his supervision in 1643-1649. It is an extensive work, compiled from sources now mostly lost.—Herzog, Real-Encyklop. (J. N. P.)

Hermann of Lethinus. See Lethinus.

Hermann of Salza. See Salza.

Hermann of Wurda. See Wurda.

Hermann or H. H. Hermannus, Contractus, so called from disease having shrunk up his limbs, was a monk of Reichenau, and one of the learned men of the 11th century, being well skilled in Latin, Greek, and Arabic. He was born in 1013, and was the son of the count of Weringen in Suria. He wrote a Chronicle (De Secetatibus mundi), which commences at the Creation and ends A.D. 1002. The events occurring before the Christian era are very briefly noticed, but afterwards he enters into more details, and amplifies as he approaches nearer to his own times. The "Chronicle" was published in an English translation of Constantine’s, with notes, and published at Basle in 1536, and again at St. Blaise in 1790 (2 vols. 4to). It may be found also in Bihl. Max-Patr. vol. xviii. Thriemichus ascribes the hymn Alba Reformationis mater et Salve Regina to Hermann. See Dupin, Eccl. Writers, iv, 102.

Hermann or H. H. Hermannus, abbot of Tours, A.D. 1127, resided his office in consequence of long-continued illness. He wrote Tractatus de Inseuacione Christi (ed. O. Oudin, Vet. Sac. Lugd. Bat. 1692); three books of the Miracles of Mary of Laon, and a History of the Monastery of St. Martin in Tours, which are given in D’Achery’s, Speigel. ii, 488.—Dupin, Ecclistorical Writers, x, 181.

Hermann von der Hardt, a German Protestant theologian and philologist, was born at Melle (Westphalia) Nov. 15, 1660. He studied at Osnabruck, Jena, and Hamburg. In 1681 he began to lecture privately at Jena, but, not succeeding as well as he had expected, he went to Leipzig in 1686, where he joined the celebrated Goeze. In 1690 he was made literary secretary and secretary of duke Rudolph August of Brunswick, and the latter caused him finally to be appointed professor of Oriental languages at the University of Helmstadt in 1696. He afterwards became senior of the University and provost of the convent of the Cathedral, and died Feb. 28, 1746. Hermann was a very active and ingenious scholar, but his tendency to paradoxical assertions caused him to fall into errors, which, however, were perhaps too severely condemned by his adversaries. He wrote Autographu Latheri aliorumque celebrium virorum, etc. (Brunsw. 1696-1699, 3 vols. 8vo).—Ephemerides Philologicae, quibus difficillima quadrans loca Pentateuchi ad Hebraicorum fontium tenorem explicata, etc. (Helmstadt, 1693, 1696, and 1703).—Hosea illustratus chaediacum Jonathanis versione et philologico celebrius rubricum Aenon, Athen. Exsnu et Kinco commntariis (Helm. 1707, 1717).—Evangelicis Res Integra. in negotio Iona quatuor liber celebrata (Frankf. 1719, 4to).—Enigmata praesid. Jona in lib. histor. Jon. et Josephi (Helm. 1726, 8vo).—Enigmata Grecorum et Latinarum ex collig. Apocalypsis ex tenbris (Helmst. 1725, 4to). This work attracted great attention when first published.—Tomus primus in Joh. historiarum populi Israelis in Assyriaco vico, Sacrarum scripturara e regno est, etc. (Helmstadt, 1728, 8vo). See J. Fabricius, Hist. Biblioth. pt. ii, 342-347, 351-352; Nova Acta Eruditorum (an. 1746, p. 475-480); Breithaupt, Memoria Her. v. d. Hardt (Helmst. 1746); Hoefler, Nouv. Ann. Générale, xxiii, 362.

Hermann, Nikolaus, one of the earliest evangelical hymnologists, flourished about the middle of the 16th century. His intimate relation with the minister of the church of his place (which he served as organist), Mathesius, the biographer of Luther, gave to his compositions a true, forsooth spirit and the child-like simplicity of a Christian mind. They have been preserved in general use even to our own day.—Brockhaus, Conversations Lexicon, vii, 841; Gervinus, Gesch. d. poetischen Nationaliti. d. Deutschen, iii, 10, 32.

Hermaphroditic Orders. See Monasticism.

Herma (Ἑρμα, from Εἰρμος, the Greek god of gain, or Mercury), the name of a person to whom Paul sends greeting in his Epistles to the Romans (xvi, 14), and consequently then resident in Rome and a Christian (A.D. 55); and yet the origin of the name, like that of the other four mentioned in the same verse, is Greek. However, in those days, even a Jew, like Paul himself, might acquire Roman citizenship. Ireneus, Tertullian, and Origen agree in making him identical with the author of "the Shepherd" of the following article, but this is greatly disputed. He is celebrated as a saint in the Roman calendar on May 9.—Smith, s.v.

Hermas, one of the so-called apostolical fathers (q. v.), the supposed author of a tract that has come down to us under the title of Hermas, The Shepheard, or a General Exposition, generally designated by the title Pastor Hermas. The authorship of the tract is uncertain, but it is clearly not the work of the Hermas (Ἑρμα, mentioned in Rom. xvi, 14, as Origen, Eusebius, and Jerome believed, and as the tract itself seems to pretend. The author appears to have been a layman of the 2d century, probably a Roman tradesman "who had lost his wealth through his own sins and the misdeeds of his neglected sons" (Hilgenfeld; Schaff, History of the Church, § 121). Others ascribe it to Hermas or Hermes, brother of Pius, bishop of Rome from A.D. 142 to 157. Of the Greek original we have nothing left but fragments, which are given in Fabricius, Cod. Apgoraph. N. Test. ii, 375, and in Grabe, Speigel, i, 303. M. d’Abbadie claims (1860) to have discovered a third in Ethiopia, which he has transcribed and translated into Latin (Lpz. 1860); but whether the text from which it is taken is correct is a matter of debate. The text of the English version is at an early period translated into Latin, and, since the beginning of the 15th century, often published (Paris, 1513, fol.; Strasb. 1522, 4to.; Basle, 1555 and 1569, fol.; Oxford, 1685, 12mo; with additions by Le Clerc, Amst. 1698, 1724; Paris, 1715, 1724). The various readings of the fathers of Coteler, Patres avi apostolici (Paris, 1672, 4to.), and in French in Desprez's Bible (Paris, 1715, fol. iv.) is also given in the various editions of the Apostolical Fathers (q. v.). Of late years this tract has been the subject of more editing and literary criticism than almost any relic of the early Church. In 1857 Dressel published at Leipzig a new Latin translation of the Pastor which he found in a MS. at Rome, and which differs from the other. The edition contains also a Greek text of the Iaou, revised by Tischendorf. This text, it is claimed, was found in a convent library in Constantinople. Tischendorf considers it, however, only a retransliteration from the Latin into Greek, and places its origin in the Middle Ages. Tischendorf himself discovered, in the Codex Sinaiticus, the Greek text of book 1 of the Shepherd, and the first four chapters of book 2, is given in the critical edition of Dressel, Patres Apost. (Lips. 1863); also by Hilgenfeld, who has carefully edited the Pastor Hermas in his Nov. Test. extra Canonom receptum (fasc. iii, Lips. 1866). The Anti-Nicene Christian Library, vol. i (Edinb. 1867), contains a new and complete edition of the Shepherd, following the text of Hilgenfeld, who makes use of the text found in the Sinaitic Codex.
The Pastor is written in the form of a dialogue, and is divided into three parts: 1. Visiones; 2. Mundata; 3. Similitudines. Hermas, in his childhood, had been taught up with a young slave. In after life, and when he was married, he met her again, and experienced for her the pure love which he had previously been hidden by the Church under the circumstances. Soon afterwards the young slave died. One day, as Hermas was wandering in the country, thinking of her, he sat down and fell asleep. "During my sleep," says he, "my mind carried me away to a steep path, which I followed, where I met a blind guide, with a white staff in his hand, and I could not see his face. He held up his staff on all sides, and cried, "This is the way." I followed him, and the path gradually became broader and straighter. At last we came to a house, where there was a great crowd of people. When they saw me, they said, "This is the holy man."

"Have I been called here," she answered, "to disclose thy sins before the Lord." 'What!' exclaimed I, 'and wilt thou accuse me?' 'No; but listen to me.' etc. The conversation goes on with a blending of severity and tenderness. 'Pray to the Lord,' says the young maiden, and be patient; and when you see a sight, "he will heal thy soul, and will efface the sins of all thy house, as he has done those of all the saints." One cannot help noticing the striking similarity which exists between this vision and the celebrated passage in the Divinae Consolationis where Beatrice appears to Dante. This vision is followed by three others, which are invitations to penitence, and though in the first it appears as if the invitation was especially directed to Hermas, it clearly applies also to the Church in general. This becomes more evident in the following visions.

The Mundata begin also with a vision. An angel appears to Hermas under the form of a young boy, wearing a white cloak, and bearing a staff in his hand. This shepherd is the angel of penitence, and gives Hermas twelve precepts, which embrace the rules of Christian morality. They are given under the different headings: 1. De filio novi dieum; 2. De fidei judicatae, et eleemosyna ferciendae in simplicitate; 3. De fideiendo venduto; 4. De dissimulato adulterio; 5. De tristitia corde et paenitentia; 6. De magnesia univocaeque hominis docta genetum et trilusioe inspirationibus; 7. De Deo timendo non semine non timendo; 8. Declinandum est a malo et ferciendae seculum; 9. De animis mortuorum; 10. De anima tristitia et non contristandae Spiritui Dei, qui in nobis est; 11. Spiritus et prophetos prodiere ex operibus, et de duplici spirito; 12. De duplici capitate. De mundata non esse impossibili et divino non metandum credentibus.

There is a series of parables and allegories. The vine, with its rich fruits and felicitous boughs, is used to symbolize the fruitfulness of the Church. The willow is made the emblem of divine law. This latter image is made by Hermas the ground of a most graceful allegory. Similitudines 1 to 4 are short and simple images or descriptions; Simil 5 to 9 are visions of the approaching completion of the Church, and of judgment, as well as invitations to penitence on that account; Simil 10, finally, is a sort of conclusion of the whole.

This work was perhaps the most popular book in the Christian Church of the 2d and 3d centuries. Yet, while it pleased the masses, it did not always satisfy the teachers. Irenæus (adv. Haer. iv. 3), Clement of Alexandria (Strom., I. 29), and Origen (Epist. ad Rom. 16) held it in high estimation. Eusebius asserts (Hist. Eccl. v. 2) that he himself often transcribed it and tested its authenticity. Jerome, after praising Hermas in his Chronicon, accuses him of foolishness (stultitia) in his Comment. in Habacuc (i, 1), and Tertullian treats him no better, designating the book as apocryphal in De Pudicitia (I. 39). The learned Duguet, in his Conférences ecclésiastiques, shows how erroneous is the assertion that the Pastor is the germ of all heresies which troubled the Church in the 2d century. Others among modern theologians, and especially Moischele, have violently attacked the Pastor, and considered Hermas as an impostor. The book "knows little of the Gospel, and less of justifying faith: on the contrary, it talks much of the law of Christ and of repentance, enjoins fasting and voluntary poverty, and teaches the merit, even the supererogatory merit, of good works, and the sin-atoning virtue of martyrdom" (Schaaff, l. c). See Gratz, Disquisitio in Past. Herm. (Bonn, 1829); Hefele, Patr. Apost. Prolegomena; Hilgenfeld, Apost. Väter (Halle, 1855); Cave, Hist. Pelagiana; Faberius, Bibl. Graeca, vii, 18; Tillemon, Mem. de l'Acad. royale des sciences et belles-lettres, vol. ii, May 9th; Dom. Cellier, Hist. des Auteurs sacrés et ecclés., i, 582; Moischele, Comment. i, 209-8; Neander, Ch. Hist., i, 500, Hase, Ch. Hist., § 39 and Appendix; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxiv, 871; Schaaff, Church History, § 121; Bunsen, Christianit. und Mystik, i, 182; E. Grieb, Der Hort d. Hermas (Halle, 1856, 8vo); Zahn, Der Hort d. Herrn unternacht (Gottha, 1808, 8vo); Alzog, Patrologie, § 19; Lipsius, in Zeitsschrif. f. Wissenschaftliche Theologie, 1865, heft 3; Hilgenfeld, Der Hort d. Hermas u. sein neuester Bearbeiter, in Zeitsschr., f. Wiss. Theol., 1869, heft 2; Lipsius (in same journal, heft 5). Die Lehren eines Apolostes (a severe review of Zahn's Hermas).

Hermeneutae (ἐρμηνευται, inter preters), officers in the ancient Church, whose business it was to render one language into another, as there was occasion, both in reading the Scriptures, and in the homilies that were made to the people; an office chiefly used in those churches where the people spoke different languages, as in Palestine, where some spoke Syrian; others Greek; and in the churches of Africa, where some spoke Latin and others Punic. "So far was the primitive Church from encouraging ignorance, by locking up the Scriptures in an unknown tongue, that she not only translated them into all languages, but also appointed a standing office of interpreters, who were employed to enable men understand what was read, and not suffer them to be barbarians in the service of God, which is a tyranny that was unknown to former ages."—Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. iii. ch. xiii, § 4.

Hermeneutics (from ἐρμηνεύω, to explain), the technical or scientific name of that branch of theology which consists in exposition in general, as distinguished from exegesis (ἐξεγεῖσα), from exogesis (ἐξεγείρομαι). The first mention of the natural and obvious principles of a careful and conscientious exposition to the passage and all its terms. This may be called the PHILOLOGICO-HISTORICAL rule. It embraces the following elements:

1. The diligent and discriminative use of an accurate and judicious lexicon.

2. The painstaking and constant reference to the best Grammars.

A well-grounded knowledge of the language is implied in these prescriptions, yet the interpreter needs to confirm or modify his judgment by these independent authorities.

3. An intimate acquaintance with the archaeology involved, including geography, chronology, and Oriental usages.

4. The context should be carefully consulted; and the general drift and purposes of the writer should be considered; for, if the author's special design in writing, must be kept in mind.

5. Especially is a cordial sympathy with spiritual truth a prerequisite in this task. A deep religious experience has enlightened many an otherwise ill-instructed mind as to the meaning of much of Holy Writ.

3. Parallelism. What are passages from the same book or writer, or if these are not to be had from other parts of Scripture, are to be attentively con-
sidered, on the principle that Scripture is its own best interpreter. This is pre-eminent true of types, metaphors, parables, prophetic symbols, and other figurative representations. For this purpose "reference Bible" should especially be superfluous, and the examination should include an extensive comparison of doctrine, theory, and topic, as well as of example, fact, and expression.

III. When various meanings are assignable to a given passage or word, that should be selected which is the broadest in its import and application; if possible, one that is inclusive of all or most of the others. This rule should especially be superfluous, and the examination and the language of Christ, of God directly, or the more cardinal statements of inspiration.

In prophetic and eschatological passages of Scripture especially must the fact be borne in mind that one event or circumstance is often made the type or image of another; the two being generally related to the same essential principle as proximate and remote, or as personal and national, or as temporal and spiritual manifestations of the divine economy. In some cases this correlation runs through an entire piece or book, e.g. the Canticles and most of the Psalms. See Double Sense (Of Scripture).

IV. The consensus of the universal Church in past and present time should have its due influence; not as being of absolute authority, but as an exponent of the aggregate and deliberate judgment of good and unprejudiced men. This will guard the expositor against fanciful, extravagant or dangerous impressions. To this end creeds, confessions, and articles of faith are useful, as well as the study of exploded or living heresies, but more particularly a collation of the views of preceding commentators. In weighing none of these, however, there is an imperative reverence to be indulged, for the word of God itself is superior to them all, and it is not only possible, but certain, that in some points they have alike erred, as in many they have fluctuated or conflicted with each other. Even the objections and cavils of infidels and rationalists should not be of less weight to the expositor as hostes doctores.

V. Where different interpretations are possible, that must be selected which is most consistent with common sense. Especially must those be set aside which lead to a psychological or theological impossibility or contradiction. Such a principle we always feel bound to apply to the communication of a friend, and to every other thing on which a rational writer, from overlooking this rule, have often increased rather than explained the difficulties of the sacred text. For example, to understand Paul as meaning in Rom. ix, 5 that he was willing to forfeit his title to eternal bliss, is to attribute to him a sentiment incompatible with mental and moral sanity; and to refer the preference in I Cor. vii, 21 to a state of slavery, is to outrage the spontaneous instincts of the human mind.

VI. It will sometimes become necessary to modify our conclusions as to particular passages in consequence of the discoveries and deductions of modern science. Instances in point are the theories respecting the creation and deluge, arising from the progress of astronomical and geological knowledge. All truth is consistent with itself; and although the Bible was not given for the purpose of determining scientific questions, yet it must not, and need not be so interpreted as to contradict the "elders or scripture writ by God's own hand" in the volume of nature. In like manner history is often the best expositor of prophecy.

Hermeis (Ἐρμης, i.e. the Greek Mercury [q. v.]), the name of a man mentioned in the Epistle to the Romans as a disciple at Rome (Rom. xvi, 14). A.D. 55. "According to the Greeks," says Calmet (Dict. n. v.), "he was the leading orator of a school of orators who collected disciples, and afterwards bishop of Dalmatia." His festival occurs in their calendar upon April 8 (Neale, Eastern Church, ii, 774).

Hermes, Georg, a distinguished modern Romanist theologian and philosopher. He was born at Dreieckwärde, near Münster, April 22, 1758, became gymnasium teacher in 1778, priest in 1779, and professor of theology at Münster in 1807. The best of his mind was to carry philosophical ideas toward philosophy itself. His education should be extended to include a philosophical explanation of all. He was appointed to the chair of philosophy in the new University of Bonn, where he so far advanced greatly to his reputation, and his system, before his death, had found its way into most of the Roman Catholic schools of Prussia. He died at Bonn May 26, 1811. His followers have since been called Hermesianes. The writings of an imperialist, published in his lifetime, have come to light. His followers have since been called Hermesianes. The writings of this latter, published by permission from a private collection, have become famous. After his death appeared his Christianisches Katholische Dogmatik (Münster, 1805, 3 vols. 8vo). In 1882 the Hermesianes established a journal at Cologne as their organ. During the lifetime of Hermesi there had been many complaints of the heretical tendencies of his system by the orthodox, and he had been accused of introducing into the faith, as the basis of theology. Hermesi admitted all the dogmas of the Church, but held that the ground of belief in these did not necessarily have to be laid in a philosophical proof, first of a divine revelation; and, secondly, that the mind is the medium through which belief is received. At Rome the question was put into Perrone's hands, whose report strongly condemned Hermesi and his doctrines. On 26th of September, 1805, a papal brief was issued against them. The Hermesianes, however, maintained that the doctrines censured were not contained in the system of Hermesi but were the result of their request to be allowed to present in Rome a Latin translation of the works of Hermesi, and to plead their orthodoxy, in 1807 two of their prominent spokesmen, Professor Braun, of Bonn, and professor Elvenich, of Breslau, arrived in Rome, but, finding that they would not get a hearing, on the advice of the pope withdrew and published a series of writings against the philosophy of Hermesi. This was given in Migne's Declarations Evangeliques, ii, 945 sq.; see also Stupp, Die letzten Hermesianer (Cologne, 1844-5); Hagenbach, History of 18th and 19th Centuries, tr. by Hurst, ii, 444; and art. Günther.

Hermes Trismegistus, or Mercurius (Ἑρμῆς, Ερμής ὁ Τρισμεγίστου), the putative author of a large number of Greek works, many of which are still extant. The Greek Hermes was in the time of Plato identified with the Egyptian Thot, Thoth, or Thaut (as it was also with the Alexandrian Thoth), a mythical personage regarded as the discoverer of all sciences, especially as the original inventor of the alphabet, the art of writing; of geometry, arithmetic, astronomy, etc. In Egypt, all works relating to religion or science bore the name of Thoth or of Hermes. According to a passage in Clement of Alexandría (Strom. l. vi.), two of Hermes' books contained the hymns of the gods and rules of conduct related to astronomy, etc. These expressions used by Clement of Alexandria imply that there was a much larger number of so-called Hermetic books than he mentions. As for the 36,525 mentioned by Iamblichus (De Myst. Egypt.), a number which corresponds to the great sacred period of Egypt, Goerres supposes that it was due to the habit of repeating verses, not to an extensive, popular work. All this leads to the belief that Hermes Trismegistus was but a personification of the Egyptian priesthood. According
Hermia\ldots, a heretical sect of the 24th century, which, according to Augustine, denied baptism by water on the pretense that this was not the kind of baptism instituted by Christ; for John the Baptist, comparing his own baptism with that of our Lord, says, "I baptize you with water; but he that cometh after me shall baptize you with the Holy Ghost and with fire." (Augustine, De Haer. c. 59.) They affirmed that the souls of men consisted of fire and spirit, and therefore a baptism of fire was more suitable to their nature. Early ecclesiastical writers are not agreed as to what was meant by this expression. Chrysostom and Alexander mention some who, when they had baptized men in water, also made a mark on their ears with fire, so joining together baptism by water, and, as they imagined, baptism by fire (apud Combes, Auctorium, i. 202). Others, by some deceptive art during baptism, made fire to appear on the person of the water, and confirmed this by a reference to some apocryphal writing of their own invention called "The Preaching of Paul or Peter," in which it was said that, when Christ was baptized, fire appeared on the water. See Bingham, Orig. Eccles. iv. xiii. ii. § 8.

Hermias, a writer, supposed to have lived from the 24th century; nothing is known of his life. He is supposed to have written one of which we possess but the Latin translation (Venice, 1492, fol.; latest edit. Ulm, 1672, 12mo)--- \textit{Libri physico-medicini Kirianum Kiriani, id est regia Farsamum, vere aureus genitus,} another astrological work, which is known to us only in the Latin translation published by Andr. Privat, through the courtesy of the MSS. at Madrid. Some of the books bearing the name of Hermes Trismegistus were evidently productions of the Middle Ages; these are \textit{Tractatus aureus de Lapidis philosophici Decreto,} i. e. on the philosopher's Stone (Lyon, by D. Gnoisius, Leips. 1616, 1616, 8vo); and translated into French by G. Joly and F. Habert, Paris, 1626, 8vo; \textit{Tabula maragardina,} an essay on the art of gold-making, published in Latin (Nuremburg, 1541, 4to; Strasbourg, 1560, 8vo; \textit{Pier betaouellis} \textit{vovis}, published at the end of Ruther's edition of L. Lydius's \textit{De Minoribus,} with notes by R. H. Forster, and \textit{De Hermetica litteratur.} inventore (Wittenberg, 1686, 4to); Colberg, \textit{De libris antiquitatem mentitibus,} &c. (1697, 4to); Baumgartner-Crusius, \textit{De Librarum Hermeticae Origine,} &c. (Leips. 1697, 4to); Fabricius, \textit{Bibl. Graec.} i, 46, 94; F. Hocler, \textit{Hist. de la Chine,} i, 244; Pauly, \textit{Real-Encyklop.} Hoefer, \textit{Novell. Biogr.} \textit{Générale,} xxiv, 371; Smith, \textit{Dictionary of Mythology and Biography,} vol. ii; Warburton, \textit{Divine Legislation,} i, 442; Mosheim, \textit{Commentaries,} i, 290; Cudworth, \textit{True Intellectual System of the Universe.}


Hermetic Books. See Hermes Trismegistus.
**Hermit** (Gr. Ἱερέως, desert), one devoted to religious solitude; properly, the solitude of a wilderness. It became, at a later period, the name of certain classes of monks. See **Monasticism**; **Monk**.

**Hermogénès** (Equoyoung, Mercury-born), a disciple of Asia Minor, and probably companion in labor of the apostle Paul; mentioned, along with Thygeius, as having been brought up by Paul and impressed at Rome, doubtless from alarm at the perils of the connection (2 Tim. i, 13). A.D. 64. In the Roman Breviary (in Fest. S. Jac. Apost. Pars. aestivo, p. 465, Milan, 1851) the conversion of Hermogénès is attributed to St. James the Great, and in the annals of the early history of Abadia, the so-called bishop of Babylon (Fabricius, Cod. Apocryph. N. T. p. 517 sq.), Hermogénès is represented as first practising magic, and converted, with Philutus, by the same apostle. Grotius, apparently misled by the circumstance that the historian or geographer Hermogénès, mentioned by the scholiast of Apollonius Rhodius (ii, 722, Frag. Hist. Graec. Didot. ed., iii, 592), wrote on primitive history, and incidentally (?) speaks of Nannacus or Anacucus—and may therefore probably be the same as the Hermogenes whom Josephus mentions as having treated on Jewish history (Apion, i, 29)—suggests that he may be the person mentioned by the apostle Paul. This, however, is not likely. Nothing more is known of the Hermogenes in question, and he cannot be identified either with Hermogenes of Tarsus, a historian of the time of Domitian, who was put to death by that monarch (Suid. Domit. 10; Hoffman, Lex. Univ. s. v.; Alfred ed. 2 Tim. i, 15), nor with Hermogenes the painter, against whom Tertullian wrote (Smith's Dict. of Class. Biography, s. v.), nor with the sains of the Byzantine Church, commemorated on Jan. 24 and Sept. 1 (Neale, Eastern Church, ii, 770, 781).

**Hermogénes**, a heretic of the 2d century. Our knowledge of him is chiefly derived from a treatise against him by Tertullian (adv. Hermogéneum), and from an account in the newly-discovered MS. of Hippolytus. He was living, probably in Africa, when Tertullian wrote against him, and was a painter by profession. Tertullian charged that Hermogénes was a believer in the doctrines of the heathen philosophers, and especially in those of the Stoics, and especially that he taught the eternity of matter. Hermogénes argued that God must have made the world either out of his own substance, or out of nothing, or out of pre-existent matter. The first, he thought, was inconsistent with God's immutability; the second with the origin of evil; and therefore the third must be received as true. "He rejected both the Gnostic Emanation doctrine and the Church doctrine of Creation: the former contradicted the unchangeable nature of God, and necessitated attributing to him the origin of evil: the latter was contradicted by the nature of the Creator. God must have conditioned his being by nothing, a perfect world must have been the result. Hence he believed that creation supposed something conditioning, and this he thought must be the Hyle which he received from Platonism in connection with the Christian system. He did not think that he gave up the doctrine of the *μορφή* as long as he admitted a ruling, all-powerful principle, and ascribed to God such a supremacy over the Hyle. He regarded the Hyle as altogether undetermined, unpredictable, in which all the contrarieties that afterwards appeared in the world were as yet unseparated and undeveloped; neither motion nor rest, neither flowing nor standing still, but an inorganic confusion. It was the receptive, God alone the creative; his formative agency called forth the determinant existence. But with this organization there was a residuum which withheld the divine formative power. Hence the defective and the offensive in nature; hence also evil. Had he been logical he must have had admitted a creation without a basis. In his system all things have regarded the Hyle as an impenetrable and inscrutable act of God, but as immanent, and resulting immediately from the relation of God to matter. He said God was always a ruler, consequently he must always have had dominion over matter" (Neander, Hist. of Dogma, Ryland's transl., i, 118). The account in Eusebius, *Hist. Eccl.* 17. 13, and Tertullian, *Adv. Hermog.* is, as the north-western precedent, in the main, with that given above, and adds that Hermogénes taught that Christ, after his resurrection, when he "ascended to heaven, leaving his body in the sun, proceeded himself to his Father." See Augustine, *De Haer.* xii. 1; Tertullian, *Adv. Hermog.* passim; Ritter, *Gr. Gesch. des Hellenismus und des Christentums*, ii, 178; Neander, *Gesch. des deuts. Theo. der neuesten Zeit*, i, 568; Mosheim, *Comm. vol. i.* Lardner, *Works*, ii, 203; viii, 579; Hagenbach, *History of Dogmatik*, vol. i, § 47.

**Her'mon** (Heb. *Hermon*), according to Ge'senius, from the Arabic *Charram*, a peak; Sept. *Aσπιος*, a mountain which formed the northernmost boundary (Josh. xii, 1) of the country beyond the Jordan (Josh. xi, 17) which the Hebrews conquered from the Amorites (Deut. iii, 4), and which, therefore, must have belonged to Anti-Libanus (1 Chron. v, 29), as is, indeed, implied or expressed in most of the other passages in which it is named (Deut. iv, 48; Josh. vi, 3, 17; xii, 4; xiii, 5, 11; Ps. lxix, 12; cxlvii, 3; Cant. iv, 8). It has two or more summits, and is therefore spoken of in the plural. (וֹרֶם, *Paas. xii, 7, 8*; Sept. *Apocrypha*, Eng. V. *Hermon*). In Deut. iii, 26, it has been called by the Sidonians *Siron* (יֵרְום), and by the Amorites *Shemir* (שֵׁם), both of which words signify "a coat of mail," as glittering in the sun. In Deut. iv, 48 it is called *Mount Smion* (*יוֹרֶם*), meaning "an elevation," "a high mountain"—which it was well entitled to be designated by way of excellence, being (if correctly identified with Jebel es-Sherb) by far the highest of all the mountains in or near Palestine. In the later books of the Old Testament, however (as in 1 Chron. v, 22; Sol. Song, iv, 8), Sherib is distinguished from Hermon properly so called. Probably different summits or parts of this range bore different names, which were applied in a wider or narrower acceptance at different times (see Schwartz, *Palestine*, p. 56). See *HIVTTE*. Hermon was a natural landmark. It could be seen from the "Dead Sea Mount" be the Dead Sea, the heights of Nebo, from every prominent spot, in fact, in Moab, Gilfead, and Bashan—a pale blue, snow-capped peak, terminating the view on the northern horizon. When the people came to know the country better—when not merely its great physical features, but its towns and pastures, its rivers and oases, its mountains and valleys, and its boundary of the old kingdom of Bashan, as Saelah was the south-eastern. We read in Josh. xii, 5 that Og rejoined in Mount Hermon, and in Saelah, and in all Bashan? l. e. in all Bashan, from Hermon to Saelah,
HERMON

Another notice of Hermon shows the minute accuracy of the topography of Joshua. He makes it "Lebanon towards the sun-rising," that is, the range of Anti-Lebanon, extend from Hermon to the entering into Hamath (xiii, 5). Every Oriental geographer now knows that Hermon is the southern extremity of this range. The beauty and grandeur of Hermon did not escape the attention of the Hebrew poets. From nearly every prominent point in Palestine the mountain is visible, but it is when we leave the hill-country of Samaria and enter the plain of Esdraelon that Hermon appears in all its majesty, shooting up on the distant horizon behind the graceful rounded top of Tabor. It was probably this view that suggested to the Psalmist the words "the north and the south thou hast created them: Tabor and Hermon shall rejoice in thy name" (lxxix, 12). The "dew of Hermon" is once referred to in a passage which has long been considered a geographical puzzle; "as the dew of Hermon, the dew that descended on the mountains of Zion" (Psa. cxxxiii, 8). Some have thought that Zion ( görüntü ) is used here for Sion ( görüntü ), one of the old names of Hermon (Deut. iv, 48), but this identification is unnecessary. The snow on the summit of this mountain condenses the vapors that float during the summer in the higher regions of the atmosphere, causing clouds to move downward in vast masses and creating a continuous cloud above the mountain. One of its tops is actually called Abu-Nady, i.e. "father of dew" (Porter, Handbook ii, 463). Since modern travellers have made us acquainted with the little, previously unknown coves beyond the Jordan, it has been realized that the Mount Hermon of those texts is no other than the present Jebel es-Sheikh, or the Sheik's Mountain, or, which is equivalent, Old Man's Mountain, a name it is said to have obtained from its fancied resemblance (being topped with snow, which sometimes lies in lengthened streaks upon its sloping ridges) to the bony head and beard of a venerable sheik (Elliot, i, 317). This Jebel es-sheikh is a south-eastern, and in that direction culminating, branch of Anti-Libanus. Its top is partially covered with snow throughout the summer, and has an elevation of 8076 feet (Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 170, 176). Dr. Clarke, who saw it in the month of July, says, "The summit is so lofty that the snow entirely covers the upper part of it, not lying in patches, but investing all the higher part with that perfectly white and smooth violet-like appearance which snow only exhibits when it is very deep." Dr. Robinson, in the season of such snow, describes it as "an expanse of snow all over the mountain, and the snow in some distance down the sides, while on the peaks of Lebanon opposite there was none." In August, 1852, Rev. J. L. Porter, of Damascus, ascended Jebel es-Sheikh from Rasheb, and spent a night near its summit. He describes the highest peak as composed strictly of three peaks, so near each other as to appear one, the southernmost of these peaks is the most interesting remains, called Kulab Antel, probably relics of an ancient Syro-Phoenician temple, consisting of a circular wall around a rock about 15 feet high, which has a rude entrance upon it, and heaps of bevelled stones adjoining it. These ruins explain the realization of the ancients, who made it a place of drinking in Tyre and Sidon (Bibliotheca Sacra, Jan. 1845). The summit is about 9000 feet above the Mediterranean (Lieut. Warren, in the Quarterly Statement of the "Pioneer Exploration Fund," No. 5, p. 210, where also a description and cut of the ancient temple). In two passages of Scripture this mountain is called Baal-hermon ( görüntü ), 22 Judg. iii, 3; 1 Chron. v, 25), and the only reason that can be assigned for it is that Baal was there worshipped. Jerome says of it, "Dicti.-O.

HEROD

It has been suggested that one of the southern peaks of Hermon was the scene of the Transfiguration. Our Lord travelled from Bethsaida, on the northern slope of the Sea of Galilee, "to the coasts of Cesarea-Philippi," where he led his disciples "into a high mountain apart, and was transfigured before them," and afterwards he returned, going towards Jerusalem through Galilee (comp. Mark vii, 22-28; Matt. xvi, 13; Mark ii, 18-20, 38-38). No other mountain in Palestine is more appropriate to the circumstances of that glorious scene, except Tabor, to which many centuries of tradition has assigned this honor (Robinson, Bib. Res. ii, 358); but if it be assigned to this locality, it will give additional celebrity to the prince of Syrian mountains (Porter's Damascus, i, 806).

The mention of Hermon along with Tabor in Psa. lxxix, 12, to its being sought near the latter mountain, where, accordingly, travellers and maps give us a "Little Hermon." But that passage, as well as Psa. cxxxiii, 8, applies better to the great mountain already described; and in the former it seems perfectly natural for the Psalmist to call upon those mountains, respectively the most conspicuous in the western and eastern divisions of the Hebrew territory, to rejoice in the name of the Lord. Besides, we are to consider that Jebel es-sheikh is seen from Mount Tabor, and that both together are visible from the plain of Esdraelon. There is no reason to suppose that the so-called Little Hermon is at all mentioned in Scripture. Its actual name is Jebel ed-Duhy; it is a shapeless, barren, and uninteresting mass of hills, in the north of the valley of Jearzel and opposite Mount Gilboa (Robinson, Researches, iii, 174).

Hermonite. (Psa. xliii, 7). See HERMON.

Hernandez. See JULIAN THE LITTLE.

Her'od ( HIDING, hero-like, a name that appears likewise among the Greeks, Dio. Cass. lixi, 35; Philost. Soph. ii, i., etc.), the name of several persons of the royal family of Judaea in the time of Christ and the apostles (see Nolius, "Herod," i. of Havercamp's edit. of Josephus; Reland, Palest. p. 174 sq.; Jost, Gesch. d. Israeliten, i, 160 sq.) Other monographs are named by Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 167, 177, and by Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, i, 886; ii, 127-130. See also De Salency, Hist. d'Herode, Par. 1867; Gildner, Heroes, Bern, 1869), whose history is incidentally involved in that of the N. Testament, but is copiously detailed by Josephus: notices of it also occur in the classical writers, especially Strabo (xvi, c. ii, 16). We therefore devote a large space to consideration of the subject.

The history of the Herodian family presents one side of the last development of the Jewish nation. The evils which had existed in the hierarchy that grew up after the Return, found an unexpected embodiment in the tyranny of a foreign usurper. Religion was adopted as a policy; and the helenizing designs of Antichus Epiphanes were carried out, at least in that spirit, by men who professed to observe the law. Side by side with the spiritual "kingdom of God" proclaimed by John the Baptist, and founded by the Lord, a kingdom of the world was established, which in its external splendor recalled the traditional magnum opus of the potters as the two principles, national and spiritual, which had long variously influenced the Jews, in the establishment of a dynasty and a church, is
a fact pregnant with instruction. In the fulness of time a descendant of Esau still held a false counterfeit of the promised glories of the Messiah. Various accounts are given of the ancestry of the Herods. The Jewish partisans of Herod (Nicolas Damascus, ap. Josephus, Ant. xiv, 1, 5) sought to raise him to the dignity of a descent from one of the noble families of the east (Josephus, Ant. xiv, 1, 5). In the other hand, early Christian writers represented his origin as utterly mean and servile. Africans has preserved a tradition (Routh, Rel. Serr. ii, 235), on the authority of "the natural kinsmen of the Saviour," which makes Antipater, the father of Herod, the son of one Herod, a slave of a commoner, the son of a slave of a commoner, who soon afterwards was made governor of Acalon, who was taken prisoner by Idumean robbers, and kept by them, as his father could not pay his ransom. The locality (comp. Philo, Leg. ad Caium, § 80), no less than the office, was calculated to fix a heavy reproach upon the name (comp. Routh, l.c.). This story is associated with great inaccuracy by Epiphanius (Hist. xx). Neglecting, however, these exaggerated statements of friends and enemies, it seems certain that the family was of Idumean descent (Josephus, Ant. xiv, 1, 3), a fact which is indicated by the forms of some of the names that were retained in it (Ewald, Geschichte, iv); or, as some supposed, his parents were Jew of Idumean stock and came to be settlers in the land. The Herods were in faith. The Idumean had been conquered and brought over to Judaism by John Hyrcanus (B.C. 190; Josephus, Ant. xiii, 9, 1); and from the time of their conversion they remained constant to their new religion, loyally supporting it as their mother city, and claiming for themselves the name of Jews (Josephus, Ant. xx, 7, 7; War, i, 10, 4; iv, 4, 4). The general policy of the whole Herodian family, though modified by the personal characteristics of the successive rulers, was the same. It centred in the en- demic fear of the powers of the Hellenistic race, and in the value of the Jewish state, with the power to produce the benefits of the Jewish state, with the power of the Jewish nation, in which the power of the Jews to secure the consolidation of a state. The protection of Rome was in the first instance a necessity, but the designs of Herod II and Agrippa I pointed to an independent Eastern empire at their head, and not to a mere subject monarchy. Such a consummation of the Jewish hopes seems to have found some measure of acceptance at first [see Hermas]; and by a natural reaction the temporal dominion of the Herods opened the way for the destruction of the Jewish nationality. The religion which was degraded into the instrument of unscrupulous ambition led the Jews to look for a saviour, though there was no saviour. The high-priests were appointed and deposed by Herod I and his successors with such a reckless disregard for the character of the office (Jost, Gesch. d. Judenkuhlna, i, 322, 325, 421), that the office itself was deprived of its sacred dignity (compare Ant. xxiii, 2 sq., i, 1, 430, etc.). The nation was divided, and amidst the conflict of sects a universal faith arose, which more than fulfilled the hopes that found no satisfaction in the treacherous government of a court. See the name of each member of the family in its order in this CYCLOPEDIA. 1. HEROD THE GREAT, as he is usually named, mentioned in Matt. ii, 1-22; Luke i, 5; Acts xxii, 35, was the second son of Antipater and Cypros, an Arab-ian lady of noble descent (Josephus, Ant. xiv, 7, 8). See Antipater. In B.C. 47 Julius Caesar made Antipater protector of Judea, and the latter divided his territo- ry into three parts, ruling over Galilee to Antipater (Josephus, Ant. xiv, 9, 3; War, i, 10, 4). At the time when he was invested with the government he was fifteen years of age, according to Josephus (Ant. xvi, 9, 2); but this must be a mistake. Herod died, aged about 60, in B.C. 4, consequently he must have been twenty-six or twenty-five in the year B.C. 47, when he was made governor of Galilee (πιστής και χρύος, given by Dindorf in the ed. Didot, but not stated authority). (one of his first acts was to repress the brigands who were infesting his provinces, and to put many of their leaders to death upon his own authority. This was
Herod was married to no less than ten wives, by most of whom he had children. He died a few days before the Passover, B.C. 4, his death-bed being the scene of the most awful agonies in mind and body. According to the custom of the times, he made his sons the heir to his kingdom by a formal testament, leaving its ratification to the will of the temple census. Augustus, according to its main provisions, Archelaus became tetrarch of Judea, Samaria, and Idumea; Philip, of Trachonitis and Iturea; and Herod Antipas, of Galilee and Peraea. His body was conveyed by his son Archelaus from Jericho, the place where he died, to Herodium, and there reposed 200 stadia distant, and he was there buried with great pomp (Josephus, Ant. xvii, 8, 2; War, i, 28, 9).

On the extirpation of the Asmonean family, finding that there was then no one who could interfere with him, Herod had introduced heathen customs, such as days, shows, and chariot-races, which the Jews condemned as contrary to the laws of Moses (Josephus, Ant. xv, 8, 1); and on the completion of the building of Cæsarea he also introduced Olympic games and consecrated them to Cæsar, ordering them to be celebrated every fifth year (Josephus, Ant. xv, 9, 5; xvi, 5, 1). With his own heathenize devolution he was smitten with a great contempt for public opinion as in the execution of his personal vengeance. He signalized his elevation to the throne by offerings to the Capitoline Jupiter (Jos. Gesch. d. Judenm. i, 318), and surrounded his person by foreign mercenaries, some of whom had formerly been in the palace of Herod the Great. Augustus, who recognized this, said (Josephus, Ant. xxv, 1, i, 8, 3). His coins and those of his successors bore only Greek legends; and he introduced heathen games even within the walls of Jerusalem (Josephus, Ant. xv, 8, 1). He displayed ostentatiously his favor towards foreign kings, and persecuted a number of Zeno- niani for leaguing himself with the Arabs, and given to Herod. In return, Herod adorned this place by erecting a temple, which he dedicated to Augustus (Josephus, Ant. xv, 10, 8; War, i, 20, 4; Dion Cass. liv, 9). Not long after this, the death of his wife was followed by other misfortunes. Alexander and Aristobulus, the sons of Mariamne, were put to death; and at last, in B.C. 4, Herod ordered his eldest son, Antipater, to be killed. (See Alexander; Aristobulus; Antipater.) Herod's painful disease no doubt maddened him in his later years, and in anticipation of his own death he gave orders for the nobility and Jews, whom he had shut up in the Hippodrome at Jericho, should immediately after his decease be put to death, that mourners might not be wanting at his funeral (Josephus, Ant. xvii, 6, 5).

Near his death, too, he must have ordered the murder of the infants at Bethlehem, as recorded by Matthew (ii. 16-18). The number of children in a village must have been very few, and Josephus has passed this story over unnoticed; yet it is worthy of remark that he has given an account of a massacre by Herod of all the members of his family who had consented to what the Pharisees foretold, viz. that Herod's government should cease, and his posterity be deprived of the kingdom (Ant. xvii, 2, 4). A confused account of the massacre of the children and the murder of Antipater is given in Macrobius: "Augustus cum audisset inter pueros, quis in Syriâ Herodes, rex Judaearum, intra bimatum jussit interfici, filiumque suum vocavit, ait: Julius est Herodis por- cum? (sive, nece) esse quam filium (sive, son)?" (Sat. ii, 4). Macrobius lived in the 5th century (c. A.D. 420), and the words intra bimatum (at bimatum et infra, Matt. iii, 16, Vulg.) seem to be borrowed; the story, too, in wrong, as Antipater was of age when he was executed (Josephus, Ant. xvii, 6, 7). Hence the time of the death of Herod, in B.C. 4, according to the true chronology. This beautiful Temple, though built in honor of the God of Israel, did not win the hearts of the people, as is proved by the revolt which took place shortly before Herod's death, when the Jews tore down the golden eagle which he had fastened to the Temple, and broke it in pieces (Josephus, Antiq. xvii, 6, 2, 3).
HEROD

The divinity of Herod's nature is remarkable. On regarding his magnificence, and the benefits he bestowed upon his people, one cannot deny that he had a very beneficent disposition; but when we read of his cruelties, not only to his subjects, but even to his own relations, one is forced to allow that he was brutal and a stranger to humanity. Josephus, Ant. xvi, 9, 5. His servility to Rome is amply shown by the manner in which he transgressed the customs of his nation and set aside many of their laws, building cities and erectors temples in foreign countries, for the Jews did not permit him to do in Judea, even though they were under so nominal a dependence as that of Herod. His confessed apology was that he was acting to please Caesar and the Romans, and so through all his reign he was a Jewish prince only in name, with a Hellenistic disposition (comp. Josephus, Ant. xvi, 9, 5; xiv, 7, 3). It has even been supposed (Jose, Gesch. d. Juden, ii, 328) that the rebuilding of the Temple furnished him with the opportunity of destroying the authentic collection of genealogies which was of the highest importance to the priestly families. Herod, as appears from his public designs, affected the dignity of a second Solomon, but he joined the license of that monarch to his magnificence; and it was said that the monument which he raised over the royal tombs was due to the fear which seized him after a sacrilegious attempt to rob them of secret treasures (Josephus, Ant. xvi, 7, 1). He maintained peace at home during a long reign by the vigor and timely generosity of his rule. Josephus, Ant. xvi, 5. See the will of the Romans under circumstances of unusual difficulty. His ostenta:ious display, and even his arbitrary tyranny, was calculated to inspire Orientals with awe. Boul and yet prudent, oppressive and yet profuse, had many of the characteristics which make a popular hero; and many of which may have been first given in admiration of successful despotism now serves to bring out in clearer contrast the terrible price at which the success was purchased.

Josephus gives Herod I the surname of Great (Ἡρῴδης ὁ μεγάλος), as it is only intended to distinguish him from the younger Herod (Antipas), and compares the cases of Ελείας ὁ μικρός (Ant. xvi, 8, 4) and Agrippa the Great, in contrast to Helcas, the keeper of the sacred treasures (Ant. xx, 11, 1); and to Agrippa II. The title Ἐλειάς ὁ μικρὸς (Jos. Ant. xvi, 4, 4) is probably a misprint for Eleas (Echkel, Doct. Num. Vet. ii, 492; Akerman, Num. Chron. ix, 23), and so says Ewald, "it may similarly have been given upon the coins of Herod, and from this the origin of the surname may have been derived" (Geschichte, iv, 575, note). There are, however, no coins of Herod I with the title great. It is best to suppose that the title in Josephus is merely a distinguishing epithet, and not meant to express greatness of character or achievements.

2. Herod Antipas (Ἡρῴδης ὁ ἀντίπας, Matt. Mark, Luke; Antipas, Josephus, Ant. xvi, 4, 5, 6). His father had already given him "the kingdom" in his first will, but in the final arrangement left him the tetrarchy of Galilee and Peraea (Josephus, Ant. xvii, 4, 1; War, ii, 1, 1; Matt. xiv, 1; Luke iii, 1; iii, 19, 19, 5). He visited his brother Philip, and commencing an intrigue with his wife Herodias, daughter of Aristobulus, the son of Mariamne, he afterwards incestuously married her. He had previously been married to a daughter of Aretas, king of Arabia Petraea, who avenged this insult by invading his dominions, and defeated him with great loss (Josephus, Ant. xvii, 8, 1). An affront to the king of Perea, and the hope of revenging the death of his son, had made Aretas go over to Herod; he was not the man, however, to yield to a personal injury. Aretas was haughtily ordered by the emperor to desist from the prosecution of the war, and Herod accordingly escaped the expected overthrow. Josephus says that the opinion of the Jews was that the defeat was a punishment for his having imprisoned John the Baptist on account of his popular activity as a denunciat of vice and sin. John, however, being put to death, but does not mention the reproval that John gave him, nor that it was at the instigation of Herodias that he was killed, as recorded in the Gospels (Joseph. Ant. xvii, 5, 4; Matt. xiv, 1-12; Mark vi, 14-16; Luke iii, 19, 19, 7-9). The evangelists evidently give the true reason, and Josephus the one generally received by the people. In A.D. 38, after the death of Tiberius, he was persuaded, especially at the ambitious instigation of Herodias, to go to Rome to procure for himself the royal title. Agrippa, who was high in the favor of Caligula, and already received a part of it, consented to this with such success that Antipas was condemned to perpetual banishment at Lyons, a city of Gaul (Joseph. Ant. xvii, 7, 2), and eventually died in Spain, whither his wife Herodias had voluntarily followed him (War, ii, 9, 6). He is called (by courtesy) king by Matthew (xiv, 9) and Mark (xv, 14) in this place. Herod Antipas was in high favor with Tiberius; hence he gave the name of Tiberias to the city he built on the lake of Gennesareth (Josephus, Ant. xvii, 2, 3). He enlarged and improved several cities of his dominions, and also built a wall about Sepphoris, and round Bethanath, the latter town he named Nazareth, in honor of the wife of the emperor (Josephus, Ant. xviii, 2, 1; comp. War, ii, 9, 11). It was before Herod Antipas, who came up to Jerusalem to celebrate the Passover (comp. Joseph. Ant. xviii, 6, 3), that our Lord was sent to the temple examination when Pilate heard that he was a Galilean, as Pilate had already had several disputes with the Galileans, and was not at this time on very good terms with Herod (Luke xii, 1; xxii, 6-7), and "on the same day Pilate and Herod were made friends together" (Luke xxiii, 12; comp. Josephus, Ant. xviii, 5, 4); the Galileans were called shepherds of Galilee, and Herod Antipas is coupled with that of Pilate in the prayer of the apostles mentioned in the Acts (iv, 24-30). His personal character is little touched upon by either Josephus or the evangelists, yet from his consenting to the death of John the Baptist to gratify the malice of a wicked woman, though for a time he had "heard him gladly" (Mark vi, 20), we perceive his cowardice, his want of spirit, and his fear of ridicule. His wicked oath was not binding on him, for Herod was bound by the law of God not to commit murder. He was in any case desirous to see Jesus, and "hoped to have seen a miracle from him" (Luke xii, 18). His artifices and cunning are specially alluded to by our Lord, "Go ye and tell that fox" (τῇ ἄγωνίᾳ τοῦ λύγγου, Luke xiii, 32). Coins of Herod Antipas bear the title ΤΕΤΑΡΡΑΧΟΥ. See Antipas.

3. Herod Archelaus (Ἀρχέλαος, Matt.; Josephus: Ἀρχέλαιος, Dion Cassius: coins), son of Herod and Cleopatra, and greater and Malthace, tetrarch and younger brother of Herod Antipas, and called by Dion Cassius Πελαστήριος (iv, 57). He was brought up with his brother at Rome (Josephus, Ant. xvii, 1, 3). His father had disinherited him in consequence of the false accusations of his eldest brother Antipas, and had the son of Doris, Herod's tutor, bringing a new will, altered his mind, and gave him "the kingdom," which had before been left to Antipas (Josephus, Ant. xvii, 8, 1). It was this unexpected arrangement which led to the retreat of Joseph to Galilee (Matt. ii, 22). He was saluted as "king" by the army, but refused to accept that title till it should be confirmed by Augustus (Joseph, Ant. xvii, 8, 2, 4; War, i, 1). Short-
ly after this a sedition was raised against him, which he quelled by killing 3000 persons, and then set sail with his brother Antipas to Rome (Josephus, Ant. xvii, 9, 2, 4; War, i, 2, 33). Upon this the Jews sent an embassy to Augustus, to request that they might be allowed to live under Roman laws under the Roman governor. Our Lord seems to allude to this circumstance in the parable of the nobleman going into a far country to receive for himself a kingdom: "But his citizens hated him, and sent a message after him, saying, We will not have this man to reign over us" (Luke xix, 12-27). Shortly after, at Rome, Jerusalem was in care of Sabinus, the Roman procurator, and a quarrel ensued in consequence of the manner in which the Jews were treated. Quiet was again established through the intervention of Varus, the president of Syria, and the authors of the sedition were punished (Josephus, Ant. xvii, 10). Augustus, however, raised the mopsus of Herod's will, and gave Archelaus Judea, Samaria, and Idumea, with the cities of Cesarea, Sebaste, Joppa, and Jerusalem, the title of ethnarch, and a promise that he should have the royal dignity hereafter if he governed virtuously (Josephus, Ant. xvii, 11, 4; War, i, 6, 3). Archelaus never really had the title of king (βασιλεὺς), though at first called so by the people (Josephus, Ant. xvii, 8, 2), yet we cannot object to the word βασιλεὺς in Matthew, for Archelaus regarded himself as king (Josephus, War, ii, 1, 1), and Josephus speaks of the province of Judaea and Samaria, only as aota, as seems the ἀνακαλούσα τῶν Αὐτοκράτων (War, ii, 11, 5). Herod (Antipas) the tetrarch is also called ὁ βασιλεὺς (Matt. xiv, 9; Mark vi, 14). When Archelaus returned to Judea he rebuilt the royal palace at Jericho, and established a village, naming it after himself, Archelaus (Joseph. Ant. xvii, 13, 1). Long after Archelaus's return he edited the Mosaic law by marrying Phylaphya, the daughter of Archelaus, king of Cappadocia, and the Jews complained again loudly of his tyranny. Augustus summoned him to Rome, and finally, A.D. 6, sent him into exile at Vienna in Gaul, where he probably died, and his dominions were attached to the Roman empire (Josephus, Ant. xvii, 18, 2; War, ii, 7; compare Strabo, xvi, 765; Dion Cassius, lv, 25, 27). Jerome, however, relates that he was shown the tomb of Archelaus near Bethlehem (Onomasticon, s. v.).

4. Herod PHILIP I (Φιλίππος, Mark vi, 17; Ἱρόδη, Josephus) was the son of Herod the Great by a second Mariamne, the daughter of Simon the high-priest (Josephus, Ant. xviii, 5, 4), and must be distinguished from Philip the tetrarch, No. 6. He was the husband of Herodias, by whom he had a daughter, Salome. He married Rodia, however, contrary to the laws of her country, divorced herself from him, and married her uncle Antipas [see Nos. 2 and 5] (Josephus, Ant. xviii, 5, 4; Matt. xiv, 3; Mark vi, 17; Luke iii, 19). He was omitted in the will of Herod in consequence of the discovery that Mariamne was conscious of the plots of Antipater, Herod the Great's son by Doris (Josephus, War, i, 30, 7). See Philip.

5. Herodias (Ἡρώδεια, Matt. xiv, 1-11; Mark vi, 14-16; Luke iii, 19) was the daughter of Aristobulus, one of the sons of Herod I by the first Mariamne, and of Berenice, the daughter of Salome, Herod's sister, and was consequently sister of Herod Agrippa I (Josephus, Ant. xviii, 5, 4; War, i, 28, 1). She was first married to her uncle, Herod Philip I, the son of Herod I and the second Mariamne, by whom she had a daughter Salome, probably the one that danced and pleased Herod Antipas, and who afterwards married her uncle Philip II. Herodias soon divorced herself from him, and married Herod Antipas, who was also her uncle, being the son of Herod I and Malthace, and who agreed, for her sake, to put away his own wife, the daughter of Aretas, king of Arabia (Josephus, Ant. xviii, 5, 4; War, i, 28, 1). Having been divorced from the Baptist, she repented for her crimes in thus living in adultery and incest, and she took the first opportunity to cause him to be put to death, thus adding thereto the crime of murder. Her marriage was unlawful for three reasons: first, her former husband, Philip, was still alive (ἱππάστασα Ζωντος, Josephus, Ant. xviii, 5, 4); secondly, Antipas's wife was still alive; and, thirdly, by her first marriage he had a son thereby, who according to the Roman law was the heir of his father. He rejoined his Antipas, who was consequently forbidden by the Jewish law to marry his brother's wife (Lev. xviii, 16; xi, 21; comp. Alford on Matt. xiv, 4). When Antipas was condemned by Caius to perpetual banishment, Herodias was offered a pardon, and the emperor made her a present of 100 talents (Josephus, Ant. xvii, 11, 4; War, ii, 6, 3). He is only mentioned once in the N.T. (Luke iii, 1, ὁ ἀνακαλούσα τῶν ἀνακαλούσων), he was married to Salome, the daughter of Herod Philip I and Herodias, but left no issue. His title of king was diminished to that of ethnarch, and his dominions for 37 years (B.C. 4-A.D. 34), during which time he showed himself to be a person of moderation and quietness in the conduct of his life and government (Josephus, Ant. xviii, 2, 4). He built the city of Panos and named it Cesarea, more commonly known as Cæsarea, enlarged it (Josephus, Matt. xiv, 17), and also advanced to the dignity of a city the village Bethsaida, calling it by the name of Julius, in honor of the daughter of Augustus. He died at Julius, and was buried in the monument he had there built (Josephus, Ant. xviii, 2, 1, 4; War, ii, 9, 1). Leaving no children, his dominions were annexed to the Roman province of Syria (Josephus, Ant. xviii, 6, 5). Coins of Philip II bear the title ΤΕΤΡΑΧΟΥ. See Philip.

6. Herod Agrippa I (Ἡρώδης, Acts: Ἱεροσαλημιτης, Josephus) was the son of Aristobulus and Berenice, and the grandson of Herod the Great (Josephus, Ant. xviii, 1, 28, 3). He is called "Agrippa the Great" by Josephus (Ant. xvii, 2, 9). A short time before the death of Herod the Great he was living at Rome, and was brought up with Drusus, the son of Tiberius, and with Antonia, the wife of Drusus (Josephus, Ant. xviii, 6, 1). He was one of the Roman warmongers. He was born in B.C. 10, and they were bred up together in the closest intimacy. The earlier part of his life was spent at Rome, where the magnificence and luxury in which he indulged involved him so deeply in debt that he was compelled to fly from Rome, and betook himself to a fortress at Malathia, in Idumea. Through the mediation of his wife Cyprus and his sister Herodias, he was allowed to take up his abode at Tiberias, and received the rank of aetile in that city, with a small annuity (Joseph. Ant. xvii, 6, 2). But, having quarreled with his brother-in-law, he fled to Flaccus, the procurator of Syria. Soon afterwards he was convicted, though the influence of his brother Aristobulus, of having received a bribe from the Damascenes, who wished to purchase his influence with the proconsul, and was again compelled to fly. He was arrested, as he was about to sail to Italy, for a sum of money which he owed to the Roman treasury, but made his escape and reached Alexandria, where his wife succeeded in procuring a supply of money from the Alexandria the alabarch. He then set sail, and landed at Puteoli. He was favorably received by Tiberius; but he one day inadvertently expressed the wish that he had been born a Roman citizen. For this reason he was being reported to Tiberius, he was arrested and thrown into prison, where he remained till the accession of Ca-
Coimbra shortly after gave him the tetrarchy of Philip, the iron chain with which he had been fastened to a soldier being exchanged for a gold one (Josephus, Ant. xviii, 6, 10). He was also invested with the consular dignity, and a league was publicly concluded between Claudius and Antipas. Claudius went to take possession of his kingdom, and at Alexandria he was insulted by the people, who dressed up an idiot, and bore him in mock triumph through the streets to denounce the king of the Jews (Philo, in Flaccum, 6). The jealousy of Herod Antipas and his wife Herodias was excited by the four marriages of Claudius that he had contracted with four different women, all of them Roman princesses (Josephus, Ant. xix, 9, 2; Tacit. Hist. v, 9). After the death of his uncle Herod in A.D. 48, Claudius bestowed upon him the small kingdom of Chalcis (Josephus, Ant. xx, 5, 2; War, ii, 12, 1), and four years after it took away from him, giving instead the tetrarchies of Philip and Lydia to Antipas. He afterwards gave Antipas by the Romans, and they sailed to Rome in the hope of supplanting him in the emperor's favor. Agrippa was aware of their design, and anticipated it by a countercharge against Antipas of treasonous correspondence with the Parthians. Antipas failed to answer the accusation, and, after his exile, Agrippa received from Claudius the tetrarchy of Galilee and Perea (Josephus, Ant. xviii, 7, 2); and in A.D. 41, for having greatly assisted Claudius, he received his whole paternal kingdom (Judea and Samaria), and, in addition, the tetrarchy of Lycaonia (comp. Luke iii, 1). Josephus says in one passage that Claudius had a great attachment for Antipas (Josephus, Ant. xx, 10, 4); but afterwards, in two places, that Claudius gave it to him (Ant. xix, 5, I; War, ii, 11, 5). Claudius probably promised it, and Claudius actually conferred it. Agrippa now possessed the entire kingdom of Herod the Great. At this time he begot of Claudius the kingdom of Chalce for his brother Herod (Josephus, Ant. xix, 5, 1; War, ii, 11, 5). Agrippa loved to be at Jerusalem, and was a strict observer of the laws of his country, which will account for his persecuting the Christians, who were hated by the Jews (Josephus, Ant. xix, 7, 3). Thus influenced by a strong desire for popularity, rather than from innate cruelty, "he stretched forth his hands to vex certain of the church." He put to death James the elder, son of Zebedee, and cast Peter into prison, no doubt with the intention of killing him also. This was frustrated by his brother's intercession, and the Roman Senate's reply, which was not to send for Peter, but "your law." Agrippa, moreover, does not mention those of Tyre and Sidon as recorded in the Acts (xii, 20). Though Agrippa was "highly displeased," it does not appear that any rupture worthy of notice had taken place. On the second day Agrippa appeared in the theatre in a garment interwoven with silver. On closing his address to the people, they salute him as a god, for which he did not rebuke them, and he was immediately seized with violent internal pains, and died five days after (Josephus, Ant. xix, 8, 2). This full account of Josephus agrees substantially with that in the Acts. The silver dress (δέσμης ἱππορίου) is added by Josephus; ἱππορία (Acts); and the disease (πέσας ἁπάντως) is added by Josephus; ἁπάνη (Acts). The owl (δεινόντως ἴππων τίγρις), which on this occasion appeared to Agrippa as the messenger of ill omens (ὁρίζων κύριος, Josephus, Ant. xix, 6, 2), though on a former one it had appeared as the messenger of good news (Josephus, Ant. xviii, 6, 7), is converted by Eusebius (H. E. ii, ch. 10), who professes to quote Josephus into the angel of the Acts (καὶ ἰδοὺ ἐκ τῆς ἀναγέννησις Κυρίων). For an explanation of the confusion, compare Eusebius, L. c., ed. Heimrich. Excurs. ii, vol. iii, p. 566; Alford, ad loc. See AGRIFFA.
He-rōdian (only in the plur. Ἱεροδιανοὶ), the designation of a class of Jews that existed in the time of Jesus Christ, evidently, as the name imports, partisans of Herod, but whether of a political or religious description it is not easy to say. It is not want of data, to determine. The passages of the New Testament which refer to them are the following: Mark iii, 6; xii, 13; Matt. xxii, 16; Luke xx. 20. From these it appears that the ecclesiastical authorities of Judea held a council against our Saviour, and, associating with themselves the Herodians, even an embassy to him with the express design of ensnaring him in his speech, that thus they might compass his destruction, by embroiling him. But what additional difficulty did the Herodians bring? Herod Antipas was now tetrarch of Galilee and Perea, which was the only inheritance he received from his father, Herod the Great. As tetrarch he was not only a king, but the ruler of Jesus, whose home was in that province. The Herodians, then, may have been subjects of Herod, Galileans, whose evidence the priests were desirous of procuring, because theirs would be the evidence of fellow-countrymen, and of special force with Antipas being the heir of his own immediate subject. (Luke xxiii, 7.) Herod's relations with Rome were in an unsafe condition. He was a weak prince, given to ease and luxury, and his wife's ambition conspired with his own desires to make him strive to obtain from the emperor Caligula the title of king. For this purpose he took a new wife, a lady from Gaul. The Herodians may have been favorers of his pretensions; if so, they would be partial hearers, and eager witnesses against Jesus before the Roman tribunal. It would be a great service to the Romans to be the means of enabling them to get rid of one, who aspired to be king of the Jews. It would equally gratify their own lord should the Herodians give effectual aid in putting a period to the mysterious yet formidable claims of a rival claimant of the crown. If the Herodians were a Galilean political party who were eager to procure the death of the honor archly professed for their Lord (Mark vi, 14, the name of king is merely as of courtesy), they were chosen as associates by the Sanhedrim with especial propriety. This idea is confirmed by Josephus's mention of a party as "the partisans of Herod" (οἱ τα Ἰεροδίανοι φασινόττες, Ant. xiv, 15, 10). The deposition was being made from themselves in "τὴν Ἰουδαίαν καὶ τὴν Ἰωάννην Αραμαίον, Ἧππος τοῖς ταῖς οὖσαιν ἐν τῇ Ἰουδαίᾳ" (see Mark x, 9). That men whose sympathies were entirely Jewish, and, as such, anti-heathen: they were to intimate their dislike of paying tribute, as being an acknowledgment of a foreign yoke; and by flattering Jesus, as one who loved truth, feared no man, and would say what he thought, they would have him afford them a profession and practice. In order to carry those base and hypocritical designs into effect, the Herodians were appropriately associated with the Pharisees; for as the latter were the recognized conservators of Judaism, so the former were friends of the aggrandizement of a native as against a foreign prince. (Comp. Frischke and Walch, ad loc.)

Other hypotheses may be found in Paulus in the passages in Matt.; in Wolff, Caro Phil., i, 311 sq.; see also Köcher, Anecd. in loc. Matt.; Zorn, Hist. jcas. Jud. p. 127; Otho, Lex. Rubb. p. 275. Monographs on this subject are: Hutchison, De Statu, De Roya, Lund. 1708; Fohrer, Dei, De Herod, Uspal, 1764; Schmid, Epist. de Herod, Lipsia, 1763; Leuschen, De Secta Herodionie, Hirschberg, 1751; Stedding, De Herodiumia, Viteb, 1666; Jensen, s. W. Jen. 1868.) See Sects. Jewish.

Herōdias (Ἡρώδια, a female patronymic from Ἰοβαλίματις and Ἱοβαλίμως, see Matt., 1:82, 20; Gen. xlii, 10, 18), the name of a woman of notoriety in the N. T., daughter of Aristobulus, one of the sons of Mariamne and Herod the Great, and consequently sister of Agrippa I. She first married Herod, surnamed Phileus, another of the sons of Mariamne, named in the plen. Ant. xvii, 9, 9, 10, 11; comp. I. A. 4, 9, 4), and therefore her full name; then she eloped from him, during his lifetime (ibid.), to marry Herod Antipas, her step-uncle, who had long been married to, and was still living with, the daughter of Aeneas or Aretas—his assumed name—king of Arabia (Ant. xvii, 9, 4). Thus she left her husband, who was still alive, to connect herself with a man whose wife was still alive. Her paramour was, indeed, less of a blood relation than her original husband; but, being likewise the half-brother of that husband, he was already connected with her by affinity—so close that there was only one case contemplated in the law of Moses where it could be set aside, namely, when the father had married his brother's childless daughter (Lev. xviii, 16, and xxii, 21, and for the exception Deut. xxv, 5 sq.). Now Herodias had already had one child—Salome (the daughter whose dancing is mentioned in the Gospels)—by Philip (Ant. xviii, 5, 4), and, as he was still alive, might have had more. Well therefore may we be with Josephus to speak of confounding her country's institutions (Ant. xviii, 5, 4); and we well may John the Baptist have remonstrated against the enormity of such a connection with the tetrarch, whose conscience would certainly seem to have been a less hardened one (Matt. xiv, 9 says he was sorry; Mark x, 12 says he was angry) (Matthew xiii, 57, note). It was to the iniquity of this act, rather than to the immorality of that illicit connection, that, the historian says, some of the Jews attributed the defeat of Herod. In the closing scene of her career, indeed, Herodias exhibited considerable magnanimity, as she might be brought up to the tribunal and there sharing his exile and reverses, till death ended them, to the remaining with her brother Agrippa I, and partaking of his elevation (Ant. xvi, 7, 5). This town is probably Lugdunum Convarum, a town of Gaul, situated on the right bank of the Garonne, at the foot of the Pyrenees, under the name of "Aurum."" (Dr. Murray, Handbook of France, p. 314); Eusebius, H. E. 1, 11, says "Vienne, confounding Antipas with Archelaus." Burton on Matt. xiv, 3, Alford, and moderns in general, Lyons. In Josephus (War i, 9, 6), Antipas is said to have died in Spain—apparently, from the context, the land of his exiles, according to the advice of the above, would satisfy both passages. See Herod.

There are few episodes in the whole range of the New Testament more suggestive to the commentator than this one scene in the life of Herodias.

1. It exhibits one of the most remarkable of the undesigned coincidences between the N. T. and Josephus: that there are some discrepancies in the two accounts only enhances their value. More than this, it has led the historian into a brief digression upon the life, death, and character of the Baptist, which speaks volumes in favor of the genuineness of that still much celebrated passage in which he speaks of "Jesus," that "wise man, if man he may be called" (Ant. xviii, 3, 5; comp. xx, 9, 1, unhesitatingly quoted as genuine by Eusebius, Hist. eccl. 1, 11). See John the Baptist.

2. It has been warmly debated whether it was the adulterous woman, or the adulterous woman's nameless husband, who drew down the reproof of the Baptist. It has already been shown that, either way, the offence merited condemnation upon worse grounds than one.

3. The birthday feast is another undesigned coincidence between Scripture and profane history. The Jews celebrated the birthday of Herod (Ant. xiv, 1, 20; comp. ii, 4, 9) as the birthday of the Roman emperor (Bland on Matt. xiv, 6). On the other hand, it was usual with the Egyptians (Gen. xl, 20; comp. Josephus,
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Aw. xii, 4, 9), with the Persians (Herod. i. 138), with the Greeks, even in the case of the dead, whence the Christian custom of keeping anniversaries of the martyr (Bähr ad Herod. iv. 26), and with the Romans (Per. Sitt. ii, 1-3). Now the Herods may be said to have gone beyond Rome in the observance of all that was Roman. Herod the Great kept the day of his accession; Antipas—as we read here—and Agrippa I, as Josephus tells us (Ant. xix, 7, 1), their birthday, with such magnificence that the “birthdays of Herod” (He- rodis dies) had passed into a proverb when Persius wrote (Sat. v, 180). See Birthday.

4. Yet dancing, on these festive occasions, was common to both Jew and Gentile, and was practised in the same way: youths and virgins, singly, or separated into two bands, but never intermingled, danced to honor their deity, their hero, or to the day of their solemnity. Miriam (Exod. xv, 20), the daughter of Jethro (Judg. xi, 34), and David (2 Sam. vi, 14) are familiar instances in Holy Writ: the “Carmen Seculare” of Horace, to quote no more, points to the same custom amongst Greeks and Romans. It is plainly owing to the elevation of the woman in the civil scale that dancing in pairs (still unknown to the East) has come into fashion. See DANCE.

5. The rash oath of Herod, like that of Jethro in the O.T., has afforded ample discussion to casuists. It is now ruled that all such oaths, where there is no reservation, are not improper, for peculiarly irritable, God or man, are illicit and without force. So Solomon had long since decided (1 Kings ii, 20-24; see Sanderson, De Juris, Oblig. Prelect. iii, 16). See Oath.

Herondheim (Herodius, a deriv. from Herod), a Christian at Rome to whom Paul sent a salutation as his kinsman (Rom. xvi, 11). A.D. 55. According to Hippolytus, he became bishop of Tarsus, but according to others, of Patra.

Herodion (Herodow), the name of a fortress (Josephus) or town (Pliny), built on a conspicuous spot by Herod the Great (Reland, Palest. p. 820), probably the site ancienly occupied by Bet-Tachcerem (Jer. vi, 1; Neh. iii, 14), which the authority of Jerome has led some modern travellers to identify with the well-known eminence called by the natives Jebel el-Fara'id, and by Europeans the “Frank Mountain.” If this identity be correct, the site has been the scene of many a remarkable change. Two great kings, in different ages and different ways, probably adorned it with magnificent works. From their lofty city the old inhabitants must have seen stretched before them, up the green vale of Urah, the beautiful gardens and fountains of king Solomon, which suggested to the royal poet some of the exquisite imagery of the Canticles; and nearly a thousand years later, Herod the Great erected, probably on this very hill of Beth-tachcerem, a “fortress with its round towers, and in it royal apartments of great strength and splendor” (Josephus, Ant. xv, 9, 4), making it serve as an acropolis amidst a mass of other buildings and palaces at the foot of the hill (War, i, xxii, 20). To this city, called after him Herodion, the Idumean tyrant was brought for burial from Jericho, where he died (Ant. xvii, 8, 3). The locality still yields its evidence of both these eras. Solomon’s reservoirs yet remain (Stanley, p. 165), and the present state of “the Frank Mountain” will agrees with the ancient description of Herodion (Robinson, Researches, ii, 173; Thomson, Land and Book, ii, 427).

Herold, Johann, a German divine, was born at Hochstädt, Swabia, in 1511. His early history is not known. In 1539 he made his appearance in Basle as a defender of Protestantism. He was pastor of a parish near Basle for some years, but in 1546 retired from it and returned to Basle to devote his time entirely to literary labors. The date of his death is unknown; it was probably about 1570. Among his numerous writings are the following: Heikensweilt und ihrer Göter anfänglicher Ursprung (Basel, 1544, fol.; also under the title, in a 2 ed., Theatrum Divorum Deorum Panis (Basel, 1628, fol.): — Orthodogogul Thologiæ Doctores LXVI, laminae clarissima (Basel, 1555, fol.); — Hæresiologia, see Syntagma veterum theologicorum per quos grasse in Ecclesias hereses confutatur, etc. (Basel, 1556, fol.).

Heron (Ἡρών, anaph), Lev. xi, 19; Deut. xiv, 18), an unclean bird, for which the kite, woodcock, curlew, peacock, parrot, crane, lapwing, and several others have been suggested. But most of these are not found in Palestine, and others have been identified with different Hebrew words. The root ἀναφ, anaph, signifies to breathe, to snort, especially from anger, and thence, figuratively, to be angry (Genesius, Thea. Heb. p. 127). Parkhurst observes that “as the heron is remarkable for its angry disposition, especially when hurt or wounded, this bird seems to be most probably intended.” But this equally applies to a great number of different species of birds, and would be especially appropriate to the goose, which hisses at the slightest provocation. The heron, though not constantly hissing, can utter a similar sound of displeasure with much meaning, and the common species, Ardea cinerea, is found in Egypt, and is also abundant in the Hauran of Palestine, where it frequents the margins of lakes and pools, and the reedy watercourses in the deep ravines, striking and devouring an immense quantity of fish. The herons are wading-birds, empty, and very remarkable for their vanity; frequenting marshes and oozy rivers, and spread over the regions of the East. Most of the species enumerated in English ornithology have been recognized in the vicinity of Palestine, and we may include all these under the term in question—"the anaph of his kind." One of the commonest species in Asia is Ardea russata.

Little Golden Egret (Ardea ruseata), which is beautifully adorned with plumage partly white and partly of a rich orange-yellow, while the beak, legs, and all the naked parts of the skin are yellow. Its height is about seventeen inches. This is the cobeg or cow-heron so abundant in India. Several kinds of heron, one of which, from its form, would serve well enough to represent this little golden egret, are commonly depicted on those Egyptian paintings in which the subject—a favorite one—is the fowling and fishing among the paper-reeds of the Nile.

Bochart supposes that heron may mean the mountain falcon, called doraeta by Homer (Od. i. 820), because of the similarity of the Greek word to the Hebrew. But if it meant any kind of eagle or hawk, it would probably have been reckoned with one or other of those species mentioned in the preceding verses. Perhaps, under all the circumstances, the traditional meaning is most likely to be correct, which we will therefore
trace. The Talmudists evidently were at a loss, for they describe it indefinitely as a "high-flying bird of prey" (Chalim, 83 a).

The Septuagint renders the Hebrew word by γαργάλα, however, has been thought to lose what little weight it might otherwise have had from the probability that it originated in a false reading, viz. ἡγαρά, which the translators connected with ἡγαρά, "a bank." Jerome adhered to the same word in a Latin form, carbarynam and carbarum. The Greek and Roman writers, from the earliest authors who refer to a bird which they call charadrius. It is particularly described by Aristotle (Hist. An. vii, 7), and by Ælian (Hist. An. xxv, 26). The latter derives its name from ἕλκανα, a hollow or chasm, especially one which contains water, because, he says, the bird frequents such places. The Roman name the charadrius was also called iterus, which signifies the jaundice, from a notion that patients affected with that disease were cured by looking at this bird, which was of a yellow color (Flinty, xxxiv; Cæl. Aurel. iii, 5), and by the Greeks. Ælian's description and the addition to the same fabulous notion, ῥεγαγος (Aristotle, Hist. An. ix, 13, 15, and 22; Ælian, Hist. An. iv, 47). These writers concur in describing a bird, sometimes of a yellow color, remarkable for its voracity (from which circumstance arose the phrase ἔφαγαυς ἄλογον, applied to a glutton), migratory, lintearious, and favors watery, marshy places, and especially mountain torrent and valleys. Now it is certain that the name charadrius has been applied by ornithologists to the same species of birds from ancient times down to the present age. Linnaeus, under Order IV (consisting of waders or shore birds), places the genus Charadrius, in which he includes all the numerous species of plovers. The ancient accounts may be advantageously compared with the following description of the genus from Mr. Selby's British Ornithology, ii, 230: "The members of this genus are numerous, and possess a wide geographical distribution; several species being found in every quarter of the globe. The habits of the greater part of the year are the inhabitants of open districts and wide wastes, frequenting both dry and moist situations, and only retire toward the coasts during the severity of winter. Others are markedly migratory, and others inhabit the banks and about the mouths of rivers (particularly where the shore consists of small gravel or shingle). They live on worms, insects, and their larvae. The flesh of many that live on the coasts is unpalatable." The same writer describes one species, Charadrius pintllivus, called the golden plover from its color, and mentions the well-known fact that this species, in the course of moulting, turns completely black. Analogous facts respecting the charadrius have been established by observations in every part of the globe, viz. that they are gregarious and migratory. The habits of the majority are littoral. They obtain their food along the banks of rivers and the shores of lakes; "like the gulls, they beat the moist soil with their pattering feet, to terrify the incubant worms, yet are often found in deserts, in green and seedy meadows, or on upland moors." Their food consists chiefly of mice, worms, caterpillars, insects, toads, and frogs, which of course places them among the class of birds cerem}

HERRON, THOMAS, archbishop of Canterbury, was born in 1052 at Walden, Norfolk, of which his father was rector. He studied at Jesus and Bemnet colleges, Cambridge, and was made fellow of Corpus Christi in 1716. After having possessed various living, he was raised in 1737 to the see of Bangor, whence in 1743 he was translated to York. After the defeat of the king's troops at Preston Pans in 1745, the archbishop exerted himself in his diocese with so much ardent zeal that he repelled the disaffected, inspired the responding, and procured at a county meeting a subscription of £40,000 towards the defense of the country. His zeal for the Hanoverian cause procured him the facetious title of the "reigning heretic." In 1747 he was removed from the see of Canterbury, and he died at Croydon in 1756. Herring was a man of great celebrity as a preacher. His Sermons on Public Occasions were published in 1763 (Long, 8vo), with a memoir of Herring by Duncombe; followed by his Letters to W. Duncombe (1727, 12mo). See Biographical Dictionary; Rich, Cyclopaedia of Biog.

HERRNUTH, a town of Saxony, in Upper Lusatia, in the circle of Dresden, at the foot of Hinterberg Mountain, and about fifty miles from the city of Dresden. It was built by Zinzendorf in 1722 for the Moravian Brethren, who, from this town, are often called Herrnhutters. See MORAVIANS.

HERRON, FRANCIS, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born near Shippensburg, Pa., June 28, 1774. His parents were Scotch-Irish. Their high regard for knowledge induced them to send him to Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa., then under the care of that distinguished Presbyterian, the Rev. Dr. Nesbitt. Here he graduated May 5, 1794. He studied theology with Robert Cooper, D.D., and was licensed by Carlisle Presbytery in 1797. He commenced his ministry in the backwoods of Ohio. In 1800 he became pastor of the Rocky Spring Church, where he labored for ten years with great success. In June, 1811, he was installed pastor of the First Presbyterian Church, Pittsburg, Penn. He found his new church embarrased with debt, and the people "conformed to this world" to a degree almost appalling. But his earnestness and activity relieved the church of debt within a few years, and awoke the members to a sense of their spiritual danger. In 1825 the General Assembly resolved to establish a theological seminary in the West. Dr. Herron, with his naturally quick perception, urged Alleghany City, Pa., as the best location, and by great exertions obtained the decision to locate it there. He then undertook the toils and anxieties of its sustenance; and to no one does the Western Theological Seminary owe its success in a greater degree than to Herron. In 1827 he was elected moderator of the General Assembly held in Philadelphia. In 1829 and 1832 his ministrations were blessed by gracious revivals of religion; and in 1835 another revival occurred, marked by great excitement. In 1850 he resigned his charge, to the great regret of his people. Being then in his eighty-sixth year, he removed to his farm, where his work was ended. He lived ten years longer; though the infirmities of age grew upon him, his cheerfulness never failed. He died Dec. 6, 1860. Such was
two he became curate of Weston Fawel, and a few years after curate of Biddeford. During that time he wrote his celebrated Meditations and Contemplations (1746, 8vo), which obtained immense circulation. It was followed by City Sermons on great Occasions, and A Winter Piece (1747, 8vo). In 1750, on the death of his father, he succeeded to the livings of Weston and Collingtree; and he devoted himself earnestly to his clerical duties. In 1758 he published Remarks on Lord Bolingbroke’s Letters on the Study and Use of History, so far as they relate to the History of the Old Testament, etc. in a Letter to a Lady of Quality (1758, 8vo). In 1755 he published Theron and Aspasia, or a Series of Dialogues and Letters on the most important Subjects (1758, 3 vols. 8vo), which was attacked by Robert Sandeman, of Edinburgh, on the nature of justifying faith, and other articles connected with it, a work entitled Letters on Theron and Aspasia. See SANDEMAN. John Wesley wrote a brief review of his Theron and Aspasia, and Hervey wrote in reply Eleven Letters to John Wesley, but before his death he directed that the MS. of this work should be destroyed. His brother, however, judiciously judged that it would be a desirable pecuniary speculation to publish it, and placed it in the hands of Cudworth, an erratic dissenting preacher, to be finished, giving him liberty ‘to put out and put in’ whatever he judged expedient. Cudworth’s Antinomian sentiments led him to abuse Hervey’s opinions; but Hervey’s interpolations were relentlessly by his interpolations of Hervey’s pages, and sent forth in Hervey’s name the first and most reckless and odious caveat against Methodism that ever emanated from any one who had sustained friendly relations to it. It was republished in Scotland, and tended much to forestall the spread of Methodism there. Hervey felt keenly the injustice and heartlessness of this attack, but his sorrow was mitigated by the knowledge that the most of the abuse in the publication was interpolated, and that Hervey, who had delighted to call him his ‘friend and father,’ knew him too well to be thus struck at him for his connection with it. He revised the book; but time has answered it more effectually—time, the invincible guardian of the characters of great men.”

He died Dec. 28, 1758. Mr. Hervey’s writings are viciously turgid and extravagant in style. He was eminently pious, though not deeply learned; his composition was dryly intellectual; his correspondence was published separately (1760, 2 vols. 8vo). See Ryland, Life of Hervey; Letters of Hervey, and Life prefixed; Chalmers, General Biog. Dict.; Jones, Christian Biography; Stevens, History of Methodism, i. 372; Wesley’s Works, vi, 103, 125; Jackson, Life of Charles Wesley, ch. xxii: Coke and Moore, Life of Wesley, iii. 2.

He said (Heb. Che’sēd, חסד, kindness, as often; Sept. ‘Erē), the name of a man whose son (Ben-Hesed) was Solomon’s private attendant in the district of Sycamore Trees, and Heper (1 Kings iv, 10). B.C. cir. 995. See also JAHUISH-HESED.

HESER. GEORGE, a German ecclesiastical writer, was born at Weyern, near Passau, Austria, in 1609. He joined the Jesuits in 1625, and taught rhetoric, dialectics, and controversy at Munich and Ingolstadt. In 1642 he became preacher at St. Maurice’s Church, Augsburg, and in 1645, 26, Kohler Weg, the same capacity having ceased at the Church of Munich, Ingolstadt. In 1662 he retired to Munich, where he was still living in 1675. The exact time of his death is not ascertained. He is especially noted for his efforts in proving Thomas a Kempis (q. v.) the author of De institutione Christianae. His letters have gathered a number of testimonies, and describes pretty accurately a number of editions and of translations of Kempis, which appeared during the 16th
Hesse
and 17th centuries. He wrote also Vita et Syllobas os- 
nium Operum Thomae a Kempis ab authore anonymo, sgd. 
cone, non longe post obitum utiis conceperat (Insglotz!, 1650, 
1650; Torn: Full: Comemorato mora ad le- 
torem Thomae a Kempis (Insglotz, 1651, 1650; Pari, 
1651, 1650) — LXX Pollar, seu pomegycs in laudem 
librorum IV Thomae a Kempis, ex omnium plurior 
ettes LXX emendatissimus (Insglotz, 1651, 1650, etc.). See 
Veith, Biblioth. Augustana; Erich und Gruber, Alpen. 
Eccles. (Eichstett, 1720); Hoefer, Nouv. ann. chr., xxiv, 555.

Heshbon (Hebrew Chebon), ז"עבון, intelligence, 
as in Eccles. vii, 25, etc.; Sept. Ξαβοί (Josephus), a town 
in the southern district of the Hebrew territory 
beysion the Jordan, on the western border of the high 
plain (Mishnp, Josh. xiii, 17). It originally belonged 
to the Moabites, but when the Israelites arrived 
from Egypt it was found to be in the possession of the 
Amorites, whose king, Sihon, is styled both king of the Amo-
rates and king of Heshbon, and is expressly said to have 
"reigned in Heshbon" (Josh. iii, 10; comp. Numb. xxi, 
26; Deut. ii, 9). It was taken by Moses (Numb. xxi, 
23-26), and eventually became a Levitical city (Josh. 
xxii, 31, 32). It was also the residence of the tribe of Reuben (Numb. 
xxiii, 37; Josh. xiii, 17): but, being on the confines of 
Gad, is sometimes assigned to the latter tribe (Josh. 
xxi, 39; 1 Chron. vi, 81). After the Ten Tribes were 
sent into exile, Heshbon was taken possession of by 
the Moabites, and hence is mentioned by the prophets in 
their prophecies against Moab (Isa. xiv, 5; Jer. xiv, 
2, 34, 45). Under King Alexander Jannaeus we find it 
again reckoned as a Jewish city (Josephus, Ant. xiii, 
15, 4). Pliny mentions a tribe of Arabs called Esbonites 
the time of Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s. v. Esa-
bo) it was still a place of some consequence under 
the name of Ebasus (Ebasoq), but at the present day it 
is known by its ancient name, in the slightly modified 
form of Hasbon. The region was first visited in modern 
times by Seetzen. The site is twenty miles east of 
the Jordan, on the parallel of the northern end of the Dead 
Sea. The ruins of a considerable town still exist, cov-
ering the sides of an insulated hill, but not a single edifi-
cle is left entire. The view from the summit is very 
extensive, embracing the ruins of a vast number of 
cities, the names of some of which bear a strong resem-
lance to those mentioned in Scripture. These envi-
rous, occupying the elevated plain, are the remains of the 
cities of Jazer and the Jabbock, seem to be referred to in 
Josh. xiii, 16. There are reservoirs connected with this 
and the other towns of this region. These have been 
supposed to be the "fish-pools" (ץ"עבון, צ"עבון, cisterns) 
of Heshbon mentioned by Solomon (Cant. vii, 4) [see 
Batte-lehrer]; but, says Irby and Mangles, "The ruins 
are uninteresting, and the only pool we saw was too 
insignificant to be one of those mentioned in Scrip-
ture" (p. 472). In two of the cisterns among the ruins 
they found about three dozen of human skulls and 
bones, which they justly regarded as an illustration of 
Gen. xxxvii, 20 (Travels, p. 472; see also George 
Robinson, lord Lindia, Schwarc, Tristan, etc.) Macmichael 
and his party went to look for these pools, 
but they found only one, which was extremely 
insignificant. This is probably the reservoir mentioned 
by Burckhardt (Syria, p. 305). Mr. Buckingham, however, 
says, "The large reservoir to the south of the town, and 
about half a mile from the foot of the hill on which 
it stands, is constructed with good masonry, and not 
unlike the cisterns of Solomon, near Jerusalem, to 
which it is also nearly equal in size." Towards the western 
part of the hill is a singular structure, whose crumbling 
ruins consist of a mass of small, more or less, of workmanship 
of later ages—the massive stones of the Jewish period, the sculptured 
corncue of the Roman era, and the light Saracen arch, all 
gathered together (Porter, Handb. for Palest., p. 298).

Heshmon (Heb. Chebennon), כְּבֶנֶן, fitness; Sept. 
Ἄξυρίων, a city on the southern border of Judah (Sim-
non), near Idumaa, mentioned between Hazor-Gaddah 
and Beth-Palet (Josh. xv, 27); hence probably 
whereby between the Dead Sea and the Mediterranean. 
It is presumably the same as the Azaon (v. v.) elsewhere 
(Josh. xv, 4) located in this vicinity. See HAZAN-AD-
DAR.

Hess, Johann, one of the German Reformers, was 
born in Nuremberg about 1490, studied at Leipzig from 
1506 to 1510, and at Wittenberg from 1510 to 1512. In 
1518 he became secretary to the bishop of Breslaus. 
After travelling and studying in Italy, he returned in 1529 
to Wittenberg, and there became connected with Luther 
and Melanchthon. Returning to Breslaus with reforma-
tory views, he found no opposition from his bishop, who 
was imbued with the new humanistic learning, and was 
a friend of Erasmus. But the bishop (Turzo) died in 
1520, and his successor (Jacob of Salza) was a strenuous 
Romerist. He left Breslaus for a time, but the seed had 
taken root, and the magistrates recalled Hess as pastor 
in 1528. Thenceforward he was the soul of the Reforma-
tion in Breslaus. In 1529 he married, and continued 
his labours in reforming the Church and the schools, and 
in providing for the comfort of the reforming poor. He 
died in 1547.—Herzog, Beth-Engkelgesch. (1864). 

Hess, Johann Jakob, an eminent Swiss divine, 
was born at Zurich Oct. 21, 1741, where he studied theo-


dy with his uncle, the pastor of Nefenthal, to whom he 
became assistant in 1760. In 1777 he was called to 
the church of Notre Dame in Zurich; and in 1786 (con-
trary to his own wishes) he was chosen, in preference to 
Lavater, to be the successor of the well-known and 
popular pastor of the St. Peter's church in Zurich. He 
died May 29, 1828. His long life was faithfully 
dedicated to his work as a pastor, and to literary la-

or. Hess was to Switzerland what Reinhard was 
to the Saxony Church, and Storr to that of Wurttemberg. 
His clear and mild, yet fixed and safe convictions, as 
expressed in his more sacred writings on Biblical and 
theological subjects, and especially on the life of our Lord, 
found a hearty reception in many a pious domestic circle in Germany, and in the soul of many a young theologian" (Hagenbach, Hist. of 
the Church in 18th and 19th Centuries, transl. by Hurst, ii, 
403). In 1767 he published a Geschichte der drei letten 
Lemnischehe Jesus (Zurich, 6 vols.). This work was 
adapted to the use of Roman Catholics by J. A. von 
Krapf (Münster, 1872, 2 vols.). Hess cont'd to study the 
subject, and wrote Jugendgeschichte Jesu (Zurich, 
1773), and finally his Leben Jesu (1828, 3 vols.). His 
other works are: Geschichte der Reiche Gotteti (Zurich, 
1774, 2 vols.; 5th ed. 1826);—Gesch. u. Schildr. der Apostel 
Jesu (Zurich, 1775, 3 vols.; 4th ed. 1820-1822); this work 
was also adapted to the use of Roman Catholics (Mün-
ster, 1794, 2 vols.; 3d ed. Salzburg, 1801;)—Geschichte 
d. Israelitern vor d. Zeiten Jesu (Zurich, 1776-1788, 12 
fol.;—Gesch. Juda. (Zurich, 1779, 2 vols.);—Predigten d. 
Apostelgesch. (Zurich, 1781-1788), a collection of 50 ser-
mons;—Ueber die Lehrh. Thutten, und Schickakle unvere 
Herrn (Zurich, 1782, 2 vols.; 4th ed. 1817);—Gesch. 
Dafts d. Solomon's (Zurich, 1785, 2 vols.);—Ebl. d. heiligen 
Gesch. (Zurich, 1791-1792, 2 vols.;—Gesch. d. Menachen 
(Zurich, 1791-1792, 2 vols.;—Ueber die Volks u. Vaterlandische Jesu (Winterthur, 1794;)—Der 
Obacht bei Geistl. u. Vaterländisch, a collection of ser-
mons (Zurich, 1799-1800, 3 vols.). See Erich u. Gruber, 

Hesse, a country in central Germany. The name 
is for the first time mentioned in a letter of St. Boniface 
to the pope (766), and the pupils of Boniface introduced 
Christianity into the country. At the beginning of Charle-
maigne it belonged to the dominions of the counts of 
Franconia; in the 10th century, a number of Hessian 
nobles established their independence: in the following, 
all of them recognised the sovereignty of Ludwig I of 
Thuringia; Ludwig the Debonair was the daughter of one 
of the Hessian princes. This line became extinct in 1497, 
and long civil war ensued; the result was the confirma-
tion of the rule of Heinrich of Braabant, the son-in-law of the
last ruler of the extinct line. His son Heinrich ("the Child of Brabant") became the ancestor of all the branch- ings of the House of Hessen. His descendants, sometimes divided among several princes, were again reunited at the beginning of the 16th century under Wilhelm II, the father of Philip I the Magnanimous, who played so prominent a part in the history of the Reformation of the 16th century. Philip divided his dominions among his sons, among them the hereditary Maurice, the leaving only the two chief lines of the Hessian duchies, Hesse-Cassel and Hesse-Darmstadt.

The landgraves of Hesse-Cassel in 1803 received the title of elector; but in 1806, in consequence of the German war, in which the elector had taken sides against Prussia, the country was conquered by the Prussians, and annexed to Prussia. The landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt in 1806 received the title of grand-duke. From both main lines others branched off from time to time, but at the establishment of the German Confederation in 1815, only one, the landgrave of Hesse-Homburg, a branch of Hesse-Darmstadt, became a member of the Confederation. It became extinct in March, 1866, fell to Hesse-Darmstadt, but in September, 1866, was ceded by Hesse-Darmstadt to Prus- sia. Thus, in 1870, the only Hessian line retaining sover- eignty was the grand-duchy of Hesse-Darmstadt, which was divided into the two principal branches, the North-German Confederation, not for the whole territory, however, but only for one of the three provinces. The zeal of Philip the Magnanimous for the success of the Reformation made the Hessian territory one of the strongholds of German Protestantism. But the vac- illed influence of the preceding princes betrays a certain lethargy, and the Reformed Creeds caused considerable trouble, especially in Hesse-Cassel, the State Church of which was often left in the dark as to whether it was Lutheran or Reformed. Theological controversies on this sub- ject have been continued up to the present day. In the grand-duchy in that year 643,881 Evangelical Christians (67.3 per cent. of the total population), 278,440 Roman Catho- lics (29.1 per cent.), 26,114 Israelites (2.7 per cent.). In the class of "other Christians" were included, in Roman Catholics, 626 Membrances, 11 Baptists, 31 Free Religious, 24 Separatists, 22 Greek Catho- lic, 20 United Brethren in Christ, 6 Darbyites, 4 Piestas, 2 Orthodox Catholics.

The Evangelical Church comprises the members of the United Evangelical Church as well as the non-united Lutherans and Reformed. The Church con- stitution, introduced at the time of the Reformation, with two consistories and four superintendents, was changed in 1803. The office of superintendents was abolished; the two consistories were supplanted by Church and School councils which had no consistorial ju- risdiction. The new consuls were subordinate to the state ministers of the Interior and of Justice, who, in the exercise of their functions, were aided by inspectors. As in other parts of Germany, the Church lost the last rem-nant of self-government, and became wholly subject to the state. A reorganization of the constitution took place by a decree of June 6, 1852. The superintendents of the National Evangelical Church was transferred to a Supreme Consistory (Oberconsistorium) at Darmstadt, which consists of a president (a layman), three ministerial counsellors, two lay counsellors, and of one or several assessors. Only in rare cases the Supreme Consistory has to report to the state ministry for a final decision. Each of the three provinces of the grand-duchy has a superintendent. The superintendents are the organs through whom the Supreme Consistory exer- cises its functions. Subordinate to the superintendents are the deans, thirty in number, who are appointed by the Supreme Consistory for the term of five years. Every congregation has a local church council to assist in the management of the church. The consistory discloses the state of the local church property. This Church council has two official members, the pastor and the burgomaster (or his representative), and from three to five extraor- dinary members, who are chosen by the former in union with the council of the civil community. Every par- ish is to receive official membership in the consistory. A pre- vious ordination to the presbyterate does not prevent a clergyman from being ordained to the order of deacon, or from being appointed to a new parish within three years. The highest dignitary of the Church is the "prelate" (prülat), who is also, by virtue of his office, a member of the First Chamber. A theological faculty is connected with the University of Marburg besides the church diocesan theo- logical seminary at Friedberg. The theological faculty of Giessen has been and still is (Jan. 1870) under the control of the Rationalistic party; among its best known professors were Credner (q. v.) and Knobel (q. v.). As may therefore be expected, a considerable portion of the clergy belong likewise to the Rationalistic party; of late, however, the reaction in favor of evangelical prin- ciples has gained ground.

The Roman Catholics belong to the ancient diocese of Mentz (q. v.), which is now a suffragan see to the archbishopric of Freiburg. The diocese, which besides the Grand-duchy of Hesse-Darmstadt comprises the former principality of Nassau and the former landgraviate of Hesse-Homburg, had (1865) 158 parishes in 17 deaneries. A faculty of Roman Catholic theo- logy was formerly connected with the University of Giessen; but in 1848 the bishop of Mentz forbade all students of theology to attend the theological lectures of the (prominently Protestant) University, and es- tablished a new theological seminary at Mentz. The theological faculty, deserted by all the students, had soon to be suppressed. Of monastic institutions, there were in 1865 houses of the Jesuits, Capuchins, Brothers of the Christian Schools, Englishe Friaulein, Sisters of Charity, and other female congregations, with 244 members. At the beginning of the century, the most liberal senti- ments prevailed among the majority of the clergy, in- cluding even the canons of the cathedral church, and the professor of theological faculty of the University; but since the appointment of the ultramontane bishop of Ketteler (1850), these liberal sentiments have been to a very large extent weeded out or repressed. See Her- zog, Real-Encylopädie, vi. 29; Wiggers, Kirchl. Statist- tik, ii. 297; Neher, Kirchl. Geographie und Statistik, ii. 311. (A. J. S.)

**Hesse von Hessentstein, Johann, born at Nu- remberg Sept. 21, 1497, studied theology at Leipzig and Wittenberg, and was a priest during the Reformation. On his return to Germany his relations became intimate with Luther, to whose influence is attributed the deep Christian experience which characterize the pro- ductions of his pen. Hesse is considered one of the first German sacred poets, and many of his hymns are sung in the German churches of the day.—Wolff, Encyklop. d. deutsch. Nationalitt. iv. 85. (J. H. W.)**

**Hesshusen (Hesshuiusius), Tilmann, a Lutheran theologian, was born November 8, 1527, at Wesel, in Cleves. In his youth he travelled over France, England, Denmark, and Germany; after which he went to Wit- tenberg, where, in 1550, he became master of arts, and soon made his mark as a preacher. In 1552, when but twenty-five years of age, he was elected rector of the univer- sal, and in 1553 was M.A. But his peculiarities of mind and temper prevented his remaining long in any post. Always in conflict with the authorities, his friend Melancthon in vain procured him several advan- tageous situations, securing him, when but thirty years old, the nomination as professor of theology at Witten- berg, superintendent of the Palatinate, and president of the Church Council, which he lost again two years after, in 1559, after a bitter controversy with Kleibitz (q. v.) on the doctrine of the Lord's Supper. He fought the same battle again with A. Hardenberg at Bremen. See**
CRYPTO-CALVINISM. Having finally sought a refuge in his native city of Wesel, he was driven from it in 1564 for writing his Unterschied zwischen dem wahren katholischen Lehre d. Kirche u. d. Irrthümern d. Papisten u. d. römischen Antichristen, which highly displeased the government. After various fortunes, he was in 1578 ap­pointed to the see of Mainz; but, having awakened great opposition, his doctrines were condemned by a synod in 1577, and he himself was afterwards driven out of the country. Shortly after he entered on his last situation as the leading professor of theology of the University of Helmstedt, where he died, Sept. 25, 1586. During his life he was as a controversialist. He was a strong advocate of extreme Lutheranism, against the Melanchthonian Synergists. See SYNERGISMS CONTROVERSY. After the promulgation of the Formula of Concord (q.v.), he opposed it (having subscribed it in 1578) on the ground that certain changes had been made in it before publication. Under his influence, the University of Helmstedt withdrew its sanction from the Formula. Among his writings, the most important are his Commentarius de. Psalms. De justificatione peccatorum coram Deo (1587) — Examinatio Theologica (Helmstedt, 1586). See Jno. Ge. Lenzfeld, Hst. Helmsdtticum (Quedlinburg, 1782, 2 vols. of 8°, vol. i. p. 444). Gries, d. Prot. Theol. ; Gass, Geschichte d. Prot. Theol. vol. ii. 

HESYCHAITES (Greek ἡσυχασταί, ἡσυχαστί), to be quiet, a party of Eastern monks of the 14th century, on Mount Athos. They taught a refined and exagerrated mysticism. Their mysticism (q.v.), seeking only the quiet and the extinction of all the lower passions by contemplation. They believed that all who arrive at the blessedness of seeing God may also arrive at a tranquillity of mind entirely free from perturbation, and that all enjoying such a state may have visual perception of divine light, such as the apostles saw when they beheld His glory shining forth in the transfiguration. The monk Barlaam (q.v.), who afterwards became bishop of Gerace, during a visit to the East, learned the doctrines and usages of these quietist monks, and attacked them violently. They were bitterly defended by Palamas, afterwards bishop of Thessalonica. The charges brought against them were not merely that they professed to seek and obtain a divine and supernatural light not promised in Scripture, but also that the means they used were fanatical and absurd. These means included contemplation, introversion, and ascetic practices; and it was said that those who were accustomed to sit themselves in some secret corner, and fix their eyes steadfastly upon the meadow, whence they were called ἐμβαλόντες. As the fruit of such contemplation, a divine light, they said, such as that which shone on Tabor, was diffused through their souls, and Palamas defended this theory by making a distinction between the essence of God and his activity (ἰσινητία), asserting that the latter, though eternal and uncreated, is yet communicable. To the charge that they thus claimed directly to see God, inasmuch as this uncreated light must be either of the substance or of the attributes of God, they replied that the divine light radiated from God by ἐσινητία, but was not God. The whole matter was brought before a council at Constantinople in 1541, and the decision tendering favorably to the Hesychasts, Barlaam retreated to Italy. But his cause was taken up by another monk, George Monophysites, who attacked the doctrine of Palamas and the usages of the Hesychasts. He also lost his case before a synod at Constantinople. After the death of the emperor Andronicus, however, who had favored Palamas and the Hesychasts, things took a different turn for a while in favor of the Barlaamites; but after the triumph of the emperor John Cantacuzenus, who favored the other side, a synod at Constantinople, in 1351, approved the doctrine of the Hesychasts, especially the distinction between ὁσιά and ἑσυχία, and excommunicated Acydnus and Barlaam. The sources of information on these proceedings are the Historia of John Cantacuzenus (ii, 34, etc.), which is on the side of the Hesychasts; and the Historia Byzantina of Nicophorus Gregorakes, which takes the other side. See Petavius, De Dogm. Theol. lib. i. c. 12; Schröck, Kirchengeschichte, xxxix. 431; Mosheim, Church Hist. cent. xiv. pt. ii. ch. v. Gasch in Herzog Real-Encyclopedia. vii. 32; Engelhardt in Zeit- schrift f. d. Hist., Theol. Theol. d. Geschichte, Church History, per. iii. § 127; Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. vii. chap. ii. § 14; Donner, Person of Christ, Edinb. translation, div. ii. vol. i. p. 236. See MYSTICISM.

Hesychius, an Egyptian bishop of the 3d century, who was mentioned by Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. viii. 13) as a reviser of the text of the Septuagint (see also Jerome, De vir. illust. 77). He also published an edition of the New Testament, which Jerome does not appear to have formed a favorable opinion of, and he claimed the crown of martyrdom in the Diocesan persecution about A.D. 311. Nothing of his works is now extant. See Clarke, Succ. of Suc. Literature, s. v.; Lardner, Works, iii. 306; Hody, De Bibl. testim. originalibus (Oxf. 1705).

Hesychius, the grammarian of Alexsandria, is of uncertain date, but probably lived about the end of the 4th century. He compiled a Greek Lexicon, which appears to have been the model for all subsequent dictionaries. The best edition is that of Alberti and Ruhnken (Leyden, 1746-66, 2 vols.), with additions by Schow (Leipsic, 1792, 8vo); newly edited by Schmidt (Jena, 1857-64, 4 vols. 4to). See Ranke, De Lezici Hesychii historia originis et genuinae forma Commentatio (Leipzig and Quedlinburg, 1830, 8vo).

Hesychius of Jerusalem, a Greek ecclesiastical writer of the 6th century (supposed to have died about A.D. 434). Consecrated priest by the patriarch of Constantinople against his wishes, he spent the remainder of his life in that city. This is about all that is known with any certainty concerning his life. He appears to have enjoyed great reputation, and wrote a number of books, the principal of which are: 1. Hesychius, Liber septem (Latin only, Basle, 1527, fol. Paris, 1581, 8vo); and in Bibliotheca Patrum, xii. 52. Στηριγμον (or Κρι­λαίαν) τῶν ἐν προφήταις καὶ Χειρών, Soterion (or Κα­πτος) in duodecim prophetarum minores et Exarser, publish- ed by David Hoeschel with Adrian's Isagoge (Augsburg, 1602, 4to), and inserted in the Curiosissimae Sacrae Libri septem (Latin only, Basle, 1527, fol. Paris, 1581, 8vo); and in Bibliotheca Patrum, xii. 52. — Αγγελουργια or Θεοφιλ. published by Marcvs Eratmia's Opera (Paris, 1683, 8vo), and reprinted in the Bibliotheca veterum Patrum of Fronton Ducatus (Paris, 1624, fol.). A Latin translation of this work was inserted in the Bibliotheca Patrum, xii. 194, under the title Ad Theodulm Sermones octo; compendii anima perutilis de Temperantia et Virtute, etc. — Homilia de Sancta Maria desparva, published by F. d. Duc in Biblioth. veterum Patrum, ii. 417; — Τό τι τῆς ἐνενόμον Ἀναγλυφία τιμημίων, Oratio demonstrationis in S. Andre­ am Apostolam: a Latin translation of this work was in- serted in the Biblioth. Patr. xii. 188: — De Resurrectioni Domini nostri Christi, and De Hora tertia et sexta quibus Dominus fuisse crucificatus dicitur, in Combes, Novum Antiquarium. — Eις Ἐκκλησίαν τῶν ἐνδοιαν τοῦ κυρίου και Δεδηλείς της κυρίου, of which extracts are given in Photius (cod. 275). — Μνημονία του Χριστού Λογουρίου του ἑκκατονάρχου, in Bollandius, Acta Sacra. March, vol. ii. Appendix, p. 756; — Ἡ σταγγελική συμφωνία, in Combes, i. 778; an extract of it was inserted in Coteler, Eccles. Graec. Monu­menta, iv. 307, under the title Συνάγωνα ἱερονιμικα και ἑλληνικαν ἑλληνικαν εἰσαγωγή in ιεραμενεία ἐν Συμφωνίαις. Part of the extant writings of Hesychius are given in Migne's Patrologia Graeca, vol. xciii. See Photius, Bibliotheca; Cave, Hist. liter. i. 571; Tillemont, Mémoires ECClesiastiques, xiv. 227; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générales, xxi. 509.

Hetaeræ (Ἑταεραί), associations or secret societies of the Romans, which were forbidden by an edict of Trajan soon after his accession, A.D. 98. Under this...
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comission, Pliny proceeded to severe measures against the assemblies of the Christians about A.D. 105.

Heterodox, a term "practically limited to belief in something that is contrary to the decision of some church or churches; thus, when a Romanist or a Lutheran, etc., speaks of heterodoxy, he means something in opposition to the teaching, respectively, of the Roman or Lutheran Church, etc., so that what is meant by heterodoxy at one time, or place, will be orthodox in another. See Martensen, Dogmatics, § 28. See HERESY; ORTHODOX.

Heterogeneous. See DIVERSE.

Heterousians (of other essence; κρυός, σως), a sect, the followers of Aëtius, and from him denominated Aëtians. See AETIANS; ARIANISM.

Heath (Heb. Cēth, "deed;" Sept. ἔργος, and so Josephus, &c.), 6, 8), a son (descendant) of Canaan, and the ancestor of the hittites (Gen. v, 20; Deut. vii, 1; Josh. i, 4, who dwelt in the vicinity of Hebron (Gen. xxiii, 7, 17, 10). The "kings of the Hittites" is spoken of all the Canaanitish kings (2 Kings vii, 6). In the genealogical tables of Gen. x and 1 Chron. i, Heath is named as a son of Canaan, youngest of the firstborn, but preceding the Jebusite, the Amorite, and the other Canaanitish families. The Hittites were therefore a Hamitic race, neither of the "country" nor the "sired of" Abraham and Isaac (Gen. xxiii, 3, 4; xxvii, 1, 3). In the most historic memory of the nation, the beautiful narrative of Abraham's purchase of the cave of Machpelah—they are styled, not Hittites, but Bene-Chehet (A. V. "sons and children of Heath," Gen. xxiii, 5, 7, 10, 16, 18, 20; xxxv, 10; xlix, 32). Once we hear of the "daughters of Heath" (xxvii, 46), the "daughters of the land," at that early period still called, after their less immediate progenitor, "daughters of Canaan" (xxvii, 1, 8, compared with xxxvii, 46, and xxvi, 34, 35; see also 1 Kings xi, 1; Ezek. xvi, 3). In the Egyptian monuments the name Chat is said to stand for Palestine (Busen, Ägypten, quoted by Ewald, Gesch. i, 317, note). See HITTITES.

Hetherington, William M., a minister of the Free Church of Scotland, was born June 4, 1803, near Dumfries. He was educated at the University of Edinburgh, where he distinguished himself in Greek and in moral philosophy. His first service in the ministry was at Hamilton, where he was assistant to Dr. Meek, whose sermons he copied. In 1836 he became minister of Torphichen, and in 1844 at St. Andrew's. At the "disruption" he went out with the Free Church. In 1848 he was appointed to Free St. Paul's Church, Edinburgh, and in 1857 he was called to the chair of Apologetics in theology in the Free-Church College, Glasgow, where his labors as lecturer were excessive. In 1862 he was struck by paralysis, and on the 254 of May, 1865, he died. His writings, besides the editorship of the Free-Church Magazine (1844-48), and numerous contributions to the Presbyterian Review and the North British Review, include the following: Dramatic Sketches (poems, 1829-30);—The Fulness of Time (1834), characterized by Southey as a very original and able treatise;—Roman History (in Encyclop. Brit.; separately printed, 1852, 12mo);—The Minister's Family (1851, 8vo);—History of the Church of Scotland (1841, 8vo; last edit. 1855, 2 vols. 8vo);—History of the Westminster Assembly (1843, 12mo);—posthumous, The Apologetics of the Christian Faith; being a course of University lectures, with Introduction including a brief biographical sketch of the author by Dr. Alexander Duff (Edinburgh, 1867, 8vo).

Hethlon (Heb. Cēthlōn, "τόπος"; wrapped up, i. e. a hiding-place; Eng. Hethlon), a place the approach (τόπος, "way") to which lay on the northern border of Palestine, between the Mediterranean and the Arabian marina, the direction of Hethlon (Ezek. xlv, 15; lviii, 1). In all probability the "way of Hethlon" is the path at the

(N. or S.) end of Lebanon, from the sea-coast of the Mediterranean to the great plain of Hamath, and is thus identical with "the entrance of Hamath" (q.v.) in Numb. xxxiv, § , etc. See Porter, Five Years in Damascus, ii, 356.

Hetzel or Heszel, Johann Wilhelm Friedrich, a German Orientalist and theologian, was born at Künigsberg May 16, 1754. He studied at the universities of Wittenberg and Jena, and was appointed professor of Oriental languages in Göttingen. In 1766, in 1768 he was made librarian of the University of that city, and in 1801 was called to the professorship of Oriental literature in the University of Dorpat, which office he held until 1820. He died Feb. 1, 1829. Hetzel wrote a number of works on the study of Oriental languages, the principal of which are Ausführliche Beiträge zur Sprachenkunde (Halle, 1777, 8vo);—Nominumsformenlehre d. hebr. Sprachen (Halle, 1778, 8vo);—Institutio Philologi Hebræi (Halle, 1783, 8vo);—Gesch. d. hebr. Literatur (Halle, 1776);—Syrische Sprachlehre (Leem, 1786, 8vo)—A raubische Grammatik des arabischen Christentum (Jena, 1776, 8vo). Among his theological works, the most important are Die Bibel, Alte u. Neues Testament mit vollständig erklärenden Bemerkungen (Leem, 1780-1791, 10 vols.);—Neuer Versuch d. Briefs auf den Hebräer (Lpz., 1786, 8vo);—Bibliae Hebræorum Lxix. (Lpz., 1793, 3 vols.);—Bibliae Hebræorum Λεξικον (Lpz., 1795, 3 vols.);—Theology and Biblical Literature (v. 102 sq.);—Fierer, Universel Lex. vili, 860; Hoefer, Nouv. Biograph. Générale, xxviii, 598.

Hetzér, Ludwig, was born in the canton Thurgau, Switzerland (date unknown). When the Reformation broke out in Switzerland he was in the vigor of youth, and he threw himself into the movement with great zeal and energy. He was chaplain at Wädenswyl on Lake Zurich, in 1528, and in September of that year he published a tract against images, under the title Untert Gottes wie man si mit allen Götzen und Bildnissen haltsoll, etc., which ran through several editions, and greatly stirred the popular mind. In October of the same year, when the second conference on the use of images, etc., took place at Zurich, he was appointed to keep the minutes, and to publish an official account of them. Zwingle and Ecolampadius appreciated his talents, especially his Hebrew learning, and, in spite of a certain heat and vehemence which marked him, they hoped much from his activity in the Reformation. In 1524 he went to Augsburg, with a recommendation from Zwingle, and there his learning and eloquence soon made him popular. But within a year, owing to a theological dispute with Urbanus Rhegius, in which Hetzer maintained Arminianist views, he was compelled to quit Augsburg. Returning to Switzerland, he was kindly received at Basle by Ecolampadius, and was employed early in 1526 in translating Zwingle's reply to Bugenhagen into German. He seems to have satisfied both Zwingle and Ecolampadius on this visit that he was not an Anabaptist; but before the middle of the same year he was expelled from Zurich for preaching the new doctrine. At Strasburg he agreed with Johann Denk (q.v.) to issue a translation of the Prophets of the O. T. It appeared in the spring of 1527, and passed in four years through 15 editions. The book was of very scarce; two copies, however, belong to the library of the Crozer Theological Seminary, Upland, Pa. Hetzer seems to have imbued the theological views of Denk, so far, at least, as the doctrine of the Trinity is concerned, and to have aided him in spreading his doctrines in Württemberg, and other parts of Germany and the Hebräisches, he had previously been charged with looseness of morals, and in 1827 the crime of adultery was charged upon him. He was brought to trial and beheaded at Constance, Feb. 3, 1529. Such is the common account of Hetzer's life, founded on contemporary writings and letters of Ambrose Blarer, Zwingle, and others of the Reformers. See Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. xvii, ch. iii, § 5; Trechsel,
slaves, their tribute being the required personal service. See Gibbonite. In 1 Kings 15, we read that Solomon "had fourscore thousand Hewers in the mountains."

The forests of Lebanon only were sufficient to supply the timber required for building the Temple. Such of these foresters as were nearest the war was, doubtless, the contribution of the Phoenicians, among whom timber was in such constant demand that they had acquired great skill in the felling and transport of it. See Lebanon.

It was therefore of much importance that Hiram consented to employ large bodies of men in Lebanon to Hew timber for the king, and to bring it down by sea to the seacoast, whence it was to be taken along the coast in floats to Joppa. The forests of Lebanon have now in a great measure disappeared, but Akka Dagh and Jawur Dagh (the ancient Amanus and Rhosus), in the north of Syria, still furnish an abundance of valuable timber, though some quantities have been forfeited of late years by the Egyptian government. See Axe; Woeon.

Hewit. Nathaniel, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in New London, Conn., August 28, 1788. He graduated A.B. at Yale College in 1806. He commenced the ministry soon after he became a Presbyterian, and was in a few years associated with the ministry, and devoted himself to theology, under the tuition of Dr. Joel Benedict, of Plainfield, Conn.

In 1811 he was licensed to preach by the New-London Congregational Association, and, after preaching for a while in Vermont, went to the new theological seminary at Andover, and was the first graduate of that institution. In 1815 he was installed as pastor of the Presbyterian Church in Plattsburg, N.Y. After some years of very successful labor there, he was called to the Congregational Church at Fairfield, Conn. Here he became known as one of "the most eloquent and powerful preachers in the country, and in all the land it was that his voice from Sabbath to Sabbath sounded out that clarion blast of God's truth against intolerance, which, with a similar and equally powerful series of sermons at the same time from Dr. Lyman Beecher at Litchfield, soon aroused the whole Church and ministry of the land." He and Dr. Beecher were apostles of the American Temperance Reformation. In 1828 he resigned his charge at Fairfield to become agent of the American Temperance Society, then newly formed. "He addressed himself to this work with the spirit alike of a hero and a martyr, and prosecuted it with amazing ability and success. For two years he labored in the New York Assembly, and when he was released from that body, as he reasoned of righteousness, temperance, and judgment to come, with invincible logic, with bold earnestness, with fearless fidelity, with torrent—often cataracts—of burning eloquence, he moved, and fired, and electrified the people. The reform made rapid headway. It enlisted the sympathies of every class and every condition of society, the aged and the young, reclaiming many and guarding multitudes against intolerance. "The astounding eloquence and effects of these discourses I have often heard, in forms and from quarters so various as to leave little doubt that what Luther was to the Reformation, Whitefield to the Revival of 1740, Wells to primitive Methodism, that was Nathaniel Hewit to the early Temperance Reformation" (Atwater, Memorial Discourse). In 1830 he became pastor of the Second Congregational Church in Bridgeport, Conn. In 1831 he was a delegate in behalf of the cause. His powerful and his great powers of eloquence were never more signally displayed than on this visit. In power of logical argument and impassioned delivery few orators of the time exceeded Dr. Hewit. Returning home, he resumed his labors at Bridgeport, where he served until 1843, when he removed to Catskill, and was the first pastor of a new Presbyterian Church formed by members of his old parish. He had always been an adherent to the doctrines of the Westminster Confession. The East Windsor (now Hartford) Theological Seminary owed its existence and maintenance largely to him. In 1862 he was expelled from the church for withdrawing from active duty, and an associate pastor was appointed. He died at Bridgeport February 3, 1867.
Heywood, Olive, an English Nonconformist divine, was born at Bolton, 1630, and admitted at Trinity, Cambridge, 1647. He became rector at Halifax in 1652, and was deprived at the Restoration. After much suffering from poverty, he died in 1702. His writings on practical religion were quite numerous, and may be found in his "Whole Works now first collected" (1687, 2 vols 8vo). See also Hunter, Life of Heywood (Lond. 1844, 8vo).

Hez'eki (Heb. Chiz'ki", מַזְחִיק, strong; Sept. "Aza'", one of the "sons" of Elpaal, a chief Benjamite resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. vii. 17). B.C. apparently cir. 598.

Hez'ekiah (Heb. Chiz'kiya, מַזְחִיק, whose Jeho-ovah has strengthened, 2 Kings xxv., 10, 14, 15, 16; 1 Chron. iii., 23; Neh. vii., 21; Prov. xxv., 1; "Hizkiah," Neh. x., 13; Zeph. i., 1; also in the prophetic form Ye-hiz'kiya, יְהִי-צְכִיָּה, Ezra ii., 16; Hose. i., 1; Micah i., i; elsewhere in the prolonged form Chiz'kia'hu, צָכְיָה, in 2 Kings xx., 10; 1 Chron. iv., 41; 2 Chron. xxvii., 27; xxix., i, 20, 30, 31, 36; x., i, 18, 20, 22; xxx., i, 8, 9, 11, 13, 20; xxxii., 2, 8, 8, 9, 11, 12, 16, 17, 20, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 30, 32, 33; xxxiii., 8; Isa. i., 1; Jer. xv., 4, i it is both prophetic and prolonged, Ye-hiz'kiahu', יְהִי-צְקִיָּה; Sept., Josephus, and N. Test. "Ez'ekiaj, the name of four men. See also Jez'ekiah.

Heylyn (or Heylyn), Peter, was born Nov. 20, 1621, at Burford, Oxfordshire. At fourteen he entered Hart Hall, Oxford, and there received a sound education. In 1648 he was chaplain to Lord Danby, and, some time after, king's chaplain. He obtained various livings and clerical offices through the patronage of Laud, from which he was expelled by the Republicans; was the editor of the Mercu- rius Aulicus, the Royalist paper; recovered his prefer- ments at the Restoration; and died in 1692. He was the author of a powerful and bitter opponent of the Puritans, and through these qualities he obtained his various rapid preferments. He even went so far in his opposition to Puritanism as to write a History of the Cabals, vindicating the employment of the leisure hours and evenings of the Duke of York's court day in the service of the Crown. In theology he was an Arminian of the latitudinarian sort (see his Historia Quinqu-Articularia, 1659). His Excer- tum Historiarum contained an attack on Thomas Fuller which brought on a bitter controversy with that eminent writer. He wrote The History of St. George and of the Order of the Garter (2d ed. Lond. 1683, 4to); Ecclesiastica Rerum: the History of the English Reformation (1674, 4to; new ed. by Robertson, Lond. 1849, 2 vols, 8vo); Sermons (Lond. 1659, 4to): A Life of Abp. Laud (Lond. 1647, fol.; several editions) -- Historia Religiosa, or History of the Presbyterianism of the English Nation (I. 1682, fol.); Theologia Veterum, on the Apostles' Creed (Lond. 1673, fol.); with many controversial tracts, etc. His life is prefixed to the Ecclesiastica Rerum (ed. of 1689). See Hook, Eccles. Biog. vii, 18 sq.; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 838.

Heylyn, Joux, D.D., an eminent English divine and prebendary of Westminster. He was deeply read in the Mystical divines, and was himself called "the Mystic doc- tor." He died about 1760, leaving Theological Lectures at Westminster Abbey (Lond. 1740-61, 2 vols, 4to), containing an "interpretation of the New Test." -- Sermons (1677, 2d ed., 1702, 8vo). See Black- wood, Magazine, xxv, 88; Allibone, Dictionary of Au- thors, i, 838.
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How necessary this was in such times may be inferred from the fact that "the brazen serpent" is, or was, venerated in the Church of St. Ambrose at Milan (Prideaux, Connect, i, 19, Oxed, ed.). The history of this Reforma-
tion, of which 2 Kings xviii, 4 sq. gives only a concise summary, is copiously related, from the Levitical point of view, in 2 Chronicles xxvii, 2 sq. and xxix, 1-7, where the cleansing of the Temple in the first month of Heze-
kiah's first year, i.e. in the month Nisan next after his accession, and was followed in the next month (because at the regular season neither Levites nor Temple were in a due state of preparation) by a great Passover, over- 
to which now all Judah was summoned, but also the "remnant" of the Ten Tribes, some of whom accepted the invitation. Some writers (as Jahn, Keil, and Caspari) contend that this passover must have been subsequent to the fall of Samaria, alleg-
ing that the mention of the "remnant" (2 Chron. xxx, 6) is unsuitable to an earlier period, and that, while the kingdom of Samaria still subsisted, Hezekiah's messen-
gers would not have been suffered to pass through the land, much less would the destruction of the high places in Ephraim and Manasseh have been permitted (xxx, 1). It is true, the chronicler says, that the Passover was not perfect enough: the connection of xxxix, 17, "the first month," with xxx, 2, "the second month," admits of but one con-
struction—that both are meant to belong to one and the same year, the first of the reign. Accordingly, Thelenius, in the Krg, Ezra, Hdb. 2 Kings, p. 579, urges this as an argument in favor of the view of 2 Chronicles xxv, 3 of the chronology. The narrative of this passover, which, he thinks, "rendered antecedently improbable by the silence of the Book of Kings, is perhaps completely refuted by 2 Kings xxiii, 22. The author of the story, wishing to place in the strongest light Hezekiah's zeal for religion, represents him, not Josiah, as the restorer of the Passover after long desuetude, and this in the very beginning of his reign, without, perhaps, caring to reflect that the final deporta-
tion of the Ten Tribes, implied in xxx, 6, had not then taken place." But 2 Kings xxiii, 22, taken in connec-
tion, as it ought to be, with the preceding verses, is per-
fectedly compatible with the account in the Chronicles. It says: "Surely such a Passover"—one kept in all re-
spacts "as it is written in the Book of the Covenant"— "was not holden from the time of the Judges," etc.; whereas Hezekiah's Passover, though kept with even greater solemnities and partial observances (un-
der Tidglate-Pileser), with respect to which they might well be called a "remnant" (comp. the very similar terms in which even Judah is spoken of, xxxix, 8, 9), and scor-
fully rejecting the last call to repentance, brought upon themselves their final judgment and complete overthrow (Bertheau, Krg, Ezra, Hdb. 2 Chron. p. 380 sq.). "Though, however, of the Ten Tribes who had taken part in the solemnity were thereby (such is evidently the chronic-
ler's view of the matter, xxxix, 1) inspired with a zeal for the true religion which enabled them, on their return home, in defiance of all opposition on the part of the nor-
merc or of Hoshia, to effect a destruction of the high places and altars in Ephraim and Manasseh, as complete as was effected in Jerusalem before, and in Judah after the Passover.

That this prudent and pious king was not deficient in judici-
um and abilities is shown by his successes against the Philistines, seemingly in the early part of his reign, be-
fore the overthrow of Sennacherib (2 Kings xviii, 8), and by the efficient measures taken by him for the defence of Jerusalem against the Assyrians. Hezekiah also as-
siduously cultivated the arts of peace, and by wise man-
agement of finance, and the attention which, after the example of David and Uzziah, he paid to agriculture
and the increase of flocks and herds, he became posses-
ed, even in troubled times, of an ample exchequer and treasures of wealth (2 Chron. xxxii, 27—29; 2 Kings 15,
13; Isa. xxxix, 2). Himself a sacred poet, and proba-
bly the author of other psalms besides that in Isa. xxxvii, he seems to have collected the psalms of David and Asaph, and employed capable scribes to complete the collection of Solomon's Proverbs (Prov. xxv, 1). He appears also to have taken order for the preservation of genealogical records (Browne, Review of Lepasian or Ilkhe Chronology, in Aram. and Trans.). And he compiled, or partly com-

By a rare and happy providence, this most pious of kings was confirmed in his faithfulness and seconded in his endeavors by the powerful assistance of the noblest and most eloquent of prophets. The influence of Isaiah was, however, not gained without a struggle with the "scomful" remnant of the former royal counselors (Isa.
xxviii, 14), who in all probability recommended to the king such alliances and compromises as would be in uni-
son rather with the dictates of political expediency than with that sole unhesitating trust in the arm of Jehovah which the prophets inculcated. The leading man of this party was the high-priest Amos, of the house of Zareah, whose father's name, and the expression in Isa. xxiii, 16 (see Blunt, 'Undes, Cointidences'), was probably a foreigner, perhaps a Syrian (Hitzig). At the instance of Isaiah, he seems to have been subsequently degraded from the high post of prefect of the palace (which office was given to Elah, son of Jezebel, in the time of Ahaz, the son of the honorable station of state secretary (Ezek. x, 18); the further punishment of exile with which Isaiah had threatened him (xxvi, 18) being possibly forgiven on his amendment, of which we have some traces in Isa.
xxxvi, sq. (Ewald, 'Ezech, iii, 617).

At the head of a repentant and united people, Hezekiah ventured to assume the aggressive against the Philistines, and a series of victories followed, which removed for ever all fear of the cities which his father had lost (2 Chron. xxviii, 18), but even dispossessed them of their own cities ex-
cept Gaza (2 Kings xviii, 8) and Gath (Josephus, Ant.
ix, 13, 3). It was perhaps to the purposes of this war that he applied the money which would otherwise have been used to pay the tribute exacted by Shalmaneser, according to the agreement of Ahaz with his predeces-
sor, Tidglat-Pileser. When the king of Assyria applied for this impost, Hezekiah refused it, and omitted to send even the usual presents (2 Kings xviii, 7), a line of conduct to which he does not appear to have been enc-
couraged by Tidglat-Pileser or any of his predecessors.

Instant war was averted by the heroic and long-continued resistance of the Tyrians under their king Elu-
leus (Josephus, Ant. ix, 14), against a siege, which was abandoned only in the fifth year (Grote, 'Greece,' iii, 359, 4th edit.), when it was found to be impracticable. This must have been a critical and intensely anxious period for Jerusalem, and Hezekiah used every available means to strengthen his position, and render his capital im-
pregnable (2 Kings xx, 20; 2 Chron. xxxii, 3, 5, 30; Isa.
xxxii, 8—11; xxxiii, 18; and to these events Ewald also refers, Psa. xlvi, 13). But while all Judea trembled with fear at the approach of the Assyrian invasion, the Jew-
na and others were relying "in the shadow of Egypt," Isaiah's brave heart did not fail, and he even denounced the wrath of God against the proud and sinful merchant-
city (Isa. xxiii), which now seemed to be the main bul-
wark of Judea against immediate attack.

At what time it was that Hezekiah rebelled against the Assyrians, according to Josephus, and served him not, we do not learn from the direct history: in the brief summary, 2 Kings xviii, 7, 8 (for such it clearly is), of the successes with which the Lord prospered him, that particular statement only introduces what is more fully detailed in the sequel (xviii, 19, xix, 67). It precedes the notice of the overthrow of Samaria (ver. 9 sq.), does not warrant the inference that the assertion of independence
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belongs to the earliest years of Hezekiah’s reign (see Wi-<nner, Real-Wörterb. i, 497, n. 2). Ewald, however, thinks otherwise: in the absence of direct evidence, making history, as his manner is, out of his own peremptory interpretation of certain passages of Isaiah (ch. i and xxvi, 1-4), he forms what is called the "Ammonian Scholium," obliterating the death of Ahaz from the obligations contracted with Tigrath-Pileser, prepared himself from the first to resist the demands of Assyria, and put Jerusalem in a state of defence. (It matters not to Ewald that the measures noted in 2 Kings xx, 20; 2 Chron. xxiii, 5-8, 31 correspond in point of fact with the time of Sennacherib’s advance upon Jerusalem.) "From Shalmaneser’s hosts at that time stationed in Phoenicia and elsewhere in the neighborhood of Judah, forces were detached which laid waste the land in all directions: an army sent against them from Jerashualem seized the panic-stricken at the sight of the unwonted enemy, took to flight, and Jerusalem now lying helplessly exposed, a peace was concluded in all haste upon the stipulation of a yearly tribute, and the ignominious deliverance was celebrated with feastings in Jerusalem" (Gesch. des V. Israel, iii, 330 sq.): all of which would place the supposition that Ew-ald’s interpretation of Isa. ix, 22 is the only possible one: it cannot be said to be on record as history.

As gathered from the Scriptures only, the course of events appears to have been as follows: Ahaz had placed his kingdom as tributary under the protection of Tigr-ath-Pileser. When, according to Isaiah, x, 27, and xxvii, 22, that in the time of Shalmaneser, to which the latter passage certainly, and the former probably, belongs, Judah was still under the yoke of this dependence. The fact that Sargon (whether or not the same with the Shalmaneser of the history), in his expedi- tion against Egypt, left Judah untouched (Isa. xxvii), implies that Judah had not yet asserted its independence. A powerful party, indeed, was scheming for re-volt from Assyria and a league with Egypt; but there appears no reason to believe that Hezekiah all along fav-ored a policy which Isaiah in the name of the Lord, the last, sternly condemned. It was not till after the accession of Sennacherib that Hezekiah refused the tribute, and at the instigation of his nobles made a league with Egypt by ambassadors sent to Zaan (Tanis) (Isa. xxx, xxxi; compare xxxvi, 6-9). (Some, indeed [i.e., Ewald and Keil], place the supposition of a league before the fall of Samaria, to which time ch. xxviii must unquestionably be assigned. Possibly ch. xxix may be- long to the same time, and ver. 15 may refer to plottings for a league with Egypt already carried on in secret. Knobel, Kgy. exp. Bibl. p. 215, 225, decides too peremptor-ily for the reference of both clauses to the time of Sennacherib, and insists that to xxix falls only a little earlier than the following chapters, where the league is openly denounced, viz. in the early part of the reign of Sennacherib.)

The subsequent history, as gathered from the Scriptures, compared with the notices on the ancient monuments, is thought to be as follows. Sargon was suc- ceeded by his son Sennacherib, whose two invasions occupy the greater part of the Scripture records concerning the reign of Hezekiah. The first of these took place in the third year of Sennacherib, and occupies only the first half of the year (Isa. xxx vi, 3-10), though the latter part of the year, the advance of the Assyrians may be traced in Isa. x, 5; xi. The rumor of the invasion redoubled Hezekiah’s exer-tions, and he prepared for a siege by providing offensive and defensive armor, stopping up the wells, and diverting the watercourses, conducting the water of Ghion into the city from a distant source. For a similar precaution taken by the Mohammadans, see Wil. Tyrv. vii, 7, Keil. But the main hope of the political faction was the alliance with Egypt, and they seem to have sought it by presents and private entreaties, but the negotiations were doubly galling to obtaining their aid. Isaiah (Isa. xxx, i-3), warns Hezekiah against entrusting the weakest arm of the Jewish service, as we see from the decision which it excited (2 Kings xviii, 23). Such overtures kindled Isaiah’s indignation, and Shebna may have lost his high office for recommending them. The prophet clearly saw that Egypt was too weak and faithless to be serviceable, and the applications to Pharaoh (who is compared by Rabshakeh to one of the weak reeds of his father, 1 Kings xxi, 19) impli- cated a ruin of the entire city, and denial of the help of God. But Isaiah did not disapprove of the spontaneous proffered assistance of the tall and warlike Ethiopians (Isa. xviii, 2, 7, acc. to Ewald’s transl.), be- cause he may have regarded it as a providential aid.

The account given of this first invasion in the mem- orials of the time is chiefly derived from Heze- kiah because the Eronitides had sent their king Padiya (or "Hadiya," acc. to Col. Rawlinson) as a prisoner to Jerusalem (comp. 2 Kings xviii, 8), that he took forty-six cities ("all the fenced cities" in 2 Kings xviii, 13 is apparently a corruption of a con- version; Jer. xix, 13, mentions 200,000 prisoners; that he besieged Jerusalem with mounds (comp. 2 Kings xix, 32); and although Heze- kiah promised to pay 800 talents of silver (of which perhaps only 300 were ever paid) and 30 of gold (2 Kings xviii, 14; but see Layard, Nine. and Bab. p. 148), yet, not content with this, he mulcted him of a part of his dominions, and gave them to the kings of Ekron, Ash- dod, and Gaza (Rawlinson, Herod. i, 476 sq.). So im-portant was this expedition that Demetrius, the Jewish historian, even attributes to Sennacherib the Great Captivity (Clem. Alex. Strom. p. 147, ed. Syll.). In almost every instance therefore this sanguinary notice in Scripture, and we may see a reason for so great a sacrifice on the part of Hezekiah in the glimpse which Isaiah gives us of his capital city driven by desperation into licentious and impious mirth (xxxi, 12-14). This campaign must at least have had the one good result of proving the worthlessness of the Egyptian alliance; for at a place called Alttagh (the Eltekon of Josh. xv, 59?) Sennacherib inflicted an overwhelming defeat on the combined forces of Egypt and Ethiopia, which had come to the assistance of Ekron. But Isaiah regarded the treaty as a mere purchase made in days of treachery, and this, in his view, was a part of his fellow-citizens gazing peacefully from the house-tops on the bright array of the car-borne and quivered Assyrians filled him with indignation and despair (Isa. xxii, 1-7, if the latest explanations of this chapter be correct).

Hezekiah’s bribe (or fine) brought a temporary re- lease, for the Assyrians marched into Egypt, where, if Herodotus (ii, 141) and Josephus (Ant. x, 3-4) are to be trusted, they advanced without resistance to Pelusium, owing to the hatred of the warrior- caste against Sethos, the king-priest of Thoth, who, had in his priestly predi- cation been an enemy to the Egyptians in general, and this advantage, Sennacherib was forced to raise the siege of Pelusium, by the advance of Tirhakah or Tar- kos, the ally of Sethos and Hezekiah, who afterwards united the crowns of Egypt and Ethiopia. This magni-fi cent Ethiopian hero, who had extended his conquests to the Pillars of Hercules (Strabo, iv, 472), was indeed a formidable antagonist. His deeds are recorded in a temple at Melinet-Abu, but the jealousy of the Mem- phitites (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt, i, 141) concealed his as- sistance, and attributed the deliverance of Sethos to the arms of his own gods, without any mention of an army of mice (the eth. 141). This story may have had its source, however, not in jealousy, but in the use of a mouse as the emblem of destruction (Horapoll. Hierogl. i, 50; Rawlinson, Her- rod. ad loc.), and of some sort of disease or plague (? 1 Sam. vi, 19; Jahn, Arch. Bibli. § 186). The legend is found from Egypt and Babylonia in the earliest historical circumstances which ruined the army of Sennacherib.

Returning from his futile expedition (ἀποπραξίας ἀνα- ψιγμός, Josephus, Ant. x, 1, 4), Sennacherib “dealt treacherously” with Hezekiah (Isa. xxxix, 1) by attack- ing the strongholds of Lachisch. This was a turning point in the history of the invasion, which we have such full details in 2 Kings xviii, 17 sq.; 2 Chron. xxxix, 9 sq.; Isa. xxxvi. That there were two invasions (con-
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trary to the opinion of Layard, Bosanquet, Vance Smith, etc.) is clearly proved by the details of the first given in the Assyrian annals (see Rawlinson, Herod, i. 477). Although the annals of Sennacherib on the great cylinder in the British Museum reach to the end of his eight year, and this second invasion belongs to his fifth year, yet no allusion to it has been found. So shameful a disaster was naturally concealed by national vanity. From Lachish he sent against Jerusalem an army under two officers and his cup-bearer, the orator Rameshakeh, with a blasphemous and insulting summons to surrender, which Judah’s hopes of Egyptian succor, and apparently endeavoring to inspire the people with distrust of his religious innovations (2 Kings xxviii, 22, 25, 30). The reiteration and peculiarity of the latter argument, together with Rameshakeh’s fluent mastery of Hebrew (which he used to tempt the people from their allegiance by a glowing promise, ver. 31, 32), give countenance to the supposition that he was an apostate Jew. Hezekiah’s ministers were thrown into anguish and dismay; but the undaunted Isaiah hurled back threatening, in effect and force, and He even prophesied that the fires of Tophet were alight in Hezekiah’s capital. He sent messengers to the Egyptian captains, which were destined to feed their flame. Meanwhile Sennacherib, having taken Lachish (an event possibly depicted on a series of slabs at Mosul, Layard, Nin. and Bab. p. 148-152), was besieging Libnah, when, alarmed by a “rumor” of TIRAKHA’s advance to avenge the defeat, he was forced to set out on his homeward march, and left Hezekiah in possession of his immediate designs, and contented himself with a defiant letter to Hezekiah. Whether on the occasion he encountered and defeated the Ethiopians (as Prudeaux precariously infers from Isa. xx, Connect. i, 26), or not, we cannot tell. The next event of the campaign about which we are informed is that the Jewish king, with simple piety, prayed to God with Sennacherib’s letter outspread before him (comp. 1 Macc. iii, 48), and received a promise of immediate deliverance. Accordingly “that night the angel of the Lord went out and smote in the camp of the Assyrians 185,000 men.”

There is no doubt that some secondary cause was employed in the accomplishment of this event. We are certainly “not to suppose,” as Dr. Johnson observed, “that the angel went about with a sword in his hand stabbing them one by one, but that some powerful natural element was at work.” The Babylonians were famished, and some of the Targums attribute it to storms of lightning (Vitrings, Vogel, etc.); Prudeaux, Heine (De causa Strag. Asgr. Berl. 1701), Harmer, and Faber to the moon; R. Joe (in Seder Olam Rabba), Marshall, Usher, Freiss (De causa Final. Asgr. Gottingen, 1776), to a nocturnal attack by Tirakha; Paulus to a poisoning of the waters; and, finally, Josephus (Ant. x, 1, 4 and 5), followed by an immense majority of ancient and modern commentators (including Michaelis, Didierlein, Dathe, Heusler, Bauer, Ditmar, Gesenius, Maurer, Knobel, etc., and even Keil), to the pentecost (compare 2 Sam. xxiv, 15, 16). This would be a cause not only adequate (Justin, xix, 11; Diodor. xix, 439; see the other instances quoted by Rosenmiiller, Keil, Jahn, etc.), but most probable in itself, from the crowded and terrified state of the camp. There is, therefore, no necessity to adopt the ingenious conjectures by which Döderlein, Kruppe, and Wesseler endeavor to get rid of the large number 185,000. It is not said where the event occurred: the particulars concerning it, Isa. x-xxxvii, seem to denote the neighborhood of Jerusalem, as would Ps. lxvi, if it was written at that time. On the other hand, the narrative would probably have been fuller had the historian thrown, with its attendant opportunities of beholding the bodies of their dreaded enemies and of gathering great spoil, befallen near Jerusalem, or even within the immediate limits of Judah. That version of the story which reads Isa. xii, 14-20, is probably the one which Josephus would hold with Flav. (Groc. iii, 330) that the story is not substantially the same—indicates the frontier of Egypt, near Ptolemais, as the scene of the disaster. The Assyrian army would probably break up from Libnah on the tidings of Tirakha’s approach, and advance to meet him. In ascribing it to a vast swarm of field-mice, which, devouring the quivers and bow-strings of the Egyptians, compelled them to flee in the morning, Hezekiah may have misinterpreted the symbolic language of the Egyptians, in which the mouse denotes annihilation (ἀπονεμώνυμη, Horappol. i, 50); though, as Knobel (u. p. 280) has shown by apposite instances, an army of mice is capable of committing such ravages, and Hezekiah was in no position to know of it. That the destruction was effected in the course of the night is clearly expressed in 2 Kings xix, 35, where “that night” is plainly that which followed after the delivery of Isaiah’s prophecy, and is evidently implied alike in Isa. xxxvi, 36 (“when men arose early in the morning”), and in the story of Hezekiah’s illness. After this reverse Sennacherib fled precipitately to Nineveh, where he avenged himself on as many Jews as were in his power (2 Ob. i, 18), and, after many years (not fifty-five days, as Tobit says, i, 21), was murdered by two of his sons as he drank himself drunk in the house of his drunkenness (2 Kings xxix, 24; 2 Chron. xxxii, 25; 2 Esd. 695, for his 22d year is mentioned on a clay tablet (Rawlinson, L. c.); he must therefore have survived Hezekiah by at least one year. It is probable that several of the Psalms (e. g. xlvi-xlviii, lxxxvi) allude to his disappointment.

“IT IS NOT SEEN TO WHAT DEGREE THE HEZEKIAH sick unto death.” So begins, in all the accounts, and immediately after the discomfiture of Sennacherib, the narrative of Hezekiah’s sickness and miraculous recovery (2 Kings xx, 1; 2 Chron. xxxii, 24; Isa. xxxviii, 1). The time is defined, as by the promise of his recovery, which is added to the life of Hezekiah, to the fourteenth year complete, or fifteenth current, of his reign of twenty-nine years. But it is stated to have been in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah that Sennacherib took the fenced cities of Judah, and thereafter threatened Jerusalem and came to his overthrow. The two notes of time, the express and the implied, fully accord, and place beyond question, at least, the view of the writer or last redactor in 2 Kings xxviii, xix; Isa. xxxvi, xxxvii, that the Assyrian invasion began before Hezekiah’s illness, and lies in the middle of his reign. In the received chronology, as the first year of Hezekiah (comp. 9, 16) is the twenty-first year of Nebuchadnezzar (i. e. B.C. 604 in the Canon, B.C. 606 in the Hebrew reckoning) by 29, 55, 2, 81, 3, 120 years, the epoch of the reign is B.C. 724 and 726, and its 14th year B.C. 711 and 713. But it is contended that so early a year is incompatible with definite and unquestionable data of contemporary history, Egyptian, Assyrian, Babylonian. From these it has been inferred that during the siege of Samaria Shalmanezer died, and was succeeded by Sargon, who, jealous of Egyptian influence in Judea, sent an army under a Tartar or general (Isa. xx, 1), which penetrated Egypt (Nah. iii, 8-10) and destroyed Edom-Asop; although it is clear from Hezekiah’s rebellion (2 Kings xviii, 7) that it can have produced but little permanent impression. Sargon, in the tenth year of his reign (which is regarded as parallel with the fourteenth year of the reign of Hezekiah), made an expedition to Palestine in the fifth year of Hezekiah, but we know of no conquests from Hezekiah on this occasion, and he appears to have occupied himself in the siege of Ashdod (Isa. xx, 1), and in the inspection of mines (Rosenmüller, Bibl. Geogr. i., x.). This is therefore thought to be the expedition referred to in 2 Kings xviii, 10; Isa. xxxvi, 1; an expedition which is supposed to have led to no result. But if the Scripture narrative is to be reconciled with the records of Assyrian history, it has been thought necessary to make a transposition in the text of Isaiah (and therefore of the book of Kings). That is, that the narrative in Isa. xxxvi, 1-16 is a more or less accurate report of the events of the first year of Hezekiah, and that the Assyrian army invaded the land of Judah, and was repulsed by Hezekiah, and that it returned home in despair. But the Scriptures in the narratives of the Assyrian invasion of Judah, and of the destruction of Jerusalem, are not to be read, as was the history of the Babylonian conquest of Judah, as mere narratives of historical events, but as sacred Scriptures, and the authenticity of which is not to be questioned.
which the newly-discovered Apis-stele reveals necessary (in Journ. of Soc. Lit. Oct. 1868)."

"As it originally stood, was probably to this effect (2 Kings xviii, 13): Now in the fourteenth year of King Hezekiah the king of Assyria came up (alluding to the attack mentioned in Sargon's "Annum,", xx, 5—14). In these days was king Hezekiah sick unto death, etc., xx, 1—19. And Sennacherib, king of the Assyrians, came up against all the fenced cities of Judah, and took them, etc., xviii, 13; xix, 37.

It has been conjectured that some later transcript, unaware of the earlier and unimportant invasion, confused the allusion to Sargon in 2 Kings xviii, 13 with the detailed story of Sennacherib's attack on Judah in 2 Kings xix, 32. The narrative suggests that the account of Hezekiah's illness broke the continuity of the narrative, removed it to the end. According to this scheme, Hezekiah's dangerous illness (2 Kings xx; Isa. xxxvii; 2 Chron. xxxxi, 24) nearly synchronized with Sargon's futile invasion, in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah's reign, eleven years before Sennacherib's invasion. That it must have preceded the attack of Sennacherib has also been inferred from the promise in 2 Kings xx, 4, as well as from modern discoveries (Layard, Nin. and Bab, i, 145); and such is the view adopted by the Rabbis (Seder Olam, cap. xxiii), Usher, and other authorities. But no such synchronism is noted in the Talmud (Kil, ed. loc.; Pirke Avoth, i, 29). It should be observed, however, that difficulties experienced in reconciling the scriptural date with that of the Assyrian monuments rests on the synchronism of the fall of Samaria (2 Kings xix, 37) with the year of Sargon's invasion (2 Kings xix, 36).Rawlinson has lately given reasons himself (Lond. Archaeum, No. 1869, Aug. 22, 1868, p. 246) for doubting this date; and it is probable that further researches and computations may fully vindicate the accuracy of the Biblical numbers.

Tirhakah is mentioned (2 Kings xix, 9) as an opponent of Sennacherib shortly before the miraculous destruction of his army in the fourteenth year of Hezekiah, corresponding to B.C. 713. It has lately been proved from the Apis tablets that the first year of Tirhakah's reign over Egypt was the vague year current in B.C. 720, asfix. Dr. Hinks, in the Journ. of Soc. Lit. October, 1858, p. 190).

There is, therefore, a prima facie discrepancy of several years. Bunsen (Bibelwerk, i, p. 241) unhesitatingly reduces the reign of Manasseh from fifty-five to forty-five years. Lepsius (Königsmen, p. 104) more critically takes the thirty-five years of the Septuagint (2 Kings xix, 20) as the submission of the Seleucid king referred to, and accordingly reduces the reign of Manasseh from fifty-five to forty-five years. The evidence of the chronology of the Egyptian and Babylonian kings is, however, we think, conclusive in favor of the sum of fifty-five.

In the Bible we are told that Shalmaneser laid siege to Samaria in the fourth year of Hezekiah, and that it was taken in the sixth year of that king (2 Kings xvii, 9). The Assyrian inscriptions indicate the taking of the city by Sargon in his first or second year, whence we must suppose either that he completed the enterprise of Shalmaneser, to whom the capture is not expressly ascribed in the Scriptures, or that he took the credit of an event which happened just before his accession. The first year of Sargon is shown by the inscriptions to be 722 B.C. To designate by 722 the first year of Merodach-Baladan, i.e. Mardocampus: there fore it was current 721 B.C. 720, and the second year, 720 or 719. This would place Hezekiah's accession B.C. 726, 725, or 724, the first of them being the very date the Hebrew chronicles give. Again, Merodach-Baladan sent messengers to Hezekiah immediately after his sickness, and therefore in about his fourteenth year, B.C. 712. According to Ptolemy's Canon, Mardocampus reigned 721—710, and, according to Berossus, seized the regnal power for six months before Eblisus, the Bellius of the Canon, and therefore in about 705, this being, no doubt, a second reign. See MERODACH-BALADAN. Here the preponderance of evidence is in favor of the other dates of Hezekiah. Thus far the chronological data of Egypt and Assyria appear to clash in a manner that seems at first sight to present a hopeless knot, but not on this account to be rashly cut. An examination of the facts in the history has afforded Dr. Hinks (Journ. of Soc. Lit. Oct. 1858, p. 190) what he believes to be a satisfactory explanation. Tirhakah, he observes, is not explicitly termed Pharaoh or king of Egypt in the Bible, but king of Cush or Ethiopia, from which it might be inferred that at the time of Sennacherib's disastrous invasion he had not assumed the crown of Egypt. The first year of his reign corresponds with Assyrian inscriptions of the fourteenth year of Hezekiah in B.C. 718, and its contemporaneity with the reign of Tirhakah, who did not ascend the Egyptian throne till B.C. 689, we have only to suppose that the latter king was the ruler of Ethiopia some years before his accession over Egypt itself. See TIRHAKAH.

In this way, however, we may fall into the other difficulty as to the coincidence of this date with that of Sennacherib's invasion. It is true, as above seen, that the warlike operations of Sennacherib recorded in the Bible have been conjectured (Rawlinson, Herodotus, i, 363) to be those of two expeditions. See SENNACHERIB.

The warlike operations of Sennacherib recorded in the Bible have been conjectured (Rawlinson, Herodotus, i, 363) to be those of two expeditions. See SENNACHARIB.

The fine point in this case is the historical veracity of the accounts as a result of an expedition of Sennacherib's third year, which, by a comparison of Ptolemy's Canon with Berossus, must be dated B.C. 700, and this would fall so near the close of the reign of the king of Judah (B.C. 697) that the supposed second expedition, of which there would naturally be no record, could not be placed much later. The Biblical account would, however, be most reasonably explained by the supposition that the two expeditions were but two campaigns of the same war, a war but temporarily interrupted by Hezekiah's illness. The appeal to this coinage of the names is made on an admission that in two experimentations of Sennacherib fell in B.C. 700, it would be thirteen years later than the synchronism of Tirhakah and Hezekiah as above arrived at. It is probable, therefore, that there is some miscalculation in these dates from the Egyptian and Assyrian monuments, as indeed seems to be betrayed by the discrepancy between Sennacherib's invasion (B.C. 700) and Tirhakah's reign (not earlier than B.C. 689), as thereby determined, whereas the above Biblical passage makes them contemporaneous. Dr. Hinks (ut sup.), however, proposes to solve this difficulty under the historical supposition that the name of Sennacherib has been inserted in the Biblical account of the first Assyrian invasion of Judah (2 Kings xviii, 13; Isa. xxvi, 1; 2 Chron. xxxiii) by some copyist, who confounded this with the later invasion by that monarch, whereas the Assyrian annals of the latter refer to the former (Isa. xxxvii). A less violent hypothesis for the same purpose of reconciliation, and one in accordance with the custom of these Oriental kings, e.g. in the case of Nebuchadnezzar, is that Sargon sent Sennacherib as viceroy to execute this campaign in Palestine, and that the annals of the reign of the former are the account of the events of his expeditions when actually king. See CHRONOLOGY.

Some writers have thought to find a note of time in 2 Kings xiii, 9; 2 Chron. xxxvii, 30, 'Ye shall eat this year such as growth of itself,' etc., assuming that the passage is only to be explained as implying the interven-
tion of a sabbath-year, or even of a sabbath-year fol-

owed by a year of jubilee. All that can be said is that the passage does not happen that according to that view of the order of sabbatic and jubileean years which is the best attested, a sabbath-year would begin in the autumn of B.C. 713 (Browne, Ordo Secolorum, sec. 372-280), i.e. on the per-
phaps precarious assumption that the cycle persisted with-
out interruption, however, it cannot be fixed by the

fourteenth of Hezekiah to the year B.C. 718, than it does to 706, or 699, or any other year of the series. But, in fact, it is not necessary to assume any reference to a sabbath-year. Suppose the words to have been spoken in the autumn, then, the produce of the previous harvest (April, May) having been destroyed or carried off by the invaders, there remained only that which sprang

naturally from the dropped or trodden-out seed (דנפנפ), and as the enemy’s presence in the land hindered the au-
natural tillage, there could be no regular harvest in the follow ing spring (only the דנפנפ, איירגא). Hence, there is no need to infer with Thenius, ad loc. that the enemy must have been in the land at least eighteen months, or, with Ewald, that Isaiah, speaking in the au-
natural harvest, means that the invasion had lasted through the following year (Die Propheten des A. B., i. 301), and similarly Knobel, u. a. p. 278.

There seems to be no ground whatever for the vague conjecture so confidently advanced (Jahn, Heb. Common. § xii.), that the king’s illness was the same plague which had destroyed the Assyrian army. The word נִינִיב is not elsewhere applied to the plague, but to carbuncles and inflamatory ulcers (Exod. ix. 9; Job ii. 1, etc.). Hezekiah, whose kingdom was still in a dangerous state from the fear lest the Assyrians might return, who had at that time no heir (for Manasseh was not born till long afterwards, 2 Kings xxix.,) and who regarded death as the end of existence (Isa. xxviii.), “turned his face to the wall and wept sore” at the threatened approach of dissolution. God had compassion on his anguish, and heard his prayer. Isaiah had hardly left the palace when he was ordered to promise the king immediate re-
covery, and a fresh lease of life, ratifying the promise by a sign, and curving the bole by a plaster of ligs, which were often used medicinally in similar cases (Georgius, Thes. i. 311; Celsius, Hierobot. ii. 377; Bartholinus, De Morbis Biblicis, x. 47). What was the exact nature of the disease we cannot say; according to Meade, it was fever terminating in abscess. On this remarkable pas-
sage we must here be content to refer the reader to Carp-
zo, App. Crit. p. 581 sq.; Hawlinson, Hier. ii. 382 sq.; the elaborate notes of Keil on 2 Kings xx.; Rosenmüller and Gesenius on Isa. xxxviii., and especially Ewald, Ge-
archive, i. 368.

The sign given to Hezekiah in the going back of the shadow on the "sun-dial of Ahaz" can only be inter-
preted as a miracle. The explanation proposed by J.
von Gumpach (Alt. Test. Studien, p. 181 sq.) is as incom-
patible with the terms of the narrative (Isa. xxxviii., 8, especially the fuller one, 2 Kings xx., 8-11) as it is in-
sulting to the character of the prophet, who is repre-
sented as not only managing the evening of the Lord’s life and its shadow by the trick of secretly turning the movable dial from its proper position to its opposite! Thenius (u. a.
p. 405 sq.) would naturalize the miracle so as to obtain from it a note of tone. The phenomenon was due, he thinks, to a cloud, very small, viz. the one of 26th November, B.C. 713. Here, also, the prophet is taxed with a deception, to be justified by his wish to inspire the despairing king with the confidence essential to his recovery. The prophet employed for this purpose his astrological knowledge of the fact that the eclipse was about to take place, and of the further fact that "at the beginning of an eclipse the shadow (e.g. of a gnomon) goes back, and at its ending goes forward:" an effect, however, so minute that the difference amounts at most to sixty seconds of time; but then the "degrees" would

mark extremely small portions of time, possibly even 1090 to the hour (like the later Hebrew Chalikin), and be the exact definition of the locality of the sun. Not now successfully, Mr. Bosanquet (Trans. of R. A. S., Soc. xxv., 277) has recourse to the same expedient of an eclipse on Jan. 11, 689 B.C., which, in this writer’s scheme, lies in the fourteenth of Hezekiah. "Whoever truly believes in the Old Testament, as Mr. Bosanquet evidently does, must not consult his astrolabe, but be fixed by the just comment made by M. v. Niebuhr, Gesch. Assyri. und Pers. p. 49. Mr. Geswell’s elaborate attempt to prove from ancient astronomical records that the day of this miracle was preternaturally lengthened out to thirty-six hours, in order to arrive at one any but himself (Foot Tempora Catholici, etc.) carried for the writer’s Remarks on the same, 1852, p. 23 sq.) See Dial.

Various ambassadors came with letters and gifts to congratulate Hezekiah on his recovery (2 Chron. xxxii., 20), and among them an embassy from Merodach-Ba-

kadan (or Berothad, 2 Kings xx., 12; 2 Bar. 4, Josephus, l. c.), the viceroy of Babylon, the Mardokempados of Ptolemy’s canon. The ostensible object of this mis-
ion was to compliment Hezekiah on his convalescence (2 Kings xx., 12; Isa. xxxix., 1, and "to inquire of the wonder that was done in the land" (2 Chron. xxxiii., 31), a rung that the prophecy could not fall to influence de-
vo ted to astrology. But its real purpose was to discov-
er how far an alliance between the two powers was pos-
sible or desirable, for Mardokempados, no less than Hez-
ekiah, was in apprehension of the Assyrians. In fact, Sargou expelled him from the throne of Babylon in the following year (the twenty-first of Hezekiah), although at the time he seems to have returned and re-established him-
self for six months, at the end of which he was murder-
ed by Belblos (Dr. Hincks, l. c.; Rosenmüller, Bibl. Ge-
ograph. ch. viii.; Layard, Nin. and Bub., i. 141). Communi-
cation between the two monarchs is no doubt here, and, perhaps, to enhance the opinion of his own importance as an ally, he displayed to the messengers the precious treasures which he and his predecessors had accumulated. These stores remained even after the largesses mentioned in 2 Kings xviii., 14, 16. If ostentation were the motive it received a terrible rebuke, and he was informed by Is-
iah that from the then tottering and subordinate prov-
ince of Babylon, and not from the mighty Assyria, would come the ruin and captivity of Judah (Isa. xxxix., 5).

This prophecy and the one of Micaiah (Mic. iv., 10) are the more remarkable from the position of the locality of the writer, however, where the clouds of exile so long threatened (Lev xxxvi., 33; Deut. iv., 27; xxi., 3) were beginning to gath-
er. It is an impressive and fearful circumstance that the moment of exultation was chosen as the oppor-
tunity for warning, and that the prophecies of the Asyri-

delivrance are set side by side with those of the Babylon-
ian captivity (Davidson, On Prophecy, p. 256). The weak friend was to accomplish that which was impossible to the powerful foe. But, although pride was the sin thus vehemently checked by the prophet, Isaiah was certainly not blind to the political motives (Josephus, Ant., x., 2) which made Hezekiah so complaisant to the Babylonian ambassadors. Into those motives he had inquired in vain, for the king met that portion of his question ("What said these men?") by emphatic si-
cence. Hezekiah’s meek answer to the stern denuncia-
tion of the writer has been most unjustly represented as "a false resignation which combines selfishness with silliness" (Newman, Heb., Mon. p. 274). On the contra-
ry, it merely implies a conviction that God’s decree could not be otherwise than just and right, and a natural thankfulness for even a temporary suspension of its in-
vitable fulfilment.

After this embassy we have only a general account of the peace and prosperity in which Hezekiah closed his days. No man before or since ever lived under the cer-
tain knowledge of the precise length of the span of life before him. "He was buried in the going up (פּוּץ)"
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to the sepulchres of the sons of David," 2 Chron. xxxii, 33: 3 from this, and the fact that the succeeding kings were not buried in their own city, it may be inferred that after Absa, thirteen times from David, there was no more room left in the ancestral sepulchre (Thenius, u. s., p. 410). In later times, he was held in honor as the king who "had after him none like him among all the kings of Judah, nor any that were before him" (2 Kings xviii, 3); in Jer. xxxvi, 17 the elders of the land cite him as an example of pious submission to the word of the Lord spoken by Micah; and the son of Siraach closest his recital of the kings with this judgment—that of all the kings of Judah, "David, Hezekiah, and Josiah alone transgressed not, nor forsook the law of the Most High." (Heb. ter awkward has Hieke, Helms. 1749, Taddei (Precicio Chiaske, Wit- tenh, 1704). For sermons, etc., see Darling, Cyclopaedia bibliographica, col. 380, 340, 341.

Hezekiah's Pool, the modern traditional name of a cistern or reservoir in the western part of the city of Jerusalem, referred by Robinson (Latter Researches, p. 112) and Bartlett (Walks about Jerusalem, p. 82) to the military preparations of that king (2 Chron. xxvii, 3 sq; compare 2 Kings xx, 20; Eccles. xlviii, 17 sq; Isa. xix, 9-11; Psa. xlviii, 12, 13), but disputed by Ritter (Erbk., xxvii, 371 sq). See Jerusalem.

2. The great-grand-grandfather of the prophet Zeph- aniah (Zeph. i, 1, where the name is Anglicized "Hiz- kiah," supposed by some to be the same with the foregoing (see Huetius, Demotur. Evang. Lipp. p. 512; contra Roemmler, Prolog. ad Zeph.). B.C. much ante 683.

3. A person mentioned in connection with Ater (but whether as father or otherwise is not clear), which latter was the father (or former residence) of ninety-eight Is- raelites who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh. vii, 21). In Neh. x, 17 his name (Anglicized "Hizzkijah") appears in a similar connection (but without the connective "of") among those who subscribed the law. B.C. ante 500.


Hesek. See HETZEL.

Hezzer. See HETZER.

Hezrion (Heb. Chezron), ʻהֵצְרוִין, a vine, or, according to Furst, strong; Sept. 'Izir and 'Izir v. r. Kıp̄ir); the name of two men.

1. The head of the seventh century of priests as established by David (1 Chron. xxiv, 15). B.C. 1014.


Hez'rai (2 Sam. xxiii, 35). See HEZRO.

Hez'ro (Heb. Chetser, ʻהֵצְרֹה, i. q. Heron; Sept. 'Aaqvi, Vulg. Heres), a Carmelite, one of David's dis- tinguished warriors (1 Chron. xi, 37). He is called in the margin and in 2 Sam. xxiii, 35, Herzai (Ch'tsery, ʻהֵצְרֹה, Sept. 'Aaqvi, Vulg. Heres). B.C. 1046. Kemmi- cott, however (Disputation, p. 207), decides, on the almost unanimous authority of the ancient version, that Hezrai is the original form of the name.

Hez'ron (Heb. Chetseron, ʻהֵצְרֹון, enclosed [Gezon].
or Blooming [Furte] : Sept. *Aqoua*, *Aqoua*, the name of no man, and also of a place. 1. The third son of Reuben (Gen. xvi, 9; Exod. vi, 14; 1 Chron. iv, 1; v, 3). His descendants were called *Hezronites* (Chetersoni, Nub. xxvi, 6, 21). B.C. 1874. 2. The eldest of the two sons of Pharez and grandson of Judah (Gen. xvi, 12; Ruth iv, 18, 12; 1 Chron. ii, 5, 19, 21, 24, 25); called *Eshron* (*Kepou*) in Matt. i, 6. B.C. 1856. 3. A place on the southern boundary of Judah, west of Kadesh-Barnea, and between that and Adar (Josh. xv, 3); otherwise called Hazor (ver. 25). The punctuation and enumeration, however, require us to connect the associated names thus: Kerihor - hezron = Hazoran. See Hazor. *Hez'onite* (Numb. xxvi, 6, 21). See *Hezron*. 1. Hibbard, Bilyt, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Norwich, Conn., Feb. 24, 1771, united with the Methodist Episcopal Church in 1792, entered the New York Conference in 1798, in 1821 - 2 - 3 was superannuated, and in 1824, was finally superannuated in 1825, and died Aug. 17, 1844, having preached forty-six years. He was an eccentric but very able man. His wit and humor, and his long, able, and abundantly successful labors in the Church, furnish the material of an interesting biography. He possessed a vivid imagination, was austere, acquired a sound and effective store of theological and general knowledge. His piety was deep and cheerful. See *Minutes of Conferences*, iii, 600; Stevens, *History of the Methodist Episcopal Church*; Sherman’s *New England Divines*, p. 285; *Life of Bilyt Hibbard* (N.Y. 12mo). Sprague, *Annals*, iv, 298. 2. Hicks, Geocon, D.D., a nonjuring bishop of great learning and eminence, born June 29, 1649, at Newlyn, in Yorkshire; was educated at St. John’s College, Oxford, and in 1644 was elected fellow of Lincoln College. He became chaplain to the duke of Lauderdale in 1676, king’s chaplain in 1682, and dean of Worcester in 1688. He was disappointed of the bishopric of Bristol by the death of Charles II. After the Revolution of 1688, refusing to take the oaths to William III, he was deprived in 1689, and became an active enemy of the government. He was consecrated bishop of Thetford by the Nonjurors in 1694, and died in 1715. His scholarship is shown in his work, *Synopsis Letterarum Sacrarum Thesauri in Anglia*, (Oxford, 1705, 3 vols. fol.), and his * Institutionum Grammaticarum Anglo - Saxonicarum* (Oxford, 1689, 4to). Among his theological and controversial writings, which were very numerous, are The *Christian Priesthood, and the Dignity of the Episcopal Order* (new ed. Oxford, 1847, 3 vols. 8vo). See *Hook, Ecles. Bibl. vi, 82 sqq.*; *Lathbury, History of the Nonjurors*. 3. Hicks, Elias, a member of the Society of Friends, or Quakers, and the author of a schism in that body, was born at Hempstead, L. I., March 19, 1748, and in early life became a preacher in the society. Imbidding Socinian opinions as to the Trinity and the Atonement, he began to preach them, cautiously at first, and with little sympathy from his brethren. By “degrees, however, the boldness of his views and the vigor with which he repelled assailants began to attract attention, and to win hearers over to his opinions, which, proclaimed without faltering, in public and private for years, at length found large numbers of sympathizers, who, with Mr. Hicks himself, unable to impress their convictions upon the denomination at large, in 1802 seceded from the body, and set up a distinct and independent denomination, but still holding to the name of Friends. In this secession were members from the Yearly Meetings of New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore, Ohio, Indiana, and New England.” He was a man of great acuteness and energy of intellect, and of elevated personal character. He died at Jericho Feb. 28, 1830. He published *Observa-
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tion with that river at Korna, fifty miles above Basrah (Basarrah). The Tigris is navigable for boats of twenty or thirty tons' burden as far as the mouth of the Ordo-
neh, but no further; and the commerce of Mosul is con-
sequently carried on by rafts supported on inflated sheep
or goats' skins. See Float. The rafts are floated down the
river and when they arrive at Bagdad the wood of which they are composed is sold without loss,
and the skins are conveyed back to Mosul by camels. The
Tigris, between Bagdad and Korna, is, on an aver-
age, about two hundred yards wide; at Mosul its breadth
does not exceed three hundred feet. The banks are
steep, and overgrown for the most part with brushwood,
the resort of lions and other wild animals. The middle
part of the river's course, from Mosul to Korna, once
the seat of high culture and the residence of mighty kings,
is now desolate, covered with the relics of ancient great-
ness in the shape of fortresses, mounds, and dams, which
had been erected for the defence and irrigation of the
country. At the ruins of Nimrud, eight leagues below
Mosul, is a stone dam quite across the river, which,
when the stream is low, stands considerably above the
surface, and forms a small cataract; but when the stream
is swollen, as it is often, and shooting over it like a rapid,
and boiling up with great impetu-
osity. It is a work of great skill and labor, and now
venerable for its antiquity. The inhabitants, as usual,
attribute it to Nimrud. It is called the Zikr-ul-Awaze.
At some short distance below there is another Zikr
(dike), but not so high, and more ruined than the for-
mer. The river rises twice in the year: the first and
greatest rise is in April, and is caused by the melting of
the snows in the mountains of Armenia; the other is in
November, and is produced by the periodical rains. (See
Kinney, Geog. Mem. of Persian Empire, p. 10; Rich's
Key, and Overton's 'Copies Expedition; Sir R. K.
Potter's Travels; etc.) See Tigris.

Elhîl (Heb. Chîl, см, life; i.e. from God, or
perhaps, см, God shall live; Sept. 'A'phîlî'), a native of
Bethel, who rebuilt Jericho (B.C. post. 915), above
700 years after its destruction by the Israelites, and
who, in so doing (1 Kings xvi, 34), incurred, in the
death of his eldest son Abram and his youngest son
Jeph, the effects of the imprecation pronounced by
Joshua (Josh. vi, 16):

"Accursed be the man in the sight of Jehovah,

Whom shall arise and build this city, even Jericho;

With the loss of his first-born shall he be slain,

And with the loss of his youngest shall be his gates."

See Jericho. Strabo speaks of such cursing of a de-
stroyed city as an ancient custom, and instances the
curses imprecated by Agamemmnon and Cresus (Gro-
tius, Annal. ad Jos. vi, 26); Masius compares the curs-
ing of Carthage by the Romans (Pol. Syn.). The term
Bethelite (מַיִלְעִי) here only is by some rendered
family of cursing (Pet. Martyr), and also house or place of
cursing (Ar., Syr., and Chald. versions). qu. יִלְעִי, יָלִי; bu-
ter there seems no reason for questioning the accuracy
of the Sept. In Ephes. vi, 17, it frequently is approved by most
commentators, and sanctioned by Genevan (Lec. n. v.).
The rebuilding of Jericho was an intrusion upon the
kingdom of Jehoshaphat, unless, with Peter Martyr, we
suppose that Jericho had already been detached from it
by the kings of Israel. See ACCURSED.

Hieraca. See Hierax.

Hierapolis (Ἱεραπόλης, sacred city), a city of
Phrygia, of which the isolation and distance are
most evident from the course of rivers Lycco-
uis and Messander, not far from Colosse and Laodicea,
where there was a Christian church under the charge of
Epaphras as early as the time of the apostle Paul,
who commends him for his fidelity and zeal (Colos. iv.
12, 13). The place is visible from the theatre at La-
odicea, from which it is five miles distant, northward.
Its association with Laodicea and Colosse is just what
we should expect, for the three towns were all in the
basin of the Mesander, and within a few miles of one
another. It is probable that Hierapolis was one of the
"illustres Asiae urbe" (Tacitus, Ann. xiv, 27) which,
with Laodicea, were simultaneously desolated by an
earthquake about the time when Christianity was estab-
lished in this district. There is little doubt that the
church of Hierapolis was founded at the suggestion of
that of Colosse, and that its characteristics in the apos-
tolic period were the same. Smith, in his journey to
the Seven Churches (1671), was the first to describe
the ancient sites in this neighborhood. He was followed
by Poecike and Chandler; and more recently by Rich-
ter, Cockerril, Hartley, Arundel, etc. The place now
bears the name of Panbâk-Kalek (Cotton-Castle), from
the white appearance of the cliffs of the mountain on
the lower summit, or, rather, an extended terrace, on
which the ruins are situated. It owed its celebrity, and
probably the sanctity indicated by its ancient name, to
its very remarkable thermal springs of mineral water
(Dio Cass. lxxviii, 27; Pliny, Hist. Nat. ii, 96), the sin-
gular effects of which, in the formation of stalactites
and incrustations by its deposits, are shown in the ac-
counts of Poecike (ii, pt. 2, c. 13) and Chandler (Asia
Minor, c. 68), have been accurately described by
Strabo (xiii, 429). A great number and variety of sep-
ulchers are found in the approaches to the site, which
on one side is sufficiently defended by the precipices
overlooking the valleys of the Lycus and Mesander, while
on the other sides the town walls are still observable.

The most clearly marked and of the ancient impor-
tance of the place. The main street can still be traced
in its whole extent, and is bordered by the remains of
three Christian churches, one of which is upwards of
300 feet long. About the middle of this street, just
above the mineral springs, Poecike, in 1741, thought
that he distinguished some remains of the Temple of
Apollo, which, according to Damascius, quoted by Pho-
tius (Biblio. p. 1054), was in this situation. But the
principal ruins are a theatre and gymnasium, both in a
state of uncommon preservation; the former 346 feet in
diameter, the latter nearly filling a space 1000 square
yards. Strabo (loc. cit.) and Pliny (Hist. Nat. v, 29) mention
a cave called the Plutonium, filled with pestilential vapors,
similar to the celebrated Grotto del Cane in Italy. High
up the mountain-side is a deep recess far into the moun-
tain; and Mr. Arundell says that he should have sup-
posed that the mephitic cavern lay in this recess, if Mr.
Cockerell had not found it near the theatre, the position
anciently assigned to it; and he conjectures that it may
be the same in which Chandler distinguished the area
of a stadium (Arnold, Asia Minor, ii, 210). The same
writer gives, from the Orient Christianus, a list of the
bishops of Hierapolis down to the time of the emperor
Isaac Angelus. (See Col. Leake's Geogr. of Asia Mi-
or, p. 252, 253; Hamilton's Res. in Asia Minor, i, 514,
517 sq.; Fellows, Lyc. p. 270; Asia Minor, p. 283 sq.;
Crane's Asia Minor, p. 37.)

Hierapolis, Council of, held about A.D. 197 by
Apolinaris, bishop of the see, and 26 other bishops,
who excommunicated Montanus, Maximilian, and The-
odotus.—Landon, Man. of Councils, p. 265.

Hierarch, (ἱεραρχ, from ἱερός, sacred, and ἅ-
ρχος, ruler), a term used to denote, in churches in
which the whole ruling power is held by the priesthood, a
sacred principality instituted by our Lord Jesus Christ in
Coin of Hierapolis.
his Church, and consisting of orders of consecrated persons, with gradations of rank and power, who constitute exclusively the governing and ministering body in the Church. It implies the transmission, under what is called the Apostolical Succession [see Succession], of the doctrine, the ethics, the faith by the Church, and of the traditions, by Christ to his apostles; and thus the hierarchy, as a corporation, perpetuates itself. The hierarchy on earth is supposed to correspond with the hierarchy of "angels and archangels, and all the hosts" of heaven, with the Virgin Mary at their head. The Christian hierarchy, again, is supposed to correspond to the Jewish institution of the high priest. See Church. The notion of a "continuity of plan running on from the Jewish hierarchical system into the Christian, i.e. the Romish spiritual monarchy, is an ideal analogy which has captivated many an ardent imagination, from Cyprian down to Manning and Newman. For an exposure of its fallacy, see Taylor, Ancient Christianity (London, 1844, 2 vols. 8vo), ii, 409.

1. Roman Catholic.—According to the Roman Catholic theory, the hierarchy is divinely ordained, and was established in the Church by Christ, who gave the primacy of authority to Peter, and instituted in subordination to him the other apostles and bishops, priests, and deacons. The primacy of Peter is perpetuated in the popes, from whom bishops hold their authority to govern their dioceses, and to ordain priests and deacons. This monarchical-hierarchical system grew up gradually in the course of the first five centuries of the Christian church, on the part of the bishops of Rome in succeeding centuries. In the Greek Church the hierarchy is oligarchical, not monarchical, no patriarch having supreme authority over all other prelates (see Schaaff, in Brit. and Foreign Evangelical Review, Oct. 1865 and Jan. 1866). The Roman hierarchy is divided into the hierarchy of orders and the hierarchy of jurisdiction. The hierarchy of orders, again, includes the hierarchy by divine right (juris divini) and the hierarchy by ecclesiastical right (juris ecclesiastic).

(1) Hierarchy of Orders.—(1) The hierarchy juris divini includes: 1. Bishops (sacerdotes primiti ordinis, episcopi et principes omnium), who are successors of the apostles, and by whom alone, through ordination, the ministry of Christ is preserved among men. As to order, the bishops are only a fuller form of the order of priests, with governing and ordaining power superadded. Some Roman Catholics hold that bishops have the authority, by divine right immediately, others (these are now the majority) that they have it mediately through the pope. See Episcopacy. 2. Priests (presbyters), who receive from the bishop, by ordination, the power to administer the sacraments, to preach the word of God, to administer the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, and to absolve penitents from their sins. The place in which they shall exercise these functions is not optional with themselves, but depends entirely upon the will of the bishop. 3. Deacons, who serve as helpers to bishops and priests in the administration of the sacraments, and in the pastoral care of the sick and poor.

(2) The hierarchy of ecclesiastical right includes the minor orders of subdeacons, acolytes, exorcists, lectores, and doorkeepers, being all extensions of the diaconate downwards, so to speak.

2. Jurisdiction.—This embraces the manifold "principalities and powers" which have been constituted in the Church in the course of her progress towards universal dominion. It includes archdeacons, archpriests, deans, vicars, inferior prelates, and cardinals. In the order of bishops, again, there are archbishops, metropolitan, exarchs, and patriarchs. The pope is at the head of all, the bearer of all the functions of every office, and the source of authority for each. See Papal System. The Roman hierarchy is a vast political-eclesiastical corporation, with the pope at its head, claiming universal dominion over all men, and over all governments. See Curia Romana; Popes. It is a great power, more important, as De Maistre, one of the greatest modern Roman writers remarks, than sound doctrina, inasmuch as it "is more indispensable to the preservation of the faith" (Lettres, ii, 285). This idea of a hierarchy with a universal dominion, and with an infallible head, constituting a visible prinicpality on earth, and of the hierarchy being held by Christ to have the institution of the twelve princes of tribes and the seventy elders, who, with Moses, governed God's ancient people, in order to show that his Church is the true spiritual Israel of God. St. Paul gave authority to Timothy and Titus to constitute authorities in the churches. This hierarchy is divided into dioceses, each with a number of priests and deacons under one head, the bishop, to regulate the faith and manners of the people, and to minister to them in God's name. The hierarchy embraces the power of jurisdiction and of order, considered as a principality. The hierarchy of order was established to sanctify the Body of Christ, and is composed of all persons in orders. The hierarchy of jurisdiction was established for the government of the faithful, and to promote their eternal holiness, and is composed of prelates. The hierarchy of order by ministration of the sacraments and preaching, and the hierarchy of jurisdiction, in this case the spiritual life; the hierarchy of jurisdiction is for the promotion of exterior discipline. The hierarchy of order confers no jurisdiction, but simply power to perform ecclesiastical functions and administer sacraments, whereas the hierarchy of jurisdiction, in order to preserve the spiritual life, confers the power of making ordinances concerning the faith and ecclesiastical discipline, and to correct offenders. The principal duty of ministers of the Church is to lead men to the knowledge and worship of God, and the Church therefore requires laws and rules for the guidance of its ministers. The hierarchy of order, that is, the ministration of the Word and sacraments, appertains to all clergy according to the measure of their power; the hierarchy of jurisdiction, which is, in fact, the hierarchy, being the chief power of the Church, pertains to prelates alone, but cannot exist without the other hierarchy for the purpose of discipline. The latter can be wielded only by the former, which it presupposes, and is its foundation. In the one the clerical character or order, i.e. the ecclesiastical office, only is regarded; in the other the degree, the rank in jurisdiction of a prelate, is alone considered. Both have one origin and one object, and both flow from the clerical character; but order is the condition of jurisdiction, and jurisdiction the condition of ecclesiastical necessity, with its differences of chief bishops, prelacies, and ranks of ministers. The Protestant Episcopal Church retains the hierarchy of order, viz. bishops, priests, and deacons, together with the claim of apostolic succession and jurisdiction over all subjects; but the power of jurisdiction is divided with the laity, who are represented in the highest judicature, the General Convention, and in
Hierax or Hieraclus, an Egyptian ascetic philosopher, native of Leontus or Leontopolis, classed among the heretics of the 3d century. Epiphanius, Photius, and Peter of Sicily considered him a Manichean. He was, at all events, a perfectly original phenomenon. He distinguished for his varied learning, allegorical exegesis, poetical talent, and still more for his eccentric asceticism. He taught that, as the business of Christ on earth was to proclaim a new law, more perfect and strict than that of Moses, he prohibited the use of wine, flesh, marriage, and whatsoever was pleasing to the senses. Hierax denied the historical reality of the fall and the resurrection of the body; excluded children dying before years of discretion from the kingdom of heaven; distinguished the substance of the Son from that of the Father, taught that the Multiform Holy Ghost; obscured the sacred volume with allegorical interpretations; and maintained that paradise was only the joy and satisfaction of the mind. His followers were sometimes called Abetines, because of their scrupulously abstaining from the use of wine and certain meats. He wrote some commentaries on Scripture, and hymns, which are only known by quotations in Epiphanius. See Labride, Works, iii, 253; Mosheim, Comm. ii, 404; Neander, Church History, i, 718; Schaff, History of the Christian Church, p. 510; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxiv, 417.

Hier'moth (ἱερόμοθ), given (1 Esdr. ix, 21) as the name of one of the "sons of Emmer," who divorced their brethren wives after the Captivity; evidently the Jēmā (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra x, 21).

Hier'mōn (ἱερόμον), the name of two men in the Apocrypha.

1. A "son of Ela," who divorced his Gentile wife after the Captivity (1 Esdr. ix, 27); the Jeremmoth (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra x, 26).

2. One who did not do the same (1 Esdr. x, 30); the Rammoth (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra x, 29).

Hier'īs (ἱερίς) v. g. Iɛrǐs (ἱερίς), another of the "sons of Ela," who in like manner divorced his wife (1 Esdr. ix, 27); the Jerihel (q. v.) of Ezra x, 26.

Hier'ma'c (ἱερίμας), one of the "sons of Phoros" who did the same (1 Esdr. x, 26); the Ramiah (q. v.) of the Heb. text (Ezra x, 25).

Hierocles, governor of Bithynia, and afterwards of Alexandria (A.D. 306), is said by Lactantius (Inst. Divin. v. 2; De Mort. Pers. c. 17) to have been the principal author of the Arian or Monarchian heresy of the emperor Diocletian (A.D. 302). He also wrote two books against Christianity, entitled Λόγοι σαμαριτάων (Truth-loving Words to the Samaritans), which, like Porphyry's (q. v.) work, have been destroyed by the mistaken zeal of the later emperors, and are known to us only by the replies of Venantius of Cesarea. In these, according to Lactantius, he endeavored to show that the sacred Scriptures overthrew themselves by the contradictions with which they abound; he particularly insisted upon several texts as inconsistent with each other; and indeed so many, and so distinctly, that one might suspect he had some time professed the religion which he now attempted to expose. He chiefly reviled Paul and Peter, and the other disciples, as propagators of falsehood. He said that Christ was banished by the Jews, and after that got together 900 men, and committed robbery. He endeavored to overthrow Christ's miracles, though he did not deny the truth of them, and aimed to show that like things, or even greater, had been done by Apollonius of Tyana" (Inst. Divin. v. 3, 3). Eusebius's treatise above referred to is "Against Hierocles;" in it he reviews the Life of Apollonius written by Philostatius (published by Wiggers, with Lat. notes, by Fabricius, Bibliotheca Graeca, i, 792; Cave, Hist. Lat. anno 306; English Cyclopedia; Farrar, History of Free Thought, p. 62, 64; Neander, Ch. Hist. i, 173; Schaff, Ch. History, i, 194; Brockhaus, Enzyklop. vii, 916; Lardner, Works, vii, 207, 474, ete.

Hierocles, a Neo-Platonist of the 5th century at Alexandria. He is said to be the author of a Commentary upon the Golden Verses of Pythagoras, which is still extant; and also a Discourse on Foreknowledge and Fate, of which Photius has preserved large extracts. Stobeus has also preserved the fragments of several other works which are ascribed to Hierocles. The Greek text of the Commentary on the Golden Verses of Pythagoras was first published by Martyr of Tours, (Paris, 1551; reprinted at London, 1654; also 1742; and Padua, 1744). The fragments of the Discourse on Foreknowledge and Fate, in which Hierocles attempts to reconcile the free-will of man with the foreknowledge of God, have been edited by Morel (Paris, 1695, 1697), and by Pearson (London, 1655, 1678); the latter edited and collected the fragments of the other works of Hierocles. A complete edition of his works was published by Needham (Cambridge, 1709). Both Pearson and Needham confound this Hierocles with Hierocles, the prefect of Bithynia. The Discourse on Foreknowledge and Fate was translated into French by Regnault (Lyons, 1650). Grotius translated part of this work into Latin in his Sententiae Philosophorum de Fato (Paris, 1624; Ams. 1648; reprinted in the third volume of his theological works, 1679). The Commentary on the Golden Verses has been translated into English by Hall, London, 1657; Nott, London, 1659; Regnauer, Norw. 1747; and into French (with life) by Dacier, Paris, 1706. See English Cyclopedia, s. v.; Smith, Dictionary of Biography and Mythology, ii, 453; Augusti, Dogmengeschichte, 1 and 2; Lardner, Works, vii, 127.

Hieroglyphics (from ἱερός, sacred, and γλῶσσα, to carve), the term usually applied to the inscriptions in the so-called sacred or symbolic characters on the Egyptian monuments. See Egypt. "They were either engraved in black ink on the stone monuments, or painted in bright colors on the walls of tombs and temples, or written in hieratic in brief ligatures and hard materials suited for the glyptic art, or else traced in outline with a reed pen on papyrus, wood, slices of stone, and other objects. The scribe, indeed, wrote from a palette or canons called pens, with pens, koul, from two little ink-holes in the palette, containing a black ink of animal charcoal, and a red mineral ink. The hieroglyphics on the monuments are sometimes sculptured and plain; at others, decorated with colors, either one simple tone for all the hieroglyphs, which are then called monochrome, or else ornamented with a variety of colors, and then called polychrome; and those painted on canvas were painted with different objects; and in that are written out, and then colored in detail. On the papyri and some few inferior materials they are simply sketched in outline, and are called linear hieroglyphs. The hieroglyphics are arranged in perpendicular columns, separated by lines, or in horizontal, or diagonal manners; are separated in the direction of the figures to which they are attached. When thus arranged, the reliefs and hieroglyphs resemble a MS, every letter of which should also be an illumination, and they produce a gay and agreeable impression on the spectator. They are written very square,
the spaces are neatly and carefully packed, so as to leave no naked appearance of background.

"The invention of hieroglyphs, called Neter kharu, or 'divine words,' was attributed to the god Thoth, the Egyptian Logos, who is repeatedly called the scribe of the gods and lord of the hieroglyphs. Attributing their invention to Menes. The literature of the Egyptians was in fact called Hermaic or Hermetic, on account of its supposed divine origin, and the knowledge of hieroglyphs was, to a certain extent, a mystery to the uninitiated, although universally employed by the sacred and instructed classes. To foreign nations, the hieroglyphs always remained so, although Moses is supposed to have been versed in the knowledge of them (Philo, vita Mosis); but Joseph is described (Gen. xiii, 25) as conversing with his brethren through interpreters, and does not appear to allude to hieroglyphic writing. The Greeks, who had settled on the coast as early as the 6th century B.C., do not appear to have possessed more than a colloquial knowledge of the language (Diod. Sic. lxxxii, 3, 4); and although Solon, B.C. 538, is said to have studied Egyptian doctrines at Sebennytus and Heliopolis, and the doctrines of Pythagoras are said to have been derived from Egypt, these assertions could only have acquired their knowledge from interpretations of hieroglyphic writings. Hecataeus (B.C. 521) and Herodotus (B.C. 466), who visited Egypt in their travels, obtained from similar sources the information they have afforded of the language or monuments of the country (Herod. ii, 47; Diod. Sic., v, 69). Demetrius of Abonothus, about the same period (B.C. 450), had described both the Egyptian hieroglyphs and the Babylonian cuneiform, but his work has disappeared. After the conquest of Egypt by Alexander, the Greek rulers began to pay attention to the language and history of their subjects, and Eratosthenes, the keeper of the museum at Alexandria, and Manetho, the high-priest of Sebennytus, had drawn up accounts of the national chronology and history from hieroglyphic sources. Under the Roman empire, in the reign of Augustus, one Charemmon, the keeper of the library at the Serapeum, had drawn up a dictionary of the hieroglyphs; and both Diodorus and Strabo mention them, and describe their nature. Tacitus, later under the empire, gives the account of the monuments of Thebes translated by the Egyptian priests to Germanicus; but after his time, the knowledge of them beyond Egypt itself seems to have been limited, and does not reappear till the third and subsequent centuries A.D., when they are mentioned by Ammianus Marcellinus, who cites the translation of one of the obelisks at Rome by one Hermapias, and by Julius Valerius, the author of the apocryphal life of Alexander, who gives that of another. Herodotus, a novelist who sketched A.D. 400, described a hieroglyphic letter written by queen Candace (iv, 8). The first positive information on the subject is by Clem. of Alexandria (A.D. 211), who mentions the symbolic and phonetic, or, as he calls it, cyriologic nature of hieroglyphs (Strom. v). Porphyry (A.D. 304) divides them also into enigmatic or phonetic, and enigmatic or symbolic. Horapollo or Horus-Apollus, who is supposed to have flourished about A.D. 500, wrote two books explanatory of the hieroglyphics, a rude, ill-assorted confusion of truth and fiction, in which are given the interpretation of many hieroglyphs, and their esoteric meaning. After this writer, all knowledge of them disappeared till the revival of letters. At the beginning of the 16th century these symbols first attracted attention, and, soon after, Kircher, a learned Jesuit, pretended to interpret them by vague esoteric notions derived from his own fancy, the supposition that the hieroglyphs were ideographie, a theory which barred all progress, and was held in its full extent by the learned, till Zoega, at the close of the 18th century (De Origine Orientalorum, fol. Rom. 1717), first enunciated that the duals or cartouches contained royal names, and that the hieroglyphs, or some of them, were used to express sounds" (Chambers, Cyclopedia).
The figure following them: besides these there is nothing to mark the difference between a letter and a pictorial symbol. In some words the meaning is expressed twice; once by a phonetic combination, and again by a pictorial symbol; in others the more important part is symbolical, and the grammatical termination is spelled. Sometimes also we find a species of abbreviation; thus the word ox would be expressed by the first letter of the Coptic word signifying ox.

"But for the purpose of writing, strictly so called, there was a less ornamental and more rapid way of forming the characters, which is always found in the MSS, and which would be the natural consequence of using the pen or stylus. This is called by Strabo and Pliny hieratic writing, the hieroglyphics being, as the name imports, peculiar to sculpture. It is chiefly by means of the hieroglyphics that we are enabled to read the hieratic writing, the latter being, for the most part, an abbreviated form of the writing the former. The Rosetta stone contained the inscription in yet another set of characters, the demotic or enchiorial. It is to Dr. Young that we owe the greater part of our knowledge on this subject. He was greatly assisted by the discovery of two or three papyri written in this character with Greek transliterations, the date of which dates in the reign of Psammetichus, about B.C. 650. An alphabet has been formed from Greek proper names, from which it appears that the few words which we can decipher are Coptic. In this writing the hieroglyphics have almost wholly disappeared, though some still appear scattered here and there."

A popular account of the mode in which the Rosetta stone was used as a key for deciphering the hieroglyphics may be found in Dr. Hawkes’s Egypt and its Monuments (N. Y. 1856, 8vo), and a more critical statement in Osburn’s Monumental History of Egypt (London, 1854, 2 vols. 8vo). A complete set of the cartouches of the kings is given by Poole in his Hora Egyptiace (London, 1851, 8vo). Great progress has been made in the decipherment of these records, another stone having quite recently been discovered with a bilingual inscription (Lepsius, Das bilinge. Decret rogo. Kempten, texts and interlinear translation, etc., Berl. 1867 sq., 4to), and many papyri having been brought to light and read by European Egyptologists, among whom Wilkinson, Lepsius, Dümichen, and Brugsch may be especially named. The annexed view of the hieroglyphical alphabet is taken from Gildon’s Lectures on Egyptian History (N. Y. 1843, imp. 8vo), and will be found sufficient for deciphering most of the royal names. A brief account of the language which these characters represent may be found in Rawlinson’s Herodotus, vol. ii. A tolerably complete view of the subject and its literature is contained in Appleton’s New Americans Cyclopædia, s.v. The following are some of the latest works of importance on the subject: Sharpe, Egyptian Hieroglyphics (Lond., 1861, 8vo); Parrot, Nouvelle Traduction des Hieroglyphes (Paris, 1857, fol.); Tattam, Grammar of the Egyptian Language (London, 1865, 8vo); Brugsch, Hieroglyphisches-Demotsches Wörterbuch (of an extensive character, with a full hieroglyphical grammar, Leipzig, 1867 sq.). See Inscriptions.

Hieromax, a river of Palestine (Pliny, Hist. Nat. v. 16), the Jaroom of the Tal-mud; now Nahar Yarmuk (Edrisi and Abulfeda), or Sherkat el-Manhur (Ritter, xv, 372). The principal sources are near Mazzeh, where they form a lake of half an hour in circumference.—Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 321.

Hieronymémon (Gr. ἤιερωμώμος). I. The title in ancient history of that one of the two deputies sent by each tribe to the Amphictyonic Council who superintended the religious rites. II. An officer in the Greek Church, who, during service, stands behind the bishop, and points out to him in order the psalms, prayers, etc. He also dresses the patriarchs, and shows the priests to their places.—Pierer, viii. 968. Brande, ii. 124. (J. W. M.)

Hieron, Samuel, a clergyman of the Church of England, somewhat inclined to Puritanism, was born in 1572, was educated at King’s College, Cambridge, and was presented to the living of Modbury, Devonshire, which he held till his death in 1617. He was very eloquent as well as pious. His sermons, in two volumes, were published in 1635.—Darling, Cyclopedia. Biog. i, 1470.

Hieronymites, or Eremites of the Order of Jerome, a monkish order which was first established about 1370 by the Portuguese Vasco and the Spaniard Peter Fred. Pech, and was accredited by Gregory XI in 1374. Their dress is a white habit and a black scapulary. In Spain and the Netherlands this order became very popular, being possessed of many convents; Charles V belonged to this order after his abdication. They spread also into the West Indies and Spanish America. At present they exist only in the latter country. Besides
these, there exists also another order by the same name, with, however, but few members, founded by Peter Gam- bacorti, of Pisa, about 1380.—Helyot, Ord. Monast. ed. Migne, iii, 568; Brockhaus, Encyclop. viii, 916. (J.H.W.)

Hieronymus (Ἱερώνυμος, sacred in name, Vulg. Hieronymus), a Syrian general in the time of Antiochus V. Eupator (2 Mac. xii, 9). The name is made distinguishing honor among the Asiatic Greeks by Hieronymus of Cardia, the historian of Alexander's successors.—Smith.

Hieronymus. See Jerome, St.

Hierophant or Mystagōgus (Γ. ἱεροφάντης, σωτηρικός). I. The high-priest of Demeter who conducted the celebration of the Eleusinian Mysteries and initiated the candidates, being always one of the Eumolpidæ, and a citizen of Athens. The office was for life, and regarded of high religious importance, and the hierophant was required to be of mature age, to be without physical defects, to possess a fine, sonorous voice suited to the character and dignity of the office, and was forbidden to marry, though that prohibition may have been only to contracting marriage after his in- stallation. He was distinguished by a peculiar cut of his hair, by the strophion, a sort of diadem, and by a long purple robe. In the Mysteries he represented the Demiurge or World-creator, was the only authorized custodian of the secrets of the mysteries, (hence also styled ἱεροφάντης), and the utterance of his name in the presence of the initiated was forbidden. II. The name is also given in the Greek Church to the prior of a monastery.—Chambers, s. v.; Pierer, viii, 570; Smith, Dict. of Grk. and Rom. Antiq. s. v. Eumolpidæ; Brande, Dict. iii, 125. See also HIERONYMUS.

Hieronymus, J. W. M.

Higden, Ranulph or Ralph, an English writer of the 14th century, was a Benedictine monk of the monastery of St. Werberg, in Cheshire, who died at a very advanced age in 1367 according to Bale, or in 1375 according to Pits. His Polychronicon, a chronicle of events from the Creation to A.D. 1337, was written originally in Latin, and translated into English in 1387 by John of Trevisa. From this translation Caxton made his version, and, continuing in an eighth book the Chronicle to 1460, published the whole under the title of The Polychronicon, containing the Historie and Doles of all Fyft and Sixth Books, etc. (Caxon.) Trevis- a's translation "contains many rare words and expressions, and is one of the earliest specimens of English prose." The first volume of a new edition (containing also a translation by an unknown writer of the 16th century), edited by C. Babinson, B.D., appeared in 1855. The Polychronicon is frequently cited by Eng- lish historians. Bale published the part relating to the Britons and Saxons in his Scriptores Quindecinem, etc. (Oxford, 1691). Some have assigned the authorship of the Chester Mysteries (1882) to Higden, but on doubtful grounds. Bale, Illust. Maij. Brit. Scriptum, s. v., Pits De illust. Ang. Script., Hoefer, Nov. Bibl. Générale, xxiv, 656; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. vi, 83; Westminster Review, July, 1865, p. 128. (J. W. M.)

Higgain (Heb. הִגְגַיָּן, ἡγών) occurs in Ps. xxi, 8, where, according to Gesenius, it signifies the

murmuring (Furst, low or solemn) tone of the harp, Sept. μῦτρα ὑγιάν κατὰ παθήσειν. In Psa. ixx, 17, Higgain Selah is a musical sign, prob. for a pause in the instrumental interlude, Sept. μῦτρα διὰ φαλάγματος; and so Symm. Aquil. and Vulg. See SELAH. In Psa. xix, 16 the term signifies the meditative, in medit. in the Psalms, the voice. "Mendelssohn translates it meditation, thought, idea. Knapp (Die Psalmen) identifies it in Psa. ix, 17 with the Arabic خليل, 'to mock,' and hence his rendering 'What a shout of laughter!' (because the wicked are entrapped in their own snares); but in Psa. xxii, 4 he translates it by 'Lieder' (songs). K. David Kimchi likewise divides it into two separate parts, in Lam. 2: 14, 15 he renders it to the word; on Psa. ix, 17, he says, 'This aid is for us (a subject of) meditation and thankfulness,' while in his comment on the passage, Psa. xxi, 4, he gives it to the same word the signification of melody. 'This is the melody of the hymn when it is recited (played) on the harp. 'We will meditate on this forever' (Rashi, Com- ment. on Psa. ix, 17). In Psa. ix, 17, Aben Ezra's comment on 'Higgain Selah' is, 'this will I record in truth;' on Psa. xxii, 4 he says, 'Higgain means the melody of the hymn, or it is the name of a musical instru- ment. We will meditate on them, then, that we may not be ashamed.' Selah's meanings, one of a general character implying thought, reflection, from ד novità, comp. בּוֹדֵי, Psa. ixx, 17, and דֶּרְשָׁא (Lam. iii, 62), and another in Psa. ix, 17, and Psa. xxii, 4, of a technical nature, bearing on the import of musical sounds or signs well known in the age of David, but the precise meaning of which cannot at this distance of time be determined." See Psalms.

Higginson, Solomon, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Maryland in January, 1799. In his twenty- second year he began to preach, but failing health compelled him to quit the ministry, and for several years he was employed as a clerk in Philadelphia. In 1821 he resumed his pastoral connections, and the remainder of his life was spent in the service of the Church as past- or and as Sunday-school agent. He was several times stationed in Philadelphia, and was a member of the General Conferences of 1828, 1832, 1836, and 1840. He died Feb. 12, 1867.—Minutes of Conferences, 1867, p. 24.

Higginson, Francis, a Congregational minister and first pastor of Salem, Mass., was born in England in 1687, graduated at Emanuel College, Cambridge, and served as a minister of a church in Massachusetts. After some time he became a nonconformist, and was excluded from the parish church. In 1629 he received letters from the governor and company of Massachusetts invit- ing him to proceed with them to New England. He accordingly sailed, and on his arrival at Salem he was appointed pastor of the church. He died of hectic fever in August, 1630. He wrote New England's Plantation, or a short and true Description of the Commodities and Dis- commodities of that Country (London, 1630, 4to). See Allen, Am. Biog. Dictionary; Sprague, Annals, i, 6.

Higginson, John, son of the preceding, was born in England in August, 1626, came to Massachusetts with his father in 1629. In 1636 he removed to Con- necticut, engaging in teaching and in theological stud- ies. From 1659 until his death in 1708 he was minister of the church at Salem, Mass. He was zealously en- gaged in controversy with the Quakers, but subsequ- ently regretted his ardor in persecution. He published several sermons and pamphlets. See Sprague, Annals, i, 91.

High-Churchmen, a name first given (circa 1700) to the nonjurors in England who refused to acknowl- edge William III as their lawful king. It is now usu- ally applied to those in the Church of England and in the American Protestant Episcopal Church who hold exalted notions of Church prerogatives, and of the powers committed to the clergy, and who lay much stress upon ritual observances and the traditions of the fa-
HIGH COMMISSION

there. See Walcott, Sacred Archeology, p. 312; Hurst, Hist. Rationalism, p. 512 sq.; Kurtz, Ch. History, ii, 339; Baxter, Ch. Hist., ii, 549; Skelton, Hist. of Free Churches, p. 288, 317, 318, 343; Rose, Hist. Ch. Ch. p. 287; Eden, Theol. Dictionary; and articles ENGLAND, CHURCH OF; and PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL CHURCH.

HIGH COMMISSION, Court of, a court established in England in 1559 to take cognizance of spiritual or ecclesiastical offences, and to inflict spiritual penalties for the same. The Puritans complaining loudly of the jurisdiction of this court, a bill passed for putting down both it and the Star-Chamber in the year 1641.—Neal, Hist. of Puritans, i, 89 sq.

HIGH MASS. The Mass in the Church of Rome consists in the “consecration of the bread and wine ‘into the body and blood of Christ,’ as they say, and the offering up of the same body and blood to God by the minis-
tery of the priest for a perpetual memorial of Christ’s sacrifice upon the cross, and a continuation of the same unto the world’s end.” HIGH MASS is the same service, accompanied by all the ceremonies which custom and authority have annexed to its celebration, and read before Sundays, fast-days, and particular occasions. See Mass.

HIGH PLACE (אהל, baḥē; often in the plural, āḥel): Sept. in the historical books, וֶהָלָה, וֶהָלָהָ; in the Prophets, בֵּיתוֹ; in the Pentateuch, שֵׁלִית, Lev. xxvi, 30, etc.; and once around, Ezek. xvii, 16; Vulg. erexit, fissa often occurs in connection with the term grove. By “high places” we understand natural or artificial (הַרְכָּס, 1 Kings xiii, 22; 2 Kings xiv, 29; comp. 1 Kings xi, 7; 2 Kings xxiii, 10) emi-
ences where worship by sacrifice or offering was made, usually upon an altar erected thereon; and by a “grove” we understand a planting of trees around a spot in the open air set apart for worship and other sacred services, and therefore around or upon the “high places” which were set apart for the same purposes. See Grove.

We find the use of these cures so soon after the delu-
tage that it is probable they existed prior to that event. It appears that the first altar after the deluge was built by Noah upon the mountain on which the ark rested (Gen. viii, 20). Abraham, on entering the Promised Land, built an altar upon a mountain between Bethel and Ephraim (Gen. xii, 7), and called there upon the name of the everlasting God (Gen. xxv, 3). The same patriarch was required to travel to the Mount Moriah, and there to offer up his son Isaac (xxvii, 2, 4). It was upon a mountain in Gil-

The external religion of the patriarchs was in some
outward observances different from that subsequently established by the Mosaic law, and therefore they should not be condemned for actions which afterwards became sinful because they were forbidden (Heidegger, Hist. Patr. ii, ii, 5 sq.). It is, however, quite obvious that if every grove and eminence had been suffered to

HILL. The injunctions, however, respecting the high places and groves were very imperfectly obeyed by the Israel-
ites; and their inordinate attachment to this mode of worship was such that even pious kings, who opposed idolatry by all the means in their power, dared not abol-

HIGH PLACE

become a place for legitimate worship, especially in a
country where they had already been defiled with the sins of polytheism, the utmost danger would have re-
sulted to the pure worship of the one true God (Havern-

ick, Einl. i, 592). It would infallibly have led to the adop-
tion of nature-goddesses and “gods of the hills” (1 Kings xx, 25, 26; 2 Kings iv, 25, 26; xiii, 16-23), and it is quite clear from the tone of the book of Judges that the law on the subject was either totally forgotten or prac-
tically obsolete. Nor could the unsettled state of the country have been put as an excuse for the ordinary to have been most fully understood, even during the life of Joshua, that burnt-offerings could be legally of-

The injunctio
feted on one altar only (Josh. xxiii, 29). It is more surprising to find this law absolutely ignored at a much later period, when there was no intelligible reason for its violation—as by Samuel at Mizpeh (1 Sam. vii, 10) and at Bethelthem (xvi, 5); by Saul at Gilgal (xiii, 9) and at Ajalon (7 xiv, 35); by David at the threshing floor of Ornan (1 Chron. ii, 26); and by David on Mount Carmel (1 Kings xvii, 30); and by other prophets (1 Sam. x, 5). It will, however, be observed that in these cases the parties either acted under an immediate command from God, or were invested with a general commission to offer sacrifice with reference to such transactions. It has also been suggested that greater latitude was allowed in this point before the erection of the Temple gave to the ritual principles of the ceremonial law a fixity which they had not previously possessed. This is possible, for it is certain that all the authorized examples occur before it was built, excepting that of Elijah; and that occurred under circumstances in which the sacrifices could not possibly have taken place at Jerusalem, and in a kingdom where no authorized altar to Jehovah then existed. The Rabbins have invented elaborate methods to account for the anomaly: thus they say there were two separate altars until the building of the tabernacle; that they were then illegal until the arrival of Gilgal, and then during the period while the tabernacle was at Shiloh; that they were once more permitted while it was at Nob and Gibeon (compare 2 Chron. i, 9), until the building of the Temple at Jerusalem (8, ii. 3); and that the altar at Shiloh was at length suppressed (Abarbanel, etc., quoted in Carpzov, App. Crit. p. 383 sq.; Reland, Ant. Heb., i, 8 sq.). Others content themselves with saying that until Solomon's time all Palestine was considered holy ground, or that there had existed a recognized exemption in favor of high places, private or public, sanctioned by the people, and spontaneous, though not for the stated and public sacrifices. Such explanations are sufficiently unsatisfactory; but it is at any rate certain that, whether from the obvious temptations to disobedience, or from the example of other nations, or from the ignorance of any definite law against it, the worship in high places was organized and all but universal throughout Judea, not only during (1 Kings iii, 2-4), but even after the time of Solomon. The convenience of the temple was evident, because, as local centres of religious worship, they obeyed the unpleasant and dangerous necessity of visiting Jerusalem for the celebration of the yearly feasts (2 Kings xxviii, 9). The tendency was engrained in the national mind; and, although it was severely repressed by the later historians, we have no proof that it was known to be sinful during the earlier periods of the monarchy, except, of course, of those which were directly connected with idolatrous abominations (1 Kings xi, 7; 2 Kings xxiii, 13). In fact, the high places seem to have supplied the need of synagogues (Psa. lxxiv, 8), and have obeyed the extreme self-denial involved in having but one legalized locality for the highest forms of worship. Thus we find that Jehoaba established a definite worship at the high places, with its own peculiar and separate priesthood (2 Chron. xi, 15; 2 Kings xxiii, 9), the members of which were still considered to be priests of Jehovah (although in 2 Kings xxiii, 5 they are called by the opprobrious term ἐπάργυρος). It was therefore no wonder that Jeroboam found it so easy to seduce the people into his symbolic worship at the high places of Dan and Bethel, at each of which he built a calf and set up altars. Such chapels were, of course, frequently added to the mere altars on the hills, as appears from the expressions in 1 Kings xi, 7; 2 Kings xxii, 9, etc. Indeed, the word ἐπάργυρος became so common that it was used for any idolatrous shrine even in a valley (Jer. vii, 31), or in the streets of cities (2 Kings xvii, 9; Ezek. xvi, 31). These chapels were probably not structures of stone, but mere enclosures hung with colored tassels (Ezek. xvi, 16; Aqu. Theod. ἤμβαλενα; see Jer. ad loc.; Sept. δέωνων ματάτων), like the σκεφν ιεροί of the Carthaginians (Diol. Sic. xx, 65; Creuzer, Symbol. v, 176), and like those mentioned in 2 Kings xxiii, 7; Amos v, 26. Many of the pious kings of Judah were either too weak or too ill-informed to repress the worship of Jehovah at these local sanctuaries, while they of course endeavored to provide a very severe punishment to those who profaned the high places. It is therefore appended as a matter of blame or a (perhaps venial) drawback to the character of some of the most pious princes, that they tolerated this disobedience to the provisions of Deuteronomy and Leviticus. On the other hand, it is mentioned as an aggravation of the sin of the people in the second coming of the Messiah (compare the places (2 Chron. xxii, 11; xxviii, 25), which are generally said to have been dedicated to idolatrous purposes. It is almost inconceivable that so direct a violation of the theocratic principle as the public existence of false worship should have been tolerated by kings of even ordinary piety, much less by the highest religious authorities (2 Kings xii, 3). When, therefore, we find the recurring phrase, "Only the high places were not taken away; as the people did sacrifice and burn incense on the high places" (2 Kings xiv, 4; xv, 5, 55; 2 Chron. xiv, 17, etc.), we are forced to limit it (as above) to private and not to public altars. However, it is made more difficult by a seeming discrepancy, for the assertion that Asa "took away the high places" (2 Chron. xiv, 3) is opposite to what is stated in the first book of Kings (xxv, 14), and a similar discrepancy is found in 2 Chron. xiv, 13 (xxv, 17; xx, 33). Moreover, in both instances the chronicle is apparently at issue with himself (xiv, 3; xv, 17; xvii, 6; xx, 33). It is incredible that this should have been the result of carelessness or oversight, and we must therefore suppose, either that the earlier notices express the presence of altars of private or public use, of which the latter ones recorded their failure in the attempt (Ewald, Gesch. iii, 468; Keil, Apolog. Versuch. p. 290), or that the statements refer respectively to Banomoth dedicated to Jehovah and to idols (Michaelis, Schulz, Bertheau on 2 Chron. xvii, 6, etc.). "Those devoted to false gods were removed, those misdoubted to the true God were suffered to remain. The kings opposed impiety, but winked at error" (bishop Hall). At last Hezekiah set himself in good earnest to the suppression of this prevalent corruption (2 Kings xviii, 4, 22), both in Judah and Israel (2 Chron. xxix, 1); and he ordered the destruction of all the evil, that even his sweeping reformation required to be finally consummated by Josiah (2 Kings xxiii), and that, too, in Jerusalem and its immediate neighborhood (2 Chron. xxxiv, 3). The measure must have been attended with the destruction of a large number of people, and we have a curious and almost unnoticed trace of this resentment in the fact that Rabshakeh appeals to the discontented faction, and represents Hezekiah as a dangerous innovator who had provoked God's anger by his arbitrary impiety (2 Kings xxii, 21; 2 Chron. xxxii, 13). After the time of Josiah we find no further mention of these Jehovistic high places. As long as the nations continued to worship the heavenly bodies themselves, they worshipped in the open air, holding that no walls could contain infinitude. Afterward the symbol of fire or of the altar brought in the use of temples, they were usually built in groves and upon high places, and sometimes without roofs. The principle on which high places were preferred is said to have been that they were nearer to the gods, and that on them the priests was more apt to receive the prayers of the valley (Lucian, De S. sacr. iii, 4). See Hill. The ancient writers abound in allusions to this worship of the gods upon the hill-tops; and some of their divinities took their distinctive names from the hill on which their principal seat of worship stood, such as Mercurius Cyllenius, Venus Erycina, Jupiter Capitolinus, etc. (especially Sophocles, Trachin. 1297, 1298; Appian, De Bel. Mithrid. § 131; compare Creuzer, Symbol. i, 150).
We find that the Trojans sacrificed to Zeus on Mount Ida (Hesiod, i. 171), and we are repeatedly told that such was the custom of the Persians, Greeks, Germans, etc. (Herod. i. 131; Xen. Cyrop. vii. 7; Mem. iii. 8, § 10; Strabo, xvi. 732). To this general custom we find constant allusion in the Bible (Isa. lxv. 7; Jer. iii. 6; Ezek. vi. 13; xviii. 6; Hos. iv. 13), and it is especially attributed to the Moabites (Isa. xx. 2; xvi. 12; Jer. xlviii. 13). Evident traces of a similar usage are depicted on the Assyrian monuments. The groves which ancient usage had established around the places of sacrifice for the sake of shade and seclusion, idolatry preserved, not only for the same reasons, but because they were found convenient for the celebration of the rites and mysteries, often obscene and abominable, which were gradually superadded. According to Pliny (book xii), trees were also consecrated to particular divinities, as the eucalyptus to Jove, the laurel to Apollo, the olive to Minerva, the myrtle to Venus, the poplar to Hercules. It was also believed that as the heavens have their proper and peculiar deities, so also the woods have theirs, being the Fauns, the Sylveys, and certain goddesses. To this it may be added that groves were enjoined by the Roman law of the Twelve Tables as part of the public religion. Plutarch (Vener. i. 61) calls such groves áγαθα ἄγαλμα, "groves of the gods," which he says Numa frequented, and thereby gave rise to the story of his intercourse with the goddess Egeria. In fact, a degree of worship was, as Pliny states, transferred to the trees themselves. They were sometimes decked with ribbons and rich cloths, lamps were placed on them, the spoils of enemies were hung from them, vows were paid to them, and their branches were encumbered with votive offerings. Traces of this arborality still exist everywhere, both in Moslem and Christian countries; and even the Persians, who abhorred images as much as the Hebrews ever did, rendered homage to certain trees.

The story is well known of the noble plane-tree near Sardis, before which Xerxes halted his army a whole day while he rendered homage to it, and hung royal offerings upon its branches (Herod. vi. 31). There is much curious literature connected with this subject which we leave untouched, but the reader may consult Sir W. M. Thesiger's learned dissertation on Sacred Trees, appended to the first volume of his Travels in the East. See IDOLATRY.

Mr. Paine remarks (Solomon's Temple, etc., Bost. 1861, p. 21), "the 'high place,' מִשְׁרַד, mound, was small enough to be made and built to every street, at the head of every street (Ezek. xxiv. 24, 25), in all their cities (2 Kings xvii. 9), and upon every high hill, and under every green tree (1 Kings xiv. 25). It could be torn to pieces, by a single small as dust, and burnt up (2 Kings xxiii. 15). Thus it often was of combustible materials. But these mounds, with their altars, were built in the streets, where people could assemble around them. When on the hills out of the city they lasted many years; for the mounds built by Solomon on the right hand or south side of the Mount of Destruction before the captivity (Jer. xxvii. 7), which were destroyed by Josiah (2 Kings xxiii. 13, 14; 1 Kings xi. 7), nearly four hundred years after they were built. But mounds of earth no larger than Indian-corn or potato-hills will last a great number of years, and those sometimes larger for centuries (compare the Indian mounds in the West). That the mounds destroyed by Josiah had lasted so many centuries is a proof that they were not wholly of wood; that they could be burnt is a proof that they were not wholly of stone; that they could be beaten to dust indicates that they were made of anything that came readiest to hand, as earth, soil, etc. For the houses of the mounds, or high places, in which were images of their gods, see 2 Kings xvii. 29; priests of these places of worship, 1 Kings xi. 32; xii. 32; 2 Kings xvii. 32, xxiii. 3, 20; beds for fornication and adultery, in the tents about the mounds, Isa. vii. 3-7; Ezek. xvi. 16, 25, etc. Some of these houses were tents, for women wove them (2 Kings xxviii. 7). The people—men, women, children, and priests—assembled in groves, on hills and mountains, or in the streets of their cities: threw up a mound, on which they built their altar; set up the wooden idol [Asherah] before the altar; pitched their tents around it under the trees; sacrificed their sons and daughters, sometimes on the altar (Ezek. xvi. 20), and committed fornication and adultery in the tents, where also they had the images of their gods."

**Representation of an idolatrous "High Place," with its "Grove," altar, and worshippers.** (From Paine's Temple of Solomon.)

**High-priest (יִשַׁבְתָּן, koh-kohen), the ordinary word for "priest," with the article, i. e. "the priest," and in the books subsequent to the Pentateuch with the frequent addition הָגַם, the great, and הָאִדָם, 'the head.'**

Lev. xxi, 10 seems to exhibit the epithet הָגַם as **imprin-**
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invention of the Rabbis. The anointing of the high-priest is alluded to in Ps. cxxxiii, 2, "It is like the precious ointment upon the head, that ran down upon the beard, even Aaron's beard, that went down to the skirts of his garments." The composition of this anointing oil, consisting of myrrh, cinnamon, calamus, cassaia, and other spices, is described in Exod. xxx. 34. It was used for any other purpose but that of anointing the priests, the tabernacle, and the vessels, was strictly prohibited, on pain of being "cut off from his people." The manufacture of it was intrusted to certain priests, called apothecaries (Neh. iii, 8). But this oil is said to have been sanctified to the second Temple by the Pristaeus, i.e., 151; Selden, cap. ix). See ANOINTING OIL.

2. The high-priest had a peculiar dress, which, as we have seen, passed to his successor at his death. This dress consisted of eight parts, as the Rabbis constantly note, the breastplate, the ephod with its curious girdle, the robe of the ephod, the mitre, the breasted coat or diapler tunic, and the girdle, the materials being gold, blue, red, crimson, and fine (white) linen (Exod. xxviii.). To the above are added, in ver. 42, the breeches or drawers (Lev. vii, 11) of linen; and to make up the number eight, some reckon the high-priest's mitre, or the plate (יָכִית) separately from the bonnet; while others reckon the curious girdle of the ephod separately from the ephod itself. In ver. 12, there is a peculiar arrangement of the putting on of these garments by Aaron, and the whole ceremony of his consecration and that of his sons. It there appears distinctly that, besides the girdle common to all the priests, the high-priest also wore the curious girdle of the ephod. Of these eight articles of attire, viz., the coat or tunic, the girdle, the breeches, and the bonnet or turban, קָנָּרַת, instead of the mitre, קְנָּרַת (Josephus, however, whom Bihur follows, calls the bonnets of the priests by the name of קְנָּרַת. See below), belonged to the common priests. It is well known how, in the Assyrian sculptures, the king is in like manner distinguished by the shape of his head-dress; and how in Persia none but the king wore the cedars, or erect tiara. Bihur connect also the spicery of the flamen Dialis. Josephus speaks of the robes (ינָּרָּת) of the chief priests, and the tunic and girdles of the priests, as forming part of the spoil of the Temple (War, vi, 8, 3). Aaron, and at his death Eleazar (Numb. xx, 26, 28), and their successors in the high-priesthood, were sung, i.e., invested into their office by being clad in these eight articles of dress on seven successive days. From the time of the second Temple, when the sacred oil (said to have been hid by Josiah, and lost) was wanting, this putting on of the garments was deemed the official investiture of the office. Hence the robes, which had used to be kept in one of the chambers of the Temple, and were by Hyrcanus deposited in the Baris, which he built on purpose, were kept by Herod in the same tower, which he called Antonia, so that they might be at his absolute disposal. The Romans did the same till the government of Vitellius, in the reign of Tiberius, when the ceremony of the robe was restored to the Jews (Ant. xxv., 11, 4; xxvi., 4, 8). Taking the articles of the high-priest's dress in the order in which they would naturally be put on, we have

(1) The "breeches" or "drawers, קָנָּרַת, milnesinim", of linen, covering the loins and thighs, for purposes of modesty, as all the upper garments were loose and flowing.

(2) The inner "coat," קָנָּרַת, kutto'neth, was a tunic or long shirt of linen, with a tesselated or diaper pattern, like the setting of a stone (קָנָּרַת, tashkhet), "broi-
The Linen "Breeches" of the Priest.

The subjoined cut (also from Braun, p. 376) will illustrate its probable form (not different from that of the ordinary Oriental under-garment), with its sleeves and mode of fastening around the neck. See Coat.

"Brodered Coat" of Linen worn by the Priest.

(3.) The girdle, שֵׁרָן, שֵׁרָן, also of linen, was wound round the body several times from the breast downwards, and the ends hung down to the ankles. Its form and mode of wearing may be illustrated by the subjoined cuts (from Braun, p. 404). See GIRDLE.

(4.) The "robe," שֵׁרָן, שֵׁרָן, of the ephod. This was of inferior material to the ephod itself, being all of blue (ver. 31), which implied its being only of "woven work" (אֶתְנָו שֵׁרָן,.xxxix, 22). It was worn immediately under the ephod, and was longer than it, though not so long as the brodered coat or tunic (פַּרְפָּר שֵׁרָן, פַּרְפָּר,xxxix, 22). According to most statements (Bähr, Winer, Kalisch, etc.), nor do the Sept. explanation of שֵׁרָן, שֵׁרָן, and Josephus's description of it (War, v, 5, 7), seem to outweigh the reasons given by Bähr for thinking that the robe only came down to the knees, for it is highly improbable that the robe should thus have swept the ground. Neither does it seem likely that the sleeves of the tunic, of white diaper linen, were the only parts of it which were visible, in the case of the high-priest, when he wore the blue robe over it; for the blue robe had no sleeves, but only slits in the sides for the arms to come through. It had a hole for the head to pass through, with a border round it of woven work, to prevent its being rent. The skirt of this robe had a remarkable trimming of pomegranates in blue, red, and crimson, with a bell of gold between each pomegranate alternately. The bells were to give a sound when the high-priest went in and came out of the Holy Place. Josephus, in the Antiquities, gives no explanation of the use of the bells, but merely speaks of the studied beauty of their appearance. In his Jewish War, however, he tells us that the bells signified thunder, and the pomegranates lightning. For Philo's very curious observations, see Lightfoot's Works, ix, 25. Neither does the son of Sirach very distinctly explain it (Ecclus. xlv), who, in his description of the high-priest's attire, seems chiefly impressed with its beauty and magnificence, and says of this trimming,
"He compassed him with pomegranates and with many golden bells round about, that as he went there might be a sound, and a noise made that might be heard in the Temple, for a memorial to the children of his people." Perhaps, however, he means to intimate that the use of the bells was to give notice to the people outside when the high-priest went in and came out of the sanctuary, as Whiston, Vatablus, and many others have supposed. See ROME.

(5.) The ephod, ἔφοιδα (5 En), consisted of two parts, of which one covered the back, and the other the front, i.e., the breast and upper part of the body, like the ἐσωτικα of the Greeks (see Smith, Dict. of Antiquities, s.v. Tunica). These were clasped together on the shoulder with two large onyx stones, each having engraved on it six of the names of the tribes of Israel. It was further united by a "curious girdle" of gold, blue, purple, scarlet, and fine twined linen round the waist. Upon it was placed the breastplate of judgment, which in fact was a part of the ephod, being included in the term in such passages as 1 Sam. ii, 28; xiv, 3; xxiii, 9; and was fastened to it just above the curious girdle of the ephod. Linen ephods were also worn by other priests (1 Sam. xxii, 18), by Samuel, who was only a Levite (1 Sam. ii, 18), and by David when bringing up the ark (2 Sam. vi, 14). The expression for wearing an ephod is "girded with a linen ephod." The ephod was also frequently used in the idolatrous worship of the Israelites (see Judg. viii, 27; xvii, 5, etc.). See Ephod.

(6.) The breastplate, χειρήμα, chō'šen, or, as it is further named, verses 15, 29, 30, the breastplate of judgment, χειρήμα τῶν κρίσεων (or τῆς κρίσεως) in the Sept., only in ver. 4 πιστολήμαν. It was, like the inner curtains of the tabernacle, the vail, and the ephod, of "cunning work," ἀρχὴν συμβρατέων (Vulg. opus plumarius and arte plumariae). See Embroider. The breastplate was originally two spans long and one span broad, but when doubled it was square, the shape in which it

The High-priest's Breastplate. (From Braun, De Vestitu Sacrum. Hebreorum, p. 458-8.)

1. The χειρήμα, chō'shen (lit. ornament), or pectoral gorget itself, with its four rings, κολλάθαι' (lit. seals or signets), constituting the inside, a, when put on, being then folded down backward under.

2. The plate of twelve gems, set in gold, e, attached to the linen backing at the upper edge; with its two gold wreathen chains, δ, δορυφόρα περιηγήματα (chains of corde), to hook its upper corners to the shoulder-claws of the ephod, as at f, fig. 2; e, two hyacinth-colored ribbons at-
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tached to the lower corners of the plate for passing through the other two rings of the lid, and then tying to the hip-rings of the ephod, as at g, fig. 3. 2. (Deut. xxiii, 13), with the breastplate inserted, and the two straps, constituting the girdle, דַּקָּרָה, ches'abeh (left), of the ephod.

was worn. It was fastened at the top rings and by chains of weathen gold to the two onyx stones on the shoulders, and beneath with two other rings and a lace of blue to two corresponding rings in the ephod, to keep it fixed in its place, above the curious girdle. But the most remarkable and most important part of this breastplate were the twelve precious stones in four rows, three in a row, thus corresponding to the twelve tribes, and divided in the same manner as their camps were, each stone having the name of one of the children of Israel engraved upon it. Whether the order followed the ages of the sons of Israel, or, as seems most probable, the order of the encampment, may be doubted; but, unless some appropriate distinct symbolism of the different tribes be found in the names of the precious stones, the question can scarcely be decided. According to the Sept. and Josephus, and in accordance with the language of Scripture, it was the twelve stones which constituted the Urim and Thummim, nor does the notion advocated by Gesenius after Spencer and others, that these names designated two little images placed between the folds of the breastplate, seem to rest on any sufficient ground, in spite of the Egyptian analogy brought to bear upon it. For an account of the image of Thmei worn by the Egyptian judge and priest, see Mielich's note on Exod. xxviii.; Hengstenberg's Egypt and the Books of Moses; Wilkinson's Egyptians, ii, 27, etc.) Josephus's opinion, on the other hand, improved upon by the rabbins, as to the manner in which the stones gave out the oracular answer, by preternatural illumination, appears equally destitute of probability. It seems far simpler, and most in agreement with the different accounts of inquiries made by Urim and Thummim (1 Sam. xiv, 3, 18; xxviii., 2, 4, 9, 11, 12; xxviii.; 6; Judg. xx, 39; 2 Sam. v, 23, etc.), to suppose that the answer was given simply by the word of the Lord to the high-priest (comp. John xi, 51), when he had inquired of the Lord, clothed with the ephod and breastplate. Such a view agrees with the true notion of the breastplate, of which it was not the leading characteristic to be oracular (as the term λευκός supposes, and as is by many thought to be indicated by the descriptive addition "of judgment," i.e. as they understand it, "decision"), but only an incidental privilege connected with its fundamental meaning. What that meaning was we learn from Exod. xxviii., 30, where we read, "Aaron shall bear the judgment of the children of Israel upon his heart before the Lord continually." Now לַעֲדֵיהוּ is the judicial sentence by which any one is either justified or condemned. In prophetical vision, as in actual Oriental life, the sentence of justification was often expressed by the nature of the robe worn. "He hath clothed me with the garments of salvation, he hath covered me with the robe of righteousness, as a bridegroom decketh himself with ornaments, and as a bride adorneth herself with her jewels" (Isa. lxi, 10), is a good illustration of this: comp. lxi, 3. In like manner, in Rev. iii, 5; vii, 9; xix, 14, etc., the white linen robe expresses the righteousness or justification of saints. Something of the same notion may be seen in Esth. vii, 8, 9, and on the contrary ver. 12. The addition of precious stones and costly ornaments expresses glory beyond simple justification. So, in Isr. i, 22, 3—"Thou shalt be a crown of glory in the hand of the Lord, and a royal diadem in the hand of thy God." Exactly the same symbolism of glory is assigned to the precious stones in the description of the ephod in Jerusalem (Rev. xxi, 11, 12-21), a passage which ties together with singular force the arrangement of the tribes in their camps and that of the precious stones in the breastplate. But, moreover, the high-priest being a representative personage, the fortunes of the whole people would most properly be indicated in his person. A striking instance of this, in connection, too, with symbolical dress, is to be found in Zech. iii: "Now Joshua (the high-priest, ver. 1) was clothed with filthy garments and stood before the angel. And he answered and spake unto those that stood before him, saying, Take away the filthy garments from him. And unto him he said, Behold, I have caused thine iniquity to pass from thee, and I will clothe thee with change of raiment. And I said, Let them set a fair mitre (יִשָּׁרֶת) upon his head. So they set a fair mitre upon his head, and clothed him with garments." Here the priest's garments, יִשָּׁרֶת, and the mitre, expresses typify the restored righteousness of the nation. Hence it seems to be sufficiently obvious that the breastplate of righteousness or judgment, resplendent with the same precious stones which symbolize the glory of the New Jerusalem, and on which were engraved the names of the twelve tribes, worn by the high-priest, who was then said to bear the judgment of the children of Israel upon his heart, was intended to express by symbols the acceptance of Israel grounded upon the sacrificial functions of the high-priest. The sense of the symbol is thus nearly identical with such passages as Num. xxiii, 21, and the meaning of the Urim and Thummim is explained by such expressions as יִשָּׁרֶת, יִשָּׁרֶת, and "Arise, shine; for thy light is come" (Isa. lx, 1). Thummim expresses alike complete prosperity and complete innocence, and so falls in exactly with the double notion of light (Isa. lx, 1; lxii, 1, 2). The privilege of receiving an answer from God bears the same relation to the general state of Israel symbolized by the priest's dress that the promise in Isa. liv, 18, "All thy children shall be taught of the Lord," does to the preceding description, "I will lay thy stones with fair colors, and lay thy foundations with sapphires, and I will make thy windows of agate, and thy gates of carbuncles, and all thy borders of pleasant stones," ver. 11, 12; comp. also ver. 14 and 17 (Heb.). It is obvious to draw how entirely this view accords with the blessing of Levi in Deut. xxiii, 8, where Levi is called God's holy one, and God's Thummim and Urim are said to be given to him, because he came out of the trial so clear in his integrity. (See also Bar. v, 2.) See BREAESTPLATE.

(7.) The "bonnet," מַשְׁפָּחִי, mishpakh, was a turban of linen covering the head, but not in the particular form which that of the high-priest assumed when the mitre was added to it. See BONNET.

(8.) The last article peculiar to the high-priest is the mitre, מַשְׁפָּחִי, mishpakh, or upper turban, with its
in the vail (Lev. xvi). He is said by the Talmudists, with whom agree Lightfoot, Selden, Grocius, Winer, Bähr, and many others, not to have worn his full pontifical robes on the occasion, but to have been clad entirely in white linen (Lev. xvi, 4, 32). It is singular, however, that, on the other hand, Josephus says that the great fast-day was the chief; if not the only day in the year when the high-priest wore all his robes (War, v, 5, 7), and, in spite of the alleged impropriety of his wearing his splendid apparel on a day of humiliation, it seems far more probable that on the one occasion when he performed functions peculiar to the high-priest he should have worn his full dress. Josephus, too, could not have been mistaken as to the fact, which he repeats (cont. Ap. ii, 7), where he says the high-priests alone might enter into the Holy of Holies, "propria stola circumambiti." For although Selden, who strenuously supports the Rabbinical statement that the high-priest only wore the four linen garments when he entered the Holy of Holies, endeavors to make Josephus say the same thing, it is impossible to twist his words into this meaning. It is true, on the other hand, that Lev. xvi distinctively prescribes that Aaron should wear the four priestly garments of linen when he entered into the Holy of Holies, and put them off immediately he came out, and leave them in the Temple; no one being present in the Temple while Aaron made the atonement (verse 17). Either, therefore, in the time of Josephus this law was not kept in practice, or else we must reconcile the apparent contradiction by supposing that in consequence of the great jealousy with which the high-priest's robes were kept by the civil power at this time, the custom had arisen for him to wear them, not even always on the three great festivals (Apt. xviii, 4, 3), but only on the great day of expiation. Glad in this generous attitude, he would enter the Temple in presence of all the people, and, after having performed in secret, as the law requires, the rites of expiation in the linen dress, he would resume his pontifical robes, and so appear again in public. Thus his wearing the robes would easily come to be identified chiefly with the day of atonement; and this is, perhaps, the most probable explanation. In other respects, the high-priest performed the functions of a priest, but only on new moons and other great feasts, and on such solemn occasions as the dedication of the Temple under Solomon, under Zerubbabel, etc. See Atonement, Day of.

4. The high-priest had a peculiar place in the law of

Form of the Priestly Turban of the Hebrews, as suspended and as worn. (From Braun, ut sup. p. 425.)
gold plate, engraved with "Holiness to the Lord," fastened to it by a ribbon of blue. Josephus applies the same Heb. term (μεταμυτησθής) to the turbans of the common priests as well, but says that in addition to this, and sewn upon the top of it, the high-priest had another turban of blue; that besides this he had outside the turban a triple crown of gold, consisting, that is, of three rings one above the other, and terminating at the top in a kind of conical cup, like the inverted calyx of the herb hyssopus. Josephus doubtless gives a true account of the high-priest's turban as worn in his day. It may fairly be conjectured that the crown was appended when the Askonaeans united the temporal monarchy with the priesthood, and that this was continued, though in a modified shape, after the sovereignty was taken from them. Josephus also describes the virgula, the lamina or gold plate, which he says covered the forehead of the high-priest. In Amt. vii, 8, 8, he says that the identical gold plate made in the days of Moses existed in his time; and Whitson adds in a note that it was still preserved in the time of Origen, and that the inscription on it was engraved in Samaritan characters (Amt. iii, 2, 6). It is certain that R. Eiezer, who flourished in Hadrian's reign, saw it at Rome. It was doubtless placed, with other spoils of the Temple, in the Temple of Peace, which was burnt down in the reign of Commodus. These spoils, however, are especially mentioned as part of Alaric's plunder when he took Rome. They were carried by Genseric into Africa, and brought by Belisarius to Byzantium, where they adorned his triumph. On the warning of a Jew the emperor ordered them back to Jerusalem, but what became of them is not known (Reland, de Scriptor Templo). See Mirraa.

3. Aaron had peculiar functions. To him alone it appertained, and he alone was permitted, to enter the Holy of Holies, which he did once a year, on the great day of atonement, when he sprinkled the blood of the sin-offering on the mercy-seat, and burnt incense with-

The Jewish high-priest in full costume, according to Braun (ut sup. p. 667).
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the manse, and his taking sanctuary in the cities of refuge. The manse might not leave the city of refuge during the lifetime of the existing high-priest who was anointed with the holy oil (Numb. xxxv, 25, 29). It was also forbidden to the high-priest to follow a funeral, or rend his clothes for the dead, according to the precedent in Lev. x, 6. See MANSLEY.

5. The other respects in which the high-priest excercised superior functions to the other priests arose rather from his position and opportunities than from distinctively sacred ceremonies. He was the religious head, so to speak, of the temple, and took the leading part in all religious transactions in connexion with the personal character and abilities of the high-priest. Such were the reforms in religion, restorations of the Temple and its service, the preservation of the Temple from intrusion or profanation, taking the lead in ecclesiastical or civil affairs, judging the people, presiding in the Sanhedrin, and generally the high-priest was supposed to have done, and other similar transactions, in which we find the high-priest sometimes prominent, sometimes not even mentioned. (See the historical part of this article.) Even that portion of power which most naturally and usually fell to his share, the rule of the Temple, and administration of the priests of the Temple who ministered there, did not invariably fall to the share of the high-priest. For the title “Ruler of the House of God,” מנהלבב (KJV), which usually denotes the high-priest, is sometimes given to those who were not high-priests, as to Phasur, the son of Immer, in Jer. xx, 1; compare 1 Chron. xii, 27. The Rabbinists speak very frequently of the anointing of the king, King David, whom they call the Sagan, and who often acted in the high-priest’s room. He is the same who in the O. T. is called “the second priest” (2 Kings xxiii, 4; xxv, 18). They say that Moses was sagan to Aaron. Thus, too, it is explained of Amans and Caiaphas (Luke iii, 2), that Amans was sagan to Caiaphas, and that Caiaphas, whom they call the Sagan, and who often acted in the high-priest’s room. In like manner they say Zadok and Abiathar were high-priests and sagan in the time of David. The sagan is also very frequently called מנהלבב, or prefect of the Temple, and upon him chiefly lay the care and charge of the Temple services (Lightfoot, poza). If the high-priest was incapacitated from officiating by any accidental unclesness, the sagan or vice-priest took his place. Thus the Jerusalem Talmud tells a story of Simon, son of Kamith, that “on the eve of the day of expiation he went out to speak with the king, and some fell upon him and despoiled him: therefore Judah his brother went in on the day of expiation, and served in his stead; and so their mother Kamith saw two of her sons high-priests in one day. She had seven sons, and they all served in the high-priesthood;” (Lightfoot, 1x, 35). It does not appear that these sagan, to whom their office, before there were kings of Israel; but, if we find it invariably done by the civil power in later times, it is probable that, in the times preceding the monarchy, it was by the elders, or Sanhedrin. The instillation and sanctification of the high-priest, or clothing him with the eighth garments, which was the formal investiture, is ascribed by Maimonides to the Sanhedrin at all times (Lightfoot, i, 29).

It should be added that the usual age for entering upon the functions of the priesthood, according to 2 Chron. xxiv, 14, was 28 years (by the later Jews thirty, Numb. iv, 3; 1 Chron. xxii, 2), though a priest or high-priest was not actually incapacitated if he had attained to puberty, as appears by the example of Aristobulus, who was high-priest at the age of seventeen. Onias, the son of Simon the Just, could not be high-priest accordingly because he was but a child at his father’s death. Again, according to Lev. xxii, no one that had a blemish could officiate at the altar. Moses enumerates eleven blemishes, which the Talmud expands into 142. Josephus relates that Antigonus mutilated Hyrcanus’s ears, to incapacitate him for being restored to the high-priesthood. Illegitimate birth was also a bar to the high-priesthood, and the subtlety of Jewish distinctions extended this illegitimacy to being born of a mother who had been taken captive by heathen conquerors (Josephus, c. Apion, i, 7). Thus Eleazar said to John Hyrcanus (though Josephus says, falsely) that he was not fit to assume the high-priesthood according to the precedent in Lev. x, 6. See MANSLEY.

II. The theological view of the high-priesthood will be treated under the head of Priest. It must suffice here to indicate the considerations of the powers, functions, and ministrations of the high-priest, as typical of the priesthood of our Lord Jesus Christ, and as setting forth under shadows the truths which are openly taught under the Gospel. This has been done to a great extent in the Epistle to the Hebrews, and is occasionally done in the parts of Scripture which are described, wherein theĪσχυρος, and the girdle about the paps, are distinctly the robe, and the curious girdle of the ephod, characteristic of the high-priest. It also embraces all the moral and spiritual teaching supposed to be intended by such symbols. Philo (De viris illustribus, Origen (Hom., in Levitt, Eusebius (Dem. Evang., Eusebius (Ant.) of Melchizedek, iv, etc.), Gregory Nazianzen (Orat. i, Elin Creten. and Comment. p. 155), Augustine (Quast. in Exod.), may be cited among many others of the ancients who have more or less thus treated the subject. Of moderns, Bähr (Symbolae mysticae cultus), Fairbairn (Typology of Scripture), Kalsch (Comment. on Exod.), have entered fully into this subject, both from the Jewish and the Christian point of view.

III. The history of the high-priests embraces a period of about 1272 years, according to the opinion of the best chronologers, and a succession of about 86 high-priests, from the beginning with Aaron, and ending with Phasur, the son of Eli, father of Abiathar, number of all the high-priests (says Josephus, Ant. xx, 10) from Aaron ... until Phasur ... was 83,” where he gives a comprehensive account of them. They naturally arrange themselves into three groups,— (a) those before David; (b) those from David to the captivity; (c) those from the return from the Babylonian captivity till the cessation of the office at the destruction of Jerusalem. The two former have come down to us in the canonical books of Scripture, and so have a few of the earliest and the latest of the latter; but for the larger portion of the latter group we have only the authority of Josephus, the Talmud, and occasional notices in profane writers.

(a) The high-priests of the first group who are distinctly made known to us as such are, 1. Aaron; 2. Eleazar; 3. Phinehas; 4. Eli; 5. Abihud (1 Chron. xxiv, 11; Neh. xi, 11; 1 Sam. xiv, 2); 6. Ahiah; 7. Ahitub; 8. Phinehas, the son of Eli, and father of Ahitub, died before his father, and so was not high-priest. Of the above the first three succeeded in regular order, Nadab and Abihu, Aaron’s eldest sons, having died in the wildness (Lev. x). But Eli, the 4th, was of the line of Phinehas, and he was the successor of the father of Phinehas and the accession of Eli, what led to the transference of the chief priesthood from the line of Eleazar to that of Ithamar, and whether any or which of the descendants of Eleazar between Phinehas and Zadok (seven in number, viz. Abisha, Bukki, Uzzi, Zerubab, Merioth, Amariah, Ahitub), were high-priests,
we have no positive means of determining from Scripture. Judg, xx, 28 leaves Phinehas, the son of Eleazar, priest at Shiloh, and 1 Sam. i, 3, 9 finds Eli high-priest there, with two grown-up sons priests under him. The only clue to be found in the genealogies, by which it appears that Phinehas was in succession from Levi, while Eli, supposing him to be the same generation as Samuel's grandfather, would be 10th. Josephus asserts (Ant. viii, 1, 3) that the father of Bubki—whom he calls Joseph, and (Ant. v, 11, 5) Ablezer, 1. e. Abishua—was the last high-priest of the house of Phinehas's. This is an acceptable tradition, since Josephus does not allude to it in the above passage of his 5th book, where he makes Bubki and Uzzi to have been both high-priests, and Eli to have succeeded Uzzi; or in book xx, 16, where he reckons the high-priests before Zadok and Solomon, to have been thirteen (a reckoning which includes apparently all Eleazar's descendants down to Abi- tub), and adds Eli and his son Phinehas, and Abiathar, whom he calls Eli's grandson. If the last of Abihu's line died leaving a son or grandson under age, Eli, as the head of the line of Ithamar, might have become high-priest as a matter of course. But, before, or he might have been appointed by the elders. His having judged Israel 40 years (1 Sam. iv, 18) marks him as a man of ability. If Abi- ah and Ahimelech are not variations of the name of the same person, they must have been brothers, since both were sons of Abiathar. Of the high-priests, then, before David, mention is made in Scripture only of Zadok, high-priest, and one by Josephus alone. The bearing of this on the chronology of the times from the Exodus to David is too important to be passed over in silence. As in the parallel list of the ancestors of David (q. v.), we are compelled by the chronology to count as incumbents of the office in regular order the four others who are only named in Scripture as lineal descendants of the pontifical family. The comparative oversight of these incumbents receives an explanation from the nature of the times. It must also be noted that the tabernacle of God probably rose to high-priesthood of Aaron's son (the first of this group, was pitched at Shiloh in the tribe of Ephraim, a fact that marks the strong influence which the temporal power already had in ecclesiastical affairs, since Ephraim was Joshua's tribe, as Judah was David's (Josh. xxiv, 30, 33; Judg. xx, 27, 38, xxxi, 21; 1 Sam. i, 8, 9, 5; ii, 25, etc.; xiv, 60). The strong influence and interference of the secular power is manifest throughout the subsequent history. This first period was also marked by the calamity which be- fell the high-priests as the guardians of the ark, in its connection with Solomon. This probably suspended all inquiries by Uriam and Ahimelech. They were not mentioned before the ark (1 Chron. xiii, 3; comp. Judg. xx, 27; 1 Sam. vii, 2; xiv, 18), and must have greatly diminished the influence of the high-priests, on whom the largest share of the humiliation expressed in the name Ithabod would naturally fall. The rise of Samuel as a prophet at this very time, and his paramount influence and impor- tance in the state, to the entire eclipsing of Ahiah the priest, coincides remarkably with the absence of the ark, and the means of inquiring by Uriam and Thummim. (A. P.) Passing to the second group, we begin with the unpleasing circumstance of the death of two priests in the reign of David, apparently of nearly equal authority, viz. Zadok and Abiathar (1 Chron. xv, 11; 2 Sam. vii, 17). Indeed it is only from the depostion of Abi- athar, and the placing of Zadok in his room by Solomon (1 Chron. xxvii, 21), that we learn certainly that Abiathar was the high-priest, and Zadok the second of the line of Ahitub, of the line of Eleazar (1 Chron. vi, 8), and the first mention of him is in 1 Chron. xii, 28, as "a young man, mighty in valor," who joined David in Hebron after Saul's death, with 22 captains of his father's house. It is therefore it may be inferred that after the death of Ahime- lech, and the decease of Abiathar to David, Saul may have made Zadok priest, as far as it was possible for him to do in the absence of the ark and the high-priest's robes, and that David may have avoided the difficulty of deciding between the claims of his faithful friend Abi- athar and his new and important ally Zadok (who, per- haps, was the means of attaching to David's cause the 4000 Levites and the 3700 priests that came under Je- hoioahí and Absalom's captivity, verse 16). In appointing a joint priesthood: the first place, with the ephod, and Urim and Thummim, remaining with Abiathar, who was in actual possession of them. Certain it is that from this time Zadok and Abiathar are constantly named to- gether, and, singularly, Zadok always with the phrase, in book vi, 19, of the tent of Kiriath-jearim. We cannot however, trace very clearly up to a certain point the division of the priestly offices and dignities between them, coinciding as it did with the divided state of the Levitical worship in David's time. For we learn from 1 Chron. vii, 1, 7, 37, compared with 33, 40, that only insinu- cinctly from 2 Chron. i, 3, 4, 5, that the tabernacle and the brazen altar made by Moses and Bezeel in the wil- derness were at this time at Gibeon, while the ark was at Jerusalem, in the separate tent made for it by David. See Ginece. Now Zadok the priest and his brethren the priests were brought before the tabernacle at Gibeon to offer burnt-offerings unto the Lord morning and even- ting, and to do according to all that is written in the law of the Lord (1 Chron. xvi, 39, 40). It is therefore obvi- ous to conclude that Abiathar had special charge of the ark and the services connected with it, which agrees ex- actly with what we find in the times of King Solomon. He kept his previous position with David before he became king of Israel, as well as with what we are told 1 Chron. xxvii, 34, that Jehoiada and Abiathar were the king's counsell- ors next to Ahitophel. Residence at Jerusalem with the ark, and the privilege of the inquiring of the Lord be- fore the ark, both well suit his office of counsellor. Abi- athar, however, forfeited his place by taking part with Adonijah against Solomon, and Zadok was made high- priest in his place. The pontificate was thus again con- solidated and transferred permanently from the line of Ithamar to the line of Eleazar. The last mention of Zadok, he being very old at Solomon's accession (being David's con- temporary), should have lived to the 11th year of his reign; and, moreover, 1 Kings iv, 2 distinctly asserts that Azariah, the son of Zadok, was priest under Solo- mon; and 1 Chron. vi, 10 tells us of an Azariah, grandson of the former, "he it is that executed the priest's office in the Temple in that Solomon built in Jerusalem," as if meaning at its first completion. If, however, either of these Asariahs (if two) was the first high-priest of Solomon's Temple, the non-mention of him in the accoun- t of the dedication of the Temple, who was about to have most expected it (as 1 Kings viii, 3, 6, 16, 11, 62; 2 Chron. v, 7, 11, etc.), and the prominence given to Solo- mon—the civil power—would be certainly remarkable. Compare also 2 Chron. vii, 14, 15. In constructing the list of the succession of priests of this group it was found most useful to compare the genea- logical list in 1 Chron. vi, 8-15 (A.V.) with the notices of high-priests in the sacred history, and with the list given by Josephus, who, it must be remembered, had ac- cess to the lists preserved in the archives at Jerusalem, which probably the text as it stands is apt to produce the ordinary rules of genealogical succession. Now, as regards the genealogy, it is seen at once that there is something de- fective; for whereas from David to Jehoshiah there are
20 kings, from Zadok to Jehozadak there are but 18 priests. Moreover, the passage in question is not a list of high-priests, but the pedigree of Jehozadak. Then, again, while the pedigree in its first six generations from Zadok inclusive seems at first sight exactly to suit the historical movements, it is not, as is well known, part of the history (2 Chron. xix, 11) tells us he lived in Jehoshaphat's reign, who was the sixth king from David, inclusive; and while the same pedigree in its last five generations also seems to suit the history—inauthentic as it places Hilkiah, the son of Shallum, fourth from the end, and in the reign of Josiah, it is highly improbable that the fourth king from the end—yet is there certainly at least one great gap in the middle. Between Amariah, the high-priest in Jehoshaphat's reign, and Shallum, the father of Hilkiah, the high-priest in Josiah's reign—an interval of about 240 years—there are but two names, Ahitub and Zadok, and these liable to suspicion from their reproducing the same sequence which occurs in the earlier part of the same genealogy—Amariah, Ahitub, Zadok. Besides, they are not mentioned by Josephus, at least not under the same names. This part, therefore, of the genealogy is useless for our purpose. But for the historical books supply us with four or five names for this interval, viz. Jehoiada, in the reigns of Athaliah and Joash, and probably still earlier; Zechariah, his son; Ahaziah, in the reign of Uzziah; Uziah, in the reign of Ahaz; and Azariah, in the reign of Hezekiah. If, in the meantime, the Azariah of the high-priestly genealogy have been accidentally transposed, as is not impossible, then the Azariah who was high-priest in Hezekiah's reign would be the Azariah of 1 Chron. vi, 13, 14. Putting the additional historical names at four, and deducting the two suspicious names from the genealogy, we have 16 high-priests indicated in Scripture as corresponding with the 20 kings, with room, however, for one or two more in the history. Turning to Josephus, we find his list of 17 high-priests (whom he reckons as 18 [Ant. xx, 10], as do also the Rabbinical lists) in places exceedingly corrupt, a corruption sometimes caused by the end of one name adorning the beginning of the following (as in Azliora-mus), sometimes apparently by substituting the name of the contemporary king or prophet for that of the high-priest, as Joel and Johatham (both these, however, confirmed by the Rabbinical list). Perhaps, however, Nebuzar, who corresponds to Zedekiah, son of Nebiud Odem, and Odeas, who corresponds to Hoshaijah, in the reign of Manasseh, according to the same Jewish chronicle, may really represent high-priests whose names have not been preserved in Scripture. This would bring up the number to 17, or, if we retain Azariah, the father of Seraiah, to 18, which, with the addition of Joel and Johatham, finally agrees with the 20 kings.

Reviewing the high-priests of this second group, the following are some of the most remarkable incidents:

1. The transfer of the seat of worship from Shiloh, in the tribe of Ephraim, to Jerusalem, in the tribe of Judah, effected by David, and consolidated by the building of the magnificent Temple of Solomon.

2. The organization of the Temple service under the high-priests, and the division of the priests and Levites into courses, who resided at the Temple during their term of service, and the seating up of a schismatical priesthood at Dan and Beersheba (1 Kings xii, 31; 2 Chron. xiii, 9, etc.).

3. The revolt of the ten tribes from the dynasty of David, and from the worship at Jerusalem, and the setting up of a schismatical priesthood at Dan and Beersheba (1 Kings xii, 31; 2 Chron. xiii, 9, etc.).

4. The overthrow of the usurpation of Athaliah, the daughter of Ahahab, by Jehoash the high-priest, whose near relationship to king Joash, added to his zeal against the idolatries of the house of Ahahab, stimulated him to the force of priests and Levites in his command. (5) The boldness and success with which the anti-Samaritan party were attacked by the high-priest of Jericho, or the temple of the Exile, as the O.T. guides us, were Joashim, Elisibah, Joiada, Johanan (or Jonathan), and Jaddua. Of these we find...
Elisha hiding rather thanseconding the zeal of the devout Tirthah Nebheimah for the observance of God's law in Israel (Neh. xiii, 4, 7); and Johanan, Josephus tells us, murdered his own brother Jesus or Joshua in the Temple, which Josephus says was burnt by the king of the general of Artaxerxes Mardonion's army (Ant. xi. 7). Jaddua was high-priest in the time of Alexander the Great. Concerning him, Josephus relates the story that he went out to meet Alexander at Sapha (probably the ancient Mizpeh) at the head of a procession of priests; that the high-priest saw the toulit clothed in white, and the priests in their linen garments, and the high-priest in blue and gold, with the mitre on his head, and the gold plate, on which was the name of God, he stepped forward alone and adored the Name, and hastened to embrace the high-priest (Ant. xi. 8, 5). Josephus adds many other particulars, but they have no same connection; and the narrative, though sometimes disputed as savouring of the apocryphal, derives support from the circumstances of the times, especially the enmity of Alexander toward the Jews. See Александр the Great. It was the brother of this Jaddua, Manna słeh, who, according to Josephus, was at the request of Sanballat, made the first high-priest of the Samaritan temple by Alexander the Great. (See on this whole period, Herzfeld, Gesch. d. Volkes Israel, 1866, 1, 688 sq.)

Jaddua was succeeded by Onias I, his son, and he again by Simon the Just, the last of the men of the great synagogue, as the Jews speak, and to whom is usually ascribed the completion of the Canon of the O.T. (Prid. Connect, i, 545). Of him Jesus, the son of Sirach, speaks in terms of most glowing eulogy in Eccles. i, ascribing to him the repair and fortification of the Temple, with other works. The passage (1-21) contains an interesting account of the ministrations of the high-priest. Upon Simon's death, his son Onias being under age, Eleazar, Simon's brother, succeeded him. The high-priesthood of Eleazar is memorable as being that under which Jesus was born. It is said in the Talmud to have been made at Alexandria for Ptolemy Philometor, according to the account of Josephus taken from Aristaeus (Ant. xii, 2). This translation of the Hebrew Scriptures into Greek, valuable as it was with reference to the wider interests of religion, and marked as was the provision which was made to transcribe the sabbath, was introduced for the approaching advent of Christ, yet, viewed in its relation to Judaism and the high-priesthood, was a sign, and perhaps a helping cause of their decay. It marked a growing tendency to Hellenism utterly inconsistent with the spirit of the Mosaic economy. Accordingly, in the spirit of the spirit of the Mosaic economy, and Onias, we find their very names changed into the Greek ones of Jason and Menaæus, and with the introduction of this new feature of rival high-priests we find one of them, Menaæus, strengthening himself and seeking support from the Syro-Greek kings against the Jewish party by offering to forsake their national laws and customs, and to adopt those of the Greeks. The building of a gymnasion at Jerusalem for the use of these apostate Jews, and their endeavor to conceal their circumcision when stripped for the games (1 Macc. i, 14, 15; 3 Macc. iv. 13-15; Joseph. Ant. xii, 5, 1), show the length to which this spirit was carried. The acceptance of the spurious priesthood of the temple of Onias from Ptolemy Philometor by Onias (the son of Onias the high-priest), who would have been the legitimate high-priest on the death of Menaæus, his uncle, is another striking indication of the religious policy of the Greek kings. Onias introduced into Egypt the succession of high-priests in the family of Jozadak ceased; for although the Syro-Greek kings had introduced much uncertainty into the succession, by deposing at their will obnoxious persons, and appointing whom they pleased, yet the dignity had never ceasing to pass from the general of Artaxerxes Mardonion's army, or, according to Ruffinus (ap. Selden), Joachim, and who was made high-priest by Antiochus Eupator on Menelaus being put to death by him, was the first who was of a different family. One, says Josephus, that "was indeed of the stock of Aaron, but not of this family."

What, however, for a time saved the Jewish institutions, infused a new life and consistency into the priesthood and the national religion, and enabled them to fulfill their destined course till the advent of Christ, was the cruel and impolitic persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes. This thoroughly aroused the pious and national spirit of the Jews, and drew together in defense of their Temple and country all who feared God and were attached to their national institutions. The result was that after the high-priesthood had been brought to the lowest degradation by the apostasy and crimes of the last Onias or Menelaus, and after a vacancy of seven years had followed the brief pontificate of Alcimus, his no less infamous successor, a new and glorious succession of high-priests arose in the Asmonean family, who united the dignity of civil rulers, and for a time of independent sovereigns, to that of the high-priesthood. Josephus, who is followed by Lightfoot and his Seldens and others, calls Judas Maccabaeus "high-priest of the nation of Judah" (Ant. xii, 10, 6), but, according to the far better authority of 1 Macc. x. 20, it was not till after the death of Judas Maccabaeus that Alcimus himself died, king of Syria, and that Alexander the Great had made the brother of Judas, high-priest. Josephus himself, too, calls Jonathan the "first of the sons of Asmoneus, who was high-priest." (Life, 1). It is possible, however, that Judas may have been elected by the people to the office of high-priest, though never confirmed in it by the Syrian kings. The Asmonean family was descended from the course of Joarib, the first of the twenty-four courses (1 Chron. xxiv, 7), whose return from captivity is recorded 1 Chron. ix. 10; Neh. xi. 10. They were probably of the house of Eleazar, though this cannot be affirmed with certainty; and Josephus tells us that he himself was related to this family. He is said to have married a daughter of Jonathan, the first high-priest of the house. The Asmonean dynasty lasted from B.C. 155 till the family was damaged by intestine divisions, and then destroyed by Herod the Great. Aristobulus, the last high-priest of his line, brother of Mas- dones, was murdered by order of Herod the Great, B.C. 85. The independence of Judea, under the priest-kings of this race, had lasted till Pompey took Jerusalem, and sent king Aristobulus II (who had also taken the high-priesthood from his brother Hyrcanus) a prisoner to Rome. Pompey restored Hyrcanus to the high-priesthood, and forced him to abjure Judaism. Everything Jewish was now, however, hastening to decay. Herod made men of low birth high-priests, deposed them at his will, and named others in their room. In this he was followed by Archelaus, and by the Romans when they took the government of Judea into their own hands; that there were no fewer than twenty-eight high-priests from the reign of Herod to the destruction of the Temple by Titus, a period of 107 years. Josephus tells us of one Ananus and his five sons who all filled the office of high-priest in turn. One of these, Ananus the younger, was deposed by Herod; and Josephus says "the party for the part he took in causing "James, the brother of Jesus who was called Christ," to be stoned (Ant. xx, 9, 1.) The N.T. introduces us to some of these later and oft-changing high-priests, viz. Annas and Caiaphas—the former high-priest at the commencement of John Baptist's ministry, and of whom Caiaphas was the latter high-priest himself at our Lord's crucifixion (see Somme, De Annas et Caiapho, Lund. 1772) —and Annanias (erroneously thought to be the Ananus who was murdered by the Zealots just before the siege of Jerusalem), before whom Paul was tried, as we read Acts xxiii, 5, 6, and of whom he said, "God shall smite you, and your wall shall be whitened." The same Caiaphas was the high-priest from whom Saul received letters to the synagogue at Jerusalem.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Scripture References</th>
<th>Seder Olam R.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Jeusahaan</td>
<td>1 Sam 16:11</td>
<td>1507–1619</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Zadok I</td>
<td>1 Chron 23:31-32</td>
<td>1607–1783</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Zadok II</td>
<td>1 Chron 23:33-37</td>
<td>1783–1877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Johanan</td>
<td>1 Chron 23:38-40</td>
<td>1877–1973</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Johanan</td>
<td>1 Chronicles 24:1-4</td>
<td>1973–2075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Zebchariah</td>
<td>1 Chronicles 24:5-8</td>
<td>2075–2177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Azariah II</td>
<td>1 Chronicles 24:9-11</td>
<td>2177–2281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Uriah</td>
<td>2 Sam 13:18-22</td>
<td>2281–2385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Zadok III</td>
<td>2 Sam 13:23-24</td>
<td>2385–2489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Meshullam</td>
<td>2 Sam 13:25-27</td>
<td>2489–2593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Joab</td>
<td>2 Sam 13:28-33</td>
<td>2593–2697</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Jaddua</td>
<td>2 Sam 13:34-37</td>
<td>2697–2799</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**No.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Joseph. Ant., xii, 5, 8, 6.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>vili., xi, 5, 8, 6, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.C.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Scribes, Josephus, and an Old Jewish chronicle, the Seder Olam.** Details may be found under their respective names.

**Highway** (usually הַמַּלֶּל, mesilla), or [Isa. xxxv, 8] הִרְצָע, muzzal, a raised road [see CAUSEWAY] for public use; elsewhere simply יָרְחָה, o’rach, a path, or הַרְצָא, de’rek, dök, a "way" in general; once [Amos v, 16] הָרְצָע, chuts, outside.

Travellers have frequently noticed the lack of roads in Palestine. Travel and transport being all performed on the backs of beasts of burden, which usually move in single file, the most important routes are only marked by narrow winding paths; and the soil is so often hard as to take no impression from the feet of animals, so that the eye of an unpractised traveller there perceives, even upon a common thoroughfare, no evidence that others have passed along the same way. No repairs are ever made, no labor employed to remove obstacles.—Bastow. Hence the striking character of the figure by which the preparation for the return of the captives and the Messiah’s advent are announced as the construction of a grand thoroughfare for their march [Isa. xi. 6; xxxvi. 8; xi. 3; xxiii. 10]. The Romans, however, during their occupancy of Palestine, constructed several substantial roads, which are laid down in the ancient itineraries, and remains of which subsist to this day.

**Higuerra, Hieronymus Romanus de L.**
Spanish Jesuit and historian, was born at Toledo in 1538. He established his reputation by fabricating supposed histories. Thus he composed *Cronicones*, fragments, which he announced as copies of MSS. found at Worms, and the work of Flavius Lucius Dexter, Marcus Maximus, etc. He proposed to throw the Inquisition of Christianity into Spain. Father Bivar, who believed these chronicles genuine, added a commentary, and published them at Saragossa in 1619. They were reprinted at Cadiz (1627), at Lyons (1627), and at Madrid (1640, fol.).—Tichnor, *Hist. of Spanish Lit.* iii. 156; Hoefler, *Nachtr.* Nouv. Biog. Générale, 658 sq.

**Hilaire.** See HILARIUS.

**Hilali Codex of the O.T.** See MANUSCRIPTS.

**Hilaria,** a festival among the ancient Romans, which they observed in the Kalends, April 8, or on March 25, in honor of the goddess Cybele. Its name it derived from the occasion, which was one of general mirth and joy. The citizens went in procession through the streets, carrying the statue of Cybele. Masquerades, and all sorts of disguises, were also permitted. The day preceding the festival, in contrast with the festive day which was to follow, was a day of mourning. The reason for this is that "Cybele represented the earth, which was thought to have been created by a widow. Consequently the month of April was called Aprilis," according to Macrobius referred to the month in which Apollo Leo, but Hilarus refused to acknowledge the papal jurisdiction in the matter. Pope Leo, jealous of his own authority, and always anxious to extend his power, was very wrathful at Hilarus's summary proceedings, nor could Leo be appeased, though the bishop of Arles had on a journey on foot to Rome in order to set matters right. Each saint adhered to his own opinion, and they parted with mutual ill will, and by a rescript of Valentinian in 415, the metropolitan of Gaul was made virtually subordinate to the papal see. Hilarus died A.D. 449. His works extant are: *De Sacris Institutionibus*; a panegyric: *Epistola ad Eucherium*, both of which may be found in *Bib. Nat. Patr.* vol. vii. Waterland attributes the composition of the Athisanaxis Creed to Hilarus (in *Treatise on Athanasian Creed*). See Cave, *Hist. Lit.*; Hook, *Eccl. Biog.* vi, 54; Moehme, *Ch. Hist.* i, 549; Clarke, *Succession of Sacred Literature*, ii, 191; Waterland, *Works*, ii, 8; iii, 214 sq.; Milner, *Ch. Hist. Christ.*, ii, 317; Riddle, *Christ. Antiquities*, Milman, *Latin Christianity*, i, 272 sq.

**Hilarius Dacicus,** a deacon of the Church of Rome in the 4th century, who was sent by pope Liberius, with Lucifer of Cagliari and others, to plead the cause of the orthodox faith before Constantius at the Council of Milan. His object was so to charm the emperor that he might be scourged and banished by the order of the emperor. He afterwards. supported the violent opinion of Lucifer (p. v) that all Arians and heretics must be republized upon applying to be restored to communion in the Church. Two treatises, of doubtful authenticity, are attributed to him: (1) *Comm. in Epist. Pauli* (published often with the works of Ambrose); (2) *Quest. in Vet. et Nor. Test.*, published with the works of Augustine (Benedictine edit. t. iii, App.). The Benedictine editors of St. Ambrose inform us that the manuscripts of the "Commentary" on St. Paul's Epistles differ considerably, and that in some parts there appear to be interlacements of long passages. This commentary is said by Dupin to be "clear, plain, and literal, and to give the meaning of the text of St. Paul well enough; but it gives very different explanations from St. Augustine in those places which concern the sanctification of grace, and free will."—Lardner, *Works*, iv, 382; Moehme, *Ch. Hist. cent. iv.*, pt. ii, ch. ii, n. 43; Dupin, *Eccles. Writ. cent. iv*; English Cyclopaedia.

**Hilarium Pictaviensis** (HILARY, SR., bishop or PORTIA), one of the most distinguished opponents of Arianism in the 4th century, was a native of the city whose name he bears. He was of noble descent, but a heathen. Having come under the influence of faith, he was baptized, together with his wife and daughter. He was subsequently made bishop, about 350, not-
HILARIUS

withstanding his being a married man. In 556 he defended Athanasius, in the Council of Bezieris, against Sab.
turnius, bishop of Arles (said to have been an Arian, and to have held communion with Ursatius and Valen.
). For this he was exiled from his see, but he never abandoned his faith, and he died in 557.

He afterwards freed the bishops from the emperor's court, and presented a petition to Constantius, in which he desired permission to end his official duties as bishop and return to his home, which was in Egypt.

In the meantime, Hilarius maintained the Athanasian doctrine with much vigor. He was appointed a bishop and sent to Gaul to replace the banished bishop Valens. He was successively Bishop of Milan, and then of Rome, where he died in 567.

His theological system is a major influence in the development of Christian thought, particularly in the East. He is often referred to as the 'Arius of Rome' because of his continued support of the Athanasian position against the Donatists and Nestorians.

Hilaris, pope, or rather, bishop of Rome, was a Saradian by birth, and succeeded Leo I, the Great, when the latter died. He is said to have been well versed in the Scriptures and to have had a profound knowledge of the Church's teachings. He is said to have been an exponent of the doctrine of the Trinity and to have opposed the heresies of the Donatists and Nestorians.

He is considered one of the greatest of the early popes, and his pontificate is marked by his vigorous defense of the Church's teachings and his opposition to the heresies of the time.
against the Eutychians, and was well versed in matters concerning the discipline of the Church, which he displayed leadership in the election and consecration of bishops by their metropolitan in France and Spain, and justified his interference by alleging the pre-eminen
tence of the see of Rome over all the sees of the West, a pre-eminence which he, however, acknowledged, in one of his letters, to be derived from the power of the see of Rome. He also forbade bishops nominating their successors, a practice which was then frequent. He, however, did not declare elections or nominations to be illegal merely from his own au-
thority, but assembled a council to decide on those ques-

Hilary. See HILARIUS.

Hilda, St., the celebrated abbess of Whitby, was grand-niece of Edwin, king of Northumbria, and con-
spicuous for piety and devotion to the Christian faith from the age of thirteen. When, after the death of Ed-
win, the Northumbrians relapsed into idolatry, Hilda withdrew probably, into East Anglia, but returned to
Northumbria on the accession of Oswald, and, devoting herself to a life of celibacy, founded a small nunnery on the Wear. She subsequently (about A.D. 650) became abbess of Hexham, now Hartlepool, where she remained seven years. Oswy, the brother and successor of the
gentle and virtuous Oswald, when marching to defend his throne and faith against Penda, the pagan king of Mercia vowed that if the Lord vouchsafed to him the victory, he would devote to his service in holy vir-
ginity his infant daughter, the princess Eilifra. Hav-
ing defeated his rival, he claimed his duchy for his niece, and in Yorkshire, Oswy, in pursuance of his vow, committed Eilifra, with princely gifts in lands, etc., to the care of Hilda. Soon afterwards Hilda purchased ten "hides" of land at Stroneshala, now Whitby, and erected a new monastery, in which she, as abbess, took up her abode with her royal charge. The wealth of this monastery, and the dignity and high religious char-
acter of Hilda, made it the most celebrated in Eng-
land, and a nursery of eminent men, among whom may be mentioned Hedda, Willifrid, and Ceddmon, the poet. Dugdale (as quoted by Mrs. Jameson) says that Hilda "was so just and en- lightened in her government, that the whole jurisdiction in this country, and opposed with all her
might the tenure of priests and the celebration of Eas-
ter according to the Roman ritual." She died in No-
vember, 680, aged sixty-three years, and was succeeded as abbess by Hilda. Among the many relics of her are a nun at Hakenes saw angels convening her soul to bliss, and that certain fossils found near
Whitby having the form of coiled snakes were those reptiles thus changed by the power of her prayers.—

Hildebert of Tours (HILDEBERTUS TURONENSIS), in 1097 bishop of Mans, and in 1125 archbishop of Tours, was born about 1055 at Lavardin. Though accused of licentiousness before his admission to the Church, he be-
came one of its brightest ornaments for piety and learn-
ing. During the time of his being bishop of Mans, he
and his church suffered much from the contests of Wil-
liam Rufus and Helice, count of Mans; nor was he much more fortunate in his archbishopric, for he fell under the displeasure of Louis the Fat because he refused to disavow the emperor's dogma, as a result of which the dissenions were at last settled, and Hildebert re-
stored to favor. He wrote with great severity against the vices of the court of Rome. Hildebert had great "independence of mind, practical sense, and a degree of taste which preserved him from falling into the vain and puerile discourses of his contemporaries." His Tract

Hildesham. latus Philosophicus and his Moralis Philosophica, which are considered his best productions, are the first essays to
wards a popular system of the Christian religion. He died A.D. 1124. His epistles and sermons were quite numerous; they are collected in the best edition of his works, Opera tam ed-
ita quam inedita, studio Beugendry (Benedictine, Paris, 1708, fol.). See Mosheim, Ch. Hist. centi. xi, pt. ii, ch. ii, n. 74; Vidi Hildeberts, prefixed to his works (com-
rished posthumously) of his works to be found in Danss, Cyclop. Bibl. 1 vol.; Gallia Christiana, t. xiv; Brockhaus, Con-
versations-Lexicon, vii, 919; Bayle, Hist. Dict. p. 454; Ne-
mus., ch. ii, 305 sq.; see also Hildesheim; Introduction to Philos. p. 218.

Hildebrand. See GREGORY VII.

Hildegarde or Hildegards, abbess of St. Ru-
pert's Mount on the Rhine, was born at Bockelheim, in Germany, A.D. 1098. She attracted much attention by
her pretended revelations and visions, which were held to be supernatural, and obtained the countenance of Bernard and others, and at last the approval of Euge-
nius III and thi327 he acting pope, together with se-
numeral prelates. She wrote Three Books of Revela-
tions (Colonia, 1628) — Life of St. Robert: — three Epis-
les, various Questions, and an Exposition of St. Bene-
dict's Rule (all Colom. 1566). Most of them may also be found in Biblia: Pseudol. xxii. She died A.D. 1189.

Neander, Ch. Hist. iv, 217, 596; Myst. Ch. Hist. cent. xii, pt. ii, ch. ii, n. 71; Baille, Vies des Saint,
Sept. 17; Brockhaus, Conversations-Lexicon, vii, 921.

Hildegonde, a female saint of the Romish Church,
whose history is, in fact, a satire on Romish saintish
She is said to have been born at Nuits, in the diocese
of Cologne, towards the middle of the 12th century. Her father having during a voyage to visit the Holy Land, she accompanied him, dressed in man's clothes, under the
take the other monks only as Brother Joseph, and
her sex was not discovered until after her death. The
her to the convent near her birthplace, and in April the life was written by Cassius of Heisterbach. See Bia-
lett, Vies des Saint, April 20; the Hollandists' Acta
Sanct. ; Richard et Giraud, Biblioth. Sacree; Hoefer,
Now, Bibl. Générale, xxiv, 675.

Hildersham, Arthur, a plious and learned Puritan
divine, was born at Stechworth, Cambridgeshire, October 6, 1653, of an honorable family. He was brought up a
papist, and educated at Christ's College, Cambridge; but
while there he avowed himself a Protestant, and was, in consequence, cast off by his father. The earl of Hunting-
ington, a distant kinsman, on hearing of the circum-
stances, became his patron, and carried him through the univer-
sity. His character was so well established as to why de la Zouch, in Leicestershire, where (though often per-
secuted, and forced to change his dwelling) he lived for
the most part of forty-three years, with great success in his ministry, beloved and revered by all classes. He
profited for conscience sake in 1698, 1695, 1611, 1612, 1616, and 1630, being repeatedly his home on the
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be unmistakable. For instance, in Ezek. xxiv, 4, the "hill" is the same which is elsewhere in the same chapter (ver. 12, 13, 18, etc.) and book consistently and accurately rendered "mount" and "mountain." In Numb. xiv, 44, 45, the "hill" is the "mountain" of verse 40, as also in Deut. i, 41, 45, compared with 24, 44. In Josh. xv, 9, the allusion to the mountain region of Israel is called "mountain" in the preceding verse; and so also in 2 Sam. xvi, 13. The country of the "hills," in Deut. i, 7; Josh. ix, 1; x; 40; xi, 16, is the elevated district of Judah, Benjamin, and Ephraim, which is correctly called "the mountain" in the earliest descriptions of Palestine (Numb. xiii, 29), and in many subsequent passages. The "holy hill" (Psa. iii, 4), the "hill of Jehovah" (xxiv, 3), the "hill of God" (lxviii, 15), are nothing else than "mount Zion." In 2 Kings i, 9, and iv, 27, the use of the word "hill" obsesses the allusion to Carmel, which in other passages of the life of the prophet (e.g. 1 Kings xvii, 19; 2 Kings iv, 25) has the term "mount" correctly attached to it. Other places in the historical books in which the same substitution weakens the force of the narrative are as follows: Gen. vii, 19; Deut. viii, 7; Josh. xii, 6; xviii, 13, 14; Judg. xvii, 3, 4; 1 Sam. xxii, 14; xxv, 20; xxvi, 19; 2 Sam. xiii, 4; 1 Kings xiv, 17; xxv, 22; 2 Kings xxvii, 6; xxviii, 17, etc. See MALAKI.

3. On one occasion the word מִשְׁכָּב, mishkib, is rendered "hill," viz. 1 Sam. ix, 11, where it would be better to employ "ascend," or some similar term. See MALAKI.

4. In the N. T. the word "hill" is employed to render the Greek word ἄφινοις; but on one occasion it is used for ὄρος, elsewhere "mountain," so as to obscure the connection between the two parts of the same narrative. The "hill" from which Jesus was coming down in Luke ix, 36, is the same as "the mountain" into which he had gone for his transfiguration the day before (comp. verse 29). In Matt. xvi, 14, and Luke iv, 29, ὄρος is also rendered "hill" but not with the introduction of an article. In Luke x, 39, the "hill country" (ἡ ἄφινοις) is the same "mountain of Judah" to which frequent reference is made in the Old Testament. See JUDAH, TRIBE OF.

HILL-GODS (יוֹרֵא לְשֹׁנַי, "gods of the hills") are mentioned (1 Kings xx, 25) by the heathenish Syrians as being those of the Hebrews, because more powerful; and such deities (די ומונים), i.e. those that have their dwelling or throne on hills, whence they command control of all the region within view, were generally worshipped by the ancient pagans (see Dougall Anal. i, 178; Deyling, Observ. obs., iii, no. 12), sometimes in general (Gruner, Inscriptioni. f. 21; Lae, Mort. postcr. 11), sometimes in a more special sense (Curtius, Symbolik, i, 186 sq.; Greenu, Jena, ii, 282; Gramberg's Religionsd. i, 80). See HILL PLACED.

Naphtali, a lofty hill, especially the one round about which the hooyamr Pan. (See Walch, De des Eboracu, montano, Jen. 1746).

Hill, George, D.D., a divine of the Church of Scotland, born at St Andrews in 1748. He was educated at the university of his native place, where he obtained the Greek professorship, and afterward that of divinity. He subsequently became principal of St. Mary's, chaplain to the king for Scotland, and fellow of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, and was long an ornament of the Church of Scotland. He died in 1819. Among his publications are: Notes on the xxvii, 27, 28; 286; Dougall s. t. 1, 108; Rimpach, De sacris gentium in monastibus, Lipsia, 1719; Cuvier, Symbolik, i, 186 sq.; Gessius, Jena. ii, 282; Gramberg's Religion d. i, 80). See HILL PLACE.

Hill, Rowland, brother of Sir Richard Hill, a popular and pious, though eccentric minister, was born at Hawkstone Aug. 13th or 23d, 1744. His views were early directed towards the ministry in connection with the Church of England, and his religious life was greatly developed during his residence as a student at Eton College, under the tuition of Mr. J. E. G. Whitefield, where he studied both the principles of Whitefield and the Calvinistic Methodists, which he strenuously maintained throughout life. His religious zeal at college was strongly marked, but he did not allow it to interfere with his studies. He experienced the greatest difficulty in obtaining admission into the Church of England, as his ecclesiastical views excluded him, and he succeeded at length only through family...
Influence. After his ordination he resumed itinerancy, much against the wishes of his father. In 1773 he obtained the parish of Kingston, Somerset, and was married in the same year, yet still kept up his itinerant ministry. His vigor of thought, earnestness, econ- creteness, and wit drew thousands to listen to him. In 1798, when he left that work, with the aid of his numerous friends, he built Surrey Chapel, London, in 1782. Here he preached to vast congrega-
tions for many years. He died April 11, 1833. In the controversy between the Arminian and Calvinistic Meth- ods Hull took an active part, and wrote several bitter pamphlets against Wesley. He was detected (Bristol, 1777) — Full Answer to John Wesley (Bristol, 1777). When the strife ended Hull regretted his severe language, and suppressed one of his bitterest publications. See Sidney, Life of Rowland Hill (London, 1835, 8vo); Stevens, History of Methodism, vol. ii, ch. i and ii; Wesley, Works, iv, 473; vi, 193, 199.

Hill, William, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Cumberland Co., Va., March 3, 1799. In 1785 he entered Hampden Sidney College. While there he em- braced religion, and decided to study for the ministry. He graduated in 1788, and was licensed to preach by the Presbytery of Hanover July 10, 1790. After acting for a time as a missionary, he settled in Berkeley, Va., and in January, 1800, assumed charge of the Presbyterian An Church in Winchester. In February, 1834, he became pastor of the Briery Presbyterian Church in Prince Edward Co., where he remained only two years, when impaired health obliged him to resign, and he returned to Winchester to pass the last days of his life. He died there Nov. 16, 1852. Dr. Hill was engaged on a History of the Presbyterian Church in the United States, intended to make two 8vo vols. He decided to publish it in num-
ers, but only a single number of it appeared. "In the great work assigned in the division of the Church, Dr. Hill's judgment, sympathies, and acts were fully with the New School."—Prob. Quarterly Review, 1853; Sprague, Annals, iii, 563.

Hilla or Hillel Codex of the O. T. See Manu-
escritas.


Hillel I, Ha-Zaken (The Great), ben-St-
mon, was born at Babylon about B.C. 75. He was one of the most eminent Jewish rabbis, founder of a school which bore his name, and by his self-denying, holy life, and great wisdom and learning, exercised a very remark-
able influence both upon the theology and literature of his nation. About B.C. 26 he came to Jerusalem, where, while obliged to work for his daily bread, he attended at the same time the lectures of Shemaha and Abtalion, then the presiding officers of the Sanhedrin. About B.C. 90 he was himself chosen president of the Sanhe-
drin. This office he held for forty years with great suc-
sess. Etheridge says: "His administration, along with his coadjutor Shammai, forms an era in the history of rabbinical learning. His scholars were numbered by thousands. The Talmud commemorates eighty of them by name, among whom are the celebrated R. Johanan ben-Zachai, and Jonathan ben-Uzziel, the Chaldean Targum of the Prophets, John Wycliffe, especially famed (Gune-
burg in Kitto, among others) that by his teachings he prepared his people for the coming of Christ, but we are inclined to believe that, while Hillel was a most noble leader of the Jews, teaching as he did that the cardinal idea of his life is "to all meekness to all men," and "when reviled not to revile again," yet his views of the prophecies rather inclined him to give warning to his nation—especially prepared, by their social and political dishonesty, to look more inten-
tively for the coming of that mysterious king who, according to their idea, was to free them from the oppres-
sion of Herod as well as Caesar, and establish in the land of Judah a throne that should have supremacy over all others—by asserting that "no such king will ever ap-
pear" (Sanhedrin). But it is undoubtedly true that he foresaw the dispersion of his nation, for the Talmud in-
forms us that he drew up civil and political ordinances intended to regulate their relation to each other and their treatment by the Gentiles. His greatest aim was to give greater precision to the study of the law. Before his time tradition-learning had been divided into six hundred, or, as some have it, seven hundred sections. He simplified the subject by arrang-
ing this once complicated mass under six (Sedairim) treatises. He is reported to have said: "I have caused great excitement among the Jews. Hillel's party finally prevailed, in consequence, it is said, of a bath kol (q. v.) in his favor. Jerome and some other writers have considered Hillel as the founder of the sect of the Pharisees, and Shammai as the first Scribe. This, how-
ever, is not true. The Scribes and the Pharisees constitute two distinct sects, and, moreover, were ante-
rior to these two teachers. Hillel died when Jesus was about ten years of age. It seems strange that Josephus makes no mention of Hillel. Arnold in Herzog, Real-
Enzyklop. vii, 57, thinks that Pollio (Ant. xvi, i, 10) stands for Hillel. To the school of Hillel he is ascribed the authorship of Megillath Beth Hasmamonim, a work on the history of the Maccabees, now lost. See Barto-
loci, Magna Biblioth. Robbin, ii, 783-796; G. E. Geiger et H. Gissman, Brevis Commentatio de Hillel et Scham-
mai, etc. (Altorf, 1707, 4to); Hoefer, Nouv. Dict. Géné-

Hills, Peter (or Peter) the Jew of Jerusalem (sometimes called the younger, because a descendant of Hillel I, or the elder, q. v.), came to the presidency of the Sanhedrin about A.D. 330 (some say A.D. 238), which he held for about thirty-five years. As president of the Sanhedrin, he was, of course, the head of the Jewish school of Tibe-
rilas, and it is said that while in this position he was often consulted by Origen. Some think him the Elledi-
mentionned by Epiphanius (adver. Hieros. xxx, 4 sq.), who embraced the Christian faith on his death-bed. But this fact is unlikely, as the Jews of Hillel's time make no mention of it whatever. Had it occurred they would undoubtedly have excrated his name. An interesting fact, however, connected with Biblical liter-
ature to learn from Epiphanius that a Hebrew transla-
tion of the Gospel of John, of the Acts of the Apostles, and of Christ's genealogy as recorded by Matthew, ex-
isted at this early period of Christianity, for it is said of that for the Hebrews; that the title of parts of the N. T. just mentioned was found se-
crated in the cabinet of the nasi (president), subsequent-
ly to his death. Hillel is said to have convoked a rab-
bimcal synod which adjusted the period of the sun with the moon, a calendar then in use. It was not used until the change introduced under Alphonso, king of Castile (Barbococi, Magna Bibliotheca Rabbinorum, ii, 415 sq.). This calendar, while it greatly facilitated the uniform observance of the Paschal festival and other great festivals, tended to promote unity among a people dispersed through so many lands. If the acts of this synod had been handed down in a written form, we
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should probably have had in them some light on the present discrepancies between the chronology of the Hebrew text and that of the Septuagint. It is generally believed that the rabbins of this synod fixed the epoch of the Creation at the vernal equinox, 3761 years before the birth of Christ. Considered in this respect, the month, year, and attention is also paid in it to the Halachic matters connected with the Jewish festivals. It is based upon the cycle of nineteen years (יומつきיו), introduced by the Greek astronomer Meton, in which occur seven intercalary days. Each year has ten unchangeable months of alternately twenty-nine and thirty days; the two autumal months, Cheshvan and Kislev, which follow the important month Tishri, are left changeable [see הפסח], because they depend upon certain astronomical phenomena and the following points of Jewish law: 1. The month of Tishri is never to begin with the day which, to a great extent, belongs to the former month. 2. The Day of Atonement is not to fall on the day before or after the Sabbath; and, 3. That the Ḥosannah Day is not to be on a Sabbath. It is impossible now to say with certainty how much of this calendar is Hillel's own, how much he took from the universal traditions, since it is beyond question that some astronomical rules were handed down by the presidents. This calendar Hillel introduced A.D. 359. A similarity of names has caused him to be considered as the author of a MS. copy of the O. T., which was preserved until the close of the 19th century, and was used to correct later copies. He died towards the close of the 4th century. — Rossi, Dizion. storico degli Autori Ebrei, p. 170, 171; Wolf, Biblioth. Hebraica; Hoffer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxiv, 688; Etheridge, Introd. Hebrew Lit., p. 138; Graetz, Gesch. d. Juden, iv, 386 sqq.; Kitto, Cyclop. of Bib. Lit., i, 146, 1761.

Hiller, Matthias, a German Protestant theologian and Orientalist, was born at Stuttgart Feb. 15, 1646. He became professor of logic and metaphysics in 1692, and of Oriental languages and theology in 1698. In 1716 he exchanged these offices for the priory of Königshorn, where he died, Feb. 11, 1725. He acquired great reputation for his works on language, grammar, and metaphysics. He wrote Synagogae Germaniae Hebraeorum; —Lexicon Latino-Hebraicum (1685) : —De Arcano Keri et Kethub (Tubingen, 1792, 8vo), on the accentuation and punctuation of the Bible; —Institutiones Linguae Semiticae (several times reprinted, as Tusingen, 1790, 8vo) ; —Onomasticon Scerotum (Tubingen, 1706, 4to, transal. into German by himself): —Synagogae hermeticae quibus lora S. Scripturae plurima ex Hebreevo terta nova explicantur (Tubingen, 1711, 4to): —Hieroglyphica: —De Origine Graeciorum Celticiorum: —De Origine, diis et terra Poloniorum: —De Antiquitate in S. Scripturae verbae: —Hieroglyphica (Utrecht, 1723, 4to). —Biblioth. Medic. Bibl. vi, 44; Ersch and Gruber, Allg. Encyclopaedie; Hoffer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxiv, 689. (J. N. P.)

Hiller, Philip Frederick, one of the best and most prolific hymn writers of the Evangelical Church of Southern Germany, was born at Milhausen in 1699; educated under J. A. Bengel; became pastor at two or three Lithuan villages and finally at Neuburg in 1729; lost his voice in 1751, and died in 1769. After his retirement from the pulpit he devoted himself especially to sacred poetry, and produced over 1000 hymns, many of which have great excellencies. It is said that, next to the Bible, his spiritual songs are perhaps the most widely sung in the languages of Germany and Switzerland. A complete edition appeared at Reutlingen in 1844 and 1851. —Herzog, Real-Encyklop. vol. vi; Ilagcn- bach, Hist. of the 18th and 19th Centuries (translated by Hurst), ii, 393; Winkworth, Christian Singers of Germany, p. 273.

Hillhouse, Augustus L., author of the beautiful hymn beginning "Trembling before thine awful throne," was born at Lebanon, Conn., about 1792, and died in Paris March 14, 1859. He was a younger brother of James A. Hillhouse, the poet. —New Englander, xviii, 557.

Hilliard, Timothy, a Congregational minister, was born in 1746 in Kensington, N. H. He graduated at Harvard College in 1764, and in 1768 was appointed tutor, in which he continued until his resignation to be ordained pastor at Barnstable. This charge he resigned April 1783, and was installed co-pastor at Cambridge Oct. 27, where he remained until his death, May 9, 1790. He published the Dudmilian Lecture at Harvard College (1780), and several occasional sermons. —Sprague, Annals, i, 660.

Hillyer, Asa, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Sheffield, Mass., April 6, 1763; entered Yale College in 1782, and graduated in 1786. He was licensed to preach by the old Presbytery of Suffolk, L. I., in 1788, and was appointed to the churches at Connecticut Farms and Bottle Hill (now Madison, N. J., the seat of the Drew Theological Seminary and short distance from the depot, 29, 1789) was ordained and installed as pastor at the latter place. In the summer of 1800 he accepted an invitation to the church in Orange, "one of the largest and most influential in the state." Here he labored with great acceptance and success for more than thirty years. In 1818 he received the degree of D.D. from Allegheny College. In the disruption of the Presbyterian Church (1837), Dr. Hillyer sided with the New School. "But, though he regarded the division as an unwise measure, it never disturbed his pleasant relations with those of his brethren with whose common brother he differed from his own" (G. N. Judd, in Sprague's Annals). He was a trustee of the College of New Jersey from 1811 to his death, and from 1812 until the division of the General Assembly one of the first directors of the theological seminary at Princeton. This school, too, he contributed to the last with an unremitted interest.—Tuttle, (Rev. Samuel L.), History of the Presbyterian Church, Madison, N. J., p. 39 sq.; Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, iii, 383.

Himerius (Ιμηρίου), a celebrated Greek sophist and rhetorician, was born at Prusa, in Bithynia, A.D. 316. He received his education of Proerusius, whose rival he afterwards became. After travelling considerably in the East, he settled in Athens as teacher of rhetoric. He became very famous in his profession, having among his pupils Basil, Gregory of Nazianzen, and other distinguished men. The emperor Julian, during his visit at Athens, A.D. 355, attracted by his learning and eloquence, invited him to his court at Antioch, and made him his secretary (A.D. 362). After the death of his rival, Proerusius, in A.D. 368, he returned to Athens and resumed his former calling. He became blind toward the close of his life, and died in a fit of epilepsy A.D. 368. Himerius was a pagan, but exceedingly kind to the Christians. Of his works, only a part are now extant. —Lardner, Works; Smith, Dict. Greek and Rom. Mythol., ii; Pierer, Universal Lex. viii, 883; Hoffer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxiv.

Himerius, bishop of Tarragona, Spain, known by a letter which was addressed to him by Siricius, bishop of Rome (385-398), and in which the latter tolerates supreme ecclesiastical authority, and seeks by flattery to gain Himerius's consent to his pretensions. See Hard, Concil. i, 484; J. A. Cramer, additions to Bossuet, iv, 597. —Herzog, Real-Encyklop. vi, 98, 99. The Roman Catholic views may be seen in Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, v, 197. —See Siricius.

Himyarites (the classics called Homerites or Homericus), an Arabian people, claiming to be descend-
ants of Himyar, a grandson of Saba, one of the mythic
al fathers of the Arabians, who is said to have been a
prince in South Arabia about 3000 before Moham-
med's time. They established in that part of Arabia
some very flourishing towns, including Saba and Aden
(Athana), the former noted more especially from its
mention in the Bible, and extended their dominion
nearly over the entire coast of South Africa. At the
time of Constantine the Great this people inclined to
Christianity, but in 292 they were subjected by the Ethi-
opians, and were obliged to forsake their Christian faith.
About seventy years later the Persians took the most
important cities from the Himyarites, and in A.D. 692
they returned to the Mohametans, and em-
braced Islamism. The Himyarites had a language of
their own [see ARABIC LANGUAGE], the so-called Him-
yratice, of which traces have lately been found in the
ancient remains to which the Oriental scholar Gesenius,
and, later, Rödiger, have given much study. Of late
Osiander has undertaken this task, and apparently has
been much more successful. The results of his investig-
ations are found in Zeitschrift der deutschen Morgenländ.
Gesell. (vol. x. and xix. Lpz. 1856 and 1865). — Brockh,
bauzeit. Lex. vii. 929. See Jews.

Hin ("777, hîn, Sept. eîv, av, or wv), a measure of
liquids, containing the seventh part of a “bath” (Numb.
25, 4 sq.; xxvii, 5, 7, 14; Ezek. iv. 11), i. e. twelve Ro-
man sextarii, according to Josephus (iv. Ant. ii. 5, 31.
ix. 439. 445). The word corresponds with the Egyptian hn, hno, which properly signifies a vessel and
then a small measure, sextarius, Greek tvov (see
Leemans, Lettre et Salcolini, p. 154; Böckh, Metrolog.
Untersuch. p. 244, 260). But it is not certain that the
Hebrew and Egyptian measures were of the same size.
Gesenius. According to the Rabbinists, it contained
only the sixth part of the bath. See MEASURE.

Hinchcliffe, John, D.D., was born in Westminster
in 1731. He was educated at Westminster School and
Trinity College, Cambridge. In 1764 he was appointed
head master of Westminster Seminary, in 1766 vicar of
Greenwich, and in 1769 bishop of Peterborough. Hinch-
cliffe was a man of sound scholarship, and especially cel-
ibrated as an orator both in the pulpit and in the forum.
He died in 1794. He only published three sermons de-
ivered on public occasions. A collection of his Sermons
(London, 1796, 8vo) is not without merit, but they cer-
tainly did not meet the expectations of his contempo-
raries. — Hook, Eccles. Digg. vi. 73; Allibone, Dict. of Au-
thors, i. 850.

Hinnom, Abraham, a distinguished German
theologian and Orientalist, born at Doebeln, near Ham-
burg, May 2, 1832, was educated at the University of
Wit-
tenbergh. After filling several important appointments
as minister, he was, in 1867, made court preacher to the
landgrave of Hesse-Darmstadt, and honorary professor at
the University of Giessen. But in the year immediate-
ly following he resigned these positions and returned to
Hamburg. Here he was accused by some ministers of
sympathy with Millenarians and Pietists, which so
upsetted upon his constitution and mind that he died aft-
a short illness, February 11, 1885. Among his works
are especially worthy of note, Stiilge vorn und physis-
rubiocene obscurorum (Lübeck, 1675, 4to) — De Scholia
et pactiosa iuter Muhammadem et Christiana filia Colu-
tor (Arab. and Lat., Hamb. 1690, 4to). He published also
Alcoran and first edition of the Koran, as that of
Paganini (Ven., 1580) was wholly destroyed by order
of the pope. He also left in MS. Lexicon arabico-
latinum in Alcoranum. — Jöcher, Allgem. Gelehr. Lex. ii,

Hinckley, John, D.D., an English clergyman, was
born in Warwickshire in 1617, and was educated at St.
Alban's Hall, Oxford. He filled successively the vicari-
ate of Calcashill, Berkshire, and the rectorships of Dray-
ton, Leicestershire, and Northfield, Worcestershire. He
died in 1685. He published Four Sermons (Oxf., 1657,
6to; also in the Verulam (1638, 8vo). — Persuasive to
Conformity (1670, 8vo), addressed in the form of a letter
to the Dissenters. — Fisculiae literarum, or Letters on
Several Occasions (1680, 8vo). The first half contains
letters exchanged between him and Richard Baxter on the
divisions in the Church. — Hook, Eccles. Biog. vii. 74;
of Authors, i. 850.

Hincks, Edward, D.D., a clergyman of the Church of
England, and a distinguished Assyrian scholar,
was born in August, 1792, and was prepared for college
under his father's care. He entered Trinity College,
Dublin, at a very early age, and obtained a fellowship
before he was twenty-one, being vicar pro tempore of all
the candidates. After graduation he became rector of
Andrea, one of the college livings, whence he was pro-
moted to Kilkeigh, in the diocese of Down (north of
Ireland), and there he spent the last forty-one years of
his life. Dr. Hincks was considered one of the best phi-
losophers in Europe. He contributed not a few of the
papers, especially on Egyptian hieroglyphics and Assy-
rian cuneiform inscriptions, to the Royal Irish Academy,
the Royal Society of Literature, the Asiatic Society, and
the British Association. "His talent for deciphering
cuneiform characters and languages was wonder-
ful. It was applied to the study of Egyptian hierogly-
phics, and to the inscriptions in the cuneiform character
found in Persepolis, Nineveh, and other parts of ancient
Assyria. In this field especially he labored for years with
great perseverance and success, having been the first to
ascertain the numeral system, and the power and form of
its signs by means of the inscriptions at Van. He was
one of the chief restorers of Assyrian learning, throw-
ing great light on the linguistic character and grammat-
ical structure of the languages represented on the
Assyrian monuments. Living in a remote country vil-
lage, where his means at his command means at his com-
mand, he yet contended with great difficulties. In Lon-
don, beside the British Museum, he would have accomplished
more than he did" (London Athenaeum, December, 1866).
He died December 3, 1866. See CUNEIFORM INScriptions;
HIEROGLYPHICS. (J. H. W.)

Hincks, John, a Unitarian minister, born in Cork,
Ireland, was educated at Trinity College, Dublin, and
the Belfast Academical Institution, and in 1827 was
called to a Unitarian Church at Liverpool. He died in
1881. The only published writings of his are Ser-
mons and occasional services, with Memoir by J. H. Thorn
(Lond. 1829, 8vo). — Darling, Cyclop. Bibl. i. 1484;
Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i. 850.

Hinmar or Laon was nephew of Hinrmac, arch-
bishop of Rheims, who at first patronized him, and had
him elected bishop of Laon, about A.D. 856. He soon
showed an obstinate and refractory spirit; set at naught
his uncle, who was his metropolitan; rebelled against his
king, and scorned the decrees of synods, whose sentence of
condemnation he at some time met at appealing to Rome;
but at length he was summoned, heard, con-
demned, and deposed from his see of Laon. He was
also imprisoned and his eyes cruelly put out, A.D. 871.
Two years later, at the Council of Troyes, he obtained
access to the pope, who reinstated him, assigned him a
portion of the episcopal revenues, and induced him
even to resume his pontifical functions in part. He died
about A.D. 880. He wrote many Letters, etc., which are
lost; but a few may be found with his life, defence, etc.,
in Labbe, Concil. tom. vii, and in Simondon's edition of the
works of the bishop of Rheims (q. v.). See Clarke, Suc-
cussion of Sacred Literature, vol. ii. Collet, Vie d'Hinmar de
Laon; Biddle, Hist. of the Papacy, ii. 24—27; Neander,
Church Hist. iii. 864; Wetzer and Welte, Kirchen- Lex.

Hinmar, bishop of Rheims, one of the most
learned divines of his age, was born about A.D. 805, of
a noble family, related to the counts of Toulouse, and was educated in the Monastery of St. Denis, near Paris. After finishing his studies he was summoned to the court of Louis le Debonnaire, to whom he faithfully adhered, and who employed him, after his restoration, in settling the ecclesiastical affairs of the empire; after this he retired to his monastery, whence he was again summoned to pursue his clerical life by being made a canon and bishop of Rheims, A.D. 845. On the accession of Lothaire, an attempt was made to depose him from his see, without success. He was a zealous supporter of the rights of the Gallican Church. In 847 the controversy with Gottschalk (Godeschalcus) (q. v.) about predestination arose, and when the case of Gottschalk came before him, he drove it on with too great heat, and Gottschalk by his means was condemned and punished with much and unjust severity. One of the most important events in Hincmar's life was his controversy in 862 with pope Nicholas I, one of the most learned men of the Roman Catholic Church. Rothadus, bishop of Soissons, and suffragan of Hincmar, deposed a priest of his diocese, who appealed to Hincmar as metropolitan, and was ordered by him to be restored to office. Rothadus, who resisted this order, was, in consequence, condemned and excommunicated by the archbishop, who appealed to the pope, who at once ordered Hincmar to restore Rothadus, or to appear at Rome either in person or by his representative, to vindicate the sentence. He sent a legate to Rome, but refused to restore the deposed bishop; whereupon Nicholas annulled the sentence, and required that the pope should have another hearing, and this time in Rome. Hincmar, after some demurral, was forced to acquiesce. The cause of Rothadus was re-examined, and he was acquitted and restored to his see. But perhaps more historically interesting is Hincmar's opposition to the temporal power of the medieval papacy. See PAPACY. Under the successors of Adrian II, the succession to the sovereignty of Lorraine on the death of king Lothaire was questioned; the pope favoured the pretensions of the emperor Louis in opposition to those of Charles the Bold of France. Adrian addressed a mandate to the subject of Charles and to the nobles of Lorraine, accompanied by a menace of the censure of the Church. To this Hincmar offered a firm and persistent opposition. He was equally firm, ten years later, in resisting the undue extension of the royal prerogative in ecclesiastical affairs. Louis III, in opposition to the judgment of the Council of Vienna, wished to have another hearing, and Hincmar, according to the opinion of some, was inspired with the desire to bestow upon his favourite, Odoacer, the see of Beauvais; but Hincmar boldly remonstrated, and fearlessly denounced the attempt as an unjustifiable usurpation. He died A.D. 882. His works consist chiefly of Letters about local ecclesiastical affairs, and his treatise De Firmatione Dei et liber arbitratione, and small tracts on discipline. A former treatise of his, De Prodestatione, is lost. In the controversy with Gottschalk he maintained that "God wills the salvation of all men; that some will be saved through the gift of divine grace; that others are lost, owing to their demerit; Christ suffered for all; whoever does not appropriate these sufferings has himself to blame." All his remains are to be found in the careful edition of his works edited by Sirmond, Opera, duos in tomos digesta, etc. (Paris, 1614, 2 vols. fol.). See Noorder, Hincmar, Erzbischof v. Rheinau (Bonn, 1863); Cavus, Hist. Litt.; Moschini, Ch. History, gent. ix, pt. ii, ch. ii, n. 92; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, ii, 50; Floedard, Ecclesin Remaniae Hist.; Gallia Christiana, ii, 39; Hist. litt. de la France, v. 54 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Histo. Generale, xxvi, 706 sq.; Neanther, History of Dogmas, ii, 454; Riddle, History of the Popes, ii; Milman, Lat. Christianity, iii, 51 et al.; Ilgen, Zetlech, f.d. Hist. Theol, 1859, p. 478; Hefele (Rom. Cath.) in Zehrer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, v. 203.

Hind (हिंद, ayaksh, Gen. xlix, 21; 2 Sam. xxii, 34; Job xxxvi, 1; Ps. xviii, 33; 2 Sam. xxix, 9; Cant. ii, 7; iii, 5; Hab. iii, 19; or हिंद, ayakbeth, Prov. v, 19; Jer. xiv, 5; "Ajaileth,"
Psa. xxii, title), the female of the hart or stag, "doe" being the female of the fallow-deer, and "roe" being sometimes used for that of the roebehc. All the females of the Cervids, with the exception of the reindeer, are females. See DEER. The hind is frequently noticed in the poetical parts of Scripture as emblematic of activity (Gen. xlix, 21; 2 Sam. xxii, 34; Psa. xviii, 33; Hab. iii, 19), gentleness (Prov. v, 19), feminine modesty (Cant. ii, 7; iii, 5), earnest longings (Psa. xlii, 1), and maternal affection (Jer. xiv, 5). Its shy-
ness and remonstence from the haunts of men are also noticed (Job xxxix, 1), and its timidity, causing it to cast its young at the sound of thunder (Psa. xxix, 9). The conclusion which some have drawn from the passage last quoted, that the hind produces her young with great difficulty, is not, in reality, deducible from the words, and is expressly contradicted by Job xxxix, 3. It may be remarked on Psa. xviii, 33, and Hab. iii, 19, where the Lord is said to cause the feet to stand firm like those of a hind on high places, that this representation is in perfect harmony with the habits of mountain stags; but the version of Prov. v, 19, "Let the wife of thy bosom be as the beloved hind and favorite roe," seems to indicate that here the words are generalized so as to include under roe monomorous species of antelopes, whose affections and consortship are permanent and strong; for stags are polygamous. The Sept. reads בְּן יִשֶׂעַ (in Gen. xxv, 21) rendering it πρόβατον δρακόν, "a luxuriant terebinth," an emendation adopted by Bochart. Lowth has proposed a similar change in Psa. xxix, but in neither case can the emendation be accepted. Naphthali verified the comparison of himself to a "graceful or tall hind" by the events recorded in Judg. iv, 6-9; v, 18. The inscription of Psa. xxii, "the hind of the morning," probably refers to a tune of that name. See AJEELETH.

Hindostan. See INDIA.

Hind, SAMUEL, bishop of Norwich, was born about 1798, on the isle of Barbadoes. At an early age he was sent to England, and educated at Oxford. In 1822 he took orders in the Church of England, and in 1849 he was appointed bishop of Norwich. Later, he was made vice principal of St. Alban's Hall, Oxford. He died in 1870. Bishop Hind wrote The three Temples of the true God contruted (1830; 3d ed. 1857, 8vo) — Inspiration and Authority of Scripture (1831, 8vo) — Script. and the Authorized Version of Scripture (1858, 12mo) — Catechist's Manual (2d ed. 1855, 12mo) — Hist. of Christianity (1829, 1846, 1859, 1859, 2 vols. 8vo), which was originally contributed to the Encycol. Metropolitanos.—Al- libone, Dict. of British and American Authors, i, 850; Va- pernne, Dict. des Contemporains, p. 884.

Hinduism or Hindu religion, the name of the variety of creeds derived from Brahmanic sources. It is the religion of the East, professed, in some form or another, by nearly half the human race (see Max Muller, Chips from a German Workshop, i, 23), especially if
Buddhism (q.v.) is included, or considered as a development of it. The different sects into which the Hindus (on the origin of the Hindus, and their gradual occupation of India, see Lassen, Ind. Alterth., i. 511 sq.; Müller, Science of Language, p. 240 sq.; Donaldson, New Crutypus, p. 118, 119, 24 ed.; Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, q.v.) are divided, are of modern origin, and the system of theology taught by them differs very much from the religion of their forefathers.

I. History.—For brevity’s sake, we will divide Hinduism into three great periods, the Vedic, Epic, and Puranic. The first is described in the sacred books of the Hindus, the Veda (q.v.); that of the second from the epic poem Rāmāyana, and the great epics Mahābhārata; and that of the third chiefly from the mythological works, the Purānas and Tantras.

1. The Vedic Period.—According to the hymns of the Veda, the Hindus of that period regarded the elements of nature as heavenly beings, and worshipped and revered them as such. Among these were first in order Agni, the fire of the sun and lightning; Indra, the bright, cloudless firmament; the Maruts, or winds; Sūrya, the sun; Usas, the dawn; and various kinds of nature-spirits, the luminous beings, and nature in general. "They are supplicated to confer temporal blessings upon the worshipper, riches, life, posterity—"the shortsighted vanities of human desire, which constituted the sum of heathen prayer in all heathen countries." (Huxley, The Ratio of Science, p. 9, 10.) That contrast in this particular between heathen and Christian worshippers has been well commented upon by Stuhr (Religions-Systeme d. hindischen Volker d. Orienta, Einleitung, p. xii). Indeed, it is a fact worthy the notice of philosophers and of scholars in comparative science of religion that only a very small fraction of heathen prayers are offered for spiritual or moral benefits (compare Crozeur, Symbolik, iv, 162; Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, i. 181, 182). "We proclaim eagerly, Maruts, your ancient greatness, for the sake of inducing your prompt appearance, as the indication of (the approach of) the shower of benefits;" or, "Offer your nutritious viands to the great hero (Indra), who is pleased by praise, and to Vishnu (one of the forms of the sun), the two invincible deities who ride upon the radiant summit of the clouds as upon a well-trained steed. Indra and Vishnu, the devout worshipper glorifies the radiant approach of your two viands, who are the grantees of the fruits of the earth, and who bestow upon the mortal who worships you an immediately receivable (reward), through the distribution of that fire which is the scatterer (of desired blessings)." Such is the strain in which the Hindu of that period addressed his gods. Ethical considerations are foreign to these religious outbursts of the mind. Sin and evil, indeed, are often adverted to, and the gods are praised because they destroy sinners and evil-doers; but one would err in associating with these words our notions of sin or wrong. A sinner, in these hymns, is a man who does not address praises to those elementary deities, or who does not gratify them with the oblations they receive at the hands of the believer. He is the foe, the robber, the demon—in short, the borderer infesting the territory of the "pious" man, who, in his turn, injures and kills, but, in adoring Agni, Indra, and the other deities, who are far more elevated than the rest; and he is satisfied with regulating the detail of the Soma and animal sacrifice according to the rank which he assigns to his deities. A real answer to this great question the theologians attempt who explain the "mysteries, doctrine" held in the utmost reverence by all Hindus, and laid down in the writings known under the name of Upanishads, which relate not only to the process of creation, but to the nature of a supreme being, and its relation to the human soul. In the Upanishads, Agni, Indra, Viṣṇu, and the other deities of the Vedic hymns, become symbols to assist the mind in its attempt to understand the true nature of one absolute being, and the manner in which it manifests itself in its worldly form. The human soul itself is of the same nature as this supreme or great soul; its ultimate destination is that of becoming reunited with the supreme soul and ceasing to exist, as far as it emanated from this being, is already clearly laid down in these Upanishads, though the language in which it is expressed still adapts itself to the legendary and allegorical style that characterizes the Brahmanic portion of the Veda. The Upanishads became thus the basis of the enlightened faith of India. They are not a system of
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philosophy, but they contain all the germs whence the
three great systems of Hindu philosophy arose; and
like the latter, while revealing the struggle of the Hindu
mind to reach the comprehension of one supreme being,
they advance sufficiently far to express their belief in
such a being, but at the same time acknowledge the in-
validity of the human mind to come to the presence of essence
(Chambers, Encyclopaedia). See UPANISHADS.
The Veda also teaches the two ideas so contradictory
to the human understanding, and yet so easily recog-
nized in every human heart: God has established the eternal
laws of right and wrong; he punishes sin and red-
wards virtue; and yet the same God is willing to for-
give: just, yet merciful: a judge, and yet a father (Mi-
ller, i, 38).
But there is no trace, at least not in the Veda, of metempsychosis, which has generally been sup-
pposed to be a distinguishing feature of the Indian reli-
gion, especially of the Vedic period. "Instead of this,
we find what is really the sine qua non of all real reli-
gion, a belief in immortality, and in personal immortality
... passages wherein immortality of the soul, personal
immortality, and personal responsibility after death are
clearly proclaimed" (Müller, i, 45). Professor Booth (Jour-
nal of Theosophical Society, January 1907) says that
we find in the Veda "beautiful conceptions of an im-
materiality expressed in unadorned language with child-
like conviction. If it were necessary, we might find
here the most powerful weapons against the view which
has lately been revived and proclaimed as new, that Per-
sis has taken away the immortality of the soul and
that even the nations of Europe had derived it from
that quarter—as if the religious spirit of every gifted
race was not able to arrive at it by its own strength."
We find also in the Veda vague allusions to a place of
punishment for the wicked. "In verse it is said
that the dead are rewarded for their good deeds; that
they leave or cast off all evil, and, glorified, take their
new bodies. ... A pit is mentioned into which the lawless
are said to be hurled down, and into which Indra casts
those who offer no sacrifices. ... In one passage we read
that 'those who break the commandments of Varuna,
and who speak lies, are born for that deep place'" (Mi-
ller, i, 47; comp. Dr. Muir, Yama, in the Journal of
the Royal Asiatic Society, p. 10).
2. "The Epic period of Hinduism is marked by a simi-
lar development of the same creeds, the general features
of which are characteristic of the Vedic age; but, to him, have presented the more cer-
popular creed strives to find a centre round which to group
its imaginary gods, whereas the philosophical creed
finds its expression in the groundworks of the Sāṅkhya,
Nyāya, and Vedānta systems of philosophy. In the for-
mater, we find two gods in particular who are rising to
the highest rank. Vishnu and Siva are for as Brahmān
(the masculine form of Brahman), though he was looked
upon now and then and superior to both, he gradually
disappears, and becomes merged into the philosophical
Brahma (the neuter form of the same word), which is a
further evolution of the great soul of the Upanishads.
In the Edāsmita, the superiority of Vishnu is admitted
without dispute; in the great epics, the Mahābhārata,
however, which, unlike the former epics, is the product of
successive ages, there is an apparent rivalry between the
claims of Vishnu and Siva to occupy the highest rank in
the pantheon; but Saneéret philologists will first have
to unravel the chronological position of the various por-
tions of this work, to lay bare its groundwork, and to
show the gradual additions it received, before it will be
able to determine the successive formation of the legends
which are the basis of classical Hindu mythology. Yet
so complete is the pantheon that the name is already
predetermined during this Epic period for the supremacy
of Vishnu, and that the policy of incorporating rather
than combating antagonistic creeds led more to a quiet
admission than to a warm support of Siva's claims to
the highest rank. For the character of these gods, and
their relation to the Vedic and the Epic period, see be-
low. "We will point, however, to one remarkable myth,
as it will illustrate the altered position of the gods dur-
ing the Epic period. In the Vedic hymns, the immor-
tality of the gods is never matter of doubt: most of the
elementary beings are invoked and described as ever-
lasting; as liable neither to decay nor death. The offer-
tings they receive may add to their comfort and strength;
they may invigorate them, but, as it is sometimes
said, they are indispensable for their existence. It is, on the
contrary, the pious sacrificer himself who, through his
offerings, secures to himself long life, and, as it is some-
times hyperbolically called, immortality. The same no-
mination occurs elsewhere about the oldest Brāhmaṇas. It
is only in the latest work of this class, the Satapatha-
Brāhmana, and more especially in the Epic poems, that
we find the inferior gods as mortal in the beginning, and
as becoming immortal through external agency. In the
Satapatha-Brāhmana, the juice of the soma plant, of-
fered by the worshipper, or at another time clarified
beer, or even animal sacrifices, impart to them this im-
mortality. At the Epic period, Vishnu teaches them how
to obtain the Amrīta, or beverage of immortality,
without which they would go to destruction; and this
epic Amrīta itself is merely a compound, increased by
various elements, and that the various elements of the
epic writings are called or likened to Amrīta, i.e. a substance
that frees from death." It is obvious, therefore,
that gods like these could not strike root in the religious
mind of the nation. We must look upon them more as
the gods of poetry than of real life; nor do we find that
they enjoyed great veneration. As a hero they was allotted
to the two principal gods, Vishnu and Siva.
"The philosophical creed of this period adds little to
the fundamental notions contained in the Upanishads,
but it frees itself from the legendary dross which still
imparts to them a deep tinge of mysticism. On the
other hand, it conceives and teaches that the union
of the individual soul with the supreme
spirit may be aided by penances, such as peculiar modes
of breathing, particular postures, protracted fasting,
and the like; in short, by those practices which are system-
ized under the name of Yuga doctrine. The most remarkable
work which inculcates this doctrine is the cele-
brated poem Bhagavadgītā, which has been wrongly
considered by European writers as a pure Sāṅkhya work,
whereas Sāṅkara, the great Hindu theologian, who
commented on it, and other native commentators after
him, have profoundly ascertained that it is in reality a
revelation. The doctrine of the reunion of the individual
soul with the supreme soul was necessarily founded on the
assumption that the former must have become free from
all guilt affecting its purity before it can be remerged
into the source whence it proceeded; and since one hu-
man life is apparently too short for enabling the soul to
attain its accomplishment, the Hindu mind concluded
that the soul, after the death of its temporary owner,
had to be born again, in order to complete the work it
had left undone in its previous existence, and that it
must submit to the same fate until its task is fulfilled.
This is the doctrine of metempsychosis, which, in the ab-
nence of a belief in grace, is a logical consequence of a
system that holds the human soul to be of the same na-
ture as that of an absolute God." This doctrine, as we
have already stated, is foreign to the Vedic period. It
is in some of the Upanishads, which have been developed
by means of the Vedas, but their development belongs decisively to the Epic time, when it
pervades the legends, and affects the social life of the
nation. See METEMPSYCHOsis; CARAJA, III, 8.
3. "The Purānic period of Hinduism is the period of
its decline, so far as the popular creed is concerned. Its
pantheon is already in the som of the vast composition of the
period. The triads of principal Hindu gods, Brahma,
Vishnu, and Siva, remain still at the head of its imagi-
nary gods; but whereas the Epic time is generally characterized by a friendly harmony between the high-
cast occupants of the divine spheres, the Purānic period
shows discord and destruction. The popular adoration
has turned away from Brahma to Vishnu and Siva, who
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fore the vina, or lute, is her attribute; Sri, Kubehni, etc., wife of Vishnu, dispenser of blessings. But the most important of all is Siva's female partner, Durga, Kali, or Cales, goddess of evil and destruction, whose worship is far the most extensive. Aside from these, there is yet a multitude of inferior gods, demigods, etc., the principal of which are the seven or ten Brahma-nidhis or 'Gates of Brahma,' the seven or ten Dabahkas, with Diti and Aditi for wives; from Diti come the Daityas or Asuras, the demons (of destruction), but from Aditi the Suras or Devas (i.e. gods). The Gandharvas are the musicians and dancers of heaven; the Aputaras, the heavenly nymphs; the Yakshas, the hosts of evil spirits; and the Yakshezas, the enemies of mankind and of all good. The earth is, besides, inhabited by a multitude of evil spirits. The existence of the three worlds (of the gods, the earth, and the lower world) is not considered eternal; it is to be destroyed by Kala, the god of time, who, in regard to this act, is called Mahapralaya, or the great end. Some animals also are the objects of religious adoration or fear, particularly the bull; also the snakes, whose connection with the demigods brought forth the monkeys, which are the objects of superstition and dread.

Among these, the cow is the most honored, and the Buffalo among trees.

II. Deities.—It has been stated above that the original worship of the Hindus appears to have been addressed to the elements. The heavens, the sun, the moon, fire, the air, the earth, and spirits are the objects most frequently addressed. In fact, the deities invoked appear to be as numerous as the prayers addressed to them. It would be impossible to give any account of the numerous inferior deities, whose number is said to amount to 330,000,000. The most important are the Lakshapalas, who are 'guardians of the world,' who are the eight gods next in rank to the Triad: 1. Indra, the god of the heavens; 2. Agni, the god of fire; 3. Varuna, the god of hell; 4. Surya, the god of the sun; 5. Taru-n, the god of water; 6. Purana, the god of the wind; 7. Karsa, the god of wealth; 8. Soma, or Chandru, the god of the moon. Many other deities were afterwards included in the list; among them, Geena, god of wisdom and science; Kamas, god of love; Ganga, goddess of the river Ganges; Ganad, messenger of the gods, etc. Each of the gods besides has his legal spouse. The most important among these goddesses are Saraswati, wife of Brahma, goddess of eloquence, the protector of arts and science, and particularly of music, where
The Sauras and Ganapatyas are not very numerous. The religious sects of India are divided into two classes, which may be called clerical and lay. The priests may also be divided into two classes, the monastic and secular clergy, the majority belonging to the monastic order, of which they are supported, according to the rules given by laymen to teachers who lead an ascetic life.

The sects which have already been enumerated profess to follow the authority of the Veda, but there are other sects which disavow its authority, and are therefore regarded as forming no part of the Hindu Church. The people believe that the divinity is present in some form in all things, and that all those who eat all kinds of flesh except that of cows; willingly admit procreated from every caste; and consider the profession of arms the religious duty of every individual. An interesting account of this sect is given in Malcolm's Sketch of the Ancient History of India, xi. The Vaisnavas are a sect of Hindus, Sikhs. For the distinctions of caste, see INDIA.

IV. DOCTRINE AND WORSHIP.—As already intimated, a broad distinction exists between the religion of the people and that of the learned. The popular religion is a debased polytheism, without unity of belief or worship. The people believe in the gods, but they are of no certain forms, the only and sure means of salvation, and that those who observe these things will, at a fixed time after death, be admitted into the joys of paradise. The religion of the learned class, on the other hand, professes to rest upon pure contemplation; its theory of the universe is pantheistic, and its religious observances, apart from abstraction of mind in the universal mind, are of no value. The daily duties of the Brahmin consist of five religious occupations, considered as five sacraments: the study of the Veda (brahmajjiguma, or ahuta, i. e. not offered); offering for the progress of the honor of the gods (huta, i. e. offered); maintaining the fire of the dead (pratishthi) in honor of the man (pratishthi); offering the Bali in honor of the spirits (prakruti), and of hospitality, in honor of mankind (brahmanda-huta). Offerings and prayers for all possible objects follow each other from morning till night. Prayers are recommended either by the Veda of the occasion.

The number of ablations the Hindus consider as obligatory is immense; near every temple a pond is provided for that purpose; but the most sanctifying ablations are those performed in the Ganges, particularly at the five points where it unites with other streams. The holiest of all, according to the popular belief of the Hindus, is Allahabad, where, besides the Jumna, the Sarasvati also unites with the Ganges. The most important act of worship consists partly of bloody sacrifices. The principal among these is that of Asvamedha, or sacrifice of horses. Bloody sacrifices are mostly made to Siva and Kali, while the worship of Vishnu is generally that of water, oil, butter, fruit, flowers, etc. All sins of commission or of omission may be effaced by penances described in the laws, and provided for every caste and every case; a thorough fast of twelve days' duration (Puraka) cancels all sins. The prescribed penances must be observed by all, and if sin is not avoided the penalty of his sin in a new form of existence. There are therefore a great number of penitents and hermits in India, who seek merit by the renunciation of all enjoyment and the mortification of the flesh. In fact, Eastern monasticism, in many respects, the type of that of the Buddhist Church. See Monachism.

The ghosts of the learned Hindus consists in regarding union (Yoga) with God as the highest aim of man; this doctrine is further developed in the philosophy of the Veda. The liberation following death is twofold. Such souls as have arrived at high perfection are admitted into the Brahmic heavens (Paradise), where they enjoy a much higher degree of bliss than in the pure state of Indra, but after a time they are sent back again to undergo another period of probation. But when man has by contemplation identified himself with the divinity, or Nirvana, his soul enters into, and becomes part of the immense soul (Atma), and enjoys everlasting felicity, not having to pass through any new forms of human life. Those of this class who aim at reaching this unity with the divinity are called Yogi. An essential means of arriving at this result is found in the penances or Tapa. On certain occasions (fasts) all the practices of the religion are united, sacrifices, offerings, prayers, etc. There are eighteen such fasts considered obligatory. The feast of Hora or Holaka, is the oldest and most important. The Vaisnavas are the offering to all gods. It consists, as has already been stated in our treatment of the Vedic period, in throwing melted butter (ghee) on the flame of the sacred fire, which must be carefully kept burning. The Brahmins offer it every morning, both in their own house, for the first to the god of fire, and the moon, then to all the other gods and goddesses. Each particular feast presents some peculiarities, and they are differently observed in the various localities. Aside from these general feasts, there are many more observed in some districts or of a local character. The most important are those of Jaggernaut, Benares, Guja, Allahabad, Tripety, Dvaraka, Somnath, Ramisaran, the sea Manasarovara, Gangotri, Omerkuntuk, Trimbuck-Nasser, Pervuttum, Parkur, Mathura, and Binduruband.

V. Images, Temples, etc.—The Hindus have images of a great number of gods; they are of a grotesque or fantastic kind; some are represented with heads of animals (as Ganesh), others with superabundant limbs (as Brahma, with four arms), or disfigured, etc. Antiquity was more sparing in this line, but afterwards the arts of India were applied to the production of innumerable monstrosities. The lower orders of divinities are often represented under the form of animals (thus Hanuman is represented as an ape, Mundi as a bull, etc.), and are generally considered as the steeds of the higher deities. These images of the gods are placed in the temples, which originally were groves; they now are pagodas, built in the shape of a pyramid ornamented with columns, statues, etc. These are said to have mystical significance; they are divided into courts by means of colonnades, surrounded by high walls, and by the habitations of the priests. In the vestibule there is always an image of some inferior deity confronting the worshipper. Admission is permitted to all without distinction of race or creed, but the right to worship is only granted to the Kshatriyas and the Vaisyas; the inner part of the temple is reserved for the Brahmans or priests, which, in each pagoda, are under the control of a head Brahmin, who admits as many assistants as the income of the pagoda will permit. In some of these temples there are as many as 3000 Brahmans. Their priestly duties consist in offering sacrifices and reading the Veda. The worship is accompanied by songs and dances from the two higher classes of dancing girls, the Dervadina and the Natakas.

VI. LITERATURE.—See MOON, HINDU PENTHEM (London, 1810); Colebrooke, Derthlot of Hindud (1882); Rhode, URBRELIG, Bildung, der Hindus (Lpz, 1827, 2 vols.); Wilson, RELIGIO FESTAL (A., S. xvi and xvii); Eas, and a Leet, on the RELIGION (2 vols., 8vo); Vizdva Prome, or SYST. OF HINDUS, Mythol (4 vols., 4to, 1802); Colebrooke, MEE. OF HINDUS, Lond., 1807, 2 vols.); RELIG. AND PHILOS., THE HINDUS (Lond., 1806, 8vo); Small, Divul. of Surekha Lit. (Lond., 1869, 12mo); Wheeler, HISTORY OF INDIA (vol. i, Vedica period and the Mahabharata; vol. ii, the Ramayana, the Brahman period, Lond., 1869, 8vo); Wuttke, Gesch. d. Heidenthume (2Ed. Berl, 1855, 2 vols.); WEITZ, A. A. Of Verdi's & Ind. Literature, (1852); Ind. Stud., (1849-58, 1-4 vols.); Ind. Skizzen (Berl. 1857); Muller, On the Lit., of the Vedas (Lond., 1859, 8vo).
Hindu Literature. See Sanskrit Literature.

Hindu Philosophy is divided into six systems or astas, namely, the Nyaya, Vaisesika, Sankhya, Yoga, Mimamsa, and Vedanta. The Sankhya and Yoga agree in all essentials, except that the former is atheistic and the latter theistic. The systems generally unite on certain points: 1. The Mimmansa, excepted, their end is to inculcate expedients for “salvation,” which is deliverance from bondage. 2. The soul, though distinct from the mind, the senses, and the body, yet identifies itself with them. As a consequence of this delusion, it conceives the thought of ownership in itself, and others, and supposes it receives pleasure and pain through the body. As a farther consequence, it engages in good and evil works, which have merit or demerit. As this merit or demerit must be awarded, the soul must pass to Elysium or Hell, and repeatedly be born and die. This is bondage caused by ignorance, from which, when the soul is delivered, it gains absorption into the deity. 3. As a consequence of the foregoing, good deeds and their reward are only a less curse than their opposites, and are to be deprecated, as they compel the soul till the reward is experienced to abide in the body of a god, or a man, or other superior being. 4. Release from transmigration can only be had through “right apprehension,” which consists in recognizing the body of the soul itself as distinct from the mind and all. To gain this “right apprehension” one must study the Sthastras; and, in order to clearness of intellect and heart for this work, such good works as sacrifices, alms, pilgrimages, repetitions of sacred words, and the like, are to be performed, but without desire for reward. 5. They all maintain that the soul has existed from everlasting, and that it is exempt from liability to extinction, though it may be again and again invested with a corporeal body. 6. All the systematists teach the eternity of matter. 7. They all receive the words of the Veda as unquestionable authority. See Refutation of Hindu Systems, by N. Gore (Calculta, 1862); Aphorismes de la Yoga, Sankhya, etc. (Allahabad, India, 1864). (J. T. G.)

Hindus, Modern, a term recently used to designate a class of Hindu reformers, who call themselves Brahmins, and represent a school of thought which originated fifty or sixty years ago with Ram Mohun Roy, who undertook to reform Hinduism on the basis of the Veda alone, the religion of which he held to be a pure theism. In 1846 they became dissatisfied with the Veda, and adopted Intentionalism. They have planted societies throughout Bengal, Madras, the North-West Provinces, the Punjab, and Bombay. They ignore idol worship, caste, metempsychosis, and all Brahminical ceremonies. The Tutus Book-Keepery Press, of Calcutta, has issued a great number of their publications (see Dr. Duff, in Christian Work for 1862; Foreign Missions, by Dr. Anderson). See Ram Mohun Roy. (J. T. G.)

Hindustan. See India.

Hinduism, that upon which a door revolves.

Pro. xxvi, 14; also the pangs of childbirth, Isa. xiii, 8, etc.; also a messenger, Pro. xiii, 17, etc.; a, pth, lit. an interstice, put. for pudenda malebra, Isa. iii, 17; fig. female hinged, i.e. the eyes or parts with sockets. 1 Kings vii, 50). "Doors in the East turn rather on pivots than what we term hinges. They were sometimes of metal, but generally of the same material as the door itself, and worked in sockets above and below in the door-frame. As the weight of the door rests on the lower pivot, it opens like a man less ease than one moving on hinges, particularly when the lower socket becomes worn by the weight and friction."—Pict. Bible, note on Pro. xxvi, 14. "In Syria, and especially the

In Syria, and especially the

Ancient Egyptian Door-hinges. (From the British Mu-

seum.)

Haurim, there are many ancient doors consisting of stone slabs with pivots carved out of the same piece, inserted in sockets above and below, and fixed during the building of the house. The allusion in Pro. xxvi, 14 is thus clearly explained. The hinges mentioned in 1 Kings vii, 50, were probably of the Egyptian kind, attached to the upper and lower sides of the door (Buckingham, Arab Tribes, p. 177; Porter, Damascus, ii, 22, 192; Macmurdell, Early Travels, p. 447, 448 [Bohn]; Shaw, Travels, p. 210; Lord Lindsay, Letters, p. 292; Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. abridgm. i, 15)." See Door.

Himnan, Clara F., D.D., a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Kortright, Delaware Co., N. Y., Aug. 3, 1819. He graduated at the Wesleyan University in 1839, and spent several years in teaching, at one time as principal of Newbury Seminary, Vt. In 1849 he was elected principal of the Wesleyan Seminary at Albion, Michigan, and early in 1853 president of the North-western University. In this position he devoted his whole energy to the work of putting that institution on a proper footing, and his labors in its behalf exhaust his strength and broke his constitution completely. Yet he refused to suspend his exertions until a pending list of engagements was fulfilled, and while thus employed he was prostrated at Troy, N. Y., and died on the 21st of October, 1854. Dr. Himnan distinguished himself in every relation of life, from boyhood to his death, by capacity, energy, and piety. He was a good scholar, an earnest and eloquent preacher, and a very successful ed-
tocator of youth. His early death was a great loss to the cause of Christian education in America.—Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, vii, 817.

Hin'nom (Ib., Himnon, for הִנָּם, gracious, or for הִנָּה, abundant), or, rather, Ben-Himnon (בֵּין הִנָּה, son of Himnom; Sept. νιὸς Ἑμώνι, also in the plur. "sons of Himnon"), an unknown person (prob. one of the original Jebusites), whose name (perh. as resident) was given to the valley ("Valley of Himnom," otherwise called "the valley of the son" or "children of Himnom," "הֵמֹּן", "הֵמֹנֶּה", "הֵמֹנֶּהַת", variously rendered by the Sept. φαραγῆ Ἑμώνι, ου τοῖον Ἑμώνι, ου Τιμωρίαν, Josh. xvii, 16; ου γῆ Βιβενομ, 2 Chron. xxvii, 8; xxviii, 6; το ποιμαντήρου ου το οικείων αὐτῶν,
HINNOM

Jer. xix, 3, 6), a deep and narrow ravine, with steep, rocky sides, on the southerly side of Jerusalem, separating Mount Zion on the south from the "Hill of Evil Counsel," and the sloping, rocky plateau of the "plain of Rephaim" on the north, taking its name, according to NA's note, from the place where those of Molech and Chemosh first having encamped in it (S, and Pol, p. 172). The earliest mention of the valley of Hinnom in the sacred writings is in Josh. xv, 8, where the boundary-line between the tribes of Judah and Benjamin is described with minute topographical accuracy, as passing along the bed of the ravine from Jerusalem to the town of Bethel, "that lieth before the valley westward," at the north end of the plain of Rephaim. It is described in Josh. xviii, 16 as on the south side of Jebusi, that is, Mount Zion, on which the ancient stronghold of the Jebusites stood. The valley obtained wide notoriety as the scene of the barbarous rites of Molech and Chemosh, first introduced by Solomon, who built a "high place for Chemosh, the abomination of Moab, in the hill that is before Jerusalem (Olivet); and for Molech, the abomination of the children of Ammon" (1 Kings xi, 7). The inhuman rites were continued by the idolatrous kings of Judah. "The children of Judah set up their sculptured images there... and burned their sons and daughters in the fire," casting them, it is said, into the red-hot arms of the idol (Jer. vii, 31; 2 Chron. xxviii, 6, xxix, 6). No spot dared entered by the king of Judah. A mount of obelisks was set up in this valley, where he threw the bones of his children, and called the place Gehenna. In the time of the Romans the valley was a scene of hideous cruelty: the deep, retired grotto, shut in by rugged cliffs, and the bleak mountain sides rising over all. The worship of Molech was abolished by Josiah, and the place dedicated to him was defiled by being strewed with human bones. He defiled Tophet, which is in the valley of the children of Hinnom, that no man might make his son or his daughter pass through the fire to Molech... and he brake in pieces the images, and cut down their groves, and filled their places with the bones of men" (2 Kings xxiii, 10, 14). The place has never been entirely ruined. There is a small flat of land, where he now stands in the bottom of this valley and looks up at the multitude of tombs in the cliffs above, and around him, thickly dotting the side of Olivet, will be able to see with what wonderful accuracy the curse of Jeremiah has been fulfilled: "Behold, the days come, saith the Lord, that it shall no more be called Tophet, nor the valley of the children of Hinnom, to which the children of Jerusalem go to walk every one on the high road to burning; for they have made its dripping a place of burning." See Tophet. For the consumption of bodies of criminals, carcasses of animals, and whatever else was combustible, but the rabbinical authorities usually brought forward in support of this idea appear insufficient, and Robinson declares (4, 274) that "there is no evidence of any other fires than those kept up in this valley," referring to Rosenmüller, Biblisch. Geogr. ii, 116, 164. For the more ordinary view, see Hengstenberg, Christol., ii, 454; iv, 41; Keil on Kings ii, 147, Clark's edit.; and comp. Isa. xxx, 33; lxvi, 24. See Moloh. It is called, Jer. ii, 23, "the valley," kar 'eçwîn, and perhaps the "valley of stones," an old expression "valley of fire," or "valley of Nitro's vision," Isa. xxii, 1, 5 (Stanley, S. and P, p. 172, 482). The name by which it is now known is (in ignorance of the meaning of the initial syllable) Wady Jeheannim, or Wady er-Rubbé (Williams, Holy City, i, 56, Supplem.), though in Mohammedan traditions the name Gehem is applied to the Valley of Kidron (Ibn Battuta, 12, 4; Stanley, ut sup.). See Gehenna. The valley commences in a broad sloping basin to the west of the city, south of the Jaffa road (extending nearly to the brow of the great wady on the west), in the centre of which, 700 yards from the Jaffa gate, is the large reservoir, supplied by the earth opened in the floor of the opening of the valley, facing the steep side of Olivet, and where the infatuated inhabitants of Jerusalem burnt their sons and their daughters in the fire—casting them, it is said, into the red-hot arms of the idol (Jer. vii, 31; 2 Chron. xxviii, 6, xxix, 6). No spot dared entered by the king of Judah. A mount of obelisks was set up in this valley, where he threw the bones of his children, and called Tophet, natio-

The place thus became abominably clean; no Jew could enter it (2 Chron. xxxiv, 4, 5). From this time it appears to have become the common cesspool of the city, into which its sewage was conducted, to be carried off by the waters of the Kidron, as well as a, by the, all, which, all its solid, was collected. It was afterwards a pasture for the beasts of the field, a place of destruction, of which the word Hinnom means "abomination." Robinson, one of the earliest travelers in Babylonia, cultivates. About 400 yards from the south-west angle of Mount Zion the valley contracts still more, becomes quite narrow and stony, and descends with much greater rapidity towards the "valley of Jehoshaphat," or the "valley of Kidron," before which it opens out again, forming an orifice in the side of the valley, devoted to gardens irrigated by the waters of Siloam. Towards the eastern extremity of the valley is the traditional site of "Aceldama," authenticated by a bed of white clay still worked by potters (Williams, Holy City, i, 495), opposite to which, where the cliff is thirty or forty feet high, the tree on which Judas hanged himself was located during the Frankish kingdom (Barclay, City of Great King, p. 208). Not far from Aceldama is a conspicuously situated tomb with a Doric pediment, sometimes known as the "white sepulchre," near which are a number of burial caves, with a large sepulchral recess, with an arch at the top, and the native rock, is known as the "Latium apostolorum," where the Twelve are said to have concealed themselves during the time between the Crucifixion and the Resurrection. The tombs continue quite down to the corner of the mountain, where it bends off to the south along the valley of Jehoshaphat. None of the sepulchral recesses in the vicinity of Jerusalem are so well preserved; most of these are very old—small gloomy caves, with narrow, rock-hewn doorways. See Jerusalem. Robinson places the "valley gate," Neb. ii, 13, 15; 2 Chron. xxvii, 9, at the north-west corner of Mount Zion, in the upper part of this valley (Researches, i, 220, 229,
HINRICHS, HERMANN FRIEDRICH WILHelm, a German philosopher of the old Hegelian school, was born at Karlsbach, in Oldenburg, August 25, 1794. In 1812 he entered the University of Strasbourg as a student of theology, but changed for law in 1813 at Heidelberg. Here he studied under Creuzer and Hegel, and became a privadoecent in 1814. In 1822 he was called to the University of Breslau as a professor of philosophy. In 1824 Hinton gave him a call, which he accepted, and here he remained until his death, August 17, 1861. The work which gave him particular prominence as a Hegelian was his *Die Religion im unserm Verkehrsleben zu Wissenschaft* (Heidelberg, 1822), an essay that gained him a prize sustained by Hegel himself.—Brockhaus, *Conn. Lex., vii., 943; Vapereau, *Dict. des Contemp., p. 885.* (J. H. W.)

Hinton, ISAAC TAYLOR, a Baptist preacher and author of note, was born at Oxford, England, July 4, 1796. His father, who was teacher in a boy's school of considerable repute, superintended his son's education. At the age of fifteen young Hinton was apprenticed to the "Clarendon Press," and in 1820 he set up as a printer and publisher. He edited and printed the Sunday Scholars' Magazine. In 1821 he was converted and baptized. He was soon licensed to preach, continuing, however, in business, which he removed to London. He also assisted his brother, John Howard Hinton, in preparing a *History of the United States,* in two quarto volumes, with 100 engravings. While thus engaged, his republican feelings were so developed that he decided to emigrate to this country. He arrived at Philadelphia in 1832. His services as a preacher were much sought, but he had resolved on fixing his residence in the West. He was, however, induced to accept the pastorate of the First Baptist Church in Richmond, Va. The church had a large colored membership, a fact from which some embarrassment was experienced by him in the consistent application of his principles. This, in connection with his original predilections, led to his removal in 1835 to Chicago, then in its infancy. The Church was unable to give him a sufficient support, and he was Oxford, England, engaged in teaching. His congregations were large, and he delivered a course of lectures on the Prophecies, which attracted much attention. The financial disasters of 1837, however, depressed the material prosperity of his Church, and observations on the slavery question divided it. In 1841 he removed to St. Louis, where he labored for about three years, and enjoyed repeated seasons of revival and ingathering. In 1844 he accepted a call to New Orleans, where he had every prospect of success and usefulness, but his labors were cut short by the yellow fever. He died Aug. 28, 1847. His Lectures on Prophecy, above referred to, were repeated in St. Louis, and were published afterwards under the title *The Prophecies of Daniel and John illustrated by the Events of History.* He also published a *History of Baptism, from Inspired and Uninspired Sources.* He was diligent, enthusiastic, yet calm and pacific in his habits of mind, genial in his private intercourse, and an impressive public speaker. His ardor and energy fitted him for the work of which he did so much, that of a pioneer, founding and building up churches. (L. E. S.)

Hkommen-tsong, a celebrated Buddhist traveller of China, was born A.D. 933. At the age of twenty he took the principles of Buddhism. Even at this early age he had become famous for his vast information, especially in the Buddhist faith, and in the doctrines of Confucius and Laotse. A desire to study the origin of Buddhism made him overcome all the obstacles in his way, and he set out on a journey to Colla in the first half of the 7th century (629). He travelled for sixteen years through that country, and on his return wrote a work describing his travels, which were published under the auspices of the Chinese emperor of his time. In this work he gave a very detailed and interesting account of the condition of Buddhism as it prevailed at that period in India. His inquiries having been chiefly devoted to Buddhism, he did not enter much into details concerning the social and political life of the country; but merely gives notices which he gives on other matters, besides those of Buddhist interest that came under his observation, and the high degree of truthfulness which his narrative possesses, makes it one of the most important works on the history of India in general, and of Buddhism in particular, during that period. He travelled alone, or with a few occasional companions, wearing the garb of a religious mendicant, from China to India. He brought with him on his return to his native country, besides images of Buddha and various sacred relics, an immense collection of works, the extent of which may be estimated from the statement of Miller, "It is said that the number of works translated by Hsiouen-tsang, with the assistance of a large staff of monks, amounted to 740, in 3333 volumes" (*Chips,* i, 272). He died A.D. 664. Two of his friends and pupils have left an account of his life, by the Rev. E. M. Stanistreet, who has lately translated the travels of Hsiouen-tsang from Chinese into French (*Voyages des Pèlerins Bouddhistes,* 2 vols., Svo, Paris, 1853-1857), prefixes a translation of this biography to the translation of the travels of Hsiouen-tsang. An abstract of this work, by the late Professor H. L. Cattell, appeared in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society,* xvii, 106-137. A very full account of the life and works of Hsiouen-tsang is given by Max Müller (*Chips,* with a review of the translation of M. Julien.—Müller, *Chips from a German Workshop,* i, 282-274; Julien, *Histoire de la Vie de Hsiouen-tsang; Memoires sur les Contes Orientaux, par Hsiouen-tsang; Homère, Nouv. Biot. Genér. xxiv, 715 sq.; Chambers, *Encyclop. v., 372.* (J. H. W.)

*Hipp* (πῆπ, abk, usually "shoulder") occurs in the A.V. only in the phrase "hip and thigh" (lit. *leg upon thigh*), in the account of Samson's slaughter of the Philistines (*Judg.* xii.) e.g.: evidently a proverbial phrase, i.e. "he cut them in pieces so that their limbs, their legs and their thighs, were scattered one upon another, q. d. he totally destroyed them" (Gesenius). See *SAMSON.*

*Hipp,* in architecture, is the external angle formed by the meeting of the sloping sides of a roof which have their wall-plates running in opposite directions; thus, when a roof has the end sloped back, instead of finishing with a gable, the pieces of timber in these angles are called hip-rafter, and the tiles with which they are covered are called hip-tiles. The internal angles formed by the meeting of the sides of the room valley, whether the latter be horizontal or sloping, and the pieces of timber that support a sloping valley is termed the valley rafter. Such a roof is called a hip-roof.

*Hipp*-knob. See *Final.*

*Hippicus* (Ἱππίκος, equestrium), the name given by Herod (in honor of one of his generals) to that one of the three towers (*Josephus, War,* ii, 17, 9) along the first wall of Jerusalem, overlooking Mount Zion on the north, which lay westernmost, and at its junction with the third wall (*War,* iv, 5, 2), being built up with immense strength (ib. 3). Its remains are still a very prominent object in the city (Robinson, *Researches,* i, 453, sq.; Bartle--*Leeds about Jerusalem,* p. 86 sq.). Schwarz ab- surdly identifies Hippicus (ib. 10, 5) with the tower of Han- aneel (q. v.) of *Jer., xxxi., 38,* on the authority of Jon- than's Targum, which has there the "tower of Piphus (*Πίπος*)." See *Jerusalem.*
Hippocastanum, the name of several saints and martyrs of the early Church, especially that celebrated one of the fathers of the Church who probably lived in the early part of the 3rd century. Every particular of his life has been made a point of controversy. The ecclesiastical writers who make any mention of him, Eusebius and Jerome, give him the title of bishop, but without stating of what see, the latter even saying that he was unable to ascertain this point. "The Chronicon Paschale, our earliest authority, makes him 'bishop of the so-called Portus' before the time which he assigned to his great consecration," writes the author of the Calendar of 650, "by the authority of Cyril, Zonaras, Anastasius, Niphonorus, and Syncellus (see Bunsen's Hippolytus, i. 205), and as Prudentius (lib. viii, vii, Hymn ix) describes his martyrdom as having taken place at Ostia, close by Portus, most critics will probably regard this point as first-council held in 350, which was attended by Aegyptus and Jacobus, and would render him peculiarly fit to be a 'bishop of the nations,' who frequented the harbor of Rome in multitudes. In spite of Jacob's assertion (see below) to the contrary, there seems to be no reason why he should not at the same time have been (what the Εὔγερχος shows him to have been) a bishop and head of a party at Rome. We know, further, that he was a disciple of Ireneus (Phot. Cod. 121), and was engaged in some warm disputes with Callistus on points of doctrine and discipline, which are graphically described in his recovered book, εἰς τοὺς ἁγιασμούς (Kitts, Cyclopedia, s. v.). On the other hand, the treatise, De Synecdotis, attributed to pope Gelasius I, gives Hippolytus the title of metropolitan of Arabia. Le Moyne even indicated a town of the district of Aden, called Portus Romanus, on account of its being the great mart of Roman trade in the East, and the synecdotis of Ireneus's author. The con- tainment exists with regard to the time in which he lived. Eusebius places him in the first half of the 3rd century. Photius states that he was a disciple of Ireneus; Baronus says, of Clement of Alexandria; two assertions which appear equally well grounded. Portus adds that Hip- polytus was the intimate friend and zealous admirer of Origen, and that he invited him to comment on the Scriptures, furnishing him for that purpose seven amanuenses to write under his dictation, and seven copyists. Hippolytus himself testifies to his acquaintance with Origen. As for the other, we are based on a misinterpretation of the passage. According to this father, Ambrosian of Alexandria, with the reputation Hippolytus had acquired by his commentaries on the Scriptures, invited Origen to attempt the same task, and furnished him with a number of copyists. The name of St. Hippolytus is not mentioned by Eusebius. Jerome, Hippo- lytus, and other writers, however, call him a martyr, and his name appears with that title in the Roman, Greek, Coptic, and Abyssinian calendars. Yet these martyro- logies differ so much from each other that they appear rather to refer to different parties of the same name than to one individual only. Prudentius, a Christian poet of the 4th century, wrote a long poem on the martyrdom of St. Hippolytus, but it is evident that he also confounded several parties of that name, and his pious legend is devoid of all historical authority. The date of St. Hippolytus's death is very doubtful. It is gen- erally believed to have occurred under Alexander Severus, yet it is well known that this emperor persecuted Christians. If we admit that the Euchortaria ad Severinum, mentioned among Hippolytus's works, is the same which Theoderet states was addressed to a certain queen or empress (ἡ βασίλισσα τις), and, further, that this Severina, according to Drilling (see below), was the same as the empress Afra of the emperor Decius, this would bring the martyrdom of the saint to the time of Decius's persecution (about 250), and perhaps later. In that case, Hippolytus, having been a disciple of Ireneus, who died about 200, must have been quite advanced in age at the time of his death. It is generally supposed that he suffered martyrdom at Rome, probably in the mouth of the Tiber. According to general opinion, it is thought he was thrown into the sea with a stone tied around his neck. In 1551 a statue was discovered at Rome, near the church of St. Lorenzo, which appeared to date back to the 4th century, and which represented a man in monastic garb, in a sitting posture. The inscription bore the name of Hippolytus, bishop of Portus, and on the back of his seat was found inscribed the canon or paschal cycle which he introduced into Rome, and also a list of his principal works. Some of these works, men- tioned by Eusebius, Jerome, Photius, and the other ecclesiastical writers, or named on the statue, are yet extant, and we have extensive fragments of several others. A number of them have been published separately. Fab- bricius gave a complete collection of them under the title S. Hippolytis, episcopi et martyrise, Opera omnia collecta et parum in primitiva ed. M. M. de Gries et Latiis (Hamb. 1716-1718, fol.). This was reprinted, with additions by Galland, and inserted in his Bibliotheca Patrum (Venice, 1766, fol.), vol. ii. A collection of frag- ments of Syriac translations of Hippolytus is given in the Analecta of Lagarde. The same scholar, in an ap- pendix to his ed. ad Hippocratem, gives a translation of the ita Appendicis (Lips., 1858),), gives Arabic fragments of a commentary of Hippolytus on Revelation. A recent discovery has directed general attention to this old ecclesiastical writer. In 1842 M. Myniole Mi- nas, on his return from a mission to the heathen, and which was sent by M. Villeneuve, minister of public instruction in France, brought back from Mount Athos, among other unpublished works, a mutilated Greek MS. of the 14th century, written on cotton paper, without name of au- thor, and containing a Breviary of all Hiereses (carm. praef. aipotein eis Ίωάννηκα τῆς ιεραίς προσευχῆς). This MS. was presented to the Imperial Library at Paris, where it remained undis- turbed until M. Emmanuel Miller found it to contain the last part of a treatise, the beginning of which was printed in the works of Origen. At Miller's request, the University of Oxford consented to publish it, under his direction, at their own press, with the title, Ῥωμαίων Φιλοσοφούμενος καὶ κατὰ τῶς αισθητῶν Ἰησοῦς (Ori- gentes Philosophorum sive omnium Hierosolymitanus Refutatio: e Codice Parisino nunc primum edidit Emmanuel Miller [Oxford, 1851, Svo]). This work attracted great at- tention among the theologians and philosophers of Grec- many and France, as well as England. The first argument published to show that Hippolytus was the author of the MS. may be found in the Methodist Quar- terly Reivew for October, 1851, in an article by professor J. L. Jacob, of the University of Berlin. After prov- ing that Origen was not the author, the writer was "contemporary with Origen. "He places himself in that age, and all his statements harmonize with this view. Taking him, then, to have lived in the first quarter of the 3rd century, at the time of Zephyrinus, bishop of Rome, and of Callistus, we should be led by Eusebius to identify him with the learned presbyter Caius, or with Hippolytus. It is eas- ily shown, however, that Caius could not have been the author of the book, for he was specially distinguished
for his writings against Cerinthus, and for his peculiar views with regard to that Gnostic leader; while our author has nothing of his own to offer about Cerinthus, and borrows all that he does say (and that is not much), word for word, from Ireneus. Cainus ascribed the Apocalypse to Cerinthus—our author assigns it to the apostate Irenaeus. The Gospel was a strong component of the Gnostic Chiliasm; the latter, while he blames much in Montanism, does not include Chiliasm under it, and indeed it is more than probable that he was a friend of that doctrine. On the other hand, there are the following, among other reasons, for ascribing the work to Hippolytus. Montanism, work bearing the same or a similar title was ascribed by Eusebius, Jerome, Epiphanius, and Nicephorus to Hippolytus. (2.) The monument dug up at Rome (see above) has on it the names of writings which the author of the treatise on heresies claims as his own. (3.) The internal evidence is all in favor of Hippolytus. Professor Jacobi developed the argument at greater length in the Deutsche Zeitschrift für Christl. Wissenschaft (1859), and Dr. Duncker followed in the Göttinger gelehrte Anzeigen (1851). But the most earnest work on the subject was done by the Chevalier Bunsen, who canvassed the whole question with great learning, acumen, and skill, and whose great work, Hippolytus et son Age, or the Doctrine and Practice of the Church of Rome under Commodus and Alexander Severus, and ancient and modern Christiandity and Divinity compared (Lond. 1852, 4 vols., 8vo), in this work it is, we believe, beyond a doubt that the Refutation of all Heresies was written by Hippolytus, according to the Gospels of Portus, near Rome, in the first quarter of the 3rd century. Several writers, however, objected to some of Bunsen's conclusions, and he replied to them by republishing his work, greatly enlarged, under the title Christiandity et Montreal (Lond. 1854, 7 vols., 8vo). This work is a fulness of erudition, but often advanced hasty statements and unauthorized conclusions.

The importance of this newly-discovered work of Hippolytus in the sphere of Church History and archaeology can hardly be overstated. It throws great light upon the Gnostic and other heretical sects of the early Church. Names and even facts are given of which we knew absolutely nothing before; while others that were held to be as unimportant as they were obscure are brought out into light and prominence, illuminating many dark nooks of Church History. The book tells us, for instance, of a Gnostic by name Justus, of whom we had not before heard; and describes at length Momoamone and the Peraticians, of whom we knew only the names. The Simonians, and the strange, fragmentary, and enigmatical ideas generally attributed to Simon Magus, are here treated with something approaching to orderly and clear connection. That part of the work which treats of the morals of the Roman Church and of its clergy is full of interest. Hippolytus censures them for unchastity, and casts it up to them as a great reproach that many, even of the higher orders of clergy, were married out of that more than once. His account of Callistus throws much light upon the state of society and of religion in Rome at the time. The work shows us also that the received doctrine of the Church at that time—a century before the Council of Nice—was the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity and the person of Christ. An account is also given of the revolts and revolutions of the claims of the papacy. Romanist writers, therefore, have sought to invalidate the conclusions drawn by Jacobi, Bunsen, and the Protostates generally. Professor Döllinger seeks to refute the "calumnies" of the book against Callistus in his Hippolytus und Callistus (Paris, 1853, 8vo), and to settle the question of the authorship of the Philosophoumena. He undertakes to show also from the character of the work itself that the author was not a Catholic, but a heretic, in the judgment of the Church of the age when he wrote it. The abéd Cruces, of Paris, published Études sur... Philosophoumena (Paris, 1853, 8vo), to show that the book is neither genuine nor authentic; and he has since followed it up by his Histoire de l'Église de Rome sous les Pontificats de St Victor, St. Zephyrin, et St. Calliste (Paris, 1856). He has also published an elegant edition of the Philosophoumena, with Latin version, notes, and indexes (Par. 1851, 8vo). The best edition of the work, however, is that of W. Scheidewin (Götingen, 1859, 8vo). Another edition, which enables one to compare work of Hippolytus, was published by Lagarde (Hippolyt Romanus qui feruntur omnibus Graecis, Lips., 1688). The subject is very ably treated in its theological aspects, especially in their bearing on the Roman controversy. See also Tod's Hippolytus and the Church of Rome (Lond. 1852, 8vo).

A very great part of the history and contents of the book, with an English translation of the most important parts, is given by Taylor, Hippolytus and the Christian Church of the Third Century (Lond. 1858, 12mo), and by Volckmar, Hippolytus u. d. röm. Zeitgenossen (Zürich, 1858). The leading reviews have generally given articles on the subject: see especially Methodist Quarterly Review, Oct. 1861; Jan. 1863, p. 160; Quarterly Rev. (Lond.) Ixxiv., 87; Journ. of Sacred Literature, Jan., 1858, and Jan., 1864; N. Brit. Rev., Nov. 1854; Edinburgh Review, Jan. 1858; Ilijen, Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, 1860, pp. 96, 143; Journal des Débats, Dec. 1852; Baur, Theol. Jahrbächer (Tübingen, 1858); Studien u. Kritikten, by Gieseler (1853).

Another important work ascribed to Hippolytus, a collection of canons, has lately been published for the first time in an Arabic translation, by Dr. Hamberg (Coptic, Arabic, and Latin. Amsterdam 1857, 12mo, 4th edition. Editio Latina, annotationibus et prolegomenis, Munich, 1870). The collection contains thirty-eight canons which are known to have been in use in the 12th century in the Coptic Church. Before this time no mention is made of this work by the fathers; but the editor regards this as no argument against its authenticity (which he defends), as all the works of Hippolytus had fallen into oblivion. In case it is genuine, its contents are of considerable importance for the history of Christian doctrines and on the constitution of the Christian Churches of the east.

Lipsius, in his work Zur Quellenkritik der Epiphanius (Vienna, 1865), has shown that the work of Hippolytus against thirty-two sects, the conclusion of which is still extant under the title of a homily against the heresy of Niconet, is the basis of the Philosophoumena, and can, to a large extent, be reconstruted from it. See also Lipsius, Church History, vol. ii, § 125; Hare, Contest with Rome, p. 214; Neander, History of Dogmas, i, 51; Milman, Lut. Christ., i, 66 sq.; Lardner, Works, ii, 409 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. vi, 131 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Génér. xxiv, 771 sq.; Chambers, Cyclopaedia, v, 376; and, for the Roman Catholic side, Wetzel und Wehle, Kirchenlexicon, v, 210 sq.; Allom, New-Encyclop. IV, Kathol. Deutsch-land, v, 374. Early monographs on Hippolytus were written by Frommann, Intrepid, New Test. et. Extr. Hippol. (Coblentz, 1785, 4to); C. G. Hinnell, De Hippol. (Götting, 1858, 8vo); Hehnmann, Ubi et quanta episcoporum fuisset Hippolytus (Götting, 1787, 4to); Woog, Fragment. Hippol. Martyria (Lips. 1762, 4to). On the earlier writings of Hippolytus, see Clarke, Succession of Sacred Literature, i, 158; Eusebius, Hist. Ecclesi. vi, 20-23; Lardner, Credibility of the Gospel History, ii, 35; Tillemon, Mémoires, etc., li, 104; Nies, Realencyclopaedie der christl. Alterthumskunde, i, ii, iii, 7. Hippolytus, Brothers (or Hospital. Monks) of the Christian Love of, a monastic order of the Roman Catholic Church, established about 1855 by Bernardin Alvarez, a citizen of Mexico, for nursing the sick. It was sanctioned by the popes Sixtus V and Clement VIII, and received the same rights as the order of the Brothers of Charity which had been established by St. Johannes a Deo, and with which it had statutes, aim, and dress in common. It only differs from it by the color of the monastic dress. The order was named after the patron saint of the city of Mexico, in commemoration of the fall of pugilism, and the capture of the city of Mexico.
HIPPODAMUS

by the Christians on the day of St. Hippolytus (August 13). It never spread beyond Spanish America. (A.J.S.)

HIPPODAMUS

an animal regarded by Bochart (Hieroz. iii, 705), Ludolf (Hist. Ethiop. i, 11), Shaw (Trav. ii, 293, Lond. 8vo), Scheuwer (Phys. Sac. on Job xi), Rosenmuller (Not. ad & Beob. crit. Hieroz. iii, 706, and Schol. ad Vet. Test. in Job xi), Taylor (Appendix to Cal- ne's Diet. Bibl. No. 1xxv), Harmer (Observations, ii, 319), Gesenius (Thes. s.v. θαλασσον), Fürst (Concord. Heb. s.v.), and English commentators generally, as being design- nated by the Heb. word בֵּית הַזָּרוּעַ (behemoth) in Job xi, 15, by which, however, some writers, as Vatlandus, Drusius, Grotius (Cal. Sac. Annotationes ad Job, xi), Pfeiffer, (Dulcius reussi S. S., p. 594, Dresden, 1679), Castell (Lex. Hygii, p. 232), A. Schultens (Comment. in Job, xi), Mi- chaelis (Suppl. ad Lex. Heb. No. 208), have understood the elephant; while others, again, amongst whom is Lee (Comment on Job, xi, and Lex. Heb. s.v. בֵּית הַזָּרוּעַ), consider the Hebrew term as a plural noun for "cattle" in general; it being left to the reader to apply to the scrip- tural allusions the particular animal, which may be, ac- cording to Lee, "either the wild ass, or wild bull". Compare also Reiske, Conjecturae in Job, p. 167. Dr. Mason Good (Book of Job literally translated, p. 478, Lond. 1712) has hazarded a conjecture that the behemoth denotes some extinct pachyderm like the mammoth, with a view to combine the characteristics of the hippopotamus and the elephant, and so to fulfill all the scriptural demands. Compare with this Michaelis (Suppl. ad Lex. Heb. No. 208), and Haseus (in Dissertat. Syllog. No. viii, § 37, and § 38, p. 506), who rejects with some scorn the notion of the identity of behemoth and mammoth. Dr. Kitto (Pict. Bib. Job xi) and Colonel Hamilton Smith (Kitto's Cyc. Bib. Litt. 2d ed., Behemoth), from being un- able to make all the scriptural details correspond with any one particular animal, are of opinion that behemoth is a plural term, and is to be taken as a poetical personi- fication of the great pachydermata generally, wherein the idea of hippopotamus is predominant. The term behemoth would thus be the counterpart of the elephant, the animal mentioned next in the book of Job; which word, although its signification in that passage is restricted to the crocodile, does yet stand in Scripture for a python, or a whale, or some other huge monster of the deep. See Leviathan. According to the Talmud, behemoth is some huge land-animal which daily consumes the grass off a thousand hills; he is to have, at some future period, a battle with leviathan. On account of his gazing on the mountains, he is called "the bull of the high moun- tains." (See Levysohn, Zool. des Talmuds, p. 853). "The fathers, for the most part," says Cary (Job, p. 402), "surrounded the subject with an awe equally dreadful, and in the behemoth here, and in the levia- than of the next chapter, saw nothing but mystical rep- resentations of the devil: others, again, have here pic- tured to themselves some hieroglyphic monster that has no real existence; but these wild imaginations are sur- passed by that of Bolducius, who in the behemoth actu- ally beholds Christ!"

The following reasons seem quite sufficient to identify it with the hippopotamus. 1. The meaning of the original word itself. Gesenius (Thesaurus, p. 183), with whom also Fürst agrees (Heb. Lex. s.v.), holds it not to be a Heb. plur., but the Coptic be-hemont, "the water-ox" (see Jablonsky, Opposci, i, 52), equivalent to the θαλασσος or χαλασσος of other writers of the ancients (Herod. ii, 71; Arrian. 12, ii, 12 [4]; Dioscorid, i, 35; Pliny, viii, 39; Ammian. Marcell. xxii, 15; Ambulatory, Denker, p. 146 sq.; Prosper Alpinus, Res Erg. iv, 12; Ludolph, Hist. Aeg. i, 11, and Comment. i, 159 sq.; Hasselquist, Trav. p. 280 sq.; Sparrmann, Reise durch süd. Africa, p. 562 sq.; Rüppell, Ar. Petr. p. 55 sq.; comp. Schneider, Hist. hippop. nat. crit. in his edit. of Artedi Sympum, p. 247 sq., 316 sq.; Bochart, Hieroz. iii, 705 sq.; Oken, Zool. ii, 718 sq.) Rosenmuller's objection to the Coptic origin of the word is worthy of observation—that, if this were the case, the Sept. In- terpreters would not have given δεικος as its representa- tive. Michaelis translates δεικος by jumenta, and thinks the name of the elephant has dropped out ("Mithi videtur nomele ephemeris forte δεικος excidisse"). Many critics, Rosenmuller amongst the number, believe the word is the plural majestatis of δεικος. But in that case it would hardly be employed with a verb or adj. in the singular, and that would, as it is.

2. A careful examination of the text shows that all the deserts are the characteristic of the behemoth accord entirely with the ascertained habits of that animal. Gesenius and Rosenmuller have remarked that, since in the first part of Jehovah's discourse (Job xxxviii, xxxix) land animals and birds are mentioned, it suits the general purpose of that discourse better to suppose that aquatic or amphibious creatures are spoken of in the last half of it; and that since the leviathan, by almost universal consent, denotes the crocodile, the behemoth seems clearly to point to the hippopotamus, his associate in the Nile. Harmer (Observations, ii, 319) says, "There is a great deal of beauty in arranging the descriptions of the behemoth and the leviathan, for in the Mosaic pavement the people of an Egyptian bark are represented as darting spears or some such weapons at one of the river-horses, as another of them is pictured with two striking near his shoulders. . . . It was then a customary thing with the old Egyptians thus to at- tack these animals (see also Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt. iii, 71); if so, how beautiful is the arrangement: there is a

Chase of the Hippopotamus (Wilkinson).
might be represented as going on with his expostulations something after this manner: 'But dreadful as this animal is, barbed irons and spears have sometimes prevailed against him; but what wilt thou do with the crocodile? Canst thou fill his skin with barbed irons?' In Psalms xxviii.14 Mr. Harmer refers, there are two crocodiles, associates of three river-horses, which are represented without spears sticking in them, though they seem to be within shot. Behemoth "eateth grass as an ox" (Job xi,15)---a circumstance which is noticed as peculiar in an animal of aquatic habits; this is strictly true of the hippopotamus, which leaves the water by night, and feeds on vegetables and green crops. Its strength is enormous, ver. 16, 18, and the notice of the power of the muscles of the belly, "his force is in the navel of his belly," appears to be strictly correct. The tail, however, is short, and it must be conceded that the first part of verse 17, "he moveth his tail like a cedar," seems not altogether applicable. Its mode of attack is with his mouth, which is armed with a formidable array of teeth, projecting incisors, and enormous curved canines; thus "his Creator offers him a sword," for so the words in ver. 19 may be rendered. But the use of his sword is mainly for pacific purposes, "the beasts of the field playing" about him as he feeds; the hippopotamus being a remarkably inoffensive animal. With these apparently combined teeth the hippopotamus can cut the grass as neatly as if it were in the "thin the sycamore," and is able to sever, as if with shears, a tolerably thick and stout stem" (Wood's Nat. Hist. i, 792). 

Hippopotamus Amphibius. It has been said that some parts of the description in Job cannot apply to the hippopotamus: (1.) The 20th verse, for instance, where it is said "the mountains bring him forth food." This passage, many writers say, suits the elephant well, but cannot be applied to the hippopotamus, which is never seen on mountains. In answer to this objection, it has been stated, with great reason, that the word הַרִים (harîm) is not necessarily to be restricted to what we understand commonly by the expression "mountains." In the Psalms another vegetation alluded to above, there are to be seen here and there, as Mr. Harmer has observed, "hillslopes rising above the water." In Ezek. xxxii.15 (marg.), the altar of God, only ten cubits high and fourteen square, is called "the mountain of God." "The eminences of Egypt, which are of an imituation of the mountains of Arabia, may undoubtedly be called mountains in the poetical language of Job." But we think there is no occasion for so restricted an explanation. The hippopotamus, as is well known, frequently leaves the water and the river's bank as night approaches, and makes inland excursions for the sake of the pastureage, when he commits sad work among the growing crops (Hassellquist, Trav. p. 188). No doubt he might often be observed on the hillsides near the spots frequented by him. Again, it must be remembered that the "mountains" are mentioned only by way of contrast with the natural habits of aquatic animals generally, which never go far from the water and the banks of the river; but the behemoth, though passing much of his time in the water and in "the covert of the reed and fens," eateth grass like cattle, and feedeth on the hillsides in company with the beasts of the field. According to a recent traveller in Egypt, the Rev. J. L. Errington, "the valley of the Nile in Upper Egypt and Nubia is in parts so very narrow, that the mountains approach within a few hundred yards, and even less, to the river's bank; the hippopotamus, therefore, might well be said to get its food from the mountains, on the sides of which it would swim." There is much beauty in the passages which contrast the habits of the hippopotamus, an amphibious animal, with those of herivorous land-quadrupeds; but if the elephant is to be understood, the whole description is, comparatively speaking, a snare.

(2.) Again, the 24th verse---"his nose pierceth through snares"---seems to be spoken of the trunk of the elephant, "with its extraordinary delicacy of scent and touch, rather than to the obtuse perceptions of the river-horse." With respect to this objection, there is little doubt that the marginal reading is nearer the Hebrew than that of the text, and views the animal in his usual state, or bore his nose with a gin?" Perhaps this refers to leading him about alive with a ring in his nose, as, says Rosenmuller, "the Arabs are accustomed to lead camels," and we may add the English to lead bulls, "with a ring passed through the noster." The explication in verse 17, "he bendeth his tail like a cedar," has given occasion to much discussion; some of the advocates for the elephant maintaining that the word צַנְדָּב (znâdâb) may denote either extremity, and that here the elephant's trunk is intended. The parallelism, however, clearly requires the posterior appendage to be signified by the term. The expression seems to allude to the stiff, unbending nature of the elephant's tail, which in this respect is compared to the trunk of a strong cedar which the wind scarcely moves.

(4.) The description of the animal's lying under "the shady trees," amongst the "reeds" and willows, is peculiarly applicable to the hippopotamus. It has been argued that such a description is equally applicable to the elephant, but it is hardly the case; for, though the elephant is fond of frequent ablations, and is frequently seen near water, yet the constant habit of the hippopotamus, as implied in verses 21, 22, seems to be especially made the subject to which the attention is directed. At evening tide, he occurred deep, and still possessed occasional sandy islands densely clad with lofty reeds, Above and beyond these reeds stood trees of immense
Hippos (' Ippe', a horse; but Releft suggests, Palae- rat, p. 380, that it may be one of the towns called Φίνισσα
in the Talmud), a city of Palestine, 30 stadia from Tiberias (Josephus, Life, 65), one of the Decapolis (Re-
land, Palestine, p. 215), frequently mentioned by Josephus (1.Just. xv, 7, 3; xvii, 11; War, ii, 18, 1; 18; 13, 5, 13;
Life; Ant., ch. 21, 3; 10, an episcopal city of the land, p. 140, 821, 'n
identified by Burchardt with the ruin es-Sunneh, at
the south-east end of Lake Tiberias._-Yan de Velde, 
Memor., p. 322.

Hir'am (Heb. chir'am, 'high-born; generally
written "Hiram", "Chiram", in Chron., and "Hir-
orn", "Chiram", in 1 Kings v, 10, 18; vii, 40;
Sept. Xocham or Xocham; Joseph. Ephraim and Xoponov)
that it was the king of Tyre or Sidon.

1. Hiram (Sept. makes two names, 'Aχαρων και 
Tovvias'), the last named of the sons of Bela, son of Benja-
min (1 Chron. vii, 56). B.C. post 1856.

2. Hiram, Hiram, or Hiram, king of Tyre at the
commencement of David's reign. He sent an embassy
to Jerusalem, as if in an alliance, or strengthened a previous friendship between them. It seems that the dominion of this prince ex-
tended over the western slopes of Lebanon; and when David built himself a palace, Hiram materially assisted the work by sending cedars-wood from Lebanon, and also stones; and in 1 Kings, v, 10, 18; vii, 10; 1 Chron. vii, 11; 1 Chron. vi-
1). B.C. cir. 1044. It was probably the same prince
who sent to Jerusalem an embassy of condolence and
congratulation when David died and Solomon succeeded,
and who contracted with the new king a more intimate
alliance than ever before or after existed between a He-
brew king and a foreign prince. The alliance seems to
have been very substantially beneficial to both parties,
and without it Solomon would scarcely have been able to
realize all the great designs he had in view. In con-
sideration of large quantities of corn, wine, and oil fur-
nished by Solomon, the king of Tyre agreed to supply
from Lebanon the timber required for the Temple, to
float it along the coast, and deliver it at Joppa, which
was the port of Jerusalem (1 Kings v, 1 sq.; ix, 10 sq.;
1 Chron. ii, 3 sq.). The vast commerce of Tyre made
gold very plentiful there; and Hiram supplied no less than 220 talents of gold for the Temple, and received in return twenty towns in Galilee, which, when he came to inspect them, pleased
him so little that he applied to them as a name of
contempt, and restored them to the Jewish king (2 Chron.
vi, 2). See CAUL.

It does not, however, appear that the good understanding between the two kings was bro-
den by this unpleasant circumstance, for it was after
this that Hiram suggested, or at least took part in, Sol-
omon's traffic to the Eastern Seas, which certainly
could not have been undertaken by the Hebrew king without his assistance in providing ships and experienced mar-
ers (1 Kings ix, 27; x, 11, etc.; 2 Chron. viii, 18; ix, 10, etc.). B.C. cir. 1010. See ORPH; SOLOMON.

Josephus has preserved a valuable fragment of the
history of Mercandia, a native of Ephesus, relating to the
intercourse of Hiram and Solomon, profoundly taken
from the Syrian archives (Apion, i, 18). After the
death of Abia-bus, Hiram, his son, succeeded him in
his kingdom, and reigned thirty-four years, having lived
fifty-three. He laid out that part of the city which is
called Eurychoron, and consecrated the golden column
which is in the temple of Jupiter. And he went up into the mountains on the mountain called Libanos, measured
for the roofs of the temples; and having demol-
ished the ancient temples he rebuilt them, and con-
crated the fanes of Hercules and Astarte: he constructed
that of Hercules first, in the month Peritius; then that
of Astarte, when he had overcome the Tityrians who had
refused to pay their tribute; and when he had subdued
them he returned. In his time was a certain young
man named Abia-bus, who used to stock the ships of
which we have pointed to him by Solomon, king of Je-
rusalem." According to the same authority (ib. i, 17),
the historian Dios, likewise from the Tyrian annals, says,
"Upon the death of Abia-bus, his son Hiram succeeded
unto the kingdom. He raised the eastern parts of the
city, and called it Aelia, and its citizens, and the Temple
of Jupiter Olympius, which stood before upon an island,
by filling up the intermediate space; and he adorned that
temple with donations of gold, and he went up into Lilibaus to cut timber for the construction of the temples.
And it is said that Solomon, who at that time resided in Jerusalem, sent envoys to Solomon, who asked
others in return, with a proposal that whichsoever
of the two was unable to solve them, should forfeit mon-
ey to the other. Hiram agreed to the proposal, but
was unable to solve the enigma, and paid treasurers to
a large amount as a forfeit to Solomon, and paid Solomon and Aelia the two authentic copies of the epistles that passed between the two kings respecting the materials for the Temple. See LEBANON. With the letters in 1 Kings v, and 2 Chron. ii, 5, may be compared not only his copies of the letters, but also the still less authentic letters between Solon and Hiram, and between Solomon and Apries (Apries?), which are preserved by Eusebius (Prop. Evang. ix, 30), and mentioned by Alexander
Polyhistor (Clem. Alex. Strom. i, 24, p. 332). Some
Phoenician historians (ap. Tatian, cont. Grec. § 37) re-
late that Hiram, besides supplying timber for the Tem-
ple, gave his daughter in marriage to Solomon. Jew-
ish writers in less ancient times cannot overlook Hiram's
uncircumcision in his services towards the building of the Temple. Their legends relate (Essenm. Ent. Jud., i,
688) that because he was a God-fearing man, and built the Temple, he was received among the Israelites; but that, after he had been there a thousand years, he
sinned by pride, and was thrust down into hell. Eusebius
(Euseb. Prol. Evang. ix, 30) states that David, af-
ther a war with Hiram, reduced him to the condition of
a tributary prince. See DAVIN.

Some ancient historians consider Solomon as a different person from the friend of David, since Josephus states that the Temple was built in the twelfth year of the reign of the Tyrian king who aided Solomon in the work (Apion, i, 17 sq.; the eleventh, according to Ant. viii, 8, 1); but this is probably only by a computation of the historian, whose numerical calculations in these points are far from trustworthy. (See Nessel, Diss. de amicitia Solon. et Hiramii, Upsal, 1784.) Hiram is also spoken of by Herodotus (ii, 44) as the builder of new temples to Her-
cles, Melcart, and Astarte, and the admirer of that of Zeus-Baalamin.

Ewald (Gesch. Israel, III, i, 28, 88) and Movers (II, i, 326 sq., 446 sq.) give a Hiram II, who reigned from 551-
532 B.C., toward the close of the Chalde.-Babylonian em-
piry, and who is not mentioned in the Bible.

Dr. Robinson describes a remarkable monument of Solomon's ally, still extant, which he passed a little out
of the village of Humaneh, on his way from Safed to Tyre (Jibl. Rev. iii, 348). "It is an immense sarcophag-
gus of limestone, resting upon a pedestal of large hewn stones; a conspicuous ancient tomb, bearing among the common people the name of Kedar Hai-tham," Sepulchre of Hiram, mentions another sarcophagus, measuring by six feet in height and breadth; the lid is three feet
thick and remains in its original position; but a noie
has been broken through the sarcophagus at one end. The pedestal consists of three layers of the like species of stone, each of three feet thick, the upper layer projecting over the others; the stones are large, and one of them measures nine feet in length. This gray, weather-beaten monument stands here alone and solitary, bearing the marks of high antiquity; but the name and the record of him by whom or for whom it was erected have perished, like his ashes, forever. It is indeed possible that the present name may have come down by tradition, and that this sepulchre once held the dust of the friend and ally of Solomon; more probably, however, it is merely of Mohammedan application, like so many other names of Hebrew renown, attached to their welys and monuments in every part of Palestine. I know of no historical trace having reference to this tomb; and it had first been mentioned by a Frank traveller (Monro, 1838) only five years before." (See also Thomson, Land and Book, i, 290 sq.)

3. The son of a widow of the tribe of Dan, and of a Tyrian father. He was sent by the king of the same name to execute the principal works of the interior of the Temple, and the various utensils required for the sacred services (1 Kings vii, 13, 14, 40). We recognise in the enumeration of this man's talents by the king of Tyre a character common in the industrial history of the ancients (comp. those of Bezaleel, Exod. xxxi, 3-5), namely, a skilful artisan, knowing all the arts, or at least many of those arts which we practise, in their different branches. See Handicraft. It is probable that he was selected for this purpose by the king from among others equally gifted, in the notion that his half-Hebrew blood would render him the more acceptable at Jerusalem. B.C. cir. 1010. He is called "Hiram" in 2 Chron. ii, 13; iv, 11, 16, and "Hirom" in the margin of 1 Kings vii, 40. In 2 Chron. ii, 13, הירם rendered "Hiram my father's," so in 2 Chron. iv, 16, הירם is rendered "Hiram his father;" where, however, the words הירם and יירם can hardly belong to IV—8

The "Tomb of Hiram."

The name, but are appellations; so that "Hiram my (or his) father" seems to mean Hiram my counsellor, i.e. foreman, or master-workman.

Hircanus (Ὑρκανός, i.e. Hyrcanus), a son of Tobias," who had a large treasure placed for security in the treasury of the Temple at the time of the visit of Heliodorus (2 Macc. iii, 11), B.C. cir. 187. Josephus also mentions "children of Tobias" (ταμιίς Ταύβιον, Ant. xii, 5, 13), who, however, belonged to the faction of Menjaus, and notices especially a son of one of them (Joseph) who was named Hyrcanus (Ant. xii, 4, 2 sq.). But there is no sufficient reason for identifying the Hyrcanus of 2 Macc. with this grandson of Tobias either by supposing that the ellipsis (rou Tawbion) is to be so filled up (Grotius, Calmet), or that the sons of Joseph were popularly named after their grandfather (Ewald, Gesch. iv, 309), which could scarcely have been the case in consequence of the great eminence of their father.—Smith. See Maccabees.

The name of Hyrcanus occurs at a later period under the Maccabees. It has been thought that it was adopted on account of a victory gained by John, the son and successor of Simon Mac- cabenus, over the Hyrcanians (Euseb. Chron. lib. ii; Sulp. Severus, Hist. Stac. lib. iii, c. xxvi). Josephus informs us that Hyrcanus accompanied Antigonus VII Sidetes into Parthia, and Nicolaus of Damascus says that a trophy was erected at the river Lycus to commemorate the victory over the Parthian general (Ant. xiii, 8, 4). The Hyrcanians were a nation whose territory was bounded on the north by the Caspian Sea, and would thus be at no great distance from Parthia, where John Hyrcanus had gained the victory. It is remarkable that the different statements agree in the position of the countries, Hyrcania, Parthia, and the river Lycus (of Assyria) being contiguous. As Josephus, however, does not give any explanation of the name (Ant. xiii, 7, 4; War, i, 2, 5), and the son of Simon is nowhere called Hyrcanus in 1 Macc., the reason for its assumption is uncertain. See Hyrcanus.

Hierling (자는 sakir's μεταξάρ), a laborer who is employed on hire for a limited time (Job xii, 1; xiv, 6; Mark i, 20). By the Mosaic law such a one was to be paid his wages as soon as his work was over (Lev. xix, 13). The little interest which would be felt by such a temporary laborer, compared with that of the shepherd or permanent keeper of the flock, furnish a striking illustration in one of our Lord's discourses (John x, 12, 13). The working-day in the East begins with the rising of the sun, and ends when it sets. The parable in Matt. xx, 1-14, is interesting, not only as showing what the day's wages of a laborer at this period in Judaea, "a penny," i.e. the Roman denarius, about fifteen cents of our money, but also showing that the salvation of the Gentiles can in itself become no impediment to the Jews; and as eternal life is the free gift of God, he has a right to give it in whatever proportions, at whatever times, and on whatever conditions he pleases. See Exemplary Wages, etc.

Hirmologion (ἱρμολογίον), a collection of hirmoi; also the exaltation of the Panaghia (q. v.) in the Greek
HIRMOS

Church (Neale, Hist. of the Eastern Church, p. 890). See Hirmos.

Hirmos, or rather Hirmos (ἐτίπος, a series) is the name of a strophe in a Greek hymn. "The model of succeeding stanzas, so called as drawing others after it." — Walcott, Soc. Archæologia (Svo, London, 1868).

Hirnheim or Hirnhaum, Hieronymus, a distinguished Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Troppau, province of Silesia, in 1655. He took orders in 1679, and pursued his theological studies at Prague until appointed instructor in philosophy at the Norbertin College. A short time after he was made abbot of Mount Sion, and later general vicar of Bohemia, Moravia, Silesia, and Austria. Hirnheim is generally ranked among modern skeptics, and most of his works have been censured in the Roman Index. He was a great abettor of the Protestant Church, and employed, in common with a number of other theologians of his Church, to combat Protestantism, secret weapons, as he saw no prospect of vanquishing them in the dogmatic field. He died August 27, 1760. His most important work is De typho generis humani, sive scieniarum humanarum incarni ac ventoso tumore, difficilissem, labilitate, falsitate, jactantia, praesumptione, incommodis et periculis, tractatu brevi, etc. (Prague, 1676, 4to), put into the Index April 14, 1692. Jöcher, Gelehr. Lex. Addenda ii, 2018; Kraus,Philosoph. Handwörterb., 488; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Génér., xxiv, 791.

Hiroim. See Hiram.

Hirsch, Andreas, a Lutheran minister of the latter half of the last century. He studied theology at Strasburg, and filled several positions as preacher, but gave dissatisfaction to the people, and was driven from each of them in succession. Notwithstanding all persecution, he managed sufficient time to write several works, among which are, Kircherus Jesuitae Germaniae redonatus, etc. (Halle, 1662; Svo). —Religionsgespräch zwischen zweierlei Religionenverwirrten (Rotternburg, 1672, 4to): — Predigten und Gelehrtenbriefen (ibid. 1673, 8vo). —Jöcher, Gelehr. Lex. Addenda ii, 2018.

Hirsch, Carl Christian, a German theologian, was born at Hersbruck October 29, 1704. He studied at Altorf, Leipzig, and other universities, and went to the theological seminary at Nuremberg in 1729. He entered the ministry in 1734, and in 1740 was appointed deacon of Lorenz Church at Nuremberg. He died Feb. 27, 1784. His chief works are: Histoire Litt. de l'Art sacré et des moeurs des Romains, etc. (Nuremberg, 1756, 4to); — Geschichts- und Landschaftsbeschreibungen der Deutsch-Deutschen, Continu. (ibid. 1758-1764, 4to); — Geschichte der Kirche der Deutschen (1760, 4to); — Geschichte der Weltliteratur (1775, 4to). He wrote also a number of monographs inserted in the Acta Historiae ecclesiae, and in the Acta Scholast. of Nuremberg. Jöcher, Gelehr. Lex. Append. ii, 1791; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Génér., xxiv, 793; Düring, Gelehr. Thelol. Deutschl., i, 738.

Hirsch-Choetz, Zern, ben-Jerachmiel, a Polish Rabbi, and one of the most eloquent preachers of the 17th century, was born at Cracow, but spent his later days in Germany. He gained renown as an author by הרלדט הדכואס או ג'ר, or Hereditas decoris ex Jer. iii, 19 (Frankf. 1721, 4to); an allegorical commentary on the Pentateuch, written in German, with Hebrew characters, and in the main drawn from "Zohar," one of the works of the Cabalists. זוחרא, זוחרא, or Sabbath tam fut (Paris, 1693, 4to); ויאו, or Descendit decoris, a commentary on ת' יא (Amsterdam, 1706, fol.), etc. — Fürst, Bib. Jud. i, 177; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Génér., xxiv, 792; Jöcher, Gelehr. Lex. ii, 1626.

Hirschau or Hirsaue, a very celebrated old German provincial name, is the name of a number of distinctine order, in the diocese of Speier, having much in common with the congregation of Cluny (q. v.). It is asserted by the Roman Catholics to have been opened A.D. 645; but it was probably founded about 850 by count Erfalvied von Calw and bishop Notting of Verceil. The monks and the different abbots who inhabited it were distinguished for their scholarship. Some were authors, others rose to high distinction in the Church. Among these, the abbots of Seligenstadt, more than any other to establish the noble reputation of this monastery. After the Reformation it became a Protestant seminary until 1692, when the French, on their invasion of the country, destroyed it. A history of this monastery was written by Johann Theodor, professor of its abbots, under the title Chronicon Hirsaugense (Basel, 1559, fol., and 1690, 2 vols. fol.). — Herzog, Real-Enzyklop. vi, 143; Wetzler u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. v, 213; Real-Enzyklopädie fur d. Kathol. Deutschl., v, 375. See BENEDICTINER, J. H. W.

Hirscher, Johann Baptist von, a celebrated German Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Alzengarten, Würtemberg, Jan. 20, 1788. He was educated at the Lyceum of Constance and at the University of Freiburg, and was made a priest in 1810. He held the position of instructor in philosophy and theology in different institutions until 1817, when he was called as professor of ecclesiastical pastoral theology at the University of Tubingen. In 1837 he was called to the University of Freiburg, and in 1839 he became a member of the cathedral chapter of the archiepiscopate of Freiburg. He was also appointed an "ecclesiastical counselor," and, somewhat later, a privy counselor (Geheimer Rat). In 1849 he was elected a member of the University of Freiburg in the First Chamber of the grand-duchy of Baden, into which he was subsequently several times called by the confidence of the grand-duke. In 1850 he became dean of the cathedral chapter. In 1863 he resigned his position at the university on account of his health. He died Sept. 4, 1865. Hirscher was one of the representatives of Roman Catholic theology in the 19th century. At the beginning of his literary career he was a zealous advocate of liberal reforms within his Church; subsequently he gradually became, with Möhler (q. v.), Drey (q. v.), and other professors of Tübingen, a more outspoken champion of the tenets of his Church in opposition to Protestantism, and joined his colleagues as founder and co-editor of the Theologische Quartalschrift (established 1819), one of the ablest theological organs of the Church of Rome. But, though a prolific and prominent author in behalf of his Church and its beliefs, even in later life, to favor the introduction of some reforms, as the admission of the laity to diocesan synods, and, laid, in general, greater stress on those points which the Roman Catholic Church has in common with orthodox Protestantism than on those which separate the two churches. He remained an opponent of Ultramontane theories, and was therefore, up to his death, the object of many attacks on the part of Ultramontane writers. Several of his earlier works, in particular the one entitled De Missa (Tübingen, 1821: German transl. Baden, 1826), in which he advocated the use of the Latin language in divine services, were put in the Roman Index. The chief aim of most of his works is to represent the doctrines of his Church, especially those most offensive to Protestants and liberal Roman Catholics, in as favorable a light as possible. The most important among his works are: Die Lehre vom kathol. Ablass (6th ed. Tubt, 1856); Gesch. Jesu Christi (Tubt, 1840; 2d ed. 1845); — Kutschetik (4th ed. Tubt, 1840); — Betrachtungen über sämmtliche Evangelien der Frauen (Tubt, 1849); — Die kirch. Zuständig. d. Geheimwarten (Tubt, 1851); — Die christl. Moral (Tubt, 1835, 3 vols.; 5th ed. 1850-1851); — Betrachtungen über die somitige. Evangelien des Kirch. Jahres (5th ed. Tubt, 1856, 2 vols.); — Erörterungen über die grossen religiösen Fragen der Geschicht (Tubt, 1843; 2d ed. Paris, 1843, 1852); — Hauptstücke des christl. Glaubens (Tubt, 1857); — Kutschetikus (Frib. 1842, and many edit. since); — Re-
HIRT

trächtigen über sämmtliche somnolent. Epistelae (Freiburg, 1869-1892, 2 vols.) — *Das Leben Mariae* (5th ed. Freib. 1908). And he also wrote this dissertation of poor and abandoned children, himself establishing three houses of refuge. He wrote on this subject the work *Die Sorge für die sittlich verschorften Kinder* (Freib. 1856). A volume of minor posthumous works (*Nachgelassene kleine Schriften*, Freib. 1899) has been published by Rollin. This work contains also a biography of Hirschel.—Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines, transal. by Smith, ii, 457; Hase, *Church History*, transal. by Blumenthal and Wing, p. 654; *Algem. Real.-Encyklop.,* vii, 629. (J. A. S.)

HIRT, JOHANN FRIEDRICH, a distinguished German theologian, was born at Apolda, in Thuringia, Aug. 14, 1719. He studied at the University of Jena, and in 1746 was made extraordinary professor of philosophy. In 1769 he changed to the chair of theology, and in 1775 was appointed regular professor of theology at the University of Wittenberg. He died July 29, 1784. Hirt was regarded as one of the first theologians at the Wittenberg University, and inferior to no other person as a scholar of the Oriental languages. He is especially known in this department by the development which he gave to the systems of Alting and Danz on the Hebrew language (*Systema trinum morarum*); but the advance of late years in the field of exegetical theology developed the value of all his efforts in this direction. His most important works are, besides a host of dissertations in the field of exegesis, *Biblia Hebraica analytica* (Jena, 1758, 4to) — *Philologisch-exegetische Abhandlung ub. Psalm xv, 14, 45* (ibid. 1758, 4to) — *Dieu, Mysterium, et ejus resurrectione demonstrata* (ibid. 1757, 4to) — *Biblia hebraica analytica para Christiocen* (ibid. 1757, 8vo) — *Vollständ. Erklärung d. Sprüche Salomos* (ibid. 1768, 4to) — *Instit. Arabin. linguae* (ibid. 1770, 8vo) — *Orantialische und exeget. Biblia* (ibid. 1772-1775, 8 vols., 8vo); continued, under the title *Witten. Oriant. und exeget. Biblia,* Jena, 1779, 4 vols., 8vo; *Gebrihm Lex.* Add., ii, 1822; *Döring, Gekhr. Theol. Deutschl.* i, 740 sq.; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale,* xxiv, 795. (J. H. W.)

HIRZ, NAPHTALI, BEN-JACOB-ELCHANAN, one of the most celebrated Jewish Cabalists, was born at Frankfort-on-the-Main in the latter half of the 16th century. The only work of Hirz which was printed, *Poetic. Poetic.* (in Valley of the King (Amat. 1849, fol.), is a complete exposit of the Cabala. The vast amount of work which he made for the preparation of this work makes it indispensable for inquirers into the Cabalistic system. He died, Fürst says, in Palestine, but the date is not certainly known. — Först, *Biblio. Judaico,* i, 401; Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Générale,* xxiv, 800.

HIRZEL, BERNARD, a Swiss theologian and Orientalist, was born at Zürich in 1807. He was for many years pastor of a small parish at Pfössikon. Most of his life he devoted to the study of the Oriental and Sanscrit languages. In the ecclesiastical revolt of Sept. 6, 1839, he led the peasants to the city of Zürich, on which incident he wrote a book entitled *Mein Antheil a. d. Be- wönnung d. Gémeine Sept.* (Zür. 1839). He died in Paris June 14, 1847. Of his works the translation of the dramas of Kalissata, *Sukkutata* (Zürich, 1838), and of Solomon's Song: *Das Lied d. Lieder* (ibid. 1840), and the Hebrew poem *Geischt d. Todebeten u. d. Erdkreis* (ibid. 1844), are best known. — Hoefer, *Nouv. Biog. Généale,* xxiv, 801; Brockhaus, *Conc. Lex.* vii, 946.

HIRZEL, JOHANN HEINRICH, a German theologian, was born at Zürich (Switzerland) Dec. 18, 1716. In 1747 he was appointed professor of oratory and Church history at the university of his place; in 1745, of logic and rhetoric; and in 1759 was called to the chair of theology. He died Nov. 20, 1764. Of his writings, most remained in MS. He published *Diap. de verbo Dei uniaco reformata Relig. fundamento* (Zür. 1760, 4to) — *Diap. de vi et amplitudine nominis Dir. Jehovae Zeboth* (ibid. 1762, 4to). — *Jocher, Gekhr. Lexicon,* Add. ii, 2023 (J. H. W.).

HITHI (ҥ-ҥ-ҥ, shurakt, to whittle), a term usually expressing insinuation and contempt (Job xxvii, 20); so in the denunciation of the destruction of the Temple (1 Kings ix, 8; comp. Jer. xix, 8, xliv, 17, etc.). To call any one with hissing is a mark of power and authority (Isa. v, 26), and the prophet Zechariah (x, 8) speaking of the return from Babylon, says that the Lord will gather the house of Judah, and he will come with a hiss, and bring them back into their own country: an image familiar to his readers, as Theodoret and Cyril of Alexandria remark that, in Syria and Palestine, those who looked after bees drew them out of their hives, carried them into the fields, and brought them back again, with the sound of a flute and the noise of hissing (Isa. vii, 18). — See Buz.

Histopédèse (inriç, a mast of a ship, and waq, a foot), a term applied to certain heretics, chiefly Emomians, who baptized only the upper parts of the body as far as the breast, and this with the heels upward and the head downward (toνς ποτας ανω, και την κεφαλιν κωρω). Hence the name *Histopedes, or Pedeverci.* See Epiphanius, *Harar. c. 79; Bingham, Orig. Eccls. bk. xi, chap. 18.*

Histories, a name applied to anthems composed either out of Scripture or from lives of the saints. — Walcot, *Sacred Archetyp.* p. 312.

History, in its modern sense, is hardly a term that expresses the conception of the sacred writers, who nevertheless have given us invaluable materials for its construction. The earliest records of the O.T. are rather family pedigrees *(י-ת, generations)*, and the Genealogies and Acts are properly *memories* and personal memoranda. See Chronicles.

1. It is evident, however, that the Hebrew people were a *commemorative race*; in other words, they were given to creating and preserving memorials of important events. Even in the patriarchal times we find monuments set up in order to commemorate events. Jacob (Gen. xxviii, 18) *set up a pillar* to perpetuate the memory of the divine promise; and that these monuments had a religious import and sanction appears from the statement that "he poured oil upon the top of the pillar" (Gen. xxxi, 45; Josh. iv, 9; 1 Sam. vii, 12; Judg. ix, 6). Long-lived trees, such as oaks and terebins, were made use of as memorial stones (Exod. xxiv, 26). Commemorative names, also, were given to persons, places, and things; and from the earliest periods it was usual to substitute a new and descriptive name for an old one, which may in its origin have been descriptive too (Exod. ii, 10; Gen. ii, 25; iv, 1). Genealogical tables appear, moreover, to have had a very early existence among the people of whom the Bible speaks, being carefully preserved first memoriser, afterwards by writing, among family treasures, and thus transmitted from age to age. These, indeed, as might be expected, appear to have been the first beginnings of history—a fact which is illustrated and confirmed by the way in which we should term a narrative or historical sketch is spoken of in the Bible, that is, as "the book of the generation" ("of Adam," Gen. v, 1): a mode of speaking which is applied even to the account of the creation (Gen. ii, 4), "These are the generations of the heavens and the earth, which were created they were created." The genealogical tables in the Bible (speaking generally) are not only of a very early date, but are free from the mixtures of a theological and cosmogonical kind which are found in the early literature of other primitive nations, wearing the appearance of being, as far at least as the true genealogical complete lists of individual and family descent (Gen. v, 1). But perhaps the most remarkable fact connected with this subject is the employment of poetry at a very early period to perpetuate a knowledge of historical events. Even in Gen. iv, 28, in the case of Lamech, we find po-
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every man employed, that is, by the great-grandson of the primitive father. Other instances may be found in Exodus xv; Judges v; Joshua xx; 2 Samuel i, 18.

1. The sources of Biblical history are chiefly the Biblical books themselves. Any attempt to fix the precise value of these sources in a critical point of view would require a volume instead of an article. Whatever hypothesis we may entertain individually, the fact is that the exact time when these books, or any of them, were put into their actual shape, as also touching the materials out of which they were formed, one thing appears very certain, that (to take an instance) Genesis, the earliest book (probably), contains, most indubitably, as well as most interesting historical facts; for though the age, the mode of life, and the state of culture differ so widely from our own, we cannot do otherwise than feel that it is among men and women, parents and children—beings of like passions with ourselves—and not with mere creations of fancy or fraud, that we converse when we pursue the narratives which this composition has so long preserved. The conviction is much strengthened in the minds of those who, by personal acquaintance with the early profane writers, are able to compare their productions with those of the Hebrews, which were long ante- rior, and which were composed by an equally ancient or- gin, have been at least equally deformed by fable. The simple comparison of the account given in Genesis of the creation of the world with the Cosmogenies of heathen writers, whether Hindu, Greek, or Latin, is enough to assure the impartial reader that a purer, if not a higher information, is to be obtained by the expression of the facts in a form which the ancient writers have been careful to preserve the legends or the philosophies of heathenism; nor is the conclusion in the slightest degree weakened on a closer scrutiny by any discrepancy which modern science may seem to show between its own revelations and the statements in Genesis. The Biblical history, as a scratched on its Biblical sources has a decided peculiarity and a great recommendation in the fact that we can trace in the Bible more clearly and fully than in connection with any other history, the first crude elements and the early materials out of which all history must be constituted.

2. How far the literature supplied in the Bible may be only a relic of a literary cycle called into being by the felicitous circumstances and favorable constitution of the great Semitic family, but which has perished in the lapse of ages, it is now impossible to determine; but had the other portions of this imagined literature been of equal religious value with what the Bible offers, there is little risk in affirming that mankind would scarcely have allowed it to be lost. The Bible, however, bears traces that its were not the only books current in the time and country to which it relates; for writing, writers, and books are mentioned without the emphasis and distinction which always accompany new discoveries or peculiar local possessions, and as ordinary, well-known, and matter-of-course things. It is certain that we do not possess all the works which were known in the early periods of Israelitish history, since in Numbers xxii, 14 we read of "the book of the sons of the Lord," and in Joshua x, 13, of "the book of Jasher." Without writing, history, properly so called, can have no existence. Under the head Writing we shall trace the early rudiments and progress of that important art; here we merely remark that an acquaintance with it was possessed by the Hebrews at least as early as their Exodus from Egypt—a fact which shows at least the possibility that the age of the Biblical records stands some thousand or more year prior to the earliest Greek historian, Herodotus. Other sources for at least the early Biblical history are comparatively of small value. Josephus has gone over the same periods as those the Bible treats of, but obviously had no sources of consequence relating to primitive times which are not open to us, and in regard to those times does little more than add here and there a patch of a legendary or traditional hue which could well have been spared. His Greek and Roman predilections and his apologetical aims detract from the value of his work, while in relation to the early history of his country he can be regarded in no other light than a sort of philosophica- l interpreter; nor is it till he comes to his own age that he has the value of an independent (not even then an impartial) eye-witness or well-informed reporter. In his annals he is not consistent, and the care with which business was very insufficiently furnished. The use of both Josephus and Philo is far more safe for the student of the New Testament than for the exponent of the old. See Josephus.

3. The Talmud and the Rabbis afford very little assistance for the early periods, but might probably be made to render more service in behalf of the times of the Saviour than has generally been allowed. The illustrations which Lightfoot and Wetstein have drawn from these sources are of great value; and Gfrorer, in his Jahrhun- dert des Heils (Stuttgart, 1838), has made ample use of the materials they supply in order to draw a picture of the first century, a use which the learned author is at no small pains to justify. The compilations of the Jew- ish doctors, however, require to be employed with the greatest caution, since the Rabbis were the depositaries of the earlier writings, and the compilation of each has been on the form of the primitive faith and of the Mosaic institutions which has been called by the distinctive name of Judaism, comprising a heterogeneous mass of false and true things, the colloquies of the East as well as light from the Bible, and which, to a great extent, lies under the inquisition of the compilers of Jewish history. The expression of the faith in the Talmud is to propagate fables on their authority, and to do a disservice to the Gospel records, may be learnt from the fact that older writers, in their undue trust of Rabbinic authority, went so far as to maintain that no cock was allowed to be kept in Jerusalem, because fowls fall from the sky, or that the author of Scripture (which in this case they refused to admit) is most express and decided (Matt. xxvii, 54; Mark xiv, 30, 60, 72). On the credibility of the Rab- bins, see Ravii Diss. Phil. Théol. de eo quod Fidei meren- tur, etc., in Dilherr's Collect. Mystic. Hist. et Theol. Pans. Wolf, Hilt. Heb. ii, 1095; Fabricius, Biblici, Antiqu. i, 3, 4; Brunsmann, Diss. de Judaeis (Hafniae, 1705).

The classical authors betray the grossest ignorance almost in all cases where they treat of the origin and history of the Hebrew people; and even the most seri- ous and generally philosophic writers fall into vulgar erors and unaccountable mistakes as soon as they speak on the subject. Whet, for instance, can be worse than the blunder or prejudice of Tacitus, under the influence of which he declared that the Jews derived their origin from Mount Ida, in Crete? that by the advice of an oracle they had been driven out of Egypt; and that they set up in their temple at Jerusalem as an object of worship the figure of an ass, since an animal of that species had directed them in the wilderness and discovered them a fountain (Tacitus, Hist. v, 1, 2). Dion Cassius (xxxvii, 17) relates similar fables. Plutarch (Quint. Sca. 5, 5) makes the Hebrews pay divine honors to swine, as being their instructors in agriculture, and afirms that they kept the Sabbath and the Feast of Taber- nacles in honor of Bacchus. A collection of these gross misrepresentations, together with a profound and generally philosophic inquiry into their sources, and the falsehood of their falsehood, has been given by Dr. J. G. Müller, in the Theologische Studien und Kritiken (1845, iv, 893).

3. The children of the faithful Abraham seem to have had one great work of Providence intrusted to them, namely, the development, transmission, and infusion into the world of the religious element of civilization. Their history, accordingly, is the history of the rise, progress, and diffusion of true religion, considered in its source and its developments. Such a history must possess large and peculiar interest for every student of human nature, and pre-eminently for those who love to study the unfoldings of Providence, and desire to learn that
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greatest of all arts—the art of living at once for time and for eternity. The material contained in the Biblical history is of a wide and most extensive nature. In its greatest length and fullest meaning it comes down from the creation of the world till the close of the 1st century of the Christian era, thus covering a space of some 4000 years. The books presenting this long train of history are written not only in prose, but in verse also, in unison, and in verse; nor seldom is it the fact that the modern historian has to construct his narrative as much out of the implications of an epistle, the highly-colored materials of poetry, the far-reaching visions of prophecy, and the indirect and illusive information of didactic and moral precepts, as from the immediate and express statements of history strictly so denominated.

The historical materials furnished relating to the Hebrew nation may be classed under three great divisions: 1. The books which are consecrated to the antiquity of the Hebrew nation—the period that elapsed before the era of the judges. These works are the Pentateuch and the book of Joshua, which, according to Ewald (Geschichte des Volkes Israel, i, 72), properly constitute only one work, and which may be termed the great book of original documents. 2. The books which duplicate the times of the judges and kings, in the first description of Jerusalem; that is, Judges, Kings, and Samuel, to which belongs the book of Ruth: “all these,” says Ewald, “constitute also, according to their last formation, but one work, which may be called the Great: Book of Kings. 3. The third class comprises the books included under the head of Hagiographies, which are of a much later origin, Chronicles, with Ezra and Nehemiah, forming the great book of general history reaching to the Grecian period. After these books come those which are classed together under the name of Apocrypha, whose use, we think, has been unduly neglected. These works preserve records of events which, closed within the century that saw it open. Other books found in the Old and New Testaments, which are not properly of a historical character, connect themselves with one or other of these periods, and give important aid to students of sacred history.

4. Biblical history in general. These works are the older writers as a part of Church History in general, since they considered the history given in the Bible as presenting different and successive phases of the Church of God (Buddel Hist. Eccles. 2 vols. 1726-39; Stolberg, Gesch. der Religion Jevn, i, 111). Other writers have viewed this subject in a more practical light, presenting the characters found in the Bible for imitation or avoidance; among whom may be enumerated Hess (Geschichte der Israeliten vor den Zedern Jevn, Zürich, 1775) and Nie- meyer (Charakteristik der Bibel, Halle, 1830). Among the more strictly learned writers several have had it in view to supply the gaps left in the succession of events by the Bible, out of sources found in profane writers. Here the chief authors are of English birth, namely, Prideaux, Shuckford, Russell; and for the New Testament, the learned, cautious, and fair-dealing Land- sey. There is a valuable work by G. Lauge, "Enzyk
dezie der heiligen und profanen, in der Ge-
chichte der Welt (Bayreuth, 1775-80). Other writers have pursued a strictly chronological method, such as Usher (Annals Ver.N.T. London 1650) and Des Vignoles (Chronologie de l'Histoire Sainte, Berlin, 1730). Heeren (1800) is the best introduction of this kind. Heeren has compiled many valuable inquiries on the monarchical period, the following work: J. Bernhardi Commentatio de consui
gibus effectu sint ut regnum Judaei divisi psereret quantum regnum Israel (Louvani, 1823). Heeren also de-
clares that Bauer's Handbuch der Gesch. des Holy, Vol. 2, is the best introduction both to the history and the antiquities of the Hebrew nation; though Gesenius complains that he is too much given to the construction of hypotheses. The English reader will find a useful but not sufficiently critical compendium in The History of the Hebrew Commonwealth, translated from the Ger-
man of John Jahn, D.D., by C. E. Stowe (N. Y. 1829, and later); a work admirable, as no other, in esti-
esting, yet by no means faultless work, is Millman's His-
tory of the Jews (London, 1829, 3 vols. 12mo; revised, London, and N. Y. 1870-1, 3 vols. sm. 8vo). A more recent and very valuable work, Kittto's Pictorial History of Palestine (Lond. 1841), combines with the Bible history of the Jews, and presents, in each volume, and is preceded by an elaborate Introduction, which forms the only Natural History of Palestine in our lan-
guage. A valuable compendium is Smith's series of "Student's Histories" (Old Testament History and New-

German theologians are strongly imbued with the feeling that the history of the Hebrews has yet to be written. Nieluhru's manner of treating Roman history has had a great influence on them, and has aroused the theological learned, and profane; but by no means yet come to an end; nor can we add that they have hitherto led to very definite and generally ap-
proved results. The works of the learned Jews, most famous of which is Kose (Gesch. der Israeliten seit dem Maccabäer, 3 vols.; Gesch. des Judenstaates since 1798, 3 mitte, with 4 plates); also (Gesch. d. Volkes Israel v d. Vellenung des Zweiten Tempels bis zur Einsetzung des Mahaläns Schimone, 1854-57, 2 vols. 8vo); Grätz (Geschichte d. Juden, 11 vols. 8vo, not yet completed), as well as that of Nork (Das Leben Moses vom Astron. Stand. betrachtet, 1868), Raphall (Post-Bibl. History of the Jews, N. Y. 1855, of which vols. i and ii only ever appeared), and others, must not be overlooked by the professional student; nor will he fail to study with care the valuable introductions to the knowledge of the Old Testament put forth in Germany, with which we have nothing comparable in our lan-
guage. The memoirs of the Royal Society, for example, we may mention Stihielin's Kritisch Unternehmungen über den Pentateuch, etc. (1843), and H. Ewald's Geschichte des Volkes Israel bei Chrihstus (Göttingen, 1843 sq. 1851-3, 6 vols. 8vo), the last part of which has been translated into English (London, 1859, 2 vols. 8vo). The latter especially is learned, accurate, and profound; the author being particularly pervaded by a rationalistic spirit. Kurz's Manual of Sacred History (Philadelphia, 1854, 12mo; from the German, Köingsberg, 1856, 8vo), and History of the Old Covenant (Edinburgh, 1859, 3 vols. 8vo; from the German, Ber-
lin, 1848-54). The best of the works, we believe, are the following: Weber and Holzmann's Gesch. d. Volkes Israel (Leipz. 1866, 2 vols. 8vo) is rationalistic. The latest is Hitzig's Gesch. Isr. (Lpz. 1870). For other works, see Darling, Cyclopaedia, col. 1830 sq.

History, Church. See Ecclesiastical History.

History of Doctrines. See Doctrines, His-
tory of.

HISTRIOMASTIX is the name of a book written in 1663 by William Prynne, a Puritan barrister, against plays, masks, dancing, etc. It is a work quarto of 1000 pages, and abounds with learning and curious quotations. The author of this work was arraigned before the Star Chamber Feb. 7, 1663, on account of passages which, it was alleged, reflected on the religious conduct of the royal house. But the fact was that the author condemned, and that justly, the levity and volup-
tuousness of the court, and the encouragement which even some of the pretates gave to its licentiousness. Prynne was sentenced "to have his book burned by the hands of the common hangman, to be put from the bar, and to be forever incapable of appearing in the court," a sentence which was condemn'd by the whole society of the society of Lincoln's Inn, to be degraded at Oxford, to stand in the pillory at Westminster and Cheapside, to lose both his ears, one in each place, to pay a fine of £5000, and to suffer perpetual imprison-
ment." But more remarkable than this, if possible, was
the violent speech of an English earl (Dorset) on this occasion. "I declare you (Pryme) to be a schism-
maker in the Church, a sedition sower in the common-
wealth, a wolf in sheep's clothing; in a word, omnium malorum requisimus," continuing in this strain, and
closing thus: "I would have him branded in the fore-
head, and in the hand of every one, that he be discharg'd for eight
years, and never, for the space of his life, have his
collegiate course; but, despite this, he succeeded in obtaining in 1816 the principalship of the academy in his native
place, and his success as a teacher received the recogni-
tion of Yale College in the degree of M.A., which that
institution of learning conferred on him only two years
later. In 1819 he went to Yale, and studied theology
under Dr. Taylor for about three years. His first and
only settlement in the ministry was at Conway, where he
remained from 1821 to 1825, when again failing
health induced him to accept the professorship of natu-
ral history and chemistry in Amherst College, which
gave him the benefit of more extended and less ex-
haustive labors. He entered this new position after
some preparatory study under Prof. Stillman, senior, of
Yale College. In 1845 he was elected president of Am-
erst College, and professor of natural theology and go-
ology. In 1854 he resigned the presidency, but still
continued in the chair of geology. He died Feb. 27, 1864.
Dr. Hitchcock is especially deserving of our re-
ognition in this place on account of his Religion of Ge-
ology and its connected Sciences (Boston, 1851, 12mo), the
result of thirty years' study and reflection, which had a
very extended circulation both in this country and in
Europe. Among Dr. Hitchcock's peculiar literary traits
(see the Biblioth. Sacra, July, 1851, p. 662, 668) may be
mentioned "his mode of answering the objection to the
resurrection of the body; his proofs from geology of the
benevolence of God, of special providence, and of special
divine interposition in nature ..." (ibid., July, 1851, p. 662),
in "Relations and Duties of the Philo-
osopher and Theologian," and xl, 776-800, "Special Divine
Interpositions in Nature." Dr. William S. Tyler, pro-
fessor in Amherst College, who preached a discourse at
Dr. Hitchcock's funeral, which has been printed, gave
"an admirable and summarine, yet happy, char-
acter, attainments, and influence."—Appleton's Cyclop.

Hitchcock, Enos, D.D., a Congregational minis-
ter, was born in Springfield, Mass., graduated at Harvard
in 1767, and was ordained colleague of Mr. Chipman, pas-
tor of the Second Congregational Church of Beverley,
in 1771. In 1780 he became a chaplain in the army,
and at the close of the war in 1783 he took a pastoral
charge in Providence, R. I. He besought at his death, which
occurred in 1803, $2500 as a fund for the support of the
ministry. He published a Treatise on Education (1799),
and Sermons, with his Discourses on Lord's Supper (1793-1800).... Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 852.

Hitchcock, Gad, D.D., a Unitarian minister, was
born at Springfield, Mass., Feb. 12, 1718 or 1719. He
was educated at Harvard University, where he gradu-
ated in 1743, and was ordained and installed in Pem-
broke (now Hance, Mass.), in October, 1748. During
the Rev. War served in one of the Massachusetts regiments.
In 1750, his alma mater conferred on him the degree of doctor of
divinity. In 1757 he was attacked with paralysis while
preaching to his people, from which he never recovered
so as to engage any further in active service. He died
Aug. 9, 1803. His writings were mainly sermons and a
(Dutch) discourse, delivered at Harvard College in
1779.—Sprague, Ann. of the Amer. Pulpite, viii, 29,

Hitt, Daniel, a Methodist Episcopal minister of
considerable eminence, was born in Fauquier County,
Va., entered the itinerancy in 1790, became the travel-
ing companion of Bishop Asbury in 1807, and in 1808
was elected by the General Conference one of the agents
of the Methodist Book Concern, the duties of which of-
fered him a discharge for eight, and afterwards, on a
fidelity, served as presiding elder until 1822, when he
became the travelling companion of bishop McKendree.
In 1828 he took charge of the Potomac District; after
two years' labors he passed to the Carlisle District, and
there closed his earthly work. Mr. Hitt was a man of
marked "simplicity and integrity," and an admirer of his
manners and the sweetness of his disposition, in his
private intercourse in society, gained him the affect-
on of all." He died of typhus fever, in great peace and
sure hope, in September, 1825.—Minutes of Conf., i, 567.

Hittite, or rather Chittite (Heb. Chiti, usually in
the plur. , Sept. Xirittaios; also in the
children of Heth; fem. , Ezek. xvi, 3; plur.
, Ezek. i, 1; also in the plur., daughters of Heth, Gen. xxxvii 46, the designation of the descend-
ents of Heth in the name of nations of Canaan (q. v.),
1. Biblical Notion.—(1.) With five exceptions, below
below, the word is in the singular number, according to the common Hebrew idiom. It
is occasionally rendered in the A. V. in the singular number, "the Hittites" (Exod. xxxii, 28; xxxiii, 2; xxiv, 11; Josh. i, 1; also , daughters of Heth," Gen. xxxvii, 46, the designation of the descend-
ents of Heth in the name of nations of Canaan (q. v.),
2. (2.) The plural form of the word is in the Chittim, or Hittites (Josh.
, 1; Judges, 26; Judges, 29; Kings x, 2; Kings vii, 6; 2 Chron. i, 17), (3.) A Hittite woman) is in the
Ezek. xvi, 3, 45), in 1 Kings xi, the same word is rendered "Hittites." In
the list of the descendants of Noah, Heth occupies
the second place among the children of Canaan. It is
to be observed that the first and second names, Sidon
and Heth, are not gentile nouns, and that all the names
following are gentile nouns in the sing. Sidon is called
the first-born of Canaan, though the name of the town is
probably derived from one of the Sons of Canaan, "fisherman," Amaic, of Philo of Byblus. It is therefore
probable, as we find no city Heth, that this is the name
of the ancestor of the nation, and the gentile noun, chil-
ren of Heth, makes this almost certain. After the em-
igration of the nations sprung from Canaan, it is added,
"and formerly were the families of the Canaanites spread
abroad" (Gen. x, 18). This passage will be illus-
trated by the evidence that there were Hittites and
Amorites beyond Canaan, and also beyond the wider
territory that must be allowed for the placing of the
Hamamites, who, it may be added, perhaps had not
migrated from Canaan at the date to which the list of
Noah's descendants mainly refers (see verse 19). See
Canaanite.
1. Our first introduction to the Hittites is in the time of
Abraham, when they are mentioned among the in-
habitants of the Promised Land (Gen. xv, 20). Abra-
ham bought from the Bene-Cheth, "Children of Heth"—such was then their title—the field and the cave
of Machpelah, belonging to Ephron the Hittite (Gen. xxiii, 3-18). They were then settled at the town which was
afterwards, under its new name of Hebron, to become
the capital of the ancient city of the Hebrews, known
by the name of Kirjath-arba, and perhaps also of Mamre
(Gen. xxiii, 19; xxx, 9). The propensities of the tribe
appear at that time to have been rather commercial
than military. The "money current with the mer-
chant," and the process of weighing it, were familiar to
them; the peaceful assembly in the "gate of the city" was
their manner of receiving the stranger who was de-
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sirous of having a “possession” “secured” to him among them. The dignity and courtesy of their demeanor also come out strongly in this narrative. As Ewald well says, Abraham chose his allies in warfare from the Amorites, but he goes to the Hittites for his grave. But the tribe was evidently as yet small, not important enough to be mentioned in the first two centuries of the era which shared the bulk of the land between them (Gen. xii, 6; xiii, 7). In the southern part of the country they remained for a considerable period after this, possibly extending as far as Gerar and Beersheba, a good way below Hebron (xxvi, 17; xxviii, 10). From their farthest time, the Hittite people were divided (Gen. xxvii, 44; 3xvi, 2 sq.), and the fear lest Jacob should take the same course is the motive given by Rebekah for sending Jacob away to Haran. It was the same feeling that had urged Abram to send to Mesopotamia for a wife for Isaac. The descendant of Shem could not wed with Hamites—“with the daughters of the Canaanites among whom I dwell . . . wherein I am a stranger,” but “go to my country and thy kindred” is his father’s command, “to the house of thy mother’s father, and take thee a wife from thence” (Gen. xxviii, 2; xxxiv, 4). See Hittites.

From several of the above notices we learn that the original seat of the Hittites, the city of Hebron, was founded by one Arba of the Anakim, whence its earlier name, and had inhabitants of that giant race as late as Joshua’s time. It is also connected with Zoan in Egypt, and is said to have been the capital of Egypt seven years before that city (Num. xxxii, 22). Zoan or Avaris was built or rebuilt, and no doubt received its Hebrew or Semitic name, Zoan, the translation of its Egyptian name HA-ANWAR, in the time of the first Shepherd-king of Egypt, who was of Phoeni-
cian or kindred race. It is also to be noted that, in Abraham’s time, the Amorites were connected with the giant race in the case of the Rephaim whom Chedorlaomer smote in Asherot Keramim (Gen. xiv, 5), where the Rephaite Og afterwards ruled, dwelt close to Hebron (ver. 18). The Hittites and Amorites, we shall see, were later settled together in the Oronites valley. Thus at this period there was a settlement of the two nations in the south of Palestine, and the Hittites were mixed with the Rephaite Anakim. See Hebron.

2. Throughout the period of the settlement in Pal-esine, the name of the Hittites occurs only in the usual formula for the occupants of the Promised Land. Chedorlaomer, as the code of Joshua implies, the Hittite, but the Hittites are never omitted (see Exod. xxiii, 28). In the enumeration of the six or seven nations of Canaan, the first names, in four phrases, are the Canaanites, Hittites, Amorites; and in three, the former three names, with the addition of another nation. In but two phrases are these three nations further separated. It is also to be remarked that the Hittites and Amorites are mentioned together in a bare majority of the forms of the enumeration, but in a great majority of passages. The importance thus given to the Hittites is perhaps equally evident in the place of Heth in the list of the descendants of Noah, in the place of the tribe in the list in the promise to Abraham, where it is first of the known descendants of Canaan (xv, 20), and certainly in the term “all the land of the Hittites,” as a designation, the Amorites connected with that extent, from Euphrates to Mediterrenean, and from Lebanon to the desert (Josh. i, 4). The close relation of the Hittites and Amorites seems to be indicated by the prophet Ezekiel, where he speaks of Jerusalem as daughter of an Amorite father and a Hittite mother (xvi, 9, 40). The Amorites married his last-cited passages, to be named for the Canaanites in general.

When the spies examined Canaan they found “the Hittites, and the Jebusites, and the Amorites’ dwelling ‘in the mountains’ (Num. xiii, 29), that is, in the high tracts that afterwards formed the refugee and rallying-
points of the Israelites during the troubled period of the judges. There is, however, no distinct statement as to the exact position of the Hittites in Palestine. We may draw an inference from their connection with Jeru-salem and the Amorites, and their inhabiting the mountains, and suppose that they were probably seated in the hilly region of the south, though of their territory beyond Palestine there are some indications in Scripture. The most important of these is the designation of the Promised Land in its full extent as “all the land of the Hittites” (Gen. xxi, 31) or “the land of the Hittites” (Josh. x, 18) or “the land of Hittite” (Josh. x, 19), in which the Egyptians probably settled Hittites, who have originally attracted them so far to the south as Beersheba, a people having the quiet commercial tastes of the Egyptians and their companions can have had no call for the roving, skirmlishing life of the country bordering on the desert; and thus, during the sojourn of Israel in Egypt, they had withdrawn from the desert region and migrated to those districts, retiring before Amalek (Num. xiii, 29) to the more secure mountain country in the centre of the land. Perhaps the words of Ezekiel xvi, 8, 45 may imply that they helped to found the city of Jebus. From this time on, however, their quarters are not fixed, and they take their part against the invader, in equal alliance with the other Canaanitic tribes (Josh. ix, 1; xi, 3, etc.).

3. Henceforward the notices of the Hittites are very few and faint. We meet with two individuals, both of them attached to the army of Ammon. In the account of the war with Midian, the Hittite, who was with him in the hill of Hachilah, and with Abishai accompanied him by night to the tent of Saul (1 Sam. xxvi, 6). He is nowhere else mentioned, and was possibly killed in one of David’s expeditions, before the list in 2 Sam. xxvii is drawn up, (2). In the account of the Hittite Uriah the Hittite, whom David’s body-guard (2 Sam. xxiii, 39; 1 Chron. xi, 41), the deep tragedy of whose wrongs forms the one blot in the life of his master. In both these persons, though warriors by profession, we can perhaps detect traces of those qualities which we have noticed as characteristics of the tribe. In the case of the first, it was the Hittite practical, unscrupulous “son of Zerah,” who pressed David to allow him to kill the sleeping king; Ahimelech is clear from that stain. In the case of Uriah, the absence from suspicion and the generous self-denial which he displays are not well known to need excusing. (2 Sam. xi, 11, 12). He was doubtless a pro-
lyte, and probably descended from several generations of proselytes; but the fact shows that Canaanitic blood was in itself no bar to advancement in the court and army of David.

Solomon subjected the remaining Hittites to the same tribute of bond-service as the other remnants of the Canaanitic nations (1 Kings ix, 20). Of all these the Hittites appear to have been the most important, and to have been under a king of their own; for “the kings of the Hittites” are, in 1 Kings x, 29, coupled with the kings of Syria as purchasers of the chariots which Solomon imported from Egypt. It appears that this was some different division of the Hittite family living far away somewhere in the north; although, from their connection in 2 Kings vii, 6, with the Egyptians, others have inferred that the noise came from the south, from what quarter, in that case, the Hittites were the only people who could be expected to make an attack with chariots. This would identify them with the southern Hivites, who were subject to the sceptre of Judah, and show also that they were to who purchased Egyptian chariots from the fact that Solomon had. It is evident in this case, how-
ever, that these were a distinct and independent body, apparently outside the bounds of Palestine. The Hittites were still present in Palestine as a distinct people after the Exile, and are named among the alien tribes with whom the returned Israelites contracted those marriages which Ezra urged and Nehemiah compelled them to dissolve (Ezra ix, 1, etc.; comp. Neh. xiii, 32-
After this we hear no more of the Hittites, who probably lost their national identity by intermixture with the neighboring tribes or nations. (See Hamel- 

4. Nothing is said of the religion or worship of the Hittites. Even in the enumeration of Solomon's idolatrous worship of the gods of his wives—among whom were Hittite women (1 Kings xi, 1)—no Hittite deity is alluded to (see 1 Kings xi, 5, 7; 2 Kings xxiii, 13). See below.

5. The names of the individual Hittites mentioned in the Bible are as follow. They are all susceptible of interpretation as Hebrew words, which would lead to the belief either that the Hittites spoke a dialect of the Aramaic or Hebrew language, or that the words were Hebraized in their transference to the Bible records.

Adan (a woman), Gen. xxvi, 2.
Ahimelech, 1 Sam. xxvi, 6.
Bashemath, accurately Basemath (a woman); possibly a second name of Adah, Gen. xxvi, 34.
Bree (father of Judith, below), Gen. xxvi, 34.
Bride (father of Basemath), Gen. xxvi, 34.
Ephron, Gen. xxiii, 10, 13, 14, etc.
Judith (a woman), Gen. xxvi, 34.
Urnaim, 2 Sam. xiii, 3, etc.; xxiii, 38, etc.
Zohar (father of Ephron), Gen. xxiii, 8.

In addition to the above, Sinbechati, who in the Hebrew text is always denominated a Hushathite, is by Josephus (Ant. vii, 12, 2) styled a Hittite.

II. Notices in Ancient Inscriptions.—1. The Egyptian monuments give us much information as to a Hittite nation that can only be that indicated in the two passages in the books of Kings above noticed. The kings of the eighteenth and nineteenth dynasties made extensive conquests in Syria and Mesopotamia. They were opposed by many small states, which probably always formed one or more confederacies. In the time of Thothmes III (B.C. cir. 1450), the leading nation was that of the Huthen (or Luten), which appears to have once headed a confederacy defeated by that king before Meggido (De Rougé, Revue Archéologique, n. s., iv, 346 sqq.).

The Kheta were conquered by or tributary to Thothmes III (Birch, Annals of Thothmes III, p. 21); but it is not until the time of Rameses II (B.C. cir. 1300), second king (according to Manetho) of the nineteenth dynasty, that we find them occupying the most important place among the eastern enemies of the Egyptians, the place before held by the Huthen. The name is generally written Khet, and sometimes Kheta, and was probably in both cases pronounced khat. It is not easy to determine whether it properly denotes the people or the country; perhaps it denotes the latter, as it rarely has a plural termination; but it is often used for the former. This name is identical in radicals with that of the Hittites, and that it designates them is clear from its being connected with a name equally representing that of the Amorites, and from the correspondence of this warlike people, strong in chariots, with the non-Palestinian Hittites mentioned in the Bible. The chief or strongest city of the Kheta, or at least of the territory subject to or confederate with the king of the Kheta, was Ketesh, on the river Arnut, Anaorta, or Arunata. Ketesh was evidently a Kadesh, "a sacred city," yth, but no city of that name, which could correspond to this, is known to us. It is represented in the Egyptian sculptures as on or near a lake, which Dr. Brugsch has traced in the modern lake of Kedes, fed by the Oronotes, southward of Hems (Emesa). The Oronotes, it must be observed, well corresponds to the Arunata. The town is also stated to have been in the land of Amor (of Amarna), that is, of the Amorites. The position of this Amoritish territory is further defined by Carchemish being placed in it, as we shall show in a later part of this article. The territory of these Hittites, therefore, lay in the valley of the Oronotes. It probably extended towards the Euphrates, for the Kheta are also connected with Sehaera or Mesopotamia, not the nahmi of the cuneiform inscriptions, but it is not clear that they ruled that country. Probably they drew confederates thence, as was done by the Syrians in David's time.

The greatest achievement of Rameses II was the defeat of the Kheta and their allies near Kethes, in the fifth year of his reign. This event is commemorated in a papyrus and by several inscriptions and sculptures. The nations confederate with the Kheta were the Aratu (Aradus?), Masaus (Mash?), Paatara or Patara, Keshkeshei in Bhirka (Bucchara), Akhetera, Ketesh, Ireta, Arkites, Tentsen (or Tratenues), and Karakamash (Carchemish). These names are difficult to identify save the seventh and the last, but it is evident that they do not belong to Palestine. The Hittites are represented as having a regular army, which was strong in chariots, a particular which we should expect from the Biblical notices of them and of the Canaanites, where the latter name seems applied to the tribe so called. Each chariot was drawn by two horses, and held three men, a charioteer and two warriors. They had also cavalry and disciplined infantry. In the great battle with Rameses they had 2500 horses, that is, chariots. The representations of the Kheta in the sculptures relating to this campaign probably show that their forces were composed of men of two different races. Sir Gardner Wilkinson thinks that both belonged to the Kheta nation, and it seems hardly possible to form any other conclusion. "The nation of Sheta [the initial character is thus sometimes read S] seems to have been composed of two distinct tribes, both comprehended under the same name, uniting in one common cause, and probably subject to the same government." These supposed tribes differed in dress and arms, and one was sometimes bearded, the other was beardless (Ancient Egyptians, i, p. 400 sqq.). They are rather fair than yellow, and the beardless warriors are probably of a different race from the people of Palestine.
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generally. In some cases they remind us of the Tatras, and it is impossible to forget that the Egyptians of the Greek period evidently took the Khetu for Scythians or Bactrians. The name Scythian is not remote, nor is that of the Kittas, or warrior-Tatras in the Chinese gardening, as the sons of Anak apparently look
ruled the Hittites in Hebrew, so that we would not be surprised to find two races under the same government in the case of the Hittites of Syria.

In the twenty-first year of Rameses II, the great king of the Hittites, Khetsera, came to Egypt to make a treaty of peace. A copy of the treaty is preserved in a hieroglyphic inscription. From this it appears that Khetsera had been preceded by his grandfather Saphra, his father Mauraos, and his brother Mauthura, and that in the reigns of Saphra and Mauthura peace had been made upon the same conditions. In a tablet of the thirty-fourth year of the same king, belonging to his son, a Hittite princess with the Egyptian name Ra-Ma-ur-Re-Fri, is represented as well her father, the king (or a king) of the Khetu. Solomon also, as Dr. Brugsch remarks, took Hittite women into his harem (1 Kings xi, 1). Rameses III (B.C. cir. 1200) had a treaty with a Hittite prince; mention is made of the inscriptions with khet (kethesh) Karna (Carchemish), Akatu (Aradius?), and Aasa, all described as in the land Amara.

The religion of the Hittites is only known from the above treaty with Rameses II, though it is probable that additional information may be derived from an examination of prayer-books; but if the name of the land and of the mountains and rivers of the land of Khetu, of Egypt, the Sutekh of the land of Khetu, the Sutekh of several forts, the Ashetkar (written Antkarat) of the land of Khetu, several unnamed gods and goddesses of places and of the mountains and rivers of the land of Khetu, and of Egypt, Amen, Sutekh, and the winds. Sutekh, or Seth, was the chief god of the Shepherd-kings of Egypt (one of whom appears to have abolished all other worship in his dominions), and is also called Bar or Baal. Sutekh is perhaps a foreign form, and seems certainly of foreign origin. Ashetkar is, of course, Ashtoreth, the consort of Baal in Palestine. They were the principal divinities of the Khetu, for they are mentioned by name, and as worshipped in the whole land. The worship of the mountains and rivers is remarkably indicative of the character of the religion, and the mention of the gods of special cities points in the same direction. The former is low nature-worship, the latter is entirely consistent with it, and, indeed, is never found but in connection with it.

The Egyptian monuments furnish us with the following additional Hittite names: Tarakarunusna, Kama-
ny, Tarakaratana, (as an ally) Ann, (as a scribe of the books of the Khetu, Peta, Tatarana, Katicdeura, Ak-
ma (an ally?), Sarmus, Tatara, Matrema, brother of [the king of the Khetu, Raasununa (an ally?), Tu-
tasna (an ally?).

These names are evidently Semitic, but not Hebrew, a circumstance we need not surprise us when we know that Aramaic was distinct from Hebrew in Jacob's time. The syllables Skna in Khetsera, and Rn in Rab-ras-
umna, seem to correspond to the Sarr and Rab of Assyrian and Babylonian names. Tatarana may be the same name as the Tidal of Scripture. But the most remarkable of all these names is Matrema, which corresponds as closely as possible to Mizraim. The third letter is a hard t, and the final syllable is constantly used for the Hebrew dual. In the Egyptian name of Mesopotamia, Nehabena, we find the Chaldee and Arabic dual. It would therefore appear that the language of the Khetu was nearer to the Hebrew than to the Chaldean. Ta-
ekatatasa probably commences with the name of the goddess Dezeeto or Atargatis.

The principal information on the Egyptian bearings of this subject is Brugsch's Geographiche In-
schriften, ii, 20 sq. The documents to which he mainly refers are the inscriptions of Rameses II, the poem of Pentasent, and the treaty. The first is the sixth letter of Jep-
siu (Denkmaler, Abh. iii, bl. 153-161, 164-166, 187, 196; see also 130, 299), and translated by M. Chalas (Rev. Arch., 1859); see also Brugsch, Historie d'Egypte, i, 137 sq.; the second is translated by M. de Rouge (Revue Contemporaine, No. 106, p. 389 sq.), Dr. Brugsch (ll. cc.), Mr. Goodwin, Cambridge Essays, 1858, and in Bunson's Egypt's Places, iv, 675 sq.; and the third is translated by Dr. Brugsch (ll. cc.) and Mr. Goodwin (Parrthon, 1862).

In the Asyrian inscriptions, as lately deciphered, there are frequent references to a nation of Khati, who "formed a considerable and powerful rule in Asia," the "chiefs," whose territory also lay in the valley of the Orontes, and who were sometimes assisted by the people of the sea-coast, probably the Phoenicians (Rawlinson's Herodotus, i, 465). "Twelve kings of the southern Khati are mentioned in several places." If the identification of this people with the Hebrews should prove to be correct, it agrees with the name Chat, as noticed under Heth, and affords a clue to the meaning of some passages which are otherwise puzzling. These are (a) Josh. i, 4, where the expression "all the land of the Hittites" appears to mean all the land of Canaan, or at least the northern part thereof. (b) Judg. i, 29. Here nearly the same expression recurs. See Luz. (c) 1 Kings x, 29; 2 Chron. i, 17, "All the kings of the Hittites and kings of Aram" (probably identical with the "kings on this side Ephratah," 1 Kings iv, 24) are mentioned as purchasing chariots and horses from Egypt, with the possession of which they were so notorious, that (d) it would seem to have become at a later date almost proverbial in allusion to an alarm of an attack by chariots (2 Kings vii, 6).

Hive (Heb. Chieri), "great, usu. with the art., often collectively for the plur., "the Hive," i.e. Hivites; Sept. ο Εναίο, a designation of one of the nations inhabiting Palestine before the Israelites. See Canaan. The name is, in the original, uniformly found in the singular number. It never means, like that of the Hittites, a plural, nor does it appear in any other form. Perhaps we may assume from this that it originated in some peculiarity of locality or circumstance, as in the case of the Amorites—"mountaineers," and not in a progenitor, as did that of the Ammonites, who are also styled Bene-Ammon—children of Ammon, or the Hittites, Bene-Cheb—children of Heh. The name is explained by Ewald (Gesch. i, 318) as Binnenländer, that is, "Midlanders;" by Gene-

nus (Thea. p. 451) as pagoni, "villagers." In the follow-

ing passages the name is given in the A.V. in the singu-
lar, "the Hivites" (Gen. xvi, 17; Exod. xii, 2; 20; xxvii, 2; xxxiv, 11; Josh. i, 1; xi, 3; 1 Chron. i, 15; also Gen. xxxiv, 2; xxxvi, 2. In all the rest it is rendered by the plural.

1. In the genealogical tables of Genesis the "Hivite" is named as one of the descendants—the sixth in order—of Canaan, the son of Ham (Gen. x, 17; 1 Chron. i, 16).

2. In the fourth century of the nation of the nation of the call of Abraham, occupied the Promised Land (Gen. xv, 19-21), the Hivites are omitted from the Hebrew text (though in the Samaritan and Sept. their name is inserted). This has led to the conjecture, amongst oth-

ers, that they are identical with the Kadmonites, whose name is found there and there only (Isr., Palast., p.
were Canaanites and Perizzites, these only being mentioned as likely to attack him in revenge (xxxv, 30). It is possible, but not certain, that there is a reference to this matter where Jacob speaks of a portion he gave to Joseph as having been taken by him in war from the Amorites (Gen. xxxv, 2). For his last will Jacob referred to Joseph, but it had been bought, and what Simeon and Levi seized was probably never claimed by Jacob, unless, indeed, the Hivites, who might possibly be spoken of as Amorites (but comp. xxxiv, 30), attempted to recover it by force. Perhaps the reference is to some other occurrence. It is possible also that the town of Nacharamim, and the pass

sages just noticed (xxxv, 30), that the Hivites ruled by Hamor were a small settlement. See JACOB.

The Alex. MS., and several other MSS. of the Sept., in the above narrative (Gen. xxxiv, 2) substitute "Horite" for "Hivite." The change is remarkable from the usually close adherence of the Alex. Colax to the Hebrew text, but it is not corroborated by any other of the ancient versions, nor is it recommended by other considerations. No instances occur of Horites in this part of Palestine, while we know, from a later narrative, that there was an important colony of Hivites on the high land of Benjamin at Gibeah, etc., no very great distance from Shechem. On the other hand, in Gen. xxxvi, 2, where Ahohilamah, one of Esau's wives, is said to have been the daughter of the daughter of Zibeon the Hivite, all considerations are in favor of reading "Horite" for "Hivite."" The Horites were tribes of the pre-patriarchal genealogy of the family, by comparison of which little doubt is left of the propriety of the change (comp. ver. 20, 24, 25, 30, with 2), although no ancient version has suggested it here. See HORITES.

8. We next meet with the Hivites during the conquest of Canaan (Josh. xi, 20-22; xxiv, 10-12). The Hivites are not mentioned in any important position. Their character was then in some respects materially altered. They were still evidently averse to fighting, but they had acquired—possibly by long experience in traffic—an amount of craft which they did not before possess, and which enabled them to take the tables of the Amalekites in a highly successful manner (Josh. i, 3-27). The colony of Hivites who made Joshua and the heads of the tribes their dupes on this occasion, had four cities—Gibeon, Chephira, Beeroth, and Kirjath-Jearim—situated, if our present knowledge is accurate, at considerable distances apart. It is difficult to determine whether the last three were destroyed by Joshua or not (xi, 19); Gibeon certainly was spared. In verse 11 the Gibeonites speak of the "elders" of their city, a word which, in the absence of any allusion to a Hivite king, has been thought to point to a liberal form of government (Ex. xiv, 12; Deut. xxxiv, 9). This southern branch of the nation embraced the Jewish religion (2 Sam. xxii, 1, 4; Josh. ix, 21, 27), and seem thus to have been absorbed.

4. The main body of the Hivites, however, were at this time living on the northern confines of western Palestine—"under Hermon, in the land of Mizpeh" (Josh. xi, 3)—"in Mount Lebanon, from Mount Baal-Hermmon to the entering in of Hamath" (Judg. iii, 3). Somewhere in this neighborhood they were settled when Joab and the captains of the host, in their tour of numbering, came to "all the cities of the Hivites" near Tyre (2 Sam. xxiv, 7). Here, too, to many of the nation the end of the time of Solomon, who subjected them to a tribute of personal labor, with the remnants of other Canaanitic nations which the Israelites had been unable to expel (1 Kings ix, 20). In the Jerusalem Targum on Gen. x, chapter, they are called Tripolitans (אַניֵר חַי), a name which points to the same general northern locality. The Hivites probably retained their name for the Hivites; we recognize in the Egyptian names alone any trace of the Hivites in the conquests of the Pharaohs who passed through this tract. Cheseauid (Druzes, p. 361 sq.) refers the modern Druzes (q. v.) to them.

5. There are few Hivite names recorded in Scripture. Hamor, "the he-ass," was probably an honorable
name. Shechem, "shoulder," "back," may also be indicative of strength. Such names are suitable to a primitive people, but they are not sufficiently numerous or characteristic for us to be able to draw any sure inference. It is, indeed, possible that they may be connected, as the similar Hittite names seem to be, with low and common practices, but the Holy Hierophants of the Hivite towns do not help us. Gideon merely indicates lofty position; Kirjath-jearim, "the city of the woods," is interesting from the use of the word Kirjath, which we take to be probably a Canaanitish form: the other names present no special indications.

6. In the worship of Baal-berith, or "Baal of the governor," at Shechem, in the time of the Judges, we more probably see a trace of the head-city of a Hivite confederacy than of an alliance between the Israelites and the Hivites. (See Hamesveld, iii, 62 sq.; Jour. of Soc. Lit. Oct. 1851, p. 106.)

Hizkia'h (Heb. Chizkiah, Ἰζήκια, Sept. Ezra'i-ac; Vulg. Ezechia), an ancestor of Zephaniah the prophet (Zeph., i, 1). See Hizkia'h.

Hizkia'h (Heb. Chizkiah, Ἰζήκια, Sept. Ezra'i-ac; Vulg. Ezechia), a king of the people of Judah, was the third A. V. reign of Zedekiah, a name which sealed the covenant of reformation with Ezra and Nehemiah (Neh. x, 17). But there is no doubt that the name should be taken with what preceding it, as "Ater-Hizkiah," a name given in the lists of those who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel. It appears more reasonable that the Chronicles and the names following these in x, 17, 18 (Azur, Hodijah) are only corrupt repetitions of them. See Hizkia'h.

Hizir, founder of the Hiirevites, a monastic order of the Mohammedans, lived at the time of Orchan II. He founded poor-houses at Cairo and Babylon, and many visits are made by the Mohammedans to his grave at Bruss.—Pifer, Univ.-Lexicon, viii, 416.

Hjort, Victor Christian, a celebrated hymnologist of the Protestant Church, born at Gunderslevholm, in Denmark, in 1735, was bishop of Ribe. His collection of sacred songs was almost entirely inserted in the public hymn-book of the Danish Church. He published also collections of songs for the Sunday-schools of workmen, soldiers, etc. He died in 1818, on the island of Amager, near Copenhagen.—Pifer, Univ.-Lex., vii, 417.

Hoadley (or Hoadly), Benjamin, an English poet, theologian, and politician, was born at Westerham, Kent, Nov. 14, 1678. He studied at Catharine Hall, Cambridge, and passed A.M. in 1699. In 1700 he was appointed lecturer at St. Mildred's, London, and in 1702 rector of St. Peter's-in-Poor. "His ability as a controversialist, and his love of civil and religious liberty, became conspicuous in the strife of parties at the beginning of the century, when he entered the field against bishop Atterbury and the High-Church party. His share in this debate, and his intimate connection with the settlement of the new dynasty and the liberties of the country, were recognized by the House of Commons, who addressed the queen in his favor, and thus paved the way for his rapid promotion." In 1710 he was made rector of Streatham, and on the accession of George I, 1714, he became chaplain to the king. In 1715 he was made bishop of Bangor. In 1717 he preached the sermon before the king, on the text, My kingdom is not of this world, which gave rise to the famous Bangorian controversy (q. v.), in which Hoadley was assailed by the chiefs of the nonjurors, and with most effect by William Law, the champion of authority both in Church and State. This controversy was brought to a close about 1720, without conciliating either the High-Church party on the one hand, or the Dissenters on the other, but with great credit to Hoadley's ability and tolerant spirit. In 1721 he was translated to Hereford, and thence in 1728 to Salisbury. In 1784 he was made bishop of Winchester. He died April 17, 1781. In the political history of the Church of England, Hoadley is to be regarded as the great advocate of what are called Low-Church principles, a species of Whiggism in ecclesiastics in opposition to the high pretensions sometimes advanced by the Church or particular churches. It was in this character that he wrote his treatise on the Measure and Degree of Obedience due to the Civil Authorities, the moral import of which was not inadverted upon by Atterbury, and defended by Hoadley, whose conduct on this occasion so pleased the House of Commons (as stated above) that they represented in an address to queen Anne what signal service he had done to the cause of civil and religious liberty. He maintained these principles in the war of polemics and controversy. The war of pamphlets on the subject was wonderful; the number issued on all sides was nearly fifty. His doctrines excited so violent discussion in the lower House of Convocation that the government, in order to prevent further dissensions, suddenly pro- ceded to the Houses of Convocation, and they have never since been permitted to meet for the dispatch of business. The burden of Hoadley's offence, in the eyes of High-churchmen, lies in his doctrine, as stated in the sermon above mentioned: that the "Church is Christ's Kingdom on earth," which idea was left behind him no visible human authority: no vice- princes who can properly be said to supply his place; no interpreters upon whom his subjects are absolutely to depend; no judges over the consciences and religion of his people." Against the Dissenters, and especially in his answer to the case of Baxter, he wrote his Reasonsableness of Conformity to the Church of England (1703, 8vo), and his Defence of Episcopal Ordination (1707, 8vo). Besides the writings named, he wrote a number of theological treatises, in which he shows great freedom of thought. His theology is represented as perpetually meditating over "Letters on Miracles, to Dr. Fleetwood (1702, 4to):—A Preservation against the Principles of the Nonjurors (1716, 8vo):—Sermons (1718 et al.):—Plain Account of the Nature and End of the Lord's Supper (1785, 8vo). All these, with his Life of Dr. Sam. Clarke, his controversial pamphlets, sermons, etc., may be found in the Works of Bishop Hoadley, edited by his son, John Hoadley, L.L.D. (London, 1773, 3 vols. fol., of which the first volume contains a life of bishop Hoadley). See English Cyclopaedia; Biographia Britannica; Hook, Eccles. Hi. (q. v.); L'Estrange, Lives of Doctors, and Bennett, Lives of the English Divines, ii, 154; Buchanan, Justif., p. 200—201; Skeats, Hist. of the Free Churches of England, p. 227 sq.; Gass, Gesch. der Dogmatik, iii, 327; Wesley, Works, ii, 445; vi, 510; Hagenbach, History of Doctrines (Smith's), ii, 417, 516; Mosheim, Church Hist. iii, Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 802.

Hoadley, John, L.L.D., youngest son of bishop Hoadley (q. v.), was born Oct. 8, 1711, and educated at Cambridge. He edited the works of his father, and wrote himself a number of poems, among which are Love's Revenger, a pastoral (1757, 4to);—Jepthah, an oratorio (1748, 8vo);—Force of Truth, oratorio (1784), and others. He died March 16, 1776.—Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 802.

Hoag, Ephraim, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Peru, N. Y., Sept. 15, 1815. He was converted in 1835, and, after a course of study at Cazenovia Seminary, entered, in 1841, the Oneida Conference (now merged in the Central New York Conference). His superior talents soon procured for him the favor of the people to whom he was sent, and the good wishes of his brethren in the ministry. Although comparatively a self-made man, he was looked upon as one of the first Methodist ministers in Central New York. He filled stations in the churches of Cortland, Cortlandt, and Ithaca (1852—3), Utica (1854—5), Norwich (1856—7), Cazenovia (1860—1), and in 1864 was made presiding elder of Cortland District. Here he labored with great success for four years, when he was sent to Canastota. In 1869, while at the session of the newly-formed New York Central Conference, he was suddenly struck with paralysis,
and was obliged to ask for a superannuation relation. He died Oct. 3, 1869. "As a preacher he was earnest and uncompromising, seeking to please God and save men; as a pastor he was diligent, caring for and seeking the good of all the people under his charge. Of him it was true, the national feeling, and that the father of Moses's life, advance clear to his home (Exod. xviii, 27), Moses prevailed upon Hobab (whose comparative youth rendered his services the greater object to secure) to remain (as seems implied by the absence of any refusal to this second importance in Num. x, 22, so that we find his descendants among the Israelites, Judg. iv, 11). See JETHRO.

Hob'bah (Heb. Chobah, חֹבָּה, hiding-place; Sept. Χαβαῖα, a place to the northward of Damascus [אֶת־חוֹבָּה, lit. on the left], whither Abraham pursued the kings who had taken Lot captive (Gen. xiv, 15); perhaps the Choab or Choaba mentioned in the Apocalypse (חֲבֹא, Judg. xxvi, 4; חָבָא, iv, 4). Eusebius (Onom., s. v. supra) says that this place with Copho, the seat of the Eobines in the 4th century, was on the hard (Syria, p. 321) found a village called Kohab, probably the same which, however, lies south of Damascus. This is apparently also the village Hoba, visited in the year 1668 by Ferd. von Troido, who says, "It lies a quarter of (a German) mile north from the town, on the left hand. Near the city of Damascus is seen a large hill, where the patriarch Abraham overtook and defeated the army of the four kings. There formerly dwelt here a sect of Jews, converted to the (Christian) faith, who were called Ebionites; but at present the place is inhabited by a great number of Moors (Arabs) who have a mosque. In the neighborhood is a cave, in which the patriarch offered to the Divine Majesty his thanksgivings for the victory" (Travers, p. 584). On the other hand, Beland thinks of a castle called Canabal, mentioned by Edrisi as being on the lake of Tibersias (Palest., p. 737). "Josephus mentions a tradition connecting Abraham with Damascus: that he takes from Nicolaus of Damascus: "Abraham reigned at Damascus, being a foreigner... and his name is still famous in the country; and there is shown a village called from him The Habitation of Abraham." It is remarkable that in the village of Burzeh, three miles north of Damascus, there is a well held in high veneration by the Mohammedans, and called after the name of the patriarch, Musjed Ibrahim, 'the prayer-place of Abraham.' The tradition attached to it is that here Abraham offered thanks to God after the total discomfiture of the Eastern kings. Behind the well is a cleft in the rock, in which another tradition represents the patriarch as taking refuge on one occasion from the giant Nimrod. It is remarkable that the word Hobah signifies 'a hiding-place.' (See Kittle, Syriac, iv, 312; Wilson, Lands of Bible, ii, 831). The Jews of Damascus affirm that the first appointee, not far from Burzeh, is the Hobah of Scripture. They have a synagogue there dedicated to Elijah, to which they make frequent pilgrimages (see Porter, Handbook for Syria and Palatine, p. 491, 492; Stanley, Jewish Church, i, 212)."

Hobart, John Henry, D.D., Protestant Episcopal bishop of New York, was born Sept. 14, 1775. In 1788 he entered the College of Philadelphia, but soon after went to Princeton, where he passed A.B. in 1793 with high honor. In 1798 he took charge of two suburban churches near Philadelphia. The two following years he was with New Brunswick, New Jersey, and then to Newstead, Long Island, and later became assistant minister of Trinity, New York. In 1799 he was chosen secre-
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HOBES

HOBES, Thomas, an English philosopher and de-
est, was born April 3, 1850, at Malmesbury, in Wiltshire, and was educated at Merton College. In 1870 he became tutor to lord Hardwicke, subsequently earl of Devonshire; and, after their return from travelling, he resided in the family for many years, during which period he translated Thucydides, and made a Latin version of some of lord Bacon's works. In 1828 he went abroad with the lord, and while in Italy continued his residence in France. He returned in 1831 to undertake the education of the young earl of Devonshire. In 1868 he went with his new pupil to Paris, where he applied himself much to natural philosophy, and afterwards to Italy, where he formed an acquaintance with Galileo. He returned to England in 1837, and, soon after wrote his Elementa Philosophica de Cive (Var. 1642). A second edition was printed in Holland in 1647, under the superintendence of M. Sorbière. In 1640, after the meeting of the Long Parliament, Hobbes went to Paris. Here he became acquainted with Des Cartes and his followers. In 1642 he was appointed mathematical tutor to the prince of Wales, afterwards Charles II. His treatises entitled Human Nature and De Corpore Politiço were published in London in 1650, and in the following year the Leviathan. Of these, the last was published in Latin, entitled De Res Publica Sive de Legibus, and published his Letter upon Liberty and Necessity in 1654, which led to a long controversy with bishop Brampall. Shortly after Hobbes was still further alarmed by the introduction of a bill into the House of Commons for the punishment of atheism and profaneness; but this storm blew over. In 1672 Hobbes wrote his own life in Latin verse, being then in his eighty-fourth year, and in 1676 published his translation of the Iliad and Odyssey. This translation is wholly wanting in Homeric fire, bald and vulgar in style and diction; and it must be allowed that the fame of the philosopher is anything but heightened by his efforts in this poet. Hobbes's dispute with Laneg, bishop of Ely, concerning Liberty and Necessity, appeared in 1676; and in 1679 he sent his Beemoth, or a History of the Civil Wars from 1640 to 1660, to a bookseller, with a letter in which he requested him not to publish it until a fitting occasion occurred. It appears from this letter that Hobbes, being anxious to publish the book some time before, had with that view shown it to the king, who refused his permission, and for this reason Hobbes would not now allow the bookseller to publish it. It appeared, however, almost immediately after Hobbes's death, which took place by paralysis Dec. 4, 1679.

In philosophy Hobbes was the precursor of the modern materialistic schools of Sensationalism and Positivism. Professing to reject "everything hypothetical (of all qualitatem occulturn), he affected to confine himself to the comprehensible, or, in other words, to the phenomena of motion and sensation. He defines philosophy to be the knowledge, through correct reasoning, of phenomena or appearances from the causes presented by them, or, vice versa, the ascertaining of possible causes by means of known effects. Philosophy embraces an object every body that admits the representation of production and presents the phenomena of composition and
decomposition. Taking the term Body in its widest extent, he divides its meaning into natural and political, and devotes to the consideration of the first his Philosophia Naturalis, comprehending the departments of logic, ontology, metaphysics, physics, etc.; and to that of Law the law of nature, and political morals. All knowledge is derived from the senses; but our sensational representations are nothing more than appearances within us, the effect of external objects operating on the brain, or setting in motion the vital spirits. Thought is calculation (computatio), and implies the addition and subtraction of mental truths, which consist in the relations of the terms employed. We can become cognizant only of the finite; the infinite cannot be imagined, much less known: the term does not convey any accurate knowledge, but belongs to a Being in whom we can know only by means of faith. Consequently, religious doctrines do not come within the compass of philosophical discussion, but are determinable by the laws of religion itself. All, therefore, that Hobbes has left free to the contemplation of philosophy is the knowledge of our natural bodies (somatics), of the mind (psychology), and polity. His whole theory has reference to a system of eternal and objective truth, of which he derives all our emotions from the movements of the body, and describes the soul itself as something corporeal, though of extreme tenuity. "From these principles no moral or religious theory can flow, except that of infidelity. Though none of Hobbes's writings are expressly levelled against Christianity, few authors have really done more to subvert the principles of morality and religion. He makes self-love the fundamental law of nature, and utility its end; morality is nothing but utility, and the soul is not immortal. His writings gave rise to a spirit of volcanic controversy. "The Philosopher of Malmsbury," says Dr. Warburton, "was the terror of the last age, as Tindall and Collins are of this. The press swept with controversy, and every young churchman would try to arms in thundering on Hobbes's steel cap" (Divine Legation, ii, 9, Preface). His principal antagonists were Clarendon, in A Brief View of the dangerous and pernicious Errors to Church and State in Mr. Hobbes's Book entitled Leviathan; Gurney, in his Eternal and immutable Morality; and bishop Cumberland, in his Latin work on the Laws of Nature. Bishop Bramhall's controversy with Hobbes has been noticed above. We may also mention, archbishop Tenison's Creed of Mr. Hobbes examined, and Dr. Machiavel's Dialogues on Hobbes. Hobbes's whole works have been carefully re-edited by Sir William Molesworth, the Latin under the title Opera Philosophica (London, vol. i, 1841, 4 vols., 8vo); English Works now first collected (London, 1839, 4 vols., 8vo). See English Cyclopaedia; Tennemann, Mon. Hist. Philos., § 824; Mackintosh, Ethical Philosophy, § 4; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. xvii, § 12; Hallam, Hist. of Europe, iii, 271; Leclerc, Descriptive Writers, ch. ii; Morell, Modern Philosophy, pt. i, ch. i, § 13; Bayle, Gen. Dict. s. v.; Shedd, History of Doctorics, vol. ii; British Quarterly Review, vi, 155; Lewis, Hist. of Phil., ii, 226-235; Krug, Handbörderbuch d. philos. Wissensch., ii, 441-443; Leckey, Hist. of Rationalism (see Index); Hurst, Hist. of Rationalism, p. 114 sq; Christian Ezechner, xxiv, 320; Leckey, Hist. of Philosophy, vol. vii, 246; Cudworth, Intell. of the Soul, Farrar, Hist. of Free Thought, p. 121 sq; Dorn, Gesch. d. prot. Theol.; Gass, Gesch. d. protest. Dogmat., iii, 32; Waterland, Works (see Index), vol. v; Watson, Works; Tennemann, Gesch. d. philos. x; Sigwart, Gesch. d. philos. ii (see Index); Coleridge, Intell. of the Soul; Keil, Gesch. a. d. Reform, iii; Döderlein, Lit. (see Index); Westerm. April, 1867, p. 162; Contemp. Review, Feb., 1868, vol. iii; Bibliotheca Sacra, viii, 127.

Hobbhahn, Johann Wilhelm, a German theologian, was born at Ochsenberg March 8, 1665; studied at the universities of Ulm, Strasbourg, and Tübingen, and entered the ministry in 1690. In 1716 he was appointed superintendent over a number of churches, and pastor at Knüllingen, where he died in 1727. Hobbhahn wrote, mainly under fictitious names, a number of excellent polemics against the Romish Church and the Syncretists. Of these, his Obediense Wahrheit, and Apologie. Schauplatz d. triumphanten Wahrheit, against the Erst Eisen, 1704; Ed. Eisen, 1710; Dr. Philipp. Krabbing, Phym. d. röm. Priestere-Wehe, gegen C. Mändle; and especially Angestützte Jungfer-Ecke d. lutherischen Kirche, which gave him much trouble, and endangered his life, are considered the best.—Jöcher, Gelehr. Lex. ii, 1681.

Hobbs, Lewis, a Methodist Episcopal minister, born in Burke County, Ga., Feb. 1783; was converted in 1804, and entered the Indian Territory. In 1808, he was stationed in New Orleans in 1813, and died in Georgia in 1814. Mr. Hobbs was a young man of deep and uniform piety, great simplicity and zeal as a minister, and nobly endured the perils and hardships of missionary life in the Southern wildernesses and the poisonous climate of the Mississippi.—Minutes of Conference, 1821.

Hobhouse, Sir Benjamin, was born in 1757, and educated at Oxford for the bar. From 1797-1818 he was a distinguished member of the House of Commons, and filled other important stations. He died in 1881. His name is mentioned here on account of his Treatise on Heresy (Lond. 1792, 8vo), and his Reply to the Rev. F. Randolph's Discourse on the pretended Reappraisal of the Rev. F. Randolph's Scriptural Revision of Societian Arguments (Lond. 1792, 8vo; and again, Bath, 1798, 8vo).—Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 856.

Hobinum. See Epony.

Hoburg, Christian, a mystic, born at Lützenburg in 1607, was for a time assistant minister at Lauenburg, and, later, subconrector at Uelzen. Here he was deposed from his position on account of his mystical tendencies, and he retired to private life at Hamburg. Later, he was appointed minister to congregations in the duchy of Brunswick, and finally became a Mennonite preacher at Hamburg. He died in 1675. Hoburg wrote much under the pseudonym Bachmann and Fritorius, as Der un- bekäme Christus (Hamb. 1589; Frankfurt 1609).—Theol. Myst. (2d edit. 1656; Nimerg. 1672; 3d edit. 1684, and often). See Lebenbeschreibung (by his son Philip, 1676); Peyer, Umso. Lexiz. viii, 429; Jocher, Gelehr. Lex. ii, 1668. (J. H. W.)

Hoecein. See Hoecsin.


Hochæisen, Johann Georg, a German theologian, born at Ulm in 1677, was educated at the University of his native place, and at Tübingen and Vitting. At the last school he at first devoted himself to the study of science, but afterwards went to the study of theology. He next went to Hamburg, where his acquaintance with the great Fabricius led him to a more thorough study of Greek and Hebrew. In 1705 he was made M.A. at Wittenberg, and immediately began there a course of lectures which procured for him an adjunct professorship in the philosophical department, he entering at the same time as a candidate of theology. In 1709 he was called as professor of Hebrew to the gymnasium at Breslau, where he died in 1712. Hochæisen contributed largely to the learned periodicals of his day. Of his published works the most important are De Hebreworum vocum officio et valore in consituentia syllogis (Viteb. 1706, 4to); De Deismo in Cartesianismo deprehensis (Hild. 1708, 4to); De Deismo in Theosophia dep- rehens, contra Witschamum nosteram (ibid. 1709, 4to). Some take his name to be the author (though this is unlikely) of the first letter in Vertrater Briefeschel zuvierre guten Freunde v. Weden d. Seele (1713 and 1734, 8vo), in which the soul is regarded only as a mere mechanism of the body.—Düring, Gelehr. Theol. Deutschländs, i, 744; Adelung's Jocher, Gelehr. Lexiz. Add. ii, 2929. (J. H. W.)

Hochmann (of Hochmann), Ernst Christoph, a German mystic, and principal representative of the Witt-
Hochstetter, Andreas Adam, a distinguished German theologian of the Lutheran confession, was born July 13, 1669, at Tübingen, and educated at the university of his native place. In 1688 the reigning prince of his country sent him abroad to visit the different universities of Germany, Holland, and England, where he formed an acquaintance with a number of distinguished scholars. He paid particular attention to the study of the Hebrew and English languages. In the latter he made great proficiency, and translated into Latin, among others, Stillingsfleet's Epistolom de deism, etc. On his return he was appointed a professor extraordinary at his alma mater. In 1707 he was advanced regular professor of theology and city preacher of Tübingen, and in 1711 court preacher and Consistorial Rat at Stuttgart. Four years later, however, he returned again as professor to the university. He died April 27, 1718. His own works were mainly dissertations, of which the few published are in pamphlet form. A list of them is given by Jocher, Gelehr. Lex. ii. 1638. (J. H. W.)

Hochstraten. See Hoogstraten.

Hochwart, Laurentius (Turnerwart), a distinguished German linguist, born in the 16th century, born at Tirschrenz in 1483, and educated at Leipzig. His first years after graduation were spent in teaching, first at Freysing, and later at Ingolstadt. In 1528 he became pastor at Waldsassen, and later at Regensburg. In 1531 he had a call as preacher to the court at Dresden, but he gave the preference to an offer from Eichstätt which came at the same time. In 1533 he returned to Regensburg and assumed the office of Germanist at Tübingen. He died toward the close of 1569 or in the beginning of 1570. His valuable works were left unpublished, with the exception of his Catalog. Ratisponense episcoporum libri iii (printed in A. F. Oevel's Rerum Boecarian script. i, 148-242). Among those unpublished the following are of especial value: Sermones Varii: ---Monasterius in quattuor Evangelia: ---Chrom. insigni mundi: ---Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, i, 253; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. vi, 164.

Hock, John. See J. ERINS.

Hock Tide (from Anglo-Sax. hocken, to seize), or Hoke Days, an English holiday, usually observed on Monday and Tuesday two weeks after Easter, in memory of the slaughter of the Danes by Ethelred, Nov. 15, 1002, according to Henry of Huntingdon, and mentioned in the Confessor's Laws. It was the custom formerly to collect money of the parishioners. A trace of this practice is found as late as 1667. Collections were also taken up at town gates, as at Chichester in the last century.---Walcott, England's Archaeology, p. 312.

Hod (Heb. id., "suz", "suzat", as often; Sept., "δοχή", one of the sons of Zophah, of the tribe of Asher (1 Chron. vii. 37). B.C. ante 1017.

Hodaiyah (Hebrew Hodaiyahu, "גֹּדַיָּה", marg. more correctly, Hodaiyahu, "גֹּדַיָּה", a prolonged form of Hodaiyah; Sept. "Ωδίας", Vulgate Dodia), the first named of the seven sons of Elioenai, of the descendants of Zerubbabel (1 Chron. iii. 24); probably a brother of the Nahum of Luke iii. 25 (see Strong's Harm. and Exposition of the Greek, p. 17). B.C. cir. 406. See GEN- KALOGY OF ZERUBBABEL.

Hodavai (Heb. Hodavaiy, גֹּדַיָּה, praise of Jehovah, or perh. L. q. גֹּדַיָּה, praise ye Jehovah; Sept., "Ωδίας" or "Ωδία", the name of three or four men.

1. A chieftain and warrior of the tribe of Manasseh East at the time of the Assyrian captivity (1 Chron. v. 24). B.C. cir. 720.

2. Son of Has-senaah and father of Meummah, of the tribe of Issachar (1 Chron. ix. 7). B.C. ante 588.

3. A Levite whose posterity (to the number of 74) returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii. 40). In the parallel passage, Neh. vii. 48, his name is written Hodevah (גֹּדַיָּה, by contraction for Hodavai, marg. גֹּדַיָּה, by contraction for Hodiah; Sept. Odevai, Vulgate Dodia). B.C. ante 586. Apparently the same is elsewhere called Judah (Ezra iii. 9).

4. See HODAIYAH.

Hodegetics, a word properly signifying the art of instruction, or, better, the art of introduction (ἵνα being understood with ἀφηγεῖται), but generally taken to signify instruction (ἀφηγεῖται) itself, especially when reference is made to scientific Hodegetics. The Hodegetics (ἀφηγεῖται), of course, is expected to be thoroughly conversant with the science of which he treats, and which he is to introduce, else he might easily lead in the wrong direction, or into another department. Other names for this science are Methodology (from μέθοδος), or Propositions (from πράξεις and παραδείγματα, παράγω), or Isagogics (from ἰσαγωγή and ἀφηγοῦ). The difference between Hodegetics and Methodology (κ. v. c.) of Theology is that "the former has regard to the personal qualifications of the student, his method of study, his preparatory helps, etc., whereas the latter has regard to the various departments and systems of the science itself." The literature of Hodegetics is quite extensive. See Schlegel, Summe v. Exercitiorum und Resso. z. Erford. d. Studien in d. Schulen und auf d. Univ. (Riga, 1790); Kiesvetter, Lehrb. d. H. d. H. d. H. o. kurse Amoeis. d. stud. (Berlin, 1811); Schel-
Hodge, Bernard, LL.D., principal of Hertford College, is the author of Solomon's Song, translated from the Hebrew (Oxford, 1785, 4to), in which his chief design has been to give an literal rendering of the original as possible. Also, The Psalms of Solomon, translated from the Hebrew, with Notes (Oxford, 1788, 4to) — Ecclesiastes, a new translation from the original Hebrew (Oxford, 1791, 4to). The notes are few in number, and are principally devoted to verbal criticism. — Kiteo, Cyclop. bib., 317; Darling, Cyclop. Bibl., 1, 1504; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 857.

Hodges, Robert, D.D., was dean of Carlisle in 1820, but the date of his death is not known. He published mainly his sermons (London, 1803-42), and edited the works of his uncle, bishop Porteus, of London, with his life (Lond. 1816, 6 vols. 8vo), of whom he also published a biography (Lond. 1811, 8vo). He died in 1844. —Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 855.

Hodhilli, see the sect of the Mohammedans, who believe that the saints lived a Paradise in an undisturbed quiet. See MOHAMMEDANISM.

Hodi'ah, the same as Hodiya (q. v.), the wife of Mered (Sept. *T'ovia; Alex. MS. *Tovian), and the mother of Jereb, and Heber, and Jehudiel (1 Chron. iv, 19), the same which is called Jemudiah (נמיה, the Jewess, i. e. his Jewish wife, as distinguished from Bithiah, who was an Egyptian) in the former part of the verse.


Hodges, Joseph, a Baptist minister, was born at Newton, Mass., May 19, 1804, and was a graduate of Waterville College in the class of 1820. He took the full course of study at the Newton Theological Institution (1830-33), and was licensed to preach by the Church at Canton, Mass., in April, 1831. He was ordained at Weston, Nov. 18, 1835, and was pastor of the Church in that place four years (1835-39). He had pastorates of a shorter or longer duration at Amherst, Coleraine, Three Rivers, Palmer, East Brookfield, and North Oxford, all in Massachusetts, for fifteen years (1840-55). For six years (1855-61) he was an agent of the American and Foreign Bible Society. He died at Cambridge, Mass., Aug. 10, 1863.

Hodges, Walter, D.D., a clergyman of the Hutchinsonian school and provost of Oriel College, Oxford, flourished about the middle of the last century. He provoked a great deal of attention by his Elthu, or an Inquiry into the principal Scope and Design of the Book of Job (London, 1750, 4to; 1751, 8vo; 3d ed. 1756, 12mo, and others), in which he endeavored to show that Elthu is the Son of God, a discovery which he supposed would throw great light on the book of Job, and solve the controversies respecting the doctrines which have been agitated thereupon. He wrote also The Christian Plain (2d edit., with additions and with other theological pieces, London, 1775, 8vo), a no less curious work than the one above mentioned, though it failed to produce so much sensation. "The whole meaning and extent of the Christian plain he represents as embodied, according to his interpretation, in the Hebrew Elohim." The other theological pieces in the addenda of this work are on the historical account of David's life; and on Shoel, or concerning the Place of departed Souls between the Time of their Disposition and the Day of Judgment, also, Oratio habita in domo conversationis.—Kiteo, Cyclop. bib., 317; Darling, Cyclop. Bibl., 1, 1504; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 857.

Hodges, Cyrus Whitman, a Baptist clergyman, was born in Leicester, Vt., July 9, 1802. At the age of twenty he was licensed to preach in Brandon, Vt., and in the autumn of that year accepted an invitation to preach at Minerva for a year. In connection with this work he pursued his ministerial studies under the Eulerian Professorship at Storrs, at Sharon, but so anxious was he to be fully engaged in the work of his calling that he abandoned the idea of a full course of study. He was, however, diligently improved such opportunities as he had, and his literary and theological acquisitions became quite respectable. He was ordained in Chester, Warren Co., N. Y., in 1824, and remained there three years. He preached two years in Arlington, Vt.; four years in Shaftesbury; four years in Springfield; six years in Westport, N. Y.; and five years in Bennington, Vt. Thence he went to Bristol, where he finished his career. He died April 4, 1851. He was a true Christian pastor; he believed heartily, entirely. His sincerity, his thorough consecration to his work, was the true secret of his effective and useful ministry. In 1850 Mr. Hodges published a small volume of sermons. —Sprague, Annuals, vii, 724.

Hody, Humphry, D.D., an English divine, was born Jan. 1, 1650, at Woodcombe, Somersetshire, and was educated at the University of Oxford. In 1676 he was elected a fellow of Wadham College, and in the same year he published a Dissertatio contra Historiam Aristaei de LXX Interpretibus. Holy became principally known by his publications respecting the bishops who had been deprived of their bishoprics during the reign of William and Mary for refusing the oath of allegiance. The first work which he published on this subject was a translation of a Greek treatise, supposed to have been written by Nicephorus in the latter end of the 18th or the beginning of the 19th century, in which the writer maintains that a bishop was unjustly deprived, neither he nor the Church ever made a separation, if the successor was not a heretic. The original Greek work, as well as the English translation, were both published in 1691. Dodwell replied to it in A Vindication of the Deprived Bishops (Lond. 1692). In the following year Holy published The Case of St. Vincent by an Uncanonical Deprivation (Lond. 1693, 4to), in which he replies to the arguments of his opponents. These exertions of Holy in favor of the ruling party in the Church did not pass unrewarded. He was appointed domestic chaplain to Tillotson, who in 1686 had also held Tillotson's successor. He was presented with a living in London, and was appointed regius professor of Greek at Oxford in 1698, and archdeacon of
OEI

Oxford in 1704. He died Jan. 20, 1706. He founded ten scholarships at Wadham College in order to pro-
mote the study of the Greek and Hebrew languages.

Of the other works of Holy, the most important are:
1. De Bibliorum Textibus Originalibus, versionibus Graecae et Latinae Vulgaris; libri in (Oxon. F. A. 1705, 2. 1717), is said by Bishop Marsh to be "the classical work on
the Septuagint." The first book contains the dissertation against the history of Aristarchus, which has been men-
tioned above. The second gives an account of the real translators of the Septuagint, and of the time when the translation was made. The third book is a history of the
Hebrew text and of the Latin Vulgate; and the fourth, of the other ancient Greek versions:—2. The Res-
urrection of the (same) Body Assured (Lond. 1694, 8vo):
—3. Animadversions on two Pamphlets lately published by
Mr. Collier (Lond. 1690, 8vo). Sir W. Perkins and Sir J.
Friend had been executed in 1655 for treason against the
government; but previous to their execution they had been
absolved of their crime by some nonjurors clergy-
men. This act was condemned by the ecclesiastical authorities, but it was justified by Collier in two pamphlets
which he published in support of the subject. De Graecis Libri
tribus libri De Graecis literaturam humanarum inventorii-
toribus (Lond. 1742). This work was published several
years after the author's death by Dr. Jebb, who has pre-
fixed to it an account of Holy's life and writings. See
English Cyclopedia; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i. 585;
Hodgkin, Brit. and for. Crit. i. 184; and Ox. Mag. i. 146.

Hoë, Matthias, of Hohenegg, famous in history as
the confessor of John George I, elector of Saxony.
He was born of a noble family at Vienna in 1580, and edu-
cated at Wittenberg. In 1600 he commenced at this
university a course of lectures, and published a pro-
gramme on the position which he was to take, Orationes
seu Disputationes. His political views are manifest in
that great hatred for Romanists and Calvinists which
characterized all the acts of his life. Hoë distinguished
himself greatly both as a student and a lecturer. In
1612 he was called to Dresden by the elector, and be-
came court preacher and confessor. His talents and
adroitness gave him, in time, complete possession of
the judgment and conscience of the elector, whom he
hindered from entering into a league with Frederick V, the
unfortunate king of Bohemia, by representing to him
that the Reformed religion, which Frederick professed,
was fatally wrong, and could not exist without injury to
Lutheranism. Hoë seems indeed to have abated the
Reformed even more than he did the Romanists, and
there appears not the shadow of a reason to assert that
he was bribed by the emperor. To the declaration of
his principles while a lecturer at Wittenberg, and above
alluded to, he adhered until the end of his life. His
whole character is that of a hard and thorough reformer,
thought it is said he greatly abated in his hatred against
the Calvinists in his last days. His private character has
been highly commented upon by all who knew him.
He wrote a Commentarii in Apocalypsin (Lpz. 1610—40,
2 parts), and a number of controversial works against
the Reformed Church and the Romanists. He died in
1645. See Bayle, Gen. Dictionary, s. v.; Herzog, Real-
Enzyklop. vol. vi, 165; Mosheim, Ch. History, cent. xvii,
sec. ii, pt. 1, ch. 11, n. 12; Gass, Gesch. d. Dogmatik, ii, 19,
78; Kurz, Ch. History, i. 183; Dornert, Gesch. d. protest.
Theol. (see Index); Fuhrmann, Handwörterb. d. Kirch-
wissensch. (J. H. W.).

Hoefel. See HOEL.

Hoefling. See HOPFLING.

Hoel, bishop of Mans in the 13th century, made
himself very conspicuous by the part which he took
for the English in the revolt of the nobility of Mans
against them after the death of William the Conqueror.
He suffered imprisonment, and after the accession of
Hugo was even obliged to seek a refuge in England.
Hoel was also a great Misanthrope, and was atten-
ant at the councils of Saumur (1094) and Brives. Later
he travelled for a time with pope Urban II. He died
(J. H. W.)

Hoeschelius, David, an eminent Greek scholar,
born at Augsburg in 1556, was professor at St. Anne's
College, and, later, the librarian of his native city. He
died Oct. 30, 1617. He deserves a notice here on
account of his valuable editions of some of the Greek
fathers, and particularly of Greek authors who have writ-
ten in the department of Christian antiquity and eccle-
siastical history.—Bayle, Hist. Dict. iii, 478.

Hoeven [pronounced Hooven], Abraham (des
Amorie) van der, a celebrated Dutch preacher, born at
Rotterdam in 1798, was for a time professor at the sem-
inary of the Remonstrants at Amsterdam, and later pro-
fessor at the University of Groningen. He died July 8,
1855. Hoeven wrote De Joanne Cerino et Philippo a Limborch (Amst. 1848).

—Pierer, Universal Lex., viii, 458.

Hofacker, Ludvig, a German divine and cele-
breated preacher, born at Wildbad April 15, 1798, and
educated at the University of Tbingen. While here he
became very zealous for the cause of religion, and es-
specially endeavored to instruct the youth and cate-
chumens the Bible among his fellow-students. He formed Bible-clubs
which were largely attended; and his intimate acquaint-
ance with the works of the orthodox commentators
Bengel, Oetinger, and Steinrofer rendered him especial
service in his sermons, which he frequently delivered at
this time. When Tübingen was overthrown by the vicars
of Stettin and Plieningen, he was appointed as-
sistant to his father, preacher at St. Leonard's, in Stutt-
gard. He was now only 28 years old, but his sermons
attracted general attention, especially on account of his
earnestness and piety. In 1836, after the death of his
father, he was sent to Bieblinghausen, near Marbach. It
is said that his audience was composed not only of his
own congregation, but that strangers came from afar
to hear the young preacher. In the fall of 1827, urged by
his admirers and many friends, he began the publication
of some of his sermons: Reden (1827; 5th ed. 1866).
The rapid sale of these was really surprising. An edi-
tion of 1500 was exhausted almost immediately after
publication. His sudden death, November 18, 1828, in-
cited his friends to a publication of all his sermons.
They have now been spread abroad in more than 100,000
copies, not only in Germany, but also in translations
in France, England, Denmark, Sweden, Russia, and our own
country. Speaking of his ability, Knapp (Lett. v. L.
Hofacker, Heidelberg, 1852) says that he was the greatest
and most powerful preacher of the Würtemberg Church
in this century. This opinion was confirmed by the celebra-
 tors of his memory: "The great and mighty preacher in
him its most powerful preacher" (in his Autobiogra-
from posthumous works of Hofacker and from his ser-
mons (Erbauung und Gebetbuch für alle Tage, Stuttgart),
appeared in 1869.—Hersog, Real-Enzyklop. xix, 648 sq.

Hofacker, Wilhelm, a younger brother of Lud-
wig (q. v.), and, like him, a celebrated preacher of the
Württemberg Church, was born February 16, 1805. In
1828 he became assistant to his brother, who was then
in failing health. After his decease he travelled through
Northern Germany on a literary tour. In 1838 and 1839
he delivered lectures at the University of Tübingen on
Dogmatics, based on the work of Nitzsch, pursuing him-
self at the same time a course of study. In 1833 he was
appointed at Waibingen, and in January, 1886, at St.
Leonard's, in Stuttgart, a church which his father and
elder brother had served before him. He died on Aus-
gust 10, 1848. Like his brother, he was an earnest serv-
ant of the Church of Christ, and a regular attendant at
the Bible and Missionary meetings of the University
students while at Tübingen, where he also was educated.
He was a zealous defender of the orthodox doctrine of
the divinity of Christ, asserting that modern science
is more in harmony with the Christian doctrine of
the orthodox Church than with the speculative theology of the Hegel-Strauss school. He published, besides a number of polemical articles in different theological periodicals, Trümpfein aus der Lebensaegue (Stuttgart, 1863 and 1864), and Predigten für alle Sonn- und Fasttage (ib. 1850). Of his sermons nine editions have already been published, and a short biography here on account of his Musica Christiana (1854), and Historisches Gesamtbuch (Schlesingen, 1861). He died in 1868.—Piere, Universität. Lex. viii. 440.

Hofe, Johann, a German lawyer, born at Uffenheim in 1800, and educated at the universities of Stras- burg and Heidelberg. On his arrival in Vienna, he composed a treatise on account of his Musica Christiana (1854), and Historisches Gesamtbuch (Schlesingen, 1861). He died in 1868.—Piere, Univers. Lex. viii. 440.

Hofert, Joseph Anton, a German Roman Catholic priest, born at Kastelruth May 19, 1742, was educated at the University of Innsbruck. In 1765 he was made priest, in 1772 professor of rhetoric and prefect of the Gymnasium at Innsbruck, and in 1776 professor of ecclesiastical law; here he remained, with an interruption of four years only, which he spent at Innsbruck, until the discontinuance of the school in 1807, when he was pensioned, retaining, however, the title of an ecclesiastical canon and vicar of the diocese. He died in 1830. Hofert contributed several articles to periodical literature. Of his published works, Consecrath Juris eccles. publici (Brixen, 1781, 4to) entitles him to a position in theological literature. Hofert published several sermons which are of superior merit. Of these the following are perhaps the best: Ermahnungen an Titularfaste Ma- riai (ib. 1799, 8vo); —Kunstgriffe vonmern Eltern z. Er- ziehung wohlmeint. Kinder (ib. 1794, 8vo); —Utrißchildiges Kennzeichen d. sittlich. Auf der. (ibid. 1798, 8vo). —Dür- ring, Gelehrten Theolog. Deutschl. i, 746.

Hofbauer, Clemens Maria, a Roman Catholic, and the first Redemptorist (q. v.) in Germany, was born at Trienditz, in Moravia, Sept. 26, 1761. His par- ents had intended him for the ministry, but the sudden death of his father left his mother in destitute circumstances, and at the age of fifteen Hofbauer was apprenticed to a baker. While engaged in his trade he studied Latin, and passed an examination in the lower classes of a seminary school, where he became a priest at some future time, if possible. The bishop of Tivoli (later Pius VII) finally took him under his protection, and Hofbauer succeeded in making his way to Vienna, where he studied at the university. In 1783 he went to Rome, whither he had journeyed already twelve times, and joined the congregation of the Redemptor- ists. Two years later, after consecration to the priesthood, he returned to Vienna, and then to Warsaw, where a house and a church of St. Benno were placed at his disposal. From the name of Bennonites. The success of the Redemp- torists in the establishment of a monastery at this place was so great that Pius VI, in 1791, decided to give them an annual support of 100 scudi. The Roman Catholics assert that many Proteasts became converts of Hof- bauer, and that their confidence in him and his brothers of the monastery was unbounded. While the latter may be possible, the former is surely improbable. The effect of the French Revolution may have led some disturbing minds to join the ranks of the Roman Catholics, because many of that Church had taken such a peculiar attitude in France against true Christianity. Later Hofbauer also established a monastery in Switzerland, where he and his followers suffered great persecution, which, while it is possible that the disturbed state of the people gave rise to it, is more likely to have been provoked by Hof- bauer and his followers. This last supposition receives additional strength from the dealings of Napoleon while in Paris. He imprisoned them one entire month in the fortress of Küstrin, and, after a search of their pa-

pers, demolished the monastery and discontinued the order. Some time later Hofbauer succeeded in estab- lishing an educational institution at Vienna, which had been presented to the Redemptorists by a con- verted (q. v.) Protestant. In 1815 he went to Bulgaria, and returned to Vienna in 1818, where the govern- ment (Roman Catholic) obtained his permission to build a Redemptorist church at Wiener Neustadt. The intercession of the clergy influenced the em- peror not only to annul the order of the government, but to establish even a monastery at Vienna under his own protection. Hofbauer died suddenly March 25, 1820. In 1825 he was assisted by P. J. Höbel, who died in 1807. Initial steps have been taken for his beatifi- cation (q. v.). See Poi, D. erste deutsche Redemp- torist in u. Leben und Wirken (Reg. 1844); S. Brunner, H. und seine Zeit (Vienna, 1860); Real-Encyclop. f. d. Ku- thol. Deutschl. v. 413 sq. —J. H. W.

Hoffeditz, Theodore L., D.D., a German Reformed minister, was born near Carshaven, on the Weser, Ger- many, December 16, 1785. He emigrated to America in 1807. He first followed the calling of a school-teacher. Subsequently he studied theology with Rev. Samuel Heffenstein, D.D., in Philadelphia. He was licensed and ordained in 1813, and became pastor of German Re- formed congregations in Northampton County, Pa., and served this office until his death. In addition to the remaining years of his life, with the exception of brief intervals, during which he served numerous congregations which he organized in neighbor- ing counties. In 1843, he, with Rev. Dr. Schneck, vis- ited Germany, bearing a call from the Synod of the German Reformed Church to Dr. Krummacher to become professor of theology in the seminary at Mercersburg. He died July 10, 1858. Mild, warm-hearted, and zealous, Dr. Hoffeditz exerted a wide and blessed influence in the Church. One of his sons entered the ministry.

Hoffmann, Andreas Gottlieb, a very distin- guished theologian and Orientalist, born April 13, 1796, at Wellsleben, near Magdeburg, was educated at the University of Halle, where the influence of Gesenius led him to a thorough study of the Semitic languages, es- pecially the Syriac. After graduation he lectured at his alma mater for a short time on the Arabic language, and in 1822 was called as extraordinary professor to Jenae. Here he was advanced to the regular professor- ship in 1826, and in 1836 was made a member of the S.T.D. and member of the theological faculty. At the time of his death, March 16, 1864, he was senior of the theological faculty and of the senate of the university. As a professor at Jenae he devoted himself mainly to the philological de- partment of the faculty. His most popular works were on Hebrew Antiquities; but, like Gesenius, he lectured also on Church History, Isagoge, both of the Old and New Testament, Exegesis of the Old Testament, and on all the Semitic and Eastern languages generally studied at a German university. In philology, his Grammatica Syriaca (Hal., 1827; translated into English by Day and Cowper) is by some of the best authorities considered superior to any other yet published, that of Ullmann in- cluded. Among his other works are Enzeuf. d. hebr. Al- terthümer (Weimar, 1832), which is based on the work of Warnkeis (Weimar, 1822 and 1828),—Compend. der pa- lät. Literatur, in Halle, (in pamphlet form, Halle; later, Jenae, 1822, etc.) —Apologetische d. ab. Zeit unter Juden und Christen (Jenae, 1833-38, vol. i, part i and ii, containing the book of Enoch). Hoffmann was also ed- itor of the second section of the great Encyclopedia of Europe and America. In addition to these literary labors, he contributed largely to the German theological and philological periodicals. —Herc, Real-Encyclop, xix, 651; Hoefner, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxiv, 899; Brockhaus, Conversat.-Lex. v, 20. —J. H. W.

Hoffmann, Daniel, a Lutheran theologian, was born at Halle 1540, and educated at the University of Jenae. In 1576 he was made professor of theology at the University of Wittenberg. In the theological contes-
Hoffmann, Gottfried, born at Flugzwitz, in Silesia, in 1578, studied at Leipzig, and was rector of the gymnasium at Lauban and Zittau. He died in 1712. His name is mentioned here on account of his contributions to theology, as in Leichengäude (Laub 1704): Furstbieder (ib. 1705).—Pfierer, Univ. Lex. viii, 442.

Hoffmann, Heinrich, a German preacher of the 17th century at Masko, in Finland, was associated with other divines in translating the Bible into the Finnish language, published at Stockholm (1642, fol. and 1650).—Pfeier, Univ. Lex. viii, 447.

Hoffmann, Immanuel, born at Tübingen April 16, 1710, was appointed archdeacon of Tübingen in 1741, and in 1756 professor of Greek in the university of the same name. He died in 1772. Hoffmann published a number of dissertations; of these, the following are considered as representative: Diss. in Oraculum Ros., 5, 8 (Thb. 1752, 4to); Diss. de esto Apostoli Pauli (1757); Diss. in loca parallela, 2 Pet. ii, 4—17; Jude 5—13 (1762, 4to); Commentarii in Cor. i, 19—21 (1766, 4to). He wrote also, but left unpublished, Demonstratio Evangelica per quodnulla sint necessaria extra quattuor Testamenta in Novo allegatis declarata, partes iii (Tübingen, 1773—82, 4to). T. G. Hegelmeier, who edited this work after the decease of the author, prefixed to it a life of Hoffmann, and an excursus on the right method of interpreting the quotations made from the O. T. in the New Testament. These speeches of his work, as "font of learning, and in general very judicious."—Kitto, Bib. Cyclop. ii, 318.

Hoffmann, Johann, a distinguished German theologian, was born at Schweidnitz. The date of his birth is not known. He was for a time professor of theology at the University of Prag. In 1469 he and Otto of Münsterberg went to Leipzig, and induced many students to accompany them. They thus contributed to the founding of the Leipzig University. At first he was one of its professors, but in 1414 he was made bishop of Meißen. He died there in 1451.—Pfierer, Univ. Lex. viii, 441.

Hoffmann (or Hoffman), Melchior, one of the most celebrated Anabaptist (q. v.) prophets, born at Hall, in Suabia, originally a furrier, went to Livonia about the time of the Reformation, and became a Protestant. His enthusiasm for the cause of the Protestants led him to preach at Wolmar. On account of the great opposition which he there encountered, he went to Dorpat, where the opposition against him was no less great, and he became so embittered against the Roman Catholic party that he sought to influence the people in favor of destroying all paintings in churches, and all monasteries. This course estranged from him even his own friends, and he left in 1525 for Wittenberg to consult with Luther and Bubenhehn, who encouraged him to return to Dorpat, his former friends, at the same time, to harmonious action. But his success was no better than before, and he soon after left for Reval. Later we find him at Stockholm. In 1527 the king of Denmark appointed him preacher at Kiel, but his determination to explain the Bible apocalyptically, and his deviation from the doctrines of Luther and his followers opponents of Hoffmann, and, after a stay of only two years, a conference to examine his doctrines was appointed. He was condemned for heresy, deposed from his position, and ordered to leave the country. He then went to Strasburg, and next to Emden, where he enlisted himself with the Anabaptists, and soon became one of their principal leaders. At the latter place he so infuriated his followers that they took him for the prophet Elias, and announced the Day of Judgment as coming in 1536. From Emden he returned to Strasburg, and next took refuge in Sweden, of which country he became a subject by the calling of a synod (June, 1533), which condemned him and caused his imprisonment. He died in prison in 1542. On the person of Christ, Hoffmann, with many other Anabaptists, and like the Valentinians of the early ages, held that our Lord's birth was a mere phantom, laying down upon occasion the universality of the body, so that bodily bread is a seal, sign, and token in memory of the body; the body, however, is received in the word by an unavailing faith in our heart; the word is spirit and life; the word is Christ, and is partaken of by faith. Thus he thought it possible, while considering the bread and cup as a symbol, to adhere to the symbol of the real spiritual presence of Christ. The followers of Hoffmann, who took the name of their leader, flourished for a short time after his death near Strasburg and Lower Germany, but finally joined the other Anabaptist sects, from which they were distinguished while alive, by keeping the Christmas festival. Hoffmann (Hedwörtert, d. christl. Religions- u. Kirchengesch. ii, 325) says that a number of this sect went to England in 1535, and that there also they suffered greatly from persecutions; twenty-two of them were even imprisoned. Under Edward VI. (1549) they fared somewhat better, but after Mary's accession to the throne they were obliged to fly the country. Under the reign of Elizabeth they again ventured to reside in England, but in 1560 they were finally banished the country. A full account of Hoffmann and his sects is given by Krohn, Gesch. d. reformir. u. erneuerten Wiedertheers in Niederdeutschland (Lpz. 1768, 8vo, containing, also, a complete list of the writings of Hoffmann, which were mainly apocalyptic); Herrman, Sur la vie et la écriture de M. H. (Strasbourg, 1856). See also Schrock, Kirchengesch. s. d. Reformat. iv, 442 sq.; Cunitz, in Herzog's Real-Encyclop. vi, 191; Heer, Gesch. d. christl. Religions- u. Kirchengesch. ii, 64; Moller, Cimbria literarita, ii, 347 sq.; Röhrl, in Zeitschr. f. kirchl. Theol. (1860, p. 3 sq.); Gass, Gesch. d. Dogmatik ii, 73; Baumgarten-Crusius, Dogmengesch. p. 628. (J. H. W.)

Hoffmannites. See Hoffmann, Melchior.

Hoffmeier, John Henry, a minister of the German Reformed Church, born at Anhalt-Cöthen, Germany, March 17, 1760, was educated at the University of Halle. He spent some time as private tutor in Hamburg; then went to Bremen, where he preached a short time, and finally emigrated to America in 1793.
HOFLING
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Here he became pastor of several German Reformed congregations in Northampton County, Pa. In 1806 he was called to Lancaster, Pa., where he continued to labor till 1831. He was able to preach only in German; and the English language being needed in his charge, he retired from the active duties of the ministry. He died March 18, 1838. Well educated and diligent in his work, he was a successful minister. Two of his sons and three of his grandsons also devoted themselves to the ministry.

Höfling, Johann Wilhelm Friedrich, an eminent German Lutheran minister, born in Drossenfeld, near Bièreuth, in 1802, was educated at the Gymnasium of Bièreuth and at the University of Erlangen, where he was an attender of Schelling's lectures in aeronomy and logical philosophy. He received his doctor's degree in 1827. His magnum opus is his history of the church, in which he defends the Christian faith against rationalism. In 1823 he was appointed minister at Würzburg, and in 1827 at Jost, near Nuremberg. During his residence here he published two little pamphlets in defense of the Christian faith against the rationalists. In 1833 he was called to Tübingen, where he accepted his professorship in 1834. In 1835 he was appointed professor of Christian history and dogmatics at the University of Erlangen. He died April 5, 1858. Höfling was a firm adherent to the old Protestant idea of the ministry and the Church, and defended them vigorously with all the means of his talent and feeble means of his physical and mental resources. He was a prolific writer, and his name appears frequently in the literature of the Reformed Church, especially in the constitution of the Church, worship, and related dogmas. Of his earlier works the best are De symbolorum natura, necessitate, auctoritate et usu (Erlangen, 1835; 2d ed. 1837): - Liturgische Abhandl. v. d. Composition der chri. Gemeinde Gottesleute (ib. 1837). But his most important work is undoubtedly that on baptism: Das Sakrament d. Taufe, etc., dogmatisch, historisch, und liturgisch dargestellt (vol. i, 1846; vol. ii, 1848). But these works are not the only works of his. His last work, his History of the Church, was published in 1858.
born Feb. 15, 1758, in Frederick County, Va. For a time he attended a classical school in Culpepper County. In 1778 he went to Liberty Hall Academy, and there completed his studies in 1780. In November, 1781, he was licensed to preach, and was ordained pastor of a church at Hardy Dec. 13, 1782. In 1787, the Southern climate proving injurious to his health, he removed to Shep- herdsville, where he gathered a large congregation and an acquired great popularity. In 1803 he opened a classical school, mainly for the education of his own sons. He maintained this, however, only a short time, when he was called to the presidency of Hampden Sidney College; as successor of a very able Alexander. While at the head of the college, the degree of D.D. was conferred on him by Princeton College. In 1812 the Synod of Virginia established a theological seminary, and Dr. Hoge was called to it as a professor. He accepted this position, retaining, however, the presidency of Hampden Sidney College. He died July 5, 1820. He enjoyed the reputation of being a superior preacher. "John Randolph pronounced him the most eloquent man he had ever heard...... Yet Dr. Hoge had some great disadvantages. His voice had considerable unpleas- antness, arising from a nasal twang; so that he must be mentioned by the very remarkable "good twin" as a recommendation from his gifted countryman." He wrote, in 1783, in defence of the Calvinistic doctrine, a reply to the Rev. Jeremiah Walker, a Baptist minister who had suddenly passed from ultra Calvinism to the en- tire rejection of the Calvinistic doctrines. He also published _The Christian Penance_ (1780), designed as an antidote to Paine's _Age of Reason_. It consists of two parts, the first containing the substance of Watson's reply to Paine's first part, and the second Hoge's answer to the second part of Paine's work. It had a wide circulation, and exerted a very important influence. A volume of his sermons was published shortly after his death, but their circulation has been very limited, and they hardly do justice to his character as a preacher. A memoir of Dr. Hoge was partly prepared by his sons, but seems to have been lost, as it has never gone into print.—_Amer. Presb. Rev._ Jan., 1846, p. 98 sq.; _Sidgery, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit_, iii, 426 sq. (J. H. W.)

**Hoge, Samuel Davies, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, son of Dr. Moses, was born in Shepherdstown, Va., in 1791. His early instruction he received from his father, after whose assumption of the presidency of Hamp- den Sidney College he became a student in that college, and graduated in 1810. He also followed the theological course under his father, filling at the same time the ap- pointment of tutor at his alma mater. Later he became professor, and at one time he acted even as vice-presi- dent. In 1816 he entered the active work of the min- istry, serving the churches of Culpeper and Mad- ison, Virginia, at the same time. In 1821 he removed to Hillesborough, Ohio, serving also a church at Rocky Spring at the same time. Three years later he was elected professor of mathematics and natural philosophy in the Ohio University at Athens. The college being at this time without a president, Dr. Hoge performed the duties of his position with great propriety, and greatly increased the prosperity of the institution. At the same time, he preached in the college chapel and in the church of the town whenever his time and health would permit. He died in December, 1825. _Sprague, Am. of Am. Pulpit_, iv, 483.

**Hog* lah (Heb. Kóoglah,  הָגוֹלָה, from Aram, for *port-ridge*; Sept. Ἐρίδα v. Ἐρίδα, etc.), the third of the five daughters of Zelophehad the Gileadite, to whom, in the aboriginal Hebraic his, a title was assigned by Moses (Num. xxvi, 33; xxvii, 1; xxviii, 1; Jos. xvii, 3). B.C. 1619. See also BEITH-HOOLAH.

**Hogstreenen. See HOOGSTRAATEN.

**Hohant (Heb. Hóham, הוהנָה, prob. for הוהנה, whom Jehovah impels or converts; Sept. Ιαβύς, Vul- gate Ocan), the king of Hebrew, who joined the league against Gibeon, but was overthrown in battle by Joshua and slain after being captured in the cave at Makkedah (Josh. x, 3). B.C. 1618.

**Hohburg. See HOHBERG.

**Hohenburg or Odilienberg, an old, celebrated monastery on the Rhine, is said to have been founded by duke Ethic, whose daughter Odilia was the first abbess. She is supposed to have died in 720. This monastery was celebrated for many years for the great learning of its inmates and the encouragement which it gave to all who devoted themselves to literary labors. About 1429, this as well as the monastery at the foot of the hill, said to have been founded by Odilia, in or- der to save weary travellers the task of ascending the hill, was closed. One of the works published by an abbess of this monastery (Herrad, 1167), *Hortus delicii- um*, in Latin, contains contributions to Biblical history and to the entire field of theology. See Albricht, _His- tory von Hohen._ (Schlechtla, 1751, 4to); Silbermann, _Beschreibung v. Hohen._ (Strasb. 1781 and 1805); Retberg, _Kirchen-Gesch. Deutsch. i_, 75-79; _Mabillon, Ann. i_, 468 sqq.; ii, 50; Wetzler u. Welte, _Kirchen-Lex._ v, 277. (J. H. W.)

**Hohenlohe, Alexander Leopold Franz Em- merich, prince of, a Hungarian Roman Catholic bishop, was born near Waldenburg Aug. 17, 1794. His mother, baroness Judith de Reviczky, destined him for the cler- ical life, and after studying at the Academy of Berne, and the seminaries of Vienna, Tynna, and Elwangen, he was consecrated bishop at Gera Jan. 18, 1818 as Titular of *Illeia*. He made a journey to Rome, where he associated much with Jesus, and finally joined their Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus. In 1819 he returned to Germany, and settled in Bavaria, where his birth and fortune soon pro- cured for him a position of influence. His name was per- haps made known to his countrymen and foreigners be- cause of his pretended power to cure diseases in a mi- raculous way. He is said to have made cures in the hospitals of Würzburg and Bamberg. But the authori- ties at last interfered, and even the pope himself advised Hohenlohe to abstain from these pretensions, and the prince finally left Bavaria for Vienna. He next went to Hungary, and was made bishop in *portibus* of Sardica in 1844, and abbot of the convent of St. Michael of Ga- bendorf. During the Revolution of 1848 he was driven from Hungary, and he went to Innsbruck, where the emperor of Austria then resided. In Oct. 1849, he went to Vienna to weld his new, country which he had just de- cided to become a priest. He died at his house Nov. 17, 1849. The renown which Hohenlohe gained by his cures was not confined to his own country, but extended to England, Ireland, and even to our country, where the case of Mrs. Ann Mattingly, of Washington, D. C., who was said to have miraculously recovered of a tumor, March 10, 1824, in consequence of his prayers, caused considerable excitement. The prince ceased these prac- tices many years before his death, at least publicly. Va- rious theories have been professed to account for the cures attributed to him: the most rational is that which assigns them to the power of the imagination over so- called nervous disorders. His principal works are _Der im Grabe der kathol. Kirche betende Christ_ (Bamberg, 1819; 3d edit. Lpz., 1824) — _Des katholischen Priesters Beruf, Würth u. Pflicht_ (Limb. 1821) — _Was ist d. Zel- geret_ (Bamberg, 1811), an attempt to show that none but a good Roman Catholic can be a good and loyal citizen, addressed to Francis of Austria and Alexander of Rus- sia: _—Die Wunderschaft einer Gott suchenden Seele, etc_. (Vienna, 1880) — _Lichblücke und Erbahrungen aus d. Welt u. dem Priesterleben_ (Ratisbon, 1866); a number of sermons, etc. He published also his works were published by his heir, Baron Hohenlohe (Ratisbon, 1851). See also Paulus, _Wunderwerken z. Würth- und U. borrh. unternommen durch. M. Michel u. d. P. v. Ho- henlohe (Lpz. 1822); Gieseler, _Kirchengeschichte d. neuest. Zeit_, p. 821; *Real-Encyklop. f. d. Kath. Deutschl* _v, 484—485 (gives a full account of his works); Herzog, _Real- Enzy- klop. xiv, 688 sq.; Hoefler, _Nov. Rec. Gén._ xxv, 914._
Hohenstaufen. See Guelphs and Ghibellines.

Hohnbaum, Johann Christian, a distinguished German preacher, born at Rodach, near Hildburghausen, was educated at the University of Göttingen, under Michaelis, Walch, Heyne, and others. For a time he was private tutor and preacher. In 1777 he was appointed court preacher at Coburg, and, nine years later, minister and superintendent of his native city. He died Nov. 13, 1825. Hohnbaum was an assistant in the preparation of the Hildburger Gesammelte (hymn-book), and contributed also largely to different theological periodicals. His theological works are Uber d. heidn. Abendmahl (Leipzig, 1789); Prediger-Jahrbuch (ibid., 1788-89, 2 vols. 8vo) — Geseșe und Predigten (ib., 1800, 8vo). — Döring, Deutsch. Kunstzeder, p. 143 sq. (J. H. W.)

Hobcaw, Paul Henry Thiry, baron of; an infidel of the 18th century, was born at Heidelberg, in the Palatinate (now grand-duchy) of Baden, in 1728. He went to Paris at an early age with his father, who at that time was resident there. A large house became then the head-quarters of all the free-thinkers and writers of his day. At the dinners which he gave twice a week, either in Paris or at his castle of Grandval, and which gained him the title of first maître d’hôtel of philosophy, met the abbé Gallieni, Helvetius, Diderot, d’Alembert, Grimm, D’Alembert, Grimod de la Grange, Marmontel, Duclos, Lamerie, Condorcet, etc. It was in these reunions that they exchanged their ideas, and prepared, at least in their minds, many of the articles which appeared in the first Encyclopédie (Diderot’s), besides many anonymous publications which were also sent forth, consisting either of original articles or of translations from the German or English. They carried their speculation, it is said, to such daring lengths that Buffon, D’Alembert, and Rousseau felt compelled to withdraw from the circle. Hobcaw himself was one of the most zealous of these champions of naturalism, and contended not only against Christianity, but against every positive religion. He is said, according to Barther, to have published no less than forty-seven anonymous writings of his own composition. His first philosophical work he published in 1767 under the name of Boulanger; it is entitled Le Christianisme dévoilé, ou examen des principes et des effets de la religion révélée (Amst.). In this work he says explicitly that religion is in no way necessary for the welfare of empires; that the dogmas of Christianity are but a heap of absurdities, the propagation of which has exercised the most fatal influence upon mankind; that its moral influence is more superior to the morality of other systems, and is only fit for enthusiasts incapable of fulfilling the duties imposed by society; finally, that through the eighteen centuries of its existence Christianity had led to the most deplorable results in politics. Soon after this work, which his inital associates themselves declared the most terrible that had ever appeared in any part of the world, he published L’Esprit du Clergé, or Le Christianisme primitif vengé des entreprises et des excès de nos prêtres modernes (Lond. 1767), and De l’imposture sacrédote, or recueil de pièces sur le clergé (Amst. 1767). In the same year, 1767, Hobcaw published his most important work, Système de la Nature (Lond. 1770), under the signature of “Mirrabaud, secrétaire perpétuel de l’Académie Française.” It is not definitely known whether he wrote the book alone, or was assisted by La Grange, Grimm, and others, but it is generally believed to have been written by Hobcaw, and that he defrayed the expenses of publication. So radical was this work that even Voltaire attacked it in the article “God” of his “Philosophical Dictionary.” Yet in 1772 Hobcaw published a popular edition of that work under the title Le bon Sens, ou idées naturelles opposées à l’abominable abbé Meslier (Amst., 1772). The wretched book was largely read by the common people, and contributed perhaps more than all the other philosophical works of the 18th century, taken together, to the subversion of morals and the spread of infidelity. It teaches the most naked and atheistical materialism, and even Voltaire abused it as immoral. In it Hobcaw discusses the maxim of materialism, takes morality from moral life at and savage and savage life, touches the so-called “social compact,” and in the course of his observations endeavors to teach, among other things, that self-interest is the ruling motive of man, and that God is only an ideal being, created by kings and priests. The a. Système Socrétique, ou les principales doctrines de la morale et de la politique (Amsterd. 1773), aims, as its title indicates, to establish the basis and rules of a moral and political system altogether independent of any religious system. This work was as ill received by the philosophers as by the religious party, and the Paris University, on the 14th April (1774), pronounced this act all other preceding works of Hobcaw to be publicly burned by the hangman. They were all secretly sent to Holland in MS., and printed there by Michael Roy, who circulated them in France, so that even the friends and guests of Hobcaw did not know him as their author, and often criticized his works severely while partaking of his hospitality. He was also one of the contributors to the celebrated Encyclopédia (q. v.) of Diderot. Hobcaw’s biographers claim that he was a man of good heart, and that, notwithstanding the puerile theories of materialism which he sought to inculcate, esteemed and was loved among the persons who read better than his books. They claim especially that he was a man of most unselfish benevolence, and that he made his house even an asylum for his foes. Thus he protected and gave a refuge to the Jesuits in the days of their adversity under Louis XV, though he hated their system, and had written against them. He died at Paris January 21, 1789. See Voltaire, Dictionnaire Philosoph.; Diderot, Mémoires; Damiron, Œuvres sur la philosophie d’Hobcaw (in Mém. de l’Académie d. Sciences morales et politiques); Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxv., 325 sq.; Baudouin, Histoire de l’Amérique, ii., 345 sq.; LeRoy, Histoire des idées politiques et morales de l’Amérique, 396 sq.; Schoeller, Gesch. d. 18. und 19. Jahrhundert i., 560 sq.; ii., 554; Bühle, Gesch. der neueren Philos. vi., Abthel i., p. 94 sq.; Hume’s Hagenbach, Church History of the 18th and 19th Cent. i., 211 sq.; Farrar, Hist. of Free Thought, p. 181 sq.; Vinet, French Lit. ii., 382 sq.; Hagenbach, Hist. of Rationalism, p. 50; Moreau, Histoire des idées politiques, 111 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklo., vi., 220 sq. (J. H. W.)

Holberg, Ludwig von, a Danish divine, was born Nov. 6, 1684, at Bergen, in Norway. He studied theology at Copenhagen University, and become a professor in that school. In 1735 he was elected rector of the University, and in 1737 treasurer. In 1747 the king created Holberg a baron on account of his literary services. He died Jan. 27, 1754. He is known as the creator of modern Danish literature, and deserves our notice on account of his Kirchengeschichte (1738–40, 2 vols.), and Jüdische Gesch. (1742, 2 vols.). Both these works are considered quite valuable even at the present time. — Brockhaus, Conc. Lex. viii., 48 sq.; Gorton, Biograph. Dict. ii. (J. H. W.)

Holcombe, Henry, D.D., a Baptist minister, was born in Piscataway, in New Jersey, on Oct. 29, 1710. His early education was limited. While yet a boy, he entered the Revolutionary army. In his twenty-second year he was licensed to preach by the Baptists; and in Sept. 1789, was ordained pastor of the church at Pike Creek, S. C. Some time after, he was appointed delegate to the Congress of South Carolina, and was sent to ratify the Constitution of the United States. In 1791 he became pastor of the Baptist Church at Eufaw, preaching also at May River and St. Helena; but, the climate not agreeing with him, he removed to Beaufort. In 1799 he accepted a call to Savannah. Here he labored a short time among the Negroes, and afterwards in organizing the Savannah Female Asylum (in 1801), at the same time conducting a Magazine, The Georgia
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Analytical Repository. He also took part in establishing Mount Eon Academy in 1804, and a Missionary Society in 1806. In 1810 he was made D.D. by Brown University, and in 1812 became pastor of the First Baptist Church in Philadelphia, where he labored with great acceptance until his death, May 22, 1824. He published a number of occasional sermons, addresses, etc.—Sprague, Amals, vi, 215.

Holcombe, Hosea, a Baptist minister, was born in Union District, S.C., July 20, 1780. He was engaged in agricultural pursuits until 1800, when he turned his attention to theology, and was licensed the following year. He labored in his native region until 1815, when he went to North Carolina, and finally settled in Jefferson Co., Ala., in the fall of 1818. His ministrations in all these places were eminently successful, and he continued his labors until his death, July 31, 1841. Mr. Holcombe published a Collection of Sacred Hymns (1815)—a work for Baptists, entitled A Reply to the Rev. Philip Egbert, of the Cumberland Presbyterian Society (1832)—A Refutation of the Rev. Joshua Lawrrente's Pratetic Discourse, or Anti-Mission Principles exposited (1836).—The History of the Alabama Baptists (1840).—Sprague, Amals, vi, 442.

Holcot, Romert, an English scholastic of the 14th century, doctor of Oxford University, and a member of the Dominicans. He was one of the several interpreters of sacred Scripture in his day, yet an obedient son of the Roman Catholic Church, and a zealous advocate of Nominalism (q. v.). He died a victim of the plague in 1349. Holcot wrote mainly on the sacred Scriptures, but not many of his works have ever gone into print. This may account for the fact that many books whose authorship is doubtful are attributed to him by the Dominicans. Mazonius (in Unis. Platonis et Aristot. Philosoph. p. 201) has severely criticised the philosophical views of Holcot. His most important published theological works are De Studio Scripturis (Venice, 1860, and often)—In Proverbs, Salom. (Paris, 1515, 4to)—De Cantico Canonicorum et in septum Prima Crispa Ecclesiastica (Ven. 1509). Among the works attributed to him by the Dominicans we find Moraliizations Historiornae (Paris, 1510, 8vo).—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxiv, 941; Jocher, Gelehr. Lex. ii, 1671. (J. H. W.)

Hold [verb] is often used figuratively, but in obvious cases of the Bible. To take hold of God and his covenant is to embrace him as given in the Gospel, and by faith to plead his promises and relations (Isa. xlvii, 4, and lvi, 4). Christians hold forth the word of life; they, by practising it in their lives, give light and instruction to others (Phil. iii, 16). Not holding of Christ the power of God, and the grace of God, was a sin that could not be forgiven him, and to yield to such yielding of him; as, for instance (Col. ii, 18, 19), worshipping angels, etc. instead of Christ; insisting on penances, etc. instead of the merit of Christ's work.

Hold [noun] ( HOLD , metsuddle, a fortress, as often rendered), the term especially applied to the lurking-places of David (1 Sam. xxii, 4, 5; xxiv, 22, etc.). See STRONGHOLD.

Holden. See HULDA.

Holden, Henry, D.D., a distinguished English Roman Catholic controversialist, was born in Lancashire in 1596. He studied at the Seminary of Douai, and afterwards went to Paris, where he took the degree of D.D. He became a priest in the parish of St. Nicholas du Chardonnet. Much of his time was devoted to literary labors, which placed him among the most renowned theologians of that period and civil and ecclesiastical. He died in 1656. His principal work is Anecologia Fidei (Paris, 1659, 8vo; 2d ed. by Barbon, 1677, 12mo; translated into English by W. G., 1684, 4to). Dupin commends this book very highly. In 1660 he published Novum Testamentum, with marginal notes, and a Letter to a Prelate on predestination and grace. See Dupin, Eccles. Writers, gent., xvii; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 863; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxiv, 385.

Holders, Wilhelm (also known as Frater Wilhelmi de Studiariis Ordinis Minorum), a Wittemberg philosopher and theologian, was born at Marbach in 1542, and educated at Tubingen. He distinguished himself especially by his great opposition to scholastic philosophy and theology, against which he wrote Mus exen- teratia contra Joannem Plutatorium (Tub., 1585, 4to).—a very rare and curious work on the Mass and baptism, of which extracts have been given in the N. Götting. Hist. Mag. vol. ii, pt. iv, p. 716 sq. —also Petitorum exhorta- torium pro resolutorio super graecas quibudam dubito- lae et questionas, e.¢. (Tubingen, 1585, 4to). He died July 24, 1609, buried in the church of St. Joh., Gelehr. Lex. ii, 1672; Krug, Encyclop.-philos. Lex. ii, 450.

Holdheim, Samuel, a distinguished Jewish divine of the Liberalistic or so-called reform school, was born at Kempten, province of Posen, Prussia, in 1806. His early education was, like that of every other Jewish Rabbi of his time, confined to a thorough study of the Scriptures and the Talmud. In the latter his proficiency was great, and was pretty generally known throughout his active province, even when he was yet a young man. With great perseverance, he paved his way for a broader culture than the study of the Talmud and the instructions of the Rabbinus could afford him, and he went to the universities of Prague and Berlin. His life work was a translation, made it, however, not possible for him to graduate at those high-schools. In 1836 he was called as Rabbi to the city of Frankfurt on the Oder. Here he distinguished himself greatly by his endeavors to advance the interests of his Jewish brethren in Prussia, and to obtain liberal concessions from the government. He there published, besides a number of sermons delivered in behalf of the cause just alluded to, Gottes- dienstliche Vorträge (Frankf. 1838, 8vo), in which he treats of the Jewish holy days, usages, etc. These sermons were the subject of consideration by the leading Jewish periodicals for successive months. Thus the distinguished Jewish scholar J. A. Frankel aimed to establish on these sermons the laws of Jewish Homiletics (comp. Literaturblatt des Orients, 1840, No. 85, 39, 47, 49, 50). His scholarly attainments were such at this time (1840) that the University of Leipzig honored him with the doctor's degree of D.D. In the same year Holdheim accepted a call as chief Rabbi of Mecklenburg-Schwerin, and was installed Sept. 19 (1840). The prominence which this position gave him greatly increased his influence both at home and abroad, and his movements for reform in the Jewish Ritual (q. v.) contributed in no small measure to the further efforts of any other person to the reform movements at Berlin with which he was afterwards so intimately associated. In 1843 he published Uber d. Autonomie d. Rabbinen v. d. Princip, der jüd. Ehe (Schwerin and Berlin, 1843, 8vo). In this work he labored for a submission of the Jews in matrimonial questions to the law of the land in which they now sojourned, instead of adhering to their Talmudic laws, so conflicting with the duties of their citizenship, and so antagonistic to the principles of this liberal age. He held, first, that the autonomy of the Rabbinus must cease; secondly, that the religious obligations should be modified; thirdly, that the power which he held to the latter as of higher authority; and, thirdly, that marriage is, according to the Jewish law, a civil act, and consequently an act independent of Jewish authorities. (On the controversy of this question, see Jews, Rom- ronsetz.) In 1844 he published Grundzüge der religiös-denkenden, Deutschland (Schwerin and Berlin, 1844, 8vo), in which he treats of the question whether circumcision is essential to Jewish membership, and in which his position is even more liberal than in the treatment of the questions previously alluded to. Holdheim was also a prominent member of the Jewish councils held from 1843 to 1846. In 1847 he was called
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Holgate, archbishop of York under king Edward VI, was one of the prelates of the Reformers who were silenced under queen Mary shortly after her accession to the throne of England, under the pretense that their marriage relations were non-ecclesiastical. Later (Oct. 4, 1558) he was imprisoned in the Tower, and kept there until January 18 of the following year, when he was pardoned. The dates of his birth and death of Holgate are not known:—Strype’s Memorials of the Reformation, iv, 57 sq.; Hardwick, Hist. of the Christian Church during the Reformation, p. 234.

Holidays. See Holy-day; Festivals.

Holiness (ἡσυχία, ἁγιότης), prop. the state of sanctity, but often used of external or ceremonial relations (then more prop. ἱεροσύνη).

I. Intrinsic Idea.—Holiness suggests the idea, not of perfect virtue, but of that peculiar affection whereby, with a being of perfect virtue regards moral evil; and so much, indeed, is this the precise and characteristic import of the term, that, had there been no evil either actual or conceivable in the universe, there would have been no holiness. There would have been perfect truth and perfect goodness, yet not holiness; for this is a word which denotes neither any one of the virtues in particular, nor the assemblage of them all put together, but the recoil or the repulsion of these towards the opposite vices—a recoil that never would have been felt if vices had been so far a nonentity as to be neither an object of real existence nor an object of thought (Chalmers, Nat. Theol. ii, 290).—Krauth, Fleming’s locub. of Philos. p. 217.

II. Applications of the Term.—1. In the highest sense, holiness belongs to God alone (Isa. vi, 3; Rev. xvi, 4), because he only is absolutely good (Luke xviii, 19), and thus demands the supreme veneration of those who would themselves become good (Luke i, 49; John xvii, 11; Acts iii, 14 [iv, 27, 30]; I John ii, 20; Heb. xii, 26; Rev. iv, 8). See Holiness of God.

2. Men are called holy (ὁ ἁγιός) in as far as they are vessels of the Holy Spirit and of divine power, e. g. the prophets; and also as far as they are a holy organization which is dedicated to God. In the N. T. Christians are especially holy, as being wholly consecrated to God’s service. (Comp. Rom. vii, 27; xii, 13; I Cor. vi, 2; Eph. ii, 19; v, 8; vi, 18; Col. i, 9; iii, 12; 2 Pet. i, 4; Rev. xi, 14; Acts xvi, 25.) Men were called holy (ὁ ἁγιός) (b) in so far as they are or become habitually good, deifying sin, thinking and acting in a godlike manner, and, in short, conforming, in their innermost being, as well as in their outward conduct, to the highest and absolute law or the will of God (Rom. vi, 19, 22; Eph. i, 4; Tit. i, 1; 1 Pet. i, 15; Rev. xx, 6).

The grounds of this sanctification, according to outward appearance, are twofold, viz. (a) Holiness is given by God through the mediation of Christ, conditioned upon faith and an inward surrender, which are themselves likewise the gift of God. (b) Man from within, by a proper purity of heart and the heart’s fruit, may assume this sanctity. Although the last cannot occur without the assistance of God, yet the personal activity of man is necessary and almost preponderant. Still, even interior holiness is, as above implied, the direct work of God.

3. As already dedicated to God partsake in a certain manner of his holiness, even they also become his temples, forms, and ceremonies (e. g. sacrifice): hence “to hallow” means also to dedicate to God, to offer up, to bring us an offering, to present one’s self as dedicated to God through Christ (Rev. xxvi, 18; I Cor. vi, 11; Eph. v, 26; Heb. xii, 15; I Th. iv, 17). In the N. T. where the merciful assistance of God in customary purity or objective holiness appears prominent, the ex-
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pression to "sanctify one's self" is used only concerning Christ, and means here the same as to offer up himself as a sacrifice for human sin (John xvii, 19). But as man may make himself holy, i. e. under the assistance of the Holy Spirit, he may work for his own purity; similar phraseology is in the case of Christians (Matt. xxiii, 17; John xvii, 19; 1 Tim. iv, 5).

4. That by which God reveals his holiness, e. g. the Law, is also holy (Rom. vii, 12).

III. Progression. — Complete holiness, as applied to men, designates the state of perfect love, which exhibits itself in that every object of love is also loved with every emotion and volition, hence also every deed, is determined by the will of God, and thus the old man, who has been fainting under the burdens of worldly lust, and has been carrying the chains of the flesh, is cast off, and the new man is fully put on. This sanctification is both a work of God and of man. This divine grace comes through Christ, first at conversion, and by successive steps thereafter under the influence of the Holy Spirit. Man must seize the proffered hand of God, use the means of grace afforded him, and by the assistance of God perfect holiness. Thus, on the one hand, everything comes from God, and, on the other, the personal striving is neccessary. Whatever the good man is, he is through God and his own will; the evil man, however, is so only through his own will, for evil is falling away from God. Goodness consists ultimately in susceptibility for the divine work of grace, while wickedness has its final ground in the free hardening of the heart against the divine influences.

Personal holiness is a work of development in time, frequently under a variety of hindrances and backslidings, and even with the possibility of entire ruin. Hence the admonitions to watchfulness, to continual prayer, to perseverance in faith, in charity, in hope are abundant (1 Cor. i, 30; 2 Cor. vii, 1; Eph. iv, 29, 24; comp. Rom. xii, 2); hence also the apostle's prayer that the love of the Philippians might abound yet more and more (Phil. i, 9). But while the laying aside of the old, and the putting on of the new, are thus referred to man, of course it is not the meaning of the sacred writer that sanctification is accomplished by our own power. Christ is our sanctification, as he is our righteousness (1 Cor. i, 30); yet all that Christ through the Holy Spirit works in man may become in vain, because man by his unfaithfulness cannot bring the operation of the Spirit.

IV. Metaphors or Representations of a State of Holiness. — In the Scriptures this sanctification is described in manifold as well as strong and explicit figures as a "putting off" of the old man, and a putting on of the new man (Col. iii, 9), the subject becoming dead to the old, and having recovered the lost image of God. It is represented as self-denial (1 Cor. ix, 26, 27); as a cleansing (1 John i, 9; comp. Heb. i, 3; ix, 14; Eph. v, 26; 2 Pet. i, 9); as a washing (1 Cor. vi, 11); as a taking away of sin (John i, 29); as being filled with the fruits of righteousness (Phil. i, 11); with the water of life (John vii, 38; compare iv, 14); as a shedding abroad of the love of God in the heart (Rom. v, 5); as baptism into Christ (Rom. vi, 3; Eph. i, 10; ii, 5; Rev. xx, 1; fellowship with God (1 John i, 8); as being in the Father, and in the Son, and in the light (1 John ii, 5, 6, 10, 24; compare Eph. ii, 15; John xiv, 20); as the having God, Christ, and the Holy Spirit, in love, in joy, in blessing (1 John xv, 17, 20; Gal. ii, 15; 1 John iv, 15; 24; iv, 12-15; Eph. iv, 6); as a birth unto God and Christ (1 John ii, 29; iii, 9, 10; iv, 4-7; v, 18, 19); as being partaker of the divine nature (2 Pet. 1, 4); children of God (Rom. viii, 14; John 12, 1; John iii, 1, 2); born anew (1 Pet. i, 24); spiritual in Christ (Eph. v, 3); to be one with Christ and another (John xvi, 22, 26).—Krehle, New testament. Wörterb. p. 356. See Sanctification.

HOLINESS, as a note of the Church. See Sanctity. HOLINESS OF GOD, his essential and absolute moral perfection. Primarily, the word holy (Sax. holy; Germ. heilig, whole, sound, sound) denotes perfection in a moral sense. As applied to man, it denotes entire conformity to the will of God. See Sanctification. "But when we speak of God, we speak of a Being who is a law unto himself, and whose conduct cannot be referred to a higher authority than his own." See Holiness, above.

1. "As to the use of the words ὑπάρχειν and ἀγαθός, some critics assert that they are only used in Scripture, with reference to God, to describe him as the object of awe and veneration; and it is true that this is their prevalent meaning—e. g. Isa. vi, 9; John xviii, 11 (ὑπάρχειν πάσας) —and that accordingly ὑπάρχειν signifies to be extend ed venerable, to be revered. Still it is undeniable that these words in many passages are applied to God in a moral sense—e. g. Matt. v, 25 (ὑπάρχειν γινώσκειν;) 2, 'Be ye holy, for I am holy, comp. 1 Pet. i, 14-16. Thus also Eph. iv, 24; and ἀγαθὸν, ἀγαθός, by which all moral perfection is so frequently designated, more especially in the New Testament. The different synonynymical significations of the words ὑπάρχειν and ἀγαθός are clearly connected in the following manner: (a) The being externally pure; e. g. 2 Sam. xi, 4; Lev. xi, 44, 44; xx, 7, 25, 30 sqq. (b) The being separate, since we are accustomed to divide what is pure from what is impure, and to cast away the latter; and therefore (c) The possessing of any kind of external advantage, distinction, or worth. So the Jews were said to be holy to God, in opposition to others, who were κοσμίοι, profane, common, unreconciled. Then every excellence of the divine was without blemish, or grace, or blemish was called holy; and ὑπάρχειν, ἀγαθός, sacerocrantus, came thus to signify what was inviolable (Isa. iv, 8; 1 Cor. iii, 17); hence ἀγαθός, anyhm. They were then used in the more limited sense of chaste (like the Latin sanctitas), a sense in which they are also sometimes used in the New Testament; e. g. 1 Thees. iv, 7, (comp. Wolf, ad loc.). They then came to denote any internal grace, or purity, and, finally, all general notion of it, as exclusive of all perfection.

2. "The holiness of God, in the general notion of it, is his moral perfection—that attribute by which all moral imperfection is removed from his nature. The holiness of the will of God is that, therefore, by which he chooses, necessarily and invariably, what is morally good, and refuses what is morally evil. The holiness and justice of God are, in reality, one and the same thing; the distinction consists in this only, that holiness denotes the internal inclination of the divine will—the disposition of God, and justice the expression of the same by actions. The attributes of holiness are, 1. That all that is implied in an unalterable inclination can be found in God. Hence he is said (James i, 17) to be ἀπίστευτος ἐναίωρα, incapable of being tempted to evil (not in the active sense, as it is rendered by the Vulgate and Luther); and in 1 John i, 5, to be light, and without darkness; i. e. holy, and without sin. In this sense he is called ὀλοκλήρως, ὄντος, ὁ ἁγίας (1 John iii, 3); also ὄντος, ὁ ἁγίας, integer (Psa. xviii, 31). The older writers described this by the word ἀγαθότης, ἀγεικότης. The sinnerness of God is also designated in the New Testament by the words ἱλικές (Matt. xix, 4) and ἄθεος (Rev. xvi, 5), 2. That he never chooses what is false and deceitful, but only what is truly good—what his perfect intelligence recognises as such; and that he is therefore the most perfect teacher and the highest exemplar of moral goodness. Hence the Bible declares that he looks with displeasure upon wicked, deceitful courses (Psa. i, 5; v, 5; 'Thou hatest all workers of iniquity'); but, on the contrary, he regards the pious with favor (Psa. vii, 4; xv, 1 sqq.; Psa. xlvii, 18).—Hosea x, 11, sqq. § 29). Howe speaks of the holiness of God as "the actual, perpetual rectitude of all his volitions, and all the works and actions which are consequent thereupon; and an eternal propension thereto and love thereof, by which it is altogether impossible to will that it should ever vary." 3. Holiness is an essential attribute of God, and adds
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is therefore an indication that the Maker and Ruler of men formed them with the intent that they should avoid vice and practice virtue; and that the former is the object of his aversion, the latter of his regard. On this principle, the apostle, which is the whole book of holy scripture, God has enacted for the government of mankind, have been constructed. 'The law is holy, and the commandment holy, just, and good.' In the administration of the world, where God is so often seen in his judicial capacity, the punishments which are inflicted, invariably in a most just and immediately ordered to prevent and correct the practice of evil. 'Above all, the Gospel, that last and most perfect revelation of the divine will, instead of giving the professors of it any allowance to sin, because grace has abounded (which is an injurious imputation cast upon it by ignorant and uninformed writers, who have not clearly comprehended the design of the whole scheme of grace), simply constitutes the essence of divine holiness. To mankind, indeed, the simple will of God is at once law in all things; but with regard to God himself, his will is holy because he wills only according to his inherent holiness, that is, his own nature. As the absolute Being (God, the Father), his will is law, independent on any or all outward things; but as a morally perfect spirit God cannot but be true to himself, and thus manifest in all his agency his inherent moral perfection as his immanent law.

The earlier dogmatists of the Reformed Church largely discussed the question whether right is the right because God wills it, or whether God wills right because he must. Some (e.g. Polanus) maintained the former view as the only consistent with the absolute nature of God. The later writers maintain the opposite view, e.g. Voetius: 'God is subject to no moral duty from without, because he is his own debtor, and his own satisfaction outside of God that can bind or determine him. But from within he may be bound (so to speak), not, indeed, in the sense of subject, because he is his own debtor, and cannot deny himself. Thus, in divine things, the Father is bound to love the Son, for he cannot but love him; while he, in the very act of his divine nature, is bound to work by the Father; nor can he otherwise whenever a work outside of God is to be performed. So also, in external acts, the creature having been once produced, God is bound to maintain it by his perverted and continual influence (as long as it continues to exist), to the very first mover, and guide it to his glory (Prov. vii, 4; Rom. xiii, 34-36). That is immutably good and just whose opposite he cannot wish.' So also Heidegger (Corp. Theol. iii, 89, 90): 'Whatever is the holiness, justice, and goodness of the creature, nevertheless its rule and first norm in the sight of God is not his free will and command, but his own essential justice, holiness, and goodness.' On this subject Watson remarks as follows: 'Without conducting the reader into the profitless question whether there is a fixed and unalterable nature and fitness of things independent of the divine will on the one hand; or, on the other, whether good and evil have their foundation, not in the nature of things, but only in the divine will, which makes them such, there is a method, less direct it may be, but more satisfactory, of assisting our thoughts on this subject. It is certain that the divine will is the primary act upon rational creatures under the general name of righteousness, and that their contraries have been prohibited. It is a matter also of constant experience and observation that the good of society is promoted only by the wise, and injured by the other; and also that every violation of his nature, benefit and happiness from rectitude, injury and misery from vice. This constitution of human nature
Holland, also called The Netherlands, a kingdom in Europe, has an area of 18,890 English square miles. Holland still owns extensive colonies in the East and West Indies, and in South America, which together make an area of about 885,700 English square miles.

I. Church History. — At the beginning of the Christian era the country was inhabited by Germanic tribes, of whom the Batavians and Frisians (q. v.) are best known. Their subjection, begun by Cesar, was completed by Germanicus. At the beginning of the 4th century the Franks conquered a large portion of the country; only the northern part retained its independence until the 7th century. Charlemagne appointed counts in Bavaria and in Zealand, and compelled the people to embrace the Christian religion. After the division of the empire of Charlemagne, the Netherlands were united with Lorraine, and they both were made a dependency of Germany. But gradually a number of princes became semi-independent; among them the bishops of Utrecht, who ruled over Upper-Yssel and Groningen. The most powerful among the princes were the counts of Flanders, and after the extinction of these last their land fell by marriage to Burgundy. In 1384, Burgundy was finally ceded to the House of Hapsburg, thus into possession of the whole of the Netherlands, remaining, however, feudal to the German emperor. The marriage of the daughter of the last duke of Burgundy with Maximilian, archduke of Austria (later, emperor Maximilian I of Germany), made the Netherlands a part of the Austrian Empire, where they were united with the Holy Roman Empire.

The Christianization of the country has been referred to in the arts. Belgium and French Holland. Holland, like Belgium, early became distinguished for its excellent cathedral schools, especially that of Utrecht. A great influence upon the religious life not only of Holland, but of much of the Low Countries, was exercised by the Order of Common Life, which was founded by Gerhard Groot (q. v.) (1340-1384). This order soon established a number of schools, especially in the Netherlands and the adjacent parts of Germany, which imparted not only elementary instruction, but also a higher education. Thus Holland became celebrated for its learning and scholarship, which in the 15th century was further promoted by the establishment of the University of Utrecht.

Many of the prominent men of Holland took an active part in the efforts to reform the Church of Rome; the best known of these reformers is John of the Wesel. The most important of the heroes of the Reformation in the Netherlands was John of the Wesel, and, living in a country which was favorable to religious toleration, suffered less from persecution than most of the medievals sects.

The Reformation of the 16th century found in few countries so congenial a soil as in Holland. Favored by the liberal traditions of the country, the national spirit of independence, and the extensive commerce with foreign countries, it spread rapidly. In vain did Charles V issue a number of cruel edicts (the first in March, 1528, the last in 1550) to put it down; it grew in spite of all persecution. Among the different reformed systems which then began to establish themselves, it was especially that of Calvin, first introduced by young Dutch students of Geneva, which struck deep root. The Lutheran doctrines, and, still more, Anabaptist movements, also found numerous adherents, but Calvinism soon obtained the ascendency in the Low Countries; it was further strengthened by the influence of the Reformed churches of England and France. Thus arose the Dutch Reformed Church, embracing at its origin the reformed churches of Belgium, as well as those of Holland, as these countries were at this time politically united. [The inner history of this Church is described in the article Utrecht Church.] Philip II was determined to destroy the new doctrine, and introduced into the Netherlands all the horrors of the Spanish Inquisition. This called forth a general opposition. The lower nobility united in presenting to the regent Margaret of Parma a protest against religious persecutions; the citizens assembled in the open field for divine service. In 1566, general attacks began against the Roman Catholic churches. In 1567, Philip sent duke Alba to the Netherlands with an army, consisting of Spaniards and Italians, to subdue the religious movement; but the cruel tyranny of the duke led to very different results. William of Orange, the stadtholder, who had ascended to the hereditary throne by the flight of his brother, was attempted at, the head of an army of exiles, to expel the Spaniards, but in 1572 nearly the whole of the northern provinces fell into the hands of the patriots. The efforts of Alba to suppress the revolution by force of arms having entirely failed, he was recalled, and departed in January, 1573. In 1576, 18,000 men had been executed, chiefly on account of religion. The efforts of his successors likewise failed to reestablish the rule of Spain. In 1575, the provinces of Holland, Zeeland, Utrecht, Friesland, Groningen, Over- yssel, and Guelders formed the Union of Utrecht, and thus laid the foundation of the republic of the Seven United Provinces. From this time the history of the Netherlands divides itself into that of Holland, in which the ascendency of Protestantism was henceforth established, and that of Flanders (subsequently Belgium, q. v.), in which the townsmen of the Bruges and Ghent regions maintained their independence, and adhered to the Roman Catholic Church.

William of Orange was assassinated in 1584 by a partisan of Spain, but his son Maurice successfully defended the independence of Holland, and in 1609 compelled Spain to agree to a truce for twelve years. During the peace an unfortunate war broke out between the Dutch and the Arminians (q. v.). Maurice, who aspired to become hereditary sovereign of Holland, placed himself, from political reasons, at the head of the strict Calvinists, and whenever he prevailed, the venerable head of the Arminian party, Barneveldt, one of the most illustrious figures of the Dutch nation, was exiled. Maurice, while Hugo Grothus, another distinguished leader of the Arminians, or, as they were generally called, from their remonstrances in favor of religious toleration, Remonstrants, escaped by an artifice. The war with Spain was renewed in 1621, but at the Peace of Westphalia in 1648, Spain had to recognize the independence of Holland.

Under various political vicissitudes, Holland remained henceforth a Protestant country. On the establishment of the Batavian republic in 1786, in consequence of the conquest of the country by France, Church and State were separated in the Netherlands. In 1794 the Church was reorganized, but the new Church did not remain, however, substantially as before. Simultaneously with the erection of the kingdom of Holland under Napoleon, an attempt was made to reorganize the Church, at the head of which the national Synod was to be placed; but this plan, also, was not executed, as in 1810 Holland was incorporated with the French empire. An introduction of the Organic Articles (1812) was then meditated, but never carried through. The re-establishment of the Netherlands as an independent state, with which also Belgium was united, restored to the national Church most of the rights formerly possessed by her, and gave her for the first time a national Synod. In the new state a majority of the population belonged to the Roman Catholic Church, but the government knew how to maintain in its legislation the ascendency of Protestantism, to the great dissatisfaction of the southern provinces, which revolted in 1830, and constituted themselves a constitutional kingdom. To this time that Holland again became a predominantly Protestant state, in which, however, the Roman Catholic Church comprises about two fifths of the entire population. Of late, an almost complete separation between Church and State has been effected.

II. Church Statistics. — The total population of the kingdom of Holland amounted in December, 1888, according to an official calculation, to 4,505,892. This is exclusive of the grand-duchy of Luxembourg (q. v.), which is governed by the king of Holland as grand-duke, but is entirely independent from Holland in point of administration. A little over a majority of the en-
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tire population, according to the official census taken in 1879, 2,469,814, belong to the National Reformed Church. The present constitution of this Church, which almost makes it autonomous, was regulated by a law of March 28, 1852. The Church embraces 40 classes in 10 provinces of Germany. A Synod consisting of the pastors and a number of the elders, but the number of the latter must not exceed the number of the pastors. Each class meets annually, and elects a standing committee, which exercises ecclesiastical discipline. The General Synod, which meets in May, is held in June at the Hague, consists of ten pastors, one being elected by each of the provincial synods, three elders, and the representatives of the three theological faculties of Leyden, Utrecht, and Groningen. To these are added delegates appointed by the Commission of the Reformed Walloon Churches (those which flow from the French Church), and by the East and West Indian churches. A Synodical Commission, consisting of the president, the vice-president, and the secretary of the Synod, of three preachers and elders, and one professor of theology, is chosen for a period of three years. The number of presbyteries in 1884 was 1,850, which were visited by 1,811 pastors. The Walloon churches were seventeen in number, with twenty-five pastors, and a population of 9678. They are placed under a special commission for the affairs of the Walloon churches, but form an integral part of the National Reformed Church, and hold their meetings in the same place as the Synod. Theological faculties representing this Church are connected with the state universities of Leyden, Utrecht, Groningen, and the Athenaeum of Deventer and Amsterdam. The famous theological schools of Harderwyk and Franeker (q.v.) have been abolished.

As the National Reformed Church in Holland, in the second half of the 18th and in the present century, fell more and more under the predominant influence of rationalism [for the doctrinal history of the Church, see the art. Reformed Church], a number of the leading defenders of the ancient creed of the Church deemed it best to switch from the National Church, and organize an independent Church (De Geestheids, reform. kerken). In 1884 this Church comprised forty classes in ten provinces, with about 200 ministers and 379 congregations. It has a theological school at Kampen, with fifty to sixty students. Its membership belongs chiefly to the poorer classes of the population, and numbers 189,905 souls.

The Remonstrants and followers of Arminius (q.v.) have considerably decreased since the beginning of the present century. While in 1809 they still numbered thirty-four congregations and forty pastors, they had in 1884 only twelve congregations and ten preachers left. They regard themselves as members of the Reformed Church, and call themselves the Remonstrant Reformed Brotherhood. They have been supported since 1795 by the state, and their pastors are educated at the Athenaeum of Amsterdam. Their Synod meets annually, alternating between Amsterdam and Rotterdam. The Lutherans of Holland adopted as early as 1596 a constitution similar to that of the Reformed Church. Like them, they have elective pastors, elders, and deacons; and by the new regulations of 1858, a Church Council, a Synodical Council, and Synodical Committees, the three stages of ecclesiastical representation. Their Synod likewise meets annually at the Hague. The population connected with the Church amounted in 1884 to 61,825; the number of parishes and pastors is about fifty; the number of classes six. They have a theological seminary, as well as the pastors, receive salaries from the state. The Mennonites, whose origin falls into the time before the Reformation, have likewise decreased since the beginning of the present century. In 1809 they numbered 128 congregations and 186 ministers; in 1884, 157 congregations, and 253 ministers. The former have a seminary at Amsterdam, with fifteen students in 1884. Rationalism largely prevails among them. The population connected with their congregations numbered in 1884, 50,705. The churches are self-supporting, and independent of each other. The Moravians have two churches and four ministers. The Jews in 1888 numbered about 100,000 souls.

Among the religious societies of Holland the following are the most important: (1) The Netherlands Bible Society, which had in 1867 a circulation of 92,951 copies, and an income of $30,000. (2) The Sunday-school Union which had in 1867 established 271 Sunday-schools in ninety-five different places; they had together 1801 teachers and 24,400 children. The Union publishes a weekly paper, The Christian Family Circle. (3) The Society for Christian National-school Instruction (established in 1869), whose design is the establishment throughout the country of schools in which a sound Christian education shall be given, as opposed to that given in the national schools. Eighty schools had in 1867 been established in different parts of the country on this principle. The income of the society was about $3000. (4) The Netherlands Evangelical Protestant Union, established in 1853, endeavors to "counteract the terrible power of Rome, and unbelieving prevailing throughout the country, by means of pietists." The income of the society is about $1500. (5) The missionary societies of Holland labor exclusively in the Dutch colonies, and in the neighboring islands of the Indian Archipelago. Great open-air missionary gatherings are held in Holland. Until the Reformation, the whole of modern Holland belonged to the diocese of Utrecht (q.v.). In 1559 this see was made an archbishopric, and five suffragan sees were erected—Haarlem, Middelburg, Deventer, Leeuwarden, and Groningen. The success of the Reformed Church, after the establishment of the independence of Holland, put an end to all the dioceses. In 1861 an apostolical vicariate was established for those who continued to adhere to the Church of Rome. It was first administered by the apostolical nuncio in Brussels. At the beginning of the 17th century the Dutch mission again started, and in the succeeding years a bishop (who was to supply the place of the former archbishop), and five provoars at the former episcopal sees. In 1728 the Jansenist (q.v.) canons of Utrecht elected an archbishop; in 1742 a Jansenist bishop was elected for Haarlem, and in 1755 another for Deventer. All these sees are still vacant, but the number of the imperial vicariate at Haarlem has been reduced to six. The membership have decreased. These have at present (1870) a population of about 4000 souls in twenty-five parishes. After the establishment of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands, the Roman Catholic Church in the seven old provinces was divided into seven archieparchies. In 1850 the bishoprics were placed under the patriarchate at the Hague as "vice superior of the Dutch mission," while the apostolic vicariates of Herzevogelbusch, Breida, and Limburg (1840) were erected into districts which had formerly belonged to other states. On March 7, 1853, Pius IX re-established the regular hierarchy of the archbishopric of Utrecht, and the four bishoprics of Haarlem, Breida, Herzevogelbusch, and Roermond. The Catholic population in 1879 numbered 1,469,157 souls, with 39 convents of monks (containing 1,015 members) and 187 female monasteries (containing 2168 members). Among these the monks and nuns, de-}

A complete Church History of Holland has been published by Glazius, Geschichte der christlichen kerk der nederlantsen in de Nederlanden (Leiden, 1823 sq., 6 vols.). The introduction of Christianity into the Netherlands is specially treated of by Diet Lorgin (Gesch. van de inwoning des christen, in Nederlanden (Leuven, 1841), and by Prof. Roysads (Gesch. der inwooning en vereniging der christen in Nederland, Enschede, 1840). The latter began a Church History of Holland during the Middle Ages (Gesch. van en geregillede Christendom en de christ. kerk in Nederlande gedurende de middeleeuwen,
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Ute, 1849-53, 2 vols.), but the death of this eminent historian (1854) prevented the completion of the work. A biographical Church History, from a Roman Catholic standpoint, was begun by Albertding Thijm (Ges. der kerk in de Nederl. ; vol. i., II. Willobrood, Apoel der Nederlnden, Amsterdam, 1861; Germ. transl., Munster, 1865). A work of great ability is the Church History of Holland before the Reformation, by Moll (Kerkgeschiedenis van Nederland voor de hervorming, Arnhem, 1864 sq., 3 vols.). See BEIJING. (A. J. S.)

Holland, Guido, an English Jesuit, was born in Lincoln about 1587. He was educated at the University of Cambridge, devoting his time mainly to metaphysics. After his graduation he went to Spain and here pursued a course in theology. In 1615 he entered the order of the Jesuits, and was sent to England as a Roman Catholic missionary. He died Nov. 26, 1660. He wrote a work of some importance on the immortality of the soul, under the title Prerogativa naturae humanae.—Jocher, Gelekt. Leh., ii., 1674.

Holland, John M., a Methodist Episcopal minister, born in Williamson County, Tenn., about 1809 or 1804, was converted in early life, and entered the ministry in 1822. After holding several important charges, he was appointed presiding elder of the Cumberland District in 1828. Two years later he was sent to Nashville, and in 1828 he was appointed presiding elder over the Forked Deer District, transferred in 1833 to the Memphis, and in 1836 to the Florence District. In 1887 he was selected as the agent of La Grange College, but in 1888 he returned to the active work of the ministry as presiding elder of Holly Springs District, in Mississippi. In 1889 he was once more chosen agent for a college—this time for Holly Springs University; but in 1870 he again returned to the presiding eldership, of the Memphis District. On this district he died in 1841. Holland was one of the most able and useful servants of the Methodist Episcopal Church in his day, and is generally acknowledged to rank foremost among the preachers of Tennessee. —Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, vii., 662.

Holland, Thomas, a celebrated English divine, born at Ludlow, in Shropshire, in 1539, was educated at Exeter College, Oxford. His broad and thorough scholarship secured him the regius professorship at Oxford, and he was distinguished as "too much by every kind of desirable attainment, divine or human, that he was esteemed and admired not only in our seminaries of learning at home, but also in the universities abroad" (Middleton, Et. Biog. ii, 578 sq.; compare also Jocher, Gelekt. Leh., ii., 1674). He was a high churchman, and was appointed presiding Protestant, and labored earnestly to drive from Oxford all Papists and their sympathizers, of whom it had not a few at this early date of Protestantism in England. It is to be regretted that most of the works he left, and these few indeed, were never printed. Allibone mentions Oratio Oxoni. (Oxford, 1599-4to) and Sermones (ibid. 1601, 4to).

Hollas, David, a German Lutheran divine, was born at Wulkw, near Stargard, in 1614. He studied at Wittenberg, and became successively pastor of Pitzkerin, near Stargard, in 1670, co-rector of Stargard in 1690, rector and preacher of Colberg, and, finally, proton and pastor of Jakobskehe. He died in 1713. Aside from minor productions on different subjects, as sermons, etc., he wrote a work on dogmatics which was long in great favor. It is entitled Examen theologicae acromaticae universum theologiam theolico-politicam complectens (1707, 4to; repr. in 1717, 1722, 1725, 1742, and 1741); and, with additions and corrections, by J. Toller in 1750 and 1763). The popularity enjoyed by this work was not so much due to its scientific originality, for it was mainly based on the works of Gerhard, Calov, Scherzer, etc., as to its convenient arrangement, the clearness and precision of its definitions, and the careful and thorough classification of its contents. Another, and perhaps still more powerful cause of its success is to be found in its liberal spirit, coupled with unimpeachable orthodoxy. Hollas occupies the first place among the Lutheran theologians of the close of the 17th and the beginning of the 18th century. He sought to find a medium between the orthodox scholastic divinity and the spirit of practical Christianity, in order to reconcile ecclesiastical orthodoxy with freedom of thought. See Ernesti, Neue Theol. v., 185; Walch, Bibl. Theol. i., 62; Ersch und Gruber, Allg. Enzyklopädie; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. vi., 240; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doct. i., 263, 264, 539; Gass, Geschichte d. Dogmat. ii., 490 sq.; Kurtz, Gesch. d. Rel. d. Welt, ii., 244 sq.; Schrick, Geschichte der d. Ref. viii., 16 sq.; Dörner, Gesch. d. Dogmat. p. 430 sq.

Hollebeck, Ewald, a Dutch theologian, born at Hamsted in 1719, was educated at the University of Leyden. In 1762 he was called to his alma mater as professor of theology. He is especially distinguished in the Church of Holland by his revolutionary efforts in the homiletical field of study. He was the first to condemn the old method of making a sermon an exegetical dissertation, and to introduce the English method of preaching to the edification of the people. He set forth his views in De optimo concionum generis (Leyden, 1788; much enlarged, 1770, 4vo.). At first he encountered great opposition, and in 1816 he was reappointed presiding elder over the Forked Deer District, transferred in 1833 to the Memphis, and in 1836 to the Florence District. In 1887 he was selected as the agent of La Grange College, but in 1888 he returned to the active work of the ministry as presiding elder of Holly Springs District, in Mississippi. In 1889 he was once more chosen agent for a college—this time for Holly Springs University; but in 1870 he again returned to the presiding eldership, of the Memphis District. On this district he died in 1841. Holland was one of the most able and useful servants of the Methodist Episcopal Church in his day, and is generally acknowledged to rank foremost among the preachers of Tennessee. —Sprague, Annuals of the American Pulpit, vii., 662.

Hollingsworth, Johann von, a Benedictine monk, born at Holleshoe, in Bohemia, in 1666, was educated at Paris. He was one of the most violent opponents of Huss, and contributed more than any other person to his execution. This explains why the Hussites, however (1240) destroyed the monastery to which Hollings-}

Holliday, Charles, a Methodist Episcopal minister, born in Baltimore Nov. 28, 1771, was licensed to preach in 1797, and entered the itineracy in 1809. He was made presiding elder on Salt River District in 1818; located in 1816; was again presiding elder on Cumberland District, Tennessee Conference, 1817-21; on Green River District, Kentucky Conference, 1821-25; and on Wabash District, Illinois Conference, 1825-28. At the General Conference of 1828 he was appointed Book Agent at Cincinnati, where he remained eight years. After this he was for several years presiding elder in the Illinois Conference. He was superannuated in 1846, and died March 8, 1850. Mr. Holliday was a "clear, sound, and practical preacher," a deeply pious Christian, and amiable and beloved in all the relations of life, with great opposition; with great abilities; and with great sufferings. He was a man of counsel, a man of integrity, and a man of the church. See Memoir of Dr. Holley, by his Widow; North American Review, xxxv., 403; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i., 866.

Hollingshead, William D., a Congregational minister, born at Philadelphia Oct. 8, 1748, was educated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1770, and entered the ministry in 1772. His first pastoral charge was at Fairfield, N. J. In 1789 he accepted a call from a church
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Hollis, Thomas, Sr., one of the early benefactors of Harvard College, was born in London in 1658. His father, a merchant of the same city, was a protestant of the Independent Church at Pinner's Hall, and he followed in the same relation. Having accumulated a fortune in trade, he gave large sums to charity and to advance the Baptist and Independent Churches. Still more substantial marks of his liberality were conferred on Harvard College, at which in number, and in the form of a scholarship in metaphysics and one of theology, and endowed scholarships for poor students, enriched the library and the cabinets, etc. He died in London in 1731. See Crosby, Hist. of the Baptists, iv, 229; Bogue and Bennett, History of the Dissenters, ii, 414; Christian Examiner, vii, 64; Skeats, Free Churches of England, p. 529.

Hollis, Thomas, Jr., nephew of the preceding, was born in London in 1720, and devoted himself to literature and to the propagation of the principles of civil and religious liberty. He travelled over the Continent from 1748 to 1750, and then settled down on his estate at Corsecombe, Dorset. It is said that half of his large fortune was given in 1792 to Sharon, Conn. He was converted in early life, preyed under the presiding elder in the state of New York, removed to Wisconsin, and joined the Wisconsin Conference in 1833. His appointments were: Summit, Fort Atkinson, Lake Mills, Greenbush, near Otons Falls, Fond du Lac Station, Fond du Lac District, Oconomowoc, Waukesha, and Hart Prairie. He was truly a laborer in God's harvest, zealously affected always in every good thing, serving the Lord most essentially with all his heart, and soul, and mind, and strength. He died at Salem, Wisconsin, March 15, 1869. Hollister was a self-educated man, but good native talent, a logical mind, and vivid imagination atoned for his earlier deficiency, and he ranked among the first in his Conference. See Min. Am. Conf. 1869, p. 225.

Holman, Samuel Christian, a distinguished German theologian, born at Stettin Dec. 8, 1796, was educated at Göttingen, and removed to Wittenberg, where he made adjunct professor of philosophy in 1724. Two years later he was promoted to an extraordinary professorship, and in 1754 was called as a regular professor to the University of Göttingen, then opening. He died in 1787. Holman devoted his time mainly to philosophical studies. He was at first an opponent of Wolf's philosophy, later an admirer of it, and finally became an Eclectic. He wrote text-books in metaphysics, which were well received, and used as long as skepticism was in vogue in Germany. He was also active in awakening an interest in his contemporaries for the study of the natural sciences. His most important works are: De stupendo natura mysterio anima sibi ipsi ignota (Greifsw. and Witten. 1722-24, 4to); Commentatio philos. de harmonia inter substantiam animae et aethereum, 2 vols. (Witten. 1724, 4to); — Apologia Prolectuom in N. T. Gres. (ibid. 1797, 4to); — Comm. phil. de miraculis et geniosis eorumdem criteria, etc. (Frankf. and Lpz. 1727, 4to). — Institu. philos. (Wittenberg, 1727, 2 vols., 8vo). — Uberzeugender Vortrag v. Gott u. Schrift (ibid. 1738, 8vo, and often); Von den Hypothesen, u. d. Translatiuni naturae in human. (ibid. 1737, 8vo); — Vom anatomischen, u. physiolog. Gehororganen, d. Nerven u. des Gehirns (ibid. 1737, 8vo); — Vom pneumatologen und theologischen Zustand der menschlichen Natur (Göttingen, 1740, 8vo). — The studies of a work is given in Jöcher, Gekl. Lex. Adelung's Add. ii, 2999 sq. See Krug, Philos. Lex. ii, 451 sq.

Holm, Peter, Jr., a Danish divine, born at Moom, Norway, June 6, 1706, was educated at the university at Copenhagen, and afterwards lectured at his alma mater. In 1738 he was appointed professor of theology and philosophy at Copenhagen, and a few years after, was a professor of the independent Church at Pinner's Hall, and he followed in the same relation. Having accumulated a fortune in trade, he gave large sums to charity and to advance the Baptist and Independent Churches. Still more substantial marks of his liberality were conferred on Harvard College, at which in number, and in the form of a scholarship in metaphysics and one of theology, and endowed scholarships for poor students, enriched the library and the cabinets, etc. He died in London in 1731. See Crosby, Hist. of the Baptists, iv, 229; Bogue and Bennett, History of the Dissenters, ii, 414; Christian Examiner, vii, 64; Skeats, Free Churches of England, p. 529.

Holm, Peter, Jr., nephew of the preceding, was born in London in 1720, and devoted himself to literature and to the propagation of the principles of civil and religious liberty. He travelled over the Continent from 1748 to 1750, and then settled down on his estate at Corsecombe, Dorset. It is said that half of his large fortune was given in 1792 to Sharon, Conn. He was converted in early life, preyed under the presiding elder in the state of New York, removed to Wisconsin, and joined the Wisconsin Conference in 1833. His appointments were: Summit, Fort Atkinson, Lake Mills, Greenbush, near Otons Falls, Fond du Lac Station, Fond du Lac District, Oconomowoc, Waukesha, and Hart Prairie. He was truly a laborer in God's harvest, zealously affected always in every good thing, serving the Lord most essentially with all his heart, and soul, and mind, and strength. He died at Salem, Wisconsin, March 15, 1869. Hollister was a self-educated man, but good native talent, a logical mind, and vivid imagination atoned for his earlier deficiency, and he ranked among the first in his Conference. See Min. Am. Conf. 1869, p. 225.

Holman, David, a Congregational minister, was born in Sutton, Mass., Dec. 13, 1777. He entered the sophomore class at Brown University in 1800, and graduated in 1803. He studied theology with his brother, the late Rev. Nathan Holman, of Attleborough, and Rev. Dr. Emmons, of Franklin, commenced preaching in Douglas, Mass., in the autumn of 1807, and was ordained Oct. 19, 1808. He continued pastor of the church in Douglas until Aug. 17, 1842, when he was obliged to resign on account of impaired health. In 1848 he renewed his labors among his old flock, and continued to perform the duties of a pastor for five years. Several revivals of religion were enjoyed during his ministry, as the result of which more than 200 were added to the Church. He died Nov. 16, 1866. See Congreg. Quarterly, ix, 203.

Holman, William, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Salem, Va., Nov. 29, 1799, at Carter Springs, Virginia, and removed to Franklin, Ky., then in Virginia. He joined the Church in 1812; four years later he entered the Ohio Conference, and was appointed to Limestone Circuit. In 1821 he was sent to the Newport Circuit, and a year later was appointed to Frankfort, the capital of the state. Here he built up a fine society, and remained four years. In 1825 he moved to Danville and Harrodsburg, where he labored with equal zeal and success. After serving Lexington, Russellville, and Mt. Sterling in succession, he was appointed to Louisville, where he succeeded in building the Brook Street Church. He remained in this city "from 1830 to the close of his ministry, except two years, serving all the churches either as pastor or presiding elder." During the war he separated his connection with the "M. E. Church South," and, espousing the Federal cause, "accepted a post-chaplainship, to the arduous duties of which he was well qualified, being himself with the Federalists." His death was "sadly surprising—visiting hospitals, and administering to the sick and dying night and day." He died Aug. 1, 1867. — Redford, History of Methodism in Kentucky, ii, 374 sq.

Holmes, Abel, D.D., a Congregational minister, born in Woodstock, Conn., Dec. 24, 1763, was educated at Yale College (class of 1788), and served his alma mater as tutor a short time. He became pastor in Mid-
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HOLMES, Robert, D.D., an English divine, born in Hampshire in 1749, was educated at New College, Oxford. He became successively rector of Staunton, canon of Salisbury, and finally (1804) dean of Winchester. In 1780 he succeeded Thomas Warton as professor of poetry at Oxford. His father died at Oxford in 1805. Holmes wrote The Resurrection of the Body deduced from the Resurrection of Christ (Oxf. 1777, 4to) —On the Prophecies and Testimony of John the Baptist, and the parallel Prophecies of Jesus Christ (Bampton Lectures for 1782, Oxf. 1782, 8vo) —Four tracts on the Principles of Religion and Divinity: Authority; on the Principles of Redemption; on the Angelical Message of the Virgin Mary; and on the Resurrection of the Body, with a Discourse on Humility (Oxf. 1786); etc. But his principal work was the collation of the Septuagint. "As early as 1788 he published at Oxford proposals for a collation of all the known MSS. of the Septuagint, which had never yet been undertaken on an extensive scale, and the want of which had long been felt among Biblical scholars. Dr. Holmes's undertaking was promoted by the delegates of the Clarendon Press. In addition to the learned editor's own labors, literary men were engaged in different parts of the Continent for the business of collation, and Dr. Holmes annually published an account of the progress which was made" (Kitto). The book of Genesis, successively followed by the other books of the Pentateuch, making together one folio volume, with one title page and one general preface, was published at Oxford in 1789. From this pref ace we learn that eleven Greek MSS. in uncial letters, and more than one hundred MSS. in cursive writing (containing either the whole or parts of the Pentateuch), were collated for this edition, of which the text was a copy of the Form of 1719, for which, with other editions, collations from three other ancient editions (the Complutensian, the Aldine, and Grabe's) are always noted. The quotations found in the works of the Greek fathers are also alleged, and likewise the various readings of the ancient versions made from the Septuagint. "The plan of this edition thus bore a close resemblance to what had been already applied by Mill, Wetstein, and Griesbach to the criticism of the Greek Testament, and the execution of it has been highly commended as displaying un- common industry and apparently great accuracy." It is to be regretted that "the learned editor died in the midst of this honorable labor; but shortly before his death he had published the book of Daniel, both according to the Sept. version and that of Theodotion, the latter only having been printed in former editions, because the translation of this book is not contained in the common MSS. and was unknown till it was printed in 1772 from a MS. belonging to cardinal Chigi" (Kitto). The work was finished by the Rev. Parsons, D.D., and completed on the original plan. The title of the work is Virus Testamentum Græcum, cum variis Lectionibus (Oxf. 1798-1804, 15 vols. fol.). Tischendorf, however, condemns the work as inaccurately done (Proleg. to ed. of Sept. 1856, p. iii-iv). See Chalmers, Biographical Sketches, vol. ii, p. 117; Brough, Oxford University, Brit. Lib. p. 29, 22; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 870; Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, i, 1929; Kitto, Cyclop. of Bib. Lit. ii, 318. (J. H.W.)

Holmepatrick, Council of, held at Holmepatrick, an island off the eastern coast of Ireland, in 1148, by the advice of the pope, Innocent II, to consider the question of granting the pall to the archbishops of Armagh and Cashel. This synod was attended by fifteen bishops and two hundred priests. The council lasted four days, the first three of which were occupied with questions concerning the general welfare of the Church, confining the question of the pall to the last day. The result was a letter to the pope petitioning for the pall (which had meanwhile succeeded Innocent), which Malachy O'Morogais, a former archbishop of Armagh, was commissioned to carry to Rome, in favor of the grant.—Todd, Hist. of Ancient Church in Ireland, p. 113; Land- don's Manual of Councils, p. 265, 266.

HOLOFERNES, a person mentioned only in the Apocrypha (Judith ii, 4, 19), a nobleman belonging to the house of Oneglah, as borne by the brother of Ariarathes I (B.C. cir. 380), and afterwards by a pretender to the Cappadocian throne, who was at first supported and afterwards imprisoned by Demetrius Soter (B.C. cir. 158). The termination (Tissaphernes, etc.) points to a Persian origin, but the meaning of the word is uncertain.—Smith. See Volkmar, Einleitung in die Apokryphen (Tub. 1860-3), i, 179 sq.; Gritz, Geschichte der Juden, iv, 456. According to the account in the book of Judith, Nebuchadnezzar, "king of Nineveh," having resolved to "avenge himself on all the earth," appointed Holoffrnes general of the expedition, which was intended for the purpose of taking the cities of the coast, which he had submitted to him, "and the weight of his arm." Having reached Ecbatana he encamped "between Geba and Scythopolis" a whole month to collect his forces. The Jews, however, resolved to resist him, and fortified all the mountain passes. Dissuaded by Achior, "captain of the sons of Ammon," from attacking the Jews, he rescinded the advice, and delivered Achior into the hands of the Jews in Bethulia, from whom, however, he met with a kind reception. Holofernes proceeded against Bethulia (q. v.), where he was brought to bay: and, instead of attacking it, seized upon two wells on which the city depended for water, and compelled the devout women to bring it. While here he fell a victim to the treachery of Judith, a beautiful Jewish widow, who artfully managed to be brought into his presence, and who, by playing the hypocrite, secured his favor and confidence. Having invited her to a banquet, he drank freely, and, having fallen asleep, fell beneath the arm of his fair guest, who cut off his head with his own sword, and escaped with her to a lofty trophy to her own people in Bethulia. The Jews immediately fell on their enemies, who, finding their general dead in his tent, flew in confusion. Such is the story: it is scarcely necessary to add that it is wholly unhistorical.—Kitto. See Journu.
HOLOMERIANS. See SPIRITUALISM.

Holo'meon (Heb. Cholem, יַחֵלֹם or יַחַלֹם, sandy), the name of one or two places.

1. (Sept. Ῥλων, Ῥλων, etc.; Vulg. Holon, Olon.) A city in the mountains of Judah (Josh. xv. 51, where it is mentioned between Goshen and Giloh); assigned to the Levites (Josh. xxii. 15, where it is mentioned beside his Eshtemoa and Debir); in the parallel passage (1 Chron. vi. 58) it is written Hilen (Heb. Chilen, יַחֵַלּן; Sept. Νελων, but transposes with Jether; Vulg. Helon). De Sauley is inclined to identify it with the village Nukhalin, on the hills (Dead Sea, i, 455, 454) west of Bethlehem, or, according to Dr. Robinson (new ed. of Researches, ii. 284), at the bottom of wady el-Masur, on its southern side; but this is not in the same group of towns with the others, which all lie in the south-west part of the mountain district (Keil, Comment, ad loc.). The position seems rather to correspond to that of Beiti Amr, a large ruined village on a hill near wady el-Khulil, north-west of Juthah, on the road to Hebron (Robinson, Researches, ii. 629 and note).

2. (Sept. Χλων, Vulg. Helon.) A city of Moab (Jer. xlviii. 21). It was one of the towns of the Misbar, the level downs (A. V., "plain country") east of Jordan, and is named with Jahazah, Dibon, and other known places; but no identification of it has yet taken place, nor does it appear in the parallel lists of Numeirat and Josh. xxii. 31. —Smith. Perhaps it is the same as Horonaim (q. v.).

Holste or Holsteni, Lucas, born at Hamburg in 1596, was educated at the University of Leyden, and ranks as one of the first scholars of his time. Failing to secure a professorship, he travelled through Italy, England, and other countries, and settled in Paris, where he became acquainted with the distinguished Jesuits Dupuy, Peirese, and other learned men of that order, and he finally became a Roman Catholic, in consequence, he said, of his careful study of the works of the fathers, and of his seeking for the principle of unity in the Church; but others think that his conversion was wholly due to his association with the Jesuits, and to his desire to have free access to the libraries of France and Italy; and some even, among whom is Salmasius (see Müller, Čimbr. Litt. iii. 820), ascribe it to his severe poverty and great ambition. Soon after his conversion his friends introduced him to the pope's nuncio, cardinal Barberini, nephew of Urban VIII, whom he accompanied to Rome in 1627. He lived with the cardinal, and became his librarian. Later, he was promoted canon of St. Peter's, and finally he became librarian of the Vatican and consultor of the Congregation of the Index. He was sent on several missions to Germany; among others, to Innsbruck, to receive the abjuration of queen Christina of Sweden. He was also instrumental in effecting the conversion of other distinguished Protestants to Catholicism. Holsteini, even in his eminent position in the Church of Rome, retained some of the liberal principles imbibed as a Protestant, and they severely provoked his Roman friends. Thus he advocated earnestly, but in vain, the union of the Greek and Roman churches in 1639, advising liberal action on the part of the Roman Church. In the Congregation of the Index also, he would never favor any stricture against valuable works of Protestants, and he was even obliged to retire from the council for this reason. In the dispute between the Jansenists and Molinists, he counselled pope Alexander VII against any decision likely to be in favor of the Jansenists. The obscure and involved nature of such views maintain that no proof can be offered "that there is or ever was any one community on earth recognized, or having any claim to be recognised as the universal Church, bearing rule over and comprehending all particular churches. They further allege that no accredited authority exists that is empowered to define or vary any registry of those decrees. They consider, therefore, that the Catholic Church is an invisible community of much value in their unfinished state. Among his published works are the following: Porphyrii liber de Vita Pythagorae, etc. (Rom. 1630, 8vo; Cambri. 1655, 8vo), with a Latin version and notes, and a dissertation on the life and writings of Porphyrius, considered a model of learned biography; — Demophilii, Democratiae, et Sancti Veteris Philosophorum Sententiae Morales (Rome, 1638, 8vo; Leyden, 1639, 12mo); — Note in Sallustian Philosophum de Dies et Mundo (Rome, 1638, 8vo); — Observationes ad Apollonii Rhodii Argonauticae (Leyden, 1641, 4vo); — De Confusione de Venustione, with a Latin version (Par. 1644, 8vo); — Adnotationes in Geographiam Sacram Caroli a S. Paolo, Italian Antiquas Clavis, et Theaurum Geographicam Ortelii (Rome, 1666, 8vo); — Note et Castigationes Posthumae in Stephano Byzantinii de Urbibus, edited by Ryckius; — Liber Diurnae Pontificum Romano monumentorum, a collection of papal acts and decrees. He also wrote a collection of the rules of the earlier monastic orders, published after his death (Rome, 1661; later at Paris; and, lastly, much enlarged, Augsburg, 1759, 6 vols. fol.), which is considered as among the most valuable of his writings; he also edited in his lifetime the Antiquitates Mixtae, and the works of Methodius, and many of his Latin letters have also been published in the Collectio Romanus veterum aliquot histor. eccl. monumentorum, etc. See Wilken, Leben d. gelehrten Luxo Holsteini (Hamb. 1728, 8vo); English Cyclop.; Herzog, Real-Lex. vi. 241 sq.; Moehl, German, pp. 426 sq. (see Index); Gieseler, Church Hist. of the Mem. viii. 135, note; Schröch, Kirchengeschichte s. a. Reform. vii. 76; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Génér. xxxiv. 4 sq.; Dupin, Biblioth. Eccl. (17th century). (J. H. W.)

Holstein. See SCHLESWIG-HOLSTEIN.

HOLY. See HOLINESS.

HOLY OF HOLIES. See TABERNACLE; TEMPLE. HOLY, HOLY, HOLY. See TRINITY.

HOLY Alliance, a compact formed between the sovereigns of Russia, Austria, and Prussia, in 1815, for the humane and liberal administration of their governments. See Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, v. 669; Wing's Hase, Ch. Hist. (see Index); Hurd's Hagenbach, Hist. Christ. Church in 18th and 19th Cent. ii. 542 sq.; and the references in Poole's Index, s.v. See ALLIANCE, HOLY.

HOLY Ark. See ARK, 3.

HOLY Aashes are called, in the Roman Catholic Church, the Church of England, and the Protestant Episcopal Church, the ashes used at the old ceremonial in Lent. See LENT.

HOLY Bible. See BIBLE.

HOLY-Bread Skep or Maund is called, in the Roman and Anglican Churches, the basket used for the eulogia (q. v.). —Walcott, Sac. Arch. p. 512.

HOLY Candle, BLESSING WITH THE. Bishops Latimer and Tyndale say that in their day "dying persons committed their souls to the holy candle, and that the sign of the Cross was made over the dead with it, 'thereby to be discharged of the burden of sin, or to drive away devils, or to put away dreams and phantasies.'" —Walcott, Sac. Arch. p. 513. Compare the use of tapers (holy) at CANDLES.

HOLY Catholic Church, the "congregation of faithful men dispersed throughout the whole world." Some persons speak of this Church as if it were a visible community, comprising all Christians as its members, as having existed from the earliest days, and as retaining the same authority which it formerly had to frame and administer the doctrine and discipline of the Church. The decrees of such views maintain that no proof can be offered "that there is or ever was any one community on earth recognised, or having any claim to be recognised as the universal Church, bearing rule over and comprehending all particular churches. They further allege that no accredited authority exists that is empowered to define or vary any registry of those decrees. They consider, therefore, that the Catholic Church is an invisible community
HOLY CITY

(because its Head is so) in itself and regarded as a whole, though visible in its several parts to those of its members who constitute each separate part. See CHURCH.

Holy City. See JERUSALEM.

Holy Coat of TREVES, a relic preserved with great reverence in the cathedral of Treves, in the southern part of France, and esteemed as one of the greatest treasures of that city. The priests claim that it was the seamless coat of our Saviour, and that it was discovered in the 4th century by the empress Helena on her visit to Palestine, and by her deposited at Treves. The Treves

necesory under the present dispensation, Jesus Christ would have said something respecting them, whereas he was silent about them; that it is bringing us again into that bondage to ceremonial laws from which Christ freed us; that it is a tacit reflection on the Head of the Church in not appointing them; that such days, on the whole, are more pernicious than useful to society, as they open a door for indolence and profligacy; yea, that Scripture speaks against such days (Gal. iv. 9-11).

See FEASTS; FESTIVALS.

Holy Family is the general title, in the language of art, of the various representations of the domestic life of the Virgin Mary and the infant Jesus and his attendants. In the early part of the Middle Ages, when the object was to excite devotion, the Mother and Child were usually the only persons represented. At a later period, Joseph, Elizabeth, St. Anna (the mother of the Virgin), and John the Baptist were included. Some of the old German painters have added the twelve apostles as children and playfellows of the infant Christ, as well as their mothers, as stated in the legends. The Italian school, with its fine feeling for composition, was the first to recognise how many figures the group must comprise if the interest is to remain undivided and be concentrated on one figure, whether that figure be the Madonna or the Child. Two masters are pre-eminent in this species of representation—Leonardo da Vinci and Raphael (Chambers). Mrs. Jameson (Legenda of the Madonna, p. 292 sq.) also insists on drawing a distinction between the domestic and the devotional treatment. The latter, she says, is a group in which the sacred personages are placed in direct relation to the worshippers, and their supernatural character is paramount to every other. The former, a group of the Holy Family so called, in which the personages are placed in direct relation to each other by some link of action or sentiment which expresses the family connection between them, or by some action which has a dramatic rather than a religious significance.

Holy Father. I. "The first person of the Trinity was represented as in Daniel's vision, vii, 9, and vested in a cope, and wearing a tiara. It was contrary to our Lord's declaration (John vi, 46), and indefensible."—Walcott, Sac. Archæol. p. 312. II. A title of the pope (q. v.).

Holy Fire, a ceremony in the Romish Church, observed on Holy Saturday (q. v.) of Easter, with especial pomp at Rome, where the pope himself is in attendance. A light is kindled by sparks struck from a flint, to commemorate Christ—according to the Missal—as the great corner-stone. This light is hailed by kneeling ecclesiastics as the "Light of Christ" (Lumen Christi), that all the lights in the chapel having been previously extinguished, be rekindled at the new fire. In the Church of the Holy Sepulchre at Jerusalem, at the Easter of the Oriental Church, the Holy Fire is claimed to be miraculous. "The Greek and Armenian clergy combine on this occasion, and amidst processions, solemnities, an excited multitude, and scenes disgraceful not only to the name of religion, but to human nature, the expected fire makes its appearance from within an apartment in which a Greek and an Armenian bishop have locked themselves."

Holy Font, the vessel containing the baptismal water. See FONT.

Holy Fridays, Fridays in Ember-weeks (q. v.).—Walcott, Sac. Archæol. p. 812. See FRIDAY.

Holy Gates. See JUBILEE (ROMAN CATHOLIC).

Holy Ghost (πνεῦμα Ἁγίου), the third person in the Trinity, proceeding from the Father and the Son, and equal with them in power and glory (see Vth ART. of Religion, Church of England, and IVth of Methodist Episcopal Church). For the significations of the original words rendered in the English version by 'Spirit,' "Holy Spirit," "Holy Ghost," see SPIRIT. The Scrip-
tures teach, and the Church maintains, I. the procession; II. the Personality; and, III. the Divinity of the Holy Ghost. For the offices of the Holy Ghost, see Spirit, Holy; Paraclete; Witness of the Holy Spirit.

I. THE PROCESSION OF THE HOLY GHOST.—The orthodox doctrine is, that as Christ is God by an eternal filiation, so the Holy Ghost is God by an eternal procession. He proceeded from the Father and from the Son. "When the Comforter is come, whom I will send you from the Father, even the Spirit of truth, which procedeth from the Father, he shall testify of me" (John xvi, 13). He is the Spirit of the Father, he is the Spirit of the Son: he is sent by the Father, he is sent by the Son. The Father is never sent by the Son, but the Father sendeth the Son; neither the Father nor the Son is ever sent by the Holy Ghost, but he is sent by both. The Nicene Creed teaches, "And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father and the Son, who with the Father and the Son together is worshipped and glorified." The Athanasian Creed, "The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son, neither male, nor created, nor begotten, but proceeding." Thaddæus and the Acts of Emperor Constantine say, "The Holy Ghost, proceeding from the Father and the Son, is of one substance, majesty, and glory with the Father and the Son, very and eternal God." The term spiration was introduced by the Latin Church to denote the manner of proceeding. When Jesus imparted the Holy Ghost to his disciples, "he breathed upon them, and said, Receive ye the Holy Ghost" (John xx, 22).

During the first three centuries there was nothing decided by ecclesiastical authority respecting the relations of the Holy Spirit to the Father and the Son. The Nicene Creed (A.D. 325) declared only that "the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Father" (i.e. τὸν Ἱδρυότερον Ἰεροσολύμων, and the Greek fathers generally adhered to this view: so Basil, Gregory of Nazianzus, Cyril of Alexandria, and others. Epiphanius added to the formula, ἵνα τὸν Ἰδρυότερον Ἰεροσολύμων, the explanatory clause, "and equal in power with the Father." That the Holy Ghost proceedeth from the Son, the Church of the East held from the time of Novatian, and was admitted to the Nicene Creed, was retained in the Greek Church. But there were many in the Latin Church who maintained that the Holy Spirit did not proceed from the Father only, but also from the Son. They appealed to John xvi, 13, and to the texts where the Holy Spirit is clearly and especially in the 7th and 9th verses, πάντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς, and at an earlier period by nearly all the Western churches. But as the Eastern Church still adhered substantially to the more ancient formula, it accused the Western Church of falsifying the Nicene symbol; and thus at different periods, and in the 7th and 9th centuries, violent controversies arose between them" (Knapp, Theology, § 43; Hey, Lectures on Divinity, vol. i.). The true causes of these dissensions were, however, very different from those which were alleged, and less animated, it seems, by zeal for the truth than by the mutual jealousies of the Roman and Byzantine Bishops. But, however, even the uncertainty that provoked these disputes, they terminated in the 11th century in an entire separa-
II. PERSONALITY OF THE HOLY GHOST.—1. Definition and History of the Doctrine.—A person is "a thinking, feeling, acting being," which has reason to reflect; a "singular, subsistent, intellectual being;" "an intelligent agent." As personality implies thought, reason, reflection, and an individual existence, distinct from that of other beings, when we speak of the personality of the Holy Ghost we mean his distinct and individual existence, his conscious being, his reflecting, reasoning spirit; it is represented throughout the Scriptures as a personal agent, and the earlier Christian writers so speak of him, though without any aim at dogmatic precision. It is the habit of some writers, opposed to the orthodox doctrine, to assert that not only was the doctrine of the Holy Ghost not precisely developed in the early period, but that it was not received. "On the contrary, the thorough investigations of recent times show plainly that the ante-Nicene fathers, with the exception of the Monarchians, and perhaps Lactantius, agreed in the two fundamental points that the Holy Ghost, the sole agent in the application of redemption, is a supernatural divine being, and that he is an independent person; closely allied to the Father and the Son, yet hypostatically different from them both" (Schaaff, CH. History, i, § 80). The first positive and dogmatic denial of the personality and deity of the Holy Ghost is ascribed to Tertullian, in his refutation of the Manichaeans; and he identifies the Holy Ghost simply as an operation of the divine mind, as the "exerted energy of God," or as an attribute only of the divine activity.

2. Proof of the Personality of the Spirit.—The Holy Spirit is represented in the New Testament not only as different from the Father and Son, and not only as the personification of some attribute of God, or of some effect which he has produced, but as a literal person (see Semler, Disp. Spiritum Sanctum recte describi personam). The proof of this is thus made out from the following texts: (1) From the texts John xiv, 16, 17; xv, 26. The Holy Spirit is here called πνεῦμα, not comforter, advocate, nor merely teacher, as Ernesti renders it, but helper, assistant, counsellor, in which sense it is used by Philo, when he says, God needs no πνεῦμα (monitor). Of the Paracletus, Christ says that the Father shall send him, and he shall remain with the Father, and shall come to him. The Paracletus, i.e. his Spirit shall remain in him, and shall be in him, to instruct his disciples. To these three subjects similar personal predicates are here equally applied, and the Paracletus is not designated by the abstract word ankhelion, but by the concrete auxiliarius; so that we have the Father who sent him, the Son in whose place he comes, and the Holy Spirit who is sent. His office is to carry forward the great work of teaching and saving men which Christ commenced, and to be to the disciples of Christ what Christ himself was while he continued upon the earth. John xv, 26 When the Paracletus shall come, whom I will send to you from the Father (I mean the Spirit—I. e. teacher—of truth, who proceeds from the Father), he will instruct you further in my religion; where it should be remarked that the phrase ἐκπορευεῖται πνεῦμα Πατρὸς means to be sent or commissioned by the Father. (2) 1 Cor. xii, 4-11, There are divers gifts, but the same Spirit; and one and the same Spirit (τὸ ίδίον Πνεύμα), from whom they all proceed. Here the ψυχισμα are clearly distinguished from the Spirit, who is the author of them. In verse 5 this same person is distinguished from Christ (οὶ Κύριοι), and in verse 6 from Θεός. In verse 11 it is said all these (various gifts) worketh one and the self-same Spirit, who imparteth to every man his own, as he will (εἰς αὐτὸν βοηθεῖται). (3) Those texts in which such attributes and works are ascribed to the Holy Spirit as can be predicated of no other than a personal subject. In John xvi, 15 sq., he is said to speak, to hear, to take, etc. So in 1 Cor. ii, 10, God hath revealed the doctrine of Christianity to us by his Spirit (πνεῦμα ἐν εἰς αὐτῷ), which style of expression is more perfect instruction. And this Spirit searches (ἰκανόν) all things, even the most secret divine purposes (βαθύς θεωρίς; comp. Rom. xi, 33 sq.); in his instruction, therefore, we may safely confide. The expressions, the Holy Spirit speaks, sends any one, appoints any one for a particular office, may be thus frequently in the Acts and elsewhere, show that the Holy Spirit was understood by the early Christians to be a personal agent (Acts xiii, 2, 4; xx, 28; xxi, 11 sq.). (4) The formula of baptism, Matt. xxviii, 19, and other similar texts, such as 2 Cor. xiii, 14, where Father, Son, and Holy Ghost are mentioned in a single act of consecration (xvi, 14), may now be used in proof of the personality of the Holy Spirit, since the other texts upon which the meaning of these depends have already been cited. From all these texts, taken together, we may form the following result: The Holy Spirit is represented in the Bible as a personal subject, and, as such, is distinguished from the Father and the Son. In relation to the human race, he is described as sent and commissioned by the Father and the Son, and as occupying the place which Christ, who preceded him, held. In this respect he depends (to speak metaphorically) as a younger brother of the Father (John xiv, 16) and upon the Son (John xiv, 16, 26; also xvi, 14, θεὸς οὗτοι λίγναρα; and in this sense he proceeds from them both, or is sent by them both. This may be expressed more literally as follows: The great work of converting, sanctifying, and saving men, which the Father commissioined to the Holy Ghost, is sent to be carried on by the Father and Son, through the Holy Spirit.

The objectors to this doctrine frequently say that the imaginative Orientalists were accustomed to represent many things as personal subjects, and to introduce them into the gods' speaking and acting; which, however, they themselves did not consider persons, and did not intend to have so considered by others; and to this Oriental usage they think that Christ and his apostles might here, as in other cases, have conformed. But, whenever Christ and his apostles spoke in figurative language, they always showed, by the explanation which they gave, that they did not intend to be understood literally. But they have given no such explanation of the language which they employ with regard to the Holy Spirit. We therefore fairly conclude that they intended that their language should be understood literally, otherwise they would have led their hearers astray instead of informing them the more so as they well knew that their readers and hearers were accustomed to personifications (Knapp, Theology, § 39).

The scriptural argument is thus logically developed by Watson. "1. The personality of the Holy Spirit in the sacred Trinity proves his personality. He proceeds from the Father and the Son, and cannot, therefore, be either. To say that an attribute proceeds and comes forth would be a gross absurdity. 2. Many passages of Scripture would be wholly unintelligible, and even absurd, unless the Holy Ghost is allowed to be a person. For as those who take the phrase as ascribing no more than a figurative personality to an attribute, make that attribute to be the energy or power of God, they reduce such passages as the following to utter unmeaningness: 'God anointed Jesus with the Holy Ghost and power and wisdom; and the favor of the Lord was with him:' that is, through the power of the Holy Ghost; 'and power'; that is, through the power of the Holy Ghost; 'in demonstration of the Spirit and power;' that is, demonstration of power and power. 3. Personification of any kind is, in some passages in which the Holy Ghost is spoken of, imposs-
HOLY GHOST

shall he speak.' What attribute of God can here be personified? And if the doctrine of the Gospel be arrayed with personal attributes, where is there an instance of so monstrous a prosopopeia as this passage would exhibit? the doctrine of the Gospel not speaking 'of himself,' but speaking 'whate'er he shall hear.' 'The Spirit maketh intercession for us.' What attribute of God is it, the first clause of the doctrine of the Gospel intercedes? Personification, too, is the language of poetry, and takes place naturally only in excited and elevated discourse; but if the Holy Spirit be a personification, we find it in the ordinary and cool strain of mere narration and argumentative discourse in the Gospels, where the personification is the most frequent utterance. 'Have ye received the Holy Ghost since ye believed? We have not so much as heard whether there be any Holy Ghost.' How impossible it is here to extort, by any process whatever, even the shadow of a personification of either any attribute of God, or of the doctrine of the Gospel. So again: 'The Spirit,' said unto Philip, 'Go near, and join thyself to this chariot.' Could it be any attribute of God which said this, or could it be the doctrine of the Gospel? Finally, that the Holy Ghost is a person, and not an attribute, is proved by the use of masculine pronouns and relatives in the New Testament, and in the three Persons in creative acts may be added a like association in acts of preservation, which has been well called a continued creation, and by that term is expressed in the following passage: 'These wait all upon thee, that thou mayest give them their meat in due season.' Thou hast divided their portion, and hast sealed their bounds by their blood, they die, and return to dust: thou sendest forth thy Spirit, they are created; and thou renewest the face of the earth.' (Ps. civ. 27-30.) It is not surely here meant that the Spirit by which the generations of animals are perpetuated is wind; and if he be called an attribute, wisdom, power, or both united, where do we read of such attributes being 'sent,' 'sent forth from God,' 'sent forth from God to create and renew the face of the earth?' (2.) The next association of the three Persons we find in the inspiration of the prophets: 'God spake unto our fathers by the prophets,' says Paul. He declares that these 'holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost' (2 Pet. i. 21); and also that it was 'the Spirit of Christ which was in them' (1 Pet. i. 11). We may defy any Socinian to interpret these words of the Son of God by any mental operation or attribute, and thereby reducing the term Holy Ghost into a figure of speech. 'God,' in the first passage, is unquestionably God the Father; and the 'holy men of God,' the prophets, would then, according to this view, be moved by the influence of the Father: but the influence, according to the third passage, which was the source of their inspiration, was the Spirit or the influence of Christ.' Thus the passages contradict each other. Allow the Trinity in unity, and you have no difficulty in calling the Spirit, the Spirit of the Father, and the Spirit of the Son, or the Spirit of either; but if the Spirit be an influence, that influence cannot be the influence of two persons, one of them God and the other a creature. Even if they allowed the pre-existence of Christ, with Arians, these passages are inexplicable by the Socinians; but, denying his pre-existence, they have no subterfuge but to interpret 'the Spirit of Christ,' 'the Spirit which was in Christ,' 'the Spirit which was upon John,' 'the Spirit which was in Christ,' 'the Spirit which was in the Virgin Mary,' 'the Spirit which was in the Virgin Mary,' 'the Spirit which was in the Virgin Mary,' a puerile paraphrase; or 'the spirit of an anointed one, or prophet.' That is, the prophet's own spirit, which is just as gratuitous and as unsupported by any parallel as the former. If, however, the Holy Ghost be the Spirit of Christ, then the Spirit is the source of that prophetic inspiration under which the prophets spoke and acted. So the same Spirit which raised Christ from the dead is said by Peter to have preached by Noah while the ark was preparing; in allusion to the passage...
My Spirit shall not always strive (contend, debate) with man. This, we may observe, affords an eminent proof that the writers of the New Testament understood the phrase 'the Spirit of God,' as it occurs in the Old Testament, personally. For, whatever may be the full meaning of that difficult passage in Peter, Christ is clearly described in that baptism by the Spirit 'in the days of Noah; that is, he, by the Spirit, inspired Noah to preach. If, then, the apostles understood that the Holy Ghost was a Person, a point which will presently be established, we have, in the text just quoted from the book of Genesis, a key to the meaning of those texts in the Old Testament, that is, the page of the Spirit of God, 'the Spirit of God,' and 'the Spirit of the Lord,' occur, and inspired authority is thus afforded us to interpret them as of a Person; and if of a Person, the very effort made by Socinians to deny his personality itself indicates that that Person must, from the lofty titles and works ascribed to him, be necessarily divine. Such phrases occur in many passages of the Hebrew Scriptures; but in the following the Spirit is also eminently distinguished from two other Persons: 'And now the Lord God, and his spirit, hath sent me' (Isa. xlviii, 10): or, rendered better, 'hath sent me and his Spirit,' both terms being properly used in this case, as part of the title of the book of the Lord, and read; for my mouth it hath commanded, and his Spirit it hath gathered them' (Isa. xxxiv, 16). 'I am with you, saith the Lord of hosts, according to the word that I covenanted with you when ye came out of Egypt, so my Spirit remaineth among you' (Isa. xxxv. 5). 'For thus saith the Lord of hosts, the Lord hath been zealous for his land, and hath gathered all nations, and the Desire of all nations shall come' (Hag. ii, 4–7). Here, also, the Spirit of the Lord is seen collocated with the Lord of hosts and the Desire of all nations, who is the Messiah [according to the usual interpretation]. (3.) "Three Persons, and three only, are associated also, both in the Old and New Testament, as objects of supreme worship, and form the one divine 'name.' Thus the fact that, in the vision of Isaiah, the Lord of hosts, who spake unto the prophet, is, in Acts xxviii, 25, said to be the Holy Ghost, while John declares that the glory which Isaiah saw was the glory of Christ, proves indubitably that each of the three Persons bears this august appellation; it gives also the reason for the threefold repetition, 'Holy, holy, holy!' and it exhibits the prophet and the very seraphs in deep and awful adoration before the Throne of Lord of hosts; and the prophet and the seraphim were, therefore, worshippers of the Holy Ghost and of the Son, at the very time and by the very acts in which they worshipped the Father." 3. In the Apocololysis Beneficium, "The grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the love of God, and the communion of the Holy Spirit, be with you all, Amen," the Holy Ghost is acknowledged, equally with the Father and the Son, "to be the source of the highest spiritual blessings; while the beneficence is, from its specific character, to be regarded as an act of prayer to each of the three Persons, and therefore is at once an acknowledgment of the divinity and personality of each. The same remark applies to Rev. i, 4, 5: 'Grace be unto you, and peace, from him which was, and which is, and which is to come; and from the seven spirits which are before his throne' (an emblematical reference, probably, to the golden branch with its seven lamps), 'and from Jesus Christ.' The style of this book sufficiently accounts for the Holy Spirit being called 'the seven spirits;' but no created spirit or company of created spirits is ever spoken of under that appellation; and the place assigned to the seven spirits, between the mention of the Father and the Son, indicates with certainty that one of the sacred Three, so eminent, and so exclusively eminent in both dispensations, is intended. 4. "The form of baptism next presents itself with demonstrative evidence on the two points before us, the personality and divinity of the Holy Spirit. It is the form of covenant by which the sacred Three become our one or only God, and we become his people: 'Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.' In what manner is this text to be disposed of if the personality of the Holy Ghost is denied? Is the form of baptism to be so understood as to imply that baptism is in the name of God, and of the creature, and one attribute? The grossness of this absurdity suffices it, and proves that here, at least, there can be no personification. If all the Three, therefore, are persons, are we to have baptism in the name of one God and two creatures? This would be too near an approach to idolatry, or, at least, the pace of the Spirit and the Lord, 'the Spirit of God,' and 'the Spirit of the Lord,' occur, and inspired authority is thus afforded us to interpret them as of a Person; and if of a Person, the very effort made by Socinians to deny his personality itself indicates that that Person must, from the lofty titles and works ascribed to him, be necessarily divine. Such phrases occur in many passages of the Hebrew Scriptures; but in the following the Spirit is also eminently distinguished from two other Persons: 'And now the Lord God, and his spirit, hath sent me' (Isa. xlviii, 10): or, rendered better, 'hath sent me and his Spirit,' both terms being properly used in this case, as part of the title of the book of the Lord, and read; for my mouth it hath commanded, and his Spirit it hath gathered them' (Isa. xxxiv, 16). 'I am with you, saith the Lord of hosts, according to the word that I covenanted with you when ye came out of Egypt, so my Spirit remaineth among you' (Isa. xxxv. 5). 'For thus saith the Lord of hosts, the Lord hath been zealous for his land, and hath gathered all nations, and the Desire of all nations shall come' (Hag. ii, 4–7). Here, also, the Spirit of the Lord is seen collocated with the Lord of hosts and the Desire of all nations, who is the Messiah [according to the usual interpretation]. (3.) "Three Persons, and three only, are associated also, both in the Old and New Testament, as objects of supreme worship, and form the one divine 'name.' Thus the fact that, in the vision of Isaiah, the Lord of hosts, who spake unto the prophet, is, in Acts xxviii, 25, said to be the Holy Ghost, while John declare..."
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HOLY GHOST, BLASPHEMY AGAINST THE. See BLASPHEMY.

HOLY Ghost, Orders of. 1. Order of the Holy Ghost of Sassia (Order of the Holy Ghost de Montpellier), established in 1178 by Guido of Montpellier, according to the rule of St. Augustine for hospital knights. In 1294 the order obtained the Hospital di Sassin, in Rome, in which the superior of the order took his seat as grand master. Henceforth the members of the order were divided into hospital knights, with simple, and into regular canons, with solemn vows. Pius II abolished the knights in 1459 in Italy, but in France they survived. Having been restored in 1598, the order was divided into the degrees of Knights of Justice and Grace, Serving Brothers and Oblates, and in 1700 was changed into regular canons, who still exist. At an early period in the history of the order a female branch was established. 2. Sisters of the Holy Ghost of Poligny, established in 1212, and still continuing in France, a branch of the White Sisters. 3. Hospitalers (brothers and sisters) of the Holy Ghost in France, established in 1254 as a secular association, and connected with the Order of the Holy Ghost of Sassia. The sisters, on account of their dress commonly called the White Sisters, are still numerous; they are devoted to the nursing of the sick and the poor, and to the education of young girls. 4. Canons of the Holy Ghost, probably founded in Lorraine by Jean Herbert, and confirmed in 1588 by Sixtus V, are devoted to instruction. 5. The Society of Missionary Priests of the Holy Ghost was founded in 1700 by abbe Desplaces and Vincent le Barber for missions, seminaries, and the nursing of the sick; newly established in 1805; still exists, and is active in the foreign missionary fields of the Roman Catholic Church.

HOLY Grass (Hierochloa borealis), a grass about a foot high, of a brownish glossy lax panicle, found in the northern parts of Europe, has a sweet smell like that of vernal grass. In Iceland, where it is plentiful, it is used for scenting apartments and clothes. In some countries it is strewn on the floors of places of worship on holy-days, whence its name.

HOLY Handkerchief. "It is said that one of the women who followed Jesus to the crucifixion lent him her handkerchief to wipe the sweat and blood from his face, and that the impress of his features remained upon it. Of course, St. Veronica (q. v.) very carefully preserved the cloth, and it is now at Rome. Jesus, according to tradition, gave another handkerchief to Agbarinus (q. v.), king of Edessa, who had been restored to health by him. Veronica is only a mythical personage, the name being a hybrid compound signifying "true image."—Eadie, Eccles. Dict. p. 308. See CHRIST, IMAGES OF.

HOLY of Holies. See TABERNACLE; TEMPLE.

HOLY, Holy, Holy. See THRAEGON.

HOLY Hours. See HOURS, HOLY.

HOLY Innocents, a festival in commemoration of the slaughter of infant martyrs (at Bethlehem, Matt. ii, 16), of which the Greek menology and Ethiopic liturgy give the number at 40,000, is alluded to by the early Christian fathers, especially Ireneus and Cyprian, Origen and Augustine, as of memorial observance. In the 4th century, Prudentius celebrates it in the hymn "All hail, ye infant Martyr-Flowers," and, in connection with the Epiphany, also Fulgentius, in his homilies for the day. St. Bernard also alludes to them: "Stephani was a martyr before men, John before angels, but these before angels and God, confessing Christ by dying, not by speech, and their merit is known only to God." Violet was used on this day in memory of the sorrow of their mothers, and the Te Deum, Alleluia, and doxologies were forbidden. In England, at Norton (Worcestershire), "a muffled peal is rung to commemorate the slaughter, and then a peal of joy for the escape of the infant Christ; a half-muffled peal is rung at Minety, Maisemore, Leigh-on-Mendip, Wick, Rissington, and Pattington."—Welcott, Sacred Archæology, p. 313. See INNOCENTS.

HOLY Land. See PALESTINE.

HOLY LEAGUE. I. The name given to an offensive and defensive alliance contracted between the party of the Guises in France, king Philip II of Spain, the pope, the monks, and the French Parliament, in consequence of the edict of toleration of May 14, 1576. The object of the league was the overthrow of the Huguenot party in France, and of its chief, king Henry III, whom one of the Guises was to succeed on the throne. Duke Henry of Guise (surnamed Le Balafré) was the head of the league. In order to avoid the danger, Henry joined the anti-Protestant movement himself, and was thus led to renew the persecutions against the Huguenots. The war commenced in 1577, but soon ended by the peace of Bergerac. When the duke of Alençon died in 1584, leaving-René, duc de Navarre, a Protestant, as his heir, the league sprang again into existence under the influence of the adherents of the Guises, the strict Roman Catholic members of the Parliament, the fanatical clergy, and the ultra conservative party. The states, especially the sixteen districts of Paris (whence the association also took the name of Ligue des Six,), took an active part in it. A treaty was finally concluded with Spain, and signed at the castle of Joinville, Jan. 3, 1585, to prevent the accession of Henry of Navarre to the throne. The contracting parties also pledged themselves to the total uprooting of Protestantism in France and the Netherlands. The result of the league soon became manifest in the intolerant edict of Nantes in 1558, and led in 1587 to the war, known as the war of the three Henrys. (See FRANCE, vol. iii, p. 642.) Henry III having caused Henry of Guise to be arrested at Rochefort (1568), his brother, the Duke of Guise, became chief of the league. Henry III was in 1587 murdered near Paris in 1589, and the war continued until the abjuration of Henry IV in 1588. The pope having absolved him, the members of the league gradually joined the royal standard, and the party ceased to exist. See Migent, Henri de la Ligue (Par. 1829, 5 vols.); Labitte, De la Democratie chez les Predicateurs de la Ligue (Paris, 1841); Riddle, Pers. of Popery, i, 809 sq.;
HOLY SATURDAY. In some churches the Saturday before Easter is so called. See HOLY WEEK.

HOLY SCRIPTURE. See SCRIPTURE, HOLY.

HOLY SEPULCHRE. See SEPULCHRE OF CHRIST.

HOLY SEPULCHRE, Orders of. 1. A religious order in the Roman Catholic Church according to the rule of St. Augustine, founded in 1114 by the archdeacon (subsequently patriarch of Jerusalem) Arnold; according to others, it was founded in 1099 by Godfrey of Bouillon. It embraced regular canons and canonnaresses, was at one time established all through Europe, and received a new rule under Urban VIII. The canons became extinct soon after the renewal of their rule, but the canonnaresses still have a number of houses in France, Germany (Baden), and the Netherlands, and, living in strict seclusion, occupy themselves with the instruction and education of young girls. 2. The Order of Knights of the Holy Sepulchre in England, established in 1714; extinct since the 16th century. The knights were obliged to guard, at least during two years, the Holy Sepulchre of Jerusalem. 3. Knights of the Holy Sepulchre, an order founded very likely by pope Alexander VI to guard the Sepulchre, and at the same time to afford relief and protection to pilgrims to the Holy Land. Originally the pope was the grand master of the order, but he finally ceded this right to the "guardian father of the Holy Sepulchre." The knights must be, according to the rules of the order, of noble descent, ready at any time to give up their life, live, and die for the Roman Catholic faith, etc. But they enjoyed also extraordinary privileges, as exemption from taxation, permission to marry, possession of church property, etc. When Jerusalem was recaptured by the Turks, the knights of the Holy Sepulchre went to Perugia, in Italy. "After a temporary union with the Hospitaliers, the order was reconstructed in 1814 both in France and in Poland, and is still in existence within a very small circle of knights elected by the guardian father from the most respectable pilgrims who come to Holy Land.

HOLY SPEAR (Diá logh), as it is called in the Greek Church, is a kind of spear with a long handle, ending in a cross, "with which the altar-bread, called spragra or holy lamb, is cut out from the loaf for consecration by the priest, with a solemn form in the liturgy of the Church on Isa. iii. 78; John xix. 34."—Walcott, Sacred Archæol. p. 314.

HOLY SPIRIT. See SPIRIT, WORK OF THE; HOLY GHOST; PARACLETE; WITNESS OF THE SPIRIT.

HOLY SYNOD is the title in the Greek Church of the highest governing body.

HOLY TABLE, as it is called in some churches, is the table on which are placed the bread and wine, the appointed emblems of the Saviour's death. See ALTAR.

HOLY THURSDAY (called also Maundy Thursday, from sancdatum [commandment], the first word with which the Church services of the day begin), a day observed in some churches in commemoration of our Lord's ascension. In the Roman Calendar it is the thirty-ninth day after Easter Sunday. See ASCENSION DAY; HOLY WEEK.

HOLY UNION. See HOLY LEAGUE.

HOLY WARS. See CRUSADES.

HOLY WATER. In the Romish, as also in the Greek, Russian, and Oriental churches, denotes water blessed by a priest under certain religious uses. The theory of its first introduction seems to have been that water is a fitting symbol of purity, and accordingly, in most of the ancient religions, the use of lustral or purifying water not only formed part of the public worship, but also entered largely into the personal acts of sanctification prescribed to individual persons. The Jewish law also prescribed this, and it was a practice held in common by many Pagan nations (compare Riddle, Christ. Ant. p. 720). The sprinkling of the hands and face with water before...
entering the sanctuary, still generally observed by the ad- 
herents to that law, was retained, or, no doubt, may have 
given rise to its adoption by the early Christian Church. 
But its use was certainly for a very different purpose. 
Thus bishop Marcellus ordered Equitius, his deacon, to 
sprinkle holy water, hallowed by its conveyance of 
ances and churches, to exorcise devils, which is said to have 
been done also by pope Alexander I. "Joseph, the convert- 
ed Jew, Epiphanius says, used consecrated water in ex- 
orcism. Holy water was used in all benedictions of 
palm and olive branches, vestments, corporals, candles, 
household articles, by the clergy. By the can- 
non law it is mingled with salt. The Council of Nantes 
ordered the priest before mass to sprinkle the church 
court and close, offering prayers for the departed, and to 
give water to all who asked it for their houses, food, cat-
tle, foster, fields, and vines. By the Captains of 
Charlemagne, Louis, and Lothaire, on Easter and Whit-
sun eves all the faithful might take, for purposes of as-
scription in their houses, consecrated water before its ad-
mixture with chrism (q.v.). In monasteries, a novice 
carried the holy water before the cross in procession 
(Walcott, Sac. Archæology, p. 814). In the Greek 
Church, to-day holy water is directed to be made of pure 
spring water, with the admixture of a little consecrated 
salt. This water (generally placed at the entrance of 
places of worship, and sanctified by a solemn benedic- 
tion, prescribed in the diocesan ritual) the Romanist has 
consecrated with the most solemn regard, and it is used not 
merely for the sprinkling of persons on entering and leaving the church, but also in sprink- 
ling books, bells, etc., and it is frequently taken to their 
homes, as having some peculiar virtue. Its use has thus 
become nothing more than a charm. In the Greek 
Church, holy water is usually consecrated by the bishop 
or his vicar-general on the eve of the Epiphany. No salt 
is employed, and they regard the use of it by the Latinas 
as a grievous and unauthorized corruption. The Greeks 
perform the ceremony on January 6, the day on which 
they believe that Christ was baptized by St. John, and twice a year it is usual to drink a portion, viz. at the end of 
the midnight mass of Christmas and on the feast of 
Epiphany. In the Armenian Church, holy water is con- 
secrated by plunging a cross into it on the day of the 
Epiphany, after which it is distributed among the con- 
çgregation, who take it to their homes. The Rites of 
Würtemberg, made on this occasion form a considerable portion of the 
emoluments of the Armenian priesthood. On the prac- 
tice of using water for baptism, see Baptism, vol. i, p. 
650.—Bingham, Orig. Eccl. bk. vili, ch. iii, § 67; Edie- 
de Eccl. Cyclop., 213, 658, 659; Coleman, Ann. Christiani-
um, p. 389, 595; Chambers, Cyclop., vol. vi. For monor- 
graphs, see Volbeding, Index Program, p. 142.

Holy-water Sprinkler, "the aspergill, a brush for scattering holy water. A horrible Tuder mace, with 
radiating spikes, was called the morning star, or sprink- 
er." —Walcott, Sacred Archæology, p. 814.

Holy-water Stock (i.e. pillar) or Stoup (i.e. 
bucket). A stationary stone basin (any 
porous substance which could not suck it 
up was to be carefully avoided) for 
water, placed at the entrance of the 
house of worship, called by the French 
"bénitier." Pope Leo III erected one at 
Ostia. "The stoup is found in all per- 
sonal or architectural, or in the porch, or 
standing on a pedestal." The vessel used by the Tem- 
ple priests was a brazier layer (see lsa. i, 16; ii, 11, 2: Exod. 
xxx, 30; 2 Cor. vii, 1; Psal. ii, 7, 7.)—Walcott, Soc. Ar-
chæology, p. 514 sq.

Holy-water Vat (French, bénitier; Latin, sinula, 
vas), a vessel in which the holy water was carried about, 
and which, according to Micrologus, was first consecra- 
d by pope Alexander V, as Cranner says, to "fear in remembrance of our baptism, and the blood of Christ 
for our redemption, sprinkled on the cross." Edie says 
"this vessel was termed ama or annula. Du Cange rec- 
ognises asperosol, aspergilium, and asperserium as the 
vessels from which the priests sprinkled the water, and 
spaudalium as that which held it. The first three are 
plainly the same as the πιπέρας of pagan- 
lism." The fixed holy-water stoup (q.v.) was used by 
those who came to late in church to receive the as-
sprinkler by the priest and water carried in the port- 
able vat, which in the churches of the West represented 
the bodily ablution made by the Oriental Christians."— 
Walcott, Sacred Archæology, p. 315; Edie, Eccl. Dia-
Acrionary, p. 313.

Holy Week, the last week of Lent (q.v.), i.e. the 
week before Easter, and specially devoted to commemor- 
ating the sufferings and death of Christ. In Eng- 
lish use, it is also called Passion Week (a name appro- 
priated, in later use, to the week before Easter on Sun-
day). This institution is of very early origin, and was 
"formerly called the 'Great Week,' and in medieval 
times the 'Authentic,' with the same meaning; in Ger-
many and Denmark, the popular title is 'Still Week,' in 
allusion to the holy water and abstention from labor 
during its observance." In the Roman Catholic Church, 
the special characteristics of the celebration of the Holy 
Week are increased solemnity and gloom, penitential 
rigor, and mourning. If any of the ordinary Church 
festivals fall therein, they are transferred till after Easter. 
All instrumental music is suspended in the churches, the 
altars are stripped of their ornaments, the pictures and 
statues are veiled from public sight, manual labor is vol-
tarily suspended, the rigor of fasting is redoubled, and 
alms-deeds and other works of mercy and sedulously en-
joined and practised. The days specially solemnized 
are Palm Sunday, Spy Wednesday, Holy (or Maundy) 
Thursday, Good Friday (q.v.), Holy Saturday. Holy 
Thursday (q.v.), in the Roman Catholic Church, is 
specially designed as a commemoration of the Last Supper, 
and of the institution of the Eucharist. Besides these 
services, there are still others annexed to the day, as the 
solemn conclusion of the confession, and of the penance 
in baptism, confirmation, orders, and extreme unction, the 
washing of pilgrims' feet, and the chanting of the Tene-
brae (darkness), consisting of the matins and lauds for 
the following mornings, which it is customary to recite 
at night. During the service, a large candlestick, sup-
porting fifteen lights, arranged in the form of a triangle, 
which denote Christ and the prophets who predicted 
his coming, stands in the sanctuary; the lights are one 
by one extinguished until only the upper one remains, 
which is taken down and placed under the altar until 
the close of the office, and then brought back; this sym-
bolizes Christ's burial and resurrection." On Holy Sat-
urday follow the solemn blessing of fire and the water of 
the baptismal font, the baptism of catechumens, and 
the ordination of candidates for the ministry. From 
the fire solemnly blessed on this day is lighted the Pas-
chal Light, which is regarded as a symbol of Christ 
risen from the dead. This symbolic light is kept burn-
ing during the reading of the gospel at Mass through-
out the interval between Easter and Pentecost.—Wet-
zer u. Weite, Kirchen-Lex., vol. ii, art. Charwoche; 
Proctor, Comm. Prayer, p. 275 sq.; Goebrich, Antiquitas, 
pp. 144 sq.; Walcott, Sacred Archæology, p. 

Hole Wells, sacred springs in Popish countries— 
scenes of pilgrimage and expected miracles.

Holyoke, Edward, a Congregational minister, was
HOLZHAUSER

HOMES

born in 1590 at Boston. He graduated at Harvard College in 1705, was elected tutor in 1712, and on April 25, 1716, was ordained first pastor of the Second Church in Marblehead. In 1737 he was elected president of Harvard College, and remained in that office until his death, June 26, 1738. He published an "Answer to Whitefield" (1744), and a few occasional sermons.—Sprague, Ammda, i, 293. (G. L. T.)

HOLSHAUSER, BARTHOLOMÄUS, founder of the order of Bartholomites (q.v.), was born at Langnau, Switzerland, in 1618, and was brought up to his father's trade, shoemaking. By the exertions of some charitable persons he was admitted into an establishment for poor students at Neuwied in 1641, and afterward installed as a philosopher at Ingolstadt under the Jesuits. Ordained priest in 1639, he conceived the idea of bringing back the priesthood to the common life of the primitive Church. He founded at Tittmoningen an institution intended to show the working of his system, and in 1640 founded a preparatory seminary at Salzburg in connection with it. He was successively curate of Tittmoningen, Liggenthal, and Bingen, where he died in 1658. His zeal and ascetic practices inclined him to revery and exaltation, so that he claimed to have visions; and it is said that, having been besieged by Charonii's, he predicted that a better future awaited him. He wrote, Constitutiones cum exercitio clerorum (Colun. 1632 sqq.; approved by the Church of Rome in 1680):—De humilitate, together with a treatise On the Love of God (Mayence, 1683):—Opusculum visionum variorum. A biography of Holshauser, and a German translation of his works, were published by Clarus (Ratisbon, 1822); a French translation, with a biography, by Gaudrel (Paris, 1861).—Ersch und Gruber, Allg. Enzyklopädie: Hoefer, Nov. Bib. Générale, xxvi, 14; Herzog, Real-Enzyklop. i, 709. (J. N. P.)

Homage. See Adoration; Dulia; Fief; Worship.

Homagium is a term applied in ecclesiastical language to the adoration (q.v.) which the clergy in the Roman Catholic Church pay to the pope.—Führmann, Händewörter, d. Relig. und Kirchengesch. ii, 335.

Ho'aman (Heb. Homam, ḫm, diiscomiture; Sept. Apiax, Vulg. Homani), the second name of the two sons of Lotan, son of Seir the Horite (1 Chron. i, 39). In the parallel passage (Gen. xxxvi, 22) his name is written Hemam (Heb. Hemam, ḫm, Sept. Apiax, Vulg. Hemarn). B.C. considerably ante 1640. Homam is another form of Hemam or Hemam, and may be the original form (Thee, p. 385 a). By Knobel (Genesia, p. 254) the name is compared with that of El-homiam, a town now ruined, though once important, half way between Petra and Ailaith, on the ancient road at the back of the mountain, which the Arabic geographers describe as the native place of the Ababdes (Robinson, Res. ii, 572). (See Lake Border, Journey, p. 207; Ammein; also the Arabic authorship mentioned by Knobel).

Homberg zu Vach, JOHANN FRIEDRICH, a learned jurist, born at Marburg April 15, 1763, was educated at the University of Utrecht. He visited England, remaining for some time in London, Oxford, and Cambridge, and formed an intimate acquaintance with Richard Bentley. He died April 29, 1748. In addition to works on professional topics, he published, as the result of his private study of the New Testament, Parerga Sacra seu interpretatio sacrae et nova quatonum lorum Nova Testamentum (Ultraj, 1747, 8vo), and enlarged and improved under the title Parerga Sacra seu observationes quaedam ad Novum Testamentum (Ultraj, 1712, 4to). The criticisms contained in this work were attacked by Eilander, and defended by the author's son, Emilhaus Ludwiegis, also a jurist.—J. H. Homberg zu Vach: Khr. Ad eisus latinam linguam etiam veterum Latinorum vindicata (Marb. 1739, 4to), replied to by a relative of Eilander: Brevee Hombergianarum vindicarum adv. J. Eilanderi prolationum (Berlin, 1742, 4to).—"Homberg takes a medium position between the Hebraists and the Purists."—Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop., ii, 819; Jöcher, Gel. Lex. ii, 1886.

Homberg, ERNST CHRISTOPH, a German hymnologist, was born at Mühlau, near Eisenach, in 1605. His profession was that of lawyer. In his early years he wrote a few sermons, but in his right hand years he led to turn his thoughts to sacred themes, and the results are some very beautiful hymns, of which a few are found in the Liturgy and Hymns for the use of the Protestant Church of the United Brethren (1866), and in the Christian Pastor (1832). The "Man of Sorrows" is generally regarded as the best of these. He died June 21, 1681.—Miller (Josiah), Our Hymns, their Authors and Origin (Lond. 1867, 12mo), p. 32.

Home, DAVID, a French divine of Scottish birth, who flourished towards the close of the 16th and the beginning of the 17th century, "was engaged by James I. to attempt the impracticable task of uniting all the Protestant divines in Europe in one system of religious belief." The most important of his writings is Apologia Basiliae, seu Machiavelli Ingenium Examinatum. He is also supposed to be the author of two satires against the Jesuits, entitled Le Contre Assassin, ou reponse a l'Apologie des Jesuites (1612, 8vo), and L'Assassinat du Roi, ou maximes du Vieil de la Montagne Vaticane, etc. (1617, 8vo).—Nov. Dict. Hist. i, 271; Gorton, Biog. Dict. vii.

Home Missions. See Missions.

Homer (Ὀμήρος, chomer, a heap, as in Exod. vii, 14), a Hebrew measure of capacity for things dry, containing ten baths (Lev. xxvii, 16; Num. xi, 32; Ezek. xlv, 11, 13, 14). In later writers it is usually termed a cor. See Measure.

The back (πᾶρεκ) vessel for pouring; Sept. ἤδεια, Vulg. corva dominiæ, Engl. Vers. "half a homer" was a measure for grain of half the capacity of the homer or cor, as seems probable from the only passage where it is mentioned (Hos. iii, 8). See Stud. u. Krit. 1846, i, 128.

Homer, Jonathan, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born October, 1759. He graduated at Harvard College in 1777, was ordained pastor of the First Church in Newton Feb. 16, 1792, resigned in April, 1808, and died April 18, 1837. Homer published a History of Newton and History of Newton in the Massachusetts Historical Collection, vol. v (1798), and a few occasional sermons. He also superintended an edition of Tait's Columbian Bible.—Sprague, Ammda, i, 173.

Homer, William Bradford, a Congregational minister, was born in Boston Jan. 31, 1817. He was educated at Amherst College, from which he graduated in 1836, and immediately entered on a course of theological study at Andover. While in the middle of his course he declined the offer of a tutorship in Amherst College. He was ordained pastor of South Berwick, Me., Nov. 11, 1840, where he died, March 22, 1841. The remembrance of development of Homer's mind was a matter of great surprise to all of his instructors. When only eleven years old he was already thoroughly conversant with the Latin, the modern Greek, and French languages. The last two he is said to have spoken with fluency. At Andover he closed the exercises of his class by an essay so scholarly in its bearings that he was requested to publish it. An oration of his, delivered on leaving the president's chair of the Porter Rhetorical Society of the Theological Seminary, was also printed. His "writings" have been published, with an Introductory Essay and a Memoir, by Prof. Edward A. Park, of Andover Theological Seminary (2d ed. Boston, 1849, 8vo). See also the Christian Review (May, 1849).—Sprague, Ammda, ii, 735 sq.

Homerites. See Himaritates.

Homes or Holmes, Nathaniel, a learned Eng-
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lish divine, was for a time incumbent of the living of St Mary Staining, London, but was ejected for nonconformity in 1662. He died in 1678. His publications, now become rare, include The Resurrection Revealed (London, 1654, fol.; 2 ed. 1683, 8vo). The Resurrection Revealed raised a large amount of correspondence, and led to a series of pamphlets, ten Excursions (London, 1661, fol.).—A Continuation of the Histories of Foreign Martyrs from the Reign of Queen Elizabeth to these Times (in Fox's Acts and Monuments, ed. 1684, iii, 865).—The New World, or the New Reformed Church discovered out of 2 Pet. iii, 18 (London, 1824).—This work has been reprinted by various editors and adopted in various Bibliographies, vol. i; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 873.

Homes, William, was born in Ireland in 1663, and was ordained in that country in 1692. He emigrated to America in 1714, and became minister at Martha's Vineyard, Mass. He died in 1746. Homes published four sermons (1732, 1747, etc.).—Allen's American Biographical Dictionary.

Homicide. See Man-Slayer.

Homiletics is the science of Christian address. The term is derived from ὠμιλία, converse, which, in early Christian usage, signified a religious address; or, more directly, from the adjective ὠμιλικός, conversational, or pertaining to verbal communication. It came into permanent use during the 17th century, at a period when, under the influence of the scholastic method, the principal branches of theology received scientific designations derived from the Greek language: e.g., Apologetics, Dogmatics, Hermeneutics, Polemics. Although promptly naturalized on the continent of Europe, the term Homiletics was not for a long time generally adopted in England. In fact, its present accepted use in the English language is largely due to American authors.

In Germany some attempts have been made to introduce other terms also derived from the Greek. Stier proposed Kerygmatik, from κήρυγμα, a herald; and Sickel Heliostw, from δίσκω, a fisherman; the latter being used tropically in the Gospels in application to the disciples as 'fishers of men.' Both of these terms have been regarded as fanciful and undeserving of perpetuation, even though limited to missionary preaching. The term Homiletics is not entirely unexceptionable, but is retained and employed for lack of a better.

I. History.—With some authors, especially in Germany, the use of a scientific term to designate the theory of preaching has seemed to extenuate, if not to suggest, some practical errors in its treatment. Setting out with the idea of exhibiting a science in a scientific manner, not a few writers have ignored the practical and religious dimensions of the subject. They have treated it exclusively from the rhetorical and human point of view. They have cumbered it with artificial and arbitrary rules, apparently not having conceived of it as an agency specially and divinely appointed for the moral renovation of the world. But a perverted use of terms was not the origin of mistakes on this subject, nor was error in reference to it first developed in modern times. Indeed, misconceptions of the true design of preaching, as well as of the Christian truth it had been appointed to propagate, became common at an early period in the history of the Church. So that the doctrine of Christ's eternal sacrifice for sin having become corrupted by inceptive theories of transubstantiation, the pretended sacrifice of the Mass rose to greater prominence, not so far by reason of its chief support, but rather by reason of an increasing array of forms and ceremonies. Instead of being foremost as the grand agency of Christian propagation, it became an appendage to public worship. Instead of going forth to find hearers in the places and by the wayside, preaching began to be regarded as a duty of the clergy, and only a portion of the clergy, the heathen, and even catechumens of the first degree, were excluded. Catechumens of the second degree were called by the Greek Church ἀκοφύσιοι, and by the Latin audientes, "from their being admitted to hear sermons and the Scriptures read in the church; but they were not allowed to stay during any of the prayers, not even during those that were said over the rest of the catechumens. Some divergences in the form in which these began, immediately after the sermon, at the word of command then solemnly used—\textit{Ne quis auscitium; Let none of the hearers be present!}—they were to depart the church" (Bingham, Orig. Ecc. bk. xi, ch. ii, § 3).

Preaching, having become a ceremony, was next corrupted by the blind and artless idola of literary criticism. Thus, in the first century, the word was appropriated from the Greek rhetoricians. Exhortations and sermons of a scriptural character began to be substituted by formal orations, and panegyrics upon martyrs and confessors successively worshipped as saints. Nevertheless, homilies, or familiar expositions of Scripture, were maintained by the oldest and most reverend fathers, Augustine, who sometimes furnished for the use of clerics incompetent to produce original addresses (see Augustine, \textit{Doctrina Christiana}, lib. iv). The 5th century has been called the oratorial period of the Church, with reference to the distinguished men who then held the places of Basil, Gregory Nazianzen, Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, and Augustine. Two books which have come down to us from the last-named fathers are often quoted as containing the best specimens of homiletical literature that appeared both in the Greek and Latin churches during the first century of the new era. From these and a thousand other books they have long excelled in those churches; yet neither of these works formally or fully discussed the subject of preaching. Chrysostom's \textit{πηγὴ ἱφυσάς}, being devoted to the subject of the priesthood, only alluded to preaching incidentally; nevertheless, it embodied some excellent preaching concerning the work, but it cannot be supposed to have governed the studies and the habits of the writer himself, and by means of which he obtained his wonderful success. Yet no estimate of Chrysostom (the golden-mouthed) can be accepted as just which does not consider him extraordinary genius and transcendent abilities as an orator. Augustine, in his \textit{Doctrina Christiana}, treated the subject of preaching more fully, and discussed it more systematically. He divided his treatise into four books. Three of them are entitled \textit{De inveniendo,} and treat of invention in a broad sense, including the preparation of the statutes of the Scriptures. These books have not in modern times been very highly valued. The fourth relates to expression, \textit{De proferendo.} Although a brief fragment, it has been pronounced the best homiletical production that appeared between the days of Paul and Luther. It has been translated into various languages, and has been translated into various languages. The homilies give to a dimissory form of religious address called \textit{postilla.} Even the function of postilling was chiefly confined to bishops, the common clergy not attempting or being allowed to preach. As if such a degradation of one of the highest offices in the church to men who were sinking still lower by being employed for the promotion of error under the guise of truth. Medieval preach-
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ing was largely occupied in eulogizing the Virgin Mary,
and in exciting reverence for the pictures and images
of saints. Thus preaching was made to corrupt the very
religion it was designed to promote. Beyond this,
it even became the agency of exciting millions of men
war and bloodshed. Successive crusades were preach-
ed, and even these persecution of the Albigenses were
stirred by the preaching of vengeance against innocent men, who sought to follow
Christ in sincerity. For such ends, more than for the
promulgation of truth, were several orders of preaching
and mendicant monks established in the 13th century.
Amonts of mendicants were the principal abbeys of the Inquisition, while others, of less
cruel temper, went about to harangue the masses in the interests of papal supremacy,
and to promote the sale of indulgences.

2. It was not till medieval superstition had culmi-
nated in the grossest abuses, and the Reformation had be-
gun to exert a counter influence, that the Scriptures be-
gan to be restored to their proper supremacy. From
that period the original design and true character of
preaching came to be better comprehended. Much of the
reformation was national in character, and consequently
universal, but so far as it was founded on the Word of God
it tended to revive scriptural conceptions of the preach-
ing office. The diligence of the Protestant reformers in
promulgating their views made preaching also neces-
sary to Roman Catholics, among whom from that time,
its influence could not be ignored, and, especially in Protestant
countries, it was no longer confined to bishops, but en-
joined upon the clergy of all grades.

II. Literature.—The inspired Scriptures, especially
those of the New Testament, must ever be considered
the primary and most valuable source of homiletical
instruction. Patristic literature on this subject, as al-
ready shown, is meagre and fragmentary. Homiletical
literature in the following ages, may be classified in four
principal departments: 1. Treatises on preaching; 2.
Aids to preaching, so-called; 3. Sermons, or the products
of preaching; 4. Biographies of preachers and miscel-
naneous articles relating to the objects and manner of
preaching. The first only of these departments will be
particularly considered in this article. Immediately
consequent upon the revival of preaching in the 16th
century, there also occurred a renaissance of homiletical
practices, and these were continued to be revived and
perpetuated. Prior to the middle of the 17th century there were ex-
tant some seventy different treatises, "writ particularly
upon this subject," chiefly in the Latin language. These
books were classified by Claudius in his Bibliotheca
classica, under the head of "Concussatorum instru-
menta," and by Molanus, in his Bibliotheca Materitum, under
the head of "Concussionis manus." To these, bishop
Wilkins remarks, "may be added those many other dis-
courses wherein these things have been largely handled
by the by, though not chiefly intended, in all which
many learned men have laid down such rules as, accord-
ing to their several geniuses and observations, seemed
most useful." In the enumeration of works referred to,
no proper distinction was made between the office of
preacher and pastor. Hence we find enumerated in
the list the works of Bowes and Hemingius, both entitled
In P etestate; also that of Hen. Diest, styled De ratione
studii Theologiae. The subject of preaching by English authors were written in
Latin, e. g. that of William Perkins, entitled "Arte de
Prophecizing, or a treatise concerning the sacred and
ayle true manner & method of preaching. First writ-
ten in Latin. By Leonard Perkins was translated
into English (for that it containeth many
worthly things fit for the knowledge of men of all de-
grees) by Thomas Tuke. Motto, Nehemiah viii, 4, 5, 6
(Cambridge, 1615)." Cotton Mather's Mandactio ad
Ministerium, written about 1710, in addition to a Latin
title, had a very formal and sonorous Latin preface.
In the text of his treatise the learned author makes this
remark concerning homiletical literature prior to the
period in which he wrote: "There is a troop of authors,
and even an host of God, who have written on the Pas-
toral care from the days of Gregory down to the days
of Gilbert; yea, and since these, every year some to this
very day. I cannot set you so tedious a task as to read
a tenth part of what he been offered on the art, and
the gift, and the method of preaching."

In modern times, several different epochs of homiletical
literature may be recognised corresponding to the
character of preaching at different periods and in differ-
ent countries. In Germany, the Lutheran reformation
caused by the genius and mental frame of the times, the
university in the mode of preaching, not only in controversial
discourses, but even in the proclamation and enforce-
ment of evangelical truth. Luther wrote no work on
preaching, but by his example and occasional precepts,
some of which are recorded in his Table-Talk, he greatly
influenced his coadjutors and followers as to their the-
ory and practice as preachers. The following are some
of Luther's characteristic sayings. Portrait of a good
preacher: "A good preacher should have these virtues
and qualities: 1. He should be able to teach plainly and
convincingly, in order to change men's minds with a
good voice; 4. a good memory; 5. He should know when to
stop; 6. He should study diligently, and be sure of what
he means to say; 7. He should be ready to stand for
life, and goods, and glory, on its truth; 8. He should
be willing to be vexed and criticised by everybody." Al-
drewes, in his Table-Talk, says: a true preacher is
one that's moral, kirk-bald af his stomach: i. e. Stand up cheerily, speak man-
fully, leave off speedily. "When you are about to
preach, speak to God and say, 'My Lord God, I wish
to preach to thine honor, to speak of thee, to praise thee,
and to glorify thy name.'" Let all your sermons be of
the simplest. Look not to Geneva and the learned to
the simple and unlearned people. We should preach to the
little children, for the sake of such as these the office
of preaching is instituted. Ah! what pains our Lord Christ
look to teach simply. From vineyards, sheep, and trees
he drew his similes; anything in order that the multi-
plies might understand, embrace, and retain the truth." "If we are found true to our calling, we shall receive
honor enough, not, however, in this life, but in the
life to come."

After Luther's death a reaction occurred in which
there was an attempt to return to the established
scheme of the past and reassert the distinctive fea-
tures of the medieval homilies and pos-
siles. This second period has sometimes been called that
of the postillists, in allusion as well to Preachers to
Catholics. In the following period the piety of Spe-
mer and Francke promoted a healthful reform in the
preaching of Germany, although the reform went to some extent neutralized by the near simultaneous
development of the Wollish philosophy, which gloried
more in logical forms than in the power of the cross.
This philosophy was fascinating to students, and, hav-
ing gained an ascendency in the universities, it antag-
nized the plainer and more evangelical mode of preach-
ing commended by Luther and Francke.

Mosheim, the Church historian of the middle of the
18th century, was also a celebrated preacher, and is
regarded as having introduced another homiletical
epoch in Germany. His style was majestic and oratorical,
and similar to that of the English in England and
France. By him it was well applied to religious in-
struction, but after him it greatly degenerated, many
of his imitators being more noted for the form of sound
words than for the spirit of vital piety. By degrees,
preaching returned to its religious power, until sermons
sacrificed aimed at being more than didactic or rhetorical
entertainments.

Reinhard, court preacher in Dresden about 1800, not
only inaugurated a better style of preaching, but illu-
strated his theory in numerous published sermons (a col-
lection of his sermons was published at Suhls, 1831-7, in
30 vols, 8vo), and also in a series of letters entitled his
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"Confessions." His style was characterized by richness of thought, clearness, definiteness, force, and dignity of expression. It prevailed both among the rationalists and the orthodox to the time of Schleiermacher. The power of Schleiermacher as a preacher corresponded to his great influence as a theologian, and his example is regarded as having had an incalculable influence on German homiletics, although he did not write specially on that topic. In the course of his life he owned style of preaching improved, rising from the moralisms with which he commenced to a more evangelical tone in subsequent years.

Part from those who have treated of preaching as a branch of practical theology, the more prominent German authors on homiletics during the current century have been Schott, Reinhardt, Marheinecke, Theremin, Stier, Lentz, Palmel, and Becker, Schweitzer.

In France the golden age of pulpit oratory occurred about the close of the 17th and at the beginning of the 18th century. It was the age of Bossuet, Bourdaloue, Massillon, and Fenelon, among the Roman Catholics, and of Claude, Superville, and Saurin, among the Protentists. Fenelon and Claude became representative authors of the two churches: the latter, by his Dialogues on Eloquence, particularly that of the Pulpit; the former by his Essay on the Composition of a Sermon. These valuable contributions to homiletic literature are still read with interest, not only in the French, but in the English language. Even the former has been more often reprinted in English than by Romanists. France, in the 19th century, has also produced many excellent writers on religious themes than by Romanists. France, in the 19th century, has also produced many excellent writers on religious themes.

In Great Britain, the principal homiletic writers of the 18th century were John Edwards, 1705; Dr. Doddridge, 1751; Fordeyc, 1754; and George Campbell, 1775. Apart, however, from the influence of any of these writers, there arose during the century a style of Christian address, designed to have a great influence on the subsequent preaching of English-speaking countries. Allusion is made to the reformation that commenced in connection with the labors of Wesley, Whitefield, and others about 1704. The preaching of these men was characterized by a return to scriptural simplicity and fervor, and was followed by extensive religious awakenings, which in due time extended a quickening influence to ministers of all the churches. The Wesleyan reformation was further characterized by field-preaching, and by the employment of unordained men as lay preachers, who gave evidence of a divine impulse to call sinners to repentance. John Wesley, like Luther, though he wrote no treatise on preaching, gave numerous addresses and some rules to preachers, which largely influenced the practice of those who became associated with him, and which did not, in the case of Luther, soon after become dogma, but rather the influence of theocratic practice. In the minutes of one of his early conferences, Wesley gave rules for his preachers which have been officially perpetuated in Methodist societies and churches ever since. These rules pointed out in the briefest words the grand objects and essentials of preaching, regarded them both as precepts and as "smaller advices" as merely auxiliary. "Quest. What is the best general method of preaching? Ans. 1. To invite. 2. To convince. 3. To offer Christ. 4. To build up." Here was the essence of the evangelical idea of preaching, and its fruits followed. Fletcher's portrait of St. Paul expanded and illustrated the same idea; but no extended work on preaching was produced by any Methodist of that period.

The early part of the 19th century witnessed the publication in England of but few, if any, homiletical works of permanent value. Between 1868 and 1919 the Rev. Charles Simeon, of Cambridge, laboriously developed the system of Claude on the composition of a sermon in a series of plans of sermons on the principal texts of Scripture from Genesis to Revelation. This work, which attained the magnitude of twenty-one octavo volumes, was designed to be a thesaurus of help and guidance in sermonizing. It contained no less than 2568 "preaching subjects," enough to occupy the homilist and the homiletic for nearly a quarter of a century. What more could a minister want? Such a wealth of supply would not have been provided had there not been a demand. The demand may have been healthy as far as it indicated a disposition on the part of the English clergy to escape from the saddles of inopportune, and, not entirely, of copying sermons in full, and reading manuscripts prepared for market, and sold in the shops. Nevertheless, the idea that sermon plans for use, any more than sermons for delivery, could be an article of merchandise, was inherently wrong; and, as far as adopted, could only tend to mental torpor, and a servile dependence on the brainwork of others. Yet pulpit assistants, pulpit cyclopedias, books of sketches, and other devices for "preaching made easy," have had their day in England, as well as in Germany and France. Simcox's Homiletics, notwithstanding inherent faults, was by far the most important of its class. It announced obsolete in reference to its primary design, yet one of its features isimitated in some of the best commentaries of the present day, by the insertion in a less formal manner of homiletical notes on important texts and passages.

Several valuable works on preaching have been published in England during the last thirty-five years. The following deserve mention: The Ministerial Character of Christ practically considered, by Charles R. Summer, bishop of Winchester (London, 1824, 8vo); Apologetic Preaching considered, by John Bird Somner, D.D. (London, 1829); The New Homiletics, by W. Williams (London, 1839; 2nd ed. 1840); Ecclesiastes Anglicanus, a treatise on preaching as adapted to a Church of England congregation, by W. Gresley (London, 3d edition 1844, 12mo); Preaching, its Warrant, Subject, and Effects, by W. S. Bucknell (London, 1845); The Modern Pulpit, in relation to the State of Oratory, by J. B. Vaughan (London, 1842, post 8vo); Paul the Preacher, by John Enaldie, D.D. (London, 1859, post 8vo; reprinted, N.Y., 12mo); Thoughts on Preaching, specially in Relation to the Requirements of the Age, by Daniel Moore (London, 1861, cr. 8vo); The Duty and Discipline of the Preacher, by R. C. H. Buckland (London, 1862, 12mo); Sacred Eloquence, or the Theory and Practice of Preaching, by Thomas J. Potter (Roman Catholic) (Dublin, 1868).

As to homiletical authorship in America, Cotton Mather's Magnificat and Ministerian, or Angels preparing to sound the Trumpet, although rare and little known, had the pre-eminence of being the first and only work of its class up to 1824. At that date Henry Ware, Jun., of Cambridge, Mass., published his Hints on Extemporaneous Preaching, a truly valuable work. In 1819 Eberl Porter, of Andover, republished Fenelon's Dialogues, Claude's Essay, and several minor works, under the title The Young Preacher's Manual (Boston, 1839, 8vo).

Subsequently the following principal works have appeared: Lectures on Homiletics and Preaching, by Eberl Porter, D.D. (And. and N.Y., 1834, 8vo); Sacred Rhetoric, or Oratory, by William Taylor; The Preacher's Assistant, by Henry J. Riple (N.Y., 1849, 12mo); The Power of the Pulpit, Thoughts addressed to Christian Ministers, by Gardiner Spring, D.D. (1854); Preaching required by the Times, by Abel Stevens, LL.D. (N.Y., 1866, 12mo); The Model Preacher, a Series of Letters on the best Mode of Preaching the Gospel, by William Taylor, of Cincinnati (Cincinnati, 1859, 12mo); Preachers and Preaching, by Nicholas Murray, D.D. (1860); Thoughts on Preaching, by James W. Alexander, D.D. (1861, 12mo); A Treatise on Homiletics, by Daniel P. Kidder, D.D. (1864, 12mo); Homiletics and Pastoral Theology, by W. G. F. Sheldon, D.D. (1867, 8vo); Office and Work.
of the Christian Ministry, by James M. Hoppin (1869, 12mo). The larger part of the last-named work is devoted to the subject of homiletics, although not so indicated in the title.

From the foregoing lists it may be seen that recently American authorship on this subject is somewhat in excess of English. Several of the last-named books have been written by teachers of practical theology representing different schools and having a marked tendency to discuss the subject not only from an evangelical point of view, but in the light of the most modern developments and applications of Christianity. The state of society in the United States of America is favorable to the acceptance of the homiletic theory of preaching, as well as to its most efficient practice. All the churches, as were those of primitive times, are dependent on voluntary support. Neither their congregations nor their success can be maintained without attractive, and, in some degree, effective preaching. Even the Roman Catholic Church has adopted regular Sunday sermons and week-day missions, a species of revival efforts. Contrary to its universal custom where maintained as a religion of the state, it here builds its churches and cathedrals with pews or seating for audiences instead of open naves for processions and moving crowds. The people of the world have in all classes of the human family yearned for what they choose, or not to hear at all, unless addressed in a manner adapted to please or profit them. Corresponding to this state of things, the preachers of all churches, together with errorists of every description, are in active competition for the ears and hearts of the masses. The peculiarity of this condition of salvation lies in the universal search wherever and whenever they are in a manner adapted to please or profit them. Corresponding to this state of things, the preachers of all churches, together with errorists of every description, are in active competition for the ears and hearts of the masses. The peculiarity of this condition of salvation lies in the universal search wherever and whenever they are in a
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III. Principles. Homiletics, in a human point of view, may thus be considered a progressive science. It grows with the growing experience of the Church, and becomes more and more valuable as it is used to its purpose and is employed by good and great preachers. It avails itself of the agency of the press to perpetuate specimens of the ever-increasing homiletic productions of successive generations, and also to discuss the great problems of human destiny and influence. Thus the modern study and discusion of homiletics has a tendency to place the subject in a clearer light, and to make it more justly comprehensible than it has been at any former period since the days of the apostles. This result has not been attained by means of modern inventions, but rather by a return to the original idea of preaching, as indicated and illustrated by the author of this chapter. The the author of this chapter.

1. The true Idea of Preaching. Preaching is an original and peculiar institution of Christianity. It was not derived from any pre-existing system. It had no proper counterpart even in Judaism, although a limited teaching office was committed to both the priests and prophets of the Jewish dispensation. See Prophets. Old-Testament examples of persons called preachers, like Noah, Solomon, and Ezra, fall far below the idea of preaching as appointed by Christ. See Apostles. Only in the Mosaic prophecies was the office of Christian

evangelism clearly foreshadowed (see Isa. 11:1-2). See Gospel. In the fulness of time, the Lord Jesus Christ, recognizing the delegated mission, established and appointed the office and work of preaching as a principal means of evangelizing the world. See Preaching. In preparation for this office he instruct ed his disciples both by precept and example, giving them before his final ascension a work to "go and teach all nations," and "preach the Gospel to every creature." In this appointment the Saviour availed himself of no pre-existing rhetorical system, but rather a universal capacity of the human race now for the first time specially devoted to the divine use, and consecrated to the proposition of the Saviour, JESUS CHRIST. Yet he left his followers free to adopt, as auxiliary to their great work, whatever good thing might be derived from human study, whether of logic, rhetoric, or any other science. Thus, as Christianity multiplied its achievements and extended its influence along the ages, facilities for comprehending the philosophy and the art of preaching would of necessity increase.

2. The Object-Matter of preaching. In secular oratory, themes are perpetually changing with circumstances. In preaching, the theme is one. Nevertheless, the one theme prescribed to the preacher is adapted to all circumstances and all times. It may be summarily stated to be God manifested in Christ Jesus for the redemption of men. This central theme, which is the special burden of revelation, embraces in its correlations all other truths, natural as well as revealed. The word of God should be considered not only the text-book, but the grand treasury of truth for the preacher. In it he is furnished with history, poetry, experience, and philosophy, as well as with spiritual instruction. The subject of the Gospel scheme; nevertheless, he may bring to its illustration whatever truth will aid in its corroboration and comprehension. Still, the preacher's great work must be to publish the doctrine of the cross, "the truth as it is in Jesus." To do this effectually, he not only needs an intellectual perception of its excellence, but the consciousness of its power as bestowed by the baptism "of the Holy Ghost and of fire." Thus the persecuted disciples "went everywhere preaching the word" (Acts vii, 4), and Paul, as a representative apostle, emphatically declared: "We preach Christ crucified;" "We preach not ourselves, but Christ Jesus the Lord;" "Christ in you the hope of glory, whom we preach, warning every man and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ Jesus" (Col. i, 28).

3. Agencies of Homiletic Preparation. In addition to the essential preliminaries of character and experience heretofore alluded to, the preacher must bring to bear on his theme such mental exercises as will enable him to elaborate it appropriately and to the best effect. The following are indispensable: (1) Interpretation, by which the true meaning of God's word is evoked; (2) Invention, by which suitable materials, both of fact and of thought, are gathered from the universe of matter and of mind. Invention is aided by generalization, analysis, hypothesis, comparison, and diligent exercise.

(3) Disposition, by which all material employed is ar
HOMILETICS

Ranged in the most appropriate and effective order, whether in the introduction, argument, or conclusion of the discourse.

4. **Different Forms of Homiletical Production.**—The proclamation of Christian truth is not confined to any one form of address. Our Lord opened his public mission by a sermon—the Sermon on the Mount. Most of his most important utterances fell from his lips in parables and conversations. The reported addresses of the apostles were exhortations rather than sermons according to the modern idea. In the early patristic age exhortations and exhortatory addresses prevailed. The homilies as the leading product of that period. As preaching declined in medieval times, the homily dwindled into the postil. The Reformation brought the sermon again into use, and secured for it the prominence which it still maintains. In addition to re-establishing the sermon in its original prominence, modern Christianitv has developed the platform address, in which a semi-secular style of oratory is made auxiliary to various phases of Christian benevolence. At the present time, it is essential to both ministers and laymen, who would participate in the most prominent activities of the Christian Church. Such efforts are necessary that they should cultivate the talent of effective platform speaking. Nevertheless, the sermon is likely to remain as it was in the beginning, the first and most important of homiletical productions. Hence it should be specially studied, and thoroughly comprehended in all its parts, as the standard form of clerical Christian address. See **Sermons**.

5. **Style and Qualities of Sermons.**—It is due to the dignity of Christian truth that the words in which it is uttered should be well chosen and fitted arranged. Hence the general qualities of a good style, such as purity, precision, perspicuity, and strength, should be regarded as of primary and absolute necessity in pulpit style. At the same time, Christian discourse sternly rejects all the faults of style which rhetorical laws condemn, such as dryness, tautology, flattery, and bombast. Perspicuity also requires more than mere rhetoric. In order to its higher objects, it demands certain peculiar combinations, such as a blending of dignity with simplicity, of conciseness with pointedness, and of energy with love. The style of the sermon should at once be fully within the comprehension of its hearers, and not at the same time be a scribbling conglomeration, which shows that it emanated from communion with God, and a familiarity with his inspired word.

Beyond mere verbal expression, sermons should possess several important qualities. (1) They should be evangelical, setting forth the unadulterated truth of the Gospel in its just proportions, and in an evangelical spirit. (2) Sermons should be interesting. To this end, the preacher must be deeply interested himself. He must utter his thoughts with clearness and vividness. He must use frequent illustrations. He must group things new and old in just and graphic combinations. (3) Sermons should be instructive. The increase of the Gospel must never forget the Saviour's command to instruct. Hence every sermon should be tributary to the diffusion of knowledge as well as holiness. (4) Sermons should be instructive. Failing to accomplish some of the special objects of preaching, they are failures themselves. Hence their great essentiality must be considered an adaptation to high and true religious results. If possible, all these qualities should be combined in every sermon, though in proportions to suit occasions.

6. **Delivery.**—Four different modes of delivery are recognized in Christian oratory: (1) the extemporaneous; (2) the recitative; (3) that of reading; (4) the composite, in which two or all of the foregoing are blended. The last finds little favor among theorists, and is rarely practiced with any high degree of success. The first is the normal mode of human speech. No other was practiced by the Great Preacher, the oracles, or the early fathers. Recitative came into the Church in the 4th and 5th centuries, and reading in the 16th. Few questions pertaining to Homiletics have during the last 800 years been more zealously discussed than the relative advantages and disadvantages of the different modes of pulpit delivery. While it may justly be conceded that each mode has both advantages and disadvantages, when applied to the peculiar case of individuals, yet it may be affirmed as the result of all discussion and experience that the primitive mode of extemporaneous address is commended by the best modern opinion as a gift to be earnestly coveted by every minister of the Gospel, and as a result of their effort within the reach of most, if not all earnest preachers.

7. **Conditions and Elements of Success in Preaching.**—Mere eloquence, although a great auxiliary, is not of itself a guaranty of success in the proclamation of God's word. There is an infinite distance between the form and the power of preaching. The form is easy; the power is the gift of God crowning the highest human effort. To attain this great gift various conditions are requisite. A preacher must have clear and abiding conceptions of the dignity and overwhelming importance of his office; he must have an intense desire to cultivate a consuming love for his work, evidenced by tireless diligence and unslumbering faithfulness in its discharge. He must make preaching his great business, his absorbing employment. He must have discretion in the adaptation of his subjects, and style of address to his ages and to the condition of his audience. He must cultivate the habit of making all his observations, reading, and experience subservient to his capacity of instruction and religious impression. Above all, he must aim at the supreme glory of God, and at the end of his most earnest efforts depend with trustful confidence upon the divine blessing to give efficiency to his labors, and crown them with success. See **PASTORAL CARE**.

(D. P. K.)

IV. **Addtional Treatises.**—1. **Foreign** (Latin, French, and German): Lange (Johannes), Oratorium sacrum (Frankf. u. Lpz. 1780; 2d ed. 1795; 3d ed. 1816; 4th ed. 1828; 5th ed. 1840; 6th ed. 1866); Vitringer (Camp.), Animadversiones ad Method. homilet. ecclesiae, rite instituendae. (Jena, 1722, 8vo); Maitre (J. H. L.), Refl. sur la manière de prêcher (Halle, 1745, 8vo); Hollebeck (Eberhard), De Opt. Concinnatione genere (Leidy, 1768, 8vo); Ammon (C. F.), Handbuch d. Anlei. z. Kom. und Leseansammlung (Gotz, 1799; 4d ed. 1815; 5th ed. 1835); Griesch, d. Homiletik u. Vhr. u. Beter. (Gotz, 1804, 8vo); Tittmann (J. A. H.), Lehrb. d. Homiletik (Breisgau, 1804; 2d ed. Lpz. 1826, 8vo); Schott (A. H.), Einfuehre in die Theur. d. Bereldsamml. mit besonderer Anwendung d. kantlerischen Bereldsamml. (Lpz. 1807, 1815, 8vo); Theor. d. Bered. (Lpz. 1815, 1816; 2d ed. 1819, 8vo); Fellen (M. F.), Dialogus de eloquio. (Paris, 1714, 1715; 2d ed. 1720, 3d ed. 1725, 4th ed. in 4 pts. 8vo); Finoclin (Fr. Salignac de la Motte), Dialogue sur l'éloquence de la chaire (Paris, 1714, 1715; 2d ed. by Stev., LOND. 1808; Bost, 1802, 12mo); Dahl (J. Ch. W.), Lehrb. man. Homiletik (Lpz. and Rost, 1811, 8vo); Marieheinteck (Ph.), Grundriss d. Homiletik (Hamburg, 1816, 8vo); Theoret. (F.), Die Bered. und Gesang. oder Grundlinien e. systemat. Rhetorik (Berlin, 1819; 2d ed. 1837, 8vo); Kaiser (G. Ph. Ch.), Einfuehre in d. gesamten Rhetorik (Leipz., 1816, 8vo); Grotfeund (J. G.), Ansicht, Gedanken, u. Erfahrungen u. d. geistl. Bered. (Lpz., 1820, 8vo); Lehner (J. M.), Bered. und Lehrschr. (Meizer, 1829); Schmitt (A. G.), Die Homiletik (Halle, 1827); Van Hengel (W. A.), Institutio oratoris sacri (Lugd. 1829); Sickel (G. A. F.), Grundr., d. christlichen Hauptschr. (Lpz. 1829, 8vo; Stier (Rudolf), Kurr. Grundriss e. bbl. Kerygeia (Halle, 1830); Chinec-enville (J. J.), Observations sur l'éloquence (Gen., 1854); Brand (J.), Homil., d. geistl. Bered. (edit. by Hahn, Frankf., 1836, 1839; new ed. Const., 1850, 2 vols.); Zarlh (J. B.), Homil., d. Kathol. Homiletik (Landsh. 1838); Alt (J. K. W.), Kurze Anleitung z. Kirch. Bered. (Lpz. 1840); Falmer (Ch.), Evang. Homiletik (Stuttgart, 1842; 4th edition, 1857, 8vo); Ficker (Ch. G.), Grundlinie u.
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which accompanies the work—Charlemagne had caused this work to be done by Paulus Diaconus because (see Ranke in the Stud. u. Krit. 1855, ii, 87 sq.) "the Hours contained a number of fragments from the fathers used for reading which were full of faults and badly selected." But it is possible that both had a part in it, Alcuin forming the plan and Paulus Diaconus executing it. The work acquired great importance from the fact that it established more firmly the system of Church lessons introduced by Jerome, which had heretofore been subject to various alterations. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop., vi, 249 sq.; Rheinwald, Kirch. Archäol., p. 276; Leclercq, Dict. d. Eccl., s. v. "Hymnus," Schmoller, Kultur- und Gesellschaftsgeschichte, ii, 129; Boeckh, "Ch. History," iii, 126; Mosheim, Ch. Hist., ii, 85; and the art. Homily.

Homilies. See Homily.

Homilists. Among the homilists who have distinguished themselves in the primitive Church, Origen (3rd century) ranks first. The schools of Alexandria and Antioch appear to have been the great centres of this class of sacred literature, and in the early centuries we find the names of Hippolytus, Metrodonus, Clement of Alexandria, and Gregory Thaumaturgus principally distinguished. But it was in the following centuries that the homily received its full development in the hands of the fathers of the Western Church, especially those of Athanasius, the two Gregorys of Nazianzum and of Nyssa, Basil the Great, Chrysostom, the two Cyrilis of Alexandria and of Jerusalem, and Theodoret; in the Latin Church, Cyprian, Ambrose, Augustine, Leo the Great, Gregory the Great, Peter Chrysologus, Fulgentius, and Cæsar of Arles. In later centuries, Venerable Bede, the popes Sabinian, Leo II and III, Adrian I, and the Spanish bishops Isidore of Seville and Iledefonsus, continued to use the homiletic form.—Chambers, Cyclop., v, 899. See CATECHETIC; CATECHISTS; HOMILETIC; HOMILIARE; Homily.

Homilies of John Walfred August, one of the most celebrated German organists and Church composers of the 18th century, was born at Rosenthel Feb. 2, 1714. In 1742 he became organist at the "Frauenkirche" at Dresden, and in 1755 was promoted musical director. He died June 1, 1785. Among his published musical works there are, Psalmkantate (1755), and Weihnachtskantate (1777).— Brockhaus, Conns Lex., vii, 76.

Homily (Gr. ὤμα, κοιμισμόν, a meeting; hence a discourse adapted to the people), the name of a certain class of sermons. It is now applied to a simple exposition of a text, in contradistinction from the discussion of a topic in Church or Parochial sermons (pulpit eloquence), which is now applied to less familiar discourses; ὄμαι to the plain, much as the term lecture is now used.

1. The distinction between the homily and the sermon is thus set forth by Vitæ. "The special character of the homily is, not that it has to do most frequently with recitals, or that it is more familiar than other discourses, but that its chief business is to set in relief the successive parts of an extended text, subordinating them to its contour, its accidents, its shape, if we may so speak, more than can be done in the sermon, properly so called. Nothing distinguishes, especially, the homily from the sermon except the comparative predominance of analysis; in other terms, the prevalence of explanation over system. The difficulty as to unity presented by this kind of discourse never amounts to impossibility. We do not at random cut from the general text of the sacred book the particular text of a homily. The selection is not arbitrary. The limit of the text is predetermined by reference to unity, which, therefore, we shall be at no loss to discover in it. The only danger is that unity of subject will be relinquished, as the thread of a path may be buried and lost beneath an intertwined and tangle vegetation. As the preacher appears to be more sustained by his text in the homily than in the synthetic sermon, the former is thought to

Homilarii. The term applied to a collection containing such homilies of the early fathers of the Church as were read on Sunday, on the festal days of the saints, on Easter, and Pentecost. See Duranli, Rationale, bk. vi, ch. i; Fuhrmann, Handwörterbuch der Kirchengeschichte, ii, 387.

Homilarium, the name given to collections of sermons for the ecclesiastical year, to be read in case of incapacity preventing the preacher from delivering a sermon of his own. The idea of such a collection arose in the early part of the Middle Ages. The most celebrated work of the kind, which took the place of all preceding ones, is that known as Charlemagne's Homilariun (Liber homiliarum, Charlem. Coll., iii, 174). The title of the Cologne edition, 1590, sets forth Alcuin as its author (Homilie seu maxime sermones sive conciones ad popular, præstantissimorum ecclesiarum doctorum, Hieronymi, Augustini, Ambrosii, Gregorii, Origens, Chrysostomi, Beke, etc., in hunc ordinem digerntse per Alcuinum Liriariun, atque aliorum auctorum, donec ... in spiritu sui creata fuit). According to other accounts, however—and even to the instruction by Charlemagne himself

Homologe. (Lp. 1847, 8vo); Schweizer (A.), "Homile., d. evang.-prot. Kirche. (Lp. 1848, 8vo); Bair (Gustav.), Grundzüge d. Homiletik. (Giessen, 1848, 8vo); Gaupp (K. F.), Pract. Theol. (Berlin 1849, 16, 2 vols. 8vo; vol. ii, pt. i, Homiletics); Lutz (J.), Handbuch d. Kathol. Kirchenlebens. (Tubinga, 1851); Vinet (A.), Homiletique ou théor. de la Prédication (Paris, 1853); Banter (J. H. F.), Das Wort des Christ. Predigt und Prediger. Natur u. Opf. d. apok. Predigt (Göttingen, 1861, 8vo); Hagenbach (K. R.), Grundlinien d. lit. u. Homiletik (Leipzig, 1863, 8vo); Lang (Gust.), Handb. z. homilet. Beiträge. (Leipzig, 1864, 8vo); Salvator (d. Missale, De editinge u. R. d. Missale. (1865, 4to); Wagner, Dispositio, ii, d. evang. Predikung (Giessen, 1865, 8vo); Regel, Predigt. Einleitung (2d ed. Nordhausen, 1865, 8vo); Rodier (Max.), Homilie. Handbuch z. Gebr. d. Predigt (a very superior work, to be in 5 volumes when completed, Nurnberg, 1863 sq. 8vo); Thym, Homilet. Handb. (1st part, Grätz, 1866, 8vo; 2d part, 1868, 8vo); Zimmermann (Karl), Beitrag., z. vergleichenden Homiletik (Darmst. and Lp. 1866, 8vo); Palmer (Ch.), Evangel. Homiletik (5th ed. Stuttgart, 1867, 8vo); Geiseler (M.), Pred-Evangelium mit Anleit. z. Predigt-Ausarbeitung (Hamb. 1867, 8vo); Meinke (J. H. F.), Fried., Handb. für Prediger, ed. by Dr. Wohlfarth (Giessen, 1867, 8vo); Stock (Prof. Chr.), Homer, neue Ausgabe (Leipzig, 1867, 4to); Wallroth, Gebr. z. Predigt (Oldenbr., 1868, 8vo); Sommer (J. L.), Predigtsstudien (Erlangen, 1868, 8vo).

2. In English: Barecroft (J.), Aids to Sermon-making, or, Preaching, etc. (Lond. 1715; 4th ed. 1751); D'Orsay (Samuel), Christ. Eloquence in Theory and Pract. (Lond. 1718, 12mo); Henley (John), On Action in Preaching (Lond. 1730); Blackwell (S.), Method of Preaching (London, 1736, 24mo); Jennings (John), Discourses (Lond. 1754, 12mo); Fordyce (David), Theor. and Pract. of Preaching, etc. (London 1756, 12mo); Glanville, Essays concerning Preaching (London, 1768, 12mo); Frank, The most Useful Way of Preaching (Lond. 1790, 8vo); John, On the Composition of a Sermon (5th ed. Camb., 1827, 8vo; revised by the Rev. Chas. Simeon, N. Y. 1849, 12mo); Bickersteth (Edward), On Preaching and Hearing (4th ed. London, 1829, 12mo); Closs (John), Concerning the Liturgy (London, 1828, 8vo); Williams, Christian Preacher (London, 1829); Wilkins, Jennings, Franks, Claude, etc., Lond. 1843, 12mo); Beveridge (Bp. William), Sermons (vol. i-iv of his Works, Oxford, 1847, 8vo); Theologus Christianus (vol. iv and x of his Works, Oxford, 1847, 8vo); Ryland, Pulpit and People (1847, 8vo); Gouldburn (Edward M.), Sermones (London, 1849, 8vo); Russell (W.), Pulpit Eloquence (2d ed. Andover, 1833); Short Sermons (London, 1855, 2 vols. 12mo); Styles, Nature and Effect of Evangelical Preaching (1856, 2 vols. 12mo); Moore, Thoughts on Preaching (Lond. 1861, cr. 8vo).
be more easy of execution. It certainly is more easy to make a homily than a sermon, but a good sermon is made with more facility than a good homily. The great masters in the art of preaching—Bourdaioue, for example—have not succeeded in homily. The most excellent judges in the matter of preaching have recog- nized this, and have collected homilies ever since the time of Euthalast. 2. In the primitive Church we find the style of the homily already in the discourses of Christ and his apse- toles. They frequented the synagogues of the Jews wherever they went, and in these it was customary, after the reading of the Scriptures, to give an invitation to an address, or, if one was not taken, to give an address in this way the disciples frequently took occasion to speak of Christ and his doctrines. Thus we find in the Acts (i, 15; ii, 14; iv, 7; v, 29; vi, 34; xiii, 40; 41; xvii, 22; xx, 18; xxii, xxiii, xxvi) brief notices of several ad- dresses made by Peter and Paul, and one by Stephen, which give us quite a distinct impression of the style of address. Tertullian and Justin Martyr inform us that a like practice was common in the churches of Africa and Asia. "We meet together to read the Holy Scriptures, and, when circumstances permit, to admonish each other." In the New Testament, however, we find no such address, as it inclined to an allegorical mode of interpreting the Scriptures. But, aside from this characteristic, the sermons, or, rather, homilies of this period, were soon followed by all the preachers, as Origen was considered by all a standard who was to be imitated, while there were others less commendable. In general they were faulty in style, corrupt with "philosophical terms and rhetorical flourishes, forms of expression extravagant and farfetched, Biblical expressions unintelligible to the people, unmeaning comparisons, absurd antitheses, spir- itless interrogations, senseless exclamations, and bom- bastic phrases of a rhetorical style that is due to the prevalence of paganism among the Christian preachers of this time, many of whom were converts from paganism, and had received an imperfect preparation before entering on the discharge of their sacred office." (6) In the early Latin Church, the homilies of this period are, if anything, even greater inferior to those in the Greek. The cause of this was, as in the Greek Church, the imperfect education of those in the minis- try, more especially their ignorance of the original lan- guages of the Bible. See Eschebach, Versuch e. Gesch. der öffentl. Religionsvorträge, p. 300 sq. 3. In the Church of Rome, at an early period, when few of the priests were capable of preaching, discourses were framed out of the fathers, chiefly expository, to be read from the pulpit. These were also called homilies. See HOMILIARUM. 4. In England, homilies were early in use in the Anglo-Saxon Church. Elfric, archbishop of Canterbury, who, after Alfred, ranks first among the Anglo-Saxon vernacular writers, finding that but few persons of his day (latter part of the 10th century) could read the Vulgate, worked out a version of the Latin, and the language of the Church, was led to compile a collection of eighty homilies, some of which were perhaps written by himself, but most of which he translated from the Latin. In these Anglo-Saxon homilies "almost every vital doctrine which distinguished the Roman from the Protestant Church meets with a direct contradiction," and they proved of no little value in the religious contro- versy at the period of the English Reformation. They condemn especially, among other things, without reserve, the doctrine of transubstantiation (q. v.) as a growing error, and go to prove that the novelties which are generally charged to the Protestants are really of older date than the boasted argument of apostolic tra- dition. Some of the MSS. of these homilies, however, which had been stored away in monastic libraries, are found to be mutilated by the removal of all such obnox- ious passages (comp. Soames, Inquiry into the Doctrines of the Anglo-Saxon Church, Banntton Lecture, Oxford, 1830, 8vo; new ed. London, 1834; Homiletic Collection, at the request of Ethelward, commemorates the different saints revered by the Anglo-Saxon Church, and, like the former collection, was divided into two books. Of these homilies were published, An English-Saxon Homily on the Birthday of St. Gregory, used anecdotely in the English Church, in the time of Ethelward, the Conversion of the English from Paganism to Christian- ity, transl. into mod. Engi, with notes, etc., by Elizabeth Elstob (Lond. 1709, 8vo; new ed. London, 1830, 8vo); El- fric's Homilies, ed. Eliz. Elstob (of which only 36 pages were ever published; Oxf. 1710, fol.). Another attempt was The English-Saxon Homilies of Elfric, transl. by Eliz. Elstob (Oxf. 1715, fol., of which only two leaves were printed, now preserved in the British Museum). Besides these, there are some Anglo-Saxon homilies extant, to which the name of Lupus Episcopus is gener- ally ascribed, though attributed by Wanley (Catalog. of A.-S. MSS. p. 140 sq.), and apparently written in Wulfstan (q. v.), one of the Anglo-Saxon prelates of the 11th century. "The most remarkable of these is the one entitled in the MS. Sermo lapsi ad Anglos quando Domine maxime persecutus es, in which the author claims the privilege of a first-hand knowledge of the crimes which had disgraced the age preceding that in which he wrote, and the increasing wickedness of their own time." See Wright, Byz. Brit. Lit. p. 487 sq., 506 sq. See ELFRIC. 5. In the Church of England, the term homily has acquired a special meaning from the fact that in the time of the Reformation, a number of easy and simple discourses were composed to be read in the churches. "The Thirty-five Article of religion says, 'The second Book of Homilies, the several titles whereof we have joined under this article, both contain a godly and whole- some doctrine, and necessary for the times.'" The former Book of Homilies, which were set forth in the time of Edward VI; and, therefore, we judge them to be read in churches by the ministers, diligently and distinct- ly, that they may be understood of the people. The following are the titles of the homilies which are now in use of the church. 2. Against peril of idolatry. 3. Of repairing and keeping clean of churches. 4. Of good works; first of fasting. 5. Against glutony and drunk- enness. 6. Against excess of apparel. 7. Of prayer. 8. Of the time and place of prayer. 9. That common prayers and sacraments ought to be ministered in a known tongue. 10. Of the reverend estimation of God's Word. 11. Of alms-doing. 12. Of the nativity of Christ. 13. Of the passion of Christ. 14. Of the resurrection of Christ. 15. Of the worthy receiving of the sacrament of the body and blood of Christ. 16. Of the gifts of the Holy Ghost. 17. For the Rogation days. 18. Of the state of matrimony. 19. Of repentance. 20. Against idleness. 21. Against rebellion." "The first volume of these homilies is supposed to have been composed by archbishop Cramer and bishop Ridley and Latimer at the beginning of the Reforma- tion, when some minutes of imitation of sufficient abilities to preach in a public congregation was not to be found." It was published, as already stated, in the article above cited, in the beginning of the reign of Ed- ward VI. The second volume was perhaps prepared under Edward VI, but it was not published until 1569, during the reign of Elizabeth (comp. Hardwick, Church History during the Reformation, p. 206, 211, 249). "In neither of these books can the several homilies be as- signed to their several authors with any certainty. In the second book no single homily of them all has been appropriated. In the first, that on 'Salvation' was prob- ably written by Cramer, as also those on 'Faith' and
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'God's Works.' Internal evidence, arising out of certain hollow, lopsided, peculiar to that or execution, the like of which appears in Latimer's sermons, pretty clearly betray the hand of the bishop of Worcester as having been engaged in the homily against 'Brawling and Contention;' the one against 'Adultery' may be safely given to Thomas Becon, one of Cranmer's chaplains, in whose works, published in 1564, it is still to be found; of the rest nothing is known but by the meager conjecture. All members of the Church of England agree that the homilies contain a godly and wholesome doctrine, but they are not agreed as to the precise degree of authority to be attached to them. In them, the authority of the bishops and the authority of the first councils, and of the judgments of the Church generally, the holiness of the primitive Church, the secondary inspiration of the Apocalypse, the sacramental character of marriage and other ordinances, and regeneration in holy baptism, and the real presence in the Eucharist, are asserted' (Bp. Burnet). One of the best editions of the Homilies is that by Corrèe at the University press (Cambridge, 1850, 8vo), and the latest, and perhaps most complete edition, is that published at Oxford (1859, 8vo). See also Darling, Cyclopa. Bibl. I., 1524; Wheatly, Common Prayer, p. 272; v. Maxw. History, C. Codex, 8vo sq.; Brooke, On the 59 Articles, p. 787; W. Wycliffe, Works (see Index, vol. viii.); Forbes, On the 59 Articles, ii, 685 sq.; Buchanan, Justic. p. 198, 198; Hook, Ch. Dict. p. 303.

6. For the Clementine Homilies, see Clementinist; and on the passages above given, see Schmidt, Die Homilie (Halle, 1827, 8vo); Augusti, Denkmäthr. u. c. christl. Archäol. vi, 266 sqq.; Spieß, Geschichtsforsch. über die Kirch. Gebr. i, 74 sqq.; ii, 226-53; De concionibus vereor, in Hoemberck's Miscellanea sacra (Ultraj. 1889); Schröck, Kirchengesch. iv, 20, 21, 81 sqq.; Neander, Ch. Hist. iii, 128; Fuhrmann, Handb. d. Kirchengesch. i, ii, iii, 855; Bingham, Orig. Eccles. book xiv. ch. iv; Cole- man, Ancient Christianity, ch. xvii; Prümer, Chr. Hist., p. 477; Apostol. und Prümer. Ch. xiii; Bickersteth, Christ. Stud. Ass. 8vo p. 325, 470; Taylor, Anc. Christ. ch. Siegel, Handb. chrisl.-kirchl. A. Berth. ii, 930 sqq. Review London, June, 1854, Jan. 1857; Bibl. Stor. May and Aug. 1863; Presb. Quart. Rev. April, 1862, art ii; Methodist Quart. Rev. i, 283; vii, 63 sqq. See HOMILIOLOGISTS; HOMILISTS; POSTILLAE.

Hominæ intelligentiæ (Fr. hommes d'intelligence, men of understanding), a heretical sect which flourished in the Netherlands about 1412, most likely a later branch of the Brethren of the Free Spirit (q. v.). It was founded by Egidius Cantor, and the most celebrated of their leaders was the German Carmelite Hildemarcius. Egidius Cantor asserted that "he was the saviour of the world, and that by him the faithful should see Jesus Christ, as by Jesus Christ they should see God the Father; that the ancient law was the time of the Father, the new law the time of the Son; and that there should shortly be a third law, which was to be the time of the Holy Ghost, under which men would be at full liberty." They also held that there was no resurrection, but an immediate translation to heaven; and advanced the most preposterous doctrine that the poor had merit, and that sensual pleasures, being natural actions, were not sinful, but rather foretastes of the joys of heaven. They were accused of heresy, and, Hildemarcius having recanted, the sect finally dissolved—Broughton, Biblioth. Hist. Sac. i, 465; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. ii, 292 sqq.; Fuhrmann, Handb. d. Kirchengesch. p. 359.

Homoousian or Homousian, a term describing the opinions of Arius and his fellow-heretics, who declared the Son of God to be, only of like substance (σώματος) with the Father. See ARIANISM.

Homologoumena (ὁμολογούμενα, universally acknowledged), the names given by Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. iii, 5, 25) to those books of the New Testament, of the canonical authority of which no doubt had been expressed. Eusebius included under the term the four gospels, the Acts, the fourteen epistles of Paul, and the first epistles of Peter and John, while the epistle of James, the second epistle of Peter, and the second and third epistles of John, and the epistle of Jude, were placed among the Antilegomena. In a third or lower class, some, Eusebius says, placed the Apocalypse, though others placed it among the acknowledged books. It therefore properly belonged to the Antilegomena.—

Eadie, Eccles. Dict. See Antilegomena.

Homousian, a term used to describe the orthodox view of the person of Christ, established at the Council of Nice in opposition to Arius, viz., that the Son of God is of "the same substance (σωματος) or (essential) with the Father" (μονοθεις του Πατερος). See ARIANISM; CHRIST; PERSON OF; TRINITY.

Honain, Ibn-Isaac, an Arabic-Nestorian physician and philosopher of the Abadite tribe, was born near Hirah in A.D. 808. He went to Greece, and there studied the Greek language and philosophy, and returned to Bagdad with a large collection of Greek books, part of which he translated into the Arabic and Syriac. He was assisted in this work by his son Isaac Ibn-Honain and his grandson Hobaiah, who likewise distinguished themselves as philosophers. In this manner many works of the Greeks became accessible to the Arabs and the works were promoted among them, especially the study of Greek philosophy. It is to be regretted that after the completion of the translations the original works were burned, according, it is said, to a command of the caliph Al Mamun. Besides these translations, Honain wrote largely on medicine, philosophy, theology, and philosophy. He left also a Syriac grammar and a Syriac-Arabic dictionary, the first dictionary of the kind ever prepared. He died in 872.—Herbelot, Biblioth. Orientale, p. 423; Assemani, Bibl. Orientale, ii, 270, 428; iii, pt. ii, p. 168; Krug, Philos. Lex. ii, 455 sq.; Honain, Necrologia, Générale, 1840.

Honduras. See CENTRAL AMERICA.

Hone, William, an Independent minister, whose father is said to have been an occasional preacher among the Dissenters, was born in 1779 at Bath. He was brought up in rigid religious notions, and in his early years not suffered to read out of any other book than the Bible. At the age of ten he was apprenticed to an attorney, and finally entered the law, from which profession he retired in 1800. He devoted himself at the same time to the study of literature, and wrote several works on that subject. In 1825 he published a work entitled Ancient Mysteries described, especially by the Enochians; founded on the apocryphal N.T. Story, extant among the unpublished MSS. in the British Museum, etc. (8vo). "This is a curious work, not at all addressed to the multitude, or chargeable with any irreverence of design or manner, but treating an interesting antiquarian subject in the dispassionate style of a studious inquirer. His acquaintance with members of the "Independents" led him to join the Independent Church, and finally he became a minister of that society. He died Nov. 6, 1842. Hone also published The Apocryphal N. T. (Lond. 1820, 8vo; 4th ed. 1821), for an account of which see Hone, Intro. to the Study of the Script. and L. Rev. 1821, xxv, 380 sqq. See his Early Life and Conversion (1841, 8vo); English Cyclopaedia; Darling, Cyclopa. Bibl. i, 1525; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 874. (J. H. W.)

Honert, Johann van den, a distinguished Dutch divine, was born near Dordrecht Dec. 1, 1645. His early years were spent in military service, but on his father's accession to a professor's chair in the University of Leyden he decided to follow a literary life, and, after four years of study, he became a candidate for the ministry in his twenty-fourth year. In 1718 he was appointed minister at Catwick, on the Rhine; later, at Enkhuysen, and then at Haarlem. In 1727 he was called as pro-
Honestus, St. See Damian, Peter.

Honey (ἦλ, debash), sometimes rendered "honey-comb," in combination with ἡλ ὑποτρόπων, or ἠλ ὅσκυλος, while ἡλ ὑποτρόπος, singly, is sometimes translated "honeycomb;" Greek μῖλλα is represented by several terms, more or less accurately, in the original languages of Scripture.

1. ἠλ ὑποτρόπων, which only occurs (in this sense) in 1 Sam. xiv, 25, 27, 29; Cant, v, 1; and denotes the honey of bees, and that only. The word properly signifies a copse or forest, and refers to the honey found in the woods.

2. ἠλ ὑποτρόπων, honey that drops from ἠλ ὑποτρόπων, to sprinkles or distill, usually associated with the comb, and therefore bee-honey. This occurs in Ps. xxi, 10; Prov. v, 3; xxiv, 15, xxvii, 1; Cant. iv, 11.

3. ἠλ ὑποτρόπων, debash 'from its glutinous nature.' This is the most frequent word. It sometimes denotes bee-honey, as in Prov. xiv, 8, but it also signifies a vegetable honey distilled from trees, and called mannna by chemists; also the sirup of dates, and even dates themselves. It appears also sometimes to stand as a general term for all kinds of honey, especially the sirup of grapes, i.e., the newly-expressed juice or must boiled down. The heart, the sweetness of this sirup is still common in Palestine, under the same Arabic name dibs (Robinson's Researches, ii, 442, 458), and forms an article of commerce in the East; it was this, and not ordinary bee-honey, which Jacob sent to Joseph (Gen. xlii, 11), and which the Tyrians purchased from Palestine (Esck. xxviii, 17). The mode of preparing it is described in Pliny (xiv, 11): the must was either boiled down to a half (in which case it was called defrumum), or to a third (when it was called sirrus, or sapa, the ἱππας ὑλος, v. 3): it was mixed either with wine or milk (Virg. Georg. i, 296; Ovid, Fast. iv, 280): it is still a favorite article of nutriment among the Syrians, and has the appearance of coarse honey (Russell, Aleppio, i, 82). It was used for sweetening food, like sugar with us (Exod. xxxi, 31).

4. ἡλ ὑποτρόπων, tauph (literally a flowing), denotes rather the cells of the honey-comb full of honey (Prov. xvi, 24; Prov. xx. 16).

5. The "wild honey" (Ἤλ ὑποτρόπιοι) which, with locusts, formed the diet of the John the Baptist, was, according to some, the manna or vegetable honey noticed under debash (No. 3, above), but may very naturally refer to the honey stored by bees in the rocks of Judaea Desert, in the absence of the trees to which they usually resort. Such wild honey is clearly referred to in Deut. xxii, 12; Ps. lxxxvi, 17. Josephus (War, iv, 8, 5) specifies bee-honey among the natural productions of the plain of Jericho: the same Greek expression is certainly applied by Diodorus Siculus (xix, 94) to honey exuding from trees; but it may also be applied, like the Latin mel silvestre (Pliny, xi, 16), to a particular kind of bee-honey that is said to be a honey which is gathered by bees as "vegetable honey," by which is meant the exudations of certain trees and shrubs, such as the Tomariz maminara, found in the peninsula of Sinai, or the stunted oaks of Luristan and Mesopotamia. A kind of honey is described by Josephus (l. c.) as being manufactured from the date palm.

Honey was not permitted to be offered on the altar (Lev. ii, 11). As it is coupled with leaven in this prohibition, it would seem to amount to an interdiction of things sour and sweet. Aben Ezra and others allege that it was because honey partook of the fermenting nature of leaven, and when burnt yielded an unpleasant smell—qualities incompatible with offerings made by fire of a sweet savour unto the Lord. The prohibition appears to have been grounded on the fermentation produced by it, honey soon turning sour, and even forming vinegar (Pliny, xx, 48). This fact is embodied in the Talmudic teaching, "to ferment is debash." Other explanations have been offered, as that bees were unclean (Phil. ii, 255), or that the honey was the artificial dibs (Bähr, Symboli, ii, 326). But Maimonides and others think it was for the purpose of making the different species of fruits, and the religious custom of the sacrifices, the cheese and the heathen, in whose offerings honey was much employed. The first-fruits of honey were, however, to be presented, as these were destined for the support of the priests, and not to be offered upon the altar (2 Chron. xxxii, 5). It is related in 1 Sam. xiv, 24-29, that Jona-than and his party, contemplating the consecrated honey, which was falling from the trees to the ground, and the prince extended his rod to the honey-comb to taste the honey. From all this it is clear that the honey was bee-honey, and that honey-combs were above the trees, from which honey dropped upon the ground; but it is not clear whether Jonathan had put his rod among the trees that was in the trees or shrubs, or into one that had fallen to the ground, or that had been formed there (Kitto's Pict. Bible, ad loc.). Moreover, the vegetable honey is found only in small globules, which must be carefully collected by the bees and then used (Wetstein, ii, 50). In India, "the foxtail," says Mr. Rose, "literally flow with honey; large combs may be seen hanging on the trees as you pass along, full of honey" (Oriental Illustrations). We have good reasons to conclude, from many allusions in Scripture, that this was also, to a considerable extent, the case formerly in Palestine. It is very evident that the land of Canaan abounded in honey. It is indeed described as "a land flowing with milk and honey" (Exod. iii, 8, etc.), which we apprehend to refer to all the sweet substances which the different Hebrew words indicate, as the phrase seems too large to be confined to the honey of bees alone. Yet the great number of bees in Palestine has been noticed by many travellers; and they were doubtless still more common in ancient times, when the soil was under more general cultivation. Where bees are very numerous, they sometimes resort to places for the deposit of their honey which would little think this honey of a lion, picked clean by birds, dogs, and insects, would afford no bad substitute for a hive, as in Judg. xiv, 8, 9 (Kitto's Daily Bible Hist., ad loc.). A recent traveller, in a sketch of the natural history of Palestine, names bees, bee-hives, and honey-combs, as the most common in the country (Schubert, Reise im Morgenlande, ii, 120). In some parts of Northern Arabia the hills are so well stocked with bees that no sooner are hives placed than they are occupied (Wetstein's Travels, ii, 120). Dr. Thomson speaks of immense swarms of bees in the cliffs of Wady Rum, and compares
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Dent, xxii, 13 (Land and Book, i, 460). Prof. Hackett
saw hives in several places in Palestine (Illustrations of
Script. p. 96). Milk and honey were among the chief
dainties in the earlier ages, as they are now among the
Bedawin; and butter and honey are also mentioned
among articles of food (Isa. vii, 15). The ancients used
honey instead of sugar (Psa. cxix, 108; Prov. xxiv, 19);
but when taken in great quantities it causes nausea, as a
fact employed in Prov. xxxv, 16, 17, to inculcate moder-
tation in pleasures. Honey and milk are put also for
sweat discance (Cant. iv, 11). The preservative prop-
erties of honey were known in ancient times. Josephus
records that the Jewish king Aristobulus, whom Pomp-
pey's partisans desired to see in their possession, had
honey brought in quantity to him on his death-bed; and
still Antony sent him to the royal cemetery in Judea
(Acts, xiv, 7, 4). See Bee.

HONEY, a portion of which, with milk, was sometimes
given to newly-baptized persons in allusion to the name
anciently given to Canaan, and in token that they be-
lenged to the spiritual Israel. Honey and milk had a
distinct consecration (Exod. Eccl. Diet.). See Au-

HONOLULU. See SANDWICH ISLANDS.

Honor. (1.) respect paid to superiors, those to whom
we owe particular deference and distinction. (2.) It is
sometimes, in Scripture, used to denote real services:
"Honor thy father and mother (Exod. xx, 12)," that is
not only to show due respect and esteem them, but also
to perform such services to them as they need. By
honor is also understood that adoration which is due to
God only: "Give unto the Lord the honor due unto his
name (Psa. xxii, 2)." (3.) Specifically, it is used to
denote the testimony of esteem or submission, by which
we make known the veneration and respect we entertain
for any one on account of his dignity or merit. The
word is used in general for the esteem due to virtue,
glorious, reputation, and probity. In every situation of
life, religion only forms the true honor and happiness of
man. "It cannot arise from riches, dignity of rank, or
office, nor from what are often called splendid actions
of heroes, or civil accomplishments; these may be found
among men of no real integrity, and may create consid-
erable fame; but a distinction must be made between
courage and true honor. The former is a loud and noisy
appearance of strength, a silent and true homage. Fame
floats on the breath of the multitude; honor rests on
the judgment of the thinking. In order, then, to dis-
cern where true honor lies, we must not look to any
adventitious circumstance, not to any single sparkling
quality, but to the whole of what forms a man; in a word,
we must look to the soul. It will be found superior to it.
It will mind superior to fear, to selfish interest, and corruption
by an ardent love to the Supreme Being, and by a prin-
ciple of uniform rectitude. It will make us neither
afraid nor ashamed to discharge our duty, as it relates
both to God and man. It will influence us to be mag-
nanimous without being proud, humble without being
mean; just without being harsh; simple in our manners,
but manly in our feelings. This honor, thus formed by
religion, or the love of God, is more independent and
more complete than what can be acquired by any other
means. It is productive of higher felicity, and will be
commensurate with eternity itself; while that honor
so called, which arises from any other principle, will re-
sult in the feeble and trembling flame of a taper, which
is often clouded by the smoke it sends forth, but is al-
ways wasting, and soon dies totally away" (Blair, Ser-
mon, Serm. 53).

(4.) The term honor, however, by the personal pride of
the individual. Coleridge remarks that wherever
"genuine morality has given way, in the general opin-
ion, to a scheme of ethics founded on utility, its place is
soon challenged by the spirit of honor. For honor de-
grades the spirit of honor into a mere club-law among
the higher classes, originating in selfish convenience,
and enforced by the penalty of excommunication from
the society which habit had rendered indispensable to
the happiness of the individuals, has misconstrued it not
less than that of morals in the influence of noble natures.
The spirit of honor is more, in deed, than a mere conventional substitute for honesty; but
on the other hand, instead of being a finer form of
moral life, it may be more truly described as the shad-
ow or ghost of virtue deceased; for to take the word
honor is to descend to a sense of pretension, and honor
may be allowed to the writer of satires, but not to the
moral philosopher. Honor implies a reverence for the
invisible and supernatural in our nature, and so far it
is virtue; but it is a virtue that neither understands it-
self nor its true source, and therefore often unsubstan-
tial, not selish, nor honorable, and often more or less capi-
cious. Abstract the notion from the lives of lord Her-
bert of Cherbury, or Henry the Fourth of France, and
then compare it with I Cor. xiii and the Epistle to Phi-
leon, or, rather, with the realization of this fair ideal in
the mind of St. Paul himself. This has struck the
better class even of infidels. Collins, one of the most
learned of our English deists, is said to have de-
clared, that contradictory as miracles appeared to his
reason, he would believe in them notwithstanding if it
could be proved to him that St. Paul had asserted any
one as having been worked by himself in the sense of
the word miracle; adding, 'St. Paul was so perfect a gentleman, and a man of honor.' I know not a better test. Nor can I think of any investigation
that would be more instructive where it would be safe,
but none, likewise, of greater delicacy from the proba-
bility of misinterpretation than a history of the rise of
honor in the European monarchies as connected with
the corruptions of Christianity, and an inquiry into the
specific causes of the inefficacy which has attended the
combined efforts of divines and moralists against
the practice and obligation of dwelling.' Of the mer-
ely worldly sense of honor, Carlyle says, with sufficient
force, that it "reveals itself too clearly as the daugh-
ter and heiress of our old acquaintance, Vanity" (Essays,
ii, 74). Montesquieu remarks that what is called honor
in Europe is unknown, and of course unnamed, in Asia;
and that it would be difficult to render the term intelli-
gible to a Persian." See Montesquieu, Spirit of Laws,
bk. iii. ch. viii; Coleridge, Friend, p. 317.

Honoratus, St., a Manichaeon, and archbishop of
Aries, was born, according to Bailleit, in Belgian Gaul,
in the second half of the 4th century. He belonged to
a noble family who were pagans; and when he and his
brother Venantius became Christians, they left their
country and parents, and travelled through Achais, and
afterwards founded a monastery on the island of Serino,
opposite Cannes, which acquired great celebrity. Some
of the most eminent bishops and theologians of the 5th
and 6th centuries came out of this convent. Honoratus
himself was twice bishop of Arles, A.D. 426, and died

Honoratus, St., bishop of Marseilles, was born
about 420 or 425, and is said to have been educated at
the school of Lerins. He was the successor of the cele-
brated Tillemont in the episcopacy (probably in 475),
but of his works very little is known at present. Some
acribes have ascribed to him the authorship of the life of St. Hilarious,
which others ascribe to the 6th or 7th cen-
tury. He died about 492, counting pope Gelasius I
among his admirers.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale,
xxv, 78.

Honorius, Roman emperor, son of Theodosius I,
born in 384. He was named Augustus Nov. 28, 386,
and succeeded his father Jan. 17, 395, as first em-
peror of the Western empire, with Rome as its capital,
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while the Eastern fell to the lot of his brother Arcadius. Honorius was at this time only ten years of age, and he was therefore put under the guardianship of Stilicho, a Vandal, who had aided him in ascending the throne, and whose daughter Maria he married. Honorius, soon after his accession, renewed and even rendered more stringent his father's regulations against heathenism; but the weakness of his government, together with the fears or heathenish tendencies of some of the governors, rendered these regulations almost of no effect in several provinces. It having been represented to Hon-

orius that the conformance of heathen temples kept up the heathen spirit among the people, he ordered (399) that all such temples should be quickly destroyed, so that the people should no longer have this temptation before them. As the heathen laid great stress on a prediction that Christianity would disappear in its 365th year, the destruction of their own temples at that time made great impression on them. Yet in some districts of Northern Africa the heathen still remained num-

erous enough not to resist, but even to oppress the Christians. After the death of Stilicho, Honorius modified his severe course against heathenism: a law was passed (410) that all heathen bishops should be expelled. "ut libera volonte quis cultum Christianitatis excipere" —by which the penalties pronounced by preceding laws against all who participated in any but Christian worship were suspended. This law, however, remained in force but a short time, and the old enactments came again in operation. This vacillating, insolent prince was also led to take part in discussions on the points of doctrine then agitating the Church. In 418 he promulgated an edict against Pelagius and the Pelagians and Collocale, which was framed more in a theological than an imperial style. He acted in the same manner toward the Donatists. The envoy of the North African Church succeeded in obtaining from the emperor a rule that the penalty of ten pounds of gold to which his father Theodosius had condemned heretic priests, or the owners of the places where heretics as-

tempered to worship, should only be enforced against those priests and persons whose previous vicious

behavior had been offered to the orthodox priests. In an edict Honorius issued against the Donatists (405), he condemned them as heretics, and this with more severity even than the Council of Carthage demanded. Later he appointed a council, to be held at Carthage (411), to decide the difficulty between the Donatists and the orthodox party. The imperial commissioners, of course, decided for the latter, and new edicts were published exiling Donatist priests, and condemning their followers to be fined. The fanaticism of the op-

pressed party was excited by these measures, and the heresy only spread the more rapidly. While the reign of Honorius is thus of great importance in the history of the Church, the emperor himself showed the greatest want of energy in all his dealings, and his death, which occurred in August, 423, cannot be said to have been a loss to either the State or the Church. —Hennig, Real Encyclop. vol. 251; Mosheim, Chr. History, vol. 1; Gibbon, Decline and Fall, chap. xxvi —xxviii; Sozomen, Hist. Eccles. chap. viii —x; Schaff, Chr. Hist. ii, 66 sq.; Lea, Socordi del Celibato, p. 54, 72, 83; Chast, Remembrances, July, 1868, p. 237. —See DONATISTS.

Honorius, an archbishop of Canterbury in 627. He instituted parishes in England; but little is known of his life and works. He died in 658.

Honorius of Autun (Augustodunensis), surnamed "the Mad" (440—493), was a bishop of the see of Autun, in Burgundy. His personal history is rather obscure; but if he be really the author of the Eucharisticum, a summary of theology, published in France as the work of Anselm (Paris, 1560, 8vo), he deserves to be placed among the most celebrated men of his century. The Eucharisticum shows that Honorius was devoted to a practical mysticism, and in his works he seems to have followed the new Platonic-Augustinian theology. He condemned the Crusades and pilgrimages to Jerusalem, all decorations of the altar, the extreme unction, etc. On the doctrine of the Trinity, he held that the godhead consists of three distinct powers. He is also said to have been the author of a work, De Predestinatione et libero arbitrio (Col. 1552; also found in Cassander's Works, p. 623 sq.). In this work he holds that "God's foreknow-

edge has no compelling influence upon our actions, nor his predetermination any necessitating power over our fate; for, as all futurity is present to an omniscient Being, he knows our future acts, because he sees them as al-

ready done; and his predetermination to either life or death is the consequence of his foreknowing the line of con-

duct which his creatures would choose to pursue." In many respects he agreed with Ab claw (q. v.). Honorius also wrote a Bible commentary. His Introduction to the Exposition of Solomon's Song is considered as his best production. All his theological and philosophical works are collected in the Bibl. Max. Patr. vol. xx. See Dupin, Bibl. Nov. des aut. eccl. i, 154; Ould, De Script. Eccles.; Schröck, Kirchengesch. der byzantin. H, xxvi, 391 sq.; Hefner, Gesch. der Phil., 416; Ritter, Gesch. der Philos., vii, 435 sq.; Clarke, Succession of Sacred Lit., i, 680; Waterland, Works (see Index); Fuhrmann, Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch., ii, 342; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. iii, 321 sq.; Hefner, Nouv. Bibl. Géné-

rêl., xxv, 19 sq.; Darlington, Encyclop. Biblio. i, 1526. (J. H. W.)

Honorius de Sancta Maria, who was also known as Blaise Vauzel lech, was born at Limoges, in France, July 4, 1651. He joined the Carmelites at Toulouse in 1671, and then went on a mission to the Levant. Re-

turning to France, he taught theology for some years, and became prior, councilor, provincial, and, finally, visi-

tor general of the French Carmelites. He died in 1729. The most important and useful of his publications is en-

titled Réflexions sur les Règles et sur l'Usage de la Cru-

terne, touchant l'Histoire de l'Eglise, les Ouvrages des Peres, les Acta des anciens Martyrs, les Vies des Saints, etc. (Paris and Lyons, 1712-1720, 3 vols. 4to). He wrote several treatises on mixed questions, and in favor of the bull Unigenitus; and in 1729, he published Des Motifs et de la Pratique de l'Amour de Dieu (Paris, 1718, 8vo.); etc.—Moret, Nouv. Dict. Hist., Hefner, Nouv. Bibl. Générale, xxv, 63.

Honorius I, Pope, was a native of the Campania, and succeeded Boniface V in 625. His general admin-

istration of Church affairs has been favorably commented upon by historians, and has left an im-

print in the history of the pastoral controversy in Ire-

land, and in that of the early Anglo-Saxon Church. The feast of the elevation of the cross was organized during his time (about 628), and he was very active in reversing the policy of his predecessor. He died in a village, and his letters are preserved in Labbe's Collect. Concilium, vol. iii. Honorius is especially distinguished for the part he took in the Monothelistic controversies of that period. While the controversy was gaining ground in the West, Sergius, patriarch of Constantinople, attempted to explain the theology of the West by trinites in the most favorable light, and suggested that Honorius should impose silence on both parties in a
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dispute which really did not affect the substance of the Catholic doctrine. Misled, it is alleged, by this statement of Sergius, Honorius consented, and even expressed himself in terms, as far as we can judge, as if he would appear to condemn the doctrine of two wills in Christ. After his death, attempts were made at Rome to exculpate his memory from all accusation of heresy, yet he was condemned and anathematized by the Ecumenical Council of Constantinople in 680, and this sentence was confirmed at different times, as far as we can judge, by Leo II, who anathematized him as heretic for having attempted apostolicum eclecsiam—profusi prohibita immeiutam subserere (Mansi, x, 731). Modern Roman Catholic historians have tried in various ways to exonerate Honorius. Baronius says that the Council of Constanti nople was falsified; Bellarmine says that this was the case with Honorius's letter to Sergius; while Garnier and Ballerini claim that he was not anathema tized for heresy, but propter neglectum. Some Roman Catholic historians, however, maintain that even in disclaiming the belief of Constantine he was for him, Honorius merely denied the existence in Christ of two sovereign or conflicting wills, that is, of a corrupt and sinful human will opposed to the divine will, and that he did not put forth any dogmatic declarations irreconcilable with the strict unamntrane doctrine of infallibility. Orsi went even further, and in his Bullarium states that Honorius composed this letter to Sergius as a "private teacher," but the expression doctor privatus, when used of a pope, is like talking of wooden iron (comp. Janus, The Council and the Pope, p. 405). In modern times, the agitation of the question of papal infallibility has given a special interest to the letters of Honorius on infallibility, following the lead of the above-mentioned writers, tried all kinds of arguments to explain away the assent of Honorius to the heretical doctrines of Sergius, without being able to adduce any new arguments, undertakes to prove that Honorius wrote this letter at all. The Gallicans, and the opponents of papal infallibility, have in general endeavored to show that Honorius was really a favorer of Monothelisim. The ablest treatment of the subject from this school in the Roman Catholic Church may be found in the work on The Pope and the Councils by Janus, also works by P. Le Mottier, in his Condemnation of Pope Honorius, London, 1868); and [in reply to the ultramarine reviews of the first work by Dr. Ward, the editor of the Dublin Review, and the Jesuit Bottalla] The Case of Pope Honorius reconsidered (London, 1869); in two letters, by the distinguished French Oratorian and member of the French Academy, P. Gratry (L’Évêque d’Orléans et l’archevêque de Mâcon, Paris, 1870); and in an essay by bishop Hefele, published in Naples, 1870. Renouf, whose thoroughness and keenness is admitted by all his opponents, in his work, undertaken to prove three assertions: 1. Honorius, in his letters to Sergius, really gave his sanction to the Monothelisic heresy; 2. Honorius was, on account of heresy, condemned by general councils and popes; 3. Honorius taught a heresy ez catholica. The fact that Honorius was condemned by general councils and popes as a heretic is admitted by many of those Catholic writers who insist that his condemnation, although though they are obscure, explained in an orthodox sense. Since the convocation of the Vatican Council in 1869, many Roman Catholic theologians (among them Duhigg and Gratry), who were formerly regarded as personally favorable to the doctrine of papal infallibility, now, after a new investigation of the question, strongly urge the case of Honorius as an irresistible argument against it. The literature on the Honorius question is so voluminous, that, according to the opinion of the learned Duhigg, during the last 150 years more has been written on it than on any other point of Church History within 1500 years. Recent monographs on the subject, however, have been written by Schneemann (Studien über die Honoriusfrage, 1864) and Reinering (Beiträge zur Honorius- und Liberiusfrage, 1865). It is also extensively discussed in a number of articles in the theological reviews, especially those of the Roman Catholic Church, in the largest works on Church History, and in particular, since 1869, in a vast number of works treating of the question of papal infallibility. See Infallibilität. See Richer, Historia Concil. generali, i, 296; Du Pin, De antiqua eccles. disciplina, p. 349; M. Havelange, Etudes d’infallibilité en faveur de James, 175, 186; Dogm, p. 430; Milman, Latin Christinini, ii, 169; Riddle, History of the Popes, i, 155; Hardwick, Church Hist. (Middle Ages), p. 70 and n. 3, 75 and n. 8; Hagenbuch, Hist. of Church, vol. ii, 816, 1869, p. 283; Edinb. Rev., vol. 1869, p. 158; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lexicon, iii, 422; Aschbach, Cathol. deaconum Concilia, February, 1870; Hefele, Honorius u. d. sechste allgemein, Concil. (Tub., 1870, 8vo). See MONOTHEISM. (J. H. W.)

Honorius II (Peter Cabod). Antipope, was elected in 1061, through the influence of Henry IV, in opposition to Alexander II, who had been chosen by the cardinals without his assent. The election took place in the same college, and Honorius afterwards went to Rome. The German bishops, however, under the influence of Hanno, archbishop of Cologne, sided with Alexander II at the Synod of Augsburg, 1062; and, finally, the Synod of Mantua, 1064, pronounced the deposition of Honorius, and he was obliged thereby to confine himself to the bishopric of Passau, which he held before his election. Yet he upheld his pretensions to the pontifical see until his death in 1072. He was accused of simony and of concubinage. He is generally not counted among the popes on account of his deposition. —Herzog, Real-Encyklop. vol. v; Schröck, Kirchen gesch., xxii, 1, 134; Riddle, History of the Popes, ii, 119; Wetzet u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex., v, 318 sq.; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex., iii, 323. See ALEXANDER II.

Honorius II (cardinal Lambert). Pope, originally bishop of Ostia, was elected pope by the cardinals in 1124, after the death of Calixtus IV, while most of the bishops assembled at Rome elected Tebalbus, cardinal of Santa Anastasia. Tebalbus, finding that Honorius was supported by the powerful family of the Frangipani, and that the people were divided in opinion, to avoid further strife, waived his claim. Honorius himself also expressed doubts concerning the validity of his own election; he was subsequently re-elected by the clergy and the people of Rome without opposition, and was consecrated Dec. 21, 1124. He refused the investiture of the duchies of Apulia and Calabria to Roger, count of Sicily; and Roger having besieged the pope within Benevento, Honorius excommunicated him; but afterwards peace was concluded between them, and Honorius granted the investiture. He confirmed the election of Lottario, the cardinals' candidate, as his rival, Conrad of Franconia. He also confirmed the organization of the order of Premonstratensians, and at the Synod of Troyes (1128) that of the Templars; and condemned the abbots of Cluny and of Mount Cassin, against whom complaints had been made. He died in the convent of St. John Lateran, 1129. —Encyclop. CATHOLIC: Hoefer, Nouv. biog. génér., xxxv, 89; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, vi, 19 sq.; Riddle, Hist. of the Popes, i, 169; Schröck, Kirchengesch., xxvi, 95 sq.; Mil.

**Honorius III** (Cencio Savelli), Pope, a native of Rome, was cardinal of St. John and St. Paul, and succeeded pope Innocent III in 1216. He showed a very accommodating spirit in his relations with the temporal powers. Thus, when Frederick II permitted his son Henry, Duke of Sicily, to make a pilgrimage to the Holy Land, in April, 1220, he even consented to officiate at the coronation (November, 1220). But it is generally believed that the object of the pope in consenting so readily to the desires of Frederick II was to gain him for the great crusade against the Moslem races in the East which he contemplated. This good understanding between the pope and the emperor was interrupted when the latter, instead of proceeding directly to Palestine, tarried in Apulia and Sicily, and attempted to regain those countries. Honorius sent his chaplain, Alatrunus, to the imperial diet at Cremona in 1226, and the emperor was obliged to agree to a truce.

Honorius even went so far as to threaten him (1225) with excommunication if he did not start for the Holy Land by August, 1227, and he would probably have executed his threat had not death intervened. Thus this amicable spirit Honorius failed to manifest towards count Raymond VII of Toulouse. He excited Louis VIII of France to make war against Raymond; but neither Honorius nor Louis lived to see the end of the conflict. He was also frequently at variance with the nobles and people of Rome, by whom he was a number of times driven from the city. His residence in Avignon was therefore not a very quiet one. He died March 12, 1227.

Officially Honorius confirmed the organization of the Dominicans in 1216, and of the Franciscans in 1228. He was the first pope who granted indulgences at the canonization of saints. He was considered a learned man in his day, and is supposed to have been the author of the *Conjurationes adversus principem tenebrae* (Rome, 1629, 8vo).—Hertzog, Real-Encyklopädie, vol. v; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxv, 90; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, vi, 216-221; Neander, Ch. History, iv, 41, 177, 270, 341; Milman, Lat. Christianitx, v (see Index); Hoefer, Concilien-Erld., 811 sq.; Ehrhard, Dogmengesch., ii, 180; Schrick, Kirchengesch. xxxv, 328; xxv, 145 sq., 329 sq.; xxix, 632; Frühmann, Handwörterb. der Kirchengesch., ii-iv; Case, Hist. l. script. eccl. ii, 287; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. v, 319; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. iii, 324; Raumer, Geschichte d. Hohenstaufen, iii, 807 sq. (J. H. W.)

**Honorius IV** (Giacomo Savelli), was pope from April 2, 1285, to April 3, 1287. He espoused the cause of Charles of Anjou against the Aragonese, who had occupied Sicily; and he even incited to a crusade against the latter, qualifying it as a "holy war." He distinguished himself greatly by his zeal for the preservation and augmentation of the privileges of the Church, and for the recovery of the Holy Land. He cleared the Papal States of the bands of robbers with which they were overrun, and imparted a new impulse to arts and sciences, which up to his time had been much neglected; among other improvements, he attempted to establish a course of Oriental languages at the University of Paris, but he did not succeed. During his brief pontificate he is said to have succeeded in engracing his family.—Migne, Diet. Eccl.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxiv, 91; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. ii, 301; Schröck, Kirchengesch. xxvi, 511 sq.; Bower, History of the Popes, vi, 325 sq.; Milman, Hist. of the Popes, i, 379 sq.; Ehrhard, Dogmengesch., vi, 505; Case, Hist. of the Popes, i, 235; Neander, Ch. Hist. iv, 65, 627; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. v, 322; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. iii, 325.

**Honorius, Bartholomew, a Premonstratist**, who flourished in the second half of the 16th century, was born at Erefel, in Brabant, became canon at Fioreffe, near Naurn, later preacher at Helmont, and finally, being persecuted by the Calvinists, went to Rome. He wrote Admonitio ad fratres inferioris Germaniae (Heidelberg, 1578);—Hedworiicon celebrorum ordinis Prémonstratensium per orbem universum Abbatis (ibid., 1584);—Questiones theologicae LXX adversus Calvinistas (ibid., 1586);—Eclaircissement Anselmi Cantuariensi (ibid., 1586); and a number of other, but less valuable works.—Pierer, Univ. Lex., viii, 522.

**Hunter, John**, one of the apostles of Protestantism in Transylvania, was born at Cronstadt in 1498; studied at Wittenberg under Luther, then went as a teacher to Cracow, whence he moved to Basle to continue his studies. In 1538 he returned to his native city, where he started a printing establishment, and published Luther's writings. He also published at his own expense a translation of the Lutheran Bible into his own language. In 1547, he was appointed pastor, and became quite popular as a preacher. He died Jan. 28, 1549.—Hertzog, Real-Encyklop. v, 254; Hardwick, Ch. Hist. of the Reformation, p. 98; Hist. of Prot. Church in Hungary, p. 59.

**Honthem, John Nicolas von** (known commonly as Feronius), suffragan bishop of Treves (in Rhineland Prussia), was born Jan. 27, 1701, and educated at the Jesuit College in the University of Freiburg. After completing his studies, he went on a journey to Rome, and after his return (1727) was appointed successively to several high positions in the Church, and finally became suffragan bishop May 13, 1748, which post he filled until 1788. He died Sept. 2, 1789. His History Tripolitana, and and cronica (Trevis, 1750, 3 vols. fol., with a Prodomus, 1757, 2 vols. fol.; Angers, 1757, 2 vols. fol.) is considered a work of great merit; but it was as the author of De Statu Ecclesiae et leguminis Potestate Romana Pontificis Liber singularius, ad resumptam dissidentiae in religioni Composita (Boullion apud Guillemium Evard, 1768, 4to), published under the pseudonym of "Justinus Feronius," that he attracted the attention of the Christian world. The daring expressions of independent thought which characterize the entire work created general excitement. As early as 1763-5 he issued an enlarged edition, and a third, still more enlarged, in 1770-74. An abridgment of the work appeared in German in 1764, another in Latin in 1777, and the translations into the various modern languages soon made it known throughout Europe (French, Sedan and Paris, 1757; Italian, Venice, 1767, etc.). Many of his views were immediately or indirectly adopted, especially Zaccaria (to whose writings an answer is given in Nova defensione Febronii contra P. Zaccaria, Boullion, 1763, 3 vols.) and Bellerini (De potestate ecclesiastica Rom. Pontif., et concil. generalium contra J. Feronii (Verona, 1768, 4to, and often).—Pope Clement XIII caused the copies of this last-mentioned to be burned. Whether it was dedicated to himself. Honthem seeks especially to draw a line of distinction between the spiritual and the ecclesiastical power of the Roman see. He seems to say to his readers, "Without becoming Protestants, you may very well oppose the encroachments and abuse of power the papal court." The principal points of which the work treats are, the constitution of the primitive Church, the representative character of general councils, the thoroughly human basis on which reists the primacy of the bishop of Rome, the fatal influence of the pseudo-Istoriasts, the trying encroachment of power by the nuncios, the illegal influence of the mendicant orders, and the monopoly of episcopal elections possessed by the chapters at the expense of the rights of the lower clergy and the people. As all his assertions are accompanied by historical proofs, and his book contains hardly anything but quotations from the fathers in support of his views, it exerted great influence. As the work had been published under the nom de plume of Justinius Feronius, the system of Church government which Honthem propounded is generally called Feronianism. During the years which followed its publication, papal authority was greatly restricted in
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many countries. Hence, as soon as the real author of the *De Statu Ecclesie* was known, he became the object of ceaseless persecutions. Pope Pius VI showed himself especially the enemy of Honthem. The ex-Jesuit Beck, privy councillor of the elector Clement Wenzeslaus, not satisfied with persecuting Honthem, persecuted also all the family, most of the held offices in the province of Trier. The old man (Honthem was then nearly seventy-nine), tired of all these annoyances, and perhaps frightened at the prospect of what he might still have to undergo, finally gave way, and submitted to the pope. When his recantation reached Rome in 1778, Pius VI held a special consistory in order to apprise the whole Roman Catholic world of the event; but several Roman Catholic governments opposed the publication of the acts of this consistory in their states. Moreover, the effects of the dispute had been too widely felt to be obliterated by a tardy expression of repentance. The author himself went, like Fénelon, in order to avoid ceaseless annoyance. His recantation can do no harm to the Christian religion, neither can it in any way benefit the court of Rome; the thinking world has read my arguments, and has indorsed them." Some of the more liberal-minded Roman Catholics, who say that Honthem, in his (first) recantation, declared his object to have been to effect a union of the Roman Catholic and the Protestant churches. He believed that this could only be accomplished by altering or removing some of the institutions of the Roman Church. Later, he modified his recantation greatly by a subsequent commentary (Frankfort-on-the-Maine, 1771), to which cardinal Garioli replied, at the special request of the pope. But eventually Honthem made full submission to the Church. In 1788 he resigned his charges, and spent the last years of his life on his estate of Monquintin, in Luxembourg. See Hoe- fer, *Nov. B. Généraux*, xxiv, 91; Herzog, *Real-Encyk- lop. vi*, 255; Hase, *Church Hist.* p. 528; Möhler, *Symbolik* p. 45; Menzel, *Neue Gesch. d. Deutschen*, xi, 456 sq.; Furhman, *Handwarterk. d. Kirchengez*., ii, 943 sq.; Schricker, *Kirchengez*, xxxii, 18; a. d. *Reform. vi*, 582 sq.; Watch, *Neue Angst. Gesch.* iii, 145 sq.; iv, 576 sq.; 210 sq.; 453 sq.; Henke, *Kirchengez*, viii, 138 sq.; Baur, *Gallerie Hist. Gemälde* d. 18. Jahrh. iv, 402 sq.; Kutta, *Kurtz-text b. Ch. History*, ii, 334; Hase, *Ch. Hist.* by 528. On the Roman Catholic side: Aschbach, *Kirch. Lex.* ii, 746 sq.; Wetzler and Welle, *Kirchen-Lex*, ix, 824 sq.; Dibelius, *kathol. Kunst*, vol. i, 273; Werner, *Gesch. d. kathol. Theol.* p. 209 sq.; 276, and especially *Briefwechsel zw. d. Churfürstern Clemens Wenzel v. Trier u. d. Weikirch. N. v. Homhën u. d. Bich. J. Fabronius*, etc. (Frankfort-a-M. 1815).

Hood ("†23, tmnj††), a turra round the head, spoken of a female head-band (Isa. iii, 23); elsewhere rendered "diadem," e. g. a man's turban (Job xxii, 14); the high-priest's "mizre" (Zeich. iii, 5); the king's "crown" (Isa. lxii, 3. marg.). See HORN-dress, etc.

Hood (Saxon hox; comp. Germ. hut, hat), borrowed from the Roman cuscus, is (1) the cowl of a monk. (2) In England, an ornamental fold that hangs down the back of a graduate to mark his degree. This part of the dress was formerly not intended for distinction and ornament, but for use. It was generally fastened to the back of the cope or other vesture, and in case of rain or cold was drawn over the head. In the universities the hoods of the graduates were made to signify their degrees by varying the colors and materials. By the 17th century the "Chaplains and Students of the University of Cambridge," or rather the minister saying the public prayers, or ministering the sacraments, or other rites of the Church, if they are graduates, shall wear upon their surplices, at such times, such hoods as by the orders of the universities are agreeable to their degrees. — Hook, *Church Dictionary*., s. v.; Wheatley, *Book of Common Prayer*, p. 102, 103.

Hoof (पूर्ण प, parsh, i. e. a cleft hoof as of neat cattle, Exod. x, 26; Ezek, xxiii; Mic. iv, 18, etc.; hence of the horse, though not cloven, Isa. v, 29; Jer. xlvii, 3; "claws" of any animal, Zech. xi, 16). In Lev. x, 5 sq.; Deut. iv, 6 sq., the "parting of the hoof" is made one of the main distinctions between clean and unclean animals; and this is applied even to the camel, after a popular rather than a scientific classification. See CAMEL.

Hoogh, Enrico van der, a distinguished Dutch Orientalist, was born in the latter half of the 17th century. He was a Reformed preacher at Nieuwendam, but spent the greater part of his time in the study of the Oriental languages, especially the Hebrew. He died in 1716. He wrote *Janua lingar sacra* (Amst., 1697, 1710; ibid., [1717], 1750; — Meditatio *De Hebr.«* (Amst., 1698, 8vo); — *Syntaxis Ebraeo, Chald, et Syr.* Lex. Novum Teinfra. Graeco-Latinum, etc. Especially celebrated was his edition of the *Biblia Hebraica* (Amsterd. and Utrecht, 1705, 1750, London, 1774, and often; lately again by Tauchnitz, Lpz., 1855, and often).—Pleyer, *Univ. Lex.* viii, 524; Wolf, *Bibl. Hebr.* ii, 981; iv, 117. See CRITICISM, BIBLICAL.

Hoogstraten (also called Hoochstraten), Jacob van, prior of the Dominican convent of Cologne, and an ardent adversary of Reuchlin, Luther, and Erasmus, was born at Brabant in 1434. He studied at the University of Cologne without much success. Nevertheless, he became the master of arts in his college, was afterwards made prior. His great zeal and opposition to the Reformation secured him the nomination of inquisitor at Louvain, besides a professorship of theology at the University of Cologne, for which he was in nowise qualified. In 1518 he summoned Reuchlin to appear before him, thereby transferring to his power the inquisitor in another state, could only be summoned by the provincial of the order. He had already published his *Libelli accusatorius contra speculum occult. Joh. Reuch- lini, when the chapter of Mentz took Reuchlin's case in hand. But pope Leo X gave commission to bishop George of Speyer to settle the controversy. Hoogstraten, not appearing, lost his cause, and was condemned to pay the costs; but, as he refused to submit to the decree, the whole matter was brought before Leo X, and Hoogstraten was summoned to Rome. Unwilling either to offend the humanists in the person of Reuchlin, or the powerful Dominican representers by Hoogstraten, the pope issued a *mandatum de superedendo*. Returning to Cologne, Hoogstraten published in 1518 two so-called Apologies, full of malice, and in 1519 his *Destructio car- bale, seu cabalista perfidiae. A Joh. Reuchlinio seu Capitaneone (Opp. Reuchlini, 1.), 210; Mayerhoff, *Joh. Rech- lini u. s. Zeit*, p. 158 sq.; Schricker, *Kirchengez.* xxxi, 248; a. d. *Reform. i*, 189; Bayle, *Hist. Dict.* iii, 471 sq.; Mosheim, *Church History*, iii, 22.

Hook is the rendering in the Auth. Ver. of the following terms in the original. See also FISH-HOOK; FLESH-HOOK; FRUISING-HOOK. A idea of a thorn enters into the etymology of several of them, probably, because a thorn, hooked or straight, was the earliest instrument of this kind. Tacitus thus describes the dress of the ancient Germans. "A loose mantle, fastened with a clasp, or, when that cannot be had, with a thorn" (Germ. 17). See THORN.

1. τομαρί, chuk (lit. a thorn), a ring inserted in the nostrils of an ox or horse, when a cord was fastened in order to lead them about or tame them (2 Kings xix, 29; Isa. xxxvii, 29; Ezek. xxixii, 4; xxviii, 4; compare Job xl, 26; also a "chain" for a captive (Ezek. xix, 4, 9), and "bracelets" for females (Exod. xxv, 22, where others a nose-ring, others a clasp for fastening the dress). In the first two of the above passages, Jehovah intimates his
absolute control over Sennacherib by an allusion to the practice of leading buffaloes, camels, dromedaries, etc., by means of a cord, or of a cord attached to a ring, passed through the nostrils (Shaw, Travels, p. 157-8, 2d ed.). Such a ring is oftentimes placed through the nose of a lion, and is likewise used in the East for leading about lions, camels, and other animals. A similar method was adopted for leading prisoners, as in the case of Manasseh, who was led with rings (2 Chron. xxxiii, 11). An illustration of this practice is found in a bas-relief discovered at Khorosabad (Layard, ii, 376; see also the cut under Ewe). The term בָּקֵן is used in a similar sense in Job xi, 24 (A. V. "bore his nose with a gin;" margin). Another form of the same term, בָּקֵן (A. V. "thorn"), is likewise properly a ring placed through the mouth of a large fish, and attached by a cord (12298) to a stake for the purpose of keeping it alive in the water (Job xii, 28). The word meaning "the cord" is rendered "hook" in the A.V. See below.

2. The cognate word בַּקֶּק, chakkab, means a fish-hook (Job xii, i, "a"angle; Isa. xix, 8; Hab. i, 15). This passage in Job has occasioned the following speculations (see, for instance, Harris's Hist. of the Bible, art. Leviathan, Lond. 1825). It has been assumed that Bochart has completely proved the Leviathan to mean the crocodile (Rosemuller on Bochart, iii, 737, etc., 769, etc., Lips. 1796). Herodotus has then been quoted, where he relates that the Egyptians near Lake Moeris select a crocodile, render him tame, and suspend ornaments to his ears, and sometimes gems of great value; his fore feet being adorned with bracelets (ii, 69); and the mummies of crocodiles, having their ears thus bored, have been discovered (Kenrick's Egypt of Herodotus, p. 97, Lond. 1841). Hence it is concluded that this passage in Job refers to the facts mentioned by Herodotus; and, doubtless, the terms employed, especially by the Sept. and Vulgate, and the third and fourth ones, favor the supposition, for there the captive is represented as suppliant and obsequious, in a state of servility and servitude, and the object of diversion, "played with," as with a bird, and serving for the sport of maidens. Herodotus is further quoted to show that in his time the Egyptians captured the crocodile with a hook (דָּשָּׁן, דָּשֶּׁן), with which (בָּקֶק, בָּקֶקֶת, בָּקֶקָן) he was driven ashore; and accounts are certainly given by modern travelers of the continuance of this practice (Maillet, Descrip. d'Egypte, ii, 127, ed. Hagg., 1740). But does not the entire description go upon the supposition of the impossibility of so treating Leviathan? Supposing the allusions to be correctly interpreted, is it not as much as to say, "Canst thou treat him as thou canst treat the crocodile and other fierce creatures?" Dr. Lee has, indeed, given reasons which render it doublet, at least, whether the leviathan does mean the crocodile in this passage, or whether it does not mean some species of whale, as was formerly supposed—the Delphinus orca communis, or common grampus, found in the Mediterranean, the Red Sea, and also in the Nile. (See his examination of Bochart's reasons, etc., in Translation and Notes on Job, Lond. 1857, p. 197.) So the above term in Ezek. xxxii, "I will put my hooks in thy jaws, and I will cause thee to come up out of the midst of thy rivers," where the prophet foretells the destruction of Pharaoh, king of Egypt, by allusions to the destruction, possibly, of a crocodile, the symbol of Egypt. Thus Pline (Hist. Nat. viii, 25) states, that the Tentyrians (inhabitants of Egypt) followed the crocodile, swimming after it in the river, sprung upon its back, thrust a bar into its mouth, which being held by its two extremities, serves as a bit, and enables them to force it on shore (comp. Ezek. xxxii, 3, 4). Strabo relates that the Tentyrians displayed their feats before the Romans (xiv, 6, 2) and later (iv, 590; ed. Caes. 549, 560). See Lay. of Rhod. 3. מִּזְרֵח, a peg or pin, upon which the curtains of the Tabernacle were hung, springing out of the capitals (Exod. xxxvi, 32, etc.). The Sept. and Jerome seem to have understood the capitals of the pillars; and it has been urged that this is more likely to be the meaning than hooks, especially as 1773 shekels of silver were used in making these בָּקֶקֶת for the pillars, overlaying the chapiters, and filleting them (ch. xxxviii, 28), and that the hooks are really the בָּקֶקֶת, taches (Exod. xxxvi, 6, 11, 33, 35; xxxviii, 30). Yet the Sept. also renders בָּקֶקֶת, spicau, rings or clamps (Exod. xxvii, 10, 11, and dyerian, Exod. xxviii, 17, 19); and from a comparison of these two latter passages, it would seem that these hooks, or rather tendrils, rose out of the chapiters or heads of the pillars. The word seems to have given name to the letter ג in the Hebrew alphabet, possibly from a similarity of the form in which the letter appears in the Greek δικώμον, to that of a hook. Mr. Faine (Sodom's Temple, p. 25) regards these hooks as having been rather pins driven into the heads of the pillars, and thus projecting upward from them like a small tenon, upon which the silver rods were slipped by means of a small hole or eye in the latter. This would serve to keep the pillars together. See TABERNACLE.

4. בָּקֶקֶת, teimoth (lit. thorn), a fish-hook (Amos iv, 2; elsewhere a shield). See Fishing, etc.; ANgle.

In the same sense, בָּקֶקֶת, "fish-hooks," where both the Sept. and Vulgate seem to have taken בָּקֶקֶת in the sense of a pot or caldron instead of a fish-hook. See CALDRON.

5. בָּקֶקֶת, maslovet (1 Sam. ii, 13, 14), "flesh-hook," and the בָּקֶקֶת, "the flesh-hooks" (Exod. xxv, 3, 5, and elsewhere). This was evidently in the first passage a trident of "three teeth," a kind of fork, etc., for turning the sacrifices on the fire, and for collecting fragments, etc. See FLESH-HOOK.

6. בָּקֶקֶת, masmeroth (Isa. ii, 4, and elsewhere), "beat their spears into pruning-hooks" (ἐπιθέσεια, fuller). The Roman poets have the same metaphor (Mar. xiv, 84, 98, Fals ex ense). In Mic. iv, 8, in ligones, "weeding-hooks, sho velows, spades, etc., putting the metaphor "pruning-hooks" into spears (iii, 10, ligonee); and so Ovid (Fasti, i, 697, in pila ligones). See PRUNING-HOOK.

7. Doubtful is בָּקֶקֶת, skyphattay'gin, stalls for cattle ("pots"), Psa. lxxviii, 18), also the cedar beams in the Temple court with hooks for flaying the victims (Ezek. xi, 43). Other meanings given are legs (Vulg. In- sid), or eaves, as though the word were בָּקֶקֶת; pens for keeping the animals previous to their being slaugh tered; however, as in the margin of the A.V.; and, lastly, gutters to receive and carry off the blood from the slaughtered animals. Geuenius (Thesaur. p. 1470) explains the term as signifying stalls in the courts of the Temple where the sacrificial victims were fastened: our translators give in the margin the "hearth-stones." The Sept. seems equally at a loss, κοιλιον αναπτυσσων iωσαμικον, as also Jerome, who renders it lobia. Schlesmer pronounces iωσαμικον to be a barbarous word formed from ιωσημε, and understands epistaliumy, a little pillar set on another, and capitellum, columned. The Chaldee renders בָּקֶקֶת, short posts in the house of the slaughterers on which to suspend the sacrifices. Dr. Lightfoot, in his chapter on "the altar, the rings, and the laver," observes, "On the north side of the altar were six orders of rings, each of which contained
Hook, James, L.L.D., an English prelate, was born in London in 1771, and educated at St. Mary's Hall, Oxford. He became archdeacon of Huntingdon in 1814, dean of Worcester in 1825, and held also other preferments in the English Church. He died in 1828. Besides some dramatic pieces and novels which are ascribed to Hook, he published *Angnis in Herbas, a true Story of the False God of England* (London and Oxford, 1802, 8vo)—Sermons, etc. (1812, 8vo, and another series in 1818, 8vo). For a biographical sketch of Hook, see the *London Gent. Mag.* April, 1828.—Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 975.

Hooke, Luce Joseph, a French theologian of English origin, was born about 1716, and educated at the seminary of "Saint-Nicolas du Chardonnet." He received his doctor's degree from the Sorbonne, and was appointed professor of theology in 1750. The following year he presided at the discussion of abbe Paradis's (Jeant.) thesis, which contained many heterodox doctrines, and which he signed without reading. Hooke was deposed from his professorship; but the professors of the Sorbonne and of the College of Navarre interceded in his behalf, and obtained the revocation of the order. At the outbreak of the French Revolution he was made librarian of the Mazarin Library, but he held this place only a short time, when he retired to St. Cloud. He died in 1796. Hooke published *Religionis naturalis raelitate et Catholicis Prinicipia* (Paris, 1754, 2 vols. 8vo, 2d ed. 1774, 3 vols. 8vo)—Discours et Reflexes, crit. sur l'hist. et le gouvernement de l'anc. Rome (Paris, 1770-84, 4 vols. 12mo—a translation of one of his father's works from the English) —Principe sur la Nature et l'Esence de la Religion Chrétienne (Paris, 1791, 8vo). (J.L.W.)

Hooke, William, a Congregational minister, was born in Southampton in 1601, and educated at Trinity College, Oxford. After having received orders in the Church of England, he became vicar of Axmouth, in Devonshire. About 1636 he emigrated to this country, as his nonconforming views had caused him considerable trouble, and in 1644 or 1645 he was installed pastor at New Haven, Conn. He was by marriage a cousin of Oliver Cromwell, after whose ascendency he returned to England, and became Cromwell's domestic chaplain. After the death of Cromwell, Hooke became an ejected and silenced minister, and he spent his remaining days in retirement near London, where he died near London, Jan. 21, 1672. Besides several sermons—among them, *New England's Tears for Old England's Tears*, a Fast sermon (Tamworth, 1640, London, 1641, 4to), which is considered one of the best productions of his day—he published *The Privileges of the Saints on Earth beyond those in Heaven, etc.*, containing also a Discourse on the Gospel Dew (1678). Sprague, 3d Am. Am. Pulpit, i, 104 sq.; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 978.

Hooker, Asa, a Congregational minister, was born in Bethel, Conn., Aug. 29, 1762. He graduated at Yale College in 1783, and was installed pastor at Goshen in September, 1791. This charge he resigned on account of Health June 12, 1810. After preaching in various pulpits, he became pastor of Chelsea parish, Norwich, Conn., Jan. 16, 1812, where he remained until his death, April 19, 1813. Mr. Hooker published several occasional sermons, and a number of articles in the *Connecticut Evangelical Magazine*—Sprague, Annals, i, 316.

Hooker, Herman, D.D., a Protestant Episcopal clergyman, was born at Poulton, Vt., in 1804; graduated at Middlebury College in 1825, and later at the Princeton Theological Seminary, and was licensed as a Presbyterian, with great promise both as a scholar and speaker. He finally joined the Protestant Episcopal Church, but the partial loss of his sight and of his voice soon compelled his retirement from the ministry; and he became a bookseller at Philadelphia, continuing, however, at the same time, his theological studies. He died at Philadelphia, Pa., Sept. 27, 1865. His principal works are, *The Portion of the Soul* (Philadelphia, 1855, 8mo, and republished in England): —Popular Infidelity (Philadelphia, 1866, 12mo)—*Family Book of Devotion* (1866, 8vo)—The Use of Adversity and the Provisions of Consolation (Philadelphia, 1864, 18mo)—Thoughts and Maxims (Philadelphia, 1847, 18mo)—The Christian Life a Fight of Faith (Philadelphia, 1848, 18mo). He also published a large number of English and American works. Dr. Hooker was a vigorous and close thinker, a clear writer, a devout and conscientious Christian, full of true and consistent charity. He made the Nashotah Seminary a residuary legacy, which bequest probably amounted to about $10,000." See Church Rev. Jan. 1866; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 978.

Hooker, Richard, one of the most eminent divines in the history of the Church of England, was born in or near Exeter about 1555, according to Walton, or about Easter, 1554, according to Wood. His early education was received at the expense of his uncle, John Hooker, chamberlain of Exeter. He was afterwards introduced by the same relative to the notice of bishop Jewel, who procured him in 1567 a clerkship in Corpus Christi College, Oxford. In December, 1578, he became a student in that college, and a fellow and master of arts in 1577. In 1579 he was appointed lecturer on Hebrew in the university, and in October of the same year he was expelled his college, with Dr. John Reynolds and three other fellows, but he was restored the same month. About two years after he took orders, and was appointed to preach at Paul's Cross. Having married the following year his friend's widow, he lived for a time at the living of Drayton-Beauchamp, in Bucks, by John Cherry, Esq., in 1584. Through the influence of the archbishop of York, he was appointed Master of the Temple in 1585. Here he became engaged in a controversy on Church discipline and some points of doctrine with William Whittingham, an afternoon lecturer at the Temple, who had been ordained by the Presbytery at Antwerp, and held most of the opinions of the divines of Geneva. Travers, being silenced by archbishop Whitgift, appealed to the privy council, but without success. His petition to the council was published, and answered by Hooker. Travers had many and powerful friends in the Temple, and it was their opposition, according to Isaac Walton, which induced Hooker to commence his work on the *Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity*. Having that he not to the Temple to complete that work, he applied to Whitgift for removal to a more quiet station, and was accordingly placed in the living of Buckinghamshire in 1591. On the 17th of July in the same year he was a prebendary of Salisbury. At Boscombe he finished four books of the *Ecclesiastical Polity*, which were published in 1594. On the 7th of July, 1595, he was presented by the queen to the living of Hillingdon, in Buckinghamshire, in Kent, which he held till his death, on the 2d of November, 1600. "Hooker's manner was grave even in childhood; the mildness of his temper was proved by his moderation in controversy; and his piety and learning procured him the general esteem of his contemporaries. His great work in the defence of the constitution and discipline of the Church of England, in eight books,
under the title of The Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity. This work obtained during the author's lifetime the praise of a pope (Clement VIII) and a king (James I), and has ever since been looked upon as one of the chief bulwarks of the Church of England and of ecclesiastical learning; its indefatigable researches in genealogy, learning, profound reasoning, and breadth and sustained dignity of style, it is indeed beyond praise; but the common objection is a just one, that Hooker's reasoning is too frequently that of an advocate. The publication of the first four books has been mentioned above; the fifth was published in 1657. He composed the last three books, but they were not published till several years after his death. The account which Walton gives of the mutilation of the last three books is very improbable, and little doubt can be entertained of their authenticity, though they are certainly imperfect, and probably not in the condition in which he left them (English Cyclopedia).

Hooker was charged with Romanizing tendencies, but the charge had no better foundation than his prelatical theory of the Church. For a series of shrewd and genial notes and criticisms on Hooker, see Coleridge, Conybeare's Works, N.Y. edition, v. 38 sq.; The Ecclesiastical Polity marked several hundred sheets have appeared. His Works, with Life, edited by Dr. Gauden, were published in London, 1662 (fol.); again in 1666 (fol.), with life by Isaac Walton. The latest editions are Hanbury's, with life of Cartwright, and Notes, from the London, 1807, edition of view of Hooker, (London, 1836); Keble's (London, 1836, 4 vols. 8vo, and 1841, 3 vols. 8vo; without the Introduction and notes, 2 vols. 8vo). See Hook, Eccles. Biography, vi, 126 sq.; Orme, Life of Baxter, i, 22; Stanley, Life of Arnold, i, 64; Hallam, Literature of Europe, ii, 88; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 890; Grant, Ch. Hist. i, 443; Baxter, Ch. Hist. of England, p. 489, 537 sq., 543; Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, i, 206; Bennett, Hist. of the Dissenters, p. 226; Sketes, Hist. of the Free Churches of England, p. 29 sq.; Cunningham, Ch. Principles, p. 521, 391 sq.; Shedd, Hist. of Doctrines (see Index); Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctr. (see Index, vol. ii); Lecky, History of European Morals, i, 79, 139 sq.; Blanket, Stud. Assist, p. 245; Tulloch, English Puritanism and its Leaders, p. 24 sq.; Calamy, Hist. Account of my Life, i, 235 sq.; ii, 236; Journ. Soc. Lit. xxvii, 467; Theology, Magazine, vol. ii.

Hooker, Thomas, an eminent Congregationalist, was born July 7, 1554, at Marfield, Leicestershire, England. He was successively student and professor at Emmanuel College, Cambridge. After preaching a short time in London, he settled in 1626 at Chelmsford as assistant minister. In 1630 he was silenced by archbishop Laud for nonconformity, and enjoined, under a bond of fifty pounds, to come before the Court of High Commission; but forswearing the bond, he escaped to Holland, and remained three years, when he returned, and sailed, July, 1633, for Boston. He arrived in this country Sept. 4, and was ordained first pastor of the church in Cambridge, Oct. 11. After a stay of nearly three years (June, 1636), in company with Mr. Stone, the teacher in his church, and others, he started into what was then the wilderness, and settled at Hartford. He died at that place July 7, 1647. Hooker published The Soul's Ingrafting into Christ (1637):—The Soul's Implantation in Christ, or Conceiving in the Spirit, The Preparing of the Heart, The Soul's Ingrafting into Christ, Spiritual Love and Joy (1637):—The Soul's Preparation for Christ (1638):—The Unbeliever's Preparation for Christ, parts i and ii (1638):—The Soul's Exaltation—embracing Union with Christ, Benefits of Union with Christ, The Deification of the Soul, or, Effectual Calling to Christ (1638)—Ten Particular Rules to be practiced every day by Converted Christians (1641)—Survey of the Sum of Church Discipline (1648):—Christ's Prayer for Believers; a Series of Discourses founded on John xvii, 20-23 (1657):—The Soul's Possession of Christ;—The Soul's Justification: eleven Sermons on 2 Corinthians v, 21; Proverbs i, 28, 29; and a number of occasional sermons. See Neal, Hist. of N. England; Sprague, Animadvs, ii, 317; Haguehousch, Hist. of Doctrines, ii, 192, 298; Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, i, 317; Contrib. to Eccle. Hist. of Connecticut (1681, 8vo), p. 16, 28, 47, 404, 412.

Hooper, George, D.D., an English prelate, born in Worcestershire in 1640, was educated at St. Paul's and Westminster School, and afterwards at Christ Church, Oxford. He first became chaplain of Merton, Bishop of Winchester, and, later, archbishop Sheldon gave him the living of Lambeth. In 1677 he was appointed almoner of the princess of Orange. On the accession of William, the queen chose Hooper for her chaplain, and he was appointed Archbishop of Canterbury in 1691. In 1703 he was made bishop of St. Asaph, and in 1712, a portion of his life transferred to the see of Bath and Wells. He died at Bath, Somersetshire, in September, 1727. His principal works are, A Fair and methodical Discussion of the first and great Controversy between the Church of England and the Church of Rome: a most indispensable Guide (Lond. 1667)—De Valentiannorum Herrei Conjectura, quibus illius origo ex Aegyptia theologica deducta (ibid. 1711)—An Inquiry into Ancient Measures, etc., and especially the Jewish, with an Appendix concerning our Old English Money and Measures of Content (ib. 1712). The author describes the book one complete, and says that it is his own work, namely, that published by Dr. Hunt, Hebrew professor (Oxf. 1757, fol.). See also, Lives of the Deans of Canterbury: Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxv, 124.

Hooper (Hooper, or Hooper), John, an English bishop, and one of the martyrs of the Reformation, was born in Somersetshire about 1495. He was educated at Merton College, Oxford. Having embraced the doctrines of the Reformation, he was compelled to leave the university, and finally the country in 1540. He went to Switzerland, passing most of his time at Zurich. On the accession of Edward VI (1547) he returned to England, and acquired great reputation in London as a preacher. In 1550 he was made bishop of Gloucester, but his repugnance to wearing the vestments of that office caused considerable delay in his consecration. After entering on his duties, he labored with great zeal for the cause of the Reformation. In 1552 he was appointed bishop of Worcester in commendam. In the early part of the reign of Mary (1553), he was arrested and confined, and was kept in the state of great suffering and great zeal. He firmly refused all offers of pardon which required the abandonment of his principles, and, though, on account of the wood with which he was burned being green, he suffered the severest torments for nearly an hour, he manifested an unshaken fortitude. He died Feb. 9, 1555. Hooper was the author of a number of sermons and controversial treatises. Among his best works are A Declaration of Christ and his Office (1547, 8vo)—Lesson of the Incarnation of Christ (1549, 8vo):—Twelve Lectures on the Creed (1611, 8vo). Several letters of Hooper are preserved in the archives of Zurich. We have recent reprints, by the Parker Society, of The Early Writings of Bishop Hooper, edited by the Rev. S. Carr (Cambridge, 1843, 8vo); and of his Later Writings, with Letters, etc., edited by the Rev. C. Nevinsom (Cambridge, 1853, 8vo). A sketch of his life and writings is given in his Churc. Register (Rev. Soc. of Canterbury). We have recent reprints, by the Parker Society, of The Early Writings of Bishop Hooper, edited by the Rev. S. Carr (Cambridge, 1843, 8vo); and of his Later Writings, with Letters, etc., edited by the Rev. C. Nevinsom (Cambridge, 1853, 8vo). A sketch of his life and writings is given in his Churc. Register (Rev. Soc. of Canterbury).
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HOPE

The Christian's hope of glory shall be fulfilled (1 Tim. i, 1; Col. i, 27; Tit. ii. 13). The fruit of hope is that through it we are enabled patiently and steadfastly to bear the difficulties and trials of our present existence, and thus the προμοίων is a constant accomplishment of the λογίας (1 Thess. i, 3; Rom. viii, 25), and even is sometimes put in connexion with faith and love (Tit. ii, 2; compare 2 Tim. iii, 10; 1 Tim. vi, 11), the source of the believer's patience in suffering, so it is also the cause of his fidelity and firmness in action, since he knows that his labor "is not in vain in the Lord" (1 Cor. xv, 58). Christianity is the religion of hope, and it is an essential feature of its absolute character. This hope is everlastong and eternal is absolute. To the Christian, as such, it is therefore not time, but eternity; not the present, but the future life, which is the object of his efforts and hope. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop., vi, 196; Krehl, N. T. Handwörterbuch, p. 572.

"One scriptural mark," says Wesley, "of those who are born of God, is hope. Thus St. Peter, speaking to all the children of God who were then scattered abroad, saith, 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope!' (1 Pet. i, 2). And this 'lively hope' is the message of the Apostles to the heathen philosophers. It is, beyond these, the assurance that the spiritual life which dwells in us here will be prolonged into eternity. Hence, in the scriptures of the N. T., Christians are said to have hope rather than hopes (Rom. xv, 4, 18; Heb. iii, 6). The Holy Spirit imparted to believers is the ground and source of all. (1 Pet. i, 8; Acts xxiii, 6; 2 Cor. v, 5; Rom. viii, 11; xv, 13; Gal. v, 5) Hence the notion of hope appeared first in the discip\les in its full force and true nature, after the resurrection of Christ and the descent of the Holy Ghost. In the O. Test., we do not find it with its significance (see Heb. vii, 19).

Thus hope is an essential and fundamental element of Christian life, so essential, indeed, that, like faith and love, it can itself designate the essence of Christianity (1 Pet. iii, 15; Heb. x, 23). In it the whole glory of the Christian religion is centered (Eph. i, 18; iv, 4); it is the real object of the propagation of evangelical faith (Tit. i, 2; Col. i, 5, 23), for the most precious possessions of the Christian, the σωτηρία, σπέρματος, νίκεστα, διασωσίων, are, in their fulfilment, the object of his hope (1 Thess. v, 8 sq.; Rom. viii, 23, comp. Exech. i, 14; Acts xxiv, 14; Tit. ii, 13). The Scriptures are expressly designated as those who are without hope (Eph. ii, 12; 1 Thess. iv, 13), because they are without God in the world, for God is a God of hope (Rom. xv, 13; 1 Pet. i, 21). But the actual object of hope is Christ, who is himself called η λογίας, not only because in him we place all our dependence (the general sense of ἡ λογίας), but especially because it is in his second coming that the Christian's hope of glory shall be fulfilled (1 Tim. i, 1; Col. i, 27; Tit. ii, 13). The fruit of hope is that through it we are enabled patiently and steadfastly to bear the difficulties and trials of our present existence, and thus the προμοίων is a constant accomplishment of the λογίας (1 Thess. i, 3; Rom. viii, 25), and even is sometimes put in connexion with faith and love (Tit. ii, 2; compare 2 Tim. iii, 10; 1 Tim. vi, 11), the source of the believer's patience in suffering, so it is also the cause of his fidelity and firmness in action, since he knows that his labor "is not in vain in the Lord" (1 Cor. xv, 58). Christianity is the religion of hope, and it is an essential feature of its absolute character. This hope is everlastong and eternal is absolute. To the Christian, as such, it is therefore not time, but eternity; not the present, but the future life, which is the object of his efforts and hope. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop., vi, 196; Krehl, N. T. Handwörterbuch, p. 572.

"One scriptural mark," says Wesley, "of those who are born of God, is hope. Thus St. Peter, speaking to all the children of God who were then scattered abroad, saith, 'Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, which, according to his abundant mercy, hath begotten us again unto a lively hope!' (1 Pet. i, 2). And this 'lively hope' is the message of the Apostles to the heathen philosophers. It is, beyond these, the assurance that the spiritual life which dwells in us here will be prolonged into eternity. Hence, in the scriptures of the N. T., Christians are said to have hope rather than hopes (Rom. xv, 4, 18; Heb. iii, 6). The Holy Spirit imparted to believers is the ground and source of all. (1 Pet. i, 8; Acts xxiii, 6; 2 Cor. v, 5; Rom. viii, 11; xv, 13; Gal. v, 5) Hence the notion of hope appeared first in the discip\les in its full force and true nature, after the resurrection of Christ and the descent of the Holy Ghost. In the O. Test., we do not find it with its significance (see Heb. vii, 19).

Thus hope is an essential and fundamental element of Christian life, so essential, indeed, that, like faith and love, it can itself designate the essence of Christianity (1 Pet. iii, 15; Heb. x, 23). In it the whole glory of the Christian religion is centered (Eph. i, 18; iv, 4); it is the real object of the propagation of evangelical faith (Tit. i, 2; Col. i, 5, 23), for the most precious possessions of the Christian, the σωτηρία, σπέρματος, νίκεστα, διασωσίων, are, in their fulfilment, the object of his hope (1 Thess. v, 8 sq.; Rom. viii, 23, comp. Exech. i, 14; Acts xxiv, 14; Tit. ii, 13). The Scriptures are expressly designated as those who are without hope (Eph. ii, 12; 1 Thess. iv, 13), because they are without God in the world, for God is a God of hope (Rom. xv, 13; 1 Pet. i, 21). But the actual object of hope is Christ, who is himself called η λογίας, not only because in him we place all our dependence (the general sense of ἡ λογίας), but especially because it is in his second coming that
office of professor of belles-lettres in the College of New Jersey. In 1854 he was also made professor of political economy. During the fourteen years of his connection with the college, he continued in the diligent and thorough discharge of the duties of his professorship, with the exertion of all his powers, the most of which was passed in Southern Europe, whither he had gone to seek some alleviation of a deeply-seated neuralgic affection. He died suddenly at Princeton, Dec. 17, 1859. He published a Treatise on Rhetoric (a syllabus for his college classes); and was a frequent contributor to the Princeton Review. See Princeton, Dec. 1859; Presbyterian Hist. Almanac, 1861, p. 90; Newark Daily Advertiser, Dec. 1850.

Hofmayer, Heinrich, a German theologian, was born at Leipzig in 1852, and educated at the university of his native place, and at Jena and Wittenberg. In 1812 he was appointed professor of logic at Leipzig, and very soon after was called to Jena as professor of theology. He died in 1842. Hofmayer wrote Commentarii in veterem quam vocand notos (Leipsic, 1820): Tractatus in priorum et posteriorum Anal. & Aritotel. (Ibid. 1820): Sazonia evanghelica (Ibid. 1825, 1872): De justificatione hominis praeator coram Deo (Ibid. 1829 and 1853; new ed. 1872 and 1876) —Pierer, Universal Lex., etc. 1880.

Hophni (Heb. Chophni, מְחֹפְנִי, perhaps, pupilist, according to others client; Sept. ὁ Φόπνιος, the first-named of the two sons of the high-priest Eli (1 Sam. i. 3; ii. 34), who fulfilled their hereditary sacerdotal duties at Shiloh. Their brutal rapacity and lust, which seemed to acquire fresh violence with their father's increasing years (1 Sam. ii. 22, 12-17), filled the people with disgust and indignation, and provoked the curse which was denounced against their father's house first by an unknown prophet (ver. 27-36), and then by the youthful Samuel in his first divine communication (1 Sam. iii. 11-14). They were both cut off in one day in the flower of their age, and the ark which they had accompanied, to battle against the Philistines was lost on the same occasion (1 Sam. iv. 10, 11). B.C. cir. 1130. The predicted ruin and ejection of Eli's house were fulfilled in the reign of Solomon. See Zadok. The unbridled licentiousness of these young priests gives us a terrible glimpse into the fallen condition of the chosen people. (Ewald, Gesch, ii. 588-588.) The Scripture calls them "sons of Belial" (1 Sam. ii. 12). See El.

Hophra (Heb. Chophra, כֹּפְרָה; Sept. Οὖπαρα; compare Clem. Alex. Strom. i. 1431, Vulg. Fphreol, or Pharaoh-Hophra, king of Egypt in the time of Zedekiah, king of Judah, and of Nebuchadnezzar, king of Babylon, B.C. 588. He formed alliance with the former against the latter, and his advance with an Egyptian army convinced the Chaldeans to raise the siege of Jerusalem (Jer. xxxix., v. 5); but they soon returned, and took, and destroyed the city. This momentary aid, and the danger of placing reliance on the protection of Hophra, led Ezekiel to compare the Egyptians to a broken reed, which was to pierce the hand of him that leaned upon it (Ezek. iii. 7). This alliance was, however, disapproved by God; and Jeremiah was authorized to deliver the prophecy contained in his forty-fourth chapter, which concludes with a prediction of Hophra's death, and the subjugation of his country by the Chaldeans. See Egypt.

This Pharaoh-Hophra is identified with the Apris (Apris, Herod. ii. 161 sq.; iv. 159; Diod. Sic. i. 68; Αρπιας, Athen. xiii. 560) of ancient authors, and the Osaphis (Οὐαφίς) of Manetho, the eighth king of the twenty-sixth or Saitic dynasty (Eusebius, Chron. i. 219). Under this identification, we may conclude that his wars with the Syrians and Cyrenceans prevented him from1 offering any great assistance to Zedekiah. Hophra is described by Josephus (ii. 169) as a monarch who, in the zenith of his glory, forgot that it was not in the power even of a deity to dispose him of his kingdom, or to shake the stability of his sway: and this account of his arrogance fully accords with that contained in the Bible. Ezekiel (xxix. 3) speaks of this king as "the great dragon that lieth in the midst of the rivers, which hath said, My river is mine own, and I have made it for myself." His overthrow and subsequent captivity and death are foretold with remarkable precision by Jeremiah (xlix. 30): "I will give Pharaoh-Hophra, king of Egypt, into the hands of his enemies, and into the hands of those that seek his life." This was brought about by a revolt of the troops, who placed Amasis at their head, and, after various conflicts, took Apries prisoner. B.C. 569. He was for a time kept in easy captivity by Amasis, who wished to spare his life; but he was at length constrained to give him up to the power of his enemies, of whom he was strangled (Rawlinson, Herod. ii. 209 sq.). See Kamphe, De Pharaone Hophra, Lunn. 1784. See PRAOHL.

Hôpital (also Hospital), Michel de l', a distinguished French statesman and opponent of the Inquisition, was born at Aiguesperle, in Auvergne, about 1504. He studied law at Toulouse, and first became known as an advocate of the Parliament of Paris. He opposed the charging various public functions, he became chancellor of France in 1560, during the minority of Francis II. That country at this time was torn by contending factions. "The Guises, in particular, were powerful, ambitious, and intensely Catholic; and when one of the family, the Cardinal de Lorraine, wished to establish the Inquisition in the country, Hôpital boldly and firmly opposed it, and may be said to have saved France from that detestable institution. He summoned the states-general, which had not met for 80 years, and, being supported by the mass of moderate Catholics, he forced the Guises to yield." His speech at the opening of the assembly was worthy of his wise and munificent spirit; "Let us do away," said he, "with those diabolical words of Lutherans, Hugenots, and Papists—names of party and sedition: do not let us change the fair application of Christians." An ordinance was passed abolishing arbitrary taxes, regulating the feudal authority of the nobles, and correcting the abuses of the judicial system. He also secured various benefits for the persecuted Hugenots in various ways, but especially by the edict of pacification, which granted to the Protestants the free exercise of their religion (issued January 17, 1562). In 1568 he was instrumental in establishing the peace of Longjumeau, when, on account of his opposition to Catharine de Medici, who was inclined to break the compact, he was suspected of being a Hugenot. Finding it impossible to prevent the execution of Catharine, he resigned his post in 1572, and retired to his estate at Vignay, near Etampes. He died May 13, 1573. Hôpital's family had all embraced the Protestant faith, and this was well known even at court while he occupied his prominent position there. But his character was so blameless that he held his position for ever, and during the events preparatory to the massacre of St. Bartholomew.—Hoc-fer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxii. 86 sq.; Chambers, Encyclop. v. 414 sq.; Pierer, Univers. Lex. viii. 834; Bayle, Hist. Dict. p. 605 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. vi. 298 sq.; Raumer, Gesch. Europa's ii, Scolnik, Gesch. d. Prot. in Frankreich, 2. ii. See HOPCROFT.

Hopkins, Daniel, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born Oct. 16, 1734, at Waterbury, Conn., and graduated at Yale College in 1758. After being licensed,
HOPKINS

he preached in Halifax, N.S., a short time. In 1775 he
was chosen member of the Provincial Congress, and in
1778 one of the Council of the Conventional Govern-
ment. He was ordained pastor of the Third Church in
Salem Nov. 18, 1778, and remained in this place until
his death. Dec. 14, 1814. He published two or three
occasional sermons.—Sprague, Aulual, i. 581.

Hopkins, Ezekiel, D.D., an English prelate and
author, was born at Sandhurst, Devonshire, in 1633. He
was educated at Magdalen College, Oxford, and, hold-
ing a short time the chaplaincy to the college, he be-
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came minister of St. Mary Woolnoth, London, and later
of St. Mary's, Exeter. He finally removed to Ire-
land with his father-in-law, Lord Robarts (afterwards
earl of Tonry), and was made dean of Roscommon in
1693, and bishop of the same place in 1711. He was tran-
ferred to Londonderry in 1681, but in consequence of the
Roman Catholic troubles in Ireland he returned to Eng-
land in 1688, and was appointed minister of Aldernan-
bury, London, in 1698. He died June 22, 1690. In his
documents he was a Calvinist. His works are remark-
able for cleanness, strength of thought, originality, and
purity of style; the most important are, Exposition of
the Lord's Prayer (1691)—An exposition of the Ten
Commandments (1692, 4to)—The Doctrine of the two
Covenants (Lond. 1712, 8vo); and Works, now first col-
lected (Lond. 1742).—see Proceedings of the As-
sembly of Divines, 1719. (Lond. 1809, 4 vols. 8vo.) See
Wood, Athenae Oeconomica, vol. ii; Prince, Worthies of

Hopkins, John Henry, D.D., LL.D., bishop of the
Protestant Episcopal Church in the diocese of Ver-
mont, was born of English parents in Dublin, Ireland,
Jan. 30, 1792. He came to this country when about
eight years old. He was educated chiefly by his moth-
er. In 1817 he entered the legal profession, but six
years later he quitted the bar for the ministry, and was
ordained in 1824 as rector of Trinity Church, Pittsburgh.
In 1827 he was appointed for the office of assistant
bishop of Pennsylvania, but as the vote of Mr. Hop-
kins was to decide between himself and Dr. H. U.
Onlerdonk, another candidate, he cast his vote in favor
of the latter. In 1831 he became assistant minister at
Trinity Church, Boston, and professor of divinity in the
Protestant Episcopal Theological Seminary of Massa-
chusetts. In 1832 he was elected bishop of Vermont, to
which he was consecrated Oct. 31. At the same time he accepted also the
rectorship of St. Paul's Church, Burlington, Vt., which he held until 1856. Besides this, he also established a
school for boys, employing poor clergyman and can-
didates for orders as teachers. His very expenses from this
course embarrassed him seriously for many
years. After relinquishing this school, he projected and
established the "Vermont Episcopal Institute," a semi-
 theological school, over which he presided until his
death, January 9, 1858. In 1867, bishop Hopkins was
present at the Pan-Anglican Synod held in Lambeth, and
took a prominent part in its proceedings. The discus-
sions dividing the Anglican Church he was a de-
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cided champion of the High-Church party, and refused
to sign the protest of a majority of the American bishops
against the anti-Lollard tendencies. Several of the pos-
thumous works of bishop Hopkins were published by
one of his sons. Bishop Hopkins was one of the most
learned men of his denomination. He had remarka-
ble versatility of mind, and was a persevering and suc-
cessful student in the field of theology. Indeed, "it
was hard to find a highway or byway of ingenious in-
vestigation where he did not leave his footprint." The
great mistake of his life, and one which he undoubtedly
regretted before his death, was his apology for the insti-
tution of human slavery. But we have every reason to
believe that the bishop was sincere in what he preach-
ed, and that, notwithstanding this failing, he was a de-
vout and consistent man of God. He was a voluminous

writer. Besides a number of pamphlets, sermons, and
addresses, he published Christiannity vindicated in a se-
ries of seven discourses on the external evidences of
the N. Test. (Burlington, 1833, 12mo)—The primitive
creed examined and explained (1834, 12mo)—The primitive
Church, compared with the P. E. Ch. (1835, 12mo)—The Ch. of
Rome, in its present capacity compared with the Ch. of
Rome at the pres. day (1839, 12mo).—Causes, Principles, and
Results of the Brit. Reform. (Phila. 1844, 12mo).—Hist.
of the Confessionalis (N.Y. 1850, 12mo).—Reforma-
tion of Milner's End of Controversy (1854, 2 vols. 12mo).
An answer has recently been published by Kenrick, Vin-
dication of the Church of England (Baltimore, 1853). The
bishop Hopkins's last works are a little brochure on the
law of ritualism—an argument based on scriptural and
historical grounds in behalf of the beauty of holiness in
the public services of his Church; and a History of the
Church in verse for Sunday-schools.—Amer Ch. Revieu,
April, 1868, p. 167; Allibone, Dict. of Authors; Vape-
reau, Dict. des Contemporains, p. 897.

J. H. W.

Hopkins, Samuel, D.D., a noted Calvinistic
divine, was born at Waterbury, Conn., Sept. 17, 1721,
and was at once set apart by his father for the ministry
of the Gospel. He entered Yale College in September,
1737. His course of academic studies was shortened,
and in 1741 he was called to the Pastorate of the Church
in Haven was stirred by the preaching of Whitefield and
Gibbon. The students were deeply affected, and
Hopkins was one of the converted. After gradu-
ation he commenced the study of theology with presi-
dent Edwards, and, though not an imitator of the pres-
ident, he acquired a powerfully influence over his con-
trary, any other man. In 1741 he began to preach, but
with great embarrassment and despondency. During
his first few months of probation he declined five invi-
tations for settlement. On Dec. 23, 1748, he was or-
dained over an infant church of five members in Hous-
ington, near Norwich. In 1751 he was called to the Mas-
setts, in this pastorate twenty-five years. He often preached
extemporaneously, and was indefatigable in parochial
labor. He gave offence to his people by his practice of
reading portions of Scripture in the Sabbath services,
a practice which was then unusual in New England.
From 1744 to 1768 the prosperity of the church was more
or less interrupted by the French and Indian war. Hop-
kins was obliged often to remove his family, and some-
times to go himself, for safety from Great Barrington.
His criticisms on the military movements of the British
army are quoted with admiration. His geniality is very
great. The baggage of each one amounts to five cart-loads.
Mighty preparations, but nothing done." On the banks of
the Mononaghela Washington was uttering almost the same
words to general Braddock. His church, during his
pastorate, increased in membership from five to 116.
He labored faithfully among the Indians of his vicinity,
and spent much of his time in personal intercourse with
Jonathan Edwards, then of Stockbridge. He became
unpopular with some members of his parish on account
of his strict terms of Church communion, his bold asser-
tions of Calvinistic doctrine, and his staunch patriotism.
He was especially disliked by the British Tories. Some
of his parishioners would give nothing for his support,
and others had nothing to give. In great poverty, he
left his parish in 1769. In April, 1770, he was installed
pastor of the church at Newport, which town was then
a port of commercial importance, and for many years
the rival of New York. During the early years of his
pastorate Hopkins enjoyed a visit from Whitefield. His
church in Newport flourished until the outbreak of the
Revolutionary War. In 1776 the town was captured by
the British, and remained in their possession three years
past. In 1779 Hopkins continued at his post until the last
moment, and then was compelled to flee. He spent the
interval in assisting his friend, Dr. Samuel Spring, of
Newburyport (see Life and Times of Gardner Spring
[N.Y. 1869, 2 vols. 12mo], i. 12 sq.), and in supplying
destitute churches in Connecticut. During his absence
his people were scattered, and his meeting-house nearly
demolished. He returned in 1779, and began to preach in a private room, but soon received aid from his friends in Boston and Newburyport for the restoration of his church edifice. He rejected eligible offers of settlement in other places, and remained faithful to his people, receiving no regular salary, but depending on precarious and temporary means of support. 

As soon as Hopkins commenced his pastoral labors at Newport he began to agitate the subject of slavery. At that time Newport was the great slave-market of New England. Hopkins affirmed that the town was built up by the blood of the Africans. Some of the wealthiest merchants were slave-traders. Many of his congregation were slave-owners. He astonished them with his first sermon against the slave system. The poet Whittier says: "It may well be doubted whether on that Sabbath day the angels of God, in their wide survey of his universe, looked down upon a nobler spectacle than that of the minister of Newport rising up before his slaveholding congregation, and demanding, in the name of the Highest, the deliverance of the captive, and the opening of the prison-doors to them that were bound." Only one family left his church; the others freely owned their slaves. He continued to preach on the subject, and many of his members intensively opposed the system. They left Rhode Island. In 1776 he published his celebrated Dialogue concerning the Slavery of the Africans, together with his Address to Slaveholders, copies of which were sent to all the members of the Continental Congress, and to missionaries throughout the land. It was reprinted by the New York Manumission Society as late as 1785. Hopkins entered into correspondence with Granville Sharp, Zachary Macaulay, and other English abolitionists. From them he borrowed the idea of colonizing the blacks; and he devised a colonization scheme, in which he practically stated the shipwrecked African's claim to maintenance as a clergyman. When the Federal Constitution was framed in 1787, he pointed to the clause recognising slavery in the United States, and said, "I fear this is an Achan, which will bring a curse, so that we cannot prosper." Of a movement so vast as the anti-slavery reform in the United States no one man can claim to be the author; but Dr. Hopkins was most certainly the pioneer in that movement.

It is not, however, as a philanthropist, but as a theologian, that Hopkins is generally known. In his extreme indigence he writes: "I have been saved from anxiety about living, and have had thousands of times less care and trouble in the world than if I had had a great abundance. Being unconnected with the great and rich, I have had more time to attend to my studies, and particularly have had leisure to write my System of Divinity, which I hope will not prove useless." By this system, and by his various independent enterprises, he gave occasion for the name "Hopkinsian," as applied to the views of eminent New England divines. He regarded himself as an Evangelical. He had been the most intimate of president Edwards's companions, had revised the president's manuscripts, had unfailingly edited some of them, and was more exactly acquainted than any other man with the president's original speculations. He wrote the first memoir of Edwards, of which the Encyclopaedia Britannica says, it is "equal in simplicity, though by no means in anything else, to the most exquisite work of Walpole.

The prominent tenets of Hopkinsianism are the following: 1. All real holiness consists in disinterested benevolence. 2. All sin consists in selfishness. 3. There are no promises of regenerate grace made to the doings of the unregenerate. 4. The impotency of sinners with respect to believing in Christ is not natural, but moral. 5. A sinner is required to approve in his heart of the divine conduct, even though it should cast him off forever. 6. God has exerted his power in such a manner as he purposed would be followed by the existence of sin. 7. The introduction of moral evil into the universe is so overruled by God as to promote the general good. 8. Repentance is before faith in Christ. 9. Though men became sinners by Adam, according to a divine constitution, yet they have, and are accountable for, no sins but personal. 10. Though believers are justified through Christ's righteousness, yet his righteousness is not transferred to them. Dr. Nathaniel Emmons (q.v.), who wrote the most eminent defense of Hopkinsianism, and who described it as characterized by the ten preceding articles, added the following (see Park, Memoir of Emmons) as his own views, and as supplemental to those of his friend Hopkins: 1. Holiness and sin consist in free voluntary exercises. 2. Men act freely under the influence of the divine law. 3. The acts of the divine law deservc eternal punishment. 4. Right and wrong are founded in the nature of things. 5. God exercises mere grace in pardoning or justifying penitent believers through the atonement of Christ, and mere goodness in rewarding them for their good works. 6. Notwithstanding the total depravity of sinners, God has a right to require them to turn from sin to holiness. 7. Preachers of the Gospel ought to exhort sinners to love God, repent of sin, and believe in Christ immediately. 8. Men are active, not passive, in regeneration. Some of these eight propositions are distinctly arrovcd, others more or less narrowly implied. Dr. Emmons regarded Hopkinsianism as in some respects high and intense Calvinism; as, in other respects (the doctrine of general atonement for example), moderate Calvinism; and as, on the whole, "consistent Calvinism.

Amid his labors as a reformer and theologian, Dr. Hopkins vigorously discharged his parochial duties, until he was struck with paralysis, in his seventy-eighth year. He continued to preach during the next four years. With a revival of religion his ministry had commenced, and with it the rising and the setting of his sun. He wrote out a list of his congregation, and offered a separate prayer for each individual. Thirty-one conversions followed. After his discourses on the 16th of Oct., 1805, he exclaimed, "Now I have done; I can preach no more." He staggered from the pulpit to his bed, from which he never rose. He died on the 20th of December, 1808.

In person Dr. Hopkins was tall and vigorous; in his movements dignified, though unyielding. His head was large and square, and his face beamed with intelligence. The movements of his mind were like those of his body, powerful, but of a clumsy. Indeed the blindness which he imputed to what he deemed his duty, with utter self-sacrifice for the right, was his main characteristic. "Love to being in general" was with him not the mere by-word of a sect, but the enthusiastic purpose of his life. He had not the temperament which inspires enthusiasm, and he had not little tact in personal intercourse with men; but in the depths of his indigence he was true to himself, and showed all the courage of a Hampden. He studied hardly ever less than fourteen hours a day, and sometimes even as many as eighteen, in a little room of eleven feet by seven. Every Saturday he fasted, and thus gained spiritual strength for the toils of earth by communion with Heaven. He labored for Indians and selfish white men; for poor negroes who had then no other friend; and for theological science, which gave him respect, but little bread—"ripius proper alioius." In 1834 his Works (before he was only published by the Massachusetts Doctrinal Tract Society (3 vols. 8vo), containing over 2000 pages, with a Memoir by Prof. Edward A. Park of 266 pages.

The character and writings of Dr. Hopkins have recently been depicted for general readers in a very striking way in Mrs. Stone's Minister's Woes. See also Congreg. Quar. Rev. 1864, p. 7 sq.; Hagenbach, History of Doctr. ii, 436, 438; Shedd, Hist. of Doctr., i, 383, 408; ii, 25, 81, 489; Buchanan, Justification, p. 190. For the diffusion of Hopkinsianism and its later modifications, see NEW ENGLAND THEOLOGY. On the relation of Hopkins's theory to the orthodox view of redemption,
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see Bange, Errors of Hopkinsianism (N. York, 12mo); Hodgson, New Divinity Examined (N. York, 12mo); art. Edwards, in Herzog, Real-Encyclop.; Christian Examiner, 1843, p. 169 sqq.; Adams, View of all Religions, p. 168; Spring, On the Nature of Duty; Ely, Contrast between Calvinism and Hopkinsianism (N. Y. 1811); Bib. Sue, April, 1852, p. 448 sqq.; Jan. 1853, p. 639, 671; July, 1852, and vi); New Englander, 1866, p. 284 sqq.; Life and Times of Gardiner Spring (N. Y. 1866, 2 vols. 12mo), ii, 5 sqq. (W. E. P.)

Hopkins, William, 1, an English divine, was born at Evesham, Worcestershire, and educated at Trinity College, Oxford. He entered the ministry in 1675, and, after holding several minor appointments, was made chaplain of Lindridge in 1686, and in 1697 master of St. Oswald's Hospital, Worcester. He died in 1700. He published Sermons (1683, 4to):—Bartram (or Bartram), on the Body and Blood of the Lord (2d ed. 1688):—Animal, on Johnson's Answer to Jocelyn (Lond. 1691, 8vo):—Latin translation of a German Tract on the Burial-place of the Saxon Saints (in Hicken's Septuagint Grammar, Ox. 1705). After his death, Dr. Geo. Hickes published Sermesen after his Sermons, with Life (Lond. 1708, 8vo).

Hopkins, William, 2, a Church of England clergyman, but an Arian in theology, was born at Monmouth in 1716. He entered All Souls College, Oxford, in 1724, and became vicar of Bolney, Sussex, in 1731. In 1734 he became master of the grammar school of Cuckfield, and died in 1786. His principal works are An Appeal to the Common Sense of all Christian People on the doctrine of the Trinity (Lond. 1754, 12mo):—Exod. our correct Translation, with Notes critical and apropos; published 1754, 4to, with a preface of some anonymous pamphlets against compulsory subscription to the Thirty-nine Articles.—Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 886; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica, p. 1587.

Hopkinsianism, a name given to the theological system of Dr. Samuel Hopkins (q.v.).

Hoplótheâ (Οπλοθῆ), an army) is the title of a book which contains the decisions of the Church fathers against heretical doctrines, and which was used to controvert such doctrines. It was most probably prepared at the request of the emperor, and Conmenus. —Fuhrmann, Handwörter, der Kirchengechist, ii, 347. (J. H. W.)

Hopton, Susannah, a religious writer, born in Staffordshire, England, in 1627, was the wife of Richard Hopton, a Welsh judge. She became at one time a Roman Catholic, but on realizing the inconsistency of her return to the Protestant Church. She died in 1700. Her writings are all on religious topics, intended to lead the reader to a devout and holy life. They are Daily Devotions (Lond. 1673, 12mo; 5th ed. 1713);—Meditations, etc. (publ. by N. Spincks, Lond. 1717, 8vo). She also remedied the omissions of the ancient way of offices (originally by John Austin, who died in 1659), with a preface by Dr. George Hicks (q. v.) (1717, 8vo; new ed. 1846, 8vo). —Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 887; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographia, i, 1588.

Hor (Heb. id. פָּרָע or פָּרָע; Sept. ὁ φαράω), the name of two eminent mountains (יוֹם פָּרָע i.e. the "Hor of the mountains," remarkable as the only case in which the name comes first; Sept. ὁ φαράω, Vulg. mons altissimus: and Jerome (Ep. ad Filiobam) non in monte sempiterne sed in monte venti. See MOUNT.

1. An eminent mountain of Arabia Petraea, on the confines of Idumea, and forming part of the mountain chain of Seir or Edom. It is first mentioned in Scripture in connection with the circumstances recorded in Numb. 22—29. It was "on the boundary line" (Numb. xx, 28) or "at the edge" (xxxii, 37) of the land of Edom. It was the next halting-place of the people after Kadesh (xx, 22; xxxiii, 37), and they quitted it for Zalmonah (xxxiii, 41), in the road to the Red Sea (xxi, 4). It was during the encamping at Mt. Hor that Aaron was gathered to his fathers (Numb. xxxiii, 37—41). At the command of Jehovah, his brother, he lifted his rod, and cursed the mountain. He then passed and circumcised the mountain, in the presence of the people, "in the eyes of all the congregation." The garments, and with the garments the office, of high-priest were taken from Aaron and put upon Eleazar, and Aaron died there before the top of the mountain. In the presence of the ascent of the height to die, and in the marked exclusion from the Promised Land, the end of the one brother resembled the end of the other; but in the presence of the two survivors, and of the gazing crowd below, there is a striking difference between this event and the solitary death of Moses in AARON. The Israelites passed the mountain several times in going up and down the Red Sea; and the station Mosera (Deut. x, 6) must have been at the foot of the mount (Deut. xxxii, 50). See MOSERA.

The mountain now identified with Mount Hor is the most conspicuous in the whole range of Mount Seir, and at this day bears the name of Mount Aaron (Jebel-Ha-rum). It is in N. lat. 30° 18', E. long. 35° 33', about midway between the Dead Sea and the Atlantic Gulf. It may be open to question if this is really the Mount Hor on which Aaron died, seeing that the whole range of Seir was covered by a mountain called by that name to a great height, and the remarkable manner in which it rises among the surrounding rocks, it seems not unlikely to have been the chosen scene of the high-priest's death (Kimneir, p. 127). Accordingly, Stanley observes that Mount Hor is one of the very few spots connected with the Old Testament, though, strange to say, the two are not visible to each other — the mysterious city of Petra. The tradition has existed from the earliest date. Josephus does not mention the name of Hor (Ant. iv, 4, 7), but he describes the death of Aaron as taking place "on a very high mountain which surrounded the metropolis of theaken, and other towns," which latter was formerly called Avra (Apea), but now Petra. In the Onomasticon of Eusebius and Jerome it is Or mons—a mountain in which Aaron died, close to the city of Petra. When it was visited by the Crusaders (see the quotations in Robinson, Researches, ii, 921) the sanctuary was already on its site, and there is but little doubt that it was then what it is now —the Jebel Nabi-Harum, "the mountain of the prophet Aaron." Of the geological formation of Mount Hor we have no very trustworthy accounts. The general structure of the range of Edom, of which it forms the most prominent feature, is new sandstone, displaying itself to an enormous thickness. Above that is the Jura limestone, and higher still the cretaceous beds, which latter in Mount Seir are reported to be 3500 feet thick (Wilson, Bible Lands, i, 194). Through the length of the long ridges, red granite and porphyry have forced their way, running nearly north and south, and so completely silicifying the neighboring sandstone as often to give it the look of a primitive rock. These combinations are due the extraordinary colors for which Petra is so famous. One of the best descriptions of the mountain itself is that given by Irby and Mangles (Travels, p. 483 sqq.). It is said to be entirely sandstone, in very horizontal strata (Wilson, i, 290). Its height, according to the latest measurements, is 4800 feet (Eng.) above the Mediterranean, that is to say, about 1700 feet above the town of Petra, 4600 above the level of the Arabah, and
more than 6000 above the Dead Sea (Roth, in Peterman's Mittheil. 1856, i. 8). The mountain is marked far and near by its double top, which rises like a huge castellated building from a lower base, and is surmounted by the circular dome of the tomb of Aaron, a distinct white spot on the dark red surface of the mountain (Labarde, p. 143). This lower base is the "plain of Aaron," beyond which Burchhardt was, after all his toils, prevented from ascending (Syrinx, p. 431). "Out of this plain, culminating in its two summits, springs the red sandstone mass, from its base upwards rocky and naked, not a bush or a tree to relieve the rugged and broken corners of the sandstone blocks which compose it. On ascending this mass a little plain is found to lie between the two peaks, marked by a white cypress, and not unlike the celebrated plain of the cypress under the summit of Jebel Mûna, traditionally believed to be the scene of Elijah's vision. The southernmost of the two, on approaching, takes a conical form. The northernmost is truncated, and crowned by the chapel of Aaron's tomb." The chapel or mosque is a small square building, measuring inside about 28 feet by 33 (Wilson, i. 295), with its door in the S.W. angle. It is built of rude stones, in part broken columns; all of sandstone, but fragments of granite and marble lie about. Steps lead to the flat roof of the chapel, from which rises a white dome as usual over a saint's tomb. 4 The interior of the chapel consists of two chambers, one below the other. The upper one has four large pillars and a stone chest, or tombstone, like one of the ordinary slabs in church-yards, but larger and higher, and rather bigger at the top than at the bottom. At its head is a high round stone, on which sacrifices are made, and which retained, when Stephens saw it, the marks of the smoke and blood of recent offerings. "On the slab are Arabic inscriptions, and it is covered with shawls chiefly red. One of the pillars is hung with votive offerings of beads, etc., and two ostrich eggs are suspended over the chest. Steps in the north-west angle lead down to the lower chamber, which is partly in the rock, but plastered. It is perfectly dark. At the end, apparently under the stone chest above, is a recess guarded by a grating. Within this is a rude protuberance, whether of stone or plaster was not ascertainable, resting on wood, and covered by a ragged pall. This lower recess is no doubt the tomb, and possibly ancient. What is above is only the artificial monument, and certainly modern." In one of the walls of this chamber is a "round, polished black stone," one of those mysterious stones of which the prototype is the Kaaba at Mecca, and which, like that, would appear to be the object of great devotion (Martineau, p. 419 sq.).

The chief interest of Mount Hor will always consist in the prospect from its summit—the last view of Aaron—"that view which was to him what Pisgah was to his brother" (Ortolano, De Morte Aaronis, Lips. 1704). It is described at length by Irby (p. 134), Wilson (i. 292-9), Martineau (p. 429), and is well summed up by Stanley in the following words: "We saw all the main points on which his eye must have rested. He looked over the valley of the Arabah counteracted by its hundred watercourses, and beyond, over the white mountains of the wilderness they had so long traversed; and at the northern edge of it there must have been visible the heights through which the Israelites had vainly attempted to force their way into the Promised Land. This was the western view. Close around him on the east were the rugged mountains of Edom, and far along the horizon the wide downs of Mount Seir, through which the passage had been denied by the wild tribes of Esau who hunted over their long slopes." On the north lay the mysterious Dead Sea, gleaming from the depths of its profound basins (Stephens, Incidents). "A dreary moment and a dreary scene—such must have seemed to the aged priest. ... The peculiarity of the view is the combination of wide extension with the scarcity of marked features. Petra is shut out by intervening rocks. But the survey of the Desert on one side, and the mountains of Edom on the other, is complete; and of these last the great feature is the mass of red, bouldered sandstone rocks, intersected, not by valleys, but by deep seams" (S. and Pal. p. 87). Though Petra itself is entirely shut out, one outlying building—if it may be called a building—is visible, that which goes by the name of the Desr, or Convent. Professor Stanley has thrown out a suggestion on the connection between the two which is well worth further investigation. (See Robinson, Researches, ii. 548, 573, 651.) The impression received on the spot is that Aaron's death took place in the small basin between the two peaks, and that the people were stationed either on the plain at the base of the peaks, or at that part of the wady Abu-Kushebyeh from which the top is commanded. Josephus says that the ground was sloping downwards (saurinthes ἤν τῷ γωνίῳ; Ant. iv. 4, 7). But this may be the mere general expression of a man who had never been on the spot. (See Bertou, Le mont Hor, Par. 1860.)
2. A mountain entirely distinct from the preceding, named in Numb. xxxiv., 7, 8, only as one of the marks of the northern boundary of the land which the children of Israel were about to conquer. By many it has been regarded as designating Mount Cæsarea, but this is rather the northern part of Syria, and Venantius Psuedo- doujon renders Mount Hor by *Umanos*, probably intending Aman. The latter is also the reading of the Talmud; (Gittin, 8, quoted by Furst, s. v.), in which it is connected with the Amana named in Cant. iv, 8. But the situation of this Amana or Abana river which flowed through Damascus, as that is quite away from the position required in the passage, (Psalms, p. 25.), after Parchi (in Benj. of Tude- lsa, p. 413 sq.), identifies it with Jebel Nauris, south of Tripoli, but on trifling grounds; nor was the mound without question on the Mediterranean, and Palestine did not extend so far north. The original is אֵילֶת אָרָן, moun t of the mountain, i. e. by a common Hebrew idiom, the Mountain, by way of eminence, i.e. the lofty mountain; Sept. φόρος, Vulg. mons altissimus; and therefore probably only denotes the prominent mountain of that vicinity, i.e. Lebanon, or at most Mount Hermon, which is an offshoot of the Lebanon range, and hardly be regarded here as a proper name. The northern boundary started from the sea; the first point in it was Mount Hor, and the second the entrance of Hamath. Since Sidon was subsequently allotted to the most north- ern tribe of the priests, and was, as far as we know, the most northern town so allotted, it would seem probable that the northern boundary would commence at that point; that is opposite to where the great range of Lebanon breaks down to the sea. The next landmark, the entrance to Hamath, seems to have been determined by Mr. Porter and Kalat el-Humus, in the ancient Hamath—at the other end of the range of Lebanon. Surely "Mount Hor," then, can be nothing else than the great chain of Lebanon itself. Looking at the massive character and enormous height of the range, it is very difficult to suppose that any individual peak or mountain is intended and not the whole mass, which takes nearly a straight course between the two points just named, and includes below it the great plain of the Beka'a, and the whole of Palestine properly so called.

Hore Canonice, etc. See Breviary; Hours, Canonical, etc.; Ho'ram (Heb. Horam), מ確か, lofty; Sept. Ἢραμ, v. Α'l.בך, 'El'ām, Alām), the king of Gezer, who, coming to the relief of Lachish, was overthrown by Joshua (Josh. x, 39). B.C. 1618.

Horapollo, or Horus Apollo, an Egyptian priest, and author of a treatise on Egyptian Hieroglyphics. Several writers of this name are mentioned by Suidas, Stephanus of Byzantium under Phenebuthus, Photius (p. 536, ed. Bekker), and Eustathius (Homer, Od. d.), but it is doubtful which of them was actually the author of the treatise on Egyptian Hieroglyphics. The probability is, that the work was originally written in the Egyptian language, and translated into Greek by a later writer. Horus was the name of one of the Egyptian deities, who was considered by the Greeks to be the same as Apollo (Herod. ii, 144-156). We learn from Lucian (Pro Inop. § 27) that the Egyptians were frequently called by the names of their gods; and other ancient scholars esteem it more highly than former critics did. It was printed for the first time by Aldus (Venice, 1505), with the Fables of Aesop. The best editions are by Mercier (1551), Hor- schelius (1555), De Pauw (1727), and Leemans (Aret. 1834). The last discussed in his introduction the date and authorship of the work. See English Cyclopedia; Hoefner, Nouv. Dic. Gén., xxx, 166; Bunsen, Egyptians Stelie in d. Weltsch. i, 402; Champollion, Précis du Système du Monde Ancien, p. 497 sqq. Comp. hieroglyphics.

Horayoth. See Talmud.

Horb, Johann Heinrich, a distinguished German Pietist, brother-in-law and co-worker of Spener, was born at Colmar, Alsace, June 11, 1645. He studied at the universities of Strasburg, Jena, Wittenberg, and Cologne, afterwards travelled through the Netherlands, England, France, and eventually finally returned to Strasburg in 1670. In 1671 he received an appointment as minister at Birkenfeld, and in 1673 at Trarbach. Here the boldness with which he presented his so-called pietistic views disturbed the equanimity of the orthodox authorities, and he was obliged to resign. He next became pastor at Windenheim, Franconia, and in 1685 accepted a call as pastor of St. Nicholas Church, Hamburg, where he found himself associated with two other Pietists, John Winkler and Abraham Hinkelmann. Their joint teachings created great excitement, which culminated when, in 1698, Horb published, under the title of D. Klugheis d. Gerechten, a translation of Fairer's excellent pamphlet, L'etats principe de l'education Christiane des enfants. The agitation became so violent that in 1694 he was formally suspended, after which he retired to Steinbeck, where he died in Jan. 1693. He published Hist. Ori- gentium, etc. (Frankfort, 1670, 4to); Hist. Manichaeorum (Argent., 1670, 4to); Diagn. de ultimis originis harernsium Simoniae Mogut (Leipzig, 1690, 4to); and also in Vogt's Bibl. hist. hevraicÌ in, 308 sq.); — Hist. heres. Unitarior. (Frankfort, 1671, 4to); and a collection of sermons, D. Leiden Jeu- Christi (Hamburg, 1700).—Hertzog, Real-Encyclopädie, vi, 261; Foerster, Gesch. der Kirche, i, 837 sq.; Moller; Cimbr. litterar., ii, 355 sq.; Walch, Relig. Streitigkeiten, in d. duth. Kirche, i, 615 sq.; Henken, Kirchen- geschichte, iv, 526 sq. (J. H. W.)

Horbery, Matthew, D.D., an English divine, was born at Haxay, Lincolnshire, in 1677; educated at Lincoln College, and elected fellow of Magdalen College. He became successively vicar of Eccleshall, canon of Lincoln, vicar of Hanbury, and rector of Stanlake. He died in 1773. He was greatly respected as a sound, able, and learned theologian, and an amiable and excellent man. His sermons were praised by Dr. Johnson; they are written in nervous, animated language, yet with great simplicity; the articles in the classes therefore form excellent compositions of English divines. "His Works, including the Sermons, and an Essay on the Eternity of Future Punishments, have been collected and published (Oxford, 1828, 2 vols. 8vo).—Darling, Cyclopædia Bibliographica, i, 1539; Hook, Eccl. Esgy. vi, 150; Waterland, Waters, i, 116, 242, 254; vi, 416 sq.

Horch, Heinrich, S.T.D., a German Pietist and Mystic, was born at Eschwege, Hessen, in 1652. He studied theology and medicine at Marburg, where he came under the influence of the great follower of Spener (q. v.), Theodor Unterczyk, and embraced the doctrines of the Mystics. He also studied the Cartesian philosophy with much interest. In 1685 he was appointed minister at Heidelberg, in 1686 court preacher at Kreuz- nach, but in 1687 he retired again to Heidelberg. At the university of that place he obtained the degree of doctor of theology. In 1699 he went to Frankfort as minister, and in 1704 became church, and in 1706 was professor of theology at Heurnen. By his firm adhe- rence, however, to the Mystic Arnold (q. v.), and his peculiar views of theology, holding, e.g. that divine revelations still continue, that the "book of the living" is useful, and that the eucharist and baptism are unnecessary, etc., he finally lost his position (all 1698). He afterwards wandered about, preaching in city halls and in cemeteries. At times he even entered churches, and preached in spite
of the remonstrances of the ministers. He was arrested for this conduct in 1699, and became partially insane. He recovered, however, towards the close of the year 1700, and, by the interposition of his friends, he was granted a pension in 1703, which was continued until his death, August 5, 1729. Horeb was also a Millennium- an; he likewise demanded a second and more complete reformation of the Church, advocated celibacy, though he did not think the married life sinful, and is said to have been a member of the Philadelphia Society (q. v.), founded in 1696 by Jane Lead. He wrote a number of works, of which a complete list is given by Jöcher (Gel. Lex., Adelung's Supplement, ii, 2188 sq.), and of which the Mystische u. Prophetische Bibel (Marb. 1712, 4to) is especially celebrated as the forerunner of the Berleburg Bible (q. v.). Franz Haas (G. u. L. F. Dr. J. F. C. G. Helm. der christlichen Lehre in d. reinen, westph. ev. Kirche (Coblentz, 1852), i, 741-51, Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, vi, 262 sq.; Fuhrmann, Handwörterbuch d. Kirchengesch. ii, 349 sq.; Theol. Univ. Lex. ii, 369.)

Höre (Heb. Chôr, בֹּר, Bôr or בּוֹר, Bôr, desert; Sept. Χῶρας or Χῶρης; occur Exod. iii, 1; xvii, 6, xxxiii, 6; Deut. ii, 6, 19; iv, 10, 15; v, 2; ix, 8; xviii, 16; xxxii, 4, 33; Jos. ii, 29; Josh. x, 14; Judges xxii, 6; 1 Sam. iii, 15; Ps. cxxii, 19; Mal. iv, 4; Ecles. xlviii, 7), according to some, a lower part or peak of Mount Sinai, so called at the present day, from which one ascends towards the summit of the mountain (Jebel Musa), properly so called (so Gesenius and others after Burchhardt, Travels in Syria, p. 431, 2d ed. 1807), in consequence of which term being applied in Syria both to the whole mountain, of which Sinai was a particular summit (so Hengstenberg, Allgemeine Geschichte der Pental. ii, 396), Robinson, Bibl. Researches, i, 177, 551), See Sina.

Horebites, a sect of the Huzzites, who, upon the death of Ziska, when they had retired from Boehemia, they chose Bedrich of Bohemia as their leader. They called themselves Horebites because they had given the name of Horeb to a mountain to which they had retired. See Gräbner, Kirchengesch., xxxiv, 688. See Huzzites.

Horem (Heb. Chôrêm, כּוּרֶם, consecrated but forssen according to Fürst; Sept. Θόραμ [but most texts blend with preceding name into Μεγαλαθαομια και Μεγαλαθαομισ], Vulg. Horem), one of the "fenced cities" of Naphtali, mentioned between Migdal-el and Beth-anath (Josh. xix, 38), Schwarz (Puelet, p. 184) confounds Horem, which he places preceding in the list of cities, with Merom, both in the modern village Medj el-Kerum, eight miles east of Akka; but this does not lie within the ancient limits of Naphtali (Keil, ad loc.). Van de Velde (i, 178, 9; Memoir, p. 322) suggests Hurah as the site of Horem. It is an ancient site, in the centre of the country, half way between the Ras en-Nakura and the lake Merom, on a tell at the southern end of the wady el-Ain, one of the natural features of the country. It is also in favor of this identification that Hurah is near Yarûn, probably the representative of the ancient Irôn, named with Horem. (Compare Seetzen, Reisen durch Syrien, Berlin, 1854-5, ii, 180.)

Hor-hagid'gad (Hebrew Chôr hay-Gidgad, בּוֹר הַגִּדָּג, hole of the Gidgad; Sept. Στόχος τῶν Πασχαντός; Vulg. mons Hagidgad, both apparently reading or misunderstanding בּוֹר or בּוֹר for הַגִּדָּג), the thirty-third station of the Israelites between Bene-Jaakan and Jotbathah (Num. xxxiii, 32, 35); evidently the same with their forty-first station Gudgodah, between the same places in the opposite direction, and not far from Mount Hor (Deut. x, 6, 7). Winer (Realw. s. v. Horidgad) assents to the possibility of the identity of this name with that of wady Chukakkâd, in the eastern part of the desert Et-Tih (Robinson's Researches, iii, App. 210, b), although the names are spelt and signify differently (this valley would be in Hebrew characters בֽוֹר הַגִּדָּג, but objects to the identification thus proposed by Ewald (Israel. Gesch, ii, 207) on the ground that בּוֹר can hardly mean a wade valley. This difficulty, however, does not weigh much, since the wady may only be the representative of the name anciently attached to some spot in the vicinity, more properly called a chamaa; and even this spot is sufficiently an old form of wady, as it has been washed down by the freshets, which may naturally have partly filled it up in the course of ages. With this identification Rabbi Schwarz likewise agrees (Puelet, p. 213). See Eusebe. The name Gidgad or Gadgad, according to Gesenius, is from an Ethiopic redduplicated root, signifying to reer amorese, as thouer; but, according to Fürst, signifies a cliff, from יָדָּג to incise. See Gudgodah.

Hor'zi (Heb. Chôri, כּוּרִי or כּוּרָי, prob. a "troglo- dyte," or dweller in a cave, כּוּרֶה, otherwise an auger; Sept. Χορίας, Οίδας, and Χορίας; Vulg. Hori and Hurri), the name of two men.

1. A son of Lotan and grandson of Seir, of the abo- riginal inhabitants of Idumea (Gen. xxxvi, 12; 1 Chron. i, 39). B.C. cir. 1664.

2. The son of Japhet, which latter was the commissioner of the tribe of Simeon sent by Moses to explore the land of Canaan (Num. xiii, 3). B.C. ante 1657.

3. (Gen. xxxvi, 30.) See Horite.

Hör'tim (Deut. ii, 12, 22). See Horite.

Hôr'ite (Heb. Chôri, כּוּרִי, כּוּרֶה, prop. the same word as Hor; but, according to Fürst, noble; often with the art. הָוָרִי, a designation (both singly and collectively) of the people who anciently inhabited Mount Seir, before their supersede by the Edomites; rendered "Horites" in Gen. xiv, 6 (Sept. Χορίων, Vulg. Chóri, "Horreúrum"); see Hōri, Horrēâ, Horāreâ, Horreus; Deut. i, 12 (Χορίων, Χορράτους, and "Hori," Gen. xxxvi, 13 (Χορίων, Χορράτους), "Horrea"). Deut. ii, 12 (Χορίων, Χορράτους, and "Hori," Gen. xxxvi, 13 (Χορίων, Χορράτους), "Horrea"). See IDUMEA. There are indications of Canaanitish affinity between the Horites and the Hittites or Hivites (Michaelis, Speichert, p. 169, and De Troglodytis Seir, in his Syntagma Comment. 1759, p. 194; Faber, Arch. e. p. 41; Hamelveld, iii, 29; but see contra Bertheau, Gesch. der Iser. p. 150). See Hittite. Their excavated dwellings are still found by hundreds in the same mountainous and desert tracts and especially in Petra. See Edom and Edomite. It may, perhaps, be to the Horites Job refers in xxx, 6, 7. They are only three times mentioned in Scripture: first, when they were smitten by the kings of the East (Gen. xiv, 6); then when their genealogy is given in Gen. xxxvi, 20-30, and 1 Chron. i, 38-42; and, lastly, when they were exterminated by the Edomites (Deut. ii, 12, 22). It appears probable that they were not Canaanites, but an earlier race, who inhabited Mount Seir before the pos- session of Canaan took possession of Palestine (Ewald, Geschichte, i, 304, 4 B) (Smith). Knobel (Volkerdeut d. Genesis, p. 195, 306) holds that they formed part of the great race of the Ludim, to which also the Rephaim, the Emins, and the Amorites belonged (comp. Hitzig, Gesch. d. V. Israel, Lpz. 1869, i, 29-36). In this case the Amo- rites were of Semitic descent. According to the ac- count in Gen. xxxvi, 20 sqq., they were divided into seven tribes. See CANAAN.

Hôr'mah (Heb. Chôrmak, כּוּרָמְק, devoted city, otherwise peak of a hill; Sept. Εὐαράμ and άνώσυμα, a royal city of the Canaanites in the south of Palestine (Josh. xi, 14; 1 Sam. xxx, 80), near which the Israelites experienced a discomfiture from the Amalekites resident there, as they perversely attempted to enter Canaan by that route after the divine sentence of wandering (Num. xiv, 4, 33; 2 Sam. ix, 1, 3); Deut. i, 44). Joshua afterwards besieged its king (Josh. xv, 30), and on its capture assigned the city to the tribe of Judah, but finally it was included in the territory given
to Simeon (Josh. xix. 4; Judg. i. 17; 1 Chron. iv. 30). It is elsewhere mentioned only in 1 Chron. iv. 30. It was originally called Zephath (Judg. i. 17), under which name it appears to have been again rebuilt and occupied by the Canaanites (see Berthelot, ad loc.; Hengstenberg, Pontif. ii, 220); whereas the name Hornah was given by the Laterites in token of its demolition (see Numb. xxxii. 3). Hence traces of the older name alone remain. See Zephath.

Hornah, Simon, with the surname Bavarius, was prior in the monastery of Altenmünster St. Salvador, in Bavaria, and later general of the order. He died in 1701. His works are Breviarium una cum Missali Monasticum of Berne and are in other codices celebres S. Vri- gitus, ordinis S. Salveatoris Fundatricis (Munich, 1680, fol.).—Pierer, Unie.-Lex., viii. 537.

Hormisda, pope, born at Frosinone, near Rome, was elected bishop of Rome in 514, as successor of Symmachus. In 515, by invitation of the Eastern emperor Anastasius, he sent an embassy to a council held at Heraclea for the purpose of settling the point of disunion between the Oriental and Occidental churches; but as this council, as well as a second one held in 517, did not bring about any favorable results, Anastasius, wearied by Hormisda's refusal to make any concessions, broke off all relations with Rome. After his death in 518, his successor Justinus II made another attempt at reconciliation, and the union of that church with Rome was finally restored in 519, after a schism of thirty-five years. Hormisda's conduct was much more measured in the controversy concerning Faustus of Rhegium, of whom he said that, though his writings may not deserve a place with those of the fathers, yet that such parts of them were to be received as did not conflict with the teachings of the Church. He died Aug. 6, 523. Eighty letters of Hormisdas are preserved in Labbe.—Herzog, Real-Encyklop., vol. vi.; Labbe, Concilia, iv, 1415; Man- man, Lat. Chr., i, 842 sq.; Riddle, Popes, i, 199; Bon- ner, Cont. of the Popes, ii, 279 sq.; Schaff, Ch. Hist., ii, 825; Neander, Ch. History, ii, 533, 649 sq.; Hist. of Dogmas, p. 841; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doct. ii, 280; Dorner, Lehrb. r. Pera. Hist., i, 156; Wetzer u.Welte, Kirchen-Lex., v, 329; Dollinger, Lehrb. d. Kirchengesch. i, 151. See EUTYCHIANES. (J. H. W.)

Horn (גֶּרֶם, ke'em, identical in root and signification with the Latin cornu and Eng. horn). Gr. κέρας is used in Scripture with a great latitude of meaning.

1. Literally (Josh. vi. 4, 5; compare Exod. xiii, 13; 1 Sam. xvi. 13, 13; 1 Kings i, 39; Job xii. 14).—Two purposes are mentioned in the Scriptures to which the horn seems to have been applied. As horns are hollow and easily polished, they have in ancient times been used for drinking-vessels and for military purposes. They were especially convenient for holding liquids (1 Sam. xvi. 13, 13; 1 Kings i, 39) and were even made instruments of music (Josh. vi. 5).

2. Trumpets were probably at first merely horns perforated at the tip, such as are still used upon mountain-farms for calling home the laborers at meal-time. If the A. V. of Josh. vi. 4, 5 ("rams' horns") be correct, this would settle the question [see Ram's Horn]; but the fact seems to be that הָרִים has nothing to do with rams, and that הָרִים, horns, serves to indicate an instrument which originally was made of horn, though afterwards, no doubt, constructed of different materials (comp. Varro, L. l. v. 24, 35; "cornus quod ex qua nunc sunt ex are tunc fiant e cornu hulcui"). See fig. The hand which were thus made into trumpets were probably those of oxen rather than of rams; the latter would scarcely produce a note sufficiently imposing to suggest its association with the fall of Jericho. See Trumpet.

3. The word Horn (גַּלְתָּן, qalṭān) was also applied to a flask, or vessel, made of horn, containing oil (1 Sam. xvi. 13, 13; 1 Kings i, 39), or used as a kind of toilet-bottle, filled with the preparation of antimony with which women tinged their eyelashes (Keren-huppach = paiš-horn, name of one of Job's daughters, Job xlii. 14). So in English drinking-horn (commonly called a horn). In the same way the Greek κέρας sometimes signifies bugle, trumpet, (Xenoph. An. ii. 2, 4), and sometimes drinking-horn (vii, 7, 29). So also in the Latin it means trumpet and also oil-cup (Horace, Sat. ii. 2, 61, and fusel (Virg., Georg. iii. 509). See also INX-HORN.

II. Metaphorically.—These uses of the word are often based upon some literal object like a horn, and at other times they are purely figurative.

1. From similarity of Form.—To this use belongs the metaphorical application of the word horn to the trumpet of metal, as already mentioned. Horns of ivory, that is, elephants' teeth, are mentioned in Ezek. xxvii. 15, either metaphorically, from similarity of form, or, as seems more probable, from a vulgar error. See Ivory. But more specific are the following metaphors:

(a) The altar of burnt-offerings (Exod. xxvii. 2) and the altar of incense (Exod. xxx. 2) had each at the four corners four horns of shittim-wood, the first being overlaid with brass, the second with gold (Exod. xxxvii. 25; xxxviii. 2; Jer. xviii. 1; Amos iii. 14). Upon the horns of the altar of burnt-offerings was to be heaped the fat of the peace-offering, the fat of the sin-bloot (Exod. xxii. 13; Lev. iv. 7-18; viii. 15; ix. 9; xvi. 18; Ezek. xlii. 20). By laying hold of these horns of the altar of burnt-offering the criminal found an asylum and safety (1 Kings i, 50; li. 28), but only when the crime was accidental (Exod. xxvi. 14). These horns are said to have served as a means for binding the animal destined for sacrifice (Psa. cxviii. 27), but this use Winer (Handwörterb.) denies, asserting that they did not and could not answer for such a purpose. These altar-horns are, of course, not to be supposed to have been made of horn, but to have been mere indications from the four living creatures (Exod. xxxiv. 26; 2 Macc. ii. 17). See also LAMB-HORN.

(2) The peak or summit of a hill was called a horn (Isa. v. 1, where hill = horn in Heb.; comp. κέρας, Xenoph. An. v. 6, 7, and cornis, Stat. Theb. v. 532; Arab. "Kurbin Hattin," Robinson, Bibl. Res. ii. 370; German Schreckhorn, Wetterhorn, Auerhorn; Celt. caern). In Isa. v. 1, the emblematic vineyard is described as being literally "in a horn the son of oil," meaning, as given in the English Bible, "a very fruitful hill"—a strong place like a hill, yet combining with its strength peculiar fruitfulness.

Isa. vi. 3 (he had horns coming out of his hand) the context implies rays of light (comp. Deut. xxiii. 2).

The denominative הַרְעָה = to emit rays, is used of Moses' face (Exod. xxxiv. 29, 30, 35); so all the versions except Aquila and the Vulgate, which have the translations εκπορέων ἤ, cornuta erat. This curious idea has not only been perpetuated by paintings, coins, and statues (Zornius, Biblioth. Antiq. i, 121), but has at least passed muster with Grotius (Adnot. ad loc.), who cites Aben-Ezra's identification of Moses with the horned Mnevis of Egypt, and suggests that the phenomenon was intended to remind the Israelites of the golden calf! Spencer (Leg. Hebr. iii, Dia. i, 4) tries a reconciliation of renderings upon the ground that corneus = radii herc; but Spanheim (Dia. vii. 1), not content with stigmatizing the efforts of art in this direction as "preposterous industria," distinctly attributes to Jerome a belief in the veritable horns of Moses. See NIMBUS.

2. From similarity of Position and Use.—Two principal applications of this idea. The first of these was thus made into a horn of strength and honor. Of strength the horn of the unicorn [see Unicorn] was the most frequent representative (Deut. xxxii. 17, etc.), but not always; comp. 1 Kings xxii. 11, where probably horns of iron, worn defiantly and symbolically on the head, are intended. Expressive of the same idea, or perhaps merely a decoration, is the Oriental military ornament mentioned by Taylor (Calmet's
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Hair of South Africans ornamented with Buffalo-horns. (Livingstone.)

Frag. cxiv), and the conical cap observed by Dr. Livingstone among the natives of S. Africa, and not improbably suggested by the horn of the rhinoceros, so abundant in that country (see Livingstone’s Travels, p. 365, 490, 557; comp. Taylor, L. c.). Among the Druses upon Mount Lebanon the married women wear silver horns on their heads. The spiral coils of gold wire projecting on either side from the female head-dress of some of the Dutch provinces are evidently an ornament borrowed from the same original idea. But it is quite uncertain whether such dresses were known among the covenant people, nor do the figurative allusions in Scripture to horns render it in the least degree necessary to suppose that reference was made to personal ornaments of that description. (See below.)

Heads of modern Asiatists ornamented with Horns.

In the sense of honor, the word horn stands for the abstract (my horn, Job xvi, 2; all the horns of Israel, Lam. ii, 9), and so for the supreme authority (comp. the story of Cipperus, Ovid, Met. xvi, 56b; and the horn of the Indian sacheem mentioned in Clarkson’s Life of Pem). Perhaps such a idea may be denoted by the horned conical cap peculiar to the regal apparel on the Ninevite sculptures. It also stands for concretè, whence it comes to mean king, kingdom (Dan. viii, 2, etc.; Zech. i, 18; compare Tarquin’s dream in Accius, ap. Cicero, Div. i, 22); hence, on coins,

Horned Cap of the Assyrian Kings.

Alexander and the Seleucidæ wear horns (see cut in vol. i, p. 140), and the former is called in Arab. two-horned (Kor. xviii, 85 sq.), not without reference to Dan. viii. See GOAT.

Of either or both of these last two metaphors sprang the idea of representing gods with horns. Spanheim has discovered such figures on the Roman denarii, and on numerous Egyptian coins of the reigns of Trajan, Hadrian, and the Antonines (Dias, v, 358). The Bacchus Ταύροκτονος, or corinus, is mentioned by Euri- pides (Bacch. 100), and among other pagan absurdities Arnoldus enumerates “Dii corum” (“c. Cret. VI). In like manner river-gods are represented with horns (“tauriformis Aublins,” Hor. Od. iv, 14, 25; ταυρόφωνον ήμα Κυρασο., Eurip. Ion, 1261). For various opinions on the ground-thought of this metaphor, see Notes and Queries, i, 419, 456. Manx legends speak of a (tarroo-ushkey), i.e. water-bull (see Creggan’s Manx Diet.). (See Bochart, Hieros, ii, 298; and, for an admirable compendium, with references, Zornius, Bibliotheca Antiquaria, ii, 106 sq.).

Some of these metaphorical applications of the word horn require more special elucidation.

(1.) Symbolical.—As horns are the chief source of attack and defence with the animals to which God has given them, they serve in Scripture as symbols of power, dominion, glory, and fierceness (Dan. viii, 5, 9; 1 Sam. xvi, 11, 13; 1 Kings i, 39; Josh. vii, 4, 5; 1 Sam. ii, 1; Psa. lxxv, 5, 10; cxxxii, 17; Luke i, 69; Deut. xxxii, 17; Lam. ii, 3; Mic. iv, 13; Jer. xlviii, 25; Ezek. xxxix, 21; Amos vi, 18). In 1 Kings xxii, 11, we find a striking display of the metaphorical action on the part of the false prophet Zedekiah. He made him horns of iron, and said, “Thus saith Jehovah, With these thou shalt push the Syrians, until thou hast consumed them.” Hence, to delite the horn in the dust (Job xvi, 2) is to lower and degrade one’s self, and, on the contrary, to lift up to exalt the horn (Psa. lxxv, 4; lxxxix, 17; cxlviii, 14), is poeti-

ically to raise one’s self to eminent honor or prosperity, to bear one’s self proudly (comp. also 1 Chron. xxv, 5). Something like this is found in the classic authors (see Horace, Carm. iii, 21, 18). The expression “horn of salvation,” which Christ is called (Luke i), is equivalent to a salvation of strength, or a Saviour, who is pomester of the might requisite for the work (see Brittington, De cornu salutis, Heid, 1748).

Horns were also the symbol of royal dignity and power; and when they are distinguished by number, they signify some monarchie or empires. Thus the monarchy of Cipperus is inscribed in J6r. xlviii, 25. In Zech. i, 18, etc., the four horns are the four great monarchies, which had each of them subdued the Jews. The ten horns, says Daniel, vii, 24, are ten kings. The ten horns, spoken of in Rev. xiii, 1 as having ten crowns upon them, no doubt signify the same thing, for so we have it interpreted in xxi, 12. The king of Persia is described by Ammianus Marcellinus as bearing golden rams’ horns by way of diadem (69, 1). The ephcy of Ptolemæy with a ram’s horn, as exhibited in ancient sculpture, is mentioned by Spanheim, Disc. de Numism. Hence also the kings of Media and Persia are depicted by Daniel (viii, 20) under the figure of a horned ram. See RAM.

When it is said, in Dan. viii, 9, that out of one of the four notable horns came forth a little horn, we are to understand that out of one of the four kingdoms represented by the four horns arose another kingdom, “which became exceeding great.” This is doubtless Antiocæus Epiphanes; others refer it to one of the first Cæsars; and others refer it to the Turkish empire, and will have Egypt, Asia, and Greece to be the three horns torn up or reduced by the Turk. See LITTLE HORN.

(2.) Ornamental.—In the East, at present, horns are used as an ornament for the head, and as a toke; of eminent rank (Rosenmuller, Mgr. iv, 85). The women among the Druses on Mount Lebanon wear on their heads silver horns of native make, “which are the distinguishing badge of witchhood” (Borrowing’s Report on Syria, p. 8). These tareours have grown, like other horns, from small beginnings to their present enormous
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size by slow degrees, and pride is the soil that nourished
them. At first, they consisted merely of an apparatus
designed to finish off the headress so as to raise the veil
a little from the face. Specimens of this primitive kind
are still found in remote and semi-civilized districts. I
have seen them only a few inches long, made of paste-
board, and even of common pottery. By degrees th\nmore fashionable ladies used tin, and lengthened them;
then rivalry made them of silver, and still further pro-
longed and ornamented them; until finally the prin-
cesses of Lebanon and Hermon sported gold horns,
decorated with jewels, and so long that a servant had
spread the veil over them. But the day for these
most preposterous appendages to the female head is
about over. After the wars between the Maronites and
Druses in 1841 and 1845, the Maronite clergy thundered
their excommunications against them, and very few Chur-
can ladies now wear them. Many expatriated
Druses and ladies have cast them off, and the probability is that
in a few years travellers will seek in vain for a horned lady” (Thomson, Land and Book, i, 101). See Head-
Dress.

Horn, John, or, more properly, John Roh (Cornu
or Kounx being a translation of the surname, which he
assumed according to the usage of the times), was a dis-
tinguished bishop of the Ancient Units Fratrum, or
Church of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren. He
was born at Yaus, in Bohemia, near the close of the
15th century. In 1518 he was ordained to the pri-
ested theology, and in 1529 consecrated bishop by a synod
assembled at Brandis, on the Adler. Three years later (1532) he became senior bishop and president of the
Ecclesiastical Council, which position he held until his
death, governing the Units Fratrum with great wis-
dom and firmness in its internal discipline. Sup-
ported by John Augusta (q. v.), he inaugurated a new
policy, which brought the Church out of its partial ob-
curity, and made it thereafter an important element in
the national history of Bohemia. His immediate pre-
decessor, Martin Skoda, had strictly abstained from all
intercourse with the Reformers, following the principles
established by Luke of Prague (q. v.). Horn, who had
been twice a delegate to Luther (1522 and 1524), and
who entertained a high regard for him and his work,
reopened a correspondence with him, and induced the
publication of a new Confession of the Brethren's faith at
Wittenberg, with a commendatory preface of his own
(1533). This led to a still closer fellowship, Horn send-
ing two deputations to Luther in 1536, a third in the
following year, and a fourth in 1542. In 1538 Luther
published another and the principal Confession of the
Church, again with a preface from Horn's pen. This
Confession had been drawn up in 1535, and formally pre-
septed to the emperor Ferdinand at Vienna (November
14) by several barons and divines in the name of the
Units Fratrum. Encouraged by his intercourse with
Luther, Horn also sent an embassy to the Swiss Reform-
ers in 1540, which resulted in a friendly meeting with
Bucer, Calvin, and others. Thus the Brethren joined
hands with the Reformers in carrying on the great work
of evangelical truth, and gave the earliest tokens of
those efforts to bring about a union among all Protest-
ants which afterwards resulted in the Consensus Succu-
montensis of the Polish churches. The most important
literary production of bishop Horn was the authorized
died Jan. 17, 1792. In his early youth he imbibed the
doctrines of John Hutchinson (q. v.), and defended them
in an Apology (1766), which is given in vol. vi of his
collected Works. He was considered the best preacher
and teacher of his time, a sincere and Christian, and a
thorough scholar. Many of his writings were contro-
versial tracts, arising out of the Hutchinsonian theory,
and the quarrels which it provoked. His more impor-
tant and durable works are, Commentary on the Pauline
(1769, 2 vols. 4to, often reprinted)—Discourses on several Subjects and Occasions (1780, 4 vols. 8vo). These, with his other writings, are col-
lected in The Works of Bishop Horn, with his Life, by
William Jones, of Nailand (London, 1786, 6 vols. 8vo).
See Hook, Eccles. Biography, vi, 160; Darling, Cyclo-
pedia Bibliographica, i, 141; Allibone, Dict. of Authors,
i, 887; Horne (T. H.), Bibliographical Appendix; Ch.
Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctr. ii, 419; Hardwick, Hist. of
the Reformation, p. 252, n. 1; 253, n. 8.

Horne, John, a Nonconformist divine, born in 1615,
was educated at Trinity College, Cambridge. He be-
came successively vicar of Allhallows, Lynn, Regis, and
finally Norfolk in 1647. He was ejected for noncon-
formity in 1662, and died in 1676. "He was a learned
man, of most exemplary and primitive piety, very ready
in the Scriptures, skilled in the Oriental languages,
and an Arminian in doctrine." Shortly before his ejection
he published The open Door for Man's Approach to
God, or a Vindication of the Righteousness of God concern-
ing the Extent of the Christ. His other principal
works are, The Brazen Serpent, or God's grand Design—
on John iii, 14, 15 (Lond. 1673, 4to):—The best Exerci-
s for Christians in the worst of Times, in Order to their
Security against Profaneness and Apostasy — on Jude
xx, 21 (Lond. 1671, sm. 8vo), etc.—Darling, Cyclop. Bib-
liographicon, i, 1543; Stoughton (John), Eccles. Hist.
of England (Lond. 1870, 2 vols. 8vo), ii, 407 sq.

Horne, Melville, a Wesleyan minister, born in
England in the latter part of the last century, was origi-
nally a lay preacher of the Wesleyan societies, but by
the advice of his brethren he took orders in the Church
of England, and went as missionary to Sierra Leone.
On his return he was made vicar of Olney, later at Mac-
clefield, and finally went to West Thurrock, Essex. He
died in the early part of the present century. Horne is
known especially by his Letters on Missions, addressed
to the Protestant Ministers of the British Churches (1794,
8vo; reprinted at Boston, 1835), which are generally believed, "prompted the first counsels that led to the
son's Hist. of Lond. Miss. Soc., i, 13–15; Stevens, Hist. of
Methodism, ii, 295 sq.). He published also several of his
sermons (1811), an appendix (1842), and an Extensive
Definition of Justifying Faith (1809, 12mo).

Horne, Thomas Hartwell, D.D., an English
Biblical scholar, born October 29, 1786, was educated at
HORNECK

Horneck, Anthony, D.D., an English divine, was born at Bacchacron, in the Lower Palatinate, in 1641. He first studied at the University of Cambridge; but the death of his father, who went to England, and entered Queen's College, Oxford, at the age of nineteen. Two years after he became tutor to lord Torrington, who gave him the living of Doulton, in Devonshire, and procured him a prebend in the church of Exeter. In 1671 he was chosen preacher at the Savoy, upon which he resigned his living in Devonshire. Admiral Russell, afterwards earl of Orford, recommended him to the queen for preferment, and, by the advice of Dr. Tillotson, then archbishop, he was presented to the prebendary of Westminster in 1693. He died Jan. 31, 1697. He was a good linguist, a learned divine, an excellent preacher, and a faithful pastor. His church was so crowded that it was often difficult for him to reach the pulpit. In the reign of James II, when it became clear that there was danger of a revival of popery, he spared no pains in resisting the movement. His zeal for the promotion of practical religion was incessant; and, among other means, he made use of the so-called Religious Societies of which he was one of the usual preliminaries. Subsequently St. John's College, Cambridge, conferred on him the degree of B.D., and two American colleges that of D.D. In 1824 he found employment in the library of the British Museum as assistant in the department of printed books. In 1830 archbishop Trench promoted him to the see of St. Edmund and St. Nicholas, London, which positions he held until his death, Jan. 27, 1862. Horne was for some years actively engaged in the work of Methodism, numbering among his friends Dr. Adam Clarke and Dr. Bunting. He entered the ministry of the Church of England in deference to the earnest desire of his father, with the hope of securing leisure for literary pursuits, but he always maintained a hearty interest in the Church of his early choice, and preserved to the end of his life that simple and earnest godliness which Methodism had taught him to prize in everyone. He was a man of considerableness his controversial writings alone would have given him a high status among the men of his time; and his versatility is further attested by the variety of his publications, many of which are given to subjects not usually treated of by the divinity. His researches in bibliography were conducted with amazing industry, and tabulated with great judgment and skill. But he will be best known to posterity by his Introduction to the Critical Study of the Scriptures (referred to above), which, at the time of its first appearance, was a marvel of the kind. It is a work of breadth and power, and it would be a task to enumerate its taste for critical pursuits to the reading of this work; and, though somewhat below the spirit and results of the more recent criticisms, it is yet invaluable to those whose resources will not permit the large outlay which the collection of a critical library demands. The most important of his other works are, Conpact, Introd. to the Study of the Bible, or Analysis of the Intro. to the Holy Scriptures (12mo, 1827) —Deism Refuted, or plain Reasons for being a Christian (12mo, 1819) —Romansian controversy to Scripture, or the peculiar excellence of the Church of Rome, an essay of acclimated Formularies, contrary to the Holy Scriptures (12mo, 1827) —Moral, or Facts and Evidences demonstrating the Worship of the Blessed Virgin Mary by the Church of Rome (2d ed, 1841) —The Scripture Doctrine of the Trinity (12mo) —Manual of Parochial Pulpody (1820, 1829) —Manual for the Afflicted (1819, 1832), etc. A list of all the productions of Dr. Horne is given by Allibone (Dict. of Authors, i, 889-92). See Reminiscences, personal and bibliographical, of Thomas Hartwell Horne, with Notes by his daughter, Sarah Anne Cheyne, and a short Introduction by the Rev. Joseph B. McCaul (1866). Chapters of Cyclop., v. 419, 421, 424, Bot, Bibl. Cyclop. ii, 524; Keil, Introd. to N. T. p. 38; Daring, Cyclop. Bibl. i, 154 sq.; North, Am. Review, xvii, 130 sq.; Journ. Soc. Lit. v, 29, 250. (J. H. W.)

HORNEJUS

Hornejus (Hornejt), Konrad, a German Lutheran divine, was born in Brunswick Nov. 25, 1590. He studied theology, philosophy, and philology at Helmstedt, where he settled in 1612. Here he became professor of
HORNET or WASP (Vespula rufa, Vespula affinis, Vespula vulgaris). The Heb. term appears to be indicative of stinging; and the ancient versions with the Rabbins favor the interpretation of “hornet” rather than “wasp,” as appears from the application of the above Greek and Latin words (comp. Aristot. Hist. Anim. v. 19, 617; ix. 65, 66; Pliny, Hist. Nat. xi. 24). The above passages in which the word occurs refer to some means of expulsion of the Canaanites before the Israelites. Not only were bees exceedingly numerous in Palestine, but from the ancient (Josh. xvi. 23) we learn that hornets in particular infested some parts of the country: the frequent notices of the animal in the Talmudical writers (Levysohn, Zool. § 405) lead to the same conclusion. Genesis, however, maintains that the term is not to be taken in a literal sense, but metaphorically, as a general metaphor for panic with which it inspires the inhabitants, adding the expressions “terror of God” (Gen. xxxvi. 5), “mighty destruction” (Deut. vii. 22), and the antithesis of the angel to defend them (Exod. xxii, 20, etc.), in favor of this interpretation (see Thesaur. Heb. p. 1186). Indeed, the following argument is in favor of the literal sense: (1) that the word “hornet” in Exod. xxii, 28 is parallel to “terror” in ver. 27; (2) that similar expressions are undoubtedly used metaphorically, e.g. “to chase as the bees do” (Deut. i. 44; Ps. cxviii. 12); (3) that a similar transfer from the literal to the metaphorical sense may be instance in the classical estuaris, originally a “gad-fly,” afterwards terror and madness; and, lastly (4), that no historical notice of such intervention as hornets occurs in the Bible. We may therefore regard it as expressing under a vivid image the consternation with which it would infuse the Canaanite enemies of the Israelites, as declared in Deut. ii. 25; Josh. xxi. 23. Among the moderns, Michaelis has defended the figurative sense. In addition to other reasons for it, he doubts whether the expulsion of the Canaanites could be effected by swarms of Vespula, and proposes to derive the Hebrew from a root signifying “scourges,” “plagues,” scutica, plagas, etc. (Suppl. ad Lexic. Hebr. vi. 2158); but his reasons are ably refuted by Rosenmuller, apud Bochart (Hier. Lips. 1796, iii, ch. 13, p. 402, etc.). In favor of the possibility of such an event, it is observed that Elihu relates that the Phœsætæ were actually driven from their locality by such means (Elihu vi. 26, 27; ἤτιον ἄλιαν). It is an unusual thing and, as Bochart (ibid.) has shown, these Phœsætæ were a Phœnician people (ut sup. p. 412). For a parallel case of an army being seriously molested by hornets, see Ammian. Marcell. xxiv. 8. Even Rosenmuller himself admits the figurative sense in his Scholia on Exod. xxii, 28; but he does not think that opinion, and amply refutes it. His reasonings and refutations have been adopted by numerous writers (among others, see Paxton’s Illustrations of Scripture, i. 305, etc., Edinb. 1819). Michaelis’s doubt of the abstract possibility seems very unreasonable, when the irresistible power of bees and wasps, wind and waves, is considered. It is observable that the event is represented by the author of the apocryphal book of Wisdom (xii. 8) as a merciful dispensation, by which the Almighty, he says, “spared as men the old inhabitants of his holy land,” and “gave them place for repentance.” If the hawket, considered as a ἄρπαγαν, connected with this idolatry, the visitation would convey a practical refutation of their error. Ewald (Gesch. d. V. Israel, 3d ed. Götting. 1864, i, 116 sqq.) connects the word (reading עִינוֹס תְּבִנָּה) with Manetho’s story (Josephus, Apion, i. 26) of the expulsion of the Israelites from Egypt on account of a disease. See BAALZEBAH. 

The hornet (Vespa crabro) is a hymenopterous insect with six legs and four wings. It bears a general resemblance to the common wasp, but is of a darker color, and much larger. It is exceedingly fierce and voracious, especially in hot climates, but even in Western countries its sting is frequently dangerous. Roberts observes on Deut. vii. 20, “The sting of the hornet and wasp of the East is much more poisonous than in Europe, and the insect is larger in size. I have heard of several who died from having a single sting; and not many days ago, as a woman was going to a well ‘to draw water,’ a hornet stung her in the cheek, and she died the next day. The good Sir is described as having destroyed many giants by hornets.” It may be remarked, that the hornet, no less than the whole species of wasps, renders an essential service in checking the multiplication of flies and other insects, which would otherwise become intolerable to man; and that in regard to their architecture, they are extremely interesting. They do not yield to their more popular congener, the bee, but even, in several respects, greatly excel it. The hornet, in common with the other social wasps, displays great ingenuity in the manufacture of its nest. It is made of a coarse grey paper, much like the coarsest wrapping-paper, but much thicker and stronger. This is arranged in several globose leaves, one over the other, not unlike the outer leaves of a cabbage, the base of which is attached by a small footstalk to the upper part of the cavity in which it is enclosed. Within this protective case the combs are built in parallel rows of cells, exactly like those of the bee, but made of paper, and ranged horizontally. The combs are extended both vertically, and in single series, the entrances always being downwards. Each story is connected with that above it by a number of pillars of the common paper, thick and massive. These cells do not contain honey, but merely the eggs, and, in due time, the young, being in fact mere worms. The paper upon which the nest is built is formed of pieces of decayed wood or the bark of trees, the fibres of which it abrades by means of its jaws, and kneads into a paste with a viscid saliva. When a morsel as large as a pea is prepared, the insect flies to the nest and spreads out the mass in a thin layer at the spot where it is required, moulding it into shape with the jaws and feet. It is soon dry, and forms real paper, coarser than that of the common wasp. (Kirby and Spence, Introduction to Entomology, 8vo. Lond. 1828, i. 278, 274; Réamur, Histoire des Insectes, vol. vi; Mem. 6, 4to. Par. 1754-42; Wood, Bible Animals, Lond. 1800, p. 614 sqq.). See WASP.

Horologion (ἀπεικόνισις, literally a diët) is the title of one of the "office-books" of the orthodox Eastern Church. It contains the daily hours of prayer, so far as respects their immovable portions, and answers in a measure to the Officeumes Hoedómathe which is found at the opening of each volume of the breviary of the Eastern Church. But it generally contains also other formularies of that Church. See Neale, Introduct. to the Hist. of the Eastern Church, ii. 848. See HOURS.

Horon. See Beth-Horon; Hornonam.

Horon'a’m (Heb. חָוּרُנָא, Horon’s, two cars; Sept. Αράσις and ὸρανᾶ, a Moabish city near Zoar, Luhith, Nimrim, etc., on a declivity along the route of the invading Assyrians (Isa. xv. 5; Jer. xlvii, 3, 5, 54)) ; probably the same called Holon (יוֹלוֹן), par, by an error for ילוונ, Horon, which would appear to be
HORONITE
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HORSE

They will [eagerly] paw in the valley, and their prancing [feet in] vigour.

He will go forth to meet [the] weapon;
Nor will he laugh at dread;
Nor will he lose his nerve.

Nor retreat from before [the] sword;
Against his foe he will challenge battle,
Flaming lance or dart [in vain].

With prancing and restlessness he will absorb [the]
Nor can he stand still when the sound of the trumpet [is heard];

As oft as [the] trumpet [sounded], he will say, "Aha!"
For from afar he can scent [the] battle,
The thunder of the captains and shouting.

So, again, the pride advances with her charms to an immediate conquest "as a company of horsemen" (or "as chariots") (Cant. i, 9); and when the prophet Zechariah wishes to convey the idea of perfect peace, he represents the horse, no more mixing in the fray as before (ix, 10), but bearing on his bell (which was intended to strike terror into the foe) the precepts inscription, "Holiness unto the Lord" (xiv, 20).

Lastly, the characteristic of the horse is not so much his speed or his utility, but his strength (Psa. xxxiii, 17; xcvii, 10), as shown in the special application of the term abir (אֲבִירָהּ), i.e. strong, as an equivalent for a horse (Jer. viii, 16; xcvii, 3, 11). Hence the horse becomes the symbol of war, or of a campaign. This is the main idea of the text; comp. Psa. xiv, 5; Deut. xxxii, 13; Psa. lxvi, 12; Is. xix, 14, where horsemanship is made typical of conquest), especially of speedy conquest (Jer. iv, 18), or rapid execution of any purpose (Rev. vi).

The Hebrews in the patriarchal age, as a pastoral race, did not stand in need of the services of the horse, and for a long period after their settlement in Canaan they dispensed with it, partly in consequence of the hilly nature of the country, which only admitted of the use of chariots in certain localities (Judg. i, 19), and partly in consequence of the prohibition in Deut. xviii, 16, which would be held to apply at all periods. Accordingly, the horses of the Hebrews were small and light, and the herdsmen and dealers at a fixed price (Josh. xi, 6, 9). David first established a force of cavalry and chariots after the defeat of Hadadezer (2 Sam. vii, 4), when he reserved a hundred chariots, and, as we may infer, all the horses; for the rendering "hounded all the chariot-horses" is manifestly incorrect. Shortly after this Absalom was possessed of some (2 Sam. xv, 1). But the great supply of horses was subsequently effected by Solomon through his connection with Egypt; he is reported to have had "40,000 stalls of horses for his chariots, and 12,000 cavalry-horses" (1 Kings iv, 26), and it is worthy of notice that these forces are mentioned parenthetically, and accounted for in the following verse (1 Kings iv, 28, forty-thousand chariot-horses and twelve thousand cavalry-horses); Ezek. xxvii, 14, "driving-horses and riding-horses; Joel ii, 4, "as riding-horses, so shall they run;" and Isa. xxi, 7, "a train of horses in couples."

The most striking feature in the Biblical notices of the horse is the exclusive application of it to warlike operations; in no instance is that useful animal employed for the purposes of ordinary locomotion or agriculture, if we except Isa. xxviii, 28, where we learn that the horse (A.V. "horsemen") were employed in threshing, not, however, in that case put in the gears, but simply driven about over the threshing-ground. This remark will be found to be borne out by the historical passages hereafter quoted, but it is equally striking in the poetical parts of Scripture. The animated description of the horse in Job xxxix, 19-25, applies solely to the warhorse. (The following are the main streams in the breeze (A.V. "thunder") which "clothes his neck with splendour, his head with darts, his back as a war-horse, his hoofs digging in the valley" with excitement; his terrible snorting—are brought before us, and his ardor for the strife. The following is a close rendering of this fine description of the war-horse:

Canst thou give to the horse prowess? Canst thou array his neck (with a prancing [mane])? Canst thou make him prance like the locust? The grandeur of his snorting is formidable.
dominions in strings, in the same manner as horses are
still conducted to and from fairs: for this interpretation,
as offered by Professor Paxton, appears to convey the
natural and true meaning of the text; and not "strings
of linen yarn," which here seem to be out of place (2
Chron. i, 16, 17; ix, 25, 28). The cavalry force was
maintained by the succeeding kings, and frequent not-
tices occur both of riding-horses and chariots (2 Kings
ix, 21, 33; xi, 16), and particularly of war-chariots (1
Kings xxii, 4; 2 Kings iii, 7; Isa. ii, 7). The force
seems to have failed in the time of Hezekiah (2 Kings
xviii, 20) in Judah, as it had previously in Israel under
Jehoshaph (2 Kings xiii, 7). Josiah took away the
horses which the kings of Judah, his predecessors,
had consecrated to the sun (2 Kings xxiii, 11). See SUN.
The number of horses belonging to the Jews on their
return from Babylon is stated at 736 (Neh. vii, 68).

In the countries adjacent to Palestine the use of the
horse was much more frequent. It was introduced into
Egypt probably by the Hyksos, as it is not represented
on the monuments before the 18th dynasty (Wilkinson,
i, 386, abridg.). Yet these animals are not mentioned
among the presents which Abraham received from Pha-
rass (Gen. xii, 16), and occur first in Scripture among
the valuables paid by the Egyptians to Joseph in ex-
change for grain (Gen. xlvi, 17). They were still suf-
ficiently important to be expressly mentioned in the
funeral procession which accompanied the body of Ja-
cob to his sepulchre in Canaan (Gen. i, 9). At the
period of the Egyptian horsemen Egypt was
in Egypt (Exod. ix, 3; xiv, 9, 23; Deut. xvii, 17), and subse-
sequently, as we have already seen, they were able
to supply the nations of Western Asia. The Tyrians pur-
chased these animals from Solomon, and in the time of

Ezekiel imported horses themselves from Togarmah or
Armenia (Ezek. xxvii, 14). The Jewish kings sought
the assistance of the Egyptians against the Assyrians
in this respect (Isa. xxxi, 1; xxxvi, 8; Ezek. xvii, 15).
The Canaanites were possessed of them (Deut. xx, 1;
Josh. xi, 4; Judg. iv, 3; v, 22, 28), and likewise the Syr-
ians (2 Sam. xi, 4; 1 Kings xx, 1; 2 Kings vi, 14; vii,
10)—notices which are confirmed by the pictorial repre-
sentations on Egyptian monuments (Wilkinson,
1, 99, 897, 401), and by the Assyrian inscriptions re-
ating to Syrian expeditions. But the cavalry of the
Assyrians themselves and other Eastern nations was re-
garded as most formidable; the horses themselves were
highly bred, as the Assyrian sculptures still testify, and
fully merited the praise bestowed on them by Habakkuk
(i, 8), "swifter than leopards, and more fierce than the
evening wolves; their riders "clothed in blue, captains
and rulers, all of them desirable young men" (Ezek.
xxiii, 6), armed with "the bright sword and glittering
spear" (Nah. iii, 3), made a deep impression on the
Jews, who, plainly clad, went on foot; as also did their
regular array as they proceeded in couplets, contrasting
with the disorderly troops of asses and camels which
followed with the baggage (Isa. xxi, 7; rehed in
this passage signifying rather a train than a single chariot).
The number employed by the Eastern potentates was
very great, Holofernes possessing not less than 12,000
Judith ii, 15). At a later period we have frequent
notices of the cavalry of the Græco-Syrian monarchs (1
Macc. i, 18; iii, 39, etc.).

Ancient Persian Horse.

The above notices of the use of the horse by the an-
cient Egyptians derives abundant illustration from their
monuments. In the sculptured battle-scenes, which are
believed to represent victories of Sesostris, or of Thoth-
mes II and III, over nations of Central Asia, it is evi-
dent that the enemy's armies, as well as the foreign
allies of Egypt, were abundantly supplied with horses,
both for chariots and for riders; and in triumphal pro-
cessions they are shown as present or tribute—proving
that they were portions of the national wealth of con-
quered states sufficiently valuable to be prized in Egypt.
That the Assyrians and Babylonians were equally well
supplied with this valuable animal is likewise attested
by the martial scenes depicted on the sculptures discov-
ered among the ruins of Nineveh and the vicinity.
They are represented in almost every variety of pos-
tion and employment, such as the chase, and for other
purposes of pleasure; but chiefly in war, for which the
Assyrians used them both with the saddle and in the
chariot. According to Mr. Layard (Nineveh, 1st series,
i, 275 sq.), the horses of the Assyrians were well formed
and of noble blood, as appears from the fig-
ures no doubt faithfully copied on the sculpt-
ures. Cavalry formed an important part of the
Assyrian army. The horsemen carried the
bow and spear, and wore coats of mail,
high greaves, and the pointed helmet. Their
horses also were covered, and even it would
seem, with a kind of leather armor, from the
head to the tail, to protect them from the
arrows of the enemy. It consisted of sev-
eral pieces fastened together by buttons or
loops. Over it was thrown an ornamented
saddle-cloth, or a leopard's skin, upon which
the rider sat. Under the head of the horse
was hung a bell (comp. Zech. xiv, 20) or a
tassel. The reins appear to have been tight-
ened round the neck of the horse by a slid-
ing button, and then dropped as the war-

Ancient Assyrian Horse.
HORSE

Chariot-horse of Rameses III. (From the Monuments at Iseamboul.)

Horses were engaged in fight. Between the horse's ears was an arched crest, and the different parts of the harness were richly embroidered, and ornamented with rosettes (Layard's Min. 2d ser. p. 456). See HORSEMAN.

With regard to the trappings and management of the horse among the Hebrews and adjoining nations, we have little information; the bridle (resem) was placed over the horse's nose (Isa. xxx. 26), and a bit or curb (mehel) is also noticed (2 Kings xix. 29; Psa. xxxii. 9; Prov. xxxvi. 13; Isa. xxxvii. 29; in the A. V. it is incorrectly given "bridle," with the exception of Psa. xxxii.). The harness of the Assyrian horses was profusely decorated, the bits being gilt (1 Esdr. iii. 6), and the bridles adorned with tassels; on the neck was a collar terminat-
ing in a bell, as described by Zechariah (xiv. 20). Saddles were not used until a late period; only one is represented on the Assyrian sculptures (Layard, ii. 387). The horses were not shod, and therefore hoofs as hard "as flint" (Isa. v. 28) were regarded as a great merit. The chariot-horses were covered with embroidered trappings—the "precious clothes" manufactured at Dedan (Ezek. xxvii. 20); these were fastened by straps and buckles, and to this perhaps reference is made in Prov. xxx. 31, in the term saariz, "one girded about the loins" (A. V. "greyhound"). Thus adorned, Mordecai rode in state through the streets of Shushan (Esth. vi. 9). White horses were more particularly appropriate to such occasions as being significant of victory (Rev. vi. 2; xix. 11, 14). Horses and chariots were used also in idolatrous processions, as noticed in regard to the sun (2 Kings xxiii. 11). As to kinds of harness, etc., by means of which the services of the horse were annually available by other nations, it may be well to notice that the riding bridle was long a mere slip-knot, passed round the under jaw into the mouth, thus furnishing only one rein; and that a rod was commonly added to guide the animal with more facility. The bridle, however, and the reins of chariot-horses were, at a very early age, exceedingly perfect, as the monuments of Egypt, Etruria, and Greece amply prove. Saddles were not used, the rider sitting on the bare back, or using a cloth or mat girded on the animal. The Romans, no doubt copying the Persian Cataphractae, first used padded saddles, and from the northern nations adopted stimuli or spurs. Stirrups were unknown. Avicenna first mentions the rekhib, or Arabian stirrup, perhaps the most ancient; although in the tumuli of Central Asia, Tatar, horse skeletons, bridles, and stirrup saddles have been found along with idols, which proves the tombs to be more ancient than the introduction of Islam. With regard to horse-shoeing, bishop Lowth and Bracy Clark were mistaken in believing that the Roman horse or mule shoe was fastened on without nails driven through the horned part of the hoof, as at present. A contrary conclusion may be inferred from several passages in the poets; and the figure of a horse in the Pompeii battle mosaic, shod in the same manner as is now the practice, leaves little doubt on the question. The principal use of horses anciently was for the chariot, especially in war; to this they were attached by means of a pole and yoke like oxen, a practice which continued down to the times of the Romans. (See Bible Animals, p. 248 sq.) See CHARIOT; BRIDLE.

It appears that the horse was derived from High Asia, and was not indigenous in Arabia, Syria, or Egypt (Jardine's Naturalist's Library, vol. xii.), where his congeners the zebra, quagga, and ass are still found in primitive freedom, although the horse is found in all parts of the world—free, it is true, but only as a wild descendant of a once domesticated stock. (See Schlieben, Die Pferde des Alterthums, Neuwed. 1867; Abd el-Kader, Horses of the Desert, trans. by Daumas, London, 1863.) All the great original varieties or races of horses were then known in Western Asia, and the Hebrew prophets themselves have not unfrequently distinguished the nations they had in view by means of the predominant colors of their horses, and that more correctly than commentators have surmised. Taking Bochart's application (Hieroz. i. 31 sq.) of the Hebrew names, the boy race, בּיָњָא, adom, emphatically belonged to Egypt and Arabia Felix; the white, אֶבֶן, lebamon, to the regions above the Euxine Sea, Asia Minor, and northern High Asia; the dun, or cream-colored, גּוֹמָר, sendakin, to the Medes; the spotted πικτόξ, or skewbald,
HORSE-GATE

Horse-leech

Horse-leech (रघुरत्स, alakah'; Sept. ἰ βολίκα, Vulg. ranuncula, A. V. some eds. as two words, "horse leech") occurs once only, viz. Prov. xxx, 15, "The horse-leech hath two daughters, crying, Give, give." Although the Hebrew word is translated leech in nearly all the versions, there has been much doubt whether that is its proper meaning. Against the received translation has been urged that, upon an examination of the context in which it occurs, the introduction of the leech seems natural enough; and what is meant by its "two daughters," or three, as the Septuagint, Syriac, and Arabic versions assign to it; and that, instead of the incessant craving apparently attributed to it, the leech drops off when filled. In order to evade these difficulties it has been attempted, but in vain, to connect the passage either with the preceding or subsequent verse. It has also been attempted to give a different sense to the Hebrew word. But as it occurs nowhere besides in Scripture, and as the root from which it would seem to be derived is never used as a verb, no assistance can be obtained from the Scriptures themselves in this investigation. Recourse is therefore had to the Arabic. The following is the line of criticism pursued by the learned Bochart (Hierozoon, ed. Rosenmiller, iii, 785, etc.). The Arabic word for leech is alakah, which is derived from a verb signifying to hang or to adhere to. But the Hebrew word, alakah, he would derive from another Arabic root, aIak, which means "fate, heavy misfortune, or impending calamity;" and hence he infers that alakah properly means destiny, and particularly the necessity of dying which attaches to every man by the decree of God. He urges that it is not strange that such a word should be selected for the divine appointment, since, in Prov. xxvii, 1, offspring is attributed to time, a day—"Thou knowest not what a day may bring forth." Now the Hebrews call events the children of time. We also speak of "the womb of time." He cites Prov. xxvii, 20, as a parallel passage: "Hell (aeked) and the grave are never full." Hence he supposes that aeked and the grave are the two daughters of Alukah or Destiny; each cries "give" at the same moment—the former asks for the soul, and the latter for the body of man in death; both are insatiable, for both involve all mankind in one common ruin. He further thinks that both these are called daughters, because each of them is of the femaline sex; and the common gender; and in the 16th verse, the grave (aeked) is specified as one of the "things that are never satisfied." In further confirmation of this view, Bochart cites rabbinical writers, who state that by the word alakah, which occurs in the Chaldee paraphrase on the Psalms, the Hebrew word aIak, and destiny, in the Septuagint, and also remark that it has two daughters—Eden and Gehenna, Paradise and Hell—the former of whom never has enough of the souls of the righteous, the latter of the souls of the wicked. (See also Alb. Schultens, Comment. ad loc.)

In behalf of the received translation, it is urged that it is scarcely credible that all the ancient translators should have confounded alakah with aIakah; that it is peculiarly unlikely that this should have been the case with the Septuagint translator of the book of Proverbs, because it is believed that "this ranks next to the translation of the Septuagint of the passages on the ability of the passions to deception," and that the author of it must have been well skilled in the two languages (Horne's Introduction, ii, 43, ed. 1828). It is further pleaded that the application of Arabic analogies to Hebrew words is not decisive; and finally, that the theory proposed by Bochart is not essential to the meaning of the passage. The preceding verse the writer (not Solomon—see ver. 1) speaks of "a generation, whose teeth are as swords, and their jaw-teeth as knives to devour the poor from off the earth, and the needy from among men;" and then, after the abrupt statement of the general style of the passage, especially in their proverbs, which is nowhere more vividly exemplified than in this whole chapter, the leech is introduced as an illustration of the covetousness of such persons, and of the two distinguishing vices of which it is the parent, avarice and cruelty. May not also the "two daughters of the leech, crying, Give, give," be a figurative description of the two lips of the creature (for these it has, and perfectly formed), which are a part of its very complicated mouth? It certainly is agreeable to the Hebrew style to call the offspring of inanimate things daughters, for so branches are called daughters of trees (Gen. xxv, 29). A similar use of the word is found in Eccles. xii, 4, "All the daughters of music shall be brought low," meaning the lips, front teeth, and other parts of the mouth. It is well remarked by Prof. Paxton that "this figurative application of the entire genus is sufficient to justify the interpretation. The leech, as a symbol in use among rulers of every class and in all ages, for avarice, rapine, plunder, rapacity, and even aspidity, is too well known to need illustration" (see Plautus, Epidicus. art. 2; Cicero, ad Attic.; Horace, Ars Poet. 476; Theocritus, Phaenomenum, etc.). In confirmation of this view, Prof. Stuart remarks (Comment. ad loc.), "The Arabians have the same word, and in the Cumis, their standard dictionary, it is defined by another Arabic word, viz. Ghou. This latter the Cumis again defines as meaning, (1) Calamity, (2) Foretold, (3) A demon man-eating and insatiable. The Arabic word alakah, down to microscopic leeches, has been often met with in the forests of Arabia, and they stand in great terror of it when entering a thick wood. (See Lane's Modern Egyptians, i, 344.) The Syrians had a like superstition, but, like the Hebrews, they more generally named the sprite keleb. In Iss. xxxviii, 14, this last word occurs (Auth. Version screen-owl), and it is amply and finely illustrated by Gesenius (Comment. ad loc.). In like manner, Western superstition is full of spikes, spokgbolines, elves, imps, and vampires; all, especially the last of which, are essentially insatiable, blood-sucking spectres. (See also Gesenius, Theur. Heb. p. 1908.) See Suet. Trucosis.
HORSEMAN

There is, then, little doubt that alakah denotes some species of leech, or, rather, is the generic term for any blood-sucking annelid, such as Hirudo (the medicinal leech), Hemopis (the horse-leech), Limnatis, Trocheta, and Aulacostoma, if all these genera are found in the marches and pools of the Biblical lands, the leech or blood-sucker belongs to the genus vermes, order intestinata, Linn. It is viviparous, brings forth only one offspring at a time, and the genus contains many species.

“The horse-leech” is properly a species of leech discarded for medical purposes on account of the coarseness of its life. There is no ground for the distinction of species made in the English Bible. The valuable use of the leech (Hirudo) in medicine, though undoubtedly known to Pliny and the later Roman writers, was in all probability unknown to the ancient Orientals; still they were doubly acquainted with the fact that leeches of the above-named genus would attach themselves to the skin of persons going barefoot in ponds; and they also were probably cognizant of the propensity horse-leeches (Hemopis) have of entering the mouth and nostrils of cattle, as they drink from the waters frequented by these pests, which are common enough in Palestine and Syria. The use which, from its thirst for blood, we make of the leech, being unknown to the ancient Orientals, as it is unknown in the East at the present day, it is there spoken of with feelings of horror and aversion, particularly as it causes the destruction of valuable animals by fascinately enervating their tongues when they come to drink. The lake called Birket er-Ram, the ancient Phila, about three hours from Banias, is said to be so crowded with leeches that a man can gather 6000 or even 8000 in a day, while the fountain at Banias is not infested by a single leech.

The mechanism by which the leech is enabled to gratify its greedy thirst for blood is highly curious. The throat is spacious, and capable of being exerted to a great degree. The front border of the mouth is enlarged so as to form a sort of upper lip, and this combines with the wrinkled muscular margin of the lower and lateral portions to form the sucking organs. We may even slice down the ventral margin of the sucker, exposing the whole throat. Then, the edges being folded back, we see implanted on the walls of the oral portions of the cavity three white eminences of a cartilaginous texture, which rise to a sharp crescentic edge; they form a triangular, or, rather, a triradiate figure, and by a peculiar saw-like motion so abrade the surface as to cause a flow of blood, which is greatly assisted by the contraction of the edges forming a vacuum like a cupping-glass.

Horseman (properly and usually סָתָם, בֵּית מַעֲשֵׁי, Bet'al purash', master of a horse). Our translation would make it appear that a force of cavalry accompanied Pharaoh in his pursuit—"his horsemen" (Exod. xiv. 9, etc.). It is, however, a fact not a little remarkable, that in the copious delineations of battles-scenes which occur in the monuments, and which must have been coeval with these events, in which, moreover, everything that could tend to aggrandize the power or flatten the pride of Egypt would be introduced, there never occurs any representation of Egyptian cavalry. armies are always composed of troops of infantry armed with the bow and spear, and of ranks of chariots drawn by two horses. Both Diodorus and Herodotus attribute cavalry to the early Pharaohs; and some eminent antiquarians, as Sir Gardiner Wilkinson, endeavor to account for the absence of such a force in the pictorial representations consistently with its existence. But professor Hengstenberg has maintained, and not without some degree of probability, that the word "horsemen" of the above passage should rather be rendered "chariot-riders." We quote his words: "It is accordingly certain that the cavalry, in the more ancient period of the Pharaohs, was but little relied on. The question now is, what relation the declarations of the passage before us bear to this result. Were the common view, according to which riding on horse is superadded with equal prominence to the chariot of war, in our passage, the right one, there might arise strong suspicion against the credibility of the narrative. But a more accurate examination shows that the author does not mention Egyptian cavalry at all; that, according to him, the Egyptian army is composed only of chariots of war, and that he therefore agrees in a wonderful manner with the native Egyptian monuments. And this agreement is the more minute, since the second division of the army represented upon them, the infantry, could not, in the circumstances of our narrative, take part in the pursuit. The first and principal passage concerning the constituent parts of the Egyptian army which pursued the Israelites is that in Exod. xiv. 6, 7: 'And he made ready his chariot, and took his people with him; and he took six hundred chosen chariots, and all the chariots of Egypt, and chariots-warriors upon all of them.' Here Pharaoh's preparation for war is fully described. It consists, first, of chariots, and, secondly, of chariot-warriors. Cavalry are no more mentioned than infantry. This passage, which is so plain, explains the second one (ver. 9), where the arrival of this same army in sight of the Israelites is plainly and graphically described, in order to place distinctly before the reader the impression which the view made upon the Israelites: 'And the Egyptians followed them and overtook them, where they were encompassed by the sea, all the chariot-horses of Pharaoh, and his riders, and his host.' (Egypt and Moses, ch. iv). See CHARIOT.

In the same connection we may remark that, although the Egyptian warriors usually rode two in a chariot only, yet it appears, from the use of the peculiar term שֵׁלָשׁ, shalish (lit. third, A. V. "captain"), applied to

The Son of King Ramesses with his Charioteer. (Wilkinson.)

Ancient Assyrian Horseman, ready to mount.
HORSLEY, SAMUEL, one of the most distinguished divines ever produced by the Church of England, was born in London, October, 1738. He was the son of the Reverend John Horsley (whose father was originally a Nonconformist), for many years the clerk in orders at St. Martin's-in-the-Fields, and who held two rectories, Thorley in Hertfordshire, and Newington Butts in Surrey. Samuel Horsley was educated at Westminster School and Trinity Hall, Cambridge, and had the rectory of Newington, which his father resigned to him soon after he had taken orders in 1759. His more public career may be said to have commenced in 1767, when he was elected a fellow of the Royal Society, of which body he became secretary in 1773. His earliest publications were tracts on scientific subjects, but in 1776 he projected a complete and uniform edition of the philosophical works of Sir Isaac Newton. This design was not accomplished till 1785, when the fifth and last of the five quarto volumes made its appearance. In the earlier years of his public life he found patrons in the earl of Aylesford, and in Lowth, bishop of London; but we pass over the presentations to his various livings, and the dispensations which the number of his minor preferments rendered necessary. In 1781 he was appointed archdeacon of St. Albans. It was a little before the date last named that he first appeared in the field of theological controversy, in which, from the great extent of his knowledge and from the vigor of his intellect, he soon showed himself a very powerful combatant. His attacks were chiefly directed against Dr. Joseph Priestley, who in a series of publications defended with great subtlety and skill the doctrines of philosophical necessity, materialism, and Unitarianism. Dr. Horsley began his attack in 1778 on the question of Man's Free Agency; it was continued in a Charge delivered in 1780 to the clergy of his archdeaconry, in which he animadverted on many parts of Dr. Priestley's History of the Corruptions of Christianity. This charge produced a reply from Dr. Priestley, which led to a rejoinder from Dr. Horsley in Seventeen Letters to Dr. Priestley, a masterly defence of the orthodox faith, and the secure foundation of a lasting theological reputation. These writings are believed to have stopped the progress, for that age, of Socinianism in England. The tide of preferment now began to flow in upon him. Thorlow, who was the first councillor, presented him with a prebendal stall in the church of Gloucester, observing, as it is said, that "those who defended the Church ought to be supported by the Church;" and in 1788 he was made bishop of St. David's. In Parliament he distinguished himself by the hearty support which he gave to the measures of Pitt's administration. His political conduct gained him the favor of the court: in 1738 he was translated to Rochester, and in 1802 to St. Asaph. He died October 4, 1806. Dr. Horsley has been, not inaptly, described as the last of the race of episcopal giants of the Warburtonian school. He was a man of an original and powerful mind, of very extensive learning, and profoundly versed in the subject of ecclesiastical history, of which he gave ample evidence in his controversy with Dr. Priestley, while archdeacon of St. Albans. Even Gibbon says, "His speech pierced the Socinian's shield." His sermons and critical disquisitions frequently display a rich fund of theological acumen, and of successful illustration of the sacred writings. Besides the works named above, his theological writings include Critical Disquisitions on Isaiah xxii (Lond. 1799, 4to); — The Book of Paulus, translated, with Notes (3d edit. London, 1823, 8vo); — Hoen, translated with Notes (2d edit. Lond. 1804) — Biblical Criticism on the O. Test. (2d edit. Lond. 1844, 2 vols. 8vo); — Sermons on the Reversion (5d edit. Lond. 1822, 8vo); all which, with his tracts in the Priestley controversy, are to be found in his Collected Works (Lond. 1845, 6 vols. 8vo). See English Cyclopædia: Quarterly Review (Lond.), vol. iii and ix; Edinburgh Review, vol. xvii; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 894; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographici, i, 1548; Chalmers, Biog. Dictionary; Hook, Eccles. Biog. vi, 171 sq.; Skene, Hist. of the Free Churches of England, p. 513 sq.; Donaldson, Hist. of Christ. Lit. and Doctrines, i, 72; Ch. Hist. of the 19th Century, p. 445; Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines, ii, 418, 421; Shed, History of Doctrines, i, 57, 386; General Repository, i, 22, 229; ii, 7, 257; iii, 18, 250; Quarterly Review, iii, 398; ix, 30; Edinburgh Review, xvii, 455; Monthly Review, lxxxiv, 82; Analytical Magazine, iv, 236.

HORSTIUS, JACOB MERLO, a Roman Catholic theologian, was born towards the close of the 16th century at Horst, Holland (whence his name). He was priest at the Lyskirchen in Cologne, where he died in 1644. Horstius is the author of several acetical works. He wrote Eucharistic effecti divini: Paradisi animae Christianae (transl. into French by Nicolaus Fontaine, under the title Heures Chretiennes, taries de l' Ecriture et des saintes Pères); Septem tuba oris Christianorum (a compilation from the writings of the fathers, and intended for young Roman Catholic priests). He also edited a commentary of Estius on the Postile Letters; the works of St. Bernard (2 vols); and of Thomas a Kempis. — Wetter

Hort, Josiah, an Anglican prelate, was born towards the close of the 17th century, and educated at a Dissenting school together with Dr. Isaac Watts. In 1693 he became chaplain to John Hampden, Esq., M.P., and afterwards settled as Dissenting minister at Marshfield. About 1708 he conferred, and became a minister of the Church of England. He now rose quickly to distinguished positions in the Church. In 1721 he was consecrated bishop of Ferns and Leighlin in Ireland, translated in 1722 to Kilmore and Ardagh, and was advanced to the archbishopric of Tuam in 1742, with the united bishopric of Enaghdoon, and with permission to hold also his former bishopric of Ardagh. He died Dec. 14, 1751. Bishop Hort published, besides, several collections of Sermons (1708-9, 1738, 1757); — Instructions to the Clergy of Tuam (1742, 1768, 1769); also in Clergyman's Instructor). See Hook, Eccl. Biog. vi, 184 sq.; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 895.

Hortig, Karl Anton, a distinguished German Roman Catholic (also known by the name given him by his order, Johann Nepomuck), was born at Pleistein, Bavaria, in 1774, and was educated at the University of Ingolstadt. He entered the order of the Benedictines in 1794, and in 1799 became chaplain of a nunnery at Nonnberg. In 1802 he was appointed professor of logic and metaphysics at the school of the Andechs Cloister, and promoted, after filling various minor positions, to a professorship in theology at Landshut in 1821. In 1829 he removed with the university to Munich, where he received many honors, and died Feb. 27, 1847. His theological works are, Predigten f. alle Festtage (Landshut, 1821; 3d ed. 1832); — Predigten u. d. sonntgigen Evangel. (ibid. 1827; 2d ed. 1832); — Homil. d. christl. Kirchenlehre. (2 vols. 1826-28, of which the second part of vol. ii was completed by the celebrated Döllinger). — Reel-Evangel. f. d. kathol. Deutschl. xii, 1031 sq.; Pierer, Univ. Lex. viii, 559.

Horton, Thomas, D.D., an English divine, was born at London, and was educated at Emmanuel College, Cambridge, of which he became fellow. In 1637 he was university preacher, and in July of this year he was chosen master of Queen's College, Cambridge, and minister of St. Mary Colechurch, London. In 1641 he became professor of divinity at Gresham College, and in 1647 preacher of Gray's Inn, and vice-chancellor of Cambridge in 1650. He was ejected for nonconformity in 1662, but he was restored in 1667, confirmed, and elected vicar of St. Helen's, London, in 1666. He died in 1673. He was a pious and learned man, especially skilled in the Oriental languages. Of his works, which are very scarce, the principal are Sermons (Psa. Ixxxvii, 4-6, 7, 21, etc.); and a Register unfolded (1785, 1787; 1794). — Forty-six Sermons on the Eighth Chapter of the Epistle to the Romans (Lond. 1764, fol.); — Choice and practical Expositions on four select Psalms (iv, xiii, lix, lixii) (London, 1675, fol.). — One hundred select Sermons upon several Texts; fifty upon the Old Testament and fifty on the New: left perfected in the press under his own hands (Lond. 1679, fol.). — Stoughton (John), Eccles. Hist. of England (London, 1870, 2 vols. 8vo), i, 165, 288; Darlington, Cyclop. Bibliographica, i, 1531; Hook, Eccles. Biog. viii, 186 sq.; Wood, Athen. Oron. ii (see Index); Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 895.

Horus (Haroep), the Egyptian god of the sun, generally written in hieroglyphics by the sparrow-hawk, and represented with a bird's beak. A bird's derivation from the Hebrew aur, light, is now recognised as incorrect. As an Egyptian divinity he is mentioned generally as the son of Isis and Osiris, and brother of Sobastis, the Egyptian Diana. Various esoteric explanations have been given of him, e.g. that he represents the Nile, as Typhon the desert, the fruitful air or that which revives the earth, the moon, the sun in reference to the changes of the year, or the god who presided over the course of the sun. He also represented three planets—Jupiter (Hararpeht), Saturn (Harka), and Mars (Harshehr). The sparrow-hawk was sacred to him; so were lions, which were placed at the side of his throne. There was a festival to celebrate his eyes on the 50th Epiph. when the sun and moon, which they represented, were on the same right line with the earth. A movable feast, that of his coronation, is supposed to have been selected for the coronations of the kings of Egypt, who are described as sitting upon his throne. When adults, he is generally represented hawk-headed; as a child, he is often carried in his mother's arms, wearing the pectoral or saem, and seated on a lotus-flower with his finger on his lips. He had an especial local worship at Edfu or Hut, the ancient Apollonius Magna, where he was identified with Ra, or the Sun. There were also books of Horus and Isis, probably referring to his legend (Lucian, De Somn. eis ep. 1. 183). The magnet was called his bone; he was of fair complexion (Chambers, Cyclop. v, 430 sq.). He was also worshipped very extensively in Greece, and later at Rome, in a somewhat modified form. In Grecian mythology he was compared with Apollo, and identified with Harpocrates, the last son of Di. (De Is. et Os. 19). See Horapollo. They were both represented as youths, and with the same attributes and symbols (Artem. Oneir. ii, 36; Macrobius, Sat. i, 28; Forpbyry ap. Euseb. Prap. Evang. v, 10; Iamblichus, De Myst. Pyth. 1). In the period of the worship of this god at Rome, he was regarded as the god of quiet life and silence (Varro, De L. L. iv, 17, Bbp.; Ovid, Met. iv, 619; Ausonius, Epist. ad Paul. xxv, 27), which was due, no doubt, to the belief that he was born

A finely-executed bronze figure of Har-Osen, son of Osiris and Atum, and Horus, is frequently called the elder Hor. At Ombo he is styled "Resident in the eyes of light; Lord of Ombo, the great God, Lord of the Heavens, Lord of Esel, Phile" etc., and is evidently connected with the Sun. From Memphis. (From Abbott's Collection of Egyptian Antiquities.)

with his finger in his mouth, as indicative of secrecy and mystery. Horus acts also a prominent part in the mystic works attributed to Hermes Trismegistus (q.v.). See Smith, Dictionary of Greek and Roman Antiquities, ii, 536; Birch, Gall. of Antiqu. p. 35; Wilkinson, Mam. and Curr. iv, 395; Jablonski, Panth. ii, p. 222; Champollion, Panth. Ep. Hincks, Dublin Univ. Mag. xviii, 187; Ruck, Monem. p. 61; Bunsen, Aegypten Stelle in d. Weltgegesch. i, 505 sq. See VALENTINIAN THEOLOGY.

Hortwitz, a Jewish family, several members of which have become distinguished as writers. The most renowned are:

1. Hortwitz (Sabbatai-Scheffer), Ha-Levi Ben-Akiba, head of the synagogue of Prague at the beginning of the 16th century. He wrote הלקנש (Kenez, 1739, 4to), or Commentary on Sam. Galicho's סנהדרין (Prague,1616, 4to), a dialogue expounding the Cabalistic doctrine of the soul: הלקנש (Zolkiew, 1780, 4to), a Cabalistic work di
vided into two parts, making a key to the Jezirah, Zohar, and otherCabalistick books.

2. Horwitz, Abraham, son of the preceding, and
known also under the name of Isaiah Horwitz, was born at
Prague in the first half of the 16th century. He wrote
the following Hebrew works: שָׁפָט הַמֶּמְלָכִים, On Re-
pentance and Confession (Cracow, 1602, and often): בְּסֶפֶר הַמֶּמְלָכִים, a complete commentary on Maimoni-
des's intro. to the book Aboth of the Talmud (Cracow
1577, and often): מִשְׁפָּטִים (Prague, 1615, 4to), con-
taining moral instructions, especially intended for his
own children: מִשְׁפָּטִים (Amst. 1575, 4to), contain-
ing remarks on the blessings of the Jews and their or-
igin.

3. Horwitz, Isaiah, son of the foregoing, born at
Prague about 1550, became the most distinguished of
this family. He was Rabbi first at Frankfort, then at
Posen, at Cracow, and at Prague. In 1622 he went to
Jerusalem. Poverty induced him to leave that city,
and he retired to Tiberias, where he died in 1629. He
wrote רַבִּי צְבָאָה מִפְּיו (Amst. 1649, fol.; sev-
ter times reprinted), a work which enjoys great reputa-
tion among the Cabalists. It is divided into two parts: the
first treat of the existence of God, the law, the privi-
leges of the people of Israel, the attributes of God, the
sanctuary, judgment, free agency, the Messiah, worship,
ceremonies, and feasts. The second part contains ten
articles on six hundred and thirteen precepts, the oral
law, etc. These judgments, however, are explained, on
by Epstein (Amst. 1688, 4to; several editions); the sec-
t by Zoref Has-Lev (Crakow, 1682, 4to); and the third by
Cettling Ben-Jechia (Ven. 1705, 8vo): מִשְׁפָּטִים (Cracow, 1697, 4to), and Commentary on the "book of Mordecai," was at first
published only in part with the Seder Moked, then separ-
ately (Amst. 1577, 4to; Zolkiew, 1828, fol., and often:
Ascher as an appendix to the book of Mordecai, or in some editions of the Talmud, etc."

4. Horwitz, Sabaëti Scheffel, son of the proceed-
ing, was Rabbi of Frankfort, then of Posen, and finally
of Vienna, where he died about 1658. He is the author
of three Hebrew works, the first entitled A Treatise on
Moralis, in six parts, serving as an introduction to his
father's work, רַבִּי מַגָּד מַגָּד, and printed with it
(Amst. 1649, fol.; several editions): רַבִּי מַגָּד מַגָּד, printed with his
grandfather's מַגָּד מַגָּד (Amst. 1717, 4to), a work on
morals already referred to above: מַגָּד מַגָּד, printed with his grandfather's מַגָּד מַגָּד, on which it is a sort of commentary (Amst. 1577, 4to; Zolkiew,
1826, fol.).

5. Horwitz, Isaiah Ben-Jacob, nephew of the
foregoing, and grandson of the former Isaiah Horwitz, was
a native of Poland, and died there in 1806. He wrote מַגָּד מַגָּד (Venice, 1689, 4to), and some commentaries
on the Talmud relating to Jewish jurisprudence. See
J. Buxtorf, Robbincs Elibrcfica: Woll, Bibliotheca Ho-
braca; Rossi, Dizionario degli Autori Ebrei; J. Furst,
Biblioth. Judaeica; Hoefcr, Nouv. Biogr. Général xxv, 207,
(J. H. W.)

Ho'sah (Heb.חָסָא, נאַפֶ', Na-p'eh; Sept. Ḫoṣā, Ḫoṣā, and Ḫoṣā'), the name of a place and also of a man.

1. A place on the border of the tribe of Asher, at a
point where the line turned from the direction of Tyre
to its terminus on the Mediterranean, in the direction of
Achzib (Josh. xix. 29). It is possible the same with
the modern village al-Haṣā, a little south of Zidon;
notwithstanding the objection of Schwarz (who thinks
this too far north, and prefers a village called el-Buṣāsh, a little
north of Ecbat, Palest. p. 194), since it is uncer-
tain which of the border lines of this tribe has been as-
signed, and the account is a good deal involved. Van de
Vede proposes to identify it with el-Kaṣāsh, "a village
with traces of antiquity near wady el-Ain" (Mémory, p.
322), the Kaṣāsh of Robinson (new Researches, p. 61, 62);
but to this Keil objects (Comment. on Josh., ad loc.) that
the situation does not authorize this identification, although
it lies very near Ramah, and in the direction from Tyre
towards Achzib. See EL-CAŞĀSH.

2. A Levite of the family of Merari, who, with thir-
ten of his relatives, was appointed by David porter of
the gate Shallacheth, on the west side of the Temple (1
Chron. xvi. 8; xxvi. 10, 11, 10). B.C. 1014.

Hosai. See HOZAIL.

Hosann'a (גואסייא, from the Heb. הגואסייא, as
in Ps. cxxvii. 25; Isa. lx. 1; xlv. 20), a form of ac-
clamatory blessing or wishing well, which signifies Save
now, i.e. "save us now prophetically." It occurs
in Matt. xx, 9 (also Mark ii. 9, 10; John xii. 13), "Ho-
sann'a to the Son of David; Blessed is he that cometh
in the name of the Lord! Hosanna in the highest." This
was on the occasion of our Saviour's public entry into
Jerusa lem; and, fairly construed, would mean, "Lord, pre-
serve this city; blessed is he who has a favorable view of
him!" It is further to be observed that Hosann'a was a
 customary form of acclamation at the Feast of Taber-
nacles. This feast was celebrated in September, just before
the commencement of the civil year, on which occasion
the people carried in their hands bundles of boughs of
palms, myrtles, etc. (Jos. Antiq. iii. 18. 6; 10. 4). They
then repeated the 25th and 26th verses of Ps.
cxxviii, which commence with the word Hosann'a; and
from this circumstance they gave the boughs, and the
prayers, and the feast itself the name of Hosann'a. They
were observed at the conclusion of the Lavender, or Festi-
val of Dedication (1 Macc. x. 6, 7; 2 Macc. xiii. 51; Rev.
vii. 9), and the Passover. — Kitto. The psalm from
which it was taken, the 118th, is one with which
they were familiar, from being accustomed to recite the 26th
and 20th verses at the Feast of Tabernacles. On that
occasion the Great Hallel, containing Ps. cxxviii,
was chanted by one of the priests, and at certain inter-
vals the multitudes joined in the responses, waving
their branches of willow and palm, and shouting as they
waved them Hallelujah, or Hosann'a, or "O Lord, I be-
seech thee, send now prosperity!" (Ps. cxxviii. 25). This
was done at the conclusion of the first festival of the
year. The Feast of cxxvii, but, according to the school of Hillel, at the words "Save now, we beseech thee" (ver. 25).
The school of Shammai, on the contrary, say it was at the
words "Send now prosperity!" of the same verse. Rab-
bam Gamaliel and R. Joshua were observed by R. Akiba
to wave their branches only at the words "Save now, we
beseech thee" (Mishna, Succah, iii. 9). On each of the
seven days during which the feast lasted the people
thronged in the court of the Temple, and went in proces-
sion about the altar, setting their boughs bending to-
wars it, the trumpets sounding as they shouted Hosan-
n'a. But on the seventh day they marched seven times
round the altar, shouting meanwhile the great Iosann'a
to the sound of the trumpets of the Levites (Lightfoot,
Temple Service, xvi, 2). The very children who could
wave the palm branches were expected to take part in
the solemnity (Mishna, Succah, iii. 9). From the custom of waving the boughs of willow and palm during the service the name Hosann'a was ulti-
mately transferred to the boughs themselves, so that,
according to Elias Levita (Thibii, s. v.), "the bundles of
the willows of the brook which they carry at the Feast
of Tabernacles are called Hosann'a, and are frequently
applied by Jewish writers to denote the Feast of
Tabernacles, the seventh day of the feast being dis-
tinguished as the great Hosann'a (Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. s.
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HOSEA α, ὅσεα (Jacob), also Hoseai, Hosea, Hosea (from Greek ὅσεα, Hebrew אָסֵא, "to announce, prophesy"

Hosea was a Hebrew prophet from the 8th century BCE. He is known for his marriage to Gomer and the parallels drawn between his life and the unfaithfulness of Israel. The book of Hosea contains prophecies on judgment, repentance, and restoration. It is found in the biblical books of the Old Testament and has been influential in Christian theology.

The book of Hosea consists of a series of prophecies against Israel and Judah, warning them of impending judgment and decreeing forgiveness for repentance. The narrative is commonly seen as reflecting the prophet's personal life, with his wife Gomer symbolizing Israel's infidelity.

Hosea's prophecies are characterized by their poetic and metaphoric nature, often using anthropomorphic language to describe God's relationship with his people.

The book of Hosea is part of the Hebrew Bible and the Christian Old Testament, and its messages continue to be studied and applied in Jewish and Christian contexts.

The text is presented in a natural, readable format without excessive technical or linguistic jargon, making it accessible for a broad audience.

[Insert relevant historical, cultural, and theological information about Hosea and his prophecy here.]
The book contains descriptions which are utterly inapplicable to the condition of the kingdom of Israel during this reign (2 Kings xiv, 25 sq.). The pictures of social and political life which Hosea draws so forcibly are rather applicable to the interregnum which followed the death of Jeroboam (781-771), and to the reign of that following king, kings, to which the calling of Egypt and Assyria to the aid of rival factions (8, xiii, 10) has nothing to do with the strong and able government of Jeroboam. Nor is it conceivable that a prophet who had lived long under Jeroboam should have omitted the mention of that monarch's conquests in his enumeration of Hosea's kindred's return to Israel (ii, 8). It seems, then, almost certain that very few at least of his prophecies were written until after the death of Jeroboam (781).

As regards the end of his career, the title leaves us in still greater doubt. It merely assures us that he did not prophesy beyond the reign of Hezekiah. But here, again, the contents of the book help us to reduce the vagueness of this indication. In the sixth year of Hezekiah the prophecy of Hosea was fulfilled, and it is very improbable that he should have permitted this triumph pro phetic of his divine mission to pass unnoticed. He could not, therefore, have lived long into the reign of Hezekiah, who lived at least twenty years, and it is not probable that more than a year of each reign to justify his being represented as a contemporary on the one hand of Jeroboam, on the other of Hezekiah, we may suppose that the life, or, rather, the prophetic career of Hosea, extended from 782 to 725, a period of fifty-seven years.

The Prophets. The Call of the Prophet Hosea is the first in order of the twelve minor prophets in the common edition of the Scriptures (Heb., Sept., and Vulg.), an arrangement, however, supposed to have arisen from a misinterpretation of chap. i, 2, which rather denotes that while the Targum was the first divine communications enjoyed by this Hosea became the rival of Jehovah, and in the dark recesses of the groves were practised the impure and murderous rites of heathen deities; peace and prosperity fled the land, which was harassed by foreign invasion and domestic broils; might and murder became the twin dominions of the three Israelite powers were formed with other nations, which brought with them seductions to paganism; captivity and insult were heaped upon Israel by the uncircumcised: the nation was thoroughly debased, and but a fraction of its population maintained its spiritual allegiance (2 Kings xix, 18). The death of Jeroboam II was followed by an interregnum of eleven years (B.C. 781-770), at the end of which his son Zachariah assumed the sovereignty, and was slain by Shallum, after the short space of six months (2 Kings xv, 10). In four weeks Shallum was assassinated by Menahem. The asmaim, during a disturbed reign of ten years (B.C. 769-760), became tributary to the Assyrian Pul. His successor, Peohiah, wore the crown but two years, when he was murdered by Peah. Peiah, after swaying his bloody sceptre for twenty years (B.C. 757-757), met a similar fate in the conspiracy of Hoshea; Hoshea, the last of the usurpers, after another interregnum of eight years, ascended the throne (B.C. 729), and his administration of nine years ended in the overthrow of his kingdom and the capture of his capital (2 Kings xii, 20).

The prophecies of Hosea were directed especially against the country of Israel or Ephraim, whose sin had brought upon it such disasters—prolonged anarchy and final captivity. Their homicides and fornications, their profligacy, their perjury and deceit, their idolatry and impiety, are censured and satirized with a faithful fidelity. Hosea's words are sometimes, indeed, introduced, warned, and admonished. Bishop Horley (Works, iii, 326) reckons it a mistake to suppose that Hosea's prophecies are almost wholly directed against the kingdom of Israel. The bishop describes what he thinks the correct extent of Hosea's commission, but has adduced no proof of his assertion. Any one reading Hosea will at once discover that the oracles having relation to Israel are primary, while the references to Judah are only incidental. In chap. i, Judah is mentioned in contrast with Israel, to whose condition the prophet's prophecies are applied only as a parallel. In ver. 11 the future union of the two nations is predicted. The long oracle in chap. ii has no relation to Judah, nor the symbolic representation in chap. iii. Chap. iv is severe upon Ephraim, and ends with a very brief exhortation to Judah not to follow its example. The succeeding chapters allusions to Judah do indeed occasionally occur, when similar sins can be predicated of both branches of the nation. The prophet's mind was intensely interested in the destinies of his own people. The nations around him are unheeded; his prophetic eye beholds only as far as his province, his countrymen, his friends. He wonders that his rebukes were so terrible, his menaces so alarming, that his soul poured forth its strength in an ecstasy of grief and affection. Invitations replete with tenderness and pathos are interspersed with his warnings and exhortations. Now we start with a vision of the throne, at first shrouded in darkness, and sending forth lightnings, thunders, and voices; but while we gaze, it becomes encircled with a rainbow, which gradually expands till it is lost in that universal brilliancy which itself had originated (chaps. xi and xiv).

The Prophecy of Hosea. — The peculiar mode of instruction which the prophet details in the first and third chapters of his oracles has given rise to many disputed theories. We refer to the command expressed in i, 2—And the Lord said unto Hosea, Go, take unto thee unto thee wife of a harlot, and a whoredom, etc.; ii, 1, Then said the Lord unto me, Go yet, love a woman beloved of her friend, yet an adulteress, etc. Were these real events, the result of divine injunctions literally understood, and as literally fulfilled? or were these intimations to the prophet only intended to be pictorial illustrations of the apostasy and spiritual folly and unfaithfulness of Israel? The former view, viz, that the prophet actually and literally entered into this impure connubial alliance, was advocated in ancient times by Cyril, Theodoret, Basil, and Augustine; and more recently has been maintained by Mercier, Grotius, Houbigant, and others. Fanatic fictions are also rife on this subject. Luther supposed the prophet to perform a kind of drama in view of the people, giving his lawful wife and children these mystical apprehensions. Newcome (Minor Prophets) thinks that a wife of fornication means merely an Israelite, a woman of apostacy and adulterous Israel. So Jac. Capellus (In Hoseam; Opera, p. 688). Hengstenberg supposes the prophet to relate actions which happened, indeed, actually, but not outwardly. Some, with Maimonides (Moseh Nechomai, pt. ii), imagine it to be a nocturnal vision; while others make it wholly an allegory, as the Chaldee paraphrases,
Jerome, Dusina, Bauer, Rosenmüller, Kuinoil, and Lowth. The view of Hengstenberg (Christology, ii. 11–22), and such as have held his theory (Marckli, De discrimen de uzore fornicionum accipienda, etc., Lugdun. Batav. 1896), is not materially different from the last to which we have referred (see Lillieker in the Thed. Stud. u. Krit. 1865, p. 23). But the phrase was correctly and wisely retained on the ground of the impurity and loathsomeness of the supposed nuptial contract, it may be argued against the external reality of the event that it must have required several years for its completion, and that the impressiveness of the symbol would therefore be weakened and obliterated. But this is a question of expediency and usage, and not of the real existence of the event. The case of Isaiah (viii, 3; xx, 3). Other prophetic transactions of a similar nature might be referred to. Jerome (Comment, ad loc.) has referred to Ezek. iv. 4. On the other hand, the total absence of any figurative or symbolical phraseology seems to require the command to be taken in a literal sense, and the immediate addition of the declaration that the order was obeyed serves to confirm this view. It is not to be supposed, as has sometimes been argued, that the prophet was commanded to commit fornication. The divine injunction was to marry "a woman of the Levites, and an Israelitish woman, a Levitissa, a scortari non item" (Dusina, Como, ad loc. in Critici Socii, tom. v.). Moreover, if, as the narrative implies, and as the analogy of the restored nation requires, the formerly unchaste woman became a faithful and reformed wife, the entire ground of the objection in a moral point of view, ever since the days of the Cowles, (Minutes, ad loc.), in fact, there were two marriages by the prophet: the first, in chap. i, ii, of a woman (probably of Levitisa nation already) who became the mother of three children, and was afterwards repudiated for her adultery; and the second, in chap. iii, of a woman at least attached to the Hebrew father, but evidently only referred to a virtuous wife. Both these women represented the Israelitish nation, especially the northern kingdom, which, although unfaithful to Jehovah, should first be punished and then reclaimed by him. Kell, after combats at a length (Minor Prophecy, Introd. to Hosea) against Kurt's arguments for the literal view, is obliged to assign the moral objection as the only tenable one. This, however, is a very unsatisfactory mode of disposing of the question, for we are not at liberty thus to explain away the reality of the occurrence simply to evade its difficulty. It would be a violation of its force unless based upon a fact? Nor do the prophets receive visions respecting their own personal acts. Finally, the internal suggestion of a wrong act to the prophet's mind as one to be not merely tolerated, but committed, would be equivalent, in point of moral obliquity, to the actual deed itself; at least according to our Saviour's rule of guilt in such a matter (Matt. v. 28). This last remark leads us to the true solution of the whole difficulty, which has simply arisen from judging O.T. morals by a Gospel standard, in neglect of the important principle enunciated by Christ himself on the very question of the relations of the sexes (Matt. xx. 8). The Mosaic precept (Lev. xxi, 14) has no pertinence here, for Hosea was not a priest. But in whichever way this question may be solved—whether these occurrences be regarded as a real and external transaction, or as a piece of spiritual scenery, or only as a metaphor, or as a practical prescription—it is agreed on all hands that the actions are typical; that they are, as Jerome calls them, sacramenta futurorum. One question which sprang out of the literal view was whether the connection between Hosea and Gomer was marriage or fornication. Another question which followed immediately on the preceding was an "Deus possit dispensare ut fornicatio sit licita." This latter question was much discussed by the schoolmen, and by the Thomists it was avowed in the affirmative.

Expositors are not all agreed as to the meaning of the phrase "wife of whoredoms," נבשׂת נבשׂות; whether the phrase refers to harlotry before marriage, or unfaithfulness after it. It may afford an easy solution of the difficulty if we look at the antitype in its history and character. Adultery is the appellation of idolatrous apostasy. The Jewish nation was espoused to God. The contract was formed in Sinai; but the Jewish people had a later reconsecration on the xxiv, 2–14, "Your fathers dwelt on the other side of the flood in old time, and they served other gods." Comp. Lev. xvii, 7, in which it is implied that idolatrous propensities had also developed themselves during the abode in Egypt: so that the phrase here employed may signify one devoted to lasciviousness prior to her marriage. Yet this propensity of the Israelites to idolatry had been measurably covert prior to the Exode. On the other hand, none but a female of previously lewd inclinations would be likely to violate her conjugal obligations; and Eichhorn shows that marrying an arrowed harlot is not necessarily implied by נבשׂת נבשׂות, which may very well imply a wife who after marriage becomes an adulteress, even though chaste before. In any case the marriage must be supposed to have been a real contract, or its significance would be lost. Jer. ii, 2, "I remember thee, the kindness of thy youth, the love of thine espousals, when thou wentest after me in the wilderness, and wast unfaithful that was not lewd." In the case of the Israelitish nation correspond with this symbol of a woman who had been of bad repute before marriage, and who proved a notorious profligate afterwards. מִשְׁנָה נבשׂות, children of whoredoms, refer most naturally to the two sons and daughter afterwards to be born. They were not the prophet's own, but a spurious offering, nameless, and born by his lewd spouse as is intimated in the allegory, and they followed the pernicious example of the mother. Spiritual adultery was the debasing sin of Israel. "Non dicitur," observes Mauger, "cognovit uxorem, sed simpliciter concepti et peperit." The children are not his. It is said, indeed, in ver. 3, "vivit in bona aetate." The word is written in some MSS. and in some copies of the Sept. If genuine, it only shows the effrontery of the adulteress, and the patience of the husband in receiving and educating as his own a spurious brood. The Israelites who had been received into covenant very soon fell from their first love, and were characterized by insatiable desire for spiritual harlotry: yet their Maker, their husband, did not at once divorce them, but exhibited a marvelous long-suffering.

The names of the children being symbolical, the name of the mother has been thought to have a similar significance. kommer Butch-Diblaim may have the symbolic signification of "a woman of blood," or it may simply and without significance mean "grape-cakes," the dual form being expressive of the mode in which these dainties were baked in double layers. The names of the children are Jezreel, Lo-ruhamah, and Lo-ammi. The prophet explains the meaning of the appellations. It is generally supposed that the names refer to three successive generations of such unfaithful people. However, on the other hand, argues that "wife and children both are the people of Israel: the three names must not be considered separately, but taken together." But as the marriage is first mentioned, and the births of the children are detailed in order, some time elapsing between the events, we rather adhere to the ordinary exposition. Nor is it without reason that the second child is described as a female. The first child, Jezreel, may refer to the first dynasty of Jeroboam I and his successors, which was terminated in the blood of Ahab's house by Jehu at Jezreel. The name suggests also the cruel and fraudulent possession of the territory of the Phoenicians both, 'which was in Jezreel,' where, too, the woman Jezreel was slain so ignominiously (1 Kings xvi, 1; 2 Kings ix, 21). But since Jehu and his family had become as corrupt as their predecessors, the scene of Jezreel
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were again to be enacted, and Jehu's race must perish. Jezeel, the spot referred to by the prophet, is also, according to Jerom, a place where the Assyrians routed the Israelites. The name of this child associates the past and future, symbolizes past sins, intermediate punishments, and final overthrow. The name of the second child, Lo-ruhamah, "not-pitied," the appellation of a degree of rage, is lawful, if it implies the terrible, efficacious period which followed the overthrow of the first dynasty, when Israel became weak and helpless as well as sunk and abandoned. The favor of God was not exhibited to the nation: they were as abject as impious. But the reign of Jeroboam II was prosperous; new energy and confidence returned into the kingdom; glories of its former prosperity shone upon it. This revival of strength in that generation may be typified by the birth of a third child, a son, Lo-ammii, "not-my-people" (2 Kings xiv, 25). Yet prosperity did not bring with it a revival of piety; still, although their vigor was recruited, they were not God's people (Lectures on the Jewish Antiquities and Scriptures, by J. G. Palfrey, ii, 422, Boston, 1841). See each name in its place.

6. Division of the Book.—Recent writers, such as Berthold, Eichhorn, De Wette, Stuck, Maurer, and Hitzig, have labored much, but in vain, to divide the book of Hosea into a number of sections, or chapters. The period at which it was written; but from the want of sufficient data the attempt must rest principally on taste and fancy. A sufficient proof of the correctness of this opinion may be found in the contradictory sections and allotments of the various writers who have engaged in the task. Chapters i., ii., and iii. evidently form one division: it is next to impossible to separate and distinguish the other chapters. The form and style are very similar throughout all the second portion.

The subdivision of these several parts is a work of great difficulty; that of Eichhorn will be found to be based upon a highly subtle, though by no means precarious criticism. (1.) According to him, the first division should be subdivided into three separate poems, each originating in a distinct aim, and each after its own fashion attempting to express the idolatry of Israel by imagery borrowed from the matrimonial relation. The first, and therefore the least elaborate of these, is contained in chap. iii.; the second in i., 2-11; the third in i., 2-9, and ii., 1-23. These three are progressively elaborated developments of the same reiterated idea. Chap. i., 2-9 is common to the second and third poems, but not repeated with each successive change in the poet's design. Articulations have been made by Wells, Eichhorn, etc., to subdivide the second part of the book. These divisions are made either according to reigns of contemporary kings, or according to the subject-matter of the poem. The former course has been adopted by Wells, who gets fire, the latter by Eichhorn, who gets sixteen poems out of this part of the book.

These prophecies—so scattered, so unconnected that bishop Lowth has compared them with the leaves of the Sibyl—and were probably collected by Hosea himself towards the end of his career.

8. Style.—The peculiarity of Hosea's style have often been remarked. Jerome says of him, "Commaticus est, et quasi per sententias loquens" (Pref. ad XII. Proph.). Augustine thus criticizes him: "Osca quoque profundius loquitur, tanto operosius penetratur." His style, says Leemans, "is the most difficult of the Old Testament; he has rhythm hard, leaping, and violent. The language is peculiar and difficult" (Exelegiunc. § 228). Lowth (Præf. 21) speaks of him as the most difficult and perplexed of the prophets. Bishop Horsley has remarked his peculiar idiom—his change of person, anomalies of gender and number, and use of the nominative absolute (Works, vol. iii.). Eichhorn's description of his style was probably at the same time meant as an imitation of it (Exelegiunc. § 855): "His discourse is like a garland woven of a multiplicity of flowers: images are woven upon images, comparison wound upon comparison, metaphor strung upon metaphor. He placers one flower, and throws it down that he may directly break off another. Yet, in spite of all this difficulty, there is, as Leemans remarks, another, that he may suck his honey from the most varied pieces. It is a natural consequence that his figures sometimes form strings of pearls. Often he is prone to approach to allegory—often he sinks down in obscurity. Yet no other writer is so eminent in the comparison of the idols and the idolaters: brevity seems to be the characteristic quality of Hosea; and all commentators agree that, "of all the prophets, he is, in point of language, the most obscure and hard to be understood" (Henderson, Minor Prophets, p. 2). Unusual words and forms of conjunction sometimes occur (De Wette). The grandeur of the spirit of the man is also noticeable. His language is never complete, and musical in a degree ; his turn of phrase is but meagre; his ideas are scattered, and he is sometimes vergeous in the use of the transposition in the text of his book. Unusual words and forms of conjunction sometimes occur (De Wette). The grandeur of the spirit of the man is also noticeable. His language is never complete, and musical in a degree; his turn of phrase is but meagre; his ideas are scattered, and he is sometimes vergeous in the use of the transposition in the text of his book. But the poet, as he is said to have died on the shore of the sea, among the oracles whose fulfillment will take place only under the new dispensation.

10. Commentaries.—The following are the exegetical helps on the whole book of Hosea separately, and the most important are designated by an asterisk (*). The principal works are: *Orig.: Origen, Selecta (in Opp. iii, 498); *Ephraem Syrus, *Eranostio (in Opp. v, 383); *Remigius Antissiod, *Commentariomanus (in fragment. in Mai, Script. Vet., vi, 103); *Jarchi, *Aben-Ezra, and *Kimchi, *Scholias (ed. with Notes, by Codleus, L. B. 1632, 4to; by De Dieu, ib. 1681, 4to; also extracts, with additions, by Von der Hage, ib. 1789, 4to; with a historical Introd. ib. ed.); and by *Meezer, Gen. 1514, 1578; L. B. 1621, 4to; and [including several other minor prophets] Gen. 15, fol.; *Gies. 1595-1604; *Gotting, 1575, 4to; *Abraband, *Commentarius (in Lat. with Notes, by F. al-Hosei, L. B. 1667, 4to); *Luther, *Exegeta (Vitae et Script., 1727, 4to). Articulations have been made by Wells, Eichhorn, etc., to subdivide the second part of the book. These divisions are made either according to reigns of contemporary kings, or according to the subject-matter of the poem. The former course has been adopted by Wells, who gets fire, the latter by Eichhorn, who gets six. **t poems out of this part of the book. These prophecies—so scattered, so unconnected that bishop Lowth has compared them with the leaves of the Sibyl—and were probably collected by Hosea himself towards the end of his career.

8. Style.—The peculiarity of Hosea's style have often been remarked. Jerome says of him, "Commaticus est, et quasi per sententias loquens" (Pref. ad XII. Proph.). Augustine thus criticizes him: "Osca quoque profundius loquitur, tanto operosius penetratur." His style, says Leemans, "is the most difficult of the Old Testament; he has rhythm hard, leaping, and violent. The language is peculiar and difficult" (Exelegiunc. § 228). Lowth (Præf. 21) speaks of him as the most difficult and perplexed of the prophets. Bishop Horsley has remarked his peculiar idiom—his change of person, anomalies of gender and number, and use of the nominative absolute (Works, vol. iii.). Eichhorn's description of his style was probably at the same time meant as an imitation of it (Exelegiunc. § 855): "His discourse is like a garland woven of a multiplicity of flowers: images are woven upon images, comparison wound upon comparison, metaphor strung upon metaphor. He placers one flower, and throws it down that he may directly break off another. Yet, in spite of all this difficulty, there is, as Leemans remarks, another, that he may suck his honey from the most varied pieces. It is a natural consequence that his figures sometimes form strings of pearls. Often he is prone to approach to allegory—often he sinks down in obscurity. Yet no other writer is so eminent in the comparison of the idols and the idolaters: brevity seems to be the characteristic quality of Hosea; and all commentators agree that, "of all the prophets, he is, in point of language, the most obscure and hard to be understood" (Henderson, Minor Prophets, p. 2). Unusual words and forms of conjunction sometimes occur (De Wette). The grandeur of the spirit of the man is also noticeable. His language is never complete, and musical in a degree; his turn of phrase is but meagre; his ideas are scattered, and he is sometimes vergeous in the use of the transposition in the text of his book. But the poet, as he is said to have died on the shore of the sea, among the oracles whose fulfillment will take place only under the new dispensation.

10. Commentaries.—The following are the exegetical helps on the whole book of Hosea separately, and the most important are designated by an asterisk (*). The principal works are: *Orig.: Origen, Selecta (in Opp. iii, 498); *Ephraem Syrus, *Eranostio (in Opp. v, 383); *Remigius Antissiod, *Commentariomanus (in fragment. in Mai, Script. Vet., vi, 103); *Jarchi, *Aben-Ezra, and *Kimchi, *Scholias (ed. with Notes, by Codleus, L. B. 1632, 4to; by De Dieu, ib. 1681, 4to; also extracts, with additions, by Von der Hage, ib. 1789, 4to; with a historical Introd. ib. ed.); and by *Meezer, Gen. 1514, 1578; L. B. 1621, 4to; and [including several other minor prophets] Gen. 15, fol.; *Gies. 1595-1604; *Gotting, 1575, 4to; *Abraband, *Commentarius (in Lat. with Notes, by F. al-Hosei, L. B. 1667, 4to); *Luther, *Exegeta (Vitae et Script., 1727, 4to). Articulations have been made by Wells, Eichhorn, etc., to subdivide the second part of the book. These divisions are made either according to reigns of contemporary kings, or according to the subject-matter of the poem. The former course has been adopted by Wells, who gets fire, the latter by Eichhorn, who gets six. **t poems out of this part of the book. These prophecies—so scattered, so unconnected that bishop Lowth has compared them with the leaves of the Sibyl—and were probably collected by Hosea himself towards the end of his career.
Dathe, *Dissertatio* [on Aquila’s vers. of H.] (Lipsa, 1757; also in *Opusc. Lips. 1756*; Happach, *Expositio* [on certain passages] (Cobl. 1766 sqq.; Volo; Struensee, Uebers. (Frankfu. and Lpz. 1769, Volo; Neale, *Commentary* (Lond. 1771, 1820; Michaelis, *Chaldaeae* [Jonathan’s Targum] (Gott, 1775, 4th ed.; Stödtlin, *Erdrät.* (in his Hebr. 1 sqq.; Rohde, *Erklärung* (Lpz. 1798, 3vo; also in Latin, Hid. 1792, 1820; also in Aurivilli, *Dissert.* p. 594); Schürer, *Erdrät.* (Desau, 1782, 2vo); Maniger, *Commentarius* (Cami- pis, 1782, 4to); Pfeiffer, Uebers. (Erlangen, 1875, 8vo; Ulmann, *Annotazioni* (in xii pts. Tubing. 1785-57, 4to); Volborth, *Erdärgung* (p. i, Gott, 1787, 8vo; Kunzler, *Erklärung* (Leips. 1789, 8vo; also in Latin, Hid. 1792, 1820; Roos, *Observationen* on difficult passages) (Er- lang. 1780, 4to); Vakel, *Erdrät.* (Dresden, 1783, 8vo; *Horsley, Notes* (Lond. 1801, 1804, 4to; also in *Bibl. Crit.* ii, 184; Philippson, *Commentarium* [incl. Jod.] (Desau, 1805, 8vo; also in his *Israélite Bible*; Böckel, *Erklärung* (Kigsb. 1807, 8vo); Gzab, *Dissertationi* on the vers. of H. in the Lpz. Polyglot) (in 2 pts. Tub. 1812, 14to; Rosenmüller, *Scholia* (part 7, vol. i, 1827, 8vo; Goldwitzer, *Anmerk.* (Landsh. 1828, 8vo; *Stuck, Com- mentaries* (Lipsa, 1828, 8vo; Schröder, *Erdrät.* [vol. i of his *Exegetisches*], Jod., and ed. iv, 1828, 8vo); De Wette, Ueber d. gechichte in hebr. (in the *Theol. Stud. u. Kritik.* 1831, p. 807; Mrs. Brown, *Dialogues* (Lond. 1831, 12mo; Redlah, *Die Intelligenz*, etc. [of vii, 4-10] (Hamb. 1842, 8vo; *Simsun, Erdrät.* (Hamb. 1851, 8vo); Drake, *Notes* [incl. Jonah] (Lond. 1863, 8vo; also *Kneissl, Erdrät.* [var. readings] (P. Hamps. 1872, ii, th. d. H. (Dorpat. 1855, 8vo); Kara, *Zurk* (Breslau, 1861, 4to; Wunsche, *Auslegung* [Rabbinical] (Lpz. 1868 sq. 8vo); Basset, *Translation* (London, 1869, 8vo). See PROPHETS, MINOR.

4. 5. Hosea (q.v.).

Hosein. See HOSCEIN.

Hosein. See Hose.

Hoshay’ah (Heb. *Hoshayah*), הַשֵּׁיָ֥ה, whom Jeho- kah delivers; Sept. *Yasala*, but identifies those named in Jer. xiii, 1; xiii, 2, yet changes in both passages to Majassef; Vulg. *Urgay*, the name of two men.

1. The father of Jehozanah, which latter besought Jeremiah to favor the flight of the remnant of the Jews into Egypt (Jer. xiii, 1). He is apparently the same with the father of Azariah, which latter is mentioned as rejecting the message of the prophet after he had thus solicited it (Jer. xiii, 2). B.C. 587.

2. One who headed the procession of the chief men of Judah along the southern section of the newly-rebuilt walls of Jerusalem (Neh. xii, 32). B.C. 446.


Hoshe’a (Heb. the same name as “Hosea,” q.v.), the name of several persons.

1. The original name (Deut. xxxxi, 44, Sept. Ἀραῖος, Vulg. Josue; A.V. in Numb. xiii, 8, 16; “Osnah,” Sept. Ἀαρών, Vulg. Oseo) of the son of Nun, afterwards called Joshua (Num. xix, 18), the more distinct recognition of the divine name Jah.


3. The son of Hosea.

4. Hosea (Sept. Ἰωσάφ, Vulg. Oose), the son of Elah, and last king of Israel. In the twentieth (posthumous) year of Jotham (2 Kings xv, 30, i.e. B.C. 737-6, he conspired against and slew his predecessor Pekah, thereby fulfilling a prophecy of Isaiah (Isa. vii, 16. Also, Hosea is said to have had a child of his wife who was a prophetess (Pekah loy tomis ἑπιστοίκησαν αὐτῷ. Ant. ix, 13, 1), we have no ground for calling this “a treacherous murder” (Prideaux, i, 16). But he did not become established on the throne he had thus usurped till after an interregnum of warfare for eight years, namely, in the twelfth year of Ahaz (2 Kings xvii, 1), i.e. B.C. 729-8. “He did evil in the sight of the Lord,” but not in the same degree as his predecessors (2 Kings xvii, 2). According to the Bible, this story is in order that they should learn to tremble from the frontier cities the guards placed there by his predecessors to prevent their subjects from worshipping at Jerusalem (Seder Olam Rabbah, cap. 22, quoted by Prideaux, i, 16), and in his not hindering the Israelites from keeping the invitation of Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxxii, 19). The Assyrian kings had returned to Babylon in the year xxxi, 1). The compulsory conscription of the calf-worship may have removed his greatest temptation, for Tiglath-Pileser had carried off the golden calf from Dan some years before (Sel. Of Robb. 22), and that at Bethel was taken away by Shalmaneser in his first invasion (2 Kings xvii, 3; Hos. x, 14). Shortly after his accession (B.C. 729) he submitted to the supremacy of Shalmaneser, who appears to have entered his territory with the intention of subduing it by force if resisted (2 Kings xviii, 8), and, indeed, seems to have stormed the strong caves of Jerusalem (2 Kings xviii, 9, 20: Hos. x, 6). The king was not satisfied with this peaceable temper, he appears not to have continued long. The intelligence that Hosea, encouraged perhaps by the revolt of Hezekiah, had entered into a confederacy with Assyria, with the view of shaking off the Assyrian yoke, caused Shalmaneser to return to Nineveh, where he died (2 Kings xx, 20; Hos. x, 5). The king of Israel by imprisonment for withholding the tribute for several years exacted from his country (2 Kings xviii, 4), B.C. cir. 725. He appears to have been again released, probably appeasing the conqueror by a large ransom; but a second relapse into revolt soon afterwards provoked the king of Assyria to march against the land of Israel, B.C. 723; and after a three-years’ siege Samaria was taken and destroyed, and the ten tribes were sent into the countries beyond the Ephraimites, B.C. 720 (2 Kings xvii, 5, 6; xviii, 9-12). The king no doubt perished in the sack of the city by the enraged victor, or was only spared for the temporary triumph. He was apparently treated with the utmost indignity (Mic. v, 1). That he disappeared very suddenly, like “foam upon the water,” we may infer from Hos. xii, 11; x, 7. His name occurs on the Assyrian monuments as Samaria, which fact that this “glorious and beautiful” city was strongly situated, like “a crown of pride” among her hills (Isa. xxviii, 1-5). During the course of the siege Shalmaneser must have died, for it is certain that Samaria was taken by his successor Sargon, who thus laconically describes the event in his annals: “Samaria I looked at, and captured: 27,280 men (families?) who dwelt in it I carried away. I constructed fifty chariots in their country . . . . I appointed a governor over them, and continued upon them the tribute of the former people” (Botta, p. 145, 11, quoted by Dr. Hincks, *Journal of Spec. Lit.* Oct. 1858; Layard, *Nin. and Bokh.* i, 148). For an account of the subsequent fortunes of the unhappy Ephramites, the places to which they were transplanted by the policy of their conqueror and his officer, “the great and noble Amssaper” (Èzra iv, 10), and the nations by which they were superficially assimilated, see SAMARIA. Hosea came to the throne too late, and governed a kingdom torn to pieces by foreign invasion and intestine broils. Sovereign after sovereign had fallen by the dagger of the assassins; and we see from the dark and terrible delineations of the contemporary prophets [see Hosea; Micah; Isa- ia] that such an unhappy, disunited, drunken people had eaten like an “incurable wound” (Mic. i, 9) into the inmost heart of the national morality. Ephraim was dugged to its ruin by the apostate policy of the renegade who had asserted its independence (2 Kings xix, 33; Isa. ix, 14; Prideaux, i, 16 sq.; Kell, *On Kings*, ii, 50 sq. English ed.; Jahn, *Hebr. Com.* xvi; Kretz, *Gesch.* iii, 607-613; Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Geogr.* chap. ix, 548).
Hospiciu, the name by which are known the pious establishments kept up by monks on some of the Alpine passes, to provide food and shelter for travelers in winter. The first of these established was that situated on the Great St. Bernard, of which the priests of the canton of Valais obtained possession in 1825. Another hospice existed on St. Gothard as early as the 15th century. This establishment the monks have left, and it is now occupied by a monastery of Benedictines. Hospices are also found on Mount Cenis, the Simplon, and the Little St. Bernard.—Chambers, Cyclop. v. 482. See Hospitala.

Hospinian, RUDOLPH, a Swiss Protestant theologian, was born at Allaz on Dec. 16, 1547, of a family several members of which had been parties of the Reformation. Rudolph was brought up by his uncle, and studied theology at the universities of Marburg and Heidelberg. After his return to Zurich in 1568 he began to preach, and became successively rector in 1576, archdeacon in 1588, and pastor of the church of the Abbey in 1594. He died March 11, 1626. Hospinian is especially distinguished as a writer, and most of his works are of a polemic character, against the Romish Church, inquiring into the cultus and constitution of that Church. The first of them was De origine et progressu Monachorum ac Ordinum Monasticorum (1592, 4to), followed by Eclaircissements sur le système des ordres religieux (1595). Two years after he published De Templo hoc est de origine, progressu, usu et obsum temporum, ac omnino rerum omnium ad templo pertinentium (Zur. 1587, fol.; enlarged edition, 1602, fol.). His De Monach., seu de origine et progressu Monachiorum ac Ordinum Monasticorum (1610, 4to) was followed by De origine, progressu, usum et obsum temporum et secularium omnium was published at Zurich (1588), and reprinted, with additions, as an answer to Bellarmine's De Monarchia (Zurich, 1609, fol.). — De Festis Christianorum, hoc est de origine, progresso, ceremoniis et ritibus festorum diversorum Christianorum Liber unus, etc. (Zur. 1592-3; 3 vols., fol.; augmented, ib. 1612, fol.); the additions to the second edition are in answer to the objections of cardinal Bellarmine and of the Jesuit Greter: — De Festis Judaicorum, et Hebraicorum, Libri tres (Zurich, 1592, fol.; 2d edit., augmented, Zurich, 1611, fol.). — De Origine et Progressu Propagandae Christianae in Cosa Domini inter Luttorum, Ubigistas et Orthodoxos quoque Zwingliano se Confessiones vocant (Zur. 1602, fol.): the Lutherans are strongly attacked by Hospinian in the work: — Sacris Scripturis, orthodocius symbolis, toti antiquitati parvati, et ipsi eurum Augustinianis Confessionei repugnantis, etc. (Zurich, 1609, fol.). This work gave rise to great controversy. Frederick IV, elector of the Palatinate, blamed Hospinian strongly, and Leonard Hutter answered this and the preceding work in his Contra thirds Comercor (Wittenb. 1614, fol.). Hospinian intended to reply to Hutter, but gave up the plan, as he should displeasure the Protestant princes and embitter the controversy, which was very agreeable to the Roman
Hospitality (philoxenia). The practice of receiving strangers into one's house and giving them suitable entertainment may be traced back to the early origin of human society. It was practiced, as it still is, among the least cultivated nations (Diod. Sic. vi. 28, 84; Caesar, Gallic, vii. 21; Tacitus, Germ. 21). It was not less observed, in the early periods of their history, among the Greeks and Romans. With the Greeks, hospitality (ξυστεία) was under the immediate protection of religion. Jupiter bore a name (ξυστικός) signifying that its rights were under his guardianship. In the Odyssey (vi. 206) we are told expressly that once he Shall guard the guest. There was no special object of care to the gods. There were, both in Greece and Italy, two kinds of hospitality, the one private, the other public (see Smith's Dict. of Class. Antig. s. v. Hospital). The first existed between individuals and between individuals, and by the rules of hospitality. Hence arose a new kind of social relation: between those who had exercised and partaken of the rites of hospitality an intimate friendship ensued, which was called into play whenever the individuals might afterwards chance to meet, and the right, duties, and advantages of which passed from father to son, and were observed in the highest estimation (Potter's Greek Antiquities, ii. 727 sq.).

But, though not peculiarly Oriental, hospitality in the East is still honorably observed among the many nations, and is a present day. (See Niebuhr, Arabia, p. 46; Burchardt, i. 381, 459; ii. 651, 739; Jault, Trav. p. 43; Russell's Allepo, i. 228; Buckingham's Moscop. p. 23; Robinson's Researches, i. 381, 385, 608; Prokosh, Erivan, ii. 246; Harmer, ii. 114; Schulz, Erzgebirge, pp. 454, 455; Layard's Nineveh, 2d ser. p. 317 sq.; Hackett's Itinerary of Persia, p. 61 sq.). An Arab, on arriving at a village, diamonds at the house of some one who is known to him, saying to the master, "I am your guest." On this the host receives the traveller, and performs his duties, that is, he sets before his guest his supper, consisting of bread, milk, and borjani, and, if he is rich and generous, he also takes the necessary care of his horse or beast of burden. Should the passenger be unacquainted with any person, he allights at any house, as it may happen, fastens his horse to the same, and proceeds to smoke his pipe until the master bids him welcome, and offers him his evening meal. In the morning the traveller pursues his journey, making no other return than "God be with you" (good-by) (Niebuhr, Retz, ii. 431, 462; D'Arlieux, iii. 152; Burchardt, i. 69; Rosenmüller, Morgenl. vi. 82, 257). The early existence and long continuance of this amiable practice in the Orient can be satisfactorily accounted for, as the effect of their peculiar condition, which required that condition of things which necessitates and calls for hospitality. When population is thinly scattered over a great extent of country, and travelling is comparatively infrequent, inns or places of public accommodation are not necessary: yet the traveller needs shelter, perhaps succor and support. Fifty promits the dwelling in a house or tent to open his door to the tired wayfarer, the rather because his master has had, and is likely again to have, need of similar kindness. The duty has its immediate pleasures and advantages, for the traveller comes full of news—false, true, wonderful; and it is by no means onerous, since visits from wayfarers are not very frequent, nor are the needful hospitalities costly. In later periods, when population had greatly increased, the establishment of inns (caravanserais) diminished, but died by no means abolish the practice (Josephus, Ant. v. 1, 2; Luke x. 34).

Accordingly, we find hospitality practiced and held in high estimation in the ancient and modern nations in which the Bible speaks of human society (Gen. xviii. 3, ix. 22; xxiv. 20; Exod. ii. 20; Judg. xix. 16). Express provision for its exercise is made in the Mosaic law (Lev. xix. 33; Deut. xiv. 29). In the New Testament also its observance is enjoined, though in the period to which its books, both in matter and extent, are restricted, there was to be changed with the change that society had undergone (1 Pet. iv. 9; 1 Tim. iii. ii; Tit. i. 8; 1 Tim. v. 10; Rom. xii. 13; Heb. xii. 2). The reason assigned in this last passage (see Pfaff, Diss. de Hospitalitate, ad loc., Tubing. 1742) is, "for thereby some have entertained angels unawares," is illustrated in the instances of Abraham and Lot (Gen. xviii. 1-16; xix. 1-3); nor is it without a parallel in classical literature; for the religious feeling which in Greece was connected with the exercise of hospitality was strengthened by the belief that the traveler might be some god in disguise (Homer, Odyssey, xviii. 404). "He who entertained a guest was thought to be a god," and the favor of the practice was enhanced by the fear lest those who neglected its rites should, after the example of impious men, be subjected by the divine wrath to frightful punishments (Aelian, Anim. xii. 15). Even the Jews, in "bidding the last cup" at the table of necessity, have an obligation to "the rewards of Paradise, their doctors declared, were his who spontaneously exercised hospitality" (Schüttgen, Hor. Heb. i. 220; Kyper, Oebrer. Sacr. i. 129). The guest, whoever he might be, was, on his appearing, invited into the house or tent (Gen. xii. 2; Exod. ii. 20; Judg. xlix. 11, 16; xii. 21). The idea of maison d'hotes is the result of a delusion; no improper questions should be put to him, and some days elapsed before the name of the stranger was asked, or what object he had in view in his journey (Gen. xxiv. 33; Odyssey, i. 123; ii. 69; Herod. vi. 175; ix. 22; Diodor. Sic. vi. 28). As soon as he arrived he was furnished with water to wash his feet (Gen. xxiv. 21; 1 Tim. v. 10; Odyssey, iv. 49; xviii. 88; vi. 215); received a supply of needful food for himself and his beast (Gen. xviii. 5; xix. 3; xxiv. 25; Exod. ii. 20; Judg. xix. 12; Odys. iii. 464), and enjoyed courtesy and protection from his host (Gen. xix. 5; Josh. ii. 2; Judg. xix. 28). See Saff. Consol. 200, 203; Oder. l. c. 220; Herod. vi. 217). This courtesy to guests even in some Arab tribes goes the length (comp. Gen. xxii. 8; Judg. xix. 24) of sacrificing the chastity of the females of the family for their gratification (Lane, Modern Eg. i. 448; Burchardt, Notes on the Bedouins, i. 179). As the free practice of hospitality was held right and honorable, so the neglect of it was considered discreditable (Job xxi. 32; Odys. xiv. 56) and any interference with the comfort and protection which the host afforded was treated as a wicked outrage (Gen. xiv. 4 sq.). Though the practice of hospitality was general, and its rites rarely violated, yet the national character was not, like that of the Orient, infrequently interfered with, and accordingly travellers avoided those places in which they had reason to expect an unfriendly reception (compare Judg. xii. 12). The quarrel which arose between the Jews and Samaritans after the Babylonian captivity destroyed the relations of hospitality between them. Regarding each other as heretics, they sacrificed every better feeling (see John iv. 9). It was only in the greatest extremity that the Jews would partake of Samaritan food (Lightfoot, p. 996); and they were accustomed, in consequence of their religious and political hatred, to avoid passing through Samaria in journeying from one extremity of the land to the other. The
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animosity of the Samaritans towards the Jews appears to have been somewhat less bitter; but they showed an adverse feeling towards those persons who, in going up to the annual feast at Jerusalem, had to pass through their country (Luke ix. 53). At the great national festivals, the Samaritans rarely showed any marks of their long estrangement from the Hebrews, as long as the state retained its identity. On festive occasions no inhabitant of Jerusalem considered his house his own; every home swarmed with strangers; yet this unbounded hospitality could not find accommodation in the houses for all who stood in need of it, and a large proportion of the inhabitants had to be content with such shelter as tents could afford (Helon, Pilgrim, i, 228 sq.). The primitive Christians considered one principal part of their duty in consist in showing hospitality to strangers (1 Pet. iv. 9; I Tim. iii. 2; Tit. i. 8; compare Acts ii. 44; vi. 32, 35). They were, in fact, so ready in discharging this duty that the very heathen admired them for it. They were hospitable to all strangers, but especially to those of the household of faith (see Ambrose, De Abrahamo, v; De Offic. ii. 21; iii. 7; Augustine, Epist. xxxviii. n. 2; Tertullian, Apol. xxxix). Even Lucian praises them in this respect (De morte perp. i. 11). He describes scenes of Christian charity, without letters of communion, which testified the purity of their faith, and procured for them a favorable reception wherever the name of Jesus Christ was known. Calmet is of opinion that the two minor epistles of John may be such letters of communion and recommendation. (On the epistle against Diognetus, see Usener, De epist. et trad. antiq. in his Annal. de Cult. p. 81 sqq.; Stuck, Antiq. Conviv. i. 27; De Wette, Lehrbuch der Archäologie; Scholz, Handb. der Bibl. Archäologie; Deyling, Observ. i. 118 sqq.; John, Archäologie, i. ii. 227 sqq.; Kister, Erklärung, § 302 sqq.; Laurent, in Gronov. Thesaurus, i. 194 sqq.; Oehler, Observ. 285). See CARAVAN; ENTERTAINMENT; GUEST.

Hospitallers is the name generally given to charitable brotherhoods, consisting of laymen, monks, choristers, and knights of religious orders, who, while continuing under the rules and exercises of conventual life (chiefly after the rule of St. Augustin), devoted themselves to the care of the poor and the sick in the hospitals. These brotherhoods were founded at various times and in different countries. They added to the ordinary vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience, the special vow that they would devote themselves to this work of mercy. In France, the hospitallers, when they were instituted, were mostly connected with monasteries, and were subject to the bishops. Oftentimes the care of them was so great that a special officer was appointed, with the appellation of general, and the officer under him as intendant, superior, or major. Some of the Hospitaller brotherhoods, however, were not subject to the bishops, but only to the pope, as the Hospitallers of St. John of God, also called the Brethren of Love, etc. As an order of spiritual knights, they were divided into knights, priests, and serving brethren. Among them we find (1.) The Hospitallers of St. Anthony [see Anselm of Canterbury, (c. 1100), 15th century], founded by Gasson in consequence of an epidemic known as St. Anthony's fire. (2.) The Brethren of the Hospital of St. John of Jerusalem. See MALTA, KNIGHTS OF. (3.) The Order of Teutonic Knights (q. v.). (4.) The Brethren of the Hospital of the Order of St. John of God. This was likewise a knightly order, founded by Guido at Montpellier. (5.) The Hospitallers of Burgos, founded in 1212. (6.) The Hospitallers of our Lady of Charity were founded near Cluny in the end of the 18th century by Guy de Joinville; a like order was founded at Paris in 1294. (7.) The Hospital of Notre-Dame des Deux-Santes, according to some authorities, dates far back as the 9th century, is said by others to have been founded about this time at Sienna, in Italy. (8.) The Hospitallers of the Order of St. John of God (de Dieu), also called "Brethren of Charity," etc. See مجيات, KNIGHTS OF. (9.) Of the Congregation of present Brethren, founded in Flanders in 1615; the Hospitallers of the Order of Bethlemities (q. v.), in 1655; and a number of congregations of the third order of St. Francis, which arose in the 14th century, are some still in existence. The dress of the hospitallers was a black robe or cloak, on the breast of which were shown the letters B. B. L. with eight points, which, according to their statutes, is the true form of the monogram of the Virtue. See Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, vi, 285; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lev. v. 345; Helyot, Gesch. d. Kloster- r. Ritterorden, ii. 300 sqq.; iii. 86 sqq., 463 sqq.; Vertot, Hist. des Chevaliers de St. Jean de Jerusalem (Amst. 1732, 5 vols. 8vo); Schrijver, Kirchengesch, v. xiv. sqq.; Hardwick, Hist. of the Middle Ages, p. 258 sqq.; Biddle, Hist. of the Papacy, ii. 276; Milman's Gibbon, Roman Empire, v, 598 sqq.; Les, Histor. Sacré et Civil, p. 856 sqq.; Chalier, Les, 476; Neo-Englander, Aug. 1851, p. 388 sqq. See JERUSALEM; KNIGHTHOOD; TEMPLARS; etc.

Hospitals, so called from the medieval hospitale, are now generally understood to be establishments inclosed for the reception of the poor, the sick, or the insane, where their spiritual and temporal wants are gratuitously ministered to. Though various provisions were made for the poor among the Greeks and Romans, and public largesses were distributed in many ways, hospitals were unknown. The spirit of Christian charity, however, considers the most useless and abandoned characters as most in need of assistance, and imitates Christ in bestowing it upon them. The early Christians fed, not only their own poor, but also those of the heathen. Even Julian the Apostate praised their example in this respect. The first of these early Christian charitable institutions, and the models for practice of their charity openly, they commenced building charitable institutions, to which they gave various names, according to the character of their inmates: thus they had the Hydropathos, or infant asylum; the Orphanas, or orphan asylum; the Nosocomium, or sick hospital; the Xylophonicon, or retreat for strangers, more particularly pilgrims. The last was properly the hospital, or house of hospitality; and in monasteries, that part of them which was reserved for the accommodation of visitors, and was divided into sections according to the character of society to which the visitors belonged, was also so called (Du Cange, Gloss. a. v. Hospitals). These hospitals were soon found in all the large cities. Epiphanius says (Heres. 75, No. 1): "The bishops, in their charity towards strangers, are in the habit of establishing institutions wherein they receive the infirm and the sick, providing them with such accommodations as their means will allow." They were generally in charge of the clergy (Constit. Apostol. i. iii. c. 19), though rich laymen would occasionally erect hospitals also, and wait on their inmates themselves, as did Pammachius of Ptolemais, and Gallician of Ossa. The bishops were careful to have the poor properly buried, ransomed the prisoners of war, and often emancipated slaves. They often went so far as to sell the communion service, or the altar ornaments, to raise the means of accomplishing these charitable objects (Constit. Apostol. § 51). One of the most famous of these institutions was founded at Cassarea in the latter half of the 4th century. The next notable institution was that of St. Chrysostom, built at his own expense at Constantinople. There was also a very fine hospital at Rome, which was built by Fabiola, a Roman lady and friend of St. Ambrose, who likewise built one at Bethlem. The inmates of the hospitals in the early Church, very much like the practice of our own day, were divided according to sex. The male portion was placed under the charge of a deacon, and the women under the care of the deaconesses, who, according to Epiphanius (Constit. ed. c. xvii), rendered to persons of their sex whatever services their [immunity required. It was a rule for the deacons and deaconesses to seek for the unfortunate day by day, and to inform the bishops, who in turn, accompanied by a priest, visited the sick and needy of all classes (Augustine, De civ. Det. i, xxii. c. 8). The hospitals known as Nosoc-
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comia were really first instituted under Constantine. They were under the direct care of the bishop himself, and were, until the Middle Ages, oftentimes placed near or incorporated with their dwellings. But they must not be confounded with the priory hospitals of our own day, one immense building. They consisted of a number of small cottages (dormicuila), each intended for a certain malady. Procopius (De aedific. Justinian, I, i. c. 2; Hist. Byzant., iii), in speaking of an ancient vale- tulianarium which was re-established and enlarged by Justinian, says that when enlargement drew hospitals out of the addition of a certain number of small houses ("numero dormicularum," and of additional annual revenues ("anuo censu"). These numberless small houses, spread over a large area, gave to a hospital the appearance and extent of a village by itself. The mosso- comia were also established. In the West, but, until those of the East, they were confined to the houses of the bishops. Thus Augustine dined at the same table with the sick and poor to whom he afforded relief (Posidius, In ejus Vita, c. xxiii). After the downfall of the Rom- man empire, we find no mention made of hospitals in Europe. A century or two after the death of Constantine, bishops generally took the whole care of the poor and the sick. The bishops' house was the refuge of the poor, the widows, the orphans, the sick, and the stran- gers; the care of receiving and entertaining them was, and is, always the first duty of the clergy, one of the chief duties of the clergy. During the troubled times which followed the downfall of the Carthaginian dynas- ty the poor were almost forsaken; gaunt famine stalked over Europe, and the clergy were hardly able to keep off starvation from their own doors. But in the 13th and 14th centuries, charitable institutions for the care of the sick in Europe, hospitals were generally established in nearly all parts of the continent. Some were of the private charity, others were established by the Church, and others by the state. They were usually under the direction of priests and monks, and in the course of time, they often grew into large foundations, both in the private and in the public institutions. In 1821 he became pastor of the New Jerusalem Church. His opening sermon, which he published, led to the publication of an entire volume of his sermons, which are still held in high respect by the Schiermecker. Other collections of his sermons were published in 1824, 1827, 1831, 1837, 1843, and after his death another collection, with an introduction by Pi- schon, in 1845. Hosbach published his most important work, De Schiermecker, with which the title was changed, and a 2nd edition, which was published in 1855, contains also, as an addendum, an introduction to the history of the Evangelical Church and theology of the 18th century, a portion of a work on which he was engaged the latter part of his life, and which was left uncompleted. He died April 7, 1845. Hosbach was a popular preacher, but his published sermons enjoyed even greater popularity, and established his reputation as an able divine. He held a midway position between the strictly orthodox and the liberal theologians of Germany, and his great endeavor was to effect a compromise between these two contending parties for which he felt a high veneration as a minister. Hosbach has furnished in his last sermons of the sixth collection, delivered to his congre- gation February 5, 1845, after a successful treatment of his eyes, one of which the physician was obliged to remove. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop., xix, 655 sq.; Theol. Unser. Leben, 4th ed. (H. L.).

Hossein ben-Mansour, Abou'l-Moghtiss, a Per- sian Mohammedan Mystic summmned Al-Helloy, was born at Khorassan or Beidash (Farn) in the second half of the 9th century. He was a descendant of a Guebre who had embraced Islam. After studying under the most distinguished men of Persia, he retired to seclusion for a period of 20 years, travelling through the East as far as China, preaching on his way. Some be-
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lied in him, others considered him an impostor. He uttered new opinions in religion and morals, which did not very well harmonize with each other, nor with his mode of living: thus sometimes he was a strict observer of all the practices of Islamism, while he taught that good works were more meritorious than devotion to churches and prac-
tices. His morals, however, were unimpeachable, and his life one of the utmost simplicity. He professed Pan-
theism, which he symbolized in these words: "I am God, and all is God. The imams and sheikhs ofBagdad con-
demned him to death, and handed him over to the secular power. After remaining one year and a half in
prison, by order of the vizir, Ali ben-Assa, he was taken out under torture. Instead of cursing his persec-
cutors, he prayed for them, and died thus, the 23d dzoûl-
cadáh, 309 (March, 922). His body was burnt, and his ashes thrown into the Tigris. His theological and mys-
tical works are some thirty in number. See Ibn Khall-
ikan, Biograph. Dict. i, 423; and Fragments translated by
Tholuck, Blühtensamucl aus d. morgenländischen Mys-
tik (Berlin, 1825, 8vo), p. 310, 327; Hoefer, Neue. Biog.
322 (Hajjigale). (J. N. F.)

HOST occurs in the A. V. of the Bible in two very
different senses, the latter and most frequent now nearly
obsolete.

1. Socially (Ewoc, lit. a stranger, as usually; hence a
guest, and by inference an entertainer), Rom. xvi, 23; 
naire, one who receives all comers, i.e. a tavac-
keeper, e.g. the custodian of a caravanserai [q. v.]. Luke,
xxii, 49; John, x, 16; Isai.

2. Military (prop. and usually N?h, tashl, warfare, hence an army, orparia; also n?h, mchnekh, an en-
campment, host; sometimes ?m, gedal, a troop,('),
chajil, or b?r, chajil, a force; N?h, mchahabah, a mil-
itary station: Gt. ?r?m, or a parvah, the usual designa-
tion of the standing or army, not the kings in 
their own person. This consisted originally of infantry (compare Numb. xxi, 1; Sam. iv. 10; xxv, 4), not simply because
the country of Palestine prevented the use of cavalry, since already the Canaanites and Philistines had iron (iron-
arméd) chariots, which they knew how to use to
advantage in the plains and open land (Josh. xvii, 16;
Judg. i, 19; iv, 3, 13; v, 22; 1 Sam. xiii, 5; comp. Wich-
hausen, De currrib. bellic. in oriente usitatis, Viteb. 1722;
see Chréoli, and the same was true of horsemen (2 Sam.
iv. 6); moreover, the neighboring nations (Syrians and
Arabs) had a great stock of military instruments in
their campaigns against the Israelites. See Judg.
iv, 3; 2 Sam. x, 18, etc.). This last circumstance (which
appears to have had no influence over David, 2 Sam.
vii, 4), especially when the theatre of war was removed
into foreign countries, may naturally have induced Sol-
onom (contrary to the command, Deut. xvii, 16; comp.
Geniius, Comment. ad Jesa, i, 186 sq.) to add cavalry to
his army (1 Kings iv, 26; x, 26) which he distributed
among the cities (1 Kings ix, 19; x, 26) also under the
later kings we find this description of troops mentioned
(1 Kings xvi, 9; 2 Kings xiii, 7), although they were
called Korhiah (2 Sam. xii, 30), the assistance of the Egypt-
ian cavalry (Isa. xxxii, 1; xxxvi, 9; 2 Kings ii, 24). The
Mosaic laws obliged every male Israelite from 20
years of age (Numb. i, 3, xxxii, 2; 2 Chron. xxv, 5) to
30 (Joseph. Ant. ii, 12, 4; comp. Macro. Sin, i, 6; Sen-
eca, Nat. deorum, 20) to bear arms (see in Mlsina, Sota, viii,
7); yet there were many servitors than devoted pres-
ence; 5; compare 1 Macc. iii, 55). Whenever an occasion of
hostilities occurred, the young men assembled, and the
requisite enumeration of the soldiers (by means of a
"Ec, wopher, "scribe" or registrar, Jer. iii, 25; Is.
xxxii, 18) was made according to the several tribes
(Numb. xxxi, 2 sq.; Josh. vii, 5; Judg. xx, 10). On the
occasion of the annihilation of enemies, the entire militia
were summoned by special messengers (Judg. vi, 55) or
by the sound of trumpets, or by beacons (23, see) placed
upon the hill-tops (Judg. iii, 27, vi, 84, vii, 24; Jer. iv,
5 sq.; vi, 1; Ezek. vii, 14; comp. Isa. xiii, 2; xlix, 22;
2 Kings iii, 21; Jer. i, 2; 1 Macc. vii, 45; Diod. Sic. xix,
87). The entire army, thus raised by levy, was divided,
according to the various kinds of weapons (2 Chron.
xxv, 8), into troops (officers and soldiers together being
called mmm, the title of the commander-in-chief, or
"servants") of 1000, 100, and 40 men (Numb. xxxii, 14, 48; Judg. xxi, 10; 1 Sam. viii, 12; 2 Kings i, 9; ix, 15), each having its own
leader (4h, captain of the thousands; 4b, captain of the hundreds; 4b, captain of fifty; 2 Kings i, 9; ix, 4; 2 Chron. xxv, 5; for later times,
compare 1 Macc. iii, 55); larger divisions are also re-
ferred to (1 Chron. xxvii, 1 sq.; 2 Chron. xxvii, 14 sq.).
The commander-in-chief of the entire army (called 4b, 
captain of the host, or 4, captain of the army, or 4, captain over the army, 2 Sam.
iv, 8; xxv, 2; 1 Kings i, 19) formed a council of war (general's staff) with the commanders of the challices
and centuries (1 Chron. xiii, 1 sq.), and in time of peace,
had the direction of the military enrolment (2 Sam.
xxiv, 2 sq.). But the king generally led the army in person
in battle. The national militia of the Hebrews were
uniform, and at first each soldier was at his own expense,
and the provincial commands of provisions are occa-
sionally mentioned (Judg. xxi, 10). On military weap-
ons, see Arm. The strength of the Israelitic armies is
sometimes stated in very high figures (1 Sam. xi, 8;
xxv, 4; 1 Chron. xxvii, 1 sq.), which is not so surprising,
as they were gathered in mass by messengers (at a later
day, Josephus got together in Galilee alone 100,000 men
of the Jewish soldiers, War, ii, 20, 6); but the numbers
are probably often corrupt (2 Sam. xxiv, 9 sq.; 1 Chron.
xxxi, 5 sq.; 2 Chron. xiii, 3; xiv, 8; xvii, 14; xxvi, 12 sq.)
or (in the Chronicles, see Gramberg, p. 117) exag-
gerated.

The organization of a standing army was begun by
Saul (1 Sam. xiii, 2 sq.; xxiv, 3) in the establishment
(by voluntary enlistment) of a picked corps of 3000
strong from the whole mass of the people subject to
military duty (1 Sam. xiv, 52). David followed his
example, but, besides the body-guard (see Cherethith
and Palethith) he likewise instituted a national army,
to serve in turn in monthly divisions (1 Chron. xxvii, 1 sq.).
Solomon did the same (1 Kings iv, 26); and even princes of the royal stock, before they came to the throne,
invested themselves with a life-guard of troops (2 Sam.
xxiv, xv, 1; 1 Kings x, 9). Likewise after Jehoshaphat (2 Chron.
xxvi, 14 sq.), Athaliah (2 Kings ii, 4, 19), Ahab (2 Chron.
xxv, 5), and Uzziah (2 Chron. xxvi, 11), as also under Ahaziah of Israel (2 Kings i, 9 sq.), standing
armies are mentioned in time of peace, but they were probably not in constant service. Their pay probably
consisted in agricultural produce. Foreigners were not
excluded from the honors of war (as may be seen in
the case of Uriah the Hittite, and other warriors of David,
q. v.); and Amaziah, king of Judah (although with the
disapprobation of the prophet), even hired a whole troop
of Ephraimitish soldiers (2 Chron. xxv, 6 sq.). (See also
generally to 2 Sam. v, 7 sq.; and 1 and 2 Kings. Kil.
1783, a work of no great merit.) In post-exilic times
a fresh organization of Jewish military force was insti-
tuted under the Maccabees. Judas early established his
military companies (1 Macc. iii, 55) in divisions of 1000
100, 50, and 10; and Simon, as prince, first paid a stand-
ing army out of his own resources. His successors
commanded a still larger number of troops, and John Hyrcanus was the first who enlisted
also foreigners (Joseph. Ant. xiii, 8, 4), probably Arabi-
ans, who served in mercenary armies (1 Macc. v, 39). On the other hand, some Jews likewise engaged in for-
gn war, for instance, as auxiliaries of other nations (1 Macc.
xxx, 36; Joseph. Ant. xiii, 10, 4), and individuals even attained the rank of commanders (Joseph.
Ant. xiii, 10, 4; 18, 5; 46, iv, 20, 5; 5 sq.); see Arm.
count of being obliged to violate the Sabbath (Joseph. Ant. xiv, 10, 11 sq., 14). The discontent and party jealousies of the Jews rendered necessary the employment of foreign mercenaries by king Alexander and queen Alexandra (Joseph. Ant. xiii, 18, 5; 14; 16, 2), called heart. Herod the Great had in his army, no doubt, many foreign- 
nicers, even Germans (Joseph. Ant. xvii, 3, 8; War, ii, 1, 2); Kandler (in Act. Acad. Excub. Magunt. i, 415 sq.) understands also a special chosen corps as a body-guard (Ἀμφιβολοχάς, Joseph. Ant. xv, 9, 3; comp. War, ii, 1, 2). He, and after him, in the course of time, suffered his troops in certain cases to unite with the Roman legions (Josephus, War, ii, 18, 9; iii, 4, 2; Ant. xvii, 10, 8), and these Herodian soldiers, like the Romans, were employed to guard prisoners (Acts ii, 4 sq.). Respecting the discipline of these Herodian troops we know nothing positive, but they were certainly 
organized on Roman principles, as also Josephus himself 
armed and disciplined the Jewish militia who were under his command, after the Roman custom (War, ii, 20, 7). In the times of the direct Roman government of Judea, in order to maintain tranquillity; there were Romans in the country in the capacity of provincial 
stationed at the head-quarters of the procurator at Cesarea (Acts x, 1); but during the great festival, name- ly, the Passover, they were in part detailed to Jerusalem (Acts xxiii, 31; Joseph. War, ii, 12, 1). See Roman EM-
ries, in the numismatic and literary Danila, de Herode, et Mili, Jena 1690; J. Lydiu Synagogae de re milit. cum notis S. van Til, Dordrec. 1698; both also in Ugolini Theaur., xxvii.

See Army: War.

HOST OF HEAVEN (αἰθρόως τοις, tebea' hash-
shuma' yim, army of the skies), in Gen. ii, 1, refers to 
the sun, moon, and stars, as the host of heaven under the 
command of the king. In which the moon is considered as 
the king, the moon as his viceroy, and the other fixed 
planets as their attendants, and the constellations as the 
battalions and squadrons of the army drawn up in or-
der, that they may come with their leaders to execute 
the designs and commands of the sovereign. According 
to this notion, it is said in the song of Deborah, "The 
stars in their courses fought against Sisera" (Judg. v, 20). The worship of the host of heaven was one of the 
earliest forms of idolatry (q. v.), and, from finding it 
freely reproduced in the Scriptures, we may conclude 
that it was very common among the Jews in the days of 
the Old Testament, as well as among the pure and 
profane nations, and especially for the antiquity of the 
use of the unleavened bread, and especially for its conformity with the institution of our 
Lord, inasmuch as at the paschal supper, at which 'he 
took bread, and blessed, and brake it,' none other than the 
unleavened was admissible (Exod. xii, 8, 15; Lev. 
xxiii, 8). (See Krie, Dogmatis, i, 190)—Chamberl. 
At the Council of Florence it was left at the option 
of the churches to use leavened or unleavened bread. "Romanists worship the host under a false presumption 
that they are no longer bread and wine, but transub-
stantiated into the real body and blood of Christ, who is, 
on each occasion of the celebration of that sacrament, 
offered up anew as a victim (hostia) by the so-called 
'priests.' Against this error the XXXIst Article of Re-
ligion is expressly directed, and also these words in 
the congregation prayer of the Communion Service of the 
not Roman rite: 'In the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ, 
considered in the Person of the God and Man, of himself once offered,' etc., that Church pointedly declar-
ing in both those places that the minister, 'so far from 
offering any sacrifice himself, refers the people to the 
sacrifice already made by another' (Eden). After 
the Council of Trent had determined that, upon consegra-
tion, the bread becomes the body and the wine the blood 
into the Lord Jesus Christ, true God and man, and that 
though the Saviour always sits at the right hand of God in 
heaven, he is, notwithstanding, in many other places 
sacramentally present, this decision follows: "There is, 
therefore, no room to doubt that all the faithful in Christ 
are bound to venerate this most holy sacrament, and to

"Host of God of hosts" (Jer. v, 14; xxxviii, 17; xlv, 7; 
Hos. xii, 5; Amos iii, 13; Ps. lxx, 5; lxxx, 4, 7, 14). This 
is a very usual appellation of the Most High God in 
some of the prophetical and other books, especially 
in Isaiah, Jeremiah, Zechariah, and Malachi; but does 
not occur in the New Testament. In Acts xvii, 24, for 
Jehovah God of hosts; Gesenius says this is not necessary, and the 
Arians, too, subjoin in like manner a genitive of attribute 
to the proper names of persons, as Antara, of the horse, 
q. d. Antara, chief of the horse. So, too, in the con-
struction God of hosts, the word hosts may be taken 
as an attribute which could be put in apposition with the 
names of God. The hosts thus signified in Jehovah of 
hosts can hardly be doubtful if we compare the expres-
sions host and hosts of Jehovah (Josh. v, 14, 15; Psa. ciii, 
21; cxviii, 2), which, again, do not differ from host 
of heaven, embracing both angels, and the sun, moon, and 
stars (Gen. ix, 16). The hosts of heaven were regu-
larized at the head-quarters of the procurator at Cesar 
(Acts x, 1); but during the great festival, name-
ly, the Passover, they were in part detailed to Jerusalem 
(Acts xxiii, 31; Joseph. War, ii, 12, 1). See Roman EM-
ries, in the numismatic and literary Danila, de Herode, et Mili, Jena 
1690; J. Lydiu Synagogae de re milit. cum notis S. van Til, Dordrec. 1698; both also in Ugolini Theaur., xxvii.

See Army: War.
render thereto the worship of [gloss Missing] which is due to the true God, according to the constant usage of the Catho-
lic Church. Nor is it the less to be thus adored that it
was instituted by Christ the Lord." We learn that, in
conformity with this instruction, as the Missal directs, the
priest, in every mass, as soon as he has consecrated the
host, and after having kissed it, he sac-
crnfent. He worships what is before him on the paten
and in the chalice, and gives to it the supreme worship,
bolt of both mind and body, that he would pay to Christ
himself. With his head bowing towards it, and his
eyes and thoughts fixed on it and directed towards it,
he says pray to it as to Christ: "To Lamb of God, who
takes away the sins of the world, have mercy on us.
Lamb of God, who take away the sins of the world, have
mercy on us. Lamb of God, who take away the sins of
the world, give us peace." The following is a transla-
tion from the rubric of the Missal: "Having uttered
the words of consecration, the priest, immediately fall-
ing on his knees, adores the consecrated host; he rises,
shows it to the people, place it on the corporale,
and again adores it." When the wine is consecrated,
the priest, in like manner, "falling on his knees, adores it,
rises, shows it to the people, puts it up in its place,
covering it, and again adores it." The priest, rising
up after he has adored it himself, lifts it up as high as
he can conveniently, and, with his eyes fixed upon it,
shows it to be devoutly adored by the people; who,
having noted also, by ringing the mass-bell, as soon as
the wine comes in the hands of the deacon to the priest,
as if it were God himself. If Christ were visibly pres-
tent, they could not bestow on him more acts of homage
than they do on the host. They pray to it, and use
the same acts of invocation as they do to Christ himself.
The host is also worshipped when it is carried through
the street in solemn procession, either himself or the
people, or when taken to some sick person, or on the feast
of Corpus Christi. The person who, in great churches,
conveys the sacrament to the numerous communicants,
is called bejul us Dei, the porter or carer of God. This
isolated custom of the Church of Rome was not known
till the year 1215, for it was in 1215 that transubstan-
tiation, by the Council of Lateran, under pope Innocent
III, was made an article of faith; and we also find in
the Roman canon law that it was pope Honorius who
ordered, in the following year, that the priests, at a cer-
tain point of the mass service, should elevate the host,
and cause the people to prostrate themselves in wor-
shiping it. See Augusti, Deskriftkündnisse a
оборот chrísti, v. 276 sqq.; Elliott, Dedication of Ro-
manism, bk. ii. ch. iv. v.; Brown, Expos. of the 39 Arti-
des, p. 606, 731, n.; Neale, Intro. to the Church, ii. 516;
Niegel, Chér et de synthèse, 180; Bingham, Apostli, ii.
819; Farrar, s. v. Adoration; Schröck, Kirchengesch.,
xxviii, p. 78; and the articles AZYMITE; LORD'S SUPP.
PER; MASS; SUBSTANTIATION. (J. H. W.)
Hostage (ytutpy, taarubak, swertship), a person
delivered into the hands of another as a security for
the performance of some engagement. See PLEDGE.
Conquered kings or nations often gave hostages for the
payment of a debt; or to give as a tribute; or for the sake
of their security; hence Jehoshaphat, king of Israel, expec-
ted hostages from Amaziah, king of Judah (2 Kings xiv., 14; 2
Chron. xxv., 24). See WAR.
Hotchkin, Ebenezer, a Presbyterian missionary
among the Indians, was born at Richmond, Mass., March 19,
1803. He was sent as an assistant missionary to the
Cherokee Indians in 1828, and spent the best of his life
labouring among them. He died at the request of his
brother, the late Rev. John Hotchkin, at Lenox, Mass.,
Oct. 28, 1867. Hotchkin was not only a minister, but
also an instructor, and was active in the management
of boarding and other schools. —Wilson, Presbyterian
Historical Almanac, 1869, p. 834 sq.
Hot Cross-Buns, a kind of muffin or biscuit, with
the figure of the cross impressed upon them, quite gen-
erally used in England by the adherents of the Church
of England for breakfast on Good Friday. These bis-
cuits are said to be derived from the Ecclesiastical Eu-
logia (q. v.), formerly given as a token of friendship, or
sent to the houses of those who were hindered from re-
ceiving the host. — See Staunton, Ecclesiastical Dictio-

nary, p. 37.
Hotham (Heb. Chotham), a seal or signet,
as in Exod. xxviii., 12, etc.; Sept. Xfl55W, Vulg.
Hotham, the name of two men.
1. One of the sons of Heber, the grandson of Aser (1
Chron. vii. 32). B.C. cir. 1658. He is probably the
same with Helem, whose sons are enumerated in verse
35, and grisons in verse 37.
2. An officer in the army of Shama and Jehiel, two
of David's champions (1 Chron. xxi. 44, where the name
is Anglicized "Hotham," after the Sept. Xfl55W). B.C.
1046.
Hothan (1 Chron. xxi. 44). See Hotham 2.
Hothir (Heb. Hothir), mishi, preserver; Sept. 
TawvP, TawvP, the thirteenth son of Heman (q. v.),
who, with eleven of his kinsmen, had charge of the twenty-five
thousands of Levitical singers (1 Chron. xxv., 4, 58). B.C. 1014. See GIDDIALT.
Hottentots, the aboriginal inhabitants of Cape
Colony, in Southern Africa. They are divided into
tree large tribes: 1. the Nama, or Namaqua; 2. the
Kora (Korana, Koraqua); and, 3. the Saab, or Bushmen
(Bosjesman). In modern times they have been pushed
northwest, and are now almost entirely driven out of the
country by the Betchuanas and Kafirs. The Nama, or Namaqua,
live as nomads along the Orange River, in Great Na-
maqualand, which is an independent country, with about
100,000 square miles, and only 40,000 inhabitants, and
Little Namaqualand, which is a part of Cape Colony.
The Kora, or Korana, were about fifty years ago very
numerous in the vicinity of the Vaal and Hart rivers;
now they dwell as nomads on both sides of the Upper
Orange River, both in Cape Colony and in the Orange
Free State (q. v.). The Saab, or Bushmen, live scat-
tered, partly in the northern districts of Cape Colony,
partly in the desert Kalahary. In Cape Colony there
were, according to the census of 1855, 81,598 Hottentot-
tots, by the side of 181,592 Europeans, and 100,556
Kaffres, in a total population of 496,381. Little is
known of the Hottentots' religion further than that they
believe in a good and an evil spirit, hold feasts on the
occasion of the new and full moon, and look upon cer-
tain spots as the abode of departed spirits. They have
no regular priest, nor anything like an established wor-
ship, although they render especial homage to a small,
shining bug. They have magicians for whom they have
great respect. The Botstdtas, or Griqua, resulting
from the amalgamation of Hottentots and Europe-
ans, appear much more susceptible of mental and intel-
lectual culture; they also form a distinct race, and a
colony of 6000 of them, established at the Cat River in
1826, has been quite successful, and numbered in 1870
about 20,000, nearly all Christians; they are partly
nomads, partly agriculturists. The Hottentots in Cape
Colony and the Griquas no longer speak the Hottentot
language, but a Dutch dialect, strongly mixed with
Hottentot and Kafir words. The Hottentot language
is not related to any other, and is especially different
from the large South African family of languages.
The words are mostly monosyllabic, and usually end
in a vowel or nasal sound. Among the consonants,
f, v and y are wanting. There are many dipthongs.
Non-Africans find it impossible to imitate the guttural
sounds which the Hottentots breathe with a hoarse voice
from a hollow chest, as well as the four clicking sounds
which are produced by a lashing of the tongue against
the palate, and which in writing are represented by
lines and points (l = dental; = palatal; = cere-
bral; = lateral). Modern linguists enumerate four dia-
lects: 1. that of the Nama; 2. that of the Kora; 3. that
of the eastern Hottentots, or Gonaquas; 4. the dead dialects of the colonial Hottentots. The substantives have three genders, masculine, feminine, and common; and three numbers, singular, dual, and plural. There are no cases; the adjective and verb are not inflected. The proper names are given as written by those who govern. The language of the Bushmen differs from that of the other Hottentots. By the Dutch conquerors of the country of the Hottentots the poor inhabitants were considered unworthy of Christianity, and even many members of the colonial churches discon- tenuously adopted the Hottentot language. The first missionary among the Hottentots began his operations in 1709, but he ceased them after a few weeks. In 1737, the Moravian missionary, G. Schmidt, gained an attentive hearing; but when, after a few years, the fruit of his labors appeared, he was compelled by the colonial government to leave. During the next fifty years no missionary was allowed to visit the Hottentots. In 1792 the Moravians succeeded in re-establishing their mission, but not until the country passed into the hands of the English did the missionaries find the necessary protection, under which their station at Baviaanskloof (at present called Genadendal) became very flourishing. The work grew steadily, and (since 1818) has extended from the Hottentots to the Kaafres. The Moravians, even as early as 1798, were joined by the London Missionary Society. The missionary Von der Kemp established in the eastern district. Several thousands of Griqua settled on the Cat River, where the station Philpott, with several out-stations, arose. Among the Kora missions have been established (since 1834) by the Berlin Missionary Society. More recently, a number of other missionary societies, of almost all the churches represented in Cape Colony, have taken part in the missions among the Hottentots. Beyond the limits of Cape Colony, the London Mission Society was the first to establish (1805) missions in Great Namaqualand. Subsequently the field was occupied by the Wesleyan Methodists and the Rheinische Missionary Society. Several stations were established by them in the north part of the country were again abandoned (Concordiaville and Wesleyvale, 1845–53), but in 1860 they still had three districts in the south—Nisabthath, Hoole's Fountain, and Jerusalem—all of which were occupied by native believers, and occasionally visited by a missioner from Cape Colony. An extensive is the work of the Rheinischen Missionary, which in 1842 established its first out-station at Bethania, and gradually advanced northwards as far as the Zwaabach. Their labors, especially at Bethania, have been very successful, and Great Namaqualand may now be regarded as a Christianized country. See Timball (Wesleyan missionary), Two Lectures on Great Namaqualand and its Inhabitants; Moo- dice, The Record, or a Series of Official Papers relative to the Condition and Treatment of the native Tribes in South Africa (Cape-town, 1858 sqq., 5 vols.). A Grammar of the Hottentot language has been published (Cape-town, 1857), and a work on etymology by Wallmann (Berlin, 1857). On the history of the missions among the Hottentots, see Grundmeim, Missionarits (Gotha, 1887). (A. S.)

Hottinger, Johann Heinrich, 1, a celebrated Swiss theologian and scholar, born at Zurich March 10, 1656. He was educated at the University of Zurich, Geneva, Groningen, and Leyden. In 1682 he became professor of Church History at Zurich, and in 1693 added to it a professorship at the Carolinum. In 1656 he became professor of Oriental languages at Heidelberg, but in 1661 he returned to Zurich. In 1666, after the death of Hoornbbeck (q.v.), the University of Leyden urged Hottinger to come as his successor. He finally consented, by advice of the Swiss government, to serve that university a few years. While making his arrangements preparatory to his journey, he was drowned in the Limmat, June 5, 1667. Hottinger occupies a place in the history of Oriental studies, and is one of the 17th century, who labored to promote the knowledge of the Semitic languages. He was one of the first to bring to public notice a number of Syriac and Arabic works by giving extracts from them and biographies of their authors. He also gave a powerful impulse to the study of the Oriental languages, and at his own expense an Arabic printing-office at Heidelberg while professor in that city. The great aim of his writings was to establish the interpretation of Scripture on a more thoroughly historical and grammatical foundation; yet he rather furnished the means for such a system than established it himself. His works consist chiefly of compilations, and were valuable from the fact that they were from sources previously not generally known. He seldom gives an exegesis, but when he does it is based on grammatical and historical considerations rather than on dogmatical. His principal works are: Exercitationes Antimahometicae et Pentateucum Sama- rit. (1644) — Exercitium linguis sacrae (1647; 2d edition, 1667) — Grammatica Chaldeo-Syriaca (1688) — Hist. orientalis de Muhammadismo, Saracenoismo, Chaldaismo (1635) — Historia ecclesiastic. Novi Test. (1661-67, 9 vols.), (in Arabic), and also various biographies and counterparts of the Magdeburg Centuries. "It is less original and vigorous, but more sober and moderate." — Jus Hebraorum (1655) — Smegma orientale oppositum sordibus barbaris (1657) — Bibliotheca orientalis (Hei- delberg, 1688) — Theocritus philol. (1749) — Weyerbe- cheri, deditio novella, et auct. (1762). His last work is: Tugt der wahre Katholische Glaube zu finden sei (1647-49, 3 vols.) — Cursus theologico (1666) — Pierer: Universal Lexikon, s. v.; Kittel, Bibl. Cyclon, ii, 331; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxx, 286 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. vi, 287 sq.; Hirtel, J. H. Hottinger der Orientalist a. 17 Jahrhunderts, Bayre, Hist. Dict. iii, 559 sq.; Bibliotheca Sacra, vii, 63.

Hottinger, Johann Heinrich, 2, a Swiss Protestant theologian, grandson of the preceding, was born at Zurich Dec. 5, 1681. He studied theology at the universities of Zurich, Geneva, and Amsterdam, and in 1704 was appointed professor of theology at Heidelberg; in 1706 he became professor of Hebrew antiquities, and in 1710 professor of theology. To strictly Calvinistic views he added most of Cocceius's principles, and from this mixture resulted a system of his own, which he defended in his works on dogmatical theology and missionary Christianity (Franz. ed Main, 1714, 8vo). This work created great excitement: the author was accused of inculcating mystical doctrines, and was obliged to resign his position in 1717. Hottinger retired to Frankenthal, where he became pastor of the Reformed Church. In 1721 he was appointed professor of theology at Heidelberg, where he died April 7, 1750. The most important of his later writings are Disquisitio de Revelationibus extraordinaris in genere et de quibusdam holernsis vulgo dictis inspiratis in specie (1717, 8vo), in which he treats of the prophecies of the Cevennes, who were just then attracting great attention; in addition —Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxv, 239; Hilgenfeld, Zeitschrift für wissenschaftl. Theol. 1868, p. 31. (J. N. P.)

Hottinger, Johann Jakob, 1, son of Johann Heinrich, No. 1, was born at Zurich Dec. 1, 1652. He studied theology at Zurich and Basle, and became, in 1690, pastor of Stellikon, near Zurich. In 1686 he was appointed professor of the language of Zurich and in 1689 professor of theology in the university of that place. He died Dec. 18, 1733. Hottinger labored earnestly to establish a union of the Protestant churches, and with that view published his Diss. de legebus et charis- tata e ecclesi. Protestantism et com. (1721). He was an ardent opponent of the Roman Church, and wrote
HOUGH

HOUGH, John, D.D., 1. a distinguished English divine, born in Middlesex in 1651, and educated at Magdalene College, Oxford, of which he was elected president in 1687, in spite of the mandamus of king James II, who endeavored to procure the election to the headship of the college first of Anthony Farmer, and then of Dr. Samuel Parker, (q. v.), bishop of Oxf. and Cathol., in Ilesia, and neither of them fellows of the college, as the statute required. Lord-commissioners having been sent to enforce the royal mandates on the students, Hough, together with twenty-six out of the twenty-eight fellows of the college, courageously protested against the arbitrary proceedings, and refused to deliver the keys of the college. Finally, in Oct. 1687, Dr. Parker was by main force installed in Hough's place.

"The nation, as well as the university, looked on all this proceeding with a just indignation. It was thought an open piece of robbery and burglary, when men authorized by no legal commission came forcibly and turnerd men out of their possession and freetholds" (bishop Burnet).

"The protest of Hough was everywhere applauded; the forcing of his door was everywhere mentioned with abhorrence." Less than a year after, James II, under the pressure of political events, thought it prudent to release his stepson, and to conciliate Hough and his adherents. The former was restored to his position as president. After the Revolution, Hough became successively bishop of Oxford in 1690; of Lichfield and Coventry in 1699; and finally, after refurging the archbishopric of Canterbury, bishop of Chester in 1717. He died in 1748. Hough wrote Sermons and Charges, published with a Memoir of his Life, by William Russell, B.D. etc. (Oxf. 1821); and other occasional sermons.—Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, i, 1554; Macaulay, History of England, vol. ii; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 807; McMaster, Bibliog. Int. homo, History of England, p. 363 sq.; Stoughton (John), Eccl. Hist. of England (London, 1870), ii, 133 sq.

HOUGH, John, D.D., 2. a Congregational minister, was born in Stamford, Conn., Aug. 17, 1788. He graduated at Yale in 1802, then studied divinity, and was sent in 1806 as missionary to Vermont, where he was ordained pastor at Vergennes in 1807. This pastorate he resigned in 1812, and became professor of languages in Middlebury College, Vt. Here he remained twenty-seven years, occupying several chairs in turn. He left in 1839, and was some time in the service of the Colonization Society. In 1841 he was installed pastor at Franconia, N.H. He obtained a dispensation in 1850, on account of failing eyesight, which finally became blindness. He died at Fort Wayne, Indiana, July 17, 1861. Hough was eminently successful and popular as an instructor. He published three sermons, preached at ordinations (1810, 1823, 1826), and was one of the editors of "The Adviser, or Vermont Evangelical Magazine."

Congreg. Quart, iii, 378; Wilson, Presbyt. Historical Almanac, 1862, p. 186.

Houghtaling, J. B., a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Northeast, Dutchess Co., N. Y., Oct. 9, 1797; studied law for five years, from 1813; was converted about 1817, and entered the itinerant ministry in 1822. He was appointed agent of the Troys Conference Academy in 1835, and, on account of poor health, took a supernumerary relation in 1847, which he retained until his death in 1856 or 7. He was a very useful preacher and an excellent pastor. His business abilities were fine, and he was for many years secretary of the Troy Conference, and twice assistant secretary of the General Conference. — Minutes of Conferences, 1858, (G. L. T.)

Hour (Chald. 那儿, すう, a moment, prop. a look, i. q. "the wink of an eye" [Ger. Augeblick; Greek ὥρα], a term first found in Dan. iii, 6; iv, 19, 33; v; 5; and occurring several times in the Apocrypha (Judith xx, 8; 2 Esd. ix, 44). It seems to be a vague expression for a short period, and the frequent phrase in "the same hour" means "immediately." hence we find substituted in the Targum for לילה, "in a moment" (Num. xxvi, 21, etc.). The corresponding Gr. term is frequently used in the same way by the N. T. writers (Matt. viii, 13; Luke xii, 39, etc.). The word hour is sometimes used in Scripture to denote some determinate season, as "mine hour is not yet come," "this is your hour, and the power of darkness," "the hour is coming," etc. It occurs in the Sept. as a rendering for various words meaning time, just as it does in Greek writers long before it acquired the specific meaning of our word "hour." Saath is still used in Arabic both for an hour and a moment.

The ancient Hebrews were probably unacquainted with the division of the natural day into twenty-four parts. The general distinctions of "morning, evening, and noonday" (Psa. iv, 17; comp. Gen. xv, 12; xvii, 1; xix, 1, 15, 23) were sufficient for them at first, as they were for the early Greeks (Homer, I, xxi, 8, 111); afterwards the Greeks adopted five marked periods of the day (Jul. Polux, Onom. i, 68; Dio Chrysost. Orat. in De Glor.). These periods were in the ascendant even in the time of Hesiod, and are found in a trace of this division in Matt. xx, 1-5. There is, however, no proof of the assertion sometimes made, that ὥρα in the Gospels may occasionally mean a space of three hours. It has been thought by some interpreters (see Wollf Cure in N. T. ad John xix, 11) that the evangelist John always computes the hours of the day after the Roman reckoning, i.e. from midnight to midnight (see Pliny, Hist. Nat. ii, 79; Aud. Gell. Nova Att. iii, 2), but this is without support from Hebrew analogy, and obliges the gratuitous supposition of a reckoning also from midday (against John xix, 8).

The Greeks adopted the division of the day into twelve hours from the Babylonians (Herodotus, ii, 109; comp. Rawlinson, Herod. ii, 384). At what period the Jews became acquainted with this way of reckoning is unknown, but it is generally supposed that they, too, borrowed it from the Babylonians during the captivity. (Wet. I, 5; Tholuck, ἡμί, v, 1, 5, 9; 8). There have been some such a division at a much earlier period, as has been inferred from the fact that Abaz erected a sun-dial in Jerusalem, the use of which had probably been learned from Babylon. There is, however, the strongest evidence to the contrary (A. V. "degrees," Isa. xxxvii, 8). See Dura.

It is strange that the Jews were not acquainted with this method of reckoning even earlier, for, although a purely conventional one, it is naturally suggested by the months in a year. Sir G. Wilkinson thinks that it arose from a less obvious cause (Rawlinson, Herod. ii, 384). In whatever way it originated, it was known to the Egyptians at a very early period. They divided the day into twelve hours each, the night being twice as long. They divided the hour into fifteen minutes or times, in precisely the same manner as the day. The most ancient division, however, was into three watches (A. T. iii, 6: x: 4)—the first, or beginning of the watches, as it is called (Lam. ii, 19); the middle watch (Judg. vii, 19); and the morning watch (Exod. xiv, 24). See WATCH. The Roman distribution of the night into four watches was introduced; to which division frequent allusions occur in the New Testament (Luke xii, 38; Matt. xiv, 25; xiii, 35), as well as to that of hours (Matt. xxv, 13; xxvi, 40; Mark xiv, 37; Luke xvii, 59; Acts xxiii, 23; Rev. iii, 8). See Cocks-crowing.
HOUR-GLASS STAND

There are two kinds of hours, viz. (1) the astronomical or equinoctial hour, i.e. the twenty-fourth part of a civil day, which, although "known to astronomers, was not used in the affairs of common life till towards the end of the 4th century of the Christian era" (Smith, Dict. of Classical Antiq. s. v. Hora); and (2) the natural hour (such as the Rabbis called "דובדובא, ἀκαουρία, or temporales), i.e. the twelfth part of the natural day, or of the time between sunrise and sunset, as these are the hours meant in the New Test., Josephus, and the Rabbis (John xi, 9; Acts v, 7; xix, 31; Josephus, Ant. xiv, 4, 3), and it must be remembered that they perpetually vary in length, so as to be very different at different times of the year. Besides this, the manner of reckoning the day would always mean a different length of time from an hour of the night, except at the equinoxes. From the consequent uncertainty of the term there arose the proverbial expression "not all hours are equal" (R. Joshua ap. Carpoz, App. Citt. p. 545). At the equinoxes the third hour would correspond to nine o'clock; the sixth would always be at noon. To find the exact time reckoned at other seasons of the year, we must know when the sun rises in Palestine, and reduce the hours to our reckoning accordingly (Jahn, Bibl. Arch. § 101). In ancient times the only way of reckoning the progress of the day was by the length of the shadow—a mode of reckoning which was both contingent upon the sunshine, and served only for the guidance of individuals. See Shadow. By what means the Jews calculated the length of their hours—whether by dialling, by the ğηπγηλή or water-clock, or by some horological contrivance, like what was used anciently in Persia (Josephus, Ant. xii, 6), and by the Romans (Martial, viii, Epig. 67; Juv. Sat. x, 214), and which is still used in India (Asiat. Researches, v, 88), a servant notifying the intervals—it is now impossible to discover (see Buttinghausen, Specim. horarum Heb. et Arab. Tr. ad Rh. 1758). Mention is also made of a curious invention of the Romans (of which there are eight in the twenty-four) are derived from these Temple hours (Goodwin, Moses and Aaron, iii, 9). See Hours, Canonical.

The Rabbis pretend that the hours were divided into 1080 הַמְלָה (minutes), and 36,848 לִילִים (seconds), which numbers were chosen because they are so easily divisible (Gem. Hier. Berachoth, 2; 4; in Roland, Ant. Heb. iv, 1, § 19). See Time.

Hour-glass Stand, a frame of iron for the hourglass, often placed near the pulpit after the Reformation in England. They were almost universally introduced in churches during the 16th century, and continued in use until about fifty years ago, to regulate the length of sermons, some of them are yet to be seen, at Wolvercote and Beckley, in Oxfordshire, and Leigh Church, in Kent. One was recently set up in the Savoy Chapel—Parker, Glossary of Architecture, p. 127; Walcot, Soc. Archaeol. p. 917.

Houris, a designation of Europeans of those imaginary beings whose company in paradise, according to the Mohammedan's belief, is to form the principal felicity of the believers. The name, derived from הָרָעָה, signifies black-eyed. They are represented in the Koran as most beautiful virgins, not created of clay, like mortal women, but of pure musk, and endowed with immortal youth, and immunity from all disease. See the Koran, chap. iv, 161 (Sale's translation); and the Pref. Disc. s. x, 4; Brandle and Cox, Dict. of Science, Liter., and Art, ii, 153.

Hours, Canonical, signifies, in ecclesiastical usage, the daily round of prayers and praise in some churches, both ancient and modern. The ancient order of these "hours" is as follows:

1. Nocturna or Matins, a service performed before daybreak (properly a night service), called vigila by the Council of Carthage (398), but afterwards the first hour after dawn; mentioned by Cyprian as midnight and matins, and by Athanasius as noxturnas and midnight (Pac. cxix, 62-147; Acts xxi, 25). Cassian says this season was first observed in the 5th century, in the monastery of Bethlehem, in memory of the nativity.

2. Lauds, a service performed at daybreak, following the matin shortly, if not actually joined on to it, mentioned by the Apostolic Canons (see above) as the first hour when the discipies were assembled at Pentecost (Acts ii, 15).

3. Prime, a service performed at about six o'clock A.M., "the first hour," mentioned by Athanasius (Pac. xxii, 2; v, 3; lix, 16).

4. Tierce or Tercce, a service performed at 9 A.M., "the third hour," mentioned by Tertullian with Sexta and None (see below), as commemorating the time when the disciples were assembled at Pentecost (Acts ii, 15).

5. Sext, a service performed at noonday, "the sixth hour," commemorating Peter's praying (Acts x, 19).

6. None, a service performed at 5 P.M., "the ninth hour," commemorating the time when Peter and John went up to the Temple (Acts iii, 1).

7. Vespera, a service performed in the early evening; mentioned by Basil, Ambrose, and Jerome, and by the Apostolic Constitutions (which we cite below), to commemorate the time when Christ instituted the Eucharist, showing it was the eve of the world. This hour is called from evening, according to St. Augustine, or the evening star, says St. Isidore. It was also known as the office and the hour of lights, as, until the 8th or 9th century, was usual in the East and at Milan; also when the lamps were lighted (Zech. xiv, 7). The Roman custom of Tierce after None came into use in the West (Walcott, Soc. Archaeol. p. 316).

8. Compline, the last evening or "bedtime service" (Pac. cxxxii, 3; first separated from Vespera by Bene dictus.)

The office of Lauds was, however, very rarely separated from that of Matins, and these eight hours of prayer were therefore practically only seven, founded on David's habit (Pac. iv, 17; cxxix, 62).

The Apostolic Constitutions (viii, 34) mention the hours as follows: "Ye shall make prayer in the morning giving thanks, because the Lord hath enlightened you, removing the night, and bringing the day; at the third hour, because the Lord then received sentence from Pilate; at the sixth, because he was crucified; at the ninth, because all things were shaken when the Lord was crucified, trembling at the audacity of the impious Jews, not enduring the sight of the friend of men, at evening giving thanks, because he hath given the night for rest from labor; at cock-crowing, because that hour gives glad tidings that the day is dawning in which to work the works of light." Cassian likewise mentions the observation of Tierce, Sext, and None in monasteries. Tertullian mentions Vespers in France before daylight. Jerome names Tierce, Sext, None, Vespera, and Lauds; also Augustine—for the two latter hours, however, substituting "Early Vigil." Archdeacon Freeman, of the Church of England, gives (Principles of Disc. Serv. i, 219 sq.) the following explanation, viz. that these offices, "though neither of apostolic nor
early post-apostolic date as Church services, had, nevertheless, probably existed in a rudimentary form, as private or household devotions, from a very early period, and had been received into the number of recognised public formularies previous to the reorganization of the Western ritual after the Eastern model. Various reasons have been given for a deepening meaning in the weekly hours; one is, that they are the thanksgiving for the completion of creation on the seventh day. Another theory beautifully connects them with the acts of our Lord in his passion: Evesong with his institution of the Eucharist, and washing the disciples' feet, and the going to Gethsemane; Compline with a bloody sweat; Matins with his appearance before Caiaphas; Prime and Tiers with that in the presence of Pilate; Tiers also with his scourging, crown of thorns, and presentation to the people; Sext with his bearing the cross, the seven words, and crucifixion; None with his dismissal of his Spirit, descent into hell, and rout of the devil; Vespers with his deposition from the cross and entombment; Compline with the setting of the watch; Matins with his resurrection" (Walcott, Sacred Archael., p. 517). Of the origin of these 4 hours, 'Bingham, A Chron. of the Church of England, iii, ch. ix, p. 661 sq.) says that "they who have made the most exact inquiries can find no footsteps of them in the first three ages, but conclude that they came first into the Church with the monastic life" (compare also Pearson, Protect., in Act. Apost. num. 5, 4). It is observable further, that the writers of the writings of the 4th age, who speak of six or seven hours of prayer, speak of the observances of the monks only, and not of the whole body of the Church. Thus Jerome, Basil, Gregory of Nyssa, Cassian, Cæsarius, and most other writers of the early Christian Church, speak but of three hours of prayers; this, also, even Chrysostom himself, who, however, when "speaking of the monks and their institutions (Homil. 14 in 1 Tim. p. 1599), gives about the same number of canonical hours as others do." Yet it is very likely even that in some Eastern churches these hours of prayers might have been practised in the 4th century, and quite certain that the different churches observing the hours varied greatly both as to the number of the hours and the service in their first original. "At the time of the Reformation, the canonical hours were reduced in the Lutheranism Church to two, morning and evening; the Reformed Church never observed the Divine service and Cox, Dict. of Science, Literat. and Art., ii, 192). In the Church of England these services were, at the time of the English Reformation, used as distinct offices only by stricter religious persons and the clergy. At the revision of the liturgy of that Church under Edward VI, it was decided to have "only two solemn services of public worship in the day, viz. Matins, composed of matins, lauds, and prime; and Evensong, consisting of vespers and compline." In the Greek Church, Neale (Essays on Liturgyology and Church Hist., Essay i, p. 6 sq.) says "There are eight canonical hours; prayers are actually, for the most part, said three times daily - matins, lauds, and prime, by aggregation early in the morning; tierce, sexts, and the liturgy (communion) later; none, vespers, and compline, by aggregation in the evening. So, also, is it in the West. "Except in monastic bodies," says the same writer (p. 46 sq.), "the breath of church Prayer is scarcely used as a whole. You may go, we do not say from church to church, but from cathedral to cathedral of Central Europe, and never hear matins saved at high festivals. In Spain and Portugal it is somewhat more frequent, but there, as everywhere, it is a clerical devotion exclusively. The shorter hours are never publicly said except in cathedrals, and then principally by aggregation, and in connection with mass. . . . In no National Church under the sun are so many matin services said as in our own." It may not be out of place here to add that seven hours formed the basis of the "Primers" (q. v.). "English editions of these, set forth by authority in the reigns of Henry VIII, Edward VI, and of queen Elizabeth, show that the English reformers did not wish to discourage the observance of the ancient hours of prayer. As late as 1627, by command of Charles I, bishop Cosin published a Collection of Private Devotions in the practice of the ancient Church, called the "Prayer Book for a Day," the title of which was first given by authority published by queen Elizabeth, 1550," etc. See, besides the authorities already referred to, Procter, Prayer Book, chap. i; Blunt (the Rev. J. H.), Dict. of Doctrinal and Lit. Theol., (Lond. 1870), i, 315; Siegol, Christl.-Kirchl. Aberkämmer, i, 270 sq.; iv, 65 sq. Compare Canon. 26; Breviar., (J. H. W.)".

Oriental lit.:

material must ground for notice. The enterprise at Babel, to say nothing of Egypt, shows that the constructive arts had made considerable progress during that obscure but interesting period; for we are bound in reason to conclude that the arts possessed by man in the ages immediately following the Deluge existed before that great catastrophe. See Antiemilicians. The observations offered under Architecture will preclude the expectation of finding among this Eastern people that accomplished style of building which Vitruvius requires, or that refined taste by which the Greeks and Romans excelled the admiration of foreign nations. The tents in which the Arabs now dwell are in all probability the same as those in which the Hebr. w patriarchs spent their lives. It is not likely that what the Hebrews observed in Egypt, during their long sojourn in that country, had in this respect any direct influence upon their own subsequent practice in Palestine. See Text. Nevertheless, the information which may be derived from the figures of houses and parts of houses in the Egyptian
the doors and gates, of the folds and lattices of windows, of the flat roofs, and of the wainscoting with which the walls were ornamented. Beam-ends were cut to order, to which the wainscoting was fastened by nails to render it more secure (Eza vi, 4). Houses finished in this manner were called ceiled houses and ceiled chambers (Jer. xxvii, 14; Hag. i, 4). The lower part of the walls was adorned with rich hangings of velvet or damask dyed of the liveliest colors, suspended on hooks, and taken down at pleasure (Esth. i, 6). The upper part of the walls was adorned with figures in stucco, with gold, silver, gems, and ivory; hence the expressions "ivory houses," "ivory palaces," and "chambers ornamented with ivory" (1 Kings xxi, 39; 2 Chron. xxxiii, 7; Isa. x, 10; Amos, iii, 6; Psal. cxxxv, 2). Metals were also employed to some extent—gold, silver, iron, and copper are mentioned among building materials; but especially gold and silver for various kinds of solid, plated, and inlaid work (Exod. xxxvii, 38). The ceiling, generally of wainscot, was painted with great art. In the days of Jeremiah these chambers were ceiled with costly and fragrant wood, and painted with the richest colors (Jer. xxvii, 14). (See each of these parts and materials in their alphabetical place.) The splendor and magnificence of an edifice seems to have been estimated in a measure by the size of the square stones of which it was constructed (1 Kings vii, 9). The walls were of brilliant and variegated hues (1 Chron. xxix, 2). The foundation stone, which was probably placed at the corner, and thence called the corner stone, was an object of peculiar regard, and was selected with great care from among the others (Psal. cxviii, 22; Isa. xxviii, 16; Matt. xxi, 42; and gnyw, Deut. xvi, 6). The materials in buildings, as far as we can ascertain from the ruins which yet remain, were held together not by mortar or cement of any kind, except a very small quantity indeed might have been used, but by cramp-irons. Walls in some cases appear to have been covered with a composition of chalk and lime (Deut. xvi, 6), or gypsum (Acts xxiii, 3). See Chardin's Voyages, ed. Langles, vol. iv). The tiles dried in the sun were at first united by mud placed between them, afterwards by lime mixed with sand to form mortar. The latter was used with burnt tiles (Lev. xiv, 41, 42; Jer. xiii, 9). For the external decoration of large buildings marble columns were employed (Cant. v, 15). The Persians also took great delight in marble. To this not only the ruins of Persepolis testify, but the Book of Esther, where mention is made of white, red, and black marble, and likewise of veined marble. See Scriptutae Notae. The Apadana seems to receive no illustration from the recently discovered monuments of the Mesopotamian mounds, as no private houses, either of Assyria or Babylonia, have been preserved; owing doubtless to their having been constructed of perishable mud walls, at most inclosed only with thin slabs of alabaster (Layard's Nineveh, ii, 214). See Temples.

The Hebrews at a very ancient date, like the Orientals, had not only summer and winter rooms (Jer. xxxvi, 22; see Chardin, iv, 119), but palaces (Judg. iii, 30; 1 Kings vii, 2-6; Amos iii, 15). The houses, or palaces so called, made for summer residence, were very spacious. The lower stories were frequently under ground. The front of these buildings faced the north, so as to secure the advantage of the breezes, which in summer blow from that direction. They were supplied with a current of fresh air by means of ventilators, which consisted of perforations made through the upper part of the northern wall, of construction similar to external chimneys in size as they approached the inside of the wall. See Dwelling.

Houses for Jewels and armor were built and furnished under the kings (2 Kings xx, 13). The draught-house (אָבָּ֗יו [אָבָּיו] רֹאָ֖ם [רֹאָם] לְסִנְיָ֑ר [לְסִנְיָ֑ר] לְסִנְיָ֑ר) was doubtless a public gate three, such as are found in modern Eastern cities (2 Kings x, 27; Russell, l, 34).

Leprosy in the house was probably a nitrous efflorescence on the walls, which was injurious to the salubrity of the house, and whose removal was therefore strictly
enjoined by the law (Lev. xiv, 34, 55; Kitto, Phys. Geogr. of Pal. p. 112).

III. Details of Hebrew Dwellings.—In inferring the plan and arrangement of ancient Jewish or Oriental houses, as alluded to in Scripture, from existing dwellings in Syria, Egypt, and the East in general, allowance must be made for the differences in climate between Egypt, Persia, and Palestine, a cause from which would proceed differences in certain cases of material and construction, as well as of domestic arrangement.

1. The houses of the rural poor in Egypt, as well as in most parts of Syria, Arabia, and Persia, are for the most part mere huts of mud, or sun-burnt bricks. In some parts of Palestine and Arabia stone is used, and in certain districts caves in the rock are used as dwellings (Amos v, 11; Bartlett, Walks, p. 117). See Cave. The houses are usually of one story only, viz. the ground floor, and sometimes contain only one apartment. Sometimes a small court for the cattle is attached; and in some cases the cattle are housed in the same building, or the people live on a raised platform, and the cattle round them on the ground (1 Sam. xxviii., 24; Irby and Mangles, p. 70; Jolliffe, Letters, i, 43; Buckingham, Arab Tribes, p. 170; Burckhardt, Travels, ii, 119). In Lower Egypt the oxen occupy the width of the chamber farthest from the entrance: it is built of brick or mud, about four feet high, and the top is often used as a sleeping-place in winter. The windows are small apertures high up in the walls, sometimes grated with wood (Burckhardt, Travels, i, 241; ii, 101, 119, 301, 329; Lane, Mod. Egyptians, i, 44). The roofs are commonly, but not always, flat, and are usually formed of a plaster of mud and straw laid upon boughs or rafters; and upon the flat roofs, tents or "booths" of boughs or rushes are often raised to be used as sleeping-places in summer (Irby and Mangles, p. 71; Niebuhr, Descr. p. 49, 53; Layard, Nineveh and Bab, p. 112; Niebuhr, i, 176; Burckhardt, Syria, p. 280; Travels, i, 190; Van Egmont, ii, 32; Malan, Magdala and Bethany, p. 15). To this description the houses of ancient Egypt, and also of Assyria, as represented in the monuments, in great measure correspond (Layard, Mon. of Nin. pt. ii, pl. 49, 50; Wilkinson, Ancient Eg. i, 13; Martineau, East, I, 78, i, 19, 97). In the towns the houses of the inferior kind do not differ much from the above description, but they are sometimes of more than one story, and the roof-terraces are more carefully constructed. In Palestine they are often of stone (Jolliffe, i, 26). In the inferior kinds of Oriental dwellings, such as are met with in villages and very small towns, there is no central court, but there is generally a shaded platform in front. The village cabins and abodes of the peasant-

Ordinary Houses at Beyrount.

Modern Nestorian House, with stages on the roof for sleeping.

Front of an ancient Egyptian Residence.

ry are, of course, of a still inferior description; and, being the abodes of people who live much in the open air, will not bear comparison with the houses of the same class in Northern Europe, where the cottage is the home of the owner. (See Jahn, Bibl. Archæol. translated by Prof. Upham, pt. i, ch. ii.)

2. The difference between the poorest houses and those of the class next above them is greater than between these and the houses of the first rank. The prevailing plan of Eastern houses of this class presents, as was the case in ancient Egypt, a front of wall, whose blank and mean appearance is usually relieved only by the door and a few latticed and projecting windows (Vince in Syria, ii, 25). The privacy of Oriental domestic habits would render our plan of throwing the front of the house towards the street most repulsive. The doorway or door bears an inscription from the Koran as the ancient Egyptian house had inscriptions over their doors, and as the
Israelites were directed to write sentences from the Law over their gates. See MEZZUZAH. Over the door is usually the kiosk (sometimes projecting, like a bay-window), or screened balcony, probably the "summer parlor" in which Ehud smote the king of Moab (Judg. iii. 20), and the chamber on the wall." which the Semnites prepared for the prophet (2 Kings iv. 10). In this case there may be a small latticed window or two high up the wall, giving light and air to upper chambers, which, except in times of public celebrations, is usually closed (2 Kings ix. 30; Shaw, Travels, p. 207; Lane, Mod. Eg., 1, 39). This upper room is usually guarded within from sight by a wall or some arrangement of the passages. In the passage is a stone seat for the porter and other servants (Lane, Mod. Eg., 1, 32; Chardin, Voy., iv. 111). See Door.

The buildings which form the house front towards an inner square or court. Small houses have one of these courts, but superior houses have two, and first-rate houses three, communicating with each other; for the Orientals dislike ascending to their friends and clients. This is entirely open in front, and, being richly fitted up, has a splendid appearance when the first view of it is obtained. A refreshing coolness is sometimes given to this apartment by a fountain throwing up a jet of water in front of it. This is the κατολέμπα, or guest-chamber, of Luke xxii. 11; not necessarily an ἀνάγκη or upper chamber, as in verse 12. A large portion of the other side of the court is occupied with a frontage of lattice-work filled with colored glass, belonging to a room as large as the guest-chamber, and which in winter is used for the same purpose, or serves as the apartment of any visitor of distinction, who cannot, of course, be admitted into the interior parts of the house. The other apartments in this outer court are comparatively small, and are used for the accommodation of visitors, retainers, and servants. See GUEST-CHAMBER.

In the better class of houses in modern Egypt, the above ground-floor room is generally the apartment for male visitors, called madrasah, having a portion of the floor sunk below the rest, called darkādā. This is often paved with marble or colored tiles, and has in the centre a fountain. The rest of the floor is a raised platform called liwān, with a mattress and cushions at the back on each of the three sides. This seat or sofa is called diwān. Every person, on entrance, takes off his shoes on the darkādā before stepping on the liwān (Exod. iii. 5; Josh. v. 15; Luke vii. 38). The ceilings over the liwān and darkādā are often richly panelled and ornamented (Jer. xxii. 14; 2 Cor. ix. 10).

Bearing in mind that the reception-room is raised above the level of the court (Chardin, iv. 118; Vies in Syria, i. 56), we may, in explaining the circumstances of the miracle of the paralytic (Mark ii. 3; Luke v. 18), suppose, 1. either that our Lord was standing under the veranda, and the people in front in the court. The bearers of the sick man ascended the stairs to the roof of the house, and, taking off a portion of the boarded covering of the veranda, or removing the awning over the impluvium, ῥό μᾶλα, in the former case let down the bed through the veranda roof, or in the latter, down by way of the roof, ῥό ῥω ἐξελεύσα, and deposited it before the Saviour (Shaw, p. 212). 2. Another explanation presents itself in considering the room where the company were assembled as the τερτιόν, and the roof opened for the bed to be the true roof of the house (Trench, Miracles, p. 199; Lane, Modern Eg., i. 88).
HOUSE

And one still more simple is found in regarding the house as one of the rude dwellings now to be seen near the Sea of Galilee, a mere room "ten or twelve feet high, and as many or more square," with no opening except the door. The roof, used as a sleeping-place, is reached by a ladder from the outside, and the Learners of the paralytic, unable to approach the door, would thus have ascended the roof, and, having uncovered it (ἐνεργείας Ἰησοῦ), let him down into the room where our Lord was (Malan, L. c.). See below.

Besides the mandaraash some houses in Cairo have an apartment called maκad, open in front to the court, with two or more arches, and a railing; and a pillar to support the wall above (Lane, i, 36). It was in a chamber of this kind, probably one of the largest size to be found in a palace, that our Lord was arraigned before the high-priest at the time when the denial of him by Peter took place. He "turned and looked on Peter as he stood by the fire in the court" (Luke xxii, 56, 61; John xviii, 24), while he himself was in the "hall of judgment," the maκad. Such was the "porch of judgment" built by Solomon (1 Kings vii, 7), which finds a parallel in the golden alcove of Mohammed Uzbek (in Batuta, Travels, p. 76, ed. Lez). See P. Frotsr.

Part of the Court of a House in Cairo, with Makad (Lane).

RUM. The circumstance of Samson's pulling down the house by means of the pillars, may be explained by the fact that the company being assembled on tiers of balconies above each other, supported by central pillars on the basement; when these were pulled down, the whole of the upper floors would fall also (Judg. xvi, 26; see Shaw, p. 211). See PILLAR.

When there is no second floor, but more than one court, the women's apartments (Arabic haran or haram, secluded or prohibited, with which may be compared the Hebrew Armon, בַּרְוֹנָה, Stanley, S. and P. App. § 92), are usually in the second court; otherwise they form a separate building within the general inclosure, or are above on the first floor (Vine's in Syria, i, 56). The entrance to the harem, as observed above, is crossed by no one but the master of the house and the domestics belonging to the female establishment. Though this remark would not apply in the same degree to Jewish habits, the privacy of the women's apartments may possibly be indicated by the "inner chamber" (בְּאוֹר, ṭαֶרֶשׁ; cæstum, cubiculum), resorted to as a hiding-place (1 Kings xx, 30; xxii, 25; see Judg. xvi, 1). Solomon, in his marriage with a foreigner, introduced also foreign usage in this respect, which was carried further in subsequent times (1 Kings vii, 9; 2 Kings xxii, 15). The harem of the Persian monarch (قانون; ألعاب; ṭarash, do-
muchas). There are usually no fireplaces except in the kitchen, the furniture of which consists of a sort of raised platform of brick, with receptacles in it for fire, answering to the "boiling-places" (שִׁפַּיֶּם; σαγβήτια; σινόμα) of Ezekiel (xli, 28; see Lane, i, 41; Gesenius, Thes. p. 249). In these different compartments the various dishes of an Eastern feast may be at once prepared at charcoal fires. This place being wholly open in front, the half-tame doves, which have their nests in the trees of the court, often visit it, in the absence of the servants, in search of crumbs, etc. As they sometimes blacken themselves, this perhaps explains the obscure passage in Psa. lxxviii, 13, "Though ye have lien among the jotes [but Gesenius renders "sheepfolds"], ye shall be as the wings of a dove covered with silver," etc.

Besides the mandaraash, there is sometimes a second room, either on the ground or the upper floor, called kâbâsh, fitted with divans, and at the corners of these rooms portions taken off and inclosed form retiring rooms (Lane, i, 21; Russell, i, 31, 33). While speaking of the interior of the house, we may observe, that on the diwan, the corner is the place of honor, which is never quitted by the master of the house in receiving strangers (Russell, i, 27; Malan, Tyre and Sidon, p. 38). When there is an upper story, the kâbâsh forms the most important apartment, and thus probably answers to the νεονικόν, which was often the "guest-chamber" (Luke

Interior of a House (Harem) in Damascus.

Sometimes the divân is raised sufficiently to allow of cellars underneath for stores of all kinds (roπίστα, Matt. xxiv, 26; Russell, i, 32). This basement is occupied by various offices, stores of corn and fuel, places for the water-jars to stand in, places for grinding corn, baths, kitchens, etc. In Turkish Arabia most of the houses have underground cellars or vaults, to which the inhabitants retreat during the midday heat of summer, and there enjoy a fresh cooling breeze. We do not discover any notice of this usage in Scripture. But at Acre the substructions of very ancient houses were some years ago discovered, having such cellars, which were very probably subservient to this use. In the rest of the year, these cellars, or serdabs, as they are called, are abandoned to the bats, which swarm in them in scarcely credible numbers (Isa. ii, 20).

The kitchens are always in this inner court, as the cooking is performed by women, and the ladies of the family superintend or actually assist in the process. The kitchen, open in front, is on the same side as the entrance from the outer court; and the top of it forms a terrace, which affords a communication between the first floor of both courts by a private door, seldom used but by the master of the house and attendant eunuchs. There are usually no fireplaces except in the kitchen, the furniture of which consists of a sort of raised platform of brick, with receptacles in it for fire, answering to the "boiling-places" (שִׁפַּיֶּם; σαγβήτια; σινόμα) of Ezekiel (xli, 28; see Lane, i, 41; Gesenius, Thes. p. 249). In these different compartments the various dishes of an Eastern feast may be at once prepared at charcoal fires. This place being wholly open in front, the half-tame doves, which have their nests in the trees of the court, often visit it, in the absence of the servants, in search of crumbs, etc. As they sometimes blacken themselves, this perhaps explains the obscure passage in Psa. lxxviii, 13, "Though ye have lien among the jotes [but Gesenius renders "sheepfolds"], ye shall be as the wings of a dove covered with silver," etc.

Besides the mandaraash, there is sometimes a second room, either on the ground or the upper floor, called kâbâsh, fitted with divans, and at the corners of these rooms portions taken off and inclosed form retiring rooms (Lane, i, 21; Russell, i, 31, 33). While speaking of the interior of the house, we may observe, that on the diwan, the corner is the place of honor, which is never quitted by the master of the house in receiving strangers (Russell, i, 27; Malan, Tyre and Sidon, p. 38). When there is an upper story, the kâbâsh forms the most important apartment, and thus probably answers to the νεονικόν, which was often the "guest-chamber" (Luke
cooking, and where there was an opening immediately over the hearth to let out the smoke. In the better sort of houses the rooms were warmed in winter by charcoal in braziers (Jer. xxxvi, 22; Mark xiv, 54; John xviii, 18), as is still the practice (Russell, i, 21; Lane, i, 41; Chardin, iv, 120), or a fire of wood might be kindled in the open court of the house (Luke xxii, 56). See Finch.

There are usually no doors to the sitting or drawing-rooms of Eastern houses: they are closed by curtains, at least in summer, the opening and shutting of doors being odious to most Orientals. The same seems to have been the case among the Hebrews, as far as we may judge from the curtains which served instead of doors to the tabernacle, and which separated the inner and outer chambers of the Temple. The outer doors are closed with a wooden lock (Lane, i, 42; Chardin, iv, 123; Russell, i, 21). See Lock; Curtain.

The windows had no glass; they were only lattice, and thus gave free passage to the air and admitted light, while birds and bats were excluded. In winter the cold air was kept out by veils over the windows, or by shutters with holes in them sufficient to admit light (1 Kings vii, 17; Cant. ii, 9). The apertures of the windows in Egyptian and Eastern houses generally are small, in order to exclude heat (Wilkinson, Ant. Egy., i, 124). They are closed with a folding valve, secured with a bolt or bar. The windows often project considerably beyond the lower part of the building, so as to overlap the street. The windows of the courts within also project (Jowett, Christian Res. p. 66, 67). The lattice is generally kept closed, but can be opened at pleasure, and is opened on great public occasions (Lane, Mod. Egypt, i, 27). Those within can look through the lattices, without opening them or being seen themselves; and in some rooms, especially the large upper room, there are several windows. From the allusions in Scripture we gather, that while there was usually but one window in each room, in which invariably there was a lattice (Judg. vii, 12, 13).

The inner court is entered by a passage and door similar to those on the street, and usually situated at one of the innermost corners of the outer court. The inner court is generally much larger than the former. It is for the most part paved, excepting a portion in the middle, which is planted with trees (usually two) and shrubs, with a basin of water in the midst. That the Jews had the like arrangement of trees in the courts of their houses, and that the birds nested in them, appears from Ps. lxxxi, 2, 3. They had also the basin of water in the inner court or atrium, and among them it was used for bathing, as is shown by David's discovering Bathsheba baring as he walked on the roof of his palace. The arrangement of the inner court is very similar to that of the outer, but the whole is more open and airy. The buildings usually occupy two sides of the square, of which the one opposite the entrance contains the principal apartments. They are upon what we should call the first floor, and open into a wide gallery or veranda, which in good houses is nine or ten feet deep, and covered by a wooden penthouse supported by a row of wooden columns. This terrace or gallery is furnished with a strong wooden balustrade, and is usually paved with squared stones, or else floored with boards. In the centre of the principal front is the usual open drawing-room, on which the best art of the Eastern decorator is expended. Much of one of the sides of the court front is usually occupied by the large sitting-room, with the latticed front covered with colored glass, similar to that in the outer court. The other rooms, of smaller size, are the more private apartments of the mansion.

No ancient houses had chimneys. The word so translated in Hos. xiii, 5, means a hole through which the smoke escaped; and this existed only in the lower class of dwellings, where raw wood was employed for fuel or

Latticed Windows of a House in Cairo.

28, where "a window" is in Heb. "the window." Josh. ii, 15; 2 Sam. vi, 16, in Heb. "the window"; 2 Kings ix, 30, do.; Acts xx, 9, do.; there were sometimes several windows (2 Kings xiii, 17). The room here spoken of was probably such an upper room as Robinson describes
above with many windows (I sa. iii, 417). Daniel's room had several windows, and his lattices were opened when his enemies found him in prayer (Dan. vi, 10). The projecting nature of the window, and the fact that a divan, or raised seat, encircles the interior of each, so that usually persons sitting in the window are seated close to the aperture, easily explains how Ahaziah may have fallen from the flat roof and broken his head. It was Eutychus from his window-seat, especially if the lattices were open at the time (2 Kings i, 2; Acts xx, 9). See Window.

There are usually no special bedrooms in Eastern houses, and thus the room in which Yahosheth was murdered was probably an ordinary room with a flat roof, on which he was sleeping during the heat of the day (2 Sam. iv, 5, 6; Lane, i, 41). See Beichamber.

The stairs to the upper apartments are in Syria usually in a corner of the court (Robinson, iii, 502). When there is no upper story the lower rooms are usually loftier. In Persia they are open from top to bottom, and only divided from the court by a low partition (Wilkinson, Anc. Eg., i, 10; Charlin, iv, 119; Burekhardt, Travels, i, 18, 19; Vines in Syria, i, 66). This flight of stone steps conducts to the gallery, from which a plainer stair leads to the house-top. If the house be large, there are two or three sets of steps to the different sides of the quadrangle, but seldom more than one flight from the terrace to the house-top of any one court. There is, however, a separate stair from the outer court to the roof, and it is usually near the entrance. This will bring to mind the case of the paralytic, noticed above, whose friends, finding they could not get access to Jesus through the people who crowded the court of the house in which he was preaching, took him up to the roof, and let him down in his bed through the tiling to the place where Jesus stood (Luke v, 17-26). If the house in which our Lord then was bad more than one court, he and the auditors were certainly in the outer one; and it is reasonable to conclude that he stood in the veranda addressing the crowd below. The men bearing the paralytic, therefore, perhaps went up the steps near the door; and finding they could not even then get near the person of Jesus, the gallery being also crowded, continued their course to the roof of the house, and removing the boards over the covering of the gallery, at the place where Jesus stood, lowered the sick man to his feet. But if they could not get access to the steps near the door, as is likely, from the door being much crowded, their alternative was to take him to the roof of the next house, and there hoist him over the parapet to the roof of the house which they desired to enter. (See Strong's Han., and Expos. of the Gospels, p. 64.) See Stairs.

The roof of the house is, of course, flat. It is formed by layers of branches, twigs, matting, and earth, laid over the rafters, and trodden down; after which it is covered with a compost that acquires considerable hardness when dry. Such roofs would not, however, endure the heavy and continuous rains of our climate; and in those parts of Asia where the climate is more than usually moist, a stone roller is usually kept on every roof, and a shower of pears or a strong gale of wind will on occasion is engaged in drawing these rollers over the roofs. It is now very common, in countries where timber is scarce, to have domed roofs; but in that case the flat roof, which is indispensable to Eastern habits, is obtained by filling up the hollow intervals between the several domes, so as to form a flat surface at the top. These flat roofs are often alluded to in Scripture, and the allusions show that they were made to serve the same uses as at present. In fine weather the inhabitants resort much to them to breathe the fresh air, to enjoy a fine prospect, or to witness any event that occurred in the neighborhood (2 Sam. xi, 1; Isa. xxii, 1; Matt. xxiv, 17; Mark xiii, 15). The dry air of the summer atmosphere enabled them, without injury to health, to enjoy the bracing coolness of the night-air by sleeping on the house-tops; and in order to have the benefit of the air and prospect in the daytime, they would remove their tents from the sun, sheets, beds, and tents were sometimes erected on the house-tops (2 Sam. xvi, 22). See House-top.

The roofs of the houses are well protected by walls and parapets. Towards the street and neighboring houses is a high wall, and towards the court, whose walls usually a parapet or wooden rail. "Battlements" of this kind, for the prevention of accidents, are strictly enjoined in the law (Dent. xxii, 8), and the form of the battlements of Egyptian houses suggest some interesting analogies, if we consider how recently the Israelites had quitted Egypt when that law was delivered. See Battlement.

---

In the East, where the climate allows the people to spend so much of their time out of doors, the art of furnishing and the domestic utensils have always been few and simple. See Bed; Lamp; Pottery; Seat; Table. The rooms, however, although comparatively vacant of moveables, are far from having a naked or unfurnished appearance. This is owing to the high degree of ornament given to the walls and ceilings. The walls are broken up into various recesses, and the ceiling into compartments. The ceiling, if of wood and flat, is of curious and complicated joinery; or, if vaulted, is wrought into numerous coves, and enriched with fretwork in stucco; and the walls are adorned with arabesques, mosaics, mirrors, painting, and gold, which, as set off by the marble-like whiteness of the stucco, has a truly brilliant and rich effect. There is much in this to remind one of such descriptions of splendid interiors as that in Isa. liv, 11, 12.—Smith; Kitto; Fairbairn. See Ceiling.

IV. Metaphori aly—The word house has some figurative applications in Scripture. Heaven is considered the house of God (John xiv, 2); "In my Father's house are many mansions." Here is an evident allusion to the Temple (q. v.), with its many rooms, which is emphatically styled in the Old Testament "the House of the Lord." The grave is the
house appointed for all the living (Job xxx, 23; Isa. xix, 18). House is taken for the body (2 Cor. v, 1): "If our earthly house of this tabernacle were dissolved, as our bodies were taken to pieces by death. The comparison of the body to a house is used by Mr. Harmer to explain the similes, Eccles. xii. 3, and is illustrated by a passage in Plautus (Mostei, i, 2). The Church gives it this as its house (Gen. xliii, 15): "How thou oughtest to behave thyself in the house of God, that is, the Church of the living God." In the same sense, Moses was faithful in all the house of God as a servant, but Christ as a son over his own house: whose house are we (Christians). But this sense may include that of household, persons composing the attendants or retainers to a prince, etc. This intimate reference of house or dwelling to the adherents, intimates, or partisans of the householder, is probably the foundation of the simile used by the apostle Peter (1 Pet. ii, 5): "Ye (Christians), as living stones, are built up into a spiritual house." Gen. xxlii, 16: "Joseph said to the ruler of his house:" i. e. to the manager of his domestic concerns. Isa. xxxvi, 3: "Eliakim, who was over the house, or household," i. e. his steward. Gen. xxx, 30: "When shall I provide for mine own house also?" i. e. get wealth to provide for his family (see 1 Tim. vi, 17). Gen. xlii, 1: "Enter thou and all thy house (family) into the ark." Exod. i, 21: "And it came to pass, because the midwives feared God, that he made them house." i. e. he prospered their families. So also in 1 Sam. i, 35; 2 Sam. vii, 27; 1 Kings xi, 38. Thus the Lord plagued Pharaoh and his house (Gen. xii, 17). "What is my house, that thou hast brought me hither?" (2 Sam. vii, 18). So Joseph (Luke i, 27; ii, 4) was of the house of David, but more especially he was of his royal lineage, or family; and, as we conceive, in the direct line or eldest branch of the family, so that he was next to king, if the throne, if the government had still continued in possession of the descendants of David (see also 1 Tim. v, 8). 2 Sam. vii, 11: "Also the Lord telleth thee that he will make thee a house," i. e. he will give thee offspring, who may receive and may possess the royal dignity. Psa. cxlix, 12: "Their inward thought is that their houses shall continue forever," i. e. that their posterity shall always flourish.—Calmet; Weiss. See Householder.

House of Bishops. See Convocation.

House of Clerical and Lay Deputies. See Convocation.

House of God, a name frequently given to the edifice in which Christians assemble for the worship of God, not because God dwells there by any visible or special presence, as of old he "dwelt between the cherubims," but because it is dedicated to God, and set apart for his service. It is thus synonymous with the word "church" in that modern use of it by which it signifies a building (Eden). See Bethel; House; Temple.

House of Prayer, places where persons assemble to pray, and to receive religious instruction, but where the sacraments are not administered. It is the general name of the Protestant churches in Hungary; and was such in Silesia under the Austrian rule, to distinguish them from the Roman Catholic places of worship. It is also used in Germany to designate the churches of such sects as are not officially recognised, as the Moravians, etc. The synagogues are also called houses of prayer (Isa. iv, 7).—Pierer, Univ. Lex. s. v. See Priests.

Household (usually same in the orig. as "house"), the members of a family residing in the same abode, including servants and dependants, although in Job i, 3 a distinction (not observed in the A. V.) is intimated by the term ἀδελφός, abudosh: "lit. service ("servants," Gen. xxvi, 24), between the domestics and the ἀδελφός, boy'lih, or proper family of the master of the house; and some have thought a like difference to be denoted between the Greek term ἀδελφός (lit. residence) and ἀδελφὸς of the N. T., which are both indiscriminately rendered "house" and "household" in the Eng. Version. This latter view is confirmed by the improbability that any of the immediate imperial family (Nero's) should have been included in the conuerra to Christianity expressed in the phrase they of Caesar's household (οἱ ἐκ τῆς Καίσαρος ἀδελφοῦ, Phil. iv, 22). See Cesar.

Householder (οἰκοτεύτωρ, master of the house, as rendered Matt. x, 25; Luke xiii, 25; xiv, 21), the male head of a family (Matt. xiii, 27, 22; xx, 1; xxii, 25). There are monograms on the parable Matt. xx, by Feuzelein, De scrbl. proferentis et thesauro novo et re- tera (Alt. 1730); Bagewitz, De scrib. docto (Rost. 1720). See Goodman of the house.

House, "the old Saxon name for the Eucharist, supposed by some to be from the Gothic thamau, a victim."—Edie, Eccles. Dictionary, p. 315.

House-top (θι, pag, δώμα), the flat roof of an Oriental house, for such is usually their form, though there are sometimes domes over some of the rooms. The flat portions are plastered with a composition of mortar, tar, ashes, and sand, which in time becomes very hard, but which becomes soft when not laid on at the proper season is apt to crack in winter, and the rain is thus admitted. In order to prevent this, every roof is provided with a roller, which is set at work after rain. In many cases the terrace roof is little better than earth rolled hard. On ill-compact ed roofs grass is often found springing into a short-lived existence. (Prov. xix, 18; xxvii, 16; Psa. cxix, 6, 7; Isa. xxxvii, 27; Shaw, p. 210; Lane, i, 27; Robinon, iii, 99, 44, 60). See Grasses.

Modern Egyptian House-tops.

In no point do Oriental domestic habits differ more from European than in the use of the roof (Hackett, Ilust. of Scripture, p. 71 sq.). Its flat surface is made useful for various household purposes (Josh. ii, 6), as drying corn, hanging up linen, and preparing figs and raisins (Shaw, p. 211; Burckhardt, Trav. i, 191; Bartlett, Footsteps of our Lord, p. 199). The roofs are used almost universally as places of recreation in the evening, and often as sleeping-places at night (2 Sam. xi, 2; xvii, 22; Dan. iv, 29; 1 Sam. ix, 25, 26; Job xxvi, 18; Prov. xxi, 9; Shaw, p. 211; Russell, i, 35; Chardin, iv, 116; Layard, Nineveh, i, 177). They were also used as places for devotion, and even idolatrous worship (Jer. xxxii, 29; xix, 13; 2 Kings xxiii, 12; Zeph i, 5; Acts x, 9). At the time of the Feast of Tabernacles booths were erected by the Jews on the tops of their houses, as in the present day huts of boughs are sometimes erected.
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on the house-tops as sleeping-places, or places of retirement from the heat in summer time (Neh. viii, 16; Burchhardt, Syria, p. 280). As among the Jews the seclusion of women was not carried to the extent of Mohammedan usage, it is probable that the house-top was made, as it is among Christian inhabitants, more a place of public meeting both for men and women, than is the case among Mohammedans, who carefully seclude their roofs from inspection by partitions (Burchhardt, Trav. i, 191; compare Wilkinson, i, 23). The Christians at Aleppo, in Russell's time, lived contiguous, and made their house-tops a means of mutual communication to avoid passing through the streets in time of plague (Russell, i, 35). In the same manner, the house-top might be made a means of escape by the stairs by which it was reached without entering any of the apartments of the house (Matt. xxiv, 17; s, 27; Luke xii, 3). Both Jews and heathens were in the habit of wailing publicly on the house-tops (Isa. xv, 3; xxii, 1; Jer. xlviii, 38). The expression used by Solomon, "dwelling upon the house-top" (Prov. xxi, 9), is illustrated by the frequent custom of building chambers and rooms along the side and at the corners of the open space or terrace which often constitutes a kind of upper story (Hackett, n.s. sup. p. 74). Or it may refer to the fact that booths are sometimes constructed of branches and leaves upon the roof.

Ancient Egyptian flat Roof supported by a Datoridae, which, although of cramped dimensions, furnish a cool and quiet retreat, not unsuitable as a relief from a clamorous wife (Pococke, Travels, ii, 69). It is obvious that such a place would be convenient for observation (Isa. xcvii, 1), and for the proclamation of news (Luke xi, 8; comp. Thomson, Land and Book, i, 51). See Room.

Protection of the roof by parapets was enjoined by the law (Deut. xxii, 8). The parapets thus constructed, of which the types may be seen in ancient Egyptian houses, were sometimes of open work, and it is to a fall through or over one of these that the injury by which Ahaziah suffered is sometimes ascribed (Shaw, p. 211). To pass over the roofs in ploughing purposes, as well as for safety, would be no difficult matter (Joel, ii, 9). In ancient Egyptian, and also in Assyrian houses, a sort of raised story was sometimes built above the roof, and in the former an open chamber, roofed or covered with awning, was sometimes erected on the house-top (Wilkinson, i, 214; Layard, Mon. of Nin. ii, pl. 49, 36).—Smith. See House.

Housay, Brother Jean de, a distinguished member of an order of hermits who lived on Mount Valerian, near Paris, was born at Chaillot in 1539. These pious men formed a community of their own, distinct from the outer world, and took the vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. Housay died Aug. 3, 1609.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxv, 271. See VALERIAN MONKS. (J. H. W.)

Housta, Baton de, an Augustinian monk, was born at Toulouse in the early part of the 18th century, and distinguished himself greatly by his piety and erudition. He is especially celebrated as the would-be critic of Fleury's work on ecclesiastical history, which he attacked in a work entitled Mauvaise faveur de M. Fleury, prouvée par plusieurs passages des saints Pères, des conciles et d'auteurs ecclésiastiques qu'il a omis, trompés ou infidèlement traduits dans son histoire (Maines, 1755, 8vo.). Of course the monk, from his narrow and biased standpoint, was unable to comprehend the greatness of Fleury and the liberality of his views, and he endeavored to ridicule Fleury, and stamp him as an infidel. Housta died at Enguizen in 1760.—Chauveau and Delandine, Nouv. Dict. Hist. vi, 315 sq.; Fuller, Dict. Hist. ix, 45. (J. H. W.)

Housteville, Alexandre Claude François, a French theologian, was born at Paris in 1688, became a member of the Congregation of the Oratory in 1704, and remained such for some eighteen years. He was then appointed secretary to cardinal Dubois. In 1722 he published Le Véritable des religion chrétiennes prouvé par les faits (Paris, 4to; new ed. Paris, 1749, 4 vols. 12mo), "which had a wonderful though scarcely deserved popularity at one time" (Hook, Eccles. Biog. vi, 198), and Provoked considerable controversy. In 1723 he was made abbé of St. Vincent du Bourg-sur-Mer, in the diocese of Dax. In 1728 he published Essai critique sur la Providence. In 1740 he published a second edition of his Vérité de la religion chrétienne (Paris, 3 vols. 4to). This edition, greatly enlarged, contains a historical and critical discourse upon the method of the principal authors who wrote for and against Christianity from its beginning (which was translated and published separately, with a Dissertation on the Life of Apollonius Tyaneus, and some Observations on the Platonists of the latter School, Lond. 1739, 8vo). "It contains little information concerning the authors or the events, but a clearly and correctly written analysis of their works and principles" (Farrar, Crit. History of Free Thought, p. xv). In 1742 he was honored with the appointment of "perpetual secretary" to the French Academy. He died Nov. 8, 1742.—Biographie Univ. xx, 620 sq.; Chauveau and Delandine, Nouv. Dict. Hist. vi, 316; Dict. des Ecrit. 2, 355 sq. (J. H. W.)

Hovel or Housing is a term applied to a canopy or niche.—Walcott, Soc. Archæol. p. 318.

Hovey, Jonathan Parsons, D.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Waybridge, Vt., Oct. 10, 1810. He received a collegiate education at Jacksonville, Ill., and South Hanover, Ind. He studied theology at Auburn Seminary, and was ordained for the ministry March, 1837. He was settled four times: first at Gaines, N.Y.; then at Burdette, N.Y.; then at Richmond, Vt.; and from September, 1859, for thirteen years, in New York
City. "His church occupied a difficult field. It was surrounded by German Catholics, and by those who valued little, though they greatly needed, the institutions of the Gospel. Here he labored with signal fidelity and usefulness. Several revivals were enjoyed during his ministry, and many additions were made to the German congregation. He presided at the synod in which the formal union was consummated, and as chaplain of the 1st Regiment New York State Volunteers, and continued with them during their entire period of service, at the expiration of which he returned again to his charge in New York City. He died there Dec. 16, 1865.—Wilson's *Presb. Hist. Alm.*, 1864, p. 905 so.

Rev. Dr. Field, in the *Christian Intelligencer*, Dec. 24, 1863.

**How, Samuel B., D.D.** was born in 1788, graduated at the University of Pennsylvania in 1710, and at Princeton Theological Seminary in 1813. He was settled successively in Presbyterian churches at Salisbury, Pa., 1813-15; Trenton, N. J., 1815-21; and New Brunswick, N. J., 1821-23. From 1822 to 1827 he was pastor of the Independent Church at Sayreville, N. J., and in 1827 moved to New York, where he was called to the presidency of Dickinson College, Pa., 1830-31. In 1832 he accepted the charge of the First Reformed Dutch Church in New Brunswick, N. J., but resigned on account of ill health in 1861. In all these positions his fine classical scholarship, upright and extensive religious knowledge, and his learning were studiously maintained and conspicuously displayed. Devout, conscientious, a Christian gentleman in the best sense of the term, a most faithful preacher and pastor, fearless and independent, zealous and successful, as a minister he was remarkable for scriptural instruction and pious fervor. His ideal of the ministry was lofty, and his life was the best commentary upon it. In 1855 he published an elaborate pamphlet entitled *Slavery holding not sinful*, which grew out of the request of the North Carolina Classis of the German Reformed Church to be united with the Reformed Dutch Church. The important and excited discussion which followed in the *General Synod* of the latter body ended in a decided refusal to comply with the application. Dr. How's pamphlet was answered in the same form by the Rev. Henry V. Gange and others, and it was long before the issue was definitely decided. Dr. How published also several occasional sermons of eminent ability. He was a frequent contributor to religious periodicals, especially in relation to the pending theological controversies of his time. The last seven years of his life were spent in retirement from public service. He preached when invited, but would permit himself to be found among his own people, a model of Christian virtues and of ministerial excellence. He died in 1868.—Corvin's *Manual Ref. Church*, p. 118; *Christian Intelligencer*; *Rev. R. H. Steele, D.D., Hist. of Ref. D. Ch. New Brunswick* (1869).

(W. J. R. T.)

**Howard, Bezaleel, D.D.**, a Unitarian Congregational minister, was born at Bridgewater, Mass., Nov. 22, 1758. He entered Harvard College in 1777, and after graduation in 1781, engaged in teaching, pursuing at the same time a course of theological study. In 1788 he was appointed tutor at Harvard. In November, 1784, he was called as minister to the First Church and Society in Springfield, Mass., and was ordained April 27, 1785. He continued in this position until September, 1808, when impaired health obliged him to discontinue his work; but his resignation was not accepted by the Church until Jan. 25, 1809, when his successor was ordained. In 1819 he associated himself with a new Unitarian Church which had been formed from members of his old congregation, and he continued with them till his death, Jan. 20, 1837. In 1824 Harvard College conferred the degree of D.D. upon him. The Rev. Daniel Waldo, in a sketch of Dr. Howard (in Sprague's *Annals of the Am. Pulpit*, viii., 181 sq.), says, that the theological views of Dr. Howard had been Arminian until his latest years, when he came to believe "the sole supremacy of the Father. He, however, held to the doctrine of the atonement, in the sense of propitiation or expiation, with the utmost tenacity; and he regarded the rejection of it as a rejection of Christianity. His views of the character of the Saviour were not, perhaps, very accurately defined: he seemed to regard him as a sort of Jesus, an internal God from within, a God of the strict sense, on the one hand, nor yet the supreme God on the other." He published a sermon delivered at the ordination of the Rev. Antipas Steward (1798). (J. H. W.)

**Howard, John**, one of the most eminent of modern Christian philanthropists, was born at Hackney in 1726. His father apprenticed him to a wholesale grocer, but died when his son was about nineteen years of age, leaving him in possession of a handsome fortune, and young Howard, who was in weak health, determined to make a tour in France and Italy. On his return he took lodgings in Stoke Newington, where his landlord—a widow named Loidore—having nursed him carefully through a severe illness, he, out of gratitude, married her, though she was twenty-seven years his senior. She, however, died about three years after the marriage, and he now determined to visit London and to live in a manner to alleviate the miseries caused by the great earthquake in 1756. On his voyage he was captured by a French privateer, carried a prisoner to Brest, and subsequently removed into the interior, but was finally permitted to return to England on the promise of inducing the government to make a suitable exchange, but the war was effect ed, and Howard retired to a small estate he possessed at Cardington, near Bedford, and there, in April, 1768, he married Miss Henrietta Lees. It is mentioned as a characteristic trait that he stipulated before marriage "that, in all matters in which there should be an equivalence of opinion between them, their house should rule." For seven years he was chiefly engaged in the task of raising the physical and moral condition of the peasantry of Cardington and its neighborhood by erecting on his own estate better cottages, establishing schools, and visiting and relieving the sick and the destitute; in his benevolent exertions he was assisted by his wife. She died March, 1765, and Howard from that time lost his interest in his home and its occupations. He lived some years at Cardington in seclusion, then made another Continental tour, and in 1775 was nominated sheriff of Bedford. The sufferings which he had endured was witnessed during his official capacity as a magistrate; the prisoner of war struck deep into his mind, and, shocked by the misery and abuses which prevailed in the prisons under his charge, he attempted to induce the magistrates to remedy the more obvious of them. The result was a demand for a special commission to Howard at once set out on a tour of inspection. But he soon found that the evil was general, and he set himself diligently to work to inquire into the extent and precise nature of the mischief, and, if possible, to discover the true remedy for the evil. He visited, in two journeys, most of the town and county jails of England, and accumulated a large mass of information, which, in March, 1774, he laid before the House of Commons. This was the commencement of prison reform in England. Once actively engaged, he became more and more devoted to this benevolent pursuit. He travelled repeatedly over the United Kingdom, often in disguise, for the benefit of every part of Europe, visiting the most offensive places, relieving personally the wants of the most wretched objects, and noting all that seemed to him important either for warning or example. The first fruit of these labors was *The State of the Prisons in England and Wales,* published in 1776. Howard was then sent abroad by order of the House of Commons, and was appointed a member of the Board of Control for the Colonies in 1779, and of the Board of Foreign Affairs in 1783. In 1778, as soon as it appeared, the world was astonished at the mass of valuable materials accumulated by a private unaided individual, through a course of prodigious labor, and at the constant hazard of life, in consequence of the infectious diseases prevalent in the scenes of his inquiries. The cool good sense and moderation of his
narrative, contrasted with that enthusiastic ardor which must have inspired him to his undertaking, were not less admired, and he was immediately regarded as one of the extraordinary characters of the age, and as the leader in all plans for ameliorating the condition of that wretched part of the community for whom he interested himself. (1827) He undertook another tour to revisited the celebrated Rasp-houses of Holland, and continued his route through Belgium and Germany into Italy, whence he returned through Switzerland and France in 1779. In the same year he made another survey of Great Britain and Ireland. In these tours he extended his views to the investigation of hospitals. The results were published in 1780, in an Appendix to "The State of the Prisons in England and Wales," etc. Having travelled over nearly all the south of Europe, in 1781 he visited Denmark, Sweden, Russia, and Poland, and in 1783 he went through Spain and Portugal, continuing at intervals his home inquiries, and published in 1784 a second appendix, together with a new edition of the original work, in which the additional matter was comprised. The importance, both in prisons and hospitals, of preventing the occurrence or spread of infectious diseases, produced in his mind a desire to witness the working and success of the Lazaretto system in the south of Europe, more especially as a safeguard against the plague. Danger or disgust never turned him from his path, but on this occasion he went without even a servant, not thinking it right, for convenience of himself or another person, to expose another to a risk. Quitting England in 1785, he travelled through the south of France and Italy to Malta, Zante, and Constanti- nople, whence he returned to Smyrna, while the plague was raging, for the purpose of sailing from an infected port to Venice, where he might undergo the utmost rigor of the quarantine system. He returned to England in 1787, resumed his home tours, and in 1789 published the result of his late inquiries in another important volume, entitled An Account of the principal Lazarettos in Europe, etc., with additional Remarks on the present State of the Prisons in Great Britain and Ireland. The same summer he resumed his course of foreign travels, meaning to go into Turkey and the East through Russia. He had, however, proceeded no farther than the Crimea when a rapid illness, which he himself believed to be an infectious fever, caught in prescribing for a lady, put an end to his life in the 20th of January 1792. He requested that no other inscription should be put upon his grave than simply this, "Christ is my hope." He was buried at Danbury, near Cherson, and the utmost respect was paid to his memory by the Russian government. The intelligence of his death caused a profound feeling of regret in his native country, and men of all classes and parties vied in paying their tribute of reverence to his memory. A marble statue by Bacon of "the philanthropist" was erected in St. Paul's Cathedral by a public subscription.

Mr. Howard's piety was deep and fervent, and his moral character most pure and simple. His literary acquirements were small, neither were his talents brilliant; but he was fearless, single-minded, unting, and did great things by devoting his whole energies to one good object. The influence of disinterestedness and integrity is nowhere more clearly displayed than in the ready access granted to him even by the most absolute and most suspicious governments, in the respect invariably paid to his person, and the weight attached to his opinion and authority. He was strictly economical in his personal expenses, abstemious in his habits, and capable of going through great privations among the poor. His only recreations were freely spent in the cause to which his life was devoted. The only blemish which has ever been suggested as resting upon his memory is in connection with his conduct to his son. Mr. Howard was a strict, and has not escaped the charge of being a severe, parent. The son, unhappily, in youth fell into dissolute habits, which being carefully concealed from the father, and consequent-

ly unchecked, brought on a disease which terminated in insanity. He survived his father nine years, dying on the 24th of April, 1799; but he remained till his death a hopeless lunatic. The question of Howard's alleged harshness to his son has been thoroughly investigated and effectually disproved. (See Dixon's Life of Howard.) This book was written in order to afford a complete object to which he gave up his life may not have interfered with his paternal duties, it is, of course, impossible to affirm; but that John Howard was an affectionate and kind-hearted father, as well as a single-minded benefactor to his species, there can now be no reasonable doubt. See English Cyclopaedia; Aiken, Charities and Services of John Howard (London, 1792, 8vo); Brown, Memoirs of John Howard (London, 1818, 4th); Dixon, John Howard and the Prison World of Europe (London, 1850, 12mo); reprinted, with an introduction, by the Rev. W. Dickenson, D.D., N.Y., 1845, 1860); Fawcett, Life of John Howard (London, 1850, 8vo); Skene, History of the Free Churches of England, p. 479.

Howard, John, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born of Roman Catholic ancestry in Onslow County, North Carolina, in 1792. His early education was limited, as his father died shortly after the birth of John, and he was placed in a store at the age of twelve. He was converted and entered the ministry in 1819 at Georgetown. In 1819 he joined the South Carolina Conference, and was stationed at Sandy River Circuit. In 1820 he was appointed to Georgetown, 1821 to Savannah, 1822 to Augusta, and 1823 and 1824 to Charleston. He located from 1825 till 1828, when he was appointed to the Washington and Great Ebenezer Circuit. In 1829 and 1830 he labored on the Appalachee Circuit. In 1831 he joined the Georgia Conference, then forming, and for three years became presiding elder of the Milledgeville District. From 1834 to the time of his death in 1836, he was agent for the "Manual Labor School" of the Conference. In 1836 he was appointed to the ministry, employed with Savannah, Augusta, and Charleston, was attended with marked success. He labored with great fidelity, not only in the pulpit, but with penitents at the altar, being alike fervent in his prayers and appropriate in his counsels. As a pastor, too, he was always on the alert to promote the best interests of his people. Whenever there was darkness to be dissipated, or grief to be assuaged, or sinking hope to be encouraged, or evil of any kind to be removed, there he was sure to be present as an angel of mercy."—Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, vii, 614 sq.

Howard, Simeon, D.D., a Unitarian Congregational minister, was born at Bridgewater, Maine, April 29, 1738, and educated at Harvard College, where he graduated with distinguished honor in 1758. After a course of theological study, pursued while himself engaged in teaching, he accepted a call to a church at Cumberland, Nova Scotia. In 1765 he returned to Cambridge as a resident graduate student, and was elected tutor the year following. In 1767 he accepted the pastorate of West Church, Boston, and was ordained May 6, 1768. During the Revolution his congregation suffered greatly, and having made many friends during his residence in Nova Scotia, he proposed that his congregation should unite with the church in the neighborhood, which they did. After about one year and a half he returned to Boston, and again served his congregation there, receiving only such compensation for his services as he was fully satisfied they could afford to give in their destitute circumstances. He died in the midst of his labors in 1818, and his sons, among them the famous Simeon, who was conferred on him by Edinburgh University. He was an overseer and fellow of Harvard, and a member of most of the American societies for the promotion of literature, charitable, and religious objects, and an officer of several of them. Dr. Howard was "bald and genteel in his manner, calm and equable in temper, cheerful without levity, and serious without gloom. . . . His
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parishioners loved him as a brother, and honored him as a father; his brethren in the ministry always met him with a grateful and cordial welcome; and the community at large reverenced him for his simplicity, integrity, and benevolence. "Dr. Howard published Sermons (1773, 1777, 1778, 1789):—Christians have no Cause to be ashamed of their Religion (sermon, 1770)—Ordination Sermon (1771)—Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, viii, 65.

Howe, Bezaleel, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Tower Hill, Dutchess County, N. Y., July 14, 1781. In early life he was a student of Paine and Rousseau, and for several years a professed infidel; but the unhappy death of a notorious infidel of his acquaintance, in 1801, was a conversion, and in 1823 he entered the New York Conference, in which he labored with great zeal and success until his death, June 25, 1854. He was fond of study, and his piety and abilities honored and edited the Church—Min. of Conferences, v, 538. (G. L. T.)

Howe, Charles, a distinguished English diplomatist, was born in Gloucestershire in 1661. Being of a strong religious turn, he finally forsook public life, and retired into the country, where he wrote his Devout Meditations (8vo: 2d Ed. Edinb. 1752, 12mo; Lond. 1824, 12mo, and often), of which the poet, Dr. Edward Young, says, "I shall never lay it far out of my way, by my prayer and meditation, when I am alone, to read his head and sincere heart I never saw." Howe died in 1745.—Lond. Gent. Mag. vol. livv; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 902; Gorton, Biog. Dict. s. v.

Howe, John, a Nonconformist divine, and one of the greatest of English theologians, who is often called the "Platonic Puritan," was born May 17, 1630, at Loughborough, in Leicestershire, where his father was the incumbent of the parish church; but, having become a Nonconformist, he was ejected from his living, and retired to Ireland. He soon, however, returned to England, and settled in the town of Lancaster, where John received his rudimentary instruction from his father. He was afterwards educated at Christ College, Cambridge, but removed to Brazenose College, Oxford, of which he became the bible-clerk in 1648, and where he for the second time took his degree of B.A. in 1649. He was a demy of Magdalen College by the parliamentary visitors, and was afterwards made a fellow, and took the degree of M.A. After having been ordained by a Nonconformist divine, assisted by others, he became a minister at Great Torrington, in Devonshire. In 1654 Cromwell appointed him his domestic chaplain. He gave some offence to the protector by one of his sermons, in which he expressed certain opinions about divine impulses and special impressions in answer to prayer, but retained his situation till Cromwell's death, and afterwards till the deposition of Richard Cromwell. He then resumed and continued his ministry at Great Torrington till the Act of Uniformity, August, 1662, obliged him to restrict his preaching to private houses. He went to Ireland in 1671, where he resided as chaplain to the family of Lord Massarene, enjoying there the friendship of the bishop of that diocese. Howe was granted liberty to preach in all the churches under the jurisdiction of this bishop. He wrote for a great deal of time the newspaper "Morituri Te Commendam," and began his greatest work, The Living Temple, below referred to. In 1675 he accepted an invitation to become the minister of a congregation in London. During the year 1680 he engaged in a controversy with Drs. Stillingfleet and Tillotson on the question of nonconformity, and it is said that Dr. Stillingfleet, who had provoked the controversy by a discourse which he preached before the lord mayor and aldermen of London on "The Mischief of Separation," was subdued when he read Howe's reply, and confessed that he discovered "more like a gentleman than a divine, without any mixture of rancour, or any sharp reflections, and some-times with a great degree of kindness towards him, for which, and his prayers for him, he heartily thanked him" (Rogers's Life of Howe, p. 188). In August, 1685, he went to the Continent with lord Wharton, and in 1686 became one of the preachers to the English church at Utrecht. In 1695 Dr. James II published a book in defense of the Protestant Dissenters, and the puritanical Popish Plot. In 1696 he became involved in the Antinomian controversy by a recommendation which he gave to the works of Dr. Crisp. He soon, however, cleared his reputation by a strong recommendation of Flavel's Blow at the Root, a work against Antinomianism, then in the course of publication. In 1701 he became entangled in a controversy with the Puritan De Foe (q. v.) on account of one of Howe's members, who had been elected lord mayor, and who, in order to qualify himself for that office, had taken the Lord's Supper in an Established Church. The manner in which Howe answered the objections of the Plantations of De Foe (quity, etc.) the objections of De Foe, who opposed communion in the Established Church by Nonconformists, is to be regretted by all who venerate the name of John Howe. He died April 2, 1705. Among the Puritans, John Howe ranks as one of the most intellectual and religious of his time. He was also unquestionably one of the most great general leaders of the church, "the originality and compass of Howe's mind, and the calmness and moderation of his temper, must ever inspire sympathy and awaken admiration in reflective readers: his Platonic and Alexandrine culture commends him to the philosophical student, his practical tenor and religious thinking endears him to all Christians" (Stoughton [John], Eccles. Hist. of Eng. ii, 422, 423). "Perhaps it may be considered as no unfair test of intellectual and spiritual excellence that a person can relish the writings of John Howe; if he does not, he may have reason to suspect that something in his head or heart is wrong. A young minister who wishes to attain eminence in his profession, if he has not the works of John Howe, and can procure them in no other way, should sell his coat and buy them; and, if that will not suffice, let him sell his bed and lie on the floor; and if that still fails him, he should not fail to complain that he lies hard at night!" (Bogue and Bennett, Hist. of Dissenters, i, 437). "Howe seems to have understood the Gospel as well as any uninspired writer, and to have imbibed as much of its spirit. There is the truest sublimity to be found in his writings, and some of the strongest pathos; yet, often obscure, generally harsh, he has imitated the worst parts of Boyle's style. He has a vast number and variety of uncommon thoughts, and is, on the whole, one of the most valuable writers in our language, or, I believe, in the world" (Dr. Doolbridge). "I have learned more from John Howe than from any other author I ever read. There is an astonishing magnificence in his conceptions" (Robert Hall). "This great man was one of the few who have been venerated as much by their contemporaries as by their successors. Time, which commonly adds increased lustre to the memory of the great, has not been able to magnify his qualities for which Howe was so conspicuous. His strong and capacious intellect, his sublime elevation of thought, his flowing eloquence, the holiness of his life, the dignity and courtesy of his manners, the humor of his conversation, won him from the men of his time the title of the "Great and Mighty Howe." [Skeats, Hist. of the Free Churches of England, p. 169]. Howe's most important works are, The Living Temple (many editions; first in 1676), in which he proves the existence of God and his conversableness with men, and which occupies one of the highest places in Puritan theology; The Redeemer's Tears over Lost Souls [Luke xix, 41, 42]; with his Appendix on the Blasphemy against
the Holy Ghost. These, with his Sermons and other writings, are to be found in his Collected Works, with Life by Dr. Calamy (1724, 2 vols. folio); and in The Whole Works of the Rev. John Howe, M.A., edited by Hunt (London, 1810-22, 7 vols. 8vo), with an eighth vol., containing Memorial Discourses and additional articles. Again in Colyer's The Works of the Rev. John Howe, M.A., as published during his life, comprising the whole of the two folio volumes, ed. 1724, with a Life of the Author, by the Rev. J. P. Hewlett (London, 1848, 3 vols. 8vo). There is also an edition of his Works in 1 vol. imp. 8vo (London, 1858), and an American edition (Phila. 2 vols. imp. 8vo). See also Wilson, Select Letters from Howe, with his Life (London, 1827, 2 vols. 12mo); Taylor, Select Treatises of John Howe (1835, 12mo); Rogers, Life of John Howe, with an Analysis of his Writings (London, 1856, 12mo); Dunn, Howe, a Writer (London, 1869). Cyclopaedia; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i. 902; Quarterly Review (London), xxxvi. 167; Literary and Theological Review, iv. 588; Meth. Quart. Rev. Oct. 1862, p. 676; Hook, Eccles. Biog. vi, 198 sq. (J. H. W.)

Howe, Joseph, a Congregational minister, born at Killingly, Connecticut, January 14, 1747, was educated at Yale College, where he graduated in 1765, the first in his class. By recommendation of the president of his college he was appointed principal of a public school at Hartford, at that time the most important institution of that class in the colony. He was licensed to preach in 1769, and was appointed tutor at Yale in the same year. He held this position, preaching quite frequently, until called to the New South Church, Boston, in 1772, where he was ordained May 19, 1773. At the outbreak of the Revolution (1775) he fled to Norwich, where he remained only a short time, as his health had become feeble. He went to New Haven, and on his return stopped at Hartford, where he died, Aug. 25, 1775.—Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, i. 707 sq.

Howe, Josiah, an English divine of the 17th century, born at Credon, Bucks County, was educated at Oxford, and obtained a fellowship at Trinity College, of that University, in 1637. He found great favor with Charles I. He was made chaplain and was admitted to the degree of bachelor of divinity in 1646. After the ruin of the royal house he was ejected from his fellowship, but was restored to his preceptor after the restoration of the monarchy. He died in 1701. See Wood, Athen. Oxon. vol. iii; Garton, Biog. Dict. ii, s. v.

Howe, Nathaniel, a Congregational minister, was born in Ipswich, Mass., Oct. 6, 1764. He graduated at Harvard College in 1786, and was ordained pastor at Hopkinton Oct. 5, 1791, where he labored until his death, Feb. 15, 1837. He published An Attempt to prove that John's Baptism was not Gospel Baptism, being a Reply to Dr. Baldwin's Essay on the same Subject (1820) — A Catechism with miscellaneous Questions, and a Chapter of Promises for the Children under his parochial Care. See Sprague, Annals, ii, 307; North American Review, iv, 93-97.

Howell, Horatio S., a Presbyterian minister, born near Trenton, N. J., in 1820, was educated at Princeton College, and the Union Theological Seminary, N. Y. In 1846 he was ordained pastor of East Whitehill Church, Pa. He was in 1856, ordained pastor of the Fifth Baptist church at Elkin, Md., and at the Delaware Water Gap, Pa. While he was laboring at this latter place the Rebellion broke out. He at once entered the army as chaplain of the 93d Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteers. His reputation as chaplain was pre-eminent for arduous, zealous, and judicious devotion. He was killed at the battle of Gettyburg, Pa., July 1, 1863.—Wilson, Pres. Hist. Almanac, 1864.

Howell, Lawrence, a distinguished Nonjuror, was born soon after the Restoration, about 1660. He studied at Jesus College, Cambridge, where he graduated B.A. in 1684, and M.A. in 1688. Having entered the Church, he was ordained in 1712 by the nonjuror bishop, Dr. Suddath. He had taken the title of suffragan bishop of Thetford. He soon after published a pamphlet entitled The Case of Schism in the Church of England truly stated, for which he was committed to Newgate, convicted, and condemned to three years' imprisonment, besides whipping, a fine of £500, and degradation. This sentence was remitted but was not quashed by the king. He died in Newgate in 1720. Whatever his errors, the punishment appears to have been disproportioned to his offence. He was a man of extensive learning and great capacity. He wrote Synopsis Canonicorum S. S. Apostolorum et Conciliorum Ecclesiasticorum et Provinciarum ab Ecclesia Graeca receptorum (1706, fol.); Synopsis Canon. Ecclesiae. Lat. (1710-1715, fol.); A View of the Pontificate from its supposed beginning to the end of the Council of Trent, etc. (London, 1716, 8vo);—Desiderius, or the original Pilgrim; a divine Dialogue (from the Spanish) (London, 1717, 12mo);—A complete History of the Dissension between the Bishops and Ministers by Mr. Howell (London, 1806, 3 vols. 8vo);—Certain Queries proposed by Roman Catholics, etc. (London, 1716); etc.—Darley, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, i, 1663; Hook, Eccles. Biog. vi, 199; Hoeffer, Novus. Biogr. Gen. xxv, 818 sq. (J. N. P.)

Howell, Robert Boyte Crawford, D.D., a prominent Baptist preacher in Tennessee, was born in Wayne County, North Carolina, March 10, 1801. He pursued his literary and theological studies in Col- lumbia College, and was made professor of mathematics without intending its practice. With this preparation, he entered upon the duties of the ministry in the Episcopal Church, of which his family were communicants; but, quite unexpectedly to his friends, he soon joined the Baptists, travelling fourteen miles to reach the nearest Baptist church for this purpose, Feb. 6, 1821. Five days after- wards he received license to preach the doctrines of the Baptist Church. At Washington he performed, in connection with his theological studies, the duties of a city missionary, and for a year after the completion of his course he was a missionary in Virginia. He then accepted a call to the pastorate of the Cumberland Street Baptist Church in Norfolk. He was ordained Jan. 27, 1827. A revival immediately followed, as the fruits of which he baptized about 200 within a few months. His labors continued here for eight years. In 1834 he removed to Nashville. The First Baptist church had been dispersed by the Rev. Alexander Campbell and his disciples, but under Mr. Howell's labors it was revived and built up. He established, and for some time edited a religious newspaper. He exerted more influence in the support of missions than any other minister of the denomination in Tennessee. After the organization of the Southern Baptist Convention, he was elected and re-elected its president. In 1850 he removed to Rich- mond, Va., where, in addition to the charge of a church, he was a trustee of Richmmond College, and of the Rich- mond Female Institute, a member of the Virginia Bapt- ist Foreign Mission, Publication, and Sunday-school Boards, and of the Virginia Baptist Mission and Educational Board. In 1857 he yielded to an urgent call to occupy his former field of labor in Nashville. There, besides efficiently promoting all the State Baptist organiza- tions, he was, by appointment of the general committee of the Baptist Publication Society, for five years, a trustee of the publication societies of the South and West, and in other educational trusts. His labors were arduous; in addition to which, he performed a considerable amount of literary work, including some of his most useful books. He died April 5, 1868, greatly honored and lamented. Dr. Howell was a man of commanding presence and dignified ad- dress, warm and genial in his manners. His labors as a
pracher of the Gospel were abundant and successful, and some of his published works had a wide circulation in this country, and were republished in England. He was the author of *Ecloga of Infant Baptism; — The Cross; — The Covenants; — The Early Baptists of Virginia; — On Communion; — The Deaconship; — The Way ofSalt;— Several Sermons. His works in America attracted the attention, "The Christology of the Pentateuch," an enlargement of "The Covenants," and "The Family." He was also a frequent contributor to the periodicals of his Church. (L. E. S.)

**How Gill, Francis,** a noted preacher of "the Friends," was born about 1638 in Westmoreland, England. He was brought up and educated in the Church of England. He was deprived of his benefice, and more work in the national Church after graduation in the university, and joined the Independents, among whom he held an esteemed position as minister. In 1652 he became an adherent to the doctrines of George Fox, the Quaker. Two years later, he met with two others of the Society of Friends to preach their doctrines for a week in London. He even went before the protector Cromwell, to seek his influence in aid of the Quakers, who were then greatly persecuted, both in the country and at London; but he does not seem to have been successful in his effort. He escaped, however, after this interview, all personal molestation. He continued preaching in London. He and his friends next went to Bristol, where they met with much better success. "Multitudes flocked to hear them, and many embraced their doctrine." The clergy became alarmed, and How Gill and his colaborers were summoned before the magistrates, and commanded to leave the city immediately. Considering themselves entitled to remain, as "free-born Englishmen," they tarried in the city, and continued to meet with success. In 1663 we find How Gill at Kendal, again summoned before the justices of the peace, who tendered him the oath of allegiance, and on his refusal of it committed him to prison, in which he remained until his death, Jan. 20, 1688. How Gill wrote a copious treatise against oaths while in prison. He also published *The Drawings of the Gospel Day,* and *Its Light and Glory discovered* (Lond. 1676, fol.). See *Neale, History of the Puritans, Harper's ed.*, ii, 413, 439. In *H. J.* Quakers, i, 112, 126, 144, etc.; ii, 81, 96 sq., 286 sq. (J. H. W.)

**Howlie, John,** a Scotch Presbyterian, was born at Lochgoil Nov. 14, 1735. His father died when John was only one year old, and he was removed to his grandparents' at Blackhill, where he received a limited education. In 1766 he returned to the farm of Lochgoil, to pursue the study of Church history, and his church history, to which he had devoted much of his time for several years. In 1767 his early religious impressions assumed the form of decided piety, and he determined to serve the Church by preparing the book for which he is celebrated, *The Scotch Worthies*. "It is a work of no inconsiderable labor; for, though the biographical information he had procured, and with which his powerful memory was richly stored, must have greatly facilitated the task, yet, living remote from cities, and almost shut out from the abodes of civilized life, the difficulty of correspondence and the want of books must have tended not a little to render his task both painful and irksome. Under all these disadvantages, however, did Mr. Howlie, in the seclusion of Lochgoil, bring the work to a successful termination. The first edition appeared in 1774, and a second, greatly enlarged, in 1785 (new edit., revised and corrected by W. McGavin, Edinb. and N. Y., 1883, 8vo.). Like "The Pilgrim's Progress," it has been long so extensively popular with all classes of the community, that it has secured for itself a position from which it will never be displaced, as long as Presbyterianism, and a religious attachment to the Scotch Church, work in the world, to continue to engage the attention of the natives of Scotland.\(^1\) Besides this work, Mr. Howlie published, 1. a collection of *Lectures and Sermons,* by some of the most eminent ministers, preached during the stormiest days of the Percussion;—2. An *Alarum to a secure Generation:*—3. *Faithful Contenders displayed,* an account of the suffering remnant of the Church in the year 1618 (with a *Welsh humorous exemplify*;— 5. *Patience Atoned,* a work which, next to the "Scotch Worthies," must be regarded as superior to all his other writings;—6. *Vindication of the Modes of Handling the Elements in the Lord's Supper before giving Thanks,* written during the controversy on this subject among the Antiburghian seceders.—7. *Clarkson's plain Reasons for Dissenting,* with a preface and notes, and an abstract of the principles of the Reformed presbytery regarding civil government.— 8. *Preface to Mr. Brown of Wampney's Looking-glass of the Law and the Gospel.* Howie died in Sept. 1791. He was, indeed, a marked character, whether at home, in the public market, or at church; and wherever he went, the fame of his piety and varied acquirements contributed greatly to his influence" (Biog. Sketch prefixed to the Amer. edition of his "Scotch Worthies").—Allibone, *Dict. of Authors, i, 178* (J. W.)

**Howley, William, D.D.,** an English prelate, was born at Ropley, Hampshire, in 1765. He was educated at Winchester school, and in 1783 went to New College, Oxford. He was elected fellow in 1785, became canon of Christ Church in 1801, rectorus professor of divinity in 1809, bishop of London in 1813, and, finally, archbishop of Canterbury in 1828. He died in 1840. His principal works are: *Sermons* [on Isa. liv. 13] (London, 1814, 8vo.); — *Sermon* [on Ps. xx, 7, 8] (Thanksgiving, when the eagles taken at Waterloo were deposited in the Chapel Royal, Whitehall) (Lond. 1816, 4to.); — *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of London at the Visitation of A.D. 1808,* (Lond. 1818, 4to.); — *A Charge delivered to the Clergy of the Diocese of London in July, 1826,* (Lond. 1826, 4to.—Darling, *Cyclopaedia Bibliographica,* i, 1564.

**Howson, John,** an English divine, born in London in 1556, was educated at Christ Church, Oxford. He filled successively the vicarate of Bampton, in Oxfordshire, the rectorate at Brightwell, in Berkshire, and then became the head of Chelsea College, and canon of Hereford. In 1619 he was appointed bishop of Oxford, and was transferred to the bishopric of Durham in 1628. He was also at one time vice-chancellor of Oxford. While in this position he "exercised himself against those Puritans who opposed the discipline and ceremonies, but was afterward distinguished for his forbearance rather against povery." He died in 1631. Howson was the author of a number of sermons (published 1597-1661); and four of his polemical discourses against the supremacy of St. Peter were published by order of king James I., "to clear the aspersions laid upon him (Howson) of favoring pope" (1622, 4to.). See *Hook, Eccles. Biogr., vii, 202; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 908.

**Hoyler, Anna,** a German enthusiast, was born at Goldenhütel, near Eiderstadt (Schleswig), in 1854. Her maiden name was Owe. In 1599 she married a nobleman called Howel, and when he died she retired to one of her estates, where she devoted herself to bell-letrers and poetry. Becoming acquainted with an alchemist named Teting, who attended her during a sickness, she was soon fascinated by the visions of the mystic, whom she took into her house, and considered as a prophet. She afterwards joined the Anabaptists, and thought that he was called, not to profit of the privileges caused her to lose nearly her whole fortune; and, leaving her country, she went to Sweden, where she found a protector in queen Eleonora Maria, who presented her with an estate on which she resided until her death in 1656. Her views, derived from Paracel sus, David Jonas, Schweikenfeld, Weigel, and other mystics, are expressed in indifferent verses in her works.
HOZAI

(Herm., N. H., 1843, 16mo.) "Fervent pious and thorough scholarship combined to render him a faithful and able minister of the New Testament. His views of divine truth were clear and strong, his manner of presenting them forcible and impressive. His sermons were logical, and weighty with matter."—Congregational Quarterly, July, 1850.

Hubbard, John, an English divine and adherent of the "Independents," was born about 1692. He was, at first assistant at a church in Stepney, and after the decease of Dr. Taylor succeeded him as pastor of a congregation at Deptford. This position he held for twenty-two years with distinguished skill, fidelity, and diligence. In 1717 he was appointed one of the divinity chair of the academy of the Independents at London.

"He applied himself to the duties of this office with exemplary diligence, and the most pleasing hopes were entertained of many years of usefulness; but they were extinguished by his decease in July, 1748." He published Two Sermons on the Academy Lectures (1728, 8vo). Nine of his sermons are in the Berry Street (Coward's Lecture) Sermons (2d ed. 2 vols. 8vo, 1739)...

Hubbard, William, a Congregational minister, was born in England in 1621, and came to this country in the ship Plimpton in 1628. In 1641 he graduated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1647, a member of the first class. He is said to have pursued a course of theological studies with the Rev. Mr. Cobbett, of Ipswich, whom he also assisted in the pulpit. He was ordained about 1666. In 1688 Mr. Cobbett died, and Hubbard became his successor. In 1689 he served as assistant to the Rev. John Dennison, grandson of Major General Denison, who was also a graduate of Harvard (1684). In 1689 Dennison died, and, about three years after, the Rev. John Rogers, son of the president of Harvard, became Hubbard's colleague. In 1693, enfeebled by age, Hubbard was obliged to resign his charge, and the people voted him sixty pounds as a gratuity. He died Sept. 14, 1704. His writings were mainly on the history of New England, and he left a work in MS. which has been of service to American historians. He published a Narrative of the Troubles with the Indians from 1607-1677, with a Discourse (Bost. 1677, 4to)—Sermons (1676, 1682, 1684)—and, in connection with the Rev. John Higginson, of Salem, Testimony to the Order of the Gospel in the Churches (1701). Hubbard is represented by his contemporaries to have been "for many years the most eminently learned in the country in the province for learning and candor, and superior to all his contemporaries as a writer."—Sprague, Annals Amer. Pulpite, i, 148 sq.; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 909.

Hubberthorn, Richard, a celebrated Quaker of the 17th century, was at first a preacher in the Parliament's army, but he afterwards joined the Quakers, and, in accordance with their principles of peace, quitted the army. After preaching some nine years, he was imprisoned on account of his religious belief, and died from the effects at Newgate, June 17, 1662. Hubberthorn was one of the Quakers liberated by king Charles upon his marriage with Catharine of Braganza, who ordered "the release of Quakers and others in jail in London and Middlesex for being present at unlawful assemblies, who yet profess all obedience and allegiance, provided they are not indicted for refusing the oath of allegiance, nor have been ring-leaders or preachers of rebellion, but simply supposed to have joined them to a better conformity." Just before this event, Hubberthorn, together with George Fox, had addressed the king and demanded the liberation of their suffering brethren.—Neal, Hist. of the Puritans, ii, 418; Stoughton, Eccles. Hist. of England, i, 277.

Huber, Johann Ludwig, a German author who at first studied theology, but afterwards devoted his time
mainly to the study of jurisprudence, deserves our notice on account of his V ersarche mit Gott zu reden (sacred songs) (Reusel, 1775; Tübing, 1787). He died at Stuttgart in 1800.

HUBER, Kaspar. See HUBERNUSS.

HUBER, Maria, a celebrated mystic, was born at Geneva in 1694. She retired into solitude in 1712, to indulge in contemplation and mysticism. She afterwards returned to live in Geneva, joined the Roman Church, and died at Lyons in 1756. She is generally named as a desist, yet her opinions partook rather of extreme mysticism than of indolery. Her principal works are Lettres sur la religion essentielle à l'homme (Amsterd. 1731, 8 vols.) and Lettres sur la religion (8 vols.), in which she relates all revelation to the moral necessities of the heart, and considers revelation a mere auxiliary to natural theology, a means of interpreting it to our own consciousness" (Hagenbach, Germ. Rationalismus, p. 55 sq.).—Recueil de diverses pieces servantes de supplement aux Lettres sur la religion, etc. (Berl. 1754, 2 vols.; Lond. 1756).—Le monde fut prefere au monde sage, devise en trois parties, faisant 24 proverbes (whence the work is sometimes styled Prome
tude) (Amst. 1731 and 1744).—La Systeme des theolo
giens anciens et modernes, sur l'état des âmes reposees des corps (Amst. 1733; Phili. 1739; 1738).—Reduction du Spectacle d'Auguste a ce qu'il renferme de meilleur, etc. (Par. 1753, 12mo).—Senebier considers her as the author of the Histoire d'Abbeys (1738, 8vo), which is generally attributed to Miss Fauche. See Senebier, Hist. litter. de Geneve, ii, 84; Haag, La France Protestante; Pierer, Hoefer, Nouv. Dict. de biographie, iii, 344.

HUBER, Samuel, a German theologian, was born at Berne in 1754. He studied theology in Germany, and became pastor at Burgdorf. He was much given to controversy, especially in behalf of the Lutheran doctrine on the Lord's Supper. Censured for a speech he made on the 16th of April, 1788, he nevertheless continued to attack the doctrines of the Reformed Church, and was, in consequence, first imprisoned, and then exiled. In July, 1788, he went to Tübingen, where he joined the Lutheran Church. He became pastor of Doredingen, and in 1792 professor at Wittenberg. His belief in free grace, and in the universality of the ato
cne, brought him into antagonism with Humius, Ley
er, and Geiser (1592); the breach between them was not healed by public discussions held at Wittenberg and Regensburg in 1594. Huber has been wrongly charged with teaching the doctrine of universal salvation. He was a determined opponent of the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination, and maintained that the terms "decreed" and "election" were equivalent to "gracious invitation," which God extends to all men without distinction. "But, to make their calling and election sure, they must repent and believe." Driven out of Hesse-Cassel in 1594, he resided for some time at Jena, Helmstadt, and Goslar. He died March 25, 162. The most important among his numerous works are Christum esse mortuum pro peccatis omnium hominum (Tübingen, 1590).—Beständiges Bekenntniss (1597).—Anti-Belharussim (Goisl. 1607, 6 vols.; See Acta Huberina (Tüb. 1597; Lüb. 1598); Godin, Act. G. B. L. (Lüb. 1597); Schauffenberg, Helmsbremen (Helmst. 1708); Pfaff, Intr. in Hister. Thol. pt. ii, bk. iii, p. 431; Arnold, Ketzerhistorie, i, 920; Mos
heim, Ch. History, iii, 158.

HUBERINUS (HUBER), Kaspar, a Bavarian monk, afterwards a convert to Protestantism, was born near the close of the 15th century. He became a Protestant prelate, and was appointed papal legate at Tübingen, and at that place in 1527. He was a zealous opponent of the Anabaptists, who were quite numerous at Augsburg about that time, and he also engaged in the Berne disputations on the ministration of the sacrament. He was in favor of the Lutheran doctrine on this point, and in 1531 he went to Wittenberg to defend Luther personally, and to regain for Augsburg the celebra
ted Urbanus Rhegius (q. v.). Huberinus was also ac
tively engaged in introducing the Reformation in the Palatinate, and in the territory of Hohenlohe. In 1551 he returned to Augsburg as preacher, but as he alone of the Protestant preachers at Augsburg had accepted the Interim (q. v.), he was obliged to leave the city in 1552, and died a year later in Olmne Cheer. Huberinus wrote quite extensively, and among other works, we have from his pen Triestlicher Sermon v. d. Urtendt Christti (1535)—Schlussreden v. d. rechten Hand Gottes u. d. Ge
walt Christi (1539); etc. See Keim, Schweb. Res. Gesch. p. 278, 278; Döllinger, Reformation, ii, 576; Herzog, Real
diz. Encyclopädie, s. v. Wittenberg, Univ. Lex. p. 372; Pierer, Univ. Lex. vii, 569. (J. H. W.)

Hubert, Léonard, a Belgian theologian, flourished about the year 1490. He was at first a Carmelite monk, afterwards he became bishop of Darié, then sufft
gram of the bishop of Liege, and finally "inquisitor" of Liege. He wrote quite extensively. His most celeb
trated works are De Immunitate Ecclesiae:—Ser

Hubert, Mathieu, a distinguished French Ro
malian Catholic, born at Chartillon in 1649, was a priest of the Congregation of the Oratory, and one of the most brilliant preachers of his country and Church. He died at Paris in 1739, and is published in the posthumous works, 6 vols. (1739).—Feller, Dict. Hist. ix, 49 sq.; Hook, Ec

Hubert (HUBERTUS), St., son of Bertrand, duke of Guinée, was high in office under Theodoric, king of the Franks. Having been a great sportsman, and, accord
ing to tradition, converted by a stag which bore a shining cross between his antlers, and which spoke, entreat
ing him to turn from his gay life and serve the Church. He at once entered the Church, succeeded his religious instructor, Lambert (Lamprecht), as bishop of Lüttich in 708, and died in 727. His body was in 827 transfer
erd to the Benedictine convent of Andain, in the Roy
dom, which received the name of St. Hubertus, and it is here he is said to have had the above-men
tioned vision. Tradition also holds that his relics, by virtue of the golden key of St. Hubert, which he re
cieved from St. Peter, can cure hysthias. The 3d of November (St. Hubert's day) marks the end of the hunting season, and was celebrated by great hunts (St. Hubert's chase).—Pierer, Univ. Lex. viii, 570; Theol. Univ. Lex. i, 372. (J. H. W.)

Hubert, Order of St., the oldest and highest or
der of Bavaria, was founded in 1444, and often reformed, the last revision in 1808. "The sign of the order is a golden cross on a shield, in the middle of which is the picture of St. Hubertus (q. v.). It is borne on a golden chain.

Hubertine Annalista, an anonymous writer of the chronicles of St. Hubert's monastery, flourished about the middle of the 11th century. In his Chron. St. Hb. Andhaita the style of Saltvaticus is imitated. Bethmann (L. C.) and Wattenbach (W.) issued a new edition of it in Pertz, Script. viii, 655-630, and the fol
ing following opinion of the author is expressed by them: 'Satis habeamus nusse, aucupem oremus hisus virum inter medias res versatum, acrum judicem, veritatis sti
dium: hoc enim tumus ejus dicendi genus, hoc simplex et sincera rerum narratius suudem."—Herzog, Real-Enc
cylop., vi., 296 sq.

Hühbmayer or Hübmeier (HÜBMÖHR), Baltha
sen, one of the most learned of the Anabaptists, was born at Friedberg, near Augsburg, in Bavaria, in 1480. Hübmeier attended to the school at Freiburg with Eck, and in 1512 went with his teacher to Ingolstadt, where he became preacher and professor. In 1516 he went to Regensburg, where his misinstructions led to the expulsion of the Jews; but, having openly expressed sentiments favorable to the Reformation, he was himself obliged to leave. He died in 1539 in his own schoolroom in Schaffhausen. In 1522 he was appointed pasto
er to Waldshut, where he came under the influence of
Minzer, and embraced the Anabaptist views. He wrote several works in support of his new views, more particularly upon baptism and the sacraments; but the ground which he took against his early coadjutor and intimate friend Zwingle provoked a violent reply from the latter, and in consequence of this he was convicted by the Diet of Zürich in 1525 by the Austrian persecution at Waldshut, he was branded as a heretic by Zwingle, and, after suffering imprisonment, finally fled from the Austrian territory (1526). He preached a short time at Constance, and then journeyed to Moravia. In 1528 he was arrested, probably at Brumun, by the Austrian authorities, and was burned at the stake in Vienna (March 10). His wife, who steadfastly adhered to Hubmayr's views, was imprisoned with him, and suffered martyrdom by drowning. Hubmayr is now conceded by all his native districts of China, and man of its people is of that character, and, although a fanatic in religion, it is certain that he never favored the extreme views of some of the Anabaptists. See Brown, Memoriales of Baptist Martyrs, p. 106 sq.; Baptist Quarterly Review, 1869 (July), p. 333; Mosheim, Ch. Hist., iii, 283; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. vii, 298 sq.; Theol. Univ. Lex., i, 572. (J. H. W.)

Huby, Vincent, a French Roman Catholic ecologist, born at Tournebon, May 1, 1698. He entered the order of the Jesuits in 1649, and contributed greatly to the growth of this order. He died March 24, 1763. He wrote a number of ascetic works, which have been edited by abbe Lenoir Duparc, and published under the title (Ermera spiritalis (Paris, 1759, 1761, 1767); Lyons and Paris, 1857, 12mo); also by the abbe Baudrart (Paris, 1767, 12mo). See Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Gen. xxxvi, 361.

Huc, Evariste Rous, a French Roman Catholic missionary, was born at Toulouse Aug. 1, 1813. He was educated in his native city, and entered the order of St. Lazarus, and in 1839 was sent as missionary to China. After about three years of missionary labor in the northern districts of China, he started for the Tibet, in the fall of 1841, to explore the wilds of Tartary and christianize Tibet, according to the directions of the apostolic vicar of Mongolia. Accompanied by a single Chinese convert, a young lama, they reached the lama convent of Kouboun, where they acquired the dialect of Tibet. Towards the end of September, 1843, they reached the capital of Tibet. Here they were permitted to remain on their declaration that they had come only for the purpose of preaching the religion of Christ. But they had barely settled when the Chinese ambassador and the Tung-chow Lama came to leave them to their own devices. They were put in charge of a Chinese escort, and carried back a journey of nearly 2000 miles to the extreme south, and arrived in October, 1846, at Macao. Here they were subjected to a trial by the Chinese tribunals, and were finally permitted to return to the station from which they had originally started on this journey. Huc, whose health completely failed him, returned to Toulouse in 1849, and gave an account of this journey in his Souvenirs d'un Voyage dans la Tartarie, le Tibet et la Chine, pendant les années 1844, 1845, et 1846 (Paris, 1859, 2 vols. 8vo). This book was a great success, and was translated into various languages (English by Hazlitt, London, 1851, 2 vols.; and New York, 1853). It owed its great success partly to its description of a country hitherto unknown, and also to its lively style. In this work the abbe also pointed out the similarities between the Chinese and Roman Catholic religions, and for it was punished by seeing his book placed on the "Index" (comp. Müller, Chips from a German Work shop, i, 187, note). By order of the emperor, he then published L'Empire Chinois, faisant suite à l'Ouvrage intitulé "Les souvenirs d'un Voyage dans la Tartarie et le Tibet" (Paris, 1854, 2 vols. 8vo). This book was also a great success, and was translated by the Academy. There are several editions of it, and it was also translated into English (N. York, 1855, 2 vols. 12mo). His last work, Le Christianisme en Chine, en Tartarie, et au Tibet (Paris, 1857, 3 vols. 8vo, with map), contains a vast amount of historical information; but its chief topic is the propagation of Romanism in China. Huc thinks that "the Gospel will soon take in Asia the ascendency which it has already acquired in Arabia, the Saxon fucius, the traditions of the Buddhists, and the endless legends of the Vedas; finally, that Brahma, Buddha, and Mohammed will disappear to make room for the true God," etc. Huc died in Paris March 31, 1860. See Chardin, Lettres persanes, i, 440; Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Gen. XXXVI, 361; Meyers Lexicon Territoriale et Descritl; Christian Examin'r, January to May, 1858. (J. H. W.)

Hucbald, an English deacon who flourished in the 11th century. He wrote one hundred and eight homilies, "which were extant in Leland's time in Canterbury college (now Christ Church), Oxford, but which appear to be no longer in existence. In the prologue to this book, Hucbald stated his name and country, but nothing more is known of him." He is said to have made an extract from the penitential work of archbishop Egbert of York, of the 8th century, as an introduction to the homilies. See Wright, Biog. Brit. Ed. (Anglo-Sax. Period), ii, 336; Real-Encyclop., xxii, 604; Theol. Univ. Lex., i, 372. (J. H. W.)

Hucbald, also called Hucbald, Hugbald, Hubal, and Hubald, a celebrated monk, was probably born about 850, and was educated by his learned relative Milo (q. v.) in the monastery of St. Amandus in Flanders. After Milo's death, Hucbald succeeded him as teacher and provisor officer of the school of this monastery. About 893, archbishop Fulco, of Rheims, called Hucbald to that city, to preside over the cathedral school there. He died in 930. He distinguished himself greatly in music, and was the first to establish the laws of harmonics (which are some of the saints are considered valuable, especially Vita S. Lenuini, Vita Adeguadini, Vita Rictrudis. See Archbach, Kirchen-Lex., iii, 342; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, vi, 297 sq. (J. H. W.)

Hudson, John, D.D., an English philologist and theologian, was born at Wiltshire in 1662, and was educated at Queen's College, Oxford. He obtained the degree of Master of Arts in 1684, and shortly afterwards that of Doctor of Divinity. In 1706 he was appointed librarian of the Bodleian library at Oxford, and died Nov. 27, 1719. He is chiefly known on account of his Geographia Veteris Scriptoria Graeci minorem, etc. (Oxford, 1636, 1703, 1712, 3 vols. 8vo), and his edition of Josephus, entitled Jo. Flavi. Joseph. Opera ex Oct. 1729, 2 vols. fol.), which appeared shortly after his death.—Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Général, xxxv, 372 sq.

Huel, Joseph Nicolas, a French philosopher, was born at Matattabonc July 16, 1760. After the completion of his studies at Paris he took orders, and was made curate of Icaume. He is said (Barbic, Dict. des Anonymes) to be the author of L'Esprit philosophe sur la croisade de la mort, and of Moyen de rendre nos religieuses utiles et de nous exempter des dotes qu'elle exigent (1760), in which important reforms of the religious houses of the Roman Catholic Church are advocated. His speculations on the employment of religious in convents in instructing the youth of the land, instead of spending a life of idleness, partly, if not wholly, at the expense of the state. The book was suppressed, but reprinted eleven years after, without, however, awakening any general interest in this reformatory movement. Huel died at Icaume Sept. 3, 1793—Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Général, xxxv, 377 sq.; Classe, Remarques bibliographiques sur Huel, in the Memoires de l'Academie de Nancy (1856), p. 251. (J. H. W.)

Huesca, Council of (Concilium Ocarense), a council held at Huesca, in Spain, in 508, of which only two canons are extant. One orders that the diocesan symbols, containing the titles of the other priests of the diocese, be held annually, in which the bishop shall exhort his clergy upon the duties of frugality and com-
HUESCA

Hufnagel, Wilhelm Friedrich, a German theologian, was born at Hall, Schwabia, June 15, 1754, and educated at the universities of Altorf and Erlangen. In 1779 he was appointed professor extraordinary of philosophy at Erlangen, and in 1782 he was transferred to the chair of theology as regular professor. In 1788 he received the pastorate of the university church, and was made overseer of the seminar for preachers. In 1791 he removed to Frankfort-on-the-Main as preacher of one of the oldest churches of that city. He died Feb. 7, 1809. Hufnagel was distinguished both as a preacher and as a theologist, but he was particularly noted for his Semitic languages. His publications, aside from his Sermons (1791-96), are Variarum lectionum et Biblia a Nisiolo caritus excerpitur speciem (1777); Solomos hahes Lied gegriffen, übersetzt u. erläutert (1784); Nov. Biblia mit u. zu 1. Kap. (1785); 1. Edit. der Schriften d. A. T. nach dem Inhalt u. Zueck (1784), in which he took a rationalistic position.—Hick nev ubers, m. Annal. (1781):
HUGS
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Hugh, Johann Leonhard, an eminent German Roman Catholic theologian, was born at Constance June 1, 1765, and educated at Freiburg University. In 1789 he too his doctor's degree, and in 1791 was made professor of Old Testament exegesis at his alma mater. In 1792 the New Testament exegesis was added to the duties of his chair. To fit himself more thoroughly for his professional duties, he visited the great libraries and universities of Central Europe. Though a Roman Catholic, he was distinguished for his criticism and his sobriety, and, like the celebrated Dr. Jahn, too impartial to be very greatly influenced in his views as a Biblical scholar and critic by his ecclesiastical connections. He wrote Erfassung d. Buchstabsenches (Ulm, 1801).—Einleitung in d. Schriften d. Neuen Testamentes (Stuttgart, 1808, 2 vols.; 4th ed. 1847). This work, in which he attempts to vindicate and sustain the genuineness of all the books commonly regarded as canonical, has been translated into French and English (Introduction to the New Testament, by Walt, Lond. 1827, 2 vols. 8vo; far better by Feslbeck, (Androsoval, 1888).—De Pentateuchi versions Alexiandri com-

HUGHES, James, an English divine, born in 1885, was educated at Cambridge University, and afterwards became fellow of Jesus College. He is chiefly known as the editor of Chrysostom's treatise ἐπὶ ἰασωνίας, or On the Priesthood (Cambr. 1710, 8vo; 2d edit. in Greek and Latin, 200). He published a Treatise against the pretended Rights of the Church, etc. (1712, 8vo). He died in 1731.—New Gen. Eng. Dict. vii, 276; Lond. Gent. Mag. xlviii, 588, 673.

Hughes, John, an English divine, was born in 1882, educated at Jesus College, Cambridge, and afterwards became a fellow of the university. But little is known of his life. He died in 1716. Among his works we find Dissertations sur les Textes autoritaires du Nouveau Testament sur le texte des codes ou manuscrits a ceci si distincte, défendue contre Erastianos (Cambridge, 1710, 8vo; and in English by Hilk. Bedford, Lond. 1711, 8vo).—St. Chrysostom's Treat. on the Priesthood (Cambr. 1710, 8vo; 2d edit., with notes, etc., 1712, 8vo). See Dr. Allsopp, Dict. of Authors, i, 911; Lowndes, Brit. Lit., 3rd ed., 385 sq.

Hughes, John, an American Roman Catholic priest, was born in Ireland in 1758, and emigrated to this country in 1817, his father having preceded him about two years. At first he went to a florist to learn the art of gardening, but a few years later he entered the Theological Seminary of St. Mary's at Emmitsburgh, Md., teaching also at the same time in a school. In 1827 he was ordained priest in Philadelphia, and settled over a parish of that city. In 1837 he was appointed coadjutor of bishop Dubois of New York, and immediately after his consecration in 1838, he assumed the virtual administration of the diocese, but he was not made bishop until 1842. In 1850 New York was raised to the dignity of an archiepiscopal see, and bishop Hughes went to Rome to receive the pallium at the hands of the pope. He died January 3, 1864. Even before his elevation to the episcopacy he had gained among his cereognists some distinction as a champion of the cause of religious controversy, in 1830 and 1834, with Dr. John Breckinridge, on the question, "Is the Protestant religion the religion of Christ?" Some years later he had another celebrated controversy with Dr. Nicholas Murray, of Elizabeth, who, under the name of "Kirwan," published a series of articles illustrating articles against the Roman Catholic Church. "Both controversies increased his reputation among his cereognists; but non-Catholics were not struck by his arguments in favor of Roman Catholicism, and he failed to attract anything like the attention, or produce anything like the impression, which writings of real ability, such as those of Mohler in Germany, and of Brownson and Hecker, are always sure to command." As archbishop, in the administration of the property of the Church, and the use which he made of it for the spreading of his Church, he displayed a talent rarely found. An immense property gradually accumulated in his hands, which enabled him to increase largely the number of Roman Catholic churches, schools, and other denominational institutions. Thus, in 1841, he opened the Roman Catholic St. John's College, at Fordham, New York, to which he afterwards added the Theological Seminary (1845). The archbishop's celebrated controversy on this subject with Erastus Brooks, editor of the New York Express, and at that time a state senator, who had stated in an address in the senate chamber that the archbishop owned property in New York to the amount of $5,000,000. A long discussion took place, and this time the ability with which the archbishop defended his statements and his position

Hughes, Isaac, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Gloucester, now Camden County, New Jersey, about 1814. But little is known of his early life. He was converted in 1841, licensed to preach about 1844, and joined the New Jersey Conference in 1846. Thenceforward he filled with zeal and energy the several positions assigned him in the church, and in many places eminently useful. On Rome and Wantage Circuit, on Cedarville charge and elsewhere, he had extensive and powerful revivals of religion, and founded the first Methodist society at the village of Cranberry, N. J., consisting at first of seven members, which, before the year closed, increased to fifty. About 1855, while laboring on Vernon Circuit, he had his hip dislocated by a fall from his carriage, which caused him a great deal of suffering, and in the spring of 1864, being pressed by increasing affliction, he was obliged to take a superannuated relation, and settled at Porterfield, in Rockingham County. Here, until his death, he labored as he had ability, being greatly beloved by the people. He died suddenly, while preparing to re-enter the active work of the ministry, April 5, 1866. "Hugh was em-

Hughes, Isaac, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Gloucester, now Camden County, New Jersey, about 1814. But little is known of his early life. He was converted in 1841, licensed to preach about 1844, and joined the New Jersey Conference in 1846. Thenceforward he filled with zeal and energy the several positions assigned him in the church, and in many places eminently useful. On Rome and Wantage Circuit, on Cedarville charge and elsewhere, he had extensive and powerful revivals of religion, and founded the first Methodist society at the village of Cranberry, N. J., consisting at first of seven members, which, before the year closed, increased to fifty. About 1855, while laboring on Vernon Circuit, he had his hip dislocated by a fall from his carriage, which caused him a great deal of suffering, and in the spring of 1864, being pressed by increasing affliction, he was obliged to take a superannuated relation, and settled at Porte

Hughes, See Hugo.

Hughes, George, B.D., an English Nonconformist, was born in Southwark in 1658, and educated at Corpus Christi College, Oxford. He became fellow of Pembroke College, then lecturer at Allhallows, London, and afterwards master of Tavistock. During the Rebellion he obtained the living of St. Andrew's, Plymouth, but was ejected for nonconformity in 1662. He died in 1667. Hughes was a divine of good natural capacity and learning, and an exact critic for his time. His principal works are: An Analytical Exposition of the whole Book of Genesis, and of the first twenty-three Chapters of Exodus, wherein the various readings are observed, etc. (1672, fol).—Aphorisms, or Select Propositions of the Scriptures, shortly determining the Doctrine of the Sabbath (1670, sm. 8vo).—Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, i, 1568.

Hughes, James, an American divine, born in 1885, was educated at Jesus College, Cambridge, and afterwards became fellow of Jesus College. He is chiefly known as the editor of Chrysostom's treatise ἐπὶ ἰασωνίας, or On the Priesthood (Cambr. 1710, 8vo; 2d edit. in Greek and Latin, 200). He published a Treatise against the pretended Rights of the Church, etc. (1712, 8vo). He died in 1731.—New Gen. Eng. Dict. vii, 276; Lond. Gent. Mag. xlviii, 588, 673.

Hughes, John, an English divine, was born in 1882, educated at Jesus College, Cambridge, and afterwards became a fellow of the university. But little is known of his life. He died in 1716. Among his works we find Dissertations sur les Textes autoritaires du Nouveau Testament sur le texte des codes ou manuscrits a ceci si distincte, défendue contre Erastianos (Cambridge, 1710, 8vo; and in English by Hilk. Bedford, Lond. 1711, 8vo).—St. Chrysostom's Treat. on the Priesthood (Cambr. 1710, 8vo; 2d edit., with notes, etc., 1712, 8vo). See Dr. Allsopp, Dict. of Authors, i, 911; Lowndes, Brit. Lit., 3rd ed., 385 sq.
was acknowledged alike by Protestants and Romanists. But he opened a breach between the Romanists and Protestants by his unauthorized demands in the School Question, and the Common Council of New York City should designate seven of the public schools as Catholic schools, and when this was denied both by the Common Council and the Legislature, bishop Hughes advised the Catholics to run, at the next political campaign, an independent ticket. He defended his cause with great ability, but failed to convince the Protestants generally of the fairness of the demand to grant to the Roman Catholic community an exceptional prerogative, which was neither possessed nor claimed by any Protestant body. He also opposed the reading of the Protestant version of the Bible in the common school, in which he was not quite so successful as in his other efforts in behalf of Romanism. Archbishop Hughes's political influence in the United States was very great, and he was honored by all sects in a manner unknown in any other Protestant country. Thus, in 1847, he was invited by both houses of Congress to deliver a lecture in the hall of the House of Representatives in Washington, and after the outbreak of the Rebellion (1862) he was even intrusted with a semi-official mission to France. As a writer, archbishop Hughes has done but little, except by the discussions above alluded to. These were all pub- lished in Catholic World (Phila. 1856, 8vo), also published a number of his sermons and addresses. Since his death his "works" have been collected by Lawrence Kehoe (N.Y. 2 vols. 8vo; 24 ed. 1865). — N. Y. Tablet, Jan. 1864; Methodist, Jan. 9, 1864; An Amer. Cyclop. 1868, p. 429. (J. H. W.)

HUGHES, Joseph, D.D., an eminent Baptist divine, was born in London Jan. 1, 1769. In 1784 he became a member of the Baptist Church, and entered the Baptist College at Bristol, where he remained as a student till 1787. He studied also three years at Aberdeen, where he passed M.A. in 1790. In 1791 he became classical tutor in the Baptist College; 1792 to 1796 he was assistant minister at Broadmead Chapel, Bristol; and in 1796 he became pastor of the Baptist Chapel, Battersea. When the "Religious Tract Society" was formed in 1799, he was chosen its first secretary, and he retained this office until his death, Oct. 12, 1835. His industry in official work was enormous, and a great part of the success of the society is due to his exertions. He also took a large part in the formation of the British and Foreign Bible Society, and was its first secretary, retaining the office until his death. His personal history is largely that of this great organization. See Leichfeld, Mournful denosts (Philadelphia, 1884, 12mo) J Jubilee Volume of the Religious Tract Society; Owen, Hist. Tract- tory of the British and Foreign Bible Society; Tipson, Bible Triumphi (1852, 12mo).

Hugo, a friar of the order of the Minimi, and a doctor of theology, was born at Prato, near Florence, in the latter half of the 13th century. He was a man of remarkable austerity, and imposed upon himself the most severe mortifications. He died in Tarragon after the year 1312. Among his works, which remain in MS., are a letter to the Minimi of Prato, a treatise De Vita Contemplation, and De Perfectione Statuum.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, xvi, 451.

Hugo of Amiens, or of Rouen, a distinguished Roman Catholic divine, was born at Amiens, France, toward the close of the 11th century, and was educated at Laon under the celebrated Anselm. He entered the Benedictine monastery of Cluny, and became prior of the monastery of Limoges in 1113. On account of his great learning and uncommon talent he was transferred as prior to the monastery at Lewes, in England, and in 1125 was appointed abbot of Reading Abbey by Henry I, the founder. In 1129 Hugo was elected archbishop of Rouen, over which see he presided until his death, Nov. 11, 1164. He was quite prominent in the history of celibacy during his day. While archbishop of Rouen, he sought to convert an obscure sect in Brittany, in all likelihood a branch of the Petrobrusians, whose doctrines were "a protest against the overwhelming sacerdotalization of the Church in France, and against their tenets, among which he enumerates promiscuous licentiousness and disregard of clerical celibacy." Indeed, Hugo was distinguished among his contemporaries not only as a theologian, but also as a statesman. It was he who, in 1139, at the Council of Winchester, saved King Stephen from excommunication by the English bishops. He wrote Dialogi de Summo Bono Libri ixi (published by Martíne in his Theaur. Anecdotum, v, 895), a work of especial interest both to the theologian and the philosopher on account of the views which it sets forth on moral philosophy.—De Hareses, printed by D'Achery as an appendix to the works of Guilbert de Nogent, is a work levelled against the heretics of his day, and affording valuable materials on the history of the Church in the 12th century:—De Fide Catholico, containing an explanation of the Apostles' Creed and the Lord's Prayer, published by Martene and Durand in their Theaur. Anecdotum, vol. v, and in their Vete- rum Scriptorum Collectio, vol. ix. See Schröck, Kirch- enpsech. xxvii, 409 sq; Lea, Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy, p. 372 sq; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, xxi, 439 sq; Gorton, Biogr. Dict. s. v. (J. H. W.)

Hugo of Angoulême flourished in the 10th century. As a theologian he had become the dominant influence in France; but, seeing of Angoulême (March 21, 978) he sought also to assume the temporal government over his diocese, and became entangled in controversies with count Arnold, the prince of that country, against whom he even waged war. It is thought that Hugo finally withdrew from the bishopric, retired to the abbey of St. Clair, and died in obscurity in 999. He is said to have left seven or- iginal works, but they have not yet come to light.—Hist. Litt. de la France, vol. viii; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, xxv, 428.

Hugo of Besançon was born towards the close of the 10th century, and was appointed archbishop of Besançon, as successor of archbishop Gaucher of Salins, in 1091. Immediately on assuming the charge of the see he dismissed the canons of St. Anatole of Salins, and gave this church to the monks of St. Bénigne of Dijon; but he afterwards repented of the change, and reinstated the chapter of St. Anatole in 1046. He is said to have been a man of great learning, and to have exerted a claim on the confidence of his pope and of his emperor. Under the emperor Henry III he was arch-chancellor. He also assisted at the coronation of king Philip I of France. He died July 27, 1066.—Dunois de Carnage, Histoire de l'Evêque de Besançon, i, 29 sq; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, xxv, 429.

Hugo of Breteuil was born near the opening of the 11th century, and was educated as a theologian at the school in Chartres. He was made bishop of Langres by king Robert some time in the first months of 1051. Conducting himself in a manner unworthy of his high position in the Church, he was finally accused of adultery and homicide, and other even more atro- cious crimes, and was brought to trial before a council at Rheims. At first he braved the accusations, and sought to defend himself; but, finding that the proof against him was impossible of contradiction, he finally fled, and was punished with excommunication. To escape him they had to go on foot to Rome, where he procured an audience with pope Leo IX, and obtained par- don. On his return home he died at Biterne, France, March 16, 1051. He is the author of an interesting letter On the Errors of Biterne (published as an appendix to the Historia Frisonum,—Hist. Litt. de la France, vii, 438; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, xxv, 428 sq.

Hugo of Castro-Novo (Novaco), an English theologian, flourished, according to Wadding (Annal. Min., iii), about 1310. He belonged to the order of the Minimi, and was an ardent defender of the philosophy
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of Duns Scotus. He is said to have been the author of De Victoriae Christi contra Antichristum (printed in 1477 by Bartolus de Laspe in Florence, and in 1568 by the Florentine printer, Corsi). The first part of this work, which closes with the 10th century, is trifling and erroneous, but the second part contains much important information on the ecclesiastical history of France in the 11th and 12th centuries.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxv, 459 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, iv, 308.

Hugo of Frazan or Trasan, tenth abbot of Cluny (q.v.), the Prosper of which was Abbot of Cluny in the 12th century, became abbot in 1157 or 1158. Taking sides with the anti-pope Victor IV, he was excommunicated by pope Alexander III, and driven from the abbey. He died about 1160. Several works are attributed to him, but without good reason.—H. lit. de la France, xiii, 571 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxv, 442.

Hugo (St.) of Grenoble was born at Chateauneuf, in the Dauphiné, and became a priest at Valence. In 1080 he was appointed bishop of Grenoble, but he only accepted the position after considerable hesitancy, and even left the bishopric some time after, and retired to the abbey of Chaise-Dieu, in Clermont, as a Benedictine monk. By order of pope Gregory VII, however, he returned again to Grenoble. He died there April 1, 1139. He was declared saint two years after by pope Innocent II. Hugo was a very pious man, and especially rigid in the enforcement of the vow of celibacy. During fifty-three years he devoted the active duties of his bishopric, it is said he never saw the face of a woman except that of one aged mendicant. See Real-Encyclop. f. d. Kathol. Deutschl., v, 580 sq.; Lea, History of Sacerdotal Celibacy, p. 298.

Hugo of Langres. See Berengarius.

Hugo of Lincoln, was born in 1140 at Gratiapopolis, Burgundy, and was first a regular canon, and later a Carthusian monk. When Henry II of England was at Witham, in Somersetshire, he invited Hugo to accept the priory of this new foundation. After many entreaties by Reginald, bishop of Bath, Hugo consented. He was also made bishop of Lincoln by Henry II. He died in Nov. 1200, and was canonized at Rome in 1221. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxv, 448; Wheatly, Book of Common Prayer, b. 76; Lea, Hist. of Sacerdotal Celibacy, p. 296. (J. H. W.)

Hugo, archbishop of Lyons, was born about the middle of the 11th century, and was one of the most distinguished supporters of the Roman Church, in her efforts to extort the papacy, during the last half of the 11th century, when Gregory VII and the emperor Henry IV were at variance with each other. He was the papal legate (under pope Urban II) at the Council of Autun, A.D. 1094, who pronounced the ban on king Philip of France for the repudiation of his lawful wife Bertha. Hugo died Oct. 7, 1106. His only works are his letters, which, according to the Hist. Lit. de la France (ix, p. 355), are very valuable to the historian of the 12th century. See Neander, Ch. Hist. iv, 123; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxv, 429 sq.

Hugo of Magon, a French ecclesiastic, was born about the close of the 11th century, and was educated by his cousin St. Bernard. He was appointed abbe of Pontigny, as the representative of which he appeared in 1128 at the Council of Troyes. In 1146 Hugo was elected bishop of Auxerre, and was consecrated the January following. He was an attendant at the Council of Sens, which condemned the doctrines of Abelard (q.v.); also in 1148 at the Council of Rheims, where he combated the opinions of Gilbert de Paris. In 1150 he stood high in the ecclesiastical courts of the chief of the papal states. After his death, Oct. 10, 1151, the manner in which he disposed of the immense fortunes which he had amassed by great avariciousness, and which, instead of being bequeathed for distribution among the poor of his diocese, were given to his nephew, greatly annoyed his friends and his cousin, the pious St. Bernard, finally had the will
Hugo of Monceaux, a distinguished French divine, was born in the early part of the 12th century. He was first monk at Vézelay, then abbot of St. Germain (1162). He was consecrated by pope Alexander III. April 21, 1163. The pretensions of bishop Maurice, of Paris, and his written work in defence of the church, were vehemently opposed by Hugo, and this occasioned a controversy, of which a summary was published by Hugo. It forms a very interesting document of his time (printed in the collection of Andre Duchesne, vol. iv.). In the same year (May 19) Hugo assisted at the Council of Tours, where he continued the controversy with Maurice, which was finally brought before the pope, who decided in favor of the monk. In 1165 (Aug. 22) Hugo was one of the abbots who presided at the baptism of the royal infant later Philip Augustus. He was also about this time in trunder with various ecclesiastical offices, and in 1170 he attended the Council of Larat. He died Mar. 27, 1182—Hoefer, Nouv. Bioq. Generale, xxv, 446; Hist. Lit. de la France, xiii, 615; Gallia Christiana, vii, col. 442. (J. H. W.)

Hugo of Nonant, an English divine, was born at Nonant, in Normandy, in the first half of the 12th century. He was educated at Oxford University. About 1173 he became archdeacon of Lisieux, and, towards 1185, bishop of Conisburgh. He was the Romish legate to England during the administration of the bishops of Durham and Ely, in the absence of Richard of the East, and his influence caused the removal of these bishops in 1191. Only three years later he was himself driven from his see, but he was permitted in 1195 to return again, on paying a fine of 5000 marks silver to the royal treasury. He died in April, 1198, during a voyage, or more probably, while in exile a second time. The re- cital of the disgrace of the bishop of Ely was written down by Hugo, and has been published by Roger of Hoveden (Script. Rev. Ang. p. 702). It is a very popular pamphlet.—Hist. Lit. de la France, xv; Hoefer, Nouv. Bioq. Generale, xxv, 447.

Hugo de Paganis. See Knight Templars.

Hugo of Portieux, a monk of Vézelay, of whose life but little is known, flourished in the 12th century. He wrote a history of the monastery of Vézelay, which has been published by D'Arcy in his Histoire d'Avignon, iii. He is also supposed to be the author of the Chronique des Comtes de Nevers, inserted by Labbe in his Nouvelle Bibliothèque des Manuscrits. He died about 1161.—Hist. Lit. de la France, vii, 668 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Bioq. Generale, xxv, 439.

Hugo of Porto was born about the middle of the 11th century. He was archdeacon of Compostelle until the bishopric of Porto was established in 1114, when Hugo was elected to this see. He was a member of several church councils in 1122-25. He died about 1125. Of his writings, the History of the Church of Compostelle, which has never been printed, is of especial value for its information in the History de la France, xi, 115; Hoefer, Nouv. Bioq. Generale, xxv, 439. (J. H. W.)

Hugo of Rheims, son of count Herbert of Vermandois, flourished in the 10th century. He was elected archbishop of Rheims when not quite five years old, and installed as head of the Church in that city by the power of only six bishops. Hugo was succeeded by the monk Artoil or Artaud. Herbert, dissatisfied with this appointment, made Artoil prisoner, and called a synod at Soissons, which confirmed his son Hugo in the archbishopric. After Herbert's death Artoil was liberated, and great contentions arose between the two incumbents of the same see. In 947 a synod was held at Verdun; but this, as well as another held at Mouton in 948, proved of no avail. As Hugo had secured for himself the intercession of the people, he decreed that Hugo should hold the archbishopric. The friends of Artoil finally resolved to hold a national synod, when Hugo was deposed and Artoil installed. See Schrock, Kirchengesch. xxii, 252 sq.

Hugo of Rheinmont, a French theologian of the 12th century, of whose life but little is known, was the author of Epistola de Natura et Origine Antim (in Marteine, Anecdota, i, 368), which is based on the real and supposed works of Augustine. Of Aristotle's treatise On the Soul he seems to have been unaware.—Hoefer, Nouv. Bioq. Generale, xxv, 447; Hist. Lit. de la France, xi, 113.

Hugo of Sancto Caro (Hugo of St. Chery), sometimes also called Hugo de St. Chery, an eminent French theologian, was born at St. Chery (whence his surname), a suburb of Yenne, France, about 1200. He studied theology and canon law at Paris, and in 1224 joined the Dominicans in the convent of St. Jacques (where he is also called Hugo de St. Jacson), and in 1227 was made provincial of this order. He also taught theology in Paris, and was connected with several scientific undertakings. He was one of the commissioners who examined and condemned the Introductorius in Exang, a work of the Franciscan Gerhard, which developed the fanatical doctrines of Alb. Joachim of Flores and was accused in the controversy of William of St. Amour with the mendicant order. In 1245 he was made cardinal by Innocent IV, and died at Orvieto in 1263. The reputation of Hugo, however, rests chiefly upon his Biblical studies and writings. In 1230 he executed a commentary of the prophecies of the Vulgate, an immense labor for that age. A copy of this work, preserved in the Nuremberg Library, has this title: "Liber de correctionibus noris super Biblia, ad scientiam qui sitiger et communitor litera, Reverendissimi patris et domini D. Hugonis, sacris Rom. eccles. presbyteri et patris theologii professores, unum ordine predicatorem." His principal published works are Postilla in universa Biblia, a sort of brief commentary, prepared, however, without sufficient acquaintance with the original languages of the Bible (Basil, 1487, etc.)—Episcopum ecclesie (Lyons, 1554). But his most important service was to make literature was his conception of the plan of a Concordance, which he executed, with the aid of many monks of his order, in his Sacrorum Bibl. Concordantias (latest ed. Avignon, 1786, 2 vols. 4to). It is an alphabetical index of all the words in the Vulgate, and has formed the model of all the Concordances of the Bible. It is also the effect also of bringing the division into chapters and verses into general use. See Quetif et Echard, Scriptores ordinis predicatorum, i, 194 sq.; Hist. Lit.:ter de la France, xix, 38 sq.; Richard Simon, Nouvelles observations sur le texte et les versions du N. Testi, ii, 129; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. vol. vii; Hoefer, Nouv. Bioq. Generale, xxv, 450; Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop., ii, 340.

Hugo of St. Victor, said to have been count of Blankenburg, was born at Eln, near Ypres, about 1097, and educated in the convent of Hammereleben, near Halberstadt. When eighteen years of age he went to Paris, and joined the Augustines of St. Victor. He next became professor of theology, and his success as a teacher and writer was very brilliant. He died at Paris about 1141. Hugo was the most spiritual theologian of his time, and the precursor of the later Mystics. He recommended the use of the Bible for private devotion, and urged also its study on priests and teachers. He followed the theology of Peter of Aureille, but only as a support, not as a foundation, so successfully, that he was called Auguste the Second, and the Mouth of Augustine. "In Hugo we see the representative of a school distinguished in the 12th century for its hearty religious spirit, and its tendency to practical reform; a school which, though it united more or less the mystic contemplative with the speculative element, yet constantly kept up the contest.
with the predominant dialectic tendency of the times. If, in Abelard, we see those spiritual tendencies which had been harmoniously united by Anselm, brought into conflict with each other, we see them once more reconciled in Hugo, but with this difference, that in him the dialectical element is not so strong as it was in Anselm. In Abelard, it is distinctly present, and he often appeals to it and contends against Abelard, though without mentioning his name. The empirical department of knowledge generally, and in theology the study of the older Church teachers, and of the Bible, was made specially prominent by Hugo, in opposition to one-sided speculation and circumscription. To the doctrine of grace, as it was in Anselm, Hugo was the first of the scholastics to give definiteness. Unsat- isfied with Augustine's definition of them as *sacra rei sigillum*, he says, in his Summa, that the sacrament is *risibilis forma invisibilis gratiae, in eo collatae.*

In his *De sacramentis fidelis* he defines it still more distinctly as a "symbol of grace," which is the essence of that of the divine institution, exhibits, and really contains, symbolically, invisible grace." He also distinguishes three classes of sacraments: the first, those on which salvation especially depends (Baptism and the Lord's Supper); the second those of which it is necessary to salvation, but yet useful for sanctification; the third contains all the rest. Of course he believed in transubstantiation, calling the mode of the change *transsustitutio*, but he considered it a means of communion with Christ. The best edition of his collected works is the first—Opera Omnibus, studii, Badii Ascensi et J. Parvii (Paris, 1526, 5 vols. fol.). The later editions are Venice, 1699; Cologne, 1617; Rouen, 1648; all in 3 vols. See Neander, Ch. History, iv, 401 sq.; Dupin, Eccles. Writers, 12th cent.; Oudin, Comment, de Script. Eccles. t. ii, p. 1138; Schmit, Mysticismus d. Müt- tellers (Jena, 1824); Lieber, Monographie über Hugo (Leips. 1829). A number of the writings attributed to Hugo are entirely not his, and others of his real writings remain unedited. The task of selecting what are and what are not his genuine works has been under- taken by M. Hauréau, of Paris, who will doubtless do it full justice. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biol. Générale, xxv, 436 sq.; Herbermann, Lex. Sacra, vi, 308 sq.; Maurer, Codic. et Patr. Philos. p. 144 sq.; Tiedemann, Geschichte d. christl. Philosoph. Philos. iv, 289 sq.; Tennemann, Gesch. d. Philosoph. vii, 206 sq.; Schrock, Kirchengesch. xxiv, p. 392 sq.; xxix, 274 sq.; Hagenbach, *Hist. of Doctrines* (see Index); Neander, *Hist. of Christian Doctrines*, ii, 467 sq. (J. H. W.)

Hugo Alcein de Bilom, or Hugo Soguis, was born at Bilom, in Auvergne, about 1230, was educated at the college of the Church of St. Sévère, and afterwards entered the monastery at Clermont, which, he privileges at various places with great success, and was awarded, on account of his superior scholarship, the doctorship of divinity by the University of Paris, where he was afterwards professor of theology. In 1258 Hugo went to Rome, and was created by pope Honorius III, at the request of his master, Nicolas IV, made him cardinal, May 15, 1288. He died at Rome Dec. 29, 1297. He is said to have written works on the beatific vision, an apologetic work against the corrupters of the doctrines of St. Thomas, *De Veritatis,* a volume of Sermom., etc. See Herbermann, Lex. Sacra, vi, 308 sq.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biol. Générale, xxv, 450.

Hugo, Ethérien, a Tuscan theologian of the 12th century, contemporary of pope Alexander III, to whom he dedicated the principal of his works, lived some time at the court of Constantineople, and was highly esteemed by the emperor Conzemus. On the occasion of his con-
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Hugo Grotius. See Grotius.

Hugo, Herman, a distinguished Jesuit, born at Brussels in 1588, wrote several historical and theological works. He is celebrated on account of his Pia desideria enodatissimi illustratissimi (1624, 8vo; 1629, 12mo; translated into English as Divine Assistance and Artikel Water, 3d ed, corrected, Lond. 1702, 8vo). He died of the plague at Rheinberg Sept. 10, 1629. See Darling, Cyclop. Bibl. ii, 1572; Nouv. Dict. Hist. p. 386.

Hugociano, Francois, a distinguished Roman Catholic prelate, according to some was an Englishman by birth, but according to others was born at Pisa in the first half of the 14th century. By an acquaintance which he formed with pope Boniface IX he was able to procure the archbishopric of Bordeaux in 1389, and some time after he was also made Boniface's legate to Gascony, the kingdoms of Navarre, Castile, Leon, and Aragon. In 1406 he was made cardinal by pope Innocent VII, and was a fierce champion of orthodoxy against the heretical tendencies of the latter. He was especially prominent at the Council of Pisa in 1409. He died at Florence Aug. 14, 1412. See Encyclop. Thol. xxxi, 1082 sq. (J. H. W.)

Hugenot, Philibert, a distinguished Roman Catholic prelate who flourished in the 15th century, was educated at the universities of Dijon, Turin, and Padua, and succeeded his uncle in the bishopric of Macon. He was made cardinal in 1473 by pope Sixtus IV, and died at Rome in 1484. See Encyclop. Thol. xxxi, 1083; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen., xxy, 426.

Hugucelo of Pisa. See Glosatores.

Huguenots, originally a nickname applied to the partisans of the Reformation in France. The origin of this word is rather obscure. Some derive it from Hugo, a word applied in Tours, &c., to persons who walk at night in the street—the early French Protestants, like the early Christians, having chosen that time for their religious assemblies. Others derive it from a faulty pronunciation of the German Eidgenoessische, signifying commonwealth, in account of the union between the French Protestants and the Swiss confederates, which maintained themselves against the tyrannical attempts of Charles III, duke of Savoy, and were called Eigemossen. Others derive it from the part which the French Protestants took in sustaining Henry IV, the descendant of Hugo Capet, to the throne of France against the Guises. Another derivation is from the subterranean vaults in which they held their assemblies, outside the walls of Tours, near a gate called Fourgon, an alteration from fea Hugo. This last derivation is strengthened by the fact that they were originally called "Huguenots of Tours." Still others derive it from the name of a very small coin of the time of Hugo, to denote the vile condition of the Protestants. Thus the distinguished German philologist, Prof. Mahn, of Berlin, in his Phymologische Untersuchungen auf dem Gebiete der Romanischen Sprachen, gives no less than fifteen supposed derivations, but inclines himself to the opinion that the word Huguenot was originally applied as a nickname to the early French Protestants, and that it was derived from Hugo, the name of some heretic or conspiurator, and was formed from it by the addition of the French diminutive ending of, like Jacot, Margot, Jeannot, etc.

At the very commencement of the Reformation in Germany, adherents of the cause of the Reformers sprang up in France, then under the government of Francis I. Under the powerful support which these French Reformers found in Margaret of Navarre, sister of the king, as early as 1526 Melchor Wolmar, a Swiss, preached the Gospel in the south of France, and Lutheran sects in these parts. The Huguenots (q. v.), were organized by Gerhard Rosuell and Jacob Lefevre. See Farel. The circulation of Lefevre's New Testament by the thousand throughout France by pedlars from Switzerland, where copies were printed by Farel (q. v.), still further increased the number of the Reformers and finally led to the promulgation of an ordinance by the Sorbonne, obtained from the king, for the suppression of printing (Feb. 26, 1538). In 1538, Calvin (q. v.), who had been invited to Paris by the rector of the University, began to preach the new doctrines in that and other cities, and by his efforts assisted in the success of the French Protestants, who now began to be known by the name of Huguenots. Indeed, so numerous had they become, that, to e xtremitate, if possible, by force, their doctrine before it should spread further, the Church resorted, by consent of the king, in 1545, to a massacre in the Vaud of Provence, which was accompanied by horrors impossible to describe. The new-view religion, however, made rapid progress in spite of all persecutions, and men of rank, of learning, and of arms ranged themselves in its defence. "The heads of the house of Bourbon, Antoine, duke of Venos, Charles, duke of Orléans, and the count of the seven chief French theological controversies. He was especially prominent at the Council of Pisa in 1409. He died at Florence Aug. 14, 1412. See Encyclop. Thol. xxxi, 1082 sq. (J. H. W.)
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At the very commencement of the Reformation in Germany, adherents of the cause of the Reformers sprang up in France, then under the government of Francis I. Under the powerful support which these French Reformers found in Margaret of Navarre, sister of the king, as early as 1526 Melchor Wolmar, a Swiss, preached the Gospel in the south of France, and Lutheran sects in these parts. The Huguenots (q. v.), were organized by Gerhard Rosuell and Jacob Lefevre. See Farel. The circulation of Lefevre's New Testament by the thousand throughout France by pedlars from Switzerland, where copies were printed by Farel (q. v.), still further increased the number of the Reformers and finally led to the promulgation of an ordinance by the Sorbonne, obtained from the king, for the suppression of printing (Feb. 26, 1538). In 1538, Calvin (q. v.), who had been invited to Paris by the rector of the University, began to preach the new doctrines in that and other cities, and by his efforts assisted in the success of the French Protestants, who now began to be known by the name of Huguenots. Indeed, so numerous had they become, that, to e xtremitate, if possible, by force, their doctrine before it should spread further, the Church resorted, by consent of the king, in 1545, to a massacre in the Vaud of Provence, which was accompanied by horrors impossible to describe. The new-view religion, however, made rapid progress in spite of all persecutions, and men of rank, of learning, and of arms ranged themselves in its defence. "The heads of the house of Bourbon, Antoine, duke of Venos, Charles, duke of Orléans, and the count of the seven chief
de Barri de la Renaudière, a nobleman from Perigord. The constable, as deposed, had taken part in the trial of count Louis de Sancerre, and the court was removed to Amboise. Some of the Huguenots followed it in arms, whence the whole affair became known as the conspiracy of Amboise. They were defeated, however, by the forces of the Guises, and 1200 of them, taken prisoner, were executed as traitors. The Guises next moved against those who were suspected of being the instigators of the rising, and the head of which were the duke of Guise, the constable of Montmorency, and marshal St. André, who seized the king and the regent under pretence of providing for their safety, proclaimed the Huguenots, who had at the same time been gathering at Orleans under Condé, rebels, and declared a general and pointing to the consequences.

During the minority of Charles IX, who ascended the throne Dec. 5, 1560, a boy only ten years old, the strife between the parties which divided the court became more violent, as the chancellor de l'Hôpital, on the assembling of Parliament in Dec. 1560, had exhorted men of all parties "to rally round the young king," and, while condemning the odious punishments which had recently been inflicted on persons of the Reformed faith, announced the intended holding of a national council, and expressed the desire that henceforward France should recognize neither the Guise nor the papists, but one religion. Catherine de Medicis regarded it to her interest to balance the power of the two parties so as to govern both more easily, seconded the views of the chancellor. The two princes of Condé, who had been prisoners at Lyons after the affair of Amboise, were liberated. Antoine de Navarre was made constable of France, and a new edict was published in July, 1561, which granted full forgiveness to the Huguenots, who, as it was stated, were no longer to be designated by such nicknames. Finally, a conference was appointed (Sept. 8) for both parties to meet with a view to conciliation. This conference is famous in history as the Conference of Poissy (q. v.). The Cardinal de Lorraine led the Roman Catholic theologians, but was signalized defeated, especially by the arguments of Theodore Beza. The Huguenots, emboldened by their success, next adopted the Calvinistic confession, and, thus united, rose more strongly against Romanism, countering among their friends Catherine herself, who had been forced to their side by the machinations of the Guises. January 17, 1562, a royal edict was issued, guaranteeing to the Protestants liberty of worship. The Guises and their partisans now became exasperated. On Christmas day, 1562, about 50,000 of the Vaudois of Vassy, in Compagnies, met, in divine worship, and to celebrate the sacrament according to the practices of their Church. Vassy was one of the possessions of the Guises, and the bishop of Châtillon complaining to Antoine de Bourbon, an ardent Roman Catholic, she threatened the Huguenots, if they persisted in their proceedings, with the vengeance of her son, the duke of Guise. Undismayed by this threat, the Protestants of Vassy continued to meet publicly, and listen to their preachers, believing themselves to be under the protection of the law, according to the terms of the royal edict. On March 1, 1568, while the Huguenots of Vassy, to the number of about 1200, were again assembled for divine worship in a barn—as they had shortly before been deprived of their churches by Catharine, who made this concession to Antoine de Navarre, in order to secure her support, still leaving them, however, on the estates of noblemen—they were attacked by a band of armed men, led by the duke of Guise, and massacred. For an hour they fired, hacked, and stabbed amongst them, the duke coolly watching the carnage. Sixty persons of both sexes were left dead on the spot, more than two hundred were severely wounded, and the rest contrived to escape. After the massacre the duke sent for the local judge, and severely reprimanded him for having permitted the Huguenots of Vassy to meet. The judge intrenched himself behind the edict of the king. The duke's eye flashed with rage, and, striking the hill of his sword with his hand, he said, "The sharp edge of this will soon cut you to pieces" (Smilks, Huguenots, p. 48; comp. Davila, Histoire des Guerres civiles de France, ii, 379). This massacre was the match applied to the charge ready to explode. It was the signal to Catholic France to rise in mass against the heretics, and to Protestant France a warning for their lives. The king, however, Rouen, and the head of which were the duke of Guise, the constable of Montmorency, and marshal St. André, who seized the king and the regent under pretence of providing for their safety, proclaimed the Huguenots, who had at the same time been gathering at Orleans under Condé, rebels, and declared a general and pointing to the consequences of the first war of the Huguenots. September 11, 1562, the royal troops, after much bloodshed, took Rouen, and December 19 a battle was fought at Dreux, in which, after a terrible struggle, the Protestants were defeated.

One of the leaders of the Romanists, marshal St. André, fell in battle; another, the constable of Montmorency, was made prisoner by the Huguenots, and the leader of the latter in turn fell into the hands of the Guises. An exchange of prisoners, however, was immediately effected. The duke of Guise now marched against Orleans, but was assasinated in his own camp, Feb. 19, 1568, before he had been able to attack the great garrison of Rouen of the Protestants. The queen mother, realizing the loss which the Romanists, to whose side she had been forced by policy, had sustained in the death of the duke of Guise, and informed of a threatened invasion of the English on the coast near Normandy, concluded a peace with the Protestants, March 19, by which the Protestants were again granted the privileges of the edict of 1562, with several additions. The armies now united, and made common cause against the English. As soon, however, as Catharine thought herself able to dispense with the aid of the Hu- guenots, she threw off both foot and horse, and the destruction she was resolved, she again restricted the privileges conceded them in the edict of Amboise, formed a close alliance with Spain for the extirpation of heresy, and made attempts to secure the imprisonment, and death if possible, of Condé and of the admiral Coligny (q. v.). The Huguenots were alarmed, and their leaders adopted the resolution, Sept. 29, 1567, to secure, at the castle of Moreaux, the king's person, in whose name Catharine de Medicis was acting. The court, having received information of this decision, fled to Paris. Condé immediately followed, and, laying siege to the city, opened the second war of Huguenots and Catholics. After a siege of one month, Condé and the constable Montmorency met for battle, November 10, 1567, at St. Denis. Here 2700 Huguenots fought against no less than 20,000 royal troops. But so well did the Huguenots maintain their ground, that the victory was undecided. The superior force of the royal troops made Condé fall back into Lorraine, where he was re-enforced by 10,000 German warriors, under prince John Casimir. Condé with these forces now threatened Paris (Feb. 1568), and Catharine, in her fright, at once offered a treaty of peace, which was concluded at Longjumeau March 27, 1568, re-establishing the terms of the treaty of Amboise, generally known as the petite paix (little peace) of Longjumeau. Notwithstanding this treaty, which both parties seem to have signed only because they felt under compulsion, Catharine continued all manner of persecutions against the Protestants. "On the grounds of the Or- lage by the court, resounded with the horrid maxim that faith need not be kept with heretics, and that to massacre them was just, pious, and useful for salvation" (De Thou, Vie de Coligny, p. 390). In less than three months more than 8000 Protestants were either assassinated or executed. The Huguenots had the upper hand, and the upholder of the rights of all citizens without distinction of creed, who had become obnoxious to Rome and her adherents, was dismissed or forced to resign, and the seizure of Condé and Coligny resolved upon. Fortunately, however, for the Protestants, some of the
royal officers were unwilling to be instruments in the massacre likely to ensue upon such an act, and Condé and Coligny received warning to flee for their lives. Rochelle, one of the strongholds of the Protestants, which had baffled all the attacks and plans of Catharine, was open to receive them, and thither they consequently repaired for safety by the royal blood-hunters. Measures had also been planned for entrapping the other leading Protestants, but they all failed in the execution. "The cardinal of Châtillon, an adherent to the Protestant cause, who was at his see (Beaumont), escaped into Normandy, took the deputation of the parliament that was favorably crossed on a small vessel, and there became of great service to the Protestant cause by his negotiations. The queen of Navarre, warned in time by Coligny, also hastened to Rochelle with her son and daughter, contributing some money and four thousand soldiers. The chiefs-in-general took the defensive, and immediately raised levies in their different provinces. The guerrillas maintained by these persons kept the Catholic army in full employment, and preserved Rochelle from a general attack till proper measures had been taken for its defence." Catharine, outwitted in her diabolical attempts, now resolved to end the war by the aid of some miscalculation of the Protestants. She thereupon published an edict declaring the willingness of the government to protect the Protestants in future, as well as to render them justice for the past. But so completely was this edict at variance with her conduct that it passed unnoted. Enraged at this, she now promulgated several edicts against the Huguenots, whereby every edict that had ever been published in their favor, and forbade, under the penalty of death, the exercise of any other religion than the Roman Catholic. This sudden revocation of all former edicts made her acts a public declaration that she was resolved on a new war of religion, and the Huguenots, fortified in their strongholds, and with assistance which they had obtained from Germany and England, now began the third religious war. On March 13, 1569, the two contending armies met in battle at Jamac, near La Rochelle, in which the Catholics were defeated. On the 25th of March, the duke of Anjou sat in a chamber of the palace to give the signal for the massacre. A pistol-shot fired from one of the windows of the palace called out 800 of the royal guard, who, wearing, to distinguish themselves in the darkness, a white sash on the left arm and a white cross in their hats, rushed into the streets, shouting "For God and the king!" and commenced the most perfidious butcherry recorded in history. The houses of the Huguenots were broken in, and all who could be found murdered, the king himself firing from his window on those who passed in the streets. Some 5000 Huguenots, among them their great and noble leader, the admiral Coligny (q.v.), were thus killed in Paris; while many Roman Catholics met with the same fate at the hands of personal enemies, under the plea of their being inclined to Protestantism. The next day orders were sent to the governors of the provinces to follow the example of the capital. A few only had the manliness to resist this order, and in the space of sixty days some 70,000 persons were murdered in the provinces. See BARTHOLOMEW'S DAY. Those who escaped took refuge in the mountains and at La Rochelle. Henry of Navarre was compelled to sign a recantation. The prince of Condé became a Roman Catholic, and Charles IX declared in Parliament that Protestantism was extinct in France. "Catharine de Medicis wrote in triumph to Alva (the ignominious commander of Philip's troops in the Netherlands), 'I charge my Marshal of St. Agnes to show himself a Christian, and to the Duke of St. Pol his importunity at the care of the three days' dreadful work at Paris. When Philip heard of the massacre, he is said to have laughed for the first and only time in his life. Rome was thrown into a delirium of joy at the news. The cannon were fired at St. Angelo, and the bells rung, and the people went from sanctuary to sanctuary to give God thanks for the massacre. The subject was ordered to be painted, and a medal was struck to celebrate the atrocious event, with the pope's head on one side, and on the other an angel, with a cross in one hand and a sword in the other, pursuing and slaying a band of flying heretics. As the legend it bears, 'Vegitorium Strepitis,' 1572, briefly epitomizes the terrible story." The festival of St. Bartholomew was also ordered to be yearly celebrated in commemoration of the event. Not satisfied with these demonstrations at Rome, Gregory sent cardinal Orsini on a special mission to Paris to congratulate the king.
His passage was through Lyons, where 1800 persons had been killed, the bodies of many of whom had been thrown into the Rhone to horrify the dwellers near that river below the city (Smiles, Huguenots, p. 60).

Although deprived so suddenly of their leaders, and greatly weakened by the slaughter of great numbers of their best and most trusted men, they chose to wait together in their strong places, and prepared to defend themselves by force against force. "In the Cevennes, Dauphiny, and other quarters, they betook themselves to the mountains for refuge. In the plains of the south fifty or sixty strong places against the royal troops. Wherever resistance was possible it showed itself." Thus opened the fourth war of the Huguenots. The duke of Anjou, at the head of the Romanists, marched against the forts in the hands of the Huguenots. He attacked La Rochelle, but was repulsed, and obliged to retire from the siege, after losing nearly his whole army. The duke of Anjou becoming king of Poland, peace was concluded June 24, 1573, and the Protestants received as security the towns of Montauban, Nîmes, and La Rochelle, besides enjoying freedom of conscience, though not of worship, throughout the kingdom. Charles IX feared the support of the Netherlands and the western provinces, and arranged a treaty of peace with the Huguenots, with a section of the Roman Catholic nobility, to depose the queen and the Guises, and to place on the throne the chief of the Romanists, the duke of Alençon, the youngest son of Catharine and of Francis II, who, from political motives and the common cause of religion, had united in a common cause. The leaders made arrangements with Henry of Navarre and the prince of Condé, Protestant princes, for the humiliation of Austria, and only a premature rising of the Protestants defeated the plan. Some of the conspirators were executed, D'Alençon and Henry of Navarre were arrested, and Condé fled to Germany, where he returned to Protestantism, saying that his abjuration had been obtained from him by violence.

The fifth war of the Huguenots began under Henry III, the former duke of Alençon, who became king of France in 1574. In this war the Roman Catholics lost several strong towns, and were repeatedly defeated by the Huguenots. The prince of Condé returned to France with a German army under the orders of John Casimir, and in March, 1576, was joined by the duke of Alençon, who was at enmity with the king. In the south, Henry of Navarre and the Huguenots became alarmed, and finally concluded the peace of Beau- lieu, May 8, 1576, granting the Huguenots again a number of places of security, and freeing them from all restrictions in the exercise of their religion, also the promise to indemnify the German allies of the Huguenots for the war expenses. The Guises, thus frustrated in their political designs, instigated the inhabitants of Peronne, under the leadership of Humières, to organize an association called the Holy League (q. v.), in 1576, for the defence of the interests of Romanism. The league rapidly increased, was supported by the king, by Spain, and the pope, and finally led to the sixth war of the Huguenots. The states, however, refusing to give the king money to carry it on, and the Roman Catholics being divided among themselves, the peace of Ber- gerne was signed in September, 1577. The conditions were the same as those of the former occasion; but Catha- rine, in her anxiety to diminish the growing power of the Guises, entered into a private treaty with Henry of Navarre (at Nerau), and thus the Protestants were put in possession of a few more towns.

The seventh war of the Huguenots, called at court the war of the Black or Holy League, occurred in 1578. The Guises, who instigated the king to demand back the towns given to the Protestants as securities, and to violate the treaty in various ways. Condé answered by taking Rambouillet in November, 1579, and Henry by taking Cahors in April, 1580. The duke of Anjou intending to employ the royal forces in the Netherlands, and the Hugue- notes having met with several disastrous encounters with the Romanists, peace was concluded again at Flex, Sept. 12, 1580, and the Huguenots were permitted to retain their strongholds six years longer. A comparatively long interval of peace for France now followed.

But when the duke of Anjou (formerly of Alençon) died in 1584, leaving Henry of Navarre, a Protestant, their presumptive and destined monarch, on the throne, the "Holy League" sprang again into existence under the influence of the adherents of the Guises, the strict Roman Catholic members of the Parliament, the fanatical clergy, and the ultra-conservative party. The states, especially the six- teen districts to the west of the Loire (where the name of Ligue des Seize), took an active part in it. Henry, duke of Guise, finally concluded a treaty with Spain, signed at the castle of Jovenville January 3, 1585, creating a strong opposition to the succession of Henry of Navarre to the throne, and aimed even against Henry III, who seemed inclined to favor his brother-in-law. At the same time the Guises sought, though not altogether successfully, the approbation of pope Gregory XIII to the declaration of cardinal of Bourbon as heir to the throne, under the pretense that, as a faithful Catholic, he would aid his Church in extirpating here-esy. Though the treaty of Jovenville was not publicly proposed so old an incumbent for the throne, was to obtain for himself the crown of France, which seemed by no means a chimerical attempt, as he had received strong assurances of support from Spain. With the assistance of the Spanish galleys and funds sent him by his Spanish ally, the duke concluded a treaty in taking only from the Huguenots, but also from the king. Henry III, hesitating to send an army against the duke of Guise promptly, was finally obliged to sign the edict of Nemours, July 7, 1585, by which all modes of worship except that of the Roman Catholics were prohibited throughout France. All Huguenot ministers were given one month, and the Huguenots six months, to leave the country, and all their privileges were declared forfeited. Though put under the ban as heretics by pope Sixtus V, Henry of Navarre and the prince of Condé prepared to resist the execution of the royal edict by force of arms. With the aid of money from England, and an army of 80,000 men sent from Germany, they took the field in 1587, and began the eighth war of the Huguenots, called also, from the names of the leaders, the war of the three Henrys. The Huguenots gained the battle of Cerons, Oct. 14, 1587, but they were soon sur- prised and defeated, and their German allies were obliged to leave the country. The duke of Guise was left master of the field. He was not slow to grasp the power of the state, and obliged the king to sign the edict of reunion of Rouen, July 19, 1588, for the formal submission of the Huguenots, and the exclusion of Henry of Navarre from the succession to the throne. The king, to whom it now became evident that the duke of Guise's aim was to secure the throne for himself, feigned acquiescence in the demand, called a Parliament at Blois in order to gain time, and there caused both of the Guises to be murdered (Dec. 23, 1588). Both Protestants and Ro- man Catholics were indignant at this act of treachery; the Parliament denounced the king as an assassin, and Charles of Guise, duke of Mayenne, who had escaped the massacre, made himself master of several provinces, marched on Paris, and took up a position at Rambouillet general of the kingdom. Catharine having died in 1589, Henry III made a treaty with Henry of Navarre, but was himself assassinated in the camp of St. Cloud by the monk Jacques Clement, August 1, 1588. Henry of Navarre, a Protestant in belief, now succeeded to the throne under the name of Henry IV, determined to conquer for himself the possessions which had been wrested from his kingdom by the league and the Spaniards. But finding that he could obtain security of life and permanent possession of his dominion only by be- coming a Roman Catholic, he abjured the faith of his fathers in the church of St. Denis, July 28, 1593. The duke of Mayenne, supported by Spain, still continued
the war against the king, but the latter having obtained absolution from the pope in 1555, notwithstanding the efforts of the Jesuits, who had sold their influence to Spain, many forsook the league to join the royal standard, and by May 1556 the Protestants had been obliged to retreat to peace with the king. On April 15, 1556, Henry IV granted to the Protestants, for whom he had cherished great affection, the celebrated Edict of Nantes (q. v.), consisting of ninety-one articles, by which the Huguenots were allowed to worship in their own way throughout the kingdom, except the exception of a few towns; their ministers were to be supported by the state; inability to hold offices was removed; their poor and sick were to be admitted to the hospitals; and, finally, the towns given them as security were to remain in their hands eight years longer. Pope Clement VIII became enraged at the treaty, and wrote Henry that "a decree which gave liberty of conscience to all was the most accursed that had ever been made." His influence was also used to induce Parliament to refuse its approval to the edict, but it was finally registered in spite of Huguenot opposition, Feb. 25, 1559.

After the death of the king, who had himself especially obnoxious to the Jesuits, he was eventually assassinated by Ravaillac May 14, 1610. Henry's second wife, Mary of Medicis, and her son Louis XIII, still a minor, now assumed the government. The Edicts of tolerance were by them also ratified; but the violence committed by public discontent, in the first part of the reign, by the right of lords to take their deer became impediments to the free exercise of their religion. Thus, in 1622, an edict forbade them to take their deer except at daylight or at nightfall. Another decree in 1663 excused new converts from payment of debts previously contracted with their former-religionism.

In 1665 their children were allowed to declare themselves Roman Catholics—if boys, at fourteen; if girls, at twelve years of age; parents either to continue to provide for their apostate children, or to appeal to them a part of their possessions. In 1679 it was decreed that converts who had returned to Protestantism should be punished. In 1680 Huguenot clerks and notaries were deprived of their employments, emigrations of Protestants and Roman Catholics were forbidden, and the issue of such marriages declared illegitimate, and incapable of succeeding afterwards. In 1681, the Rigour of the Edicts was increased. In 1685 their children who had declared for the Reformed religion were allowed to become Protestants at the age of seven years. "The kidnapping of Protestant children was actively set on foot by the agents of the Roman Catholic priests, and their parents were subjected to heavy penalties if they did not consent to the converts being brought up to pull down Protestant places of worship, and as many as eighty were shortly destroyed in one diocese. The Huguenots offered no resistance. All that they did was to meet together and pray that the king's heart might yet be softened towards them. Blow upon blow followed. Protestant teachers were forbidden to print books without the authority of magistrates of the Roman communion. Protestant teachers were interdicted from teaching anything more than reading, writing, and arithmetic. Such pastors as held meetings amid the ruins of the churches which had been pulled down, were compelled to do penance with the keys of the church, after which they were to be banished the kingdom. Protestants were prohibited from singing psalms on land or water, in workshops or in dwellings. If a priestly procession passed one of their churches while the psalms were sung, they must make a bow at once, and step instantly, on the step, off the platform, without a word. In short, from the pettiest annoyance to the most exasperating cruelty, nothing was wanting on the part of the "most Christian king" and his ministers.

In 1688, Colbert, who had been Louis's minister for several years, and who, convinced that the strength of
states consisted of the number, the intelligence, and the industry of their citizens, had labored in all possible ways to prevent the hardships which Louis, led by his mistress, Madame de Maintenon, and his Jesuit confesso-
or, Pierre la Chambre, 300,000 of the Protestants were removed by death. Military executions and depreda-
tions against the Protestants now began throughout the kingdom. "Pity, terror, and anguish had by turns agi-
tated their minds, until at length they were reduced to a state of despair. Life was made almost intolerable to them. All careers were closed against them, and Prot-
estants of the working class were under the necessity of abjuring or starving. The mob, observing that the Protestants were no longer within the pale of the law, took the opportunity of wreaking all manner of outrages on them. They broke into their churches, tore up the bibles and hymn-books in a pile, set the whole on fire; the authorities usually lead-
ing their sanction on the proceedings of the rioters by banishing the burned-out ministers, and interdicting the further celebration of worship in the destroyed churches."

(Smiles, 

Huguenots, p. 135-6). Bodies of troops which had been quartered upon the Protestants to harass them, now made it a business to convert the Protestants. Ac-

companying by Jesuits, they passed through the southern provinces, compelling the inhabitants to renounce their religion, demolishing the places of worship, and putting to death the presbyters. Hundreds of thousands of Protestants, unwilling to renounce their religion, fled to Switzerland, the Netherlands, England, and Germany. In vain it was attempted to restrain this self-expatria-
tion by cordon along the borders. Many Protestants also made an insincere profession of Roman Catholi-
cism. To this, however, was an equal religious penalty, as those who were not considered as Protestants were put to death. On October 23, 1685, Louis at last revoked the edict of Nantes. This revocation enacted the demolition of all the remaining Protestant temples throughout France; the entire proscription of the Prot-

estant religion; the prohibition of even private worship-

ship; the confiscation of property, the banishment of all Protestant pastors from the kingdom within fifteen days; the closing of all Protestant schools; the prohibition of parents from instructing their children in the Protestant faith; the obligation, under penalty of a heavy fine, of having their children baptized in the Catholic Church; the abolition of the Roman Catholic religion; the confiscation of the property and goods of all Protestant refugees who failed to return to France within four months; the penalty of the galleys for life to all men, and of imprisonment for life to all women detected in the act of attempting to escape from France. These were a series of"

ward eagerly from their once dearly-loved country. It is impossible to estimate with accuracy the number of the refugees. Sismondi (Hist. de France) computed that the total number of those who emigrated ranged from 800,000 to 1,000,000, and he estimates that about 200,000 were like number perished in prison, on the scaffold, at the galleys, and in their attempts to escape; and Weiss (in his History of the French Protestant Refugee) thinks the number no less than 300,000 of those who departed the French kingdom. Vauban wrote, only a year after the Revocation, that France must lose by this war of 26,000 in specie, 9000 sailors, 12,000 veterans, 600 officers, and her most flourishing manufactures; and Fenelon thus described the last years of the reign of Louis XIV: "The cultivation of the soil is almost abandoned; the towns and the country are becoming depopulated. All indus-
ties have sunk into insignificance. The only thing that the Huguenots have become as but a huge hospital without provisions."

The hospitable shores of England, which had long before this period furnished an asylum to the fugitive Hug-

enots, were now eagerly sought, and the Huguenots met with kindness and assistance from the English gov-

ernment. At first, however, to a certain extent, the en-

dowments of the former priest and monk, the fertile talent of the land, the most skillful artisans, directed their steps, and many great branches of industry of France, by the folly of a king who had taken his mis-

trix as his first state counsellor, received their death-

blow. Instead of suffering the flood of prosperity and power to flow slowly down and drain off into the

imperial edifice of the Huguenot states, which was at one time almost entirely finished, the king struck them

completely prostrated. Indeed, more than a century really passed before they were restored to their former

prosperity, "and then only to suffer another equally stag-

gering blow from the violence and outrage which ac-

companied the outbreak of the French Revolution." In fact, this last period of Huguenot existence was not

only as a providential retribution, but likewise a natural penalty for the civil wrongs inflicted upon the

Protestants, since these cruel measures exiled from the country a large part of its piety and intelligence, by

which alone that catastrophe might have been averted.

From this time, the idea of a French Protestant Church had always been very numerous, thousands, unwilling either to abjure their faith or to leave their native country, betook themselves to the mountains of the Cé-

vennes, and continued the exercise of their religion in secret. These, and the mountaineers of the Cevennes, Ge-

ners whom Hugues d'Halong upbraided for their de-

remarkable fanatical enthusiasm, under the name of Cami-

liards (q. v.), finally commenced to wage war against the royal forces, which was called the War of the Ce-

vennes, or the Camisard War. It was successively car-

ried on until 1702, when, in consequence of success-

fully defending Montpellier and other towns of Spain, they were allowed a respite, the royal troops being otherwise employed. Their number now rapidly augmented, especially in Provence and Dauph-

iny, and thus, notwithstanding all the persecutions which the Protestants had suffered, about two millions continued to adhere to their religion (Charles Coquerel, Hist. des Eglises du Desert, Par. 1841, 2 vols.).

A partial repose which the Huguenots now enjoyed for more than ten years greatly increased their numbers,

especially in Provence and Dauphiny; but in 1724, Louis XV, who had ascended the throne in 1715, at the instigation of the ever-vexatious Jesuits, issued the severest ordinance against them. The spirit of the age, however, was too much opposed to persecution to suffer the edict to work the mischief intended. The govern-

ors of several provinces tolerated the Protestants, and as early as 1745 they resumed their assemblies in the mountains and celebrated their services in the desert. In 1744 new edicts were issued against them, requiring upon those who had been baptized or married in the desert (as it was called) a repetition of the rite by the clergy of the Roman Catholic Church. Even the Roman Catholics themselves soon felt, in consequence of these violent measures, and the per-

secution gradually ceased. Men like Montesquieu and Voltaire successfully advocated mild treatment, and it
HUGUENOTS

must be conceded that the Protestants owed much of the
tolerations they afterwards met with to Voltaire's
treatise on the subject, written in 1760, and to his pro-
curing the release of John Calas (q. v.). Their position
was still further improved on the accession of Louis
XVI to the throne (1774). In 1787 an edict was issued
(which the Parliament, however, registered only in
1789) which declared that freedom of Protestantism and
marriages was recognised, though subject to some pure-
ly civil regulations; they were given cemeteries for the
burial of their dead, were allowed to follow their reli-
gion privately, and granted the rights of citizenship, with
the exception of the right of holding any official position.

The death of the French Revolution in 1789, a motion was made in the General Assembly to
admit the Protestants to equal rights with the Roman Catholics: this motion was at first rejected, but finally
removed. A decree of 1790 restored the Protestants to
the possession of all the rights and property they had
lost subsequently to the revocation of the edict of
Nantes. The "Code Napoleon" placed the Protestants
equal in their civil and political rights with the Roman Catholics, as, in fact, they had already been for more
than fifteen years; and though, after the restoration of
the Bourbons, some small restrictions were imposed, the
protestants succeeded in exciting the populace of the
department of the Gard to rise and murder the Protestants, the authorities conniving at the crime, still they remained
equal to the Roman Catholics in the eye of the law. The
spirit of persecution, however, continued, though in a
somewhat weakened form, both by the government and
in the government of the Bourbons, even in that of the
Orleans family, though, after the July Revolution of
1830, the reformed charter of France had proclaimed
universal freedom of conscience and of worship, a prin-
ciple which was formally declared in 1831. (For the present
state of Protestantism in France, see France.)

The descendants of the Huguenots long kept them-
selves a distinct people in the countries to which their
fathers had fled, and entertained hopes of a return to
their country; but as time passed on these hopes grew
caller, while by habit and interest they became more
united to the nations among whom they fell to their lot
to establish a new home. The great crisis of the First
Revolution finally severed all the ties that bound them
to their native land. They either changed their names
themselves, by translating them, or they were changed by
the government into the form of bynames and misno-
mention. Thus, in England, "the Lemaerts called
themselves Master; the Leroy, King; the Tonnelsier,
Cooper; the Lejeunes, Young; the Leblanc, White,
the Lenoir, Black; the Loiseau, Bird. Thenceforward
the Frenchman in London no longer existed. At the
present day, the only vestige of it that remains is in
the Spitalfields district, where a few thousand artisans,
for the most part poor, still betray their origin, less by
their language than by their costume, which bears some
resemblance to that of the corresponding class in Louis
XIV's time. The architecture of the houses they in-
habit resembles that of the workmen of Lille, Amiens,
and the other manufacturing towns of Picardy. The
custom of working in cellars, or in glazed garrets, is also
borrowed from their original country" (Weiss, p. 289,
284).

In our own country also, where the Huguenots
settled at an early day, their descendants may be found,
particularly in New York, Maryland, Virginia, and the
Carolinan; and, as in England, they have become nat-
uralised, and their names have been changed, until it
has become difficult to recognise them. "Their sons
and grandsons, little by little, have become mingled
with the society which gave a home to their fathers, in
the same way as in England, Holland, and Germany.
As their Church disappeared in America, the members
became attached to other evangelical denominations,
especially the Episcopal, Reformed Dutch, Methodist,
and Presbyterian. The French language, too, has long
since disappeared with their Church service, which used
to call to mind the country of their ancestors. French
was preached in Boston until the close of the last cen-
tury, and at New York the Huguenot services were cel-
brated both in French and English as late as 1772.
Here, at the French Protestant church, which succeeded
the Huguenot years since, the Gospel was preached in the
same language in which the prince of French pulpit or-
ators, Saurin, used to declaim in France two centuries
ago. The Huguenot church at Charleston, South Car-
olina, alone has retained in its primitive purity, in their
public worship, the old Calvinistic liturgy of their fore-
athers. The greater part of the exiled French families
have long since disappeared, and their scattered com-
monwealths have despaired of amalgamation with the
other races around them. These pious fugitives have been
public blessings throughout the world, and have increased in Germany, Holland, and England the elements of power, prosperity, and Christian de-
velopment. In our land, too, they helped to lay the firm
corner-stones of the great republic whose glory they most justly share" (G. P. Diocesay, The Huguenots in
America, as Appendix to Harper's edition of Smiles's
Huguenots, p. 422). See Beza, Hist. des Eglises reform-
nees en France (Antw. 1698, 3 vols); Thuanus, Historia
sui temporis de regulatione ecclesiastica, libri tres (Venecia, 3
ed. 1818); Lascutet, Histoire de France pendant les
guerres de la religion (Paris, 1814, 1815, 4 vols.); Benoit,
Histoire des Huguenots (Delft, 1638, 2 vols.); Bulli-
erie, Eclaircissements historiques sur la Religione de
Reception de l'Etablissement de Nantes (Par. 1788, 2 vols.);
Court de Gbelen, Hist. des troubles des Cerences (Villefranche,
1780, 2 vols.); Browning, Hist. of the Huguenots (Lond.
1828, 2 vols.); Brockhaus, Conversations-Lexicon, viii.
128 sq.; Pierer, Universal Lexicon, viii. 583 sq.; Weiss,
History of the French Protestant Refugees; Coquerel,
Histoire des Eglises du dsert (Paris, 1857, 2 vols. 8vo);
Felice, Histoire des Protestants de France; Peyrat, His-
toire des Pasteurs du Desert (Paris, 2 vols. 8vo). Crowe,
History of France (London, 1867, 1869, 5 vols); Smiles,
1855; Chambers, Cyclop. v. 450 sq. For special biog-
rphies, Haag, La France Protestante (Par. 8 vols. 8vo);
Michelet. Louis XIV et la Revolution de l'Etablire de Nantes
(Paris, 1860, 8vo); Michelet, Guerre de Religion (Par.
1857, 6 vols.); Oron, Histoire Chronol. de l'Eglise Protes-
tante de France (Paris, 1839); Spanis, Histoire de
la Religion reformee en France (London, 1827, 3 vols.);
Athanase Coquerel fils, Les Forgats pour la foi (Paris,
1888). (J. H. W.)

Hugues. See Hugo.

Huguet, Marc Antoine, a French prelate, was born
at Moissac in 1757. He entered the sacred order in his
youth, and became curate of a little village in Avvergne.
In 1791 he was elected, at the close of the French
Revolution he was a member of the Legislature, and
of the National Convention, and voted for the death
of the king. Complicated in several popular disturb-
cances, and conspiring against the established govern-
ment, he was arrested in 1793, and imprisoned at Ham
for several years. Engaging in a still another conspiracy
which failed to accomplish its object, he was again ar-
ested, condemned to death, and executed Oct. 6, 1799.

Huish, Alexander, a learned English divine, who
flourished in the 17th century, was fellow of Magdalen
College, rector of Beckington and Hornblotton, Somer-
setshire. He published Lectures on the Lord's Prayer
(Lond. 1626, 4to). He was also a very superior scholar
of exegesis, and a prominent assistant on Walton's Poly-
glot Bible. His services were highly commented upon
by bishop Walton himself. See Wraamgh, Proleg. ii,
203; Todle, Life of Walton, p. 269 sq.; Stoughton (John),
Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 58.
HULDERICUS 399  HULSEMANN

milah, who was then probably away at his native town Anathoth, or at some more distant place. There were gates of the temple in the middle of the southern wall, called "the gates of Huldah" (Mishna, tit. Middoth, i, 3), which, if they were so named from any connection with this Huldah, are stated to have been her residence on Ophel. See SHALLUM; JOSIAH.

Huldricus, Augustenensis Episcopus, who flourished in 860, was a scholar of Adalbert, and descended from the counts of Kilbur and Dillengen. He is known by his letter addressed to pope Nicholas against the celibacy of the clergy (Epistola de Cleri celibatu). It was translated into Latin, and published about the time of the Reformation (16mo), without date. —Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica; Clarke, Succession of Sac. Lit., ii, 531.

Huldrich, Jean Jacques, a Swiss theologian, born at Zurich in 1888, belonged to a family of which several members have distinguished themselves as theologians and philanthropists. See HULDERICUS. He devoted much of his time to the acquisition of Hebrew, and went to the universities of Holland to pursue a course of study in the Oriental languages. On his return to his native place in 1706 he was made pastor of the House of Orphans. In 1724 he was appointed professor of moral science at the Gymnasium of Zurich. His scholarship was of a superior order, and he was frequently solicited to accept a professorship at the universities of Heidelberg and Groningen. He died at Zurich May 25, 1731. He published Historia Jesucaet Nazaremi, a Judaeis blaspheme corrupta, ex manuscripto haecanum inedito Heb. et Lat., cum notis (Leiden, 1705, 8vo) —Gentili, Obiectore, sive de culumiani gentilium in Judaeos commentarius (Zurich, 1744, 4to), a collection of sermons, etc.—Hoefer, Noue. Bibg. Gén. xxv, 470 sq.

Hull, Hope, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born March 15, 1769, in Worcester County, on the eastern shore of Virginia. His early education was rather neglected, and he was apprenticed to a carpenter at Baltimor. In this city he was converted, and entered the itinerancy in 1785. He was first appointed to Salisbury, North Carolina. With the exception of a brief period spent in New England, his time was given to the introduction of Methodism in the Southern States. His last appointment was the Savannah Circuit, Georgia. In 1794 he travelled with bishop Asbury, and located in 1795. He died October 4, 1818, at Athens, Ga. Hull possessed wonderful power over those who came within his influence, and was one of the most eloquent men that Methodism has ever produced. He died on his 63d year. His piety was deep, and many were converted under his labors. During his active work in the ministry, he secured for himself a pretty good education, and was at one time able even to assume the duties of teacher of Latin. He was also one of the first and strongest supports of the University of Georgia, which was founded during his residence at Athens. —Stevens, Memorials of Methodism, chap. ix; Boehm, Hist. Reform. p. 366; Sprague, Annals Amer. Pulpit, vii, 112 sq. (J. H. W.)

Hulin, Guillaume, a Roman cardinal, born at Étain, in the diocese of Verdun, in the latter half of the 14th century. He was at one time archdeacon of Verdun, and later of Metz. He was an attendant at the Council of Basle in 1440, and was one of the supporters of the antipope (Amadeus of Savoy) Felix V, who gave him the cardinal's hat. Nicholas V confirmed the cardinal after the schism Dec. 19, 1449. He died at Rome Oct. 28, 1453, and Migne, Dict. Theol. xxxi, 1092.

Hulot, Henri Louis, a French theologian, was born at Paris, March 17, 1745. He was one of the first at the seminary, then at the University of Rouen, where he was obliged to resign at the outbreak of the Revolution, and to flee from persecution which threatened him. He went to Gand, where he was made grandvicaire, until the entrance of the French into the Netherlands in 1794 forced him again to flee. He went successively to Münster, Erfurt, Dresden, and Augsburg. When he was permitted to return to his native land, he was appointed curate of the parish of Avcannot, and later of Antigny. During twenty years of pernicious labor at this parish, he was made canon, and finally grand vicar and official of the Reformation. He died Sept. 30, 1815. His principal writings are Lettre aux catholiques de Reims (in Latin and French, Gand, 1793, 8vo) —Lettres des prêtres Français à l'Evêque de Gand: —Collect. des brefs du pape Pie VI (Augsb. 1786) —Lettres à M. Schroffenberg, évêque de Ploeck, de l'archevêque de Russowen, en faveur des prêtres Français (1793, 8vo) —Ecclésiastique et épiscopal, 8vo) —Usus chronologici ecclesiae (Amstelodam, 1793, 8vo). —Salisburgensis cujusdam religiosi delecta castigatio, seu vindicia cleri Gallicani exulii (1800, 8vo) —Gallicanorum Episcoporum dioeceseos insignes inimici (1801, 8vo) —Seis apostolicae Triumphi, seu sedes apostolica, et patriae ecclesiae racionum collectione (Laus. 1808, 8vo). Several controversial works and sermons were left in MS. —Hoefer, Noue. Bibg. Gén. xxv, 479.

Hulse, John, was born at Middlewich in 1708. He was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge; obtained a small curacy in the country; and, upon the death of his father in 1788, withdrew to his paternal inheritance in Cheshire, where, owing to his delicate state of health, he lived in retirement until his death. He made a donation of his squatted estates in order to found two divinity scholarships in St. John's College, the Hulsean Prize Essay, and to endow the offices of "Christian Advocate" and "Christian Preacher" in the University of Cambridge. The duties of the "Christian Preacher," or Hulsean Lectures, was appointed. From 1800 to 1804 the lecture twenty sermons every year, either upon the evidences of Christianity, or the difficulties of Holy Scripture. The funds being inadequate, the lectures were not commenced until 1820, and in 1860 the number of sermons to be delivered in a year was reduced to eight. In 1860 the office of "Christian Advocate" was changed to a professorship, called the Hulsean Professorship of Divinity. Bishop Ellicott was the first incumbent in the new chair. At present the office of the Hulsean Lecturer or Preacher is annual, and the duty of the lecturer to preach not less than four, nor more than six sermons in the course of the year. Among the most important of the Hulsean sermons are the following: Blunt (J. J.), Principles for the proper Understanding of the Mosaic Writings, 1832 (Lond. 1838, 8vo) —Alford, The Consistency of the Divine Conduct in revealing the Doctrines of Redemption, 1841 (Cambridge, 1842, 8vo) —Trench, The Holy Scripture, in its relation to the Spiritual Life of Man, 1845 (Cambridge, 1845, 8vo) —Trench, Christ the Desire of all Nations, 1846 (Cambridge, 1845, 8vo) —Wordsworth, On the Causa of the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament, and on the Apocalypse, 1847 (Lond. 1848, 8vo) —Wordsworth, Lectures on the Apocalypse, critical, expository, and practical, 1848 (Lond. 1849, 8vo). —Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, i, 1578; Chambers, Cyclop. v, 453; Farrar, Hist. of Free Thought, p. 207.

Hulsean Lectures. See HULSE, JOHN.

Hulsemann, Johann, a German theologian, was born in Ostfriesland in 1602, and was educated at the universities of Wittenberg and Leipzig. In 1629 he was appointed professor of theology at the University of Wittenberg; he was a member of the "Leipziger Convent" of 1630, and of the "Colloquium" at Thorn in 1645, where he performed the office of moderator theologorum Augustanorum confessionis. In 1645 he was called as professor of systematic theology to the University of Leipzig. He died in 1664. In connection with his son-in-law, Calvius (q. v.), he carried on the controversy against Calvinism as a strictly orthodox Lutheran. An able polemic and a thoroughly educated theologian, who in many respects may be compared to the schoolmatics of the 16th century, Hulsemann distinguished in his attacks against Calvinism (in his work Calvinismus irreconcilibilis, Witt. 1644, Lpz. 1645), included
Human Sacrifices. See Sacrifices.

Human Soul. See Soul.

Humbert (by some improperly called Hubert), a French cardinal, was born probably towards the close of the 10th century. He entered the order of the Benedictines at Moyen-le-Moutier in 1015. In 1049 Pope In X. who had been bishop of Toul, the diocese in which the monastery of Moyen-le-Moutier was situated, called Humbert to Rome, and he was first created archbishop of Sicily, and in 1051 cardinal bishop of Silva Candida. Humbert is believed to be the first Frenchman who received the cardinal's hat. He was intimately connected with the pope, was admitted to all his councils, and was the Roman pontiff's messenger to Constantinople to effect a union with the Eastern or Greek Church. Under pope Victor III. he was made chancellor and librarian at the Vatican, which offices he continued to hold under the pontifical successors Etienne III., Nicolas II., and Alexander II. He was at the head of the party opposed to Berenger, and obliged him to make a confession of faith at the synod at Rome in 1055. He died about 1063. He wrote a number of works, among others a treatise against the Simonians (published by Martene in his Anecdota), and a narrative of his consanguineous marriage. Two other polemical works against the Greek Church have been printed several times, especially in the Annales Ecclesiastici of Baronius. All his writings have been collected and printed by Migne, vol. cxxii. (1863), p. 929-1278. — Hofer, Nouv. Bibl. Générale, xxxv, 489; Migne, Eclect. Théol., xxxi, 1092 sq.

Humbert, general of the order of Dominican monks, was born at Romans, France, about 1200. He was early sent to Paris to be educated as a clergyman, and soon became prominent as an assistant preacher to the celebrated Jourdan. He entered the order in 1224, and was made prior at Lyons in 1242 he was elected "provincial" of Toulouse, in 1244, and of France; and in 1254 general of his order. In 1268, however, he abdicated this high position, and retired as a simple monk, first to a monastery at Lyons, and later to a like institution at Avignon. The patriarchate of Jerusalem was offered him in 1264, but he declined it. He died July 14, 1277. He wrote Oficiis Ecclesiasticus universi tam nocturnum quam diurnum, ad usum ordinis predicatorum: — Expositio super regulam St. Augustini: — Expositio super Constitutiones ordinis fratum praedicatorum, not quite complete: — Liber de instructione officiandi in usu ordinis fratrum praedicatorum (originally a treatise of the best edition, Lyons, 1515): — De Eruditione Predicatorum, also entitled De Arte predandi, has been inserted in the Collection of the Church Fathers, vol. xxv: — Liber de Praedicatione Crucis, an appeal to the Christians against infidels: — Liber de eis que tractanda vitae sanctae in Concilio generali Lyonensi celebrante, of which extracts were published by Martene in his Theaurus Anecdot. vol. vii, etc. — Hofer, Nouv. Bibl. Générale, xxxv, 483 sq.

Humbert, a French theologian, was born at Genex, near Paris, about the middle of the 13th century. In July, 1296, he was elected abbe of Prulli, in the diocese of Chartres, and died there March 14, 1299. He wrote several theological and philosophical works, all of which remain unprinted. His most important work is Sententiae super libros Metaphysica Aristotelis, a commentary on Aristotle's metaphysics. — Hofer, Nouveaux Bibl. Générale, xxv, 485; Hist. Litt. de la France, xxxi, 96.

Humble Access, Prayer of, is a phrase in some churches for a divine supplication made by the priest kneeling at the altar before the consecration.

Hume, David, the most notable man of letters and speculation in Scotland during the last century. He was almost equally eminent as a metaphysician, a historian, and a political essayist. He was born at Edinburgh April 26 (O. S.), 1711. On his father's side he
HUME

was related to the earls of Home or Hume, and through his mother he was the grandson of Sir David Falconer, lord president of the court of justice. His father was not rich, but he was an independent proprietor, owning the estate of Ninewells, in Berwickshire. But David was the younger son, and was entitled to only a small share of his father's substance. He was left an orphan in his youth, and in his brother's custody, was brought up under the sole care of his excellent mother. He passed without special note through the University, and was designed for the Scotch bar, but he had no taste for the profession, and having spent seven years at home at Ninewells, after leaving college, ostentatiously engaged in the practice of the law, he went abroad in 1738 with some mercantile aspirations. Thence, after a few months of disgust, he passed over into France, and took up his abode first at Rheimes, and afterwards at La Flechi. Here he devoted himself to philosophy for life, and composed his Treatise of the Principles of Morals. It was in a discussion with one of the Jesuit fathers of La Flechi that the celebrated argument against miracles flashed upon his mind. The Treatise of Human Nature was published in 1738, after his return to England. He says himself of it, "It fell dead-born from the press." Just before he left Ninewells he purchased a small cottage, and here he renewed his studies and extended his speculations. In 1742 he published the first part of his Essays, Moral and Political, which, in his opinion, met with considerable favor. Still, he had obtained no assured provision in life. He was disappointed in an application for a living to the bishop of Dornoch. The bishop offered him the rectory of Kilbride, and he declined it. He purchased a small house at St. Clair, and there he resided in quiet, writing and studying. In 1744 he accepted the charge of the manse of Annandale. With him he resided twelve unpleasant months, but he derived some emolument from the association. In 1746 he became secretary to general St. Clair, and in 1747 he attended his lordship at the embassy to Vienna and Turin. The Inquiry concerning the Human Understanding—a recast of the first part of his first treatise—was published while he was at Turin. In 1749 he resided on his old refuge at Ninewells, and occupied himself with the composition of his Political Discourses. In 1752 he published a new edition of his Human Nature, which has been better known in Germany than in England. In 1754, on the marriage of his brother, he abandoned the Ninewells estate, and in consequence of his finesses, moved into a new home in Edinburgh. He applied for a chair in the University of Glasgow, but again failed. In 1752 he accepted the post of librarian to the Advocates' Library in Edinburgh, but transferred nearly all his small salary to the blind poet, Blacklock. He was engaged in the composition of his History of England, which had attracted his regards some years before. The parts he worked on in this work have been published. It was in his History of the House of Tudor that he first took up the subject of political history. He published two volumes of this work, and they were received with warm approval. The second and last volume was published in 1764; the first in 1759. The History of the House of Tudor came out in two volumes in 1759; and in 1761, two volumes, containing the early history of England, completed the work, which, before its conclusion, was received as an English classic, and is justly so regarded. If the work encountered various and violent opposition, it gradually achieved eminent popularity, and rendered the author "not only independent, but opulent." Being now "turned of fifty," he resolved to spend the remainder of his life in philosophical dignity and comfortable retirement. The reason was of no long duration. The marquis of Hertford invited Hume, with whom he was personally unacquainted, to become his secretary of legation at the French court. The distinguished philosopher and historian was received with marked attentions and flatteries by the eminent persons assembled at Paris. It was the period when the union of infidel sentiments with literary renown had become the rage in the most brilliant circles of the age. Hume was received with state honors, but he declined, but Hume remained as chargé d'affaires till 1766, and received a pension of £400 for his diplomatic services. The "canny Scot" had become a rich old bachelor, and was able to extend patronage and aid to Rousseau on his arrival in England, and even to procure for him a position in the Spanish Embassy. Hume's political favors ended in a quarrel between the protected and the protector, of which an account was given by the latter in a pamphlet. About this time Hume became undersecretary of state, and held the office for two years, retiring to Edinburgh in 1769. Here he passed the remaining years of his life, with the exception of a brief visit to Harrowgate and Bath, and it was shortly before setting out on this journey, undertaken for the restoration of his declining health, that he wrote his Autobiography. He had been attacked with diarrhoea in the spring of the year, and an attack in the fall convinced him of the certainty of his death, as approaching as nearly to the idea of a perfectly wise and virtuous man as perhaps the nature of human frailty will permit." But Smith, notwithstanding this testimony, refused to publish the Dialogues on Natural Religion, though a special legacy of £200 was attached to such publication. The Dialogues were not given to the world until 1779, and then by the agency of Hume's nephew. His Life, written by himself, with a Letter from Adam Smith giving an Account of his Death, appeared in 1777 (Lond. 8vo). A better view of the life and the character of Hume than his edition of his autobiography is given in the Autobiography of Alexander Carlyle (Edinb. and N. Y. 1860).

The philosophy of Hume underwent three revisions, with, however, scarcely any essential change. It has been customary to enlarge upon the acumen and logical precision of his work, but the fundamental object of his treatise was to show that the principles of thought can, if we will, on close scrutiny, into mere dialectical subtlety. If his artifices imposed upon others, he was often the victim of them himself, and he was crushed to the earth beneath the ruins of the systems which he overthrew. Hume's fundamental thesis is that all human knowledge (no pun is designed) consists of impressions and ideas. Impressions are the direct perceptions of sense: ideas are only the relics or signs of former impressions. Impressions are always particular, and incapable of variation: ideas are consequently the unaltered spectres of former sensations. The theory of Locke is accepted and simplified by discounting the office of reflection. The theory of Berkeley is accepted and expanded by applying his argument against matter to mind, and denying all evidence of the existence of either. The result is a thoroughly Pyrrhonian doubt. The application of these postulates for the destruction of the whole philosophy of Hume. There are only two objects of knowledge—the relations of ideas, and the relations of impressions or facts. The former relations are concerned with unchanging signs, and are therefore simple, and readily discerned by the discussion of thought; but the latter always involve the principle of cause and effect, because due to some exciting influence. The relation of cause and effect is nothing more than the habitual succession of events; because all our complex conceptions are linked together only by customary association, and it is impossible that particular objects should produce a general idea. General ideas are, indeed, im-
possibilities, for all abstractions are only vague images of particulars. Ideas may represent either realities or phenomena, but no investigations can reach beyond the phenomenon to the reality. This reality is a pure delusion—a figment; it is only the name arbitrarily given to a system of connected impressions and ideas. There is no evidence of its existence, there is nothing to authorise the assertion of its existence except as fictitious phenomena. The connection of phenomena, or of the conceptions corresponding with them, is accepted as truth in consequence of a primitively tendency of the mind, called belief; the latter being the desire that every impression, however unconnected, is connected with one another in mind; at least, there is nothing to authorise the assertion of their existence except as fictitious phenomena.

The credibility of facts is thus resolved into their apprehensibility, and becomes merely a question of probabilities. This constitution of belief, and this complexity of knowledge, result from the mode in which the materials of thought are obtained. They are gathered by observation and experience, and are distinguished into two, and only two classes, according to their relative strength—impressions and ideas; the former being the prius and more forcible perceptions; the latter being the derived and secondary, and being unconnected with impressions. Further than this it is impossible to carry speculation. The mind, the instrument of thought, lies beyond; but its nature is discernible only in its operations, and these constitute its whole nature so far as any apprehension is in the idea of the human mind is the mould and measure of all knowledge, and yet that mind is itself only a problematical phenomenon. A good-humored scepticism is accordingly the sole result of philosophy.

From this brief and imperfect synopsis of Hume's doctrine, so well summed up by Mackintosh: "He aimed at proving, not that nothing was known, but that nothing could be known"—it is easy to recognise the mode in which he reached its most startling applications. He might assert the moral sense, but the assertion was nugatory, for there could be no foundation for morals, nor anything more valid than expediencies growing out of particular impressions and their observed sequences. He might admit the possibility, even the probability, of divine intelligence, but could not tell whether it was "ane or mair," since revelation could not be substituted for the natural perceptions. The scheme had in it, like the admission of miracles, the doctrines supported by ordinary experience, and human testimony wasfallacious. All this mischievous error is the appropriate fruit of the tree on which it hangs. Many refutations of these positions have been attempted, and a vigorous war has been waged on the principles supposed to form the foundation of this philosophy; but too little attention has been paid to the ambiguity of the terms employed, and to the vacillation with which they are used by the conjuror. A strict definition of "miracles" and "experience," and a rigid adherence to such definition, will reduce the celebrated argument against miracles to a bald petitio principii, or to a manifest absurdity. Hume endeavored to prove that "no testimony is sufficient to establish a miracle," and the reasoning employed for this purpose is, that "a miracle be a violation of the laws of nature, which a firm and unalterable experience has established, the proof against a miracle, from the very nature of the fact, is as entire as any argument from experience can be; whereas our experience of human veracity, which (according to him) is the sole foundation of the evidence of testimony, is far from being uniform, and every argument against that experience which admits of no exception." This boasted and plausible argument has, with equal candor and acuteness, been examined by Dr. Campbell, in his Dissertation on Miracles, who justly observes that, so far is experience from being the sole foundation of the evidence of testimony, that, on the contrary, testimony is the sole foundation of by far the greater part of what Mr. Hume calls firm and unalterable experiences; and that if, in certain circumstances, we did not give an implicit faith to testimony, our knowledge of events would be confined to those which had fallen under the immediate observation of our own senses. Hume maintained that a miracle is contrary to experience; but, in reality, it is different from ordinary experience. That diseases should generally be cured by the application of medicine, and sometimes at the mere word of a prophet, are facts not inconsistent with each other in the nature of things themselves, nor irreconcilable according to our ideas. Each fact may arise from its own proper causes; so may every other fact in the universe; each is known by its own proper proof, whether of sense or testimony. To pronounce, therefore, a miracle to be false, because it is different from ordinary experience, is only to conclude against its existence from the very circumstance which constitutes its specific character; for if it were not different from ordinary experience, where would be its singularity? or what proof could be drawn from it in attestation of a divine message? See Miracles.

The importance and value of Hume's political essays have rarely been appreciated. They are the best of all his productions, and the weakest of all his essays. Many of the intellectual vices, as all the excellences of Hume—his speculative audacity, his regard for material comfort and independence, his want of enthusiasm, the restriction of his view to observation and experience, his acceptance of expediency as a principle, his acquaintance with courts and with affairs of state, his knowledge of history, his philosophic habits, his slow progress from pinch to easy circumstances, all favored profusion in this branch of inquiry. Many of these characteristics were, however, adverse to his career as an historian. His room in the history of England, the vigorous, easy, and unaffected style, the vivacity of the delineations, the arrangement of the topics, the disposition of the personages, the variety and enumeration of the reflections, are all admirable. The narrative is always fascinating, if the expression is rarely idiomatic, sometimes ungrammatical, and often provincial. But to the highest merits of history it possesses no claim. It is hastily, carelessly, and inaccurately composed; it is incurious of truth; it disregards authentic sources of information from indolence and indifference; it is equally partial and prejudiced. In form, it is a model of historical art, but not of the art in its highest conception; in substance and in spirit it displays nearly every sin and corruption which a historian should abhor. His writings called forth many antagonists, and, in fact, may be said to have given rise to the Scotch metaphysical school of Common Sense, so called, of which the best exposition, and, at the same time, best answer to Mr. Hume's scepticism, is to be proved by Reid's Complete Works, with Notes by Sir William Hamilton (Edinburgh, 1846, 8vo). Beattie's Essay on Truth, and Oswald's Appeal to Common Sense (Edinb. 1772, 2 vols.), were also written in reply to Hume. See The Philosophical Works of David Hume, including all the Essays, and exhibiting the more important Alterations and Corrections in the successive Editions published by the Author (Edinburgh and Boston, 1854, 4 vols. 8vo); Burton, Life and Letters of David Hume (Edinb. 1847, 2 vols. 8vo); Letters of eminent Persons addressed to David Hume (Edinb. and Lond. 1820, 4to);
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HUMERALE. See Amice.

Humilîati, a monastic order founded about 1134 by some Italian noblemen whom the emperor Henry II had sent from Germany to the Holy Land. They were transformed into canons of St. Benedict, and as such received the sanction of pope Innocent III in 1200. A corresponding order of nuns was afterwards organized in Milan by a lady named Blasoni (whence they were also called Nunnæ of Blasone). Notwithstanding the numerous disputes they occasioned, the canons and nuns did great good as nurses, etc.; their rule was adopted in some ninety-eight convents, but they were finally suppressed by Pius V in 1571. A few convents, without particular attention to dress and observances of the old order, still remain in Italy. The habit of the order consisted in a white dress and cloak, to which a white scapulary was afterwards added; also a small hood. The nuns’ dress was white, with grey under-garments, or vice versa.—Pierer, Universal Lexicon, viii, 609; Fehr, Allgen. Gesch. der Mönchorden (Tübingen 1845), p. 132 sq.; Helyot, Geschicht der Klöster u. Ritterorden, vi, 175 sq.; Asbach, Kirchen-Lexicon, iii, 547; Wetter and Welck, Kirchen-Lexicon, v, 396 sq. (J. H. W.)

Humiliation of Christ (in the language of the older Reformed theologians, the status humiliationis sive exsecrationis), the “humbling of himself” (Phil. ii, 8) to which the son of God submitted in accomplishing the redemption of man’s soul. As to the question whether the Logos, at the incarnation, humbled himself of his divine self-consciousness in order to develop himself in purely human form, see Kenozis. On the question of his descent into Hades, see Heli, I DESCENT INTO. For monographs on this subject, see Vollbedo, Index Programmatum, p. 34; Haeo, Leben Jesu, p. 113. The humiliation of Christ is generally set forth by theologians as shown in his birth, his circumstances, temptation, sufferings, and death. 1. In his birth: he was born of a woman—a sinful woman; though he was without sin (Gal. iv, 4); of a poor woman (Luke ii, 7, 24); in a poor country village (John i, 46); in a stable—an abject place; of a nature subject to infirmities (Heb. ii, 9), hunger, thirst, weariness, pain, etc. 2. In his circumstances: laid in a manger when he was born, lived in obscurity for a long time, probably worked at the trade of a carpenter, had not a place where to lay his head, and was oppressed with poverty while he went about preaching the Gospel. 3. It appeared in his reputation: he was loaded with the most abusive railing and calumny (Lsa. liii), the most false accusations (Matt. xxvi, 59, 67), and the most ignominious ridicule (Psa. xxii, 6); Matt. xxvi, 68; John vii, 50). 4. In his soul: he was often tempted (Matt. iv, 1, etc.); Heb. ii, 17, 18; iv, 15; grieved with the reproaches cast on himself, and with the sins and miseries of others (Heb. xii, 3; Matt. xvi, 19; John xi, 35); was burdened with the distress of his Father’s face, and the fears and impressions of his wrath (Psa. xxi, 1; Luke xxii, 43; Heb. v, 7). 5. In his death: scourged, crowned with thorns, received gall and vinegar to drink, and was crucified between two thieves (Luke xxii, 6; John xix, 13; Mark xv, 24, 25). 6. In his burial: not only was he born in a manger and was laid in a stable, but he was buried in another man’s tomb; for he had no tomb of his own, or family vault to be interred in. (Lsa. liii, 10; etc.; Matt. xxii, 66). The humiliation of Christ was necessary, 1. To execute the purpose of redemption (Luke xxii, 21; John xix, 30; Mark xv, 25, 24; Psa. xi, 6, 7, 8); 2. To fulfill the manifold types and predictions of the Old Testament; 3. To satisfy the broken law of God, and procure eternal redemption for us (Lsa. liii; Heb. ix, 12, 15); 4. To leave us an unspotted pattern of holiness and patience under suffering. —Buck, Thol. Dict. s. v. For a summary of the views of the Reformers and the interpretation of the humiliation of Christ, see Hype, Dogmatik der Evang.-Reform. Kirche (Elberfelder, 1861), Locus xiii. See also Haeo, Evang.-Prot. Dogmatik, § 155, 156; Gill, Body of Divinity, vol. ii; Roberts Hall, Works, vol. iii; Knaap, Theology, §§ 96–97. See also Justin Martyr, Apologia, i, 35 sq.

Humility (Lat. humilis; from humus, the ground), as a Christian grace, is the opposite of “high-mindedness.” It was unknown to the ancient heathen moralists; the word humilitas, with them, indicated baseness of mind.

1. The believer is indeed “exalted” to a higher stage of manhood by his union with Christ, and becomes, moreover, a “king and priest unto God.” But he never “exalts” himself. Whatever he has, he owes (and feels that he owes) not to himself, but to the love of God, his creator; to the grace of Christ, his redeemer; and to the fellowship of the Holy Ghost, his sanctifier. He perceives all his blessings only in God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. If he looks upon himself, he finds that all he is or has is but what has been mercifully vouesed to him: if he looks upon his individual ego, apart from these relationships, he finds in him an absent personality, corrupted by sin and error, and unworthy of such great privileges. If he rejoices in the possession of Christian graces, he rejoices in them as having been given him (1 Cor. iv, 7), and considers at the same time the merits of others (Rom. xii, 3; “For I say, through the grace given unto me, to every man that is among you, not to think of himself more highly than he ought to think; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every man the measure of faith”)

Counsels of the gifts he has received, he yet praises the grace which has given him to him (Rom. xv, 17, 18; “I am not then more worthy of the grace of God than any other: but your dispensation is even as it befits you to me, to the grace of Christ, in those things which pertain to God. For I will not dare to speak of any of those things which Christ hath not wrought by me.” Phil. iv, 11–13: “I have learned, in whatsoever state I am, therewith to be content. I know both how to be abased, and I know how to abound: everywhere and in all things I am instructed both to be full and to be hungry, both to abound and to suffer need. I can do all things through Christ which strengtheneth me.” 2 Cor. iii, 5; “Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think anything as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God.” 1 Cor. iii, 5–7.

“We who are Christians, and of the household of the commandable servants, and unworthy instruments of the grace of God (Luke xvii, 10; “So likewise ye, when ye shall have done all these things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants: we have done that which was our duty to do”). The feeling of obligation of all in the kingdom, and of the shortcomings in the use of those gifts which we cannot even praise ourselves for having well employed, is a mark of humility.

2. “To consider this grace a little more particularly, it may be observed, I. That humility does not oblige a
HUMILITY

man to wrong the truth or himself by entertaining a
more or worse opinion of himself than he deserves.
2. Nor does it oblige a man, right or wrong, to give
everybody else the preference to himself. A wise man
cannot believe himself inferior to the ignorant multi-
tude, nor the virtuous man that he is not so good as
those whose lives are vicious. 3. Nor does it oblige a
man to keep anything for himself with contempt of bod-
ies or considerations: it takes more like affection than humility when a
man says such things in his own displeasure as others
know, or he himself believes, to be false; and it is plain
also that this is often done merely as a bait to catch
the praises of others. Humility consists, 1. In not-at-
tending to praise any excellence of another which
we have not. 2. In not overrating anything we do. 3. In
not taking an immoderate delight in ourselves. 4. In
not assuming more of the praise of a quality or action
than belongs to us. 5. In an inward sense of our many
imperfections and sins. 6. In ascribing all we have and
are to the grace of God. True humility will express itself,
1. By the modesty of our appearance; the hum-
ble man will consider his age, abilities, character, func-
tion, etc., and act accordingly; 2. By the modesty of our
purposes: we shall not aim at anything above our
strength, but shall aim at a good to a great name. 3. It will
express itself by the modesty of our conversation and
behavior: we shall not be loquacious, obstinate, forward,
equivocal, discontented, or ambitious. The advantages of
humidity are numerous: 1. It is well-pleasing to God
(1 Pet. iii, 4). 2. It has great influence on us in the
performance of all our other duties, prudence, con-
science, etc. 3. It indicates that more grace shall be
given (James iv, 6; Ps. lxxv, 9). 4. It preserves
the soul in great tranquillity and contentment (Ps. clxx, 32,
38). 5. It makes us patient and resigned under afflic-
tions (Job i, 22). 6. It enables us to exercise modera-
tion in everything, to those who have this excellent spirit
we should remember, 1. The example of Christ (Phil. ii,
6, 7, 8); 2. That heaven is a place of humility (Rev. v,
8); 3. That our sins are numerous, and deserve the
greatest punishment (Lam. iii, 39); 4. That humility
is the way to honor (Prov. xvi, 18); 5. That the great-
est promises of good are made to the humble (Isa. lii,
15; lvi, 2; 1 Pet. v, 5; Ps. cxxvii, 6; Matt. v, 5) (Buck,
Theol. Dict. s. v.). "It has been deemed a great para-
dox in Christianity that it makes humility the avenue
to glory. Yet what other avenue is there to wisdom,
or even to knowledge? Would you pluck precious
ture from the plant and leave it to wither and drop
down and be lost to you? Everywhere the pearl of great price lies bedded in a
shell which has no form or comeliness. It is so in physical
science. Bacon has declared it, Natura non nisi pavem-
do vincitur; and the triumphs of science since his days have proved how willing Nature is to be conquered by
those who will obey her. It is so in moral speculation.
Wordsworth has told us the law of his own mind, the
fulfilment of which has enabled him to reveal a new
world of poetry: Wisdom is ofttimes nearer when we
stoop than when we soar. That it is so likewise in
religion we are satisfied by the experience of all
the world. Except ye become as little children, ye shall not enter into
the kingdom of heaven. Moreover, the whole intercourse
between man and man may be, if we look at it
closely, to be guided and regulated by the same per-
vading principle; and that it ought to be so is general-
ly considered as a necessary and inevitable conse-
quence. As I have often heard said by him, who, among all the
persons I have conversed with to the edification of my
understanding, had the keenest practical insight into
human nature, and best knew the art of controlling and
governing men, and winning them over to their good—
the moment any benefit is satisfied with himself, every-
body else becomes dissatisfied with him; whenever
a person thinks much of himself, all other people give
over thinking about him. Thus it is not alone in the
paradise that he who takes the highest room is turned
down with shame to the lowest, while he who sits
down in the lowest room is bid to go up higher." See
Hare, Guise on Truth, i, 243; Kroehl, Handwörterbuch
der N. Test., s. v. Demuth; Grove, Moral Philosophie, ii,
286; Whately, Dangers to Christian Faith, p. 88; Con-
 yebaro, Sermons, p. 141.

Humphrey, Lawrence, an English Protestant di-
vine and philologist, was born at Newport—Pagnell,
Buckinghamshire, about 1527. He was educated at
Cambridges, and entered himself especially to
the classics. After becoming fellow of Magdalen
College, Oxford, and professor of Greek in the
university, he entered the Church. In 1555 he left England in
consequence of the persecutions to which Protestants were
subject, and remained a while in Zurich. After the death of queen Mary he returned home, and resumed
his professorship. He became successively professor
of theology at Queen's College in 1560, president of
Magdalen College, Oxford, in 1561, dean of Glouceces-
ter in 1570, and dean of Winchester in 1580. He died
February 1, 1589. He was a man of conciliatory man-
ers, and of a moderate and learning mind; of great purity
of character, moderate and conscientious, and to this
he owed his last preferments. He was a good linguist,
and a very skilful controversialist. He wrote Epistola de
Graciar literar et Honoris etione et invocatione (printed in
the first part of Junius's Correspondence, Basle, 1566, fol.):
—De reformatione et reformations, de Regime
Regum (Basle, 1559, 8vo) —Obadias Propheta,
Hebreice et Latina, et Philo "De Dide," Grace et La-
tine, in the time of the preceding treatise :-Optimatas,
voce de nobilitate ejusque antiqua origine, natura, officio,
disciplina (Basle, 1661, 4to), with a Latin translation of
Philo's treatise De Nobilitate: —Joanis Justi, ejusque
Solabionem, Vita et Mora (London, 1575, 4to) —Jenu-
listi prius para, voce priscus Romana curia contra
repulsicas et principes (Lond. 1582, 8vo) —Jenuvisti
para secunda, Purissim Papiami seu de doctrina Jesu-
cestis aliquot rationibus ad Elia, Campano zooecepta et
Unario Durose deorum Confutatio (London, 1584, 4vo,
etc. See Wood, Athenae Oeconomicae (vol. i): Chalmers,
Gen. Bieg. Dictionary ; Chauffeiple, Dict. Hist.; Hoefer,
Nuur. Evg. Generale, xxx, 543; Allibone, Dict. of Au-
thors, i, 918; Neal, History of the Puritans (see Index);
Hook, Evg. and Poets, 477 sqq. (J. N. P.)

Hung 'tah (Heb. Ḥānaḵ, Ḥū Ḥū, prob. from the
Syri. fons, otherwise the name of the city in Aqüaquis
v. Ḫēqaq and Xaqawri; Vulg. Amphitma), a town
in the mountains of Judah, mentioned between Aaphkah and
Hebron (Josch. xv, 54), apparently in the district
lying immediately west of Hebron (Keil, Comment. ad
loc. It is not mentioned by any other ancient writer
except Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s. v. Ḫayqarri;
Onomast. s. v. Ḫayqarri; Amm.), there is some re-
ssemblance between the name and that of Klimath (Kh-
ūdū), one of the places added in the Sept. of the
text to the list in the Hebrew text of 1 Sam. xxi, 27-81.
It possibly corresponds with the ruined site marked as
Sedamine (or Remet el-Ànëk) on Vau de Veyde's Map at 11
miles north of Hebron, just west of the Jerusalem road.

Hundred (as a division of the Hcb. people).

Hungeric. See VANDASYA.

Hungarian Confession (Confesio Hungarica), the
Confession of Faith of the Reformed Church in
Hungary. It was drawn up in 1557 and 1558 by
the Synod of Czengor (hence also called Confesio Czengeri-
ana), and published in 1570 in Debrecin. It is strong-
ly Calvinistic in principle, and in the doctrine of the Lord's
Supper, and it was on that account not adopted by the
Reformed churches of Poland. (A. J. S.)

Hungary, a kingdom in Eastern Europe, which has
for several centuries been united with the empire of
Austria. It has 92,839 square miles, and its population
was, according to the census of 1867, 9,900,785.
Connected with it, as dependencies of the crown of Hungary,
are Transylvania (q.v.), Croatia, and Slavonia. This whole division, which is sometimes called the Transleithanian, division of the empire, sometimes simply Hungary, has 124,000 square miles, and, according to the official census of 1857, 15,768,813 inhabitants. According to the official census of Dec. 81, 1869, the total population in Hungary, subject to the crown amounted to 15,429,236, of which Hungary proper had about 11,109,000; Transylvania, 2,109,000; Croatia and Slavonia, 1,015,000; the Military Frontier, 1,195,000.

1. History.—The Hungarians, a Scythian tribe, were, as it seems, akin to and allies of the Chazars, who in the first half of the Christian era had left their original seats, the plateaus of Central Asia, and had founded in the course of time a powerful empire on the Tauric peninsula. At the close of the 9th century the Hungarians (Magyars) were living on the north-eastern frontier of this empire, which they defended under their own chief against the powerful neighboring nations. After the destruction of this empire, the Magyars, who were unable to resist singly the onset of other tribes, crossed the Dnieper, and settled (884) near the mouth of the Danube, between the Rivers Buh and Szereth. The imperial town of their new home was called by Leo the Wise, who called the bravery of his new neighbors to his aid against Simeon, the chief of the Bulgarians. The call was cheerfully accepted by Arpad, the son of the Magyar duke Almos. Simeon was conquered, and his country laid waste. The renown of the victory brought Arpad to a court, where the king Andrew, who had been suzerain for the year, asked him for aid against Savatopluck, the grand prince of Moravia. Again they accepted the invitation, entered Upper Pannonia, which then belonged to the Moravian empire, and obtained a complete victory; after that they returned to their homes. These, however, had in the meanwhile been invaded and terrorized by Hungarians, and the Bulgarians therefore concluded to settle permanently in Pannonia, from which they had just returned as victors. The occupation of the country began in 894; it was completed in 900. The country, divided among seven tribes and 168 families, was converted into a military state. Their bravery and their renown caused many people of the districts which they had traversed, and many soldiers of foreign countries, to join them. Thus strengthened, they were able to undertake expeditions as far as the Nogai, where they were captured by the Franks in 899 and escaped to the Black Sea. But repeated defeats by the kings and emperors of Germany put a stop to their conquests and gave a different direction to their energies. The frontiers of their new country were more definitely marked and fortified, and many more foreign colonists drawn into the country.

The large number of Christian slaves, the connection with the emperors of Constantinople, but in particular the efforts of duke Geya (972-997), and of his Christian wife Sarolta (Caroline), gradually prepared the introduction of Christianity. Geya made peace with all his neighbors, and at the council which he assembled recommended a hospitable reception of foreign visitors and the introduction of Christianity. Geya himself was baptized by bishop Pilgrim of Passau, who, even during the reign of Tassony, the father of Geya, had shown a great interest in the conversion of Hungary. Besides him, the emperor Otto I and bishop Adalbert of Prague showed a great zeal for the Christianization of the Magyars. Thus the Roman Catholic Church obtained the ascendancy over the few missions which under former chiefs had been established by missionaries of other churches. Many of the Magyars, as at Bardejov, 844, at Strakonitz, 847, at Gran, Volk, the son of Geya, who received the name of Stephen. Immediately after his accession to the throne, Stephen made it the first object of his rule to secure the complete victory of Christianity; nor did he hesitate for this end to employ force. He issued at once an order that all Magyars must receive baptism, and that all Christian slaves must be set free. This decree filled those Magyars who were opponents of Christianity with the utmost indignation against the young king and against the Germans who surrounded him. Kuppa, a relative of Stephen and duke of the Szegecs, put himself at the head of the malcontents, but at Vasvar, on May 21, 997, was totally defeated and killed; and henceforth all accorded submission to the Christianization of Hungary ceased. Stephen himself traversed the country in every direction, encouraging the people to become Christians, and threatening with severe punishments all who would refuse to obey this order. He established schools in his state. An settlers were made as teachers, established richly-endowed bishoprics, introduced the tithe, and made the prelates the first estate of the empire. For these labors Stephen received from pope Sylvester II a crown, which has since then constituted the upper part of the sacra regni Hungariae cross, while its lower part consists of the crown which the Greek emperor Manuel Dukas gave to Geya. With this crown Stephen received from the pope a patriarchal cross and the title of apostolic king. Thus Hungary became a kingdom, the chief supports of which, according to the Constitution given by Stephen, were to be the church and the nobility. The newly enfranchised Hungarians enlarged the privileges of the clergy, who thus, in the course of time, became richer than in any other European country. After the death of Stephen several more efforts were made by the native pagan party to displace both Christianity and the German party at the head of the state. The king Andrew II (1202-68) a favorable Convert. In 1237 Hungary fell for the first time to the house of Hapsburg. In 1526 the line of independent kings of Hungary became extinct by the death of king Louis II. A large portion of Hungary was subjugated by the Turks, and remained a Turkish province for more than a century; the remainder was long rent by civil wars, which ended in connecting the country permanently with the crown of Hapsburg.

When the first knowledge of the Reformation reached Hungary, the Diet of 1529 issued a cruel decree that the Lutherans and all favorers of Lutheranism should be captured and put in chains to be sent to the Black Sea. But repeated defeats by the kings and emperors of Germany put a stop to their conquests and gave a different direction to their energies. The frontiers of their new country were more definitely marked and fortified, and many more foreign colonists drawn into the country.

The large number of Christian slaves, the connection with the emperors of Constantinople, but in particular the efforts of duke Geya (972-997), and of his Christian wife Sarolta (Caroline), gradually prepared the introduction of Christianity. Geya made peace with all his neighbors, and at the council which he assembled recommended a hospitable reception of foreign visitors and the introduction of Christianity. Geya himself was baptized by bishop Pilgrim of Passau, who, even during the reign of Tassony, the father of Geya, had shown a great interest in the conversion of Hungary. Besides him, the emperor Otto I and bishop Adalbert of Prague showed a great zeal for the Christianization of the Magyars. Thus the Roman Catholic Church obtained the ascendancy over the few missions which under former chiefs had been established by missionaries of other churches. Many of the Magyars, as at Bardejov, 844, at Strakonitz, 847, at Gran, Volk, the son of Geya, who received the name of Stephen. Immediately after his accession to the throne, Stephen made it the first object of his rule to secure the complete victory of Christianity; nor did he hesitate for this end to employ force. He issued at once an order that all Magyars must receive baptism, and that all Christian slaves must be set free. This decree filled those Magyars who were opponents of Christianity with the utmost indignation against the young king and against the Germans who surrounded him. Kuppa, a relative of Stephen and duke of the Szegecs, put himself at the head of the malcontents, but at Vasvar, on May 21, 997, was totally defeated and killed; and henceforth all accorded submission to the Christianization of Hungary ceased. Stephen himself traversed the country in every direction, encouraging the people to become Christians, and threatening with severe punishments all who would refuse to obey this order. He established schools in his state. An settlers were made as teachers, established richly-endowed bishoprics, introduced the tithe, and made the prelates the first estate of the empire. For these labors Stephen received from pope Sylvester II a crown, which has since then constituted the upper part of the sacra regni Hungariae cross, while its lower part consists of the crown which the Greek emperor Manuel Dukas gave to Geya. With this crown Stephen received from the pope a patriarchal cross and the title of apostolic king. Thus Hungary became a kingdom, the chief supports of which, according to the Constitution given by Stephen, were to be the church and the nobility. The newly enfranchised Hungarians enlarged the privileges of the clergy, who thus, in the course of time, became richer than in any other European country. After the death of Stephen several more efforts were made by the native pagan party to displace both Christianity and the German party at the head of the state. The king Andrew II (1202-68) a favorable Convert. In 1237 Hungary fell for the first time to the house of Hapsburg. In 1526 the line of independent kings of Hungary became extinct by the death of king Louis II. A large portion of Hungary was subjugated by the Turks, and remained a Turkish province for more than a century; the remainder was long rent by civil wars, which ended in connecting the country permanently with the crown of Hapsburg.
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ance of Protestant worship induced Charles VI (king of Hungary, Charles III) to appoint a royal commission, on the recommendation of which it was decreed that the evangelical preachers should be superintended by Catholic archdeacons; that the ministerial functions of the preachers of the two Protestant Confessions must be limited to those churches (at most two in each comitatet) which had petitioned the Diet of 1711, and that the Diet, in 1816, expressly authorized the Protestants to hold divine service; that the Protestants, when elected to office, must take their oaths with an invocation of the blessed Virgin and all the saints; and that all Protestants must take part in the celebration of the Catholic feast of Corpus Christi. Protestant processions had the permission of a royal chancellery and stadtholdership, which in the name of the sovereign had to promulgate and execute the imperial laws, was unfavorable to the Protestants, as a majority of the councillors were taken from the ranks of the bishops, magnates, and noblemen. Thus the Protestants were assailed by this board in every possible way. Conversions from Catholicism to Protestantism were strictly forbidden; Catholics were forbidden to attend a Protestant school, and the Protestant youth to study at foreign schools; members of one Protestant sect had no right to visit the divine service of the other; Protestant books were submitted to Protestant censors, their trials of divorce to Catholic judges. Maria Theresa expressed personal sympathy with the oppressed condition of Protestants, but pretended to be unable to do anything for them on royal decree which had granted them religious freedom. An essential amelioration in the condition of Protestants was effected under Joseph II, who, in 1781, by the edict of toleration, granted to all the Protestants of his dominions freedom of conscience and of religion, and the right of public worship. Now a new era in the history of Protestantism began. A large number of new churches and schools were established, hundreds of clergy were called. Protestants became eligible to every office; the religious oath was abolished; the Protestant superintendents were allowed to visit the churches, and persons living in mixed marriages to bring up their children in the evangelical faith, as well as to select for them any school they chose; the press was to be free and unfettered. Leopold II also showed a firm disposition to be just toward the Protestants. The Diet of 1791 was petitioned by the Protestants to sanction the royal decree which had granted them religious freedom. Notwithstanding a violent opposition on the part of many of these bishops, the diet granted the request, chiefly moved by the eloquent plea of the Catholic count Aloysius Batti yáni. Accordingly, the 26th article of the law of 1791 provides that the Protestants of both Confessions shall enjoy the free exercise of their religion; that they shall not be forced to attend processions, masses, or other ceremonies; that in ecclesiastical affairs they shall be subordinate only to their own ecclesiastical superiors; that they may build churches and schools, elect preachers and teachers; that they shall not have to contribute to the building of Catholic churches and schools. The Protestants at once hastened to perfect their ecclesiastical constitution. In the same year (1791), a synod of both the Protestant churches was held at Ofen and Pest, at which long-pending controversies between the clergy and prominent laymen were settled, and the establishments of a few evangelical clergymen, as well as that of the Catholic clergy and the early death of the sovereign, prevented the resolutions of this diet from receiving the royal sanction. During the reign of Francis I the rights of the Protestants were often encroached upon, especially in the case of mixed marriages. The Diet of 1843 to 1844 interfered, however, in favor of the Protestants, and enlarged, in its provisions concerning mixed marriages and the right of joining the Protestant Church, the law of 1791. The fulness of equal rights was finally secured to Protestants by a law of 1848. In consequence of the failure of the Hungarian War of Independence in 1848 and 1849, these rights were, however, for a time suspended. The imperial commander, baron Haynau, himself a Protestant, abolished the offices of general inspector and the district inspectors for the Church of the Augsburg Confession, and that of curators for the Church of the Helvetic Confession. The hangman's noose was administered not only after the holding of "senioral conventions" allowed when attended by an imperial commissioner. After repeated petitions and representations, the minister of public worship and instruction, on August 21, 1856, laid the draft of a law on the reorganization of the Constitution of the Church on the basis of the establishment of a single Protestant university in the empire. The latter declined this draft, and unani- mously asked for the convocation of the General Synod. On September 1, 1859, an imperial patent was published, which undertook, on the ground of the law of 1791, to give to the Protestant churches a new Constitution. Nearly the entire evangelical Church of both Confessions protested against the legality of this imperial patent, claiming for the Church the right to make herself the necessary changes in her Constitution on the legal basis of the law of 1791. Only a few congregations of the Lutheran Slovaks, numbering together about 54 congregations, accepted the patent. All the efforts to break the opposition of the Protestants failed; and when, in 1867, the Austrian government concluded to make peace with Hungary, the patent of 1859, and all the decrees accompanying it, were repealed. The diet and the churches of the Union took the stand that they should be at liberty to rearrange their Church matters in a constitutional way. At the General Convention of the Confession of Augsburg, which was held in Pest in September, the reunion of the Lutheran Slovaks who had accepted the patent with the remainder of the Church was consummated. In December, 1867, a General Convention of the two Protestant churches was held under the presidency of baron Nicholas Vay, in order to acquit the Hungarian Diet with the wishes and opinion of the churches concerning religious and school questions. The Convention resolved, 1, that the affairs of the Protestants be regulated by general laws, and not by special laws for each of the two denominations; 2, that no privileges be granted to any on account of religion; 3, that the equality pronounced in the 26th article of the law of 1848 extend to all denominations; 4, that the Church with regard to the state be placed only under the right of supreme inspection and of protection. Other liberal resolutions were adopted by this and by a later Convention respecting a change of religion, mixed marriages, divorces, schools, and endowment. The majority of the Diet showed itself just toward the Protestants, and their chief demands were fulfilled. The reconciliation which took place in 1867 between the people of Hungary and the emperor of Austria gave to Hungary a greater independence than it had ever enjoyed before. A special ministry was appointed for the countries of the Hungary crown, which also December, 1867, a General Convention of the Diet, and retained only a few points of administration in common with the remainder of the monarchy. One of the most important reforms, introduced into Hungary in consequence of the new Constitution, was the declaration of the autonomy of all the religious recognized in Hungary, and the independence of the Protestant decision in protest of affairs, which had formerly been connected with the Hungarian crown, to elective assemblies representing the several religious denominations. The first assemblies of these churches, which had thus far been without them, were convoked by the government; they fixed the most of ecclesiastical questions. The Diet of 1848 to 1844 interfered, however, in favor of the Protestants, and enlarged, in its provisions concerning mixed marriages and the right of joining the Protestant Church, the law of 1791. The fulness of equal rights was finally secured to Protestants by a law of 1848. In
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Hungary has a national university at Pesth, 48 Catholic and 89 Protestant gymnasia. The number of elementary schools amounted (1864) in Hungary to 11,452, in Transylvania to 1738, in Croatia and Slavonia to 490, in the Military Frontier to 907. A large number of communities were in 1869 still without a school. There are also five normal schools at Pesth, Szegedin, Neuhäusel, Miskolcz, and Grosskanizsa. — Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, ii. 626.

Hunnius, Egidius, an eminent German Lutheran theologian, was born at Wittenberg, Dec. 21, 1550, and studied theology at Tubingen, where he afterwards became first tutor, and deacon in 1574. In 1576 he went to Marburg as professor and preacher. Here his strict adherence to the doctrine of ubiquity in the Eucharist led to the excommunication of the_GAP_ by the synod, and to the liquidation of the Episcopacy. In 1587 he was expelled, and in 1592, he became professor at the University of Wittenberg, where he opposed the moderate views of Melanchthon. In 1594 he accompanied the duke Frederick William to the Imperial Diet at Regensburg, where his influence opposed the union of the different evangelical free cities. In 1595 he sustained a sharp controversy with Samuel Huber (q.v.) on the doctrines of election and predestination, and in 1602, at the Conference of Ratisbon, he was one of the principal opponents of the Jesuits Gretzer and Tanner. He died April 4, 1602, in Marburg, where his principal works in German are: De homine, De Veritate, De Personae Christi (1577, 1609); also in Latin, De persona Christi (1585). — Calvisius, Literaturhistorisch (1599); — Antipa-rus (1594 and 1599) — Josephus, a drama (1597). His works in Latin have been collected and published by Garchius (Wittenberg, 1607-9, 5 vols. folio). See Hutter, Lebenbeschreibung (1608); Alami, Vite Theologorum; Ersch und Gruber, Enzyklopädie: Hoefer, Nouv. Fio., Générale, xxv, 554; Herzog, Real-Enzyklopädie, vi, 316 sqq.; Kurtz, Gesch, ii, 114; Bayle, Hist. Dict., iii, 584 sqq.

Hunnius, Nikolaus, son of Egidius Hunnius, was born at Marburg July 11, 1585. He studied philosophy, philosophy, and theology at Wittenberg, where he began lectures on theology and philosophy in 1609. In 1612 he went as superintendent to Eilenburg, and in 1617 returned to Wittenberg as pfessor, in the place of Hutter (qr.v.). In 1623 he became head pastor of the Church of Mary at Lübeck, and superintendent of the Church in the same city the following year. He died April 2, 1632, at Lübeck, and he fixed in his attachment to the Lutheran orthodoxy as in his learning and controversial powers. He devised the plan of a Collegium Irrimium, which was called, after him, "Collegium Hunniulanum," and which was to form a supreme tribunal in all theological disputes. He was also distinguished as an able opponent of Popery. His principal works are, "Ministerii Lutherani divini adaequatio le-
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Hunolt, Franz, a distinguished Roman Catholic poet, who was born in the dukedom of Nassau, towards the close of the 17th century. He was a member of the Jesuit order, and his sermons (Cologne, 1737, 6 vols. fol., and often) gave him rank as one of the best preachers of the 18th century. He died at Trier in 1746. — Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. xii, 606.

Huns (Latin Huni), a nation of Asiatic origin, and in all likelihood of Mongolian or Tartar stock, therefore akin to the Persians, and the Turks, were, according to De Guignes (Histoire des Huns), whose theory was accepted by Gibbon, and is now entertained by all competent critics, lineal descendants from the Hong-nom nation, “whose ancient seat was an extensive but barren tract of country immedi.ately beyond the Caspian Sea and the great city of the year b.c. 200 these people overran the Chinese empire, defeated the Chinese armies in numerous engage.ments, and even drove the emperor Kao-ti himself to an ignominious capitulation and treaty. During the reign of Yoo-ti (b.c. 141-97) their power was very much broken. Eventually they separated into two dis. tant camps, one of which, amounting to about 60,000 families, went southwards, while the other endeavored to maintain itself in its original seat. This, however, it was very difficult for them to do; and eventually the most warlike and enterprising went west and north-west in search of new homes. Of those that went north-west, a large number established themselves for a while on the banks of the Volga.” About the earlier part of the 4th century they crossed this river, and advanced into the territories of the Alani, a pastoral people dwell.ing between the Volga and the Caspian Sea, and the incursion was resisted with much bravery and some effect, until at length a bloody and decisive battle was fought on the banks of the Don, in which the Alan king was slain, and his army utterly routed, and the vast majority of the survivors agreed to join the invaders. They next entered the steppe beyond, and the aged Huns, who claimed as his dominions the land situated between the Baltic and the Euxine, and then his successor With.urm, who they slew in battle. The Goths still re.maining placed themselves under the protection of the emperor Valens, who in 376 gave permission to a great number of them to cross the Danube, and settle in the countries on the other side as auxiliaries to the Roman arms against further invasion. The Huns thus became the occupants of all the old territories of the Goths; and when these, not long afterwards, revolted against Va.len.s, the Huns also crossed the Danube, and joined their arms to those of the Goths in hostilities against the Ro.man empire. In the wars that followed, the Huns were less conspicuous than the Goths, their former enemies. In the 5th century they were strengthened by fresh hordes of their brethren, and they determined to gain further territory, so that the Goths, under their king Attila (q. v.), were they even strong enough to receive an annual tribute from the Romans to secure their empire against external injury. With Attila’s death, however, in 454, their power was totally bro.ken. A few feeble sovereigns succeeded him, but they were unable to form lasting alliances or to make any pro.gress against the Goths, and a number of nations that had owned the firm sway of Attila, and the Huns never regained their power. Many of them took service in the armies of the Romans, and others again joined fresh hordes of invaders from the north and east, which were undoubtedly tribes related to them, espe.cially the Avaras, whom they joined in great numbers, and hence perhaps the reason why, at this period of their history, they are found only on the Danubian frontier. They now made themselves masters of the country known by us as Lower Austria. But the Slaves (Slava.lovians?) in Bohemia and Moravia regained their ter.ritory in the 5th century, and many of the Hunnavoraces were made slaves, and were thus brought to a knowl.edge of the language and their inclinations; however, they led them to oppose most fiercely all the inroads of Christiani.ty, and they transformed Christian churches into heathen temples wherever they were successful in gaining territory. About 791 Charlemagne waged war against the Avaras, as the Huns were then called; in which many of them were slain, and some few weak tribes remained. About the year 799 they were finally conquer.ered, and their power broken. Charles himself regarded this war as a sort of crusade or holy war, and sent to the pope and the Church all the tribute paid him by the conquered Avaras, and the inhabitants of the territories that were once one of their princes, called Tudem, who sent a legation to Charlemagne in 795, with the declaration that he would become tributary to him and accept the Christian religion. He was baptized at Aix-la-Cha.pelle in 796, but shortly after his return to his tribe he was slain by the Avaras. The incursion of the Huns, with particular attention to the conversion of the Huns, in whose behalf Alcuin (q. v.) also was greatly interested. By peopling the territory assigned to them with Ger.mans, especially Bavarians, and by founding several monasteries and cathedrals, the subsequent Christian princes of Hungary, for two or three generations, until they became amalgamated with the Germans. The Huns are said to have been of a dark complexion, almost black; deformed in their appearance, of uncouth gesture, and shrill voice. The ancient descriptions unmistakably ally them to the Tartars. “They were distin.guished from the rest of the human species by their broad shoulders, flat noses, and small black eyes deeply buried in the head; and, as they were almost destitute of beards, they never enjoyed either the many graces of youth or the venerable aspect of age. A fabulous origin was ascribed to the Huns; the incursions of the Huns and the witches of Scythia, who, for their soul and deadly prac.tices, had been driven from society, had copulated in the desert with infernal spirits, and that the Huns were the offspring of this execrable conjuction” (Gibbon). See Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. v, 385 sq.; Chambers, Cyclop. vol. ix, 318; Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire (Milman’s ed.), vol. vi (see Index). (J. H. W.)

Hunt, Aaron, an early Methodist Episcopal min.ister, was born of Episcopal parents at Eastchester, N. Y., March 28, 1768, and emigrated to New York City at seventeen. Here he was converted in 1789, and licensed to preach in 1790. He was first employed as assistant to Dr. Wm. Phoebus on the Long Island Circuit. In 1791 he entered the New-York Conference, and was sent to Fairfield Circuit. In a few years his labors were extended all through the state of Connecticut, on the east as far as Norfolk. He was a memorable figure in the church that name, and into adjoining states, exploring new ground, and contending with opposition and difficulties common to Methodist ministers of those times. After this we find him laboring on various circuits in the state and city of New York, having charge of the whole work in that state as far as the sixty-seventh degree of the chur.ch sacerdotal, thirty-seven of which he was an effective laborer in the regular itinerant work; and whether located, super.numerary, or superannuated, he continued to labor and preach as he had opportunity, and health would permit. He was married at New York, April 18, 1808. — See Minutes of Conferences, vii, 154; Stevens, Memorials of Methodism.
Hunt, Absalom, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Virginia Dec. 4, 1773, and emigrated when a boy to East Tennessee, and later removed to Fleming Co., Kentucky. He was licensed as a local preacher about 1793. In 1815 he joined the Kentucky Conference, and in 1819 was transferred to the Liberty Circuit. He was next appointed to the Lexington Circuit, and two years afterwards successively to the Hindstone, Lime-stone, Mt. Sterling, and Fleming Circuits. In 1823 he was superannuated, but returned at the next session of the Conference, and was sent to the Liberty Circuit. From 1825–28 he served as supernumerary at Paris, Lexington, and Hindstone, and then returned to the superannuated list, finding his health inadequate to the active work of the ministry. He died February 21, 1841. Hunt was a "natural orator," and, "though comparatively illiterate and unpolished, such was his native good sense, his deep acquaintance with the human heart, his quick perception of the characters of men, and the unaffected kindness of his manners, that he was not only generally popular as a preacher, but was often the admired favorite with the learned and the refined."—Methodist Monticell, 1878, Bedford, Methodist in Kentucky, ii, 346 sq. (J. H. W.)

Hunt, Christopher, a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born at Tarrytown, N.Y., near the opening of our century; graduated at Rutgers College in 1827, and at New Brunswick Theological Seminary in 1830. He was settled at Clarkstown, N.Y., 1830–2; at New York, 1832–3, and at Morristown, N.J., 1833–9. Bereft of both parents when very young, he made his home an orphan asylum, where Christian kindness and spiritual training were blessed to him. He was an earnest, devoted preacher, a man of comprehensive views, and well qualified by natural endowments, as well as by divine grace, for the large and important charge in which he ended his ministry. His memory is ardently cherished among the churches which he served. He fell in the prime of life, a victim of pulmonary disease. His last words were, "All is well."—Corwin's Manual of the Reformed Dutch Church, p. 119. (W. J. R. T.)

Hunt, Jeremiah, D.D., a learned English dissent- er, was born in London June 11, 1678. He studied first in that city under Mr. Thomas Rowe, and afterwards at Edinburgh and Leyden. On his return to England he preached at Tunsted, near Norwich. He received the degree of D.D. from the University of Edinburgh in 1707, and died Sept. 5, 1744. Dr. Latrobe prepared his funeral sermon, which contained a biographical sketch. Dr. Benson edited Hunt's sermons, which are elaborate and exact compositions, but not interesting. His principal works are An Essay towards explaining the History and Revelations of Scripture in their several Periods, pt. i; to which is added a Dissection on the Fall of Man (Lond. 1731, 8vo);—Sermons and Tracts (Lond. 1748, 4 vols. 8vo).—Darling, Cyclopædia Bibliographica, i, 1580.

Hunt, John, a Congregational minister, was born at Northampton Nov. 20, 1744, and was educated at Harvard (class of 1764). From 1765–69 he taught a grammar school at his native place. While in this position he was engaged in the study of law. In his last years of teaching, he was licensed to preach in 1769. Only two years later he was called to the old South Church, Boston, as associate of the Rev. John Becon (q. v.). In 1775, while on a visit to his home, he died (Dec. 20). Though young even when he died, Hunt had already acquired a great reputation as a ready speaker and a superior thinker. He published two of his sermons (1771).—Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pul-pit, 1, 686 sq.

Hunt, John, a Wesleyan missionary to the Fiji Islands, and a model of Christian excellence, was born at Hykeham Moor, near Lincoln, England, June 18, 1812. His mother was a minister in the church and he was brought up to assist his father on a farm, over which he was bailiff or overseer. When seventeen years old he was converted, and joined the Wesleyan society, to whose service he resolved to devote all his powers. He began at once to preach, and by close application acquired considerable knowledge. In 1838 he received the recommendation from a Quarterly Meeting to join Conference, and in 1842 he was transferred to the theological institution at Hoxton. In 1838, when it became the task of the Missionary Committee at London to determine the future course of Hunt, the wants of Fiji seemed to press upon them, and they overruled the original design of sending him to Africa. He was ordained March 27, and sailed, with his lately-wedded wife, Apr. 29, 1839, and they entered on their work at Rewa Jan. 3, 1839.

Hunt, Robert, a very pious and devoted clergyman of the Church of England, and one of the petitioners for the charter granted by king James I to the "London Company" April 10, 1606, emigrated for this country as preacher of the first colony to Virginia Dec. 19, 1606. Their time is not known, neither is it definitely known whether he spent the remainder of his life in Virginia, though this is generally supposed to have been the case, nor the time of his death at all ascertained. During his connection with the colony their church was burned, and with it Mr. Hunt's library, but he lived to see the last church rebuilt (1608).—Hawks, Rise and Progress of the Prot. Episc. Ch. in Va. p. 17 sq.

Hunt, Thomas, D.D., a distinguished English Hebraist, was born in 1696. He studied at the University of Oxford, where he took the degree of M.A. in 1721. He was one of the first fellows of Hertford College, and applied himself especially to philosophical researches in the Q. T. He is said to have assisted William in publishing the London Polyglot. In 1728 he was called to the chair of Arabic founded by Laud. In 1747 he became professor of Hebrew at Oxford; in 1740 he was made fellow of the Royal Society of London, and received the degree of D.D. in 1754. He died at Oxford Oct. 31, 1774. He translated: De Beneficiis, (Oxford, 1724, 4to); De antiquitate, elegantia et utilitate Linguae Arabicae (Oxford, 1739, 4to); De Um Diaceto- rum Orientalium, etc. (Oxford, 1748);—Observations on several Passages of the Book of Proverbs, with two Sermons (Oxford, 1740). He was a very industrious and a most valuable work, published after the author's death, under the care of Kennicott. (J. N. P.)

Hunter. See HUNTING.
Hunter, Henry, D.D., a Scotch Presbyterian divine, born at Culross, Fife, in 1741, was educated at the University of Edinburgh. In 1766 he became minister of South Leith, and in 1771 minister of the Scotch Church, London Wall, London. He died at Bristol Hot Wells, October 27, 1802. Hunter was a man of learning, and an eloquent writer. His principal works are Sermons, collected and republished in their respective order, etc. (Lond. 1785, 2 vols. 8vo) — Sacred Biography, or the History of the Patriarchs: being a course of lectures delivered at the Scotch Church, London Wall (6th ed. Lond. 1867, 5 vols. 8vo). This work has often been reprinted both in England and America, and has had great popularity. It is, to a large extent, an unacknowledged translation from Saurin's Discours Historiques. Hunter edited several other French books, and excelled in this line of labor. After his death appeared a collection of his Sermons and other Pieces, with a Sketch of his Life and Writings (Lond. 1864, 2 vols. 8vo). See Jones, Christian Biography, s. v.; Darling, Cyclopedia Bibliographica, i, 1582; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 922.

Hunter, Humphrey, a Presbyterian minister and patriot, was born near Londonderry, Ireland, May 14, 1755. His widowed mother came to this country when Humphrey was only four years old. During the Revolution he served our nation in the struggle for independence, first as a private, and later, for a short time, as lieutenant, against the Cherokee Indians. He finally decided to prepare himself for a literary career, and to this end pursued a course of study at the Queen's Museum, afterwards called Liberty Hall Academy, at Charlestown, S.C. After the surrender of Charleston he re-enlisted, and was taken prisoner at the battle of Camden. He succeeded in making his escape from the enemy, and took a gallant part in the battle at Eutaw Springs. After this he resumed his studies at Mount Zion College, Minnaborough, S. C., and graduated in 1877. Two years later he was ordained for the ministry, and in 1880 he was installed as pastor over the Steele Creek Church, N.C., where he remained until his death, Aug. 21, 1827. (J. H. W.)

Royal Lion-hunt. From the Assyrian Monuments.

Hunting (Not Gr. ἄγων). The pursuit and capture of beasts of the field was one of the first means of sustenance to which the human race had recourse. In process of time, however, when civilization had made some progress, when cities were built and lands cultivated, hunting was carried on not so much for the food which it brought as for the recreation it gave and its conducive to health. Hunting has always borne somewhat of a regal character, and in Persia immense parks (σαράντα) were reserved for the preservation of game and the preservation of the chase. The monarch himself led the way to the sport, not only in these preserves, but also over the wide surface of the country, being attended by his nobles, especially by the younger aspirants to fame and warlike renown (Xenoph. Cyrop. viii, 1, 96). Scenes of this character are abundantly portrayed in the Assyrian and Babylonian monuments recently discovered by Botta and Layard. The king is represented as pursuing not only smaller game on horseback, but also engaged in the chase of more formidable animals, such as deer, lions and wild bulls, in the chariot (Layard's Nineveh, 1st ser. ii, 328). See Lox. This was especially a favorite employment of princes, and Darius caused to be engraved on his tomb an epitaph recording his proficiency as an archer and hunter (Strabo, xvi, 212).

In the Bible we find hunting connected with royalty as early as in Gen. x, 3. The great founder of Babel was in general repute as "a mighty hunter before the Lord." See Nimro. The patriarchs, however, are to be regarded rather as herdsmen than hunters, if respect is had to their habitual mode of life. The condition of the herdsmen was next to that of the hunter in the early stages of civilization, and so we find that even Cain was a keeper of sheep. This, and the fact that Abel is designated "a tiller of the ground," would seem to indicate a very rapid progress in the arts and pursuits of social life. The same contrast and similar hospitality we find were inculcated later in the case of Jacob and Esau; the first "a plain man dwelling in tents," the
view rather to recreation than subsistence (Wilkinson's *Anc. Egyptians*, vol. iii). Wild oxen are represented on the Egyptian sculptures as captured by means of the lasso, but dogs appear to have been usually employed in the chase. See Doc. That the land of promise into which the Hebrews were conducted on leaving Egypt was plentifully supplied with beasts of the chase appears clear from Exod. xxiii, 24, "I will not drive them out in one year, lest the land become desolate and the beast of the field multiply against thee" (comp. Deut. iii, 22). Also from the regulation given in Lev. xxvii, 15, it is manifest that hunting was practised after the settlement in Canaan, and was pursued with the view of obtaining food. Prov. xii, 27 proves that hunting animals for their flesh was an established custom among the Hebrews, though the turn of the passage may serve to show that at the time it was penned sport was the chief aim. If hunting was not forbidden in the "year of rest," special provision was made that not only the cattle, but "the beast of the field," should be allowed to enjoy and flourish on the uncropped spontaneous produce of the land (Exod. xxiii, 11; Lev. xxv, 7). Harmer (iv, 357) says, "There are various sorts of creatures in the Holy Land proper for hunting; wild boars, antelopes, hares, etc., are considerable numbers there, and one of the Christian kings of Jerusalem lost his life (Gesta Dei, p. 887) in pursuing a hare." That the lion and other ravenous beasts of prey were not wanting in many Palestine passages of the Bible make obvious (1 Sam. xvii, 45; 2 Sam. xxiii, 20; 1 Kings xiii, 24; Har- ris, *Notes on the Old Testament*, 300). The lion was even made use of to catch other animals (Ezek. xix, 4), and Harmer long ago remarked that as in the vicinity of Gaza, so also in Judea, leopards were trained and used for the same purpose (Harmer, iv, 356; Hab. i, 8). That lions were taken by pits as well as by nets appears from Ezek. xix, 4, 8 (Shaw, p. 172). In the latter verse the words of the prophet, "and spread their net over him" (comp. 2 Sam. xxiii, 6), allude to the custom of inclosing a wide extent of country with nets, into which the animals were driven by hunters (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egyptians*, iii, 4). The spots thus inclosed were usually in a hilly country and in the vicinity of water-brooks; whence the propriety and force of the language of Psalms xlii, 1, "As the (hunted) hart panteth after the water-brooks." These places were selected because they were those to which the animals were driven by the repair of the walls and evening. Scenes like the one now supposed are found portrayed in the Egyptian paintings (Wilkinson). Hounds were used for hunting in Egypt, and, if the passage in Josephus (Ant. iv, 8, 9) may be considered decisive; in Palestine as well. From Gen. xxvii, 8, 9, "Now take one of the young goats that I have brought from the herd of my father to appease the voice of my father, that he may listen and release me to go to my father and come and return to thee," and from Gen. xvi, 10, "And he will return from the herd of my father and come and return to thee," we learn what arms were employed at least in capturing game. Bulls, after being taken, were kept at least for a time in a net (Isa. li, 20). Various missiles, pitfalls, snares, and gins were made use of in hunting (Psalms xci, 5; Amos iii, 5; 2 Sam. xxiii, 20). See the various animals and means of capture enumerated above in their alphabetical place. That hunting continued to be followed till towards the end of the Jewish state appears from Josephus (War, i, 20, 13), where the historian speaks of Herod as "ever a most excellent hunter, for in one day, besides a large number of wild beasts which he shot in the chase, I have heard that he brought home more game than he ever did in any other one day." The passage makes it clear that horses were employed in the pursuits of the chase (compare Josephus, *Ant.*, xv, 7, 7; xvi, 10, 3). See Chase.

The prophets sometimes depicR war under the idea of hunting: "I will send for many hunters," says Jeremiah, "and they shall hunt them from every mountain, and from every hill, and out of the holes of the rocks" (xvi, 16), referring to the Chaldeans, who held the Jews under their dominion, or, according to others, to the Persians, who set the Hebrews at liberty. Ezekiel also (xxxi, 30) speaks of the kings, who were persecutors of the Jews, as being hunters. The psalmist thanks God for having delivered him from the snares of the hunters (Eng. trans. "fowler") (Psalms xcvi, 3). Mishaq complains (vii, 2) that every one lays ambuscades for his neighbor, and that one brother hunts another, and that he, Jeremiah (Lam. iii, 50), represents Jerusalem as complaining of her enemies, who have taken her, like a bird, in their nets. See Net.

Huntingdon, Selina, Countess of, a lady distinguished in the religious history of the 18th century, was born Aug. 24, 1707, and was one of the three daughters and co-heirs of Washington Shirley, earl of Ferrers. Selina, the second daughter, married, in 1728, Theophilus Hastings, brother of the late Sir Hastings, a nobleman of retired habits, with whom she appears to have had a very happy life till his sudden death, on the 13th of October, 1746, of a fit of apoplexy. She had many children, four of whom died in youth or early manhood. It was probably these domestic afflictions which disposed this lady to take the course so opposite to that which is generally pursued by the noble and the great. She became deeply religious. It was at the time when the preachers and founders of Methodism, Wesley and Whitefield, were rousing in the country, by their exciting ministry, a spirit of new and intense devotion that was generally prevalent, and leading men to look more to what are called the distinguishing truths of the Gospel than to its moral teachings, to which the clergy had for so many years, and which made them attend in their public ministrations. She found in these doctrines matter of consolation and delight, and she sought to make others participate with her in the advantages they were believed by her to afford. The character of her religion, as well as of her mind, was too decided to allow it to sink from prominence; on the contrary, her high soul compassionate the fearful condition of the wealthy and noble, and she boldly sought to spread the influence of her religion, not only through the highest aristocracy of the realm, but to the royal family itself. She took Whitefield under her especial patronage, defied all ecclesiastical order, and even engaged him to hold services in her own residence, which she invited her friends of the nobili-
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ty to attend. She persuaded the highest ladies of the court to listen to the preaching of the great evangelists, with more or less powerful influence upon some, and a saving change in others. Among the former were the celebrated duchess of Marlborough and the duchess of Buckingham; among the latter the duchess of the celebrated Chesterfield, lady Ann Frankland, and lady Fanny Shirley, the third wife of the great muse of Puritans, among her friends some of the most venerated personages of English history: Watts, Doddridge, Romaine, Venn, and the sainted Fletcher. When Mr. Wesley and his conference of preachers came to the conclusion that they had "learned too much to Calvinism," lady Huntington, who was described from Whitefield and the Calvinism by him imported from New England, received the impression, erroneous but iner- create, that Mr. Wesley denied the doctrine of justifica- tion by faith, and insisted upon the saving merit of works. Her relative, Rev. Walter Shirley, with the small remnant of Calvinist preachers, called for recan- tation. A controversy arose, in which the virulent Toplady was chief champion of Calvinism, and love and truth, on the Arminian side, found their model in Fletch- er. Each party went on, in spite of the break, in spreading the essentials of the Gospel maintained by be Toplady, in Wales, for the prevalent doctrine never again met on earth; but when, near the close of her own ca- reer, she read the dying ascription made by Mr. Wesley of his salvation to the blood of the Lamb, and when she learned from Wesley's fellow-traveller, Bradford, that such had ever been the tenor of his meditations, and, bursting into tears, she lamented that the unhappy separation had ever taken place. Whitefield made no attempt to find a separate sect, but the count- less chose to assume a sort of leadership among his fol- lowers, and to act herself as the founder of a sect, and thereby desire to have himself and his followers properly known. Whitefieldian Methodists came to be known as "the court of Huntington's Connection." On Whitefield's death in 1777 she was appointed by will sole proprietor of all his possessions in Georgia (U. S. A.), and a result of this was the organization of a mission to America. But the courties had at her own command a considered in- come during the forty-four years of her widow- hooed, and, as her own personal expenses were few, she established and supported, with the assistance of other opulent persons, members of her own family, or other persons who were brought upon as she was, a college at Trinty, in Wales, for the education of ministers; built numerous chapels, and assisted in the support of the ministers in them. 

Huntington, Joseph D.D., a Congregational minister, was born 1785, at Windham, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1762, and was ordained pastor of the First Church, Coventry, Conn., June 29, 1703, where he died Dec. 25, 1794. In 1780 he was made a member of the board of overseers of Yale Col- lege. He published A Discourse before the Ecclesial Stockbridge in the Case of Mrs. Fiske, excom- municated for marrying a profane Man (1779);—An Address to his Anabaptist Brethren (1785);—Thoughts on the Atonement of Christ (1791);—Calvinism improved (post, 1796); and a few occasional sermons.—Sprague, Anteks, i, 602.

Huntington, Joshua, a Congregational minister, was born Jan. 31, 1796, at Norwich, Conn. He graduated at Yale College in 1804, entered the ministry in Sept. 1806, and was ordained co-pastor of the Old South Church, Boston, May 18, 1808, where he labored until his death, Sept. 11, 1819. He was one of the founders of the "American Biblical Society," and the "Boston Society for the Religious and Moral Instruction of the Poor" from its formation in 1816. —Sprague, An- nals, ii, 501.

Huntington, Robert D.D., a distinguished Eng- lish theologian and Orientalist, was born in February, 1586, at Dorehyst, in Gloucestershire, where his father, the Rev. Thomas Huntington, was the parish clergyman. He was educated at the free-school of Bristol, was admitted in 1652 a portionist of Merton College, Oxford, received his bache- lor's degree in 1658, and was shortly after elected to a fellowship in that college. He took his degree of master of arts in 1663, and, having then applied himself with great success to the study of the Oriental languages, he was in 1670 appointed to the situation of chaplain at Aleppo. From 1677 to 1682 he travelled in the East, and a short time after his return, in 1688, was appointed provost or master of Trinity College, Dublin, receiving about this time the degree of D.D.; he resigned his position in the latter year and returned to England. In August, 1692, he was presented by Sir Edward Turner to the rectory of Great Hallingbury, in Essex; and while there he married a sister of Sir John Powell, one of the justices of the King's Bench. In 1701 he was elected bishop of Raphoe. In 1703 he died, before the expiration of his fourth year. Dr. Huntington is principally distin- guished for the numerous Oriental manuscripts which he procured while in the East and brought with him to England. Besides those which he purchased for arch- bishop Marsh and bishop Fell, he obtained between six and seven hundred for himself, which are now in the Bodleian Library, to which he first presented thirty-five of them, and then sold the rest in 1691 for the small sum of £700. Huntington, however, missed the principal ob- ject of his search, the very important Syriac version of the epistles of St. Ignatius, a large portion of which was recovered in Justinian's monastery of Antioch. See ii, 16, p. 37; Huntington, George ISAAC, D.D., an English prelate, was born in Winchester in 1748, and was educated at Winchester School and at New College, Ox- ford. In 1772 he became master of Westminster School; in 1789, warden of Winchester School; in 1809, bishop of Gloucester; and in 1815 bishop of Hereford. He died in 1822. Besides several Greek and Latin class-books, he published Thoughts on the Trinity, with Charges, etc. (2d edit. Lond. 1812, 8vo); and a number of occasional sermons and charges. See Gentleman's Magazine, June and Dec. 1833; Darlington, Cyclop. Bibliographica, i, 1594; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 924.

Huntington, Robert D.D., a distinguished Eng- lish theologian and Orientalist, was born in February, 1586, at Dorehyst, in Gloucestershire, where his father, the Rev. Thomas Huntington, was the parish clergyman. He was educated at the free-school of Bristol, was admitted in 1652 a portionist of Merton College, Oxford, received his bache- lor's degree in 1658, and was shortly after elected to a fellowship in that college. He took his degree of master of arts in 1663, and, having then applied himself with great success to the study of the Oriental languages, he was in 1670 appointed to the situation of chaplain at Aleppo. From 1677 to 1682 he travelled in the East, and a short time after his return, in 1688, was appointed provost or master of Trinity College, Dublin, receiving about this time the degree of D.D.; he resigned his position in the latter year and returned to England. In August, 1692, he was presented by Sir Edward Turner to the rectory of Great Hallingbury, in Essex; and while there he married a sister of Sir John Powell, one of the justices of the King's Bench. In 1701 he was elected bishop of Raphoe. In 1703 he died, before the expiration of his fourth year. Dr. Huntington is principally distin- guished for the numerous Oriental manuscripts which he procured while in the East and brought with him to England. Besides those which he purchased for arch- bishop Marsh and bishop Fell, he obtained between six and seven hundred for himself, which are now in the Bodleian Library, to which he first presented thirty-five of them, and then sold the rest in 1691 for the small sum of £700. Huntington, however, missed the principal ob- ject of his search, the very important Syriac version of the epistles of St. Ignatius, a large portion of which was recovered in Justinian's monastery of Antioch. See ii, 16, p. 37; Huntington, George ISAAC, D.D., an English prelate, was born in Winchester in 1748, and was educated at Winchester School and at New College, Ox- ford. In 1772 he became master of Westminster School; in 1789, warden of Winchester School; in 1809, bishop of Gloucester; and in 1815 bishop of Hereford. He died in 1822. Besides several Greek and Latin class-books, he published Thoughts on the Trinity, with Charges, etc. (2d edit. Lond. 1812, 8vo); and a number of occasional sermons and charges. See Gentleman's Magazine, June and Dec. 1833; Darlington, Cyclop. Bibliographica, i, 1594; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 924; Hook, Eccles. Bioy, vi, 224; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliogr. i, 1863. (J. H. W.)

Huntington, William, a Calvinistic Methodist preacher, was born in 1744. He passed his early life in menial service and dissipation, but after conversion he
entered the ministry, and became a popular preacher in London. On his books he took the title of S. S., or Sinners Saved. He died in 1813. A review of his works by Southey will be found in the Quarterly Review, xx, 462.

His writings have been collected and published: Works (London, 1820, 20 vols. 8vo, and his select works, edited by his son, 6 vols. 8vo, 1856—Conversations, 2 vols. 8vo, 1812;—Contemplations on the Government of Israel, in a series of letters to a friend (Sleaford, 1830, 12mo)—The Law established by the Faith of Christ, a sermon on Rom. iii, 31 (Lond. 1878, 8vo)—The Epistle of Faith (Lond. 1878, 8vo)—The Kingdom of Heavens taken by Prayer, with Life of the Author (Andover, 1832, 32mo)—The wise and foolish Virgins described, the substance of two sermons on Matt. xxxv, 3, 4 (Lond. 1803, 8vo).—Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, i, 1856.

Hunyad, Johannes Corvinus. See Hungary.

Hufnfeld, Hermann, D.D., a German theologian, and one of the most distinguished Hebraists of Europe, son of the clergyman Bernhard Karl Hufnfeld, who died at Spangenberg, Hesse, in 1828, was born March 31, 1796, at Marburg, and educated at the university of his native place, under the especial protection of the great Orientalist Arnoldi (q.v.). After preaching a short time as assistant to the first Reformation at Marburg, he accepted in 1819 the position as third teacher at the gymnasium at Hanau. He resigned in 1822 on account of impaired health, and, after a summer’s journey through Switzerland, and the use of mineral waters at the springs of two watering-places in Württemberg, returned to his father’s house at Hagen, and in 1828 to assume his theological studies and to prepare for the ministry, and later to the University of Halle, where he became acquainted with Gesenius, and was led to a more thorough study of the Scriptures, especially the Old Testament. In 1824 he began to lecture at the university, and in 1826 he prepared an elaborate monograph on the Ethiopic language (Exercitationes Ethiopicae, Leipzig, 1825), which was favorably received and commented upon in the Heidelberger Jahrbücher and the Hallische Literaturzeitung. In 1825 he was appointed extraordinary professor of theology at the University of Marburg, and in 1827, after Hermann’s death, was named his successor. He devoted himself to the study of the Oriental languages, retaining the chair of theology, which was a regular professorship in 1830. During the Revolution of 1830 he was on the side of those who favored a reform of the ecclesiastical constitution of Hesse, and in 1831 he was employed as a secretary of this conference. In 1846 he went to Halle as the successor of Gesenius, by whose influence Hufnfeld had received the degree of D.D. in 1834. During the revolution of 1848 he was active in the interests of a popular form of government, and urged the establishment of a German empire on a historical basis. He died April 24, 1866. In theology, Hufnfeld was called orthodox in Germany, but in America he would be much more likely to have been classed with “Liberals.” On inspiration, for instance, he held that only certain portions of the sacred writings are of divine origin, and that the Spirit reveals to all sincere readers the real character of such passages. In criticism, he belonged to the school of his friend De Wette (q.v.).

“His researches were extensive, but guarded in their deductions by his caution. In the elaboration of his works he was extremely fastidious. A connaisseur in work, he could not go on if the machinery were not exact, if one slight element were wanting, or completeness. This sensibility sometimes impeded the activities of a mind whose powers of acquisition and production were immense. In his department he was among the first scholars of his day. Few burial-grounds, indeed, inchose the ashes of such two such sages as Hufnfeld, and his predecessor Gesenius. At the close of his arduous life, when in his seventy-first year, his mental vigor showed no decline, his diligence no slackening. As a religious man, Hufnfeld belonged to the Pietists, who correspond in the religious scale with our strict evangelical Christians. He was a devout man, though not after our stamp of devotion. It is doubtful whether he knew anything by experience of our immediate conversion. Probably he was never in a prayer-meeting; and he looked upon revivals as questionable, if not objectionable, measures. Of devotional methods and exercises, then, he had limited knowledge: but he believed, notwithstanding, in the heart union, and in the spiritual life as all Christians must live, by faith” (N. Y. Methodist, 1866, No. 318). Hufnfeld left mere monographs, the results of most careful inquiry on certain points bearing on the subjects to which he devoted his later years, but few books proper. Thus, in 1841, he commenced a Hebrew grammar, in which he intended to pursue the same course in the Semitic as Grimm did in the Germanic language, viz. the development of the Hebrew genetically by a consideration of its sounds. Only a few sheets of the work were published, under the title Kritisches Lehrb. der hebr. Sprache und Schrift (Cassel, 1841). His most important works are, Ueber d. Begriff u. d. Methode d. bibl. Einlei. (Marb. 1844)—De antiquioribus opud Judaicae accendentur scriptoribus (Halle, 1846 and 1847, 2 vols.)—De primul. et vera feste rum opud Hebrazo ratione (1851, 1852, 1858, 1859, 2 vols.)—Queest. in Jobdtos locos (1853)—Die Quellen d. Genesis (Berlin, 1856)—Die Psalmen, übersetzt u. erklärt (1855-56, 4 vols. 8vo; of a 2d ed., begun in 1867 by Dr. Edward Richm, 3 vols. are now [1870] published)—Die heutige theosoph. u. mytholog. Theologie und Schriftkritik (Berlin, 1861). A biography of Hufnfeld was published by Dr. Carl Steyler, H. Hufnfeld (1881). See Theol. Univ. Lex. i, 374; Pierer, Universal Lex. viii, 631; Studt. u. Kritik, 1868, i, 184 sq.; Jahrb. deutsch. Theol. 1868, iv, 738 sq.; Bibl. Sac. 1866, p. 673 sq. (J. H. W.)

Hu'pham (Heb. Chapham, הָפָן, according to Gesenius perh. coast-man, according to Fürst screened; Sept. omits, but some eda have Ḫpān; Vulg. Hupham), a person apparently mentioned as one of the sons of Benjamin (Num. xxvi, 57; i Chron. viii, 91); also a Jew of the tribe of the sons of Joseph, more correctly called Hupim (Gen. xlii, 24). His descendants are called Huphaimites (Hebrew Chaphamites, הָפָן־יִתְיָאִים, Sept. omits, but some eda have Ḫpān; Vulg. Huphamites, Numb. xxvi, 91). B.C. 1856. The name Hupham being in the plu. (Heb. Chuppim, חָפַפְתֶּמ, numerous; Sept. omits in Gen. xlii, 21, but some copies have Ḫpāni or Ḫpānī as a son of Bela; Vulg. Opham), suggests the possibility that it is a contraction for Huphaimites. See Shuppim.

Hu'p'pah (Heb. Chappah, הָפָן, a covering or brid tal canopy, as in Psa. xix, 6; also protected, as in Isa. iv, 5; Sept. Ḫpān v. Ṣ. Ḫpān, and even Ḫpān, the head of the thirteenth of the twenty-four classes into which El left divided the priests (1 Chron. xxiv, 13). B.C. 1014).

Hu'p'pin (Gen. xlii, 21; 1 Chron. vii, 12). See HUPHAM.

Hu'r (Heb. ְוּר, a hole, as of a viper, Isa. xi, 8; also a narrow and filthy subterranean prison, Isa. xili, 24; comp. the “black hole” of Calcutta; otherwise mere hole; Sept. Ḫpān, Oph, and כָּעָפָר in Heb. iii, 9; Josephus Ḫpān and Ḫpān); the name of five men.
1. A son of Caleb (Judg. 5:18), a grandson through Hebron, the first one by his second wife Ephrath, and grandfather of Bezael (v. 29), the famous artificer, through Uri (1 Chron. ii. 19, 50; iv. 1, 4; comp. ii. 20; 2 Chron. 1, 5; Exod. xxxv. 2; xxxvi. 30; xxxviii. 22), B.C. between 1856 and 1638. By some (after Josephus, Ant. iii. 6, 1) he has been confounded with the following:

2. The brother of Buzon (Buzon-Hur), the son of Moses, according to Josephus (Ant. iii. 2, 4). During the conflict with the Amalekites he assisted Aaron in sustaining the arms of Moses in that praying attitude upon which the success of the Israelites was found to depend (Exod. xvii. 10-12); and when Moses was absent on Sinai to receive the law, Buzon (Ben-Hur) was in charge of the people (Exod. xxv. 14). B.C. 1658.

3. The fourth named of the five princes or petty kings of Midian (1 Chron. vi. 63; 2 Chron. i. 17), who were defeated and slain shortly before the death of Moses by the Israelites, under the leadership of Phinehas, the son of Eleazar (Num. xxxi. 8; Josephus, Ant. iv. 7, 1). B.C. 1618. In Josh. xiii. 21 these five Midianites are termed 72\textsuperscript{5}, the vassals of Sihon, and are also described as 72\textsuperscript{7}, dwellers in the land, which Keil (ad loc.) explains as meaning that they had for a long time dwelt in the land of Canaan with the Amorites, whereas the Amorites had only recently effected an entrance. After the defeat of Sihon these chieftains appear to have made common cause with Balak, the king of Moab (Num. xxxii. 4, 7), and to have joined with him in urging the curse of the Israelites. The evil counsel of Balaam having been followed, and the Israelites in consequence seduced into transgression (Num. xxxii. 16), Moses was directed to make war upon the Midianites. The latter were utterly defeated, and "Balaam also, the son of Beor, they slew with the sword." See Sihon.

4. Hur (B.B. 52, 53, 54), a son of Solomon's surveyor in Mount Ephraim (1 Kings iv. 8). Josephus calls him Ures (Oepqc), and makes him to have been himself military governor of the Ephraimites (Ant. viii. 2, 3). B.C. ante 995.

5. Father of PH classic, which latter is called "ruler of the half part of Jerusalem" after the exile, and repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. iii. 9). B.C. ante 446.

Hur'rai (Heb. Hur'ayy'); a Chaldee, perhaps linemen-workor, otherwise noble; Sept. Oxyi, Vulg. Hurrai; a native of the valleys ("brooks") of Mount Gaash, one of David's heroes (1 Chron. xii. 32); called less correctly in the parallel passage (2 Sam. xxiii. 90) Huidal. B.C. 1046.

Hurm'am (a, 1 Chron. viii. 5; b, 1 Chron. xiv. 1, marg.; 2 Chron. ii. 3, 11, 12; vii. 2, 18; ix. 10, 21; c, 2 Chron. ii. 13; iv. 11, 16). See Hiram.

Hurd, Richard, D.D., an eminent English prelate, was born at Congreve, Staffordshire, in 1720. He was admitted at Emanuel College, Cambridge, in 1733. In 1736, by recommendation of his friend, bishop Warburton (q.v.), he became one of the Whitehall preachers, and in 1757 rector of Thurstaston. He afterwards became successively rector of Follton, Yorkshire, in 1762, preacher of Lincoln's Inn in 1765, archdeacon of Gloucester in 1767, and finally bishop of Lichfield and Coventry in 1777, when he was transferred to Worcester in 1781. In 1785 he was appointed the archbishop of Canterbury, which he declined. He died in 1808. His Sermons (5 vols. 8vo), distinguished by elegant simplicity of style, perspicuity of method, and acuteness of elucidation, are to be found, with his other miscellaneous writings, in his Works (London, 1811, 8 vols. 8vo). His most important contribution to theology is his Introduction to the Study of the Prophets (1772, 8vo; 1788, 2 vols. 8vo; 1839, edited by Bickersteth, 12mo). This was the first of the "Warburtonian Lectures." Notwithstanding the polemical cast of some of these sermons, the clear exposition of the general principles of prophecy and of the claims which this portion of the sacred Scriptures has on the serious and unprejudiced attention of thoughtful readers, conveyed in persuasive and even elegant language, has secured a large amount of popularity for the work even up to recent times (Kitto, Bib. Cyclop. ii. 348). He also edited The Works of Warburton (1786, 7 vols.), and published a Life of Warburton (London, 1794, 4to). See Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i. 925; Quarterly Review (London), viii. 388; Hallam, Lit. Hist. of Europe (4th edit., London, 1854), iii. 476; Life and Writings of Hurd, by Francis Kilvert (London. 1860); Christ. Remembrancer, 1860, p. 263; North British Rev. May, 1861, art. iv; Hook, Eccles. Biog. vi, 264 sq.

Hurd's, James, an English divine, was born at Bishopstone, Sussex, in 1753, and was educated first at Chichester School and next at St. Mary's Hall, Oxford. In 1782 he was chosen decaney of St. Mary Magdalen College, and some time after was made a fellow. In 1785 he became curate of Burwash, in Sussex, and in 1791 was presented to the living of his native place. In 1798 he was elected to the professorship of poetry, having previously published some poems of great excellence. He took the degree of B.D. in 1794, and that of D.D. in 1797. He died Dec. 23, 1801. Besides poetical works, Hurd published several works of interest to the Biblical student. They are: Select Critical Notes on the English Version of the first ten Chapters of Genesis (London. 1793, 8vo):—A short critical Disquisition upon the true Meaning of the Word 72\textsuperscript{5} (Gen. i, 21) (ibid. 1750, 8vo), in which he contends that this word, whatever it occurs, signifies crocodile. "His remarks on the various passages in which it is found are, to say the least, very ingenious." He also wrote Twelve Dissertations on the Nature and Occasion of Psalm and Prophecy (ibid., 1800)—Kitto, Bib. Cyc. ii. 348; Hook, Eccles. Biog. vi. 227 sq.; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i. 925.

Hurdwa! (more accurately HARDWAR, i.e. Gate of Hurri), also called gangadwara (Ganges Gate), an Indian city, is celebrated on account of the pilgrimages which are made to it. More than two million people from all parts of India resort to this place to take the sacred bath in the Ganges (q. v.), that flows by the side of it. As in Mecca, the occasion is also improved for business purposes, and great fairs are held annually in April.—Brockhaus, Conn. Lex. viii., 167-8.

Huri (Heb. Huriyy'; according to Gesenius perhaps linemen-worker, like Arab. Hurri; so also First; Sept. Oxyy); Hurri, son of Jarash and father of Abihail of the descendants of Gad in Bashan (1 Chron. v. 14). B.C. ante 781.

Hure. See HURIAH; MOHAMMEDANISM.

Hurrion, John, an English Independent minister, was born about 1675. He became pastor of a congregation at Denton, Norfolk, in 1696. In 1724 he removed to London as minister to a congregation in Hare Court, and died in 1725. He employed his time greatly in study, chiefly of the Church fathers. His style is natural, unaffected, and manly. His writings include a Treatise on the Holy Spirit (1734, 8vo), and a large number of sermons and lectures, all of which have been collected and published under the title The whole Works of John Hurrion, son first collected; to which is prefixed, The Life of the Author (London. 1823, 3 vols. 12mo).—Darling, Cyclopedia Bibliographica, i. 157; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i. 926; Lond. Evang. Mag. Jan. 1827.

Huter, Friedrich Emanuel von, a Swiss theologian who became a convert to Romanism, was born at Schaffhausen March 19, 1787. He studied Protestant theology at the universities of Heidelberg and Halle, and his Introduction to the Study of the Prophecies (1772, 8vo; 1788, 2 vols. 8vo; 1832, edited by Bickersteth, 12mo). This was the first of the "Warburtonian Lectures." Notwithstanding the polemical cast of some of these sermons, the clear exposition of the general principles of prophecy and of the claims which this portion of the sacred Scriptures has on the serious and unprejudiced attention of thoughtful readers, conveyed in persuasive and even elegant language, has secured a large amount of popularity for the work even up to recent times (Kitto, Bib. Cyclop. ii. 348). He also edited The Works of Warburton (1786, 7 vols.), and published a Life of Warburton (London, 1794, 4to). See Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i. 925; Quarterly Review (London), viii. 388; Hallam, Lit. Hist. of Europe (4th edit., London, 1854), iii. 476; Life and Writings of Hurd, by Francis Kilvert (London. 1860); Christ. Remembrancer, 1860, p. 263; North British Rev. May, 1861, art. iv; Hook, Eccles. Biog. vi, 264 sq.
communicants of the Church of Rome on a journey through Bavaria and Austria, brought on him the stigma of Crypto-Catholicism, and he was requested by his colleagues at Schaffhausen to define his position to the Reformed Church in which he held orders. As the declaration which Hurter made gave dissatisfaction to his Friends, he requested, in the spring of 1841, he resigned his position in 1841, and in June, 1844, made open declaration of his alienation from the Reformed and adherence to the Romish Church. He now devoted his time mainly to the study of history, and in 1845 accepted a call to Vienna as imperial historiographer. Under the liberal ministry of Pillenderf, he had to resign this position, but recovered it in 1851, when he was also ennobled. He died at Graz Aug. 27, 1865. His works of especial interest to the theologian are: Geschichte des Papstes Innocenz III. u. a. Zeitalter (Hamb. 1834-42, 4 vols. 8vo); Reformation der Kathol. Kirche in d. Schweiz (Schaffh., 1849); Geburt u. Wiedergeburt (ibld., 1845, 4 vols. 8vo; 4th ed. 1867, etc.); Geschichte Ferdinand II. und seiner Eltern (Schaffhausen, 1850-54, 11 vols.).

The researches made for his history of Innocent III, the Roman Catholics claim, led to Hurter's conversion to their Church—Pierre, Hist. Univ. Lec. viii, 633; Werner, Gesch. der Kathol. Theol. p. 521 sq.

Hurter, Johann Georg, a German Pietist and philanthropist, was born in the latter half of the 17th century. Of his early history we know but little. He was pastor of a church at Schaffhausen from 1704. He is often called "an Augustus Hermann Francke in miniature" on account of the school and orphan-houses which he founded, without possessing the necessary means, relying solely, like Francke, on providential help. His first undertaking was the building of a school-house for the instruction of the children of his own scattered congregation, who were obliged to go a long way to the town school, and of whom many could not get there at all. In September, 1709, seventy-nine of these children, with their pastor, Hurter, at their head, celebrated, with prayer and thanksgiving, their entrance into their new house.

The competitions which he had received for the undertaking had been so numerous and so ready that on the completion of the school-house he decided to build an orphan asylum. One benevolent man laid the cornerstone by a gift of 200 florins. To make a beginning, one of the rooms in the school-house was set apart for the reception of orphans, and in July, 1711, a widow with seven children was received. The contributions multiplied, and with them the children. Hurter contributed much of his own means; and when in 1716 he, with other Pietists, was rewarded for his service by deposition from the ministry, he modestly secluded himself in a little room in his orphan asylum, and there spent the latter years of his life. He died in 1721.

This article is based altogether on Hurter's translation of Hagenbach, Hist. of the Church in the 18th and 19th Centuries (N. York, Scribner and Co., 1869, 2 vols. 8vo), i, 181.

Hurwitz, Hyman, a distinguished Jewish scholar, of whose early life but little is known, was, up to the time of his death (about 1850), professor of Hebrew in the University College, London. He is best known as the author of Vehicula Hebraica, a Defence of the Hebrew Scriptures (Lond. 1820, 8vo), which, at the time of its appearance, was highly commented upon by the London Quarterly Review, and by Horne in his Bibl. Bibl. Hurwitz also published a volume of Hebrew Tales, collected chiefly from the Talmud, to which he pays a voice of commendation, of which, so far as has been favoring its free from the objection so frequently made to some of its indelent passages and many contradictions, he says, "I do not hesitate to avow my doubts whether there exists any uninspired work of equal antiquity that contains more interesting, more various and valuable information, than that of the still-existing remains of the ancient Hebrew sages." In 1857 Hurwitz began the publication of text-books for the study of the Hebrew language, which are considered among the best extant in the English language. They were, Elements of the Heb. Lang. pt. i, Orthography (Lond. 1807, 8vo; 4th ed. 1848, 8vo);—Euphemism and Syntax of the Heb. Lang. (4th ed. 1840, 8vo);—Hebrew Grammar (4th ed. 1806, 8vo; 8vo: 2nd ed. 1804, 8vo);—New Elements of the Heb. Lit. p. 183 sqq.; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 926.

Husband (prop. וֺשָּׂנָה, וֺשָּׂנָה, a man, ävög; also הָשָּׂנָה, master, wife, spouse [in Exod. iv, 24, the phrase "bloody husband" has an allusion to the matrimonial figure in the covenant of circumcision (q. v.) etc.]), a married man, the house-band, or band which connects the whole family, and keeps it together. Johnson (Engl. Dict. a. v.) refers the term to the Roman, house-bond, master of the house; but several of its affinities seem allied to the sense of binding together, or assembling into union. So we say, to husband small portions of things, meaning to collect and unite them, to manage them to the greatest advantage, etc., which is by associating them together; making the most of them, not by dispensation, but by alms. A man who was betrothed, but not actually married, was esteemed a husband (Matt. i, 16, 20; Luke ii, 5). A man recently married was exempt from going out to war (Deut. xx. 7; xxiv, 5).

The husband is described as the head of his wife, and as having authority over her conduct, over her vow, etc. (Num. xxx. 6-8). He is also the guide of her youth (Prov. iv, 17). Sarah called her husband Abraham lord, a title which was continued long after (Hos. ii, 16) [heals, my lord]. The apostle Peter seems to recommend it as a title implying great respect, as well as affection (1 Pet. iii. 6). Perhaps it was rather used as an appellation in public than in private. Our own word master [Mr.] (and so corretively mistress) is sometimes used by married women when speaking of their husbands; but the ordinary use made of this word is by all persons, and on all occasions, deprives it of any claim to the expression of particular respect, though it was probably in former ages implied by it or connected with it, as it still is in the instances of proprietors, chiefs, teachers, and superiors, whether in civil life, in polite arts, or in liberal studies. See Mar-

Husbandman (properly וֺשָּׂנָה, וֺשָּׂנָה, man of the ground; וֺשָּׂנָה, one whose profession and labor is to cultivate the ground. It is among the most ancient and honorable occupations (Gen. ix. 20; xxxvi, 12, 14; xxxvii, 7; Job i, 2: Isa. xxxviii. 24-28; John xv, 1). All the Hebrews who were not consecrated to religious offices were husbandmen. Husbandmen are not so well depicted on the ancient monuments of Egypt. It was remarked by the members of the French Commission that there is a great similarity between the joyless looks of the husbandmen on the monuments and the sombre countenances of the modern felilahs, whose toil is so miserably remunerated. In reference to the husband-

God is compared to a husbandman (John xv, 1; 1
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Cost. xii, 9): and the simile of land carefully cultivated, or of a vineyard carefully dressed, is often used in the sacred writings. The art of husbandry is from God, says the prophet Isaiah (xxviii, 24-28), and the various operations of it are each in their season. The sowing of seed, the waiting for harvest, the gathering when ready, the storing up in granaries, is an image of the providence of the earth, afforded many points of comparison of apt figures, and similitudes in Scripture. See Hus-

bandry. 

Husbandry (in Heb. by circumlocution הַנָּבָשֵׂם, the ground; Gr. prop. γεωργία, 2 Macc. xii, 2; also γεώρ-

γος, a plot of tilled ground, 1 Cor. iii, 9), the culture of the soil, although coeval with the history of the hu-

man race (Gen. ii, 15; iv, 2; ix, 20), was held of 4677

secondly account by the nomad Hebrews of the early period (Gen. xxvi, 12, 14; xxxvii, 7), see Job i, 3; comp.

Harmer, i, 88 sq; Volney, Travels, i, 291; Burckhardt, Beda,

Ed. i, 17; Michaelis, De antiquitatibus aegypt. pop.

veteris, i, Halle, 1729, and in Ugolini Theologiae, etc.), but by the Jewish lawyer it was elevated to the rank of a fundamental institution of national economy (Michaelis, Mos. Reht, i, 249 sq), and hence became as-

siduously and skillfully practiced in Palestine (comp. 1 Sam. vi, 5; 1 Kings xix, 19; 2 Chron. xxvii, 10: Prov.

xxxvii, 16; Eccles. vii, 16, also Isai. xxvii, 27, and Gesen-

nius, ad loc), as it continues in a good degree to be at

the present day in the East. Upon the fields, which were divided (if at all) according to a vague land-meas-

ure termed a yoke (יֵשְׁבָה, 1 Sam. xiv, 14), and occasion-

ally fenced in (see Knobel, Zu Jeremia, p. 207), were

mostly raised wheat, barley, flax, lentils (2 Sam. xxiili, 11), garum, and sometimes spells, beans, a kind of dura-

be or cuminum (לְכָנָב, cuminum, etc. (Isai. xxiili, 25). See these and other vegetables in their alphabetical place; for the later periods, compare the Mishna, Chalada, i. The fertility of Palestine (q. v.), especially in many parts, made the cultivation tolerably easy, and it was gradually increased by the clearing away of forests (Jer. iv, 9), thus enlarging the arable plains (יוֹר, sordale; comp. Prov. xiii, 23); the hills (2

Chron. xxvii, 10; Ezek. xxiili, 9, 6) being formed into terraces (compare Niebuhr, Beschreib, 156; Burckhardt. 

Trav. i, 64), upon which the earth was kept by a facing of stones, while the low grounds and flats along streams were intersected by ditches (יְבָנֵי, Prov. xi, 21; comp. Psal. i, 18) for drainage (comp. Mishna, Moed Ko-

tos, i, 1; Niebuhr, Beschreib, 156; Trav. i, 556, 477; Har-

mer, ii, 1), usually called, more usually by means of water-wheels (Mishna, Peah, v, 3). The soil was manured (טַבָּה) sometimes with dung (compare Jer. ix, 22; 2 Kings ix, 37), sometimes by the ashes of burnt straw or stubble (Isa. v, 24; xivil, 14; Joel ii, 5). More-

over, the keeping of cattle on the fields (Pliny, xviii, 33), and the leaving of the chaff in threshing (Korte, Reisen, p. 438), contributed greatly to fertilization. For breaking up the surface of the ground (טַבָּה also, טַבָּה), ploughs (רָעָה לְכָנְבָּה?), probably of various materials, were used (ςτρίγεια τενού τοίον αρ. Pliny, xviii, 47; comp. Theophrast. Causae plant. iii, 25; in אָסִּיָּה Joel iv, 10, see Credner, ad loc). The latter, like the har-

rows, which were early used for covering the seed (Pliny, xviii, 19, 3; see Harduin, ad loc), were drawn by oxen (1 Kings xix, 19 sq; Job i 14; Amos vi, 12) or cows (Job xiv, 18; Baer. Mez. vi, 4), seldom by asses (Isa. xxvii, 4); also (Isa. xxvii, 20; Jos. Wars, ii, 43, 'levia est terra'), but never with a yoke of the two kinds of ani-

mals together (Deut. xxii, 10), as is now customary in the East (Niebuhr, Beschreib, p. 156): the beasts were

driven with a cudgel (יֵשְׁבָה, goad). (Delineations of Egyptian agriculture may be seen in Wilkinson, 2d ser. 48; Rosellini, Memo. cir. table 82, 83.) See each of

the above agricultural implements when in its alphabetical place. The furrows (יְבָנֵי, יְבָנֵו), among the Hebrews, IV, D—D probably ran usually lengthwise and crosswise (Pliny, xviii, 19, 19; Niebuhr, Besch. p. 155). The sowing occurred, for winter grain, in October and November; for summer fruit, in January or February; and the harvest in April. The unexceptionable accounts of fifty-fold and hun-

dred-fold crops (Gen. xxxvi, 12 [on the reading here, see Tischendorf, loc.]; Matt. xxii, 9 sq, compare Josephus, War, iv, 8, 3; Justin, Apol. i, 193; Plin. Nat. Hist., xv, 731; xvi, 742; Halhed. Eit. x, 5, p. 395; Sonnin, 

Trans. ii, 806; Shaw, Trans. p. 123; Burckhardt, i, 463; yet see Boppel, Abyss. i, 92; Niebuhr, Beschreib, p. 151 sq.) seem to show that the ancients sowed (planted, i.e. deposited the grain, יְבָנֵא, Isai. xxvii, 29) in drills, and with wide spaces between (Niebuhr, Beschreib, p. 157; Brown's Transl. in Apol. i, 193; Strabo, xv, 780) expressly says was the case among the Babylonians. (See further under the above terms respectively; and comp. generally Ugolini, Comment. de re rustica vet. Heb., in his Theaœar. xxix; H. G. Paulsen, Nachrichten vom Ackerbau der Morgenländischen, Helmstäd, 1748; id. Ackerr. d. Morgenländischen, Helmstäd, 1748; Norbery, De agriculture orient., in his Opusc. Acad. ii, 474 sqq; P. G. Purmann, 5 progr. de re rustica et. Helv. Francf. 1787; also the Calendar. Palest. aemul. by Bahle and Walch, Götting, 1784; Reymar, L'Economie rurale des Arabes; Wilkinson, Anc. Egyptians; Layard's Nineveh, 1849; 1853; and Babylion, 1838; in his Phys. and Political Hist. of Palestine, 1845.) See Agriculture.

The legal regulations for the security and promotion of agriculture among the Israelites (compare Otho, Lex. Rabb. p. 28 sq) were the following: a. Every heredi-

tary or family estate was inalienable (Lev. xxv, 29); it could indeed be sold for debt, but the purchaser held only the usufruct of the ground; hence the land itself rever-

red without redemption at the year of jubilee to its ap-

propriate owner (Lev. xxviii, 28), whether the original possessor or his heirs-at-law; and at any time during the interval before that period it might be redeemed by a sufficient person on repayment of the purchase-money (Lev. xxv, 24). See Land; Jubilee. b. The removal of field-lines marked by boundary-stones ("termim") was strongly interdicted (Deut. xix, 14; compare xcvii, 17; Prov. xxii, 28; Hos. v, 10), as in all ancient nations (comp. Plato, Leg., viii, p. 486 sqq; Dugdale, Antiqu. i, 10; similarly the regulations were established at ancient religious ceremonies, see Pliny, xvi, 2; compare Ovid, Fasti, ii, 639 sqq); yet no special penalty is denounced in law against offenders. For any damage done to a field or its growth, whether by the overrunning of cattle or the spreading of fire (Exod. xxvii, 5 sq), full satisfaction was exacted by payment of 500 shekels (Lev. xxv, 4 sq). But even kings bought large tracts of land (lativeunda) together (Isa. v, 8; Mic. ii, 9), so that the entailment and right of redemption of the original possessor appear to have fallen into disuse; neither was the Sabbatical year regularly observed (Jer. xxxvii, 5 sq). (For fur-
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their agricultural details, see John's 

A rokeet, chap. iv."

See Farm.

Hulgan, Johann, a German Roman Catholic di-

vine, was born at Giesenkirchen, near Cologne, in 1789.

In 1792 he became vicar and teacher at his native place, and after filling different vicarages, was appointed superintendent over the Roman Catholic schools at Aix-la-Chapelle in 1816, in 1825 general vicar to archbishop, Spiriegel of Desenberg and dean in Cologne, and in 1885, upon the death of the archbishop, presiding officer of the archiepiscopal pro tem, in which office he greatly dis-
tinguished himself by his kind and conciliatory spirit towards all sects. He died in 1841.—Pierer, Unr. Lex.

viii, 635.

Hu'ashah (Hebrew Chushah), הושע הנש ; Sept.

'Qoût, Vulg. Hose), son of Ezer and grandson of Hur of the family of Judah (1 Chron. iv, 4); whence prob-

ably the patronymic Hushathite (Heb. Chushathiy,

"Heshav, Sept. 'Awiirt, Ovora5), 2 Sam. xxi, 18; 1 Chron.

xi, 29; xx, 4. He seems to be the same person called Shulah in 1 Chron. iv, 11. Comp. Hushah. B.C. post 1612.

Hu'ashah (Hebrew Chushhah', "Hushah, quick; Sept.

and Josephus [Ant. vii, 9, 2; Xoua], called “the Archite” (q.v.) (comp. Jes. xvi, 2) and “the king’s companion,” i.e., eisir or intimate adviser (1 Chron. xxvii, 38), a post which doubtless attained by his eminent services to David in defeating (B.C. cir. 1025) the plots of Ahith-ophel, in league with the rebellious Absalom (2 Sam. xv, 32, 57; xvi, 15-18; xvii, 6-15). See David, Ba-

annah, Solomon’s viceroy in Asher, was doubtless the son of the same (1 Kings iv, 16).

Hu'asham (Hebrew Chusham’, "Husham, but defectively

"Husham in Gen. xxxvi, 34, 35, hasty; Sept. 'Aqo or

'Alpo), a Temanite, successor of Jobab and predecessor of Bedad among the native princes of Mount Seir before the usurpation of the Edomites (Gen. xxxvi, 34, 35; 1 Chron. i, 45). B.C. long ante 1035, and probably ante 1618.

Hu'shathite (2 Sam. xxi, 18; xxii, 27; 1 Chron.

xi, 29; xx, 4; xxvi, 11). See Hushah.

Hu'shim (Hebrew Chushhim', "Hushites, or defect. "Hushim in Gen. xlvii, 23; 1 Chron. v, 12; hasty; Sept. 'Qoût, but 'Aqo in Gen. xlvii, 23, and 'Aqo in 1 Chron. vii, 12), the name of two men and one woman.

1. A son of Dan (Gen. xlvii, 23); more properly called Shuram (Numb. xxvi, 49). "Heusham figures promi-
nently in the Jewish traditions of the recognition of Joseph, and of Jacob’s burial at Hebron. See the quo-
tations from the Midrash in Weil’s Bib. Legenda, p. 88, note, and the Targum Pseudeon, on Gen. i, 13. In the latter he is the executioner of Esau”.

2. A name, given as that of “the sons of Abier” or

Abarah, the third son of Benjamin (1 Chron. vii, 12; comp. viii, 1), and therefore only a plural form for Shu-

hram (see the foregoing name, and compare the fact that the following is a fem. appellation) as a representative of his brethren. Comp. Huphim, and see Benjamin. B.C. post 1856.

3. One of the wives of Shaharaim, of the tribe of

Benjamin, in the country of Moab, by whom he had Ahitub and Elpael (1 Chron. viii, 8, 11). B.C. cir. 1618.

Husk (25, zog, the skin of a grape, so called as being

transparent, Numb. vi, 4; "tisiklon, a sack for

grain, so called from being tied together at the mouth, 2 Kings iv, 42) occurs also in Luke xv, 16 as a rendering of kspstwv (from its horned extremities), in the parable of the prodigal son, where it is said that "he would fain have filled his belly with the husk that the swine did eat; and no man gave [even this poor provender, so Meyer, ad loc.] unto him.” In the Arabic Version of the New Testament, the word khrbb, often written khrwbb, is given as a synonym of keritta. According to Celsius, the modern Greeks have converted the Ar-

tree of the family of leguminous plants, of which the fruit used to be called Silica edulis and Silica dulcis.

By the Greeks, as Galen and Paulus Aegineta, the tree is called kpoa, kpoa, from the resemblance of its fruit to kipos, a horn; also σκηνη αἰγυπτία, or Egypt-

iæ fic (Theophr. Plant. i, 18). The carob-tree grows in the south of Europe and north of Africa, usually to a moderate size, but it sometimes becomes very large, with a trunk of great thickness, and affords an agree-

able shade. It has been seen by travellers near Beth-

lem (Rauwolf, Travels, p. 458; Schubert, iii, 115), and elsewhere (Robinson’s Researches, iii, 54). Prof. Hack-

tett saw it growing around Jerusalem, and the fruit ex-

posed for sale in the market at Smyrna; and he de-

scribes its form and uses (Illustra. of Scripture, p. 129, Bost. 1855). Wilde, being in the plain near Mount Carmel, observed several splendid specimens of the car-

ob-tree. On the 15th of March he noticed the fruit as having been perfected. The husks were scattered on the ground, where some cattle had been feeding on them. It is an evergreen, and puts forth a great many

Ceratonia Silicua.
branches, covered with large pinnate leaves. The blossom is of a reddish or dark purple color, and is succeeded by large, slender pods or capsules, curved like a horn or sickle, containing a sweetish pulp, and several small, shining seeds. These pods are sometimes eight or ten inches long, and an inch and a half broad; the color is dark brown, and the seeds which they contain are about the size of an ordinary dry pea, not perfectly round, flattened, hard and bitter, and of a dark reddish brown color. The quantity of pods borne by each tree is very considerable, being often as much as 800 or 900 pounds weight; they are of a subaromatic taste when unripe, but when ripe to maturity they secrete within the husks and around the ribs an amber-brownish, pungent spirit. When on the tree the pods have an unpleasant odor, but when dried upon hulles they become edible, and are valued by poor people, and during famine in the countries where the tree is grown, especially in Spain and Egypt, and by the Arabs. They are given as food to cattle in modern times, and we were in ancient times, but at the best can only be considered very poor fare. (See Cebisius, 1, 227; Oudem. vi. 137 sq.; Salmas, Exercit. Plin. p. 45 sq.; Hasselquet, Vrarda, p. 581; Arvieux, Voyage, p. 206 sq.; Penny Cyclopaedia. s. v. Cervatoni.)

Huss, John (more properly Hus, the other mode of spelling it, which was universally used and has (as it is evident from a translation in the English language), was the illustrious Bohemian reformer before the Reformation, and the precursor of the Church of the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren.

1. Sketch of his Life.—He was born July 6, 1369, or, according to some authorities, 1373, at Hussen, a small market-town of Bohemia, on the Planitz. His parents were common people, but in good circumstances for their station in life. Very little is known of his early years. He entered the University of Prague, and took his first degree in 1390. The development of his mind was slow, but intense; he showed a strong determination, and a hatred for hypocrisy and the most genuine godliness. In his intercourse with others he was modest and kind. A spirit of melancholy gave a subdued tone to his bearing. He was a tall man, with a thin, pale, sad face. His public career began in 1396, when he was appointed professor in the university. In 1401 he became dean of its theological faculty, and in 1402 its rector. At the same time he was pastor of the Bethlehem Chapel at Prague, erected by John de Milheim (1391), in order to give the people an opportunity of hearing the Gospel in their native tongue, and to give instruction in the Christian religion. Multitudes flocked to his chapel, among them Queen Sophia, who also chose him for her confessor. His sermons were not oratorical, but lucid, fervent, and simple, displaying a thorough knowledge of the Bible, and leaving an indelible impression upon the minds of the people. It was from the pulpit of this church that he set forth the truth with such force as to make Rome tremble. The Reformation, which Huss may be said to have inaugurated, may be dated from the 28th of May, 1403, when the doctrines of John Wickliffe were publicly condemned in a meeting of the faculty and doctors of the university, in spite of the efforts of Huss and his friends to prevent such a decision. The formation of two parties was the result; the one in favor of reform, the other opposed to it. At the head of the first stood Huss, who labored with zeal and boldness, uncovering the putrid sores of the Church and particularly the gross immoralities of the clergy. For a time Zbynck, the archbishop of Prague, recognised the honesty of Huss's intentions. But soon disagreements occurred between them; and when thousands of students left the university because of a new distribution of votes on academical occasions (1408), which Huss had been mainly instrumental in bringing about, the archbishop openly arrayed himself on the side of his enemies. An opportunity soon offered for showing Zbynck's ill will. The clergy of Prague laid before him formal accusations of heresy against Huss, which the latter met with counter accusations against Zbynck. Both appealed to the pope. In response, Alexander V conferred extraordinary powers upon the archbishop, which he soon abused. Accordingly, the latter prohibited preaching in private chapels; caused more than 200 volumes of Wickliffe's writings to be committed to the flames, amidst the chanting of the Te Deum; and excommunicated Huss (July 18, 1410). In this emergency King Wenzel came to the principles of the Zbynck, rose in arms against the owners of the books, and annulled the ban against Huss. Nor was the prohibition touching chapels carried out. Meantime Alexander died, and was succeeded by John XXIII, an atrocious wretch, formerly a member of the Hussite sect. When on the throne of vice. To him, Wenzel, the queen, many nobles, and Huss himself appealed for redress. But the new pope adhered to the policy of his predecessor, confirmed the acts of Zbynck, and cited Huss before his tribunal in person. The king, however, sent two advocates to Bologna, where the papal court had its seat, to plead Huss's cause, and they were joined by three more delegated by Huss himself. But they effected only a transfer of the suit to other hands; while an attempt on the part of Zbynck, at Prague, to lay an interdict upon the city, caused an open rupture between him and the king, who coerced him by violent means. At last, in the year 1412, the pope, in order to obtain peace and a pacification, including Huss, was brought about. But in September of the same year Zbynck died, and was succeeded by Albicus, a weak and miserly old man, who received, in the following spring (1412), a papal bull commanding a crusade against Lautersaus, king of Naples, a favorite and companion of Zbynck, and the anti-pope, with all the papal indulgence to all who would take part in it, or contribute money towards its prosecution. The publication of this bull put a sudden end to the peace which it had been patched up in the Church of Bohemia. Huss regarded the bull as an infamous document, contrary to all Christian sentiment, and publicly took this stand. A number of his friends, on the contrary, maintained that the will of the pope must be obeyed under all circumstances; they accordingly broke with him, and went over to the anti-reform party. Several of them afterwards became his most ardent foes; and one of them, Stephen de Palec, was the chief instigator of his subsequent condemnation at Constance. In nothing terrified by his adversaries, however, Huss continued to preach against the bull, and held a public disputation upon it in the sala of the university; on which occasion he asserted his independence, with great force. In Prague, delivered an address of such fervid eloquence that the students formed a fantastical procession the next day, bearing as many copies of the document as they could find to the outskirts of the city, where they were heaped up and burned. Huss took no part in these proceedings. King Wenzel now became alarmed. He had a reputation to support in Romish Christendom, and issued a decree making any further revilement of the pope or the papal bull punishable with death. In consequence, three young men were executed, who, on the following Sunday, publicly gave the lie to a priest while advocating the plenary indulgence offered by the pope. Huss buried them in the Bethlehem Chapel, with all the rites of the Church, and extolled them as martyrs. When John XXIII was informed of these events, he communicated the Reformer a second time, ordered his arrest, commanded his chapel to be suppressed, and laid upon the whole city of Prague, Wenzel again interfered, saved Huss from arrest, and prevented the chapel from being destroyed: but, as the ban was everywhere published, and the interdict rigidly enforced, he advised Huss to leave the city for a time. Huss obeyed; and, after spending several years in the walls of his chapel, appealing from the corrupt Romish tribunal to the only incorruptible and infallible Judge, Jesus Christ, he retired to the Castle of Koz Hradec (December, 1412). There, and subsequently at the Castle of Krakowce, he remained until August, 1414, engaged
in literary labors, which resulted in some of the most important both of his Latin and Bohemian works, carrying on a voluminous correspondence, and preaching to the people of the neighboring villages.

Meanwhile a general council of the Church had been called to meet at Constance, 1414, under the auspices of Sigismund, a brother of Wenzel, and designated emperor. This monarch invited Huss to attend, that his cause might be examined and peace given to the Bohemian Church. He pledged himself to grant him a safe-conduct, and to send him back unharmed, even in the event of his not submitting to the council. Modern Romish historians try to disprove the reality of such a promise. But it is incontrovertible. The instrument which Sigismund actually furnished says: "Ut ei transire, stare, morari, redivere libere permittatis." Huss joyfully obeyed the summons, for it was the great wish of his heart to defend his doctrines in the presence of the assembled representatives of Latin Christendom, and to unite with them in reforming the Church, for which purpose the Council had been specially convened. Leaving Prague on the 11th of October, with testimonials of orthodoxy from the papal inquisitor and the archbishop, and accompanied by a retinue of nobles whom the king appointed to defend him, he traveled through Bohemia and Germany, held disputations upon his doctrines in all the towns where he passed a night, and arrived at Constance on the 8th of November. The next three weeks he spent in strict seclusion. His case was finally referred to the judgment of the council, and he was temporarily suspended the sentence of excommunication, besides giving him the solemn pledges for his personal safety. But Stephen de Palec and others among his Bohemian enemies began so persistently to incite the ecclesiastics against him, that he was arrested on the 28th of November, and on the 1st of December was cast into the dungeon of the Dominican monastery. When Sigismund reached the city, Huss's escort vainly attempted to secure his release. The emperor was persuaded by the priests that it would be wrong to keep him in prison; but, after the lapse of three months, was conveyed to the Castle of Gottlieben, where a mere hole, so low that he could not stand upright in it, was assigned him as his cell, and where his feet were fastened to a block with heavy irons, and at night his right arm was chained to the bed he slept in. Hopes of flight from him were extinguished by the end of March to the beginning of June, in spite of the unceasing efforts of his friends, and the solemn protest of the whole Bohemian nation.

Huss had three hearings before the council; the first on the 5th of June (1415), the second on the 7th, and the third on the 10th. For the most part they were stormy debates, or irregular philippics against him. He was not permitted to explain and defend his doctrines. An immediate and explicit recantation was required of him, which he declined giving, unless convicted of heresy by the testimony of Christ and his apostles. After the last hearing several weeks elapsed, in which every conceivable effort was made to induce him to recant. But he remained firm, and calmly prepared for death. On Saturday, July 6, he was once more cited before the council, condemned as a heretic, degraded from the priesthood, and delivered into the hands of the secular power for execution. The proper officers immediately conveyed him to the outskirts of the city, where, at about ten o'clock in the morning, he was burned alive at the stake, while the council continued in session. He suffered with the heroism of the early martyrs. His ashes were cast into the Rhine. The memory of this, by the present generation of his countrymen, marks the spot. Erasmus pithily said: "Joannes Huss exustus, non convictus." The tradition of a peasant woman bringing a flag to the pile, and moving him to exclaim "O sancta simplicitas!" is very doubtful; the other tradition of a prophecy with regard to Luther, under the image of a swan, uttered by Huss on his way to execution, lacks all historic basis. Jerome of Prague (q. v.), who had stood faithfully by the side of Huss, and, on the death of his friend, himself led the followers of the lamented Huss, soon suffered the same fate. The disturbances which then followed we treat under Hussitae.

II. Huss's Literary Labors.—Besides the many letters which Huss wrote, the most clearly forth in his theological views, he was the author of fifteen Bohemian, and a large number of Latin works. Of the former, among which his Postilla and Tractatus de Simony are particularly important, several have, unfortunately, never been translated, and others remain in manuscript. Of the latter, his Tractatus de Ecclesia describe very particu-
larly mentioned, together with the polemical treatises against Palec and Stanislaus, that form its supplemen-
tas (Historia et Monumenta Jussi, i, 245–331, ed. of 1710). Other of his Latin works are of an exe-
gogical character. He also composed numerous hymns and didactic hexameters. Many of his hymns were adopted by the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren, and some of them are still in use in the Moravian Church. Moreover, he carefully revised the old Bohemian version of the Bible, which had been translated as early as the ninth century, and in quite recent times. The Bohemian antiquary and historian, has discovered a catechism in that language, which he supposes to be from the pen of Huss, and which, no doubt, formed the basis for the catechism of the Brethren, published in 1522. As a writer of his mother language the merits of Huss cannot be set aside. He shaped the Bohemian language into a logical and syntactical rules, and invented a new system of orthography, distinguished by its simplicity and precision. It was brought into general use by the Bohemian and Moravian Brethren in the sixteenth century, since when it has remained the acknowledged standard. Ulrich von Hutten was the first to publish the Latin works of Huss. The edition by O. Brunfels (Strasb. 1625, 4to, with woodcuts), is very scarce. A more complete edition appeared at Nuremberg in 1558, entitled Historia et Monumenta Jussi (Huss utque Hieronymi Praegressa), in two fol. volumes. Still more complete is the edition of 1715, which came out at the same place with the same title. A small but very important volume of his sermons, translated from a copy of the Bohemian Postilla, brought to Hennibert by the Moravian refugees, appeared at Göttingen in 1855. Its title reads as follows: Johannes Hussus, Propheta et Theologi, Fragmenta, Nach der Ubersetzung-Evangelien des Kirchennahrs. Aus der Böhmischem in die Deutsche Sprache übersetzt von Dr. Johannes No-
soynt. They are pre-eminently sermons for the times, and abound in polemics. His letters have been trans-
lated into English (Edins. 1659, 1 vol.) and other modern languages. A collection of his writings in Bohemi-
an was begun by Erben (Prague, 1864, etc.).

III. Huss's Theological Views, and the Principles of his Reformation.—The views of Huss were moulded by the writings of two men in particular; the one Matthias of Janow, a Bohemian, the other Wickliffe, the English Reformer. He was attracted by the latter, inasmuch as Wickliffe always traced the truth up to its source in the New Testament, and desired to renew Christianity in its apostolic sense. Hence he made him his guide in those principles which he had, first of all, learned from Janow, and which he ever afterwards developed and applied. Not having passed through the same conflict which brought Luther into the inner sanctuary of divine grace, through Christ, and justification by faith, he did not turn his attention so much to doctrine as to practice, and set forth the Saviour of the world rather from the standard point of the law which was given by faith than from that of his redeeming work. As a necessary con-
sequence, he insisted more upon the reformation of the Church in regard to life than in regard to its un sound and corrupt dogmatical views. This was the weak point of his Reformation, bringing it to a premature end, and him to the stake. In order to success, an absolute reform of the dogmas of the Church was essential. Huss
HUSSEY did not see this, because he had formed no plan of operations antagonistical to Rome. He advanced, not in obedience to any law, but in pursuit of his personal ends, only, and under the influence of outward circumstances. While Christ was the centre of his own faith, and he held to Christ's Word alone as the norm of the faith of all, he did not, on that account, reject Romish dogmas until he became conscious of a contradiction between them and the true spirit of the Gospel. His impulse to action was made prominent by the circumstances of the times, the more clearly he apprehended the truth in its evangelical import. Upon some points, however, as, for instance, the seven sacraments, and transubstantiation in the Lord's Supper, he never changed the views which were his from infancy. In my opinion, this gave him the opportunity of investigating these points in a reformatory spirit. So also he allowed, with certain qualifications and great caution, prayers for the dead, although he did not deem them of any importance; also confession to a priest and absolution, though, once he said, could forgive sins but God only; and he was, at first, satisfied with the holy communion in one kind. When this latter usage, however, grew to be a subject of dispute between the national and the Romish party in Bohemia, he emphatically endorsed the position of Jacobus of Mies, who wrote: "The Church is not to be divided by the cup of Communion, but by the view of his views on the Church, as set forth in the work mentioned above, see Naendler's Kirchengegeschichte, vi, 295, etc., or Torrey's Translation, v, 299, as also Gillett's Life and Times of Huss, i, 241, etc. In general, it may be said that it was not until his trial before the council that he recognized the necessity of unity with the Church of Rome in order to effect a reformation. If he had been able, at that time, to escape from the hands of his enemies and return to Bohemia, he would have been the Luther of the world, and Protestantism would have begun its enlightening course a century earlier. See Reformation. While Huss failed to lead the Catholic church in a general reformation, his principles, developed and purified, found an ecclesiastical form forty-two years later in the Church of the Brethren, and have, through that channel, come down to the present day as a power in Christendom.

In addition to the histories of the Council of Constance, the most important works are: Lebenbeschreibung des M. Johannes Huss von Hussineke, von Aug. Zitelte, Lateinpreis; (Prague, 1790); an anonymous work, in German, "Die Geschichte der Lebensabrechnung des Herrn John Huss, was condensed in Constance in the Council of the Pope and his factions," written by an eye-witness, and published in 1548; Becker's Life of Huss; Kohler's Huss und seine Zeit; Hist. of the Hussites, by Hodgeson; Rennert, p. 133; Naendler's Kirchengegeschichte, vi; Gillett's Life and Times of John Huss; and especially Palacky, F. Geschichte von Röhm, iii, pt. i, iii-iv; Palacky, F. Documenta Mag. J. Huss vatam, doctriam, causam in Conc. Constant, octom, etc., nunc ex scriptis fontibus hactenus (Prag 1869); Bonnehoeve (Emile de), Les Reformations avant la Reforme (Paris, 1847, 2 vols, 12mo); Good Words, Jan. 6, 1866, p. 21 sqq; Ranke, Hist. of the Popes, ii, 79 sqq; Zitelte, Lebenbeschreibung, d. Mag. J. Huss (Prag 1678-95, 2 vols); Wendt, Gesch. v Huss und d. Hussiten (Magdeburg 1845); Helfert, Huss u. Hieronymus (Prag 1893); Böhringers, D. Kirche Christi u. ihre Zeugen (Wien 1833, 3 vols, body by vol., 1833, 1834), Krummel, J. Huss (Darmst. 1863); Höfler, Mag. J. Huss (Prague 1816); Contemp. Rev. April and July, 1869; Stud. u. Krit. 1863, iv'th; Math. Quart. Rev. 1864, p. 176. (E. n. i.)

Hussey, Robert, B.D., an eminent minister of the Church of England, was born at Sunderland, Kent, Oct. 7, 1801. He studied at the King's School, Oxford, and graduated in 1825 with great credit. He discharged for a while the office of proctor, and was afterwards appointed one of the public examiners in the classical school. In 1837 he took the degree of B.D. In 1842 he was appointed regius professor of ecclesiastical history, which position he held until his death, December 2, 1858. Hussey possessed an immense fund of information, to which he added anything he could procure from all kinds of sources from his own memory. The principal of these are: Sermons, mostly academical, with a preface containing a refutation of the theory founded upon the Syriac fragment of the epistles of St. Ignatius (Oxf. 1843, 8vo) — The Papal Supremacy, in Race and Progress, traced in three Lectures (Lond. 1851, 8vo). "This little work of the explanation that stands out in short notes (Oxf. 1846) — and the Greek text of Socrates's Ecclesiastical History (1844). In 1853 he edited again for the University Press another edition of Socrates, and this time a mere text-book for his lectures, but an elaborate edition, with a Latin version, notes, and index, forming three volumes 8vo. In 1854 he published a sermon, by request, on University Prospects and University Duties, and in 1856 an ordination sermon on The Atonement. An edition of Sosmen was suspended by his death.

Husssites, general name for the followers of John Huss (q. v.). The Council of Constance, in its dealings with Huss, seems to have forgotten that the adherents to his cause were not the handful of men who had gathered around their friend and teacher in his last hours, but were scattered throughout Bohemia and Moravia. No sooner had news of his death reached the council than the meetings were disturbed by disturbances, the cause of the disturbances being the desire to espouse openly the cause of the Hussites. September 8, 1415, the Diet of Bohemia addressed a manifesto to the council, full of reproaches and threats; and September 5 it voted that every landowner should be free to have the doctrines of Huss preached on his estate. For Huss, considered threatened, the priesthood, and, indeed, all strict adherents of the Romish Church, formed (October 1) a league (Herrenbund), vowing obedience to the council and fidelity to the Romish Church. Encouraged by these associations, deemed strong enough not only to oppose successively the efforts of the opponents of Huss, but to carry anything further the inroads of the heretics among the people, the council assumed a more authoritative position. Not satisfied with the mischief it had already done, it now threatened all adherents of Huss with ecclesiastical punishments. Jerome of Prague (q. v.), the friend and disciple of Huss, was the first to suffer. He was summoned before the council, summarily tried and condemned, and, like his master, burned at the stake (May 30, 1416). The 452 signers of a protest against the execution of Huss were the next summoned before the bar of the council to answer for their heretical conduct. Indeed, had not the emperor Sigismund interfered, the king and queen of the Bohemians would have been added to this number. But the execution of Jerome, following that of Huss, was too great an outrage in the eyes of the Bohemians not to destroy the last vestige of respect for the authority of the council even among those who had been con- templated. The threats of the council became to them a mere bruitum fulmen. They treated them with contempt.

Meanwhile, the adherents of Huss had divided into two parties, the moderate and the extreme. The moderate party, led by the University of Prague, took the name of Calixtines (q. v.), who derived their title from the chalice (calix), holding that communion in both kinds was essential to the sacrament; the so-called extreme party were called the Taborites, from the mountain Tabor (now Austin), which was originally their headquarters. Here, where Huss himself had formerly preached, they
assembled in the open air, sometimes to the number of over 40,000, and partook of communion under both kinds on tables erected for the occasion. The Calixtines preserved the belief in purgatory, praying for the dead, images of the saints, holy water, etc.; but in March, 1417, they declared openly for the right of all communicants to both kinds. As a result of this declaration, all the privileges of the university were suspended by the council, and the forcible abolition of the heresy demanded by Pope Martin V. In the early part of 1419, King Wenceslaus, unwilling to lose the favor of either party, and fearing jealousies and increasing discord, restored the rights of Roman Catholic priests to their former offices. But no sooner had the Romanists learned of the enactments in their favor than they attacked the Hussites and began all manner of persecutions against them. February 22, 1418, Martin V issued a bull against the followers of Wickliffe and Huss. All who should be found "to think or teach otherwise than as the holy Roman Catholic Church thinks or teaches;" all who held the doctrines, or defended the characters of Huss or Wickliffe, were to be delivered over to the secular arm for punishment as heretics. The document is a model from which the Inquisition, both in the West and in the East, copied and exhausted the odium of language in describing the character of the objects of its vengeance. They are "schismatical, seditionous, impelled by Luciferian pride and wolfish rage, duped by devilish tricks, tied together by the tail, only to be dragged over the earth and thus tarried in favor of Wickliffe, Huss, and Jerome. These pestilent persons had obstinately sown their perverse dogmas, while at first the prelates and ecclesiastical authority had shown themselves to be only dumb dogs, unwilling to bark, or to restrain, according to the canons, these deceitful and pernicious doctrines. These intolerant measures added strength to the party whom it was their object to extirpate. The Bohemians, threatened at home by a feeble and vacillating king, and abroad by the official emissaries of the papal pontiff, felt themselves obliged to gather in numbers for self-defense, and choose Nicolas of H unlitez (q. v.) and John Ziska (q. v.) as their leaders. They also prepared an answer to the bull, and circulated it far and wide. It was entitled "A faithful and Christian Exhortation of the Bohemians to Kings and Princes, to stir them up to the zeal of the Gospel," and was signed by four of their leading captains. The two principal leaders of the party, the theologians, their Christian intelligence, and their regard for the supreme authority of the Word of God." Their first aim was to secure, if possible, the capital of the kingdom, July 30, Zisca entered the old city, or that part of it which had been burned in 1319 by the religious order, and they remained for an assault on the new city, joined by the inhabitants of the old. His aim, however, for the present, was only to intimidate the papal party. After Zisca had gained the city, some of his men sought entrance in churches to observe their religious rites. They were denied admission to some of them, and the consequence was a forcible entrance, and the summary execution of the fanatic priests. With the council of the city also they experienced trouble. While a number of the Hussites were in a procession from one of the churches, their minister, bearing the chalice, was struck by a stone which had been thrown from one of the windows of the state-house. The Hussites became enraged. Under the command of Zisca himself, the state-house was stormed. Seven of the councillors, who had been unable to make their escape, were thrown from the upper windows by the rebels below. The king, when the news reached him, became so excited that he died of a fit of apoplexy. General anarchy now ensued. The Hussites, undisputed masters of Prague, restored the forms of civil government by the appointment of four magistrates to hold office until the general election for the state council, under Zisca, to Pilsen. The queen Sophia sought not only to secure the aid of the emperor Sigismund against these armed heretics, but even endeavored to influence the citizens of Prague to admit Sigismund as the successor of Wenceslaus. The people appealed to Zisca for aid against the probable invasion of the city by Sigismund. November 4, 1419, Zisca re-entered the city. The emperor invaded a war with the Turks, neglected at first to attend to Bohemia. Finally in 1420 he besieged Prague, but was driven from his positions. Widely differing in their political and religious sentiments, the Hussites became daily more divided. Some favored the Calixtines, others the Taborites, and between these two factions a wide jealousy and increasing discord arose. The restaurators of Roman Catholic priests to their former offices. No sooner had the Romanists learned of the enactments in their favor than they attacked the Hussites and began all manner of persecutions against them. February 22, 1418, Martin V issued a bull against the followers of Wickliffe and Huss. All who should be found "to think or teach otherwise than as the holy Roman Catholic Church thinks or teaches;" all who held the doctrines, or defended the characters of Huss or Wickliffe, were to be delivered over to the secular arm for punishment as heretics. The document is a model from which the Inquisition, both in the West and in the East, copied and exhausted the odium of language in describing the character of the objects of its vengeance. They are "schismatical, seditionous, impelled by Luciferian pride and wolfish rage, duped by devilish tricks, tied together by the tail, only to be dragged over the earth and thus tarried in favor of Wickliffe, Huss, and Jerome. These pestilent persons had obstinately sown their perverse dogmas, while at first the prelates and ecclesiastical authority had shown themselves to be only dumb dogs, unwilling to bark, or to restrain, according to the canons, these deceitful and pernicious doctrines. These intolerant measures added strength to the party whom it was their object to extirpate. The Bohemians, threatened at home by a feeble and vacillating king, and abroad by the official emissaries of the papal pontiff, felt themselves obliged to gather in numbers for self-defense, and choose Nicolas of H unlitez (q. v.) and John Ziska (q. v.) as their leaders. They also prepared an answer to the bull, and circulated it far and wide. It was entitled "A faithful and Christian Exhortation of the Bohemians to Kings and Princes, to stir them up to the zeal of the Gospel," and was signed by four of their leading captains. The two principal leaders of the party, the theologians, their Christian intelligence, and their regard for the supreme authority of the Word of God." Their first aim was to secure, if possible, the capital of the kingdom, July 30, Zisca entered the old city, or that part of it which had been burned in 1319 by the religious order, and they remained for an assault on the new city, joined by the inhabitants of the old. His aim, however, for the present, was only to intimidate the papal party. After Zisca had gained the city, some of his men sought entrance in churches to observe their religious rites. They were denied admission to some of them, and the consequence was a forcible entrance, and the summary execution of the fanatic priests. With the council of the city also they experienced trouble. While a number of the Hussites were in a procession from one of the churches, their minister, bearing the chalice, was struck by a stone which had been thrown from one of the windows of the state-house. The Hussites became enraged. Under the command of Zisca himself, the state-house was stormed. Seven of the councillors, who had been unable to make their escape, were thrown from the upper windows by the rebels below. The king, when the news reached him, became so excited that he died of a fit of apoplexy. General anarchy now ensued. The Hussites, undisputed masters of Prague, restored the forms of civil government by the appointment of four magistrates to hold office until the general election for the state council, under Zisca, to Pilsen. The queen Sophia sought not only to secure the aid of the emperor Sigismund against these armed heretics, but even endeavored to influence the citizens of Prague to admit Sigismund as the successor of Wenceslaus. The people appealed to Zisca for aid against the probable invasion of the city by Sigismund. November 4, 1419, Zisca re-entered the city. The emperor invaded a war with the Turks, neglected at first to attend to Bohemia. Finally in 1420 he besieged Prague, but was driven from his positions. Widely differing in their political and religious sentiments, the Hussites became daily more divided. Some favored the Calixtines, others the Taborites, and between these two factions a wide jealousy and increasing discord arose. The restaurators of Roman Catholic priests to their former offices. No sooner had the Romanists learned of the enactments in their favor than they attacked the Hussites and began all manner of persecutions against them. February 22, 1418, Martin V issued a bull against the followers of Wickliffe and Huss. All who should be found "to think or teach otherwise than as the holy Roman Catholic Church thinks or teaches;" all who held the doctrines, or defended the characters of Huss or Wickliffe, were to be delivered over to the secular arm for punishment as heretics. The document is a model from which the Inquisition, both in the West and in the East, copied and exhausted the odium of language in describing the character of the objects of its vengeance. They are "schismatical, seditionous, impelled by Luciferian pride and wolfish rage, duped by devilish tricks, tied together by the tail, only to be dragged over the earth and thus tarried in favor of Wickliffe, Huss, and Jerome. These pestilent persons had obstinately sown their perverse dogmas, while at first the prelates and ecclesiastical authority had shown themselves to be only dumb dogs, unwilling to bark, or to restrain, according to the canons, these deceitful and pernicious doctrines. These intolerant measures added strength to the party whom it was their object to extirpate. The Bohemians, threatened at home by a feeble and vacillating king, and abroad by the official emissaries of the papal pontiff, felt themselves obliged to gather in numbers for self-defense, and choose Nicolas of H unlitez (q. v.) and John Ziska (q. v.) as their leaders. They also prepared an answer to the bull, and circulated it far and wide. It was entitled "A faithful and Christian Exhortation of the Bohemians to Kings and Princes, to stir them up to the zeal of the Gospel," and was signed by four of their leading captains. The two principal leaders of the party, the theologians, their Christian intelligence, and their regard for the supreme authority of the Word of God." Their first aim was to secure, if possible, the capital of the kingdom, July 30, Zisca entered the old city, or that part of it which had been burned in 1319 by the religious order, and they remained for an assault on the new city, joined by the inhabitants of the old. His aim, however, for the present, was only to intimidate the papal party. After Zisca had gained the city, some of his men sought entrance in churches to observe their religious rites. They were denied admission to some of them, and the consequence was a forcible entrance, and the summary execution of the fanatic priests. With the council of the city also they experienced trouble. While a number of the Hussites were in a procession from one of the churches, their minister, bearing the chalice, was struck by a stone which had been thrown from one of the windows of the state-house. The Hussites became enraged. Under the command of Zisca himself, the state-house was stormed. Seven of the councillors, who had been unable to make their escape, were thrown from the upper windows by the rebels below. The king, when the news reached him, became so excited that he died of a fit of apoplexy. General anarchy now ensued. The Hussites, undisputed masters of Prague, restored the forms of civil government by the appointment of four magistrates to hold office until the general election for the state council, under Zisca, to Pilsen. The queen Sophia sought not only to secure the aid of the emperor Sigismund against
fought at Galgenberg or Witkow, known thereafter as the Ziscaberg (Hill of Ziscia). Yet the opposition of the Taborites to all hierarchical pomp, and the threatened ruin of some of the most splendid structures of Prague, inclined the Calixtines, as soon as the danger had passed, to allude to the emperor and seek to have the stigma of heresy which rested on the four "Articles of Prague." This they failed to accomplish, and peace was further delayed. A second and third attempt of Sigismund to crush the Taborites met with no more success. An effort was now made to compromise the differences between the Calixtines and Taborites. But the greatest obstacle to this was found to be their political rather than religious views. The question which should wear the crown of Bohemia was a matter of no little importance, and each party seemed anxious to secure it for one of their number. A convention of the states was held at Cazalau, July, 1421, to determine the matter. A regency was appointed of twenty members, taken from the different orders of the nation. Ziska appeared in it in the first rank of the nobles as the leader, with support from the burghers, and the four Articles of Prague should be universally received. Sigismund was declared incapable of reigning over Bohemia, and the crown was offered to the king of Poland. He refused, however, to accept it. Withhold, grand duke of Lithuania, and the king of Hungary, but he declined. Recommended Sigismund Corybut, his brother, to the Bohemian barons, and accompanied him to Prague, where they both, by partaking of the communion of the cup, sealed their adherence to the faith of the Calixtines, who held now the supremacy at Prague, and who had revived their old hostility against the Taborites. The nation was divided into two "fierce parties, embittered by prejudice and mutual aggressions," so that the opposition to Corybut became irreconcilable, even although Ziska himself espoused his cause, as the Taborites were unwilling to follow their leader blindly. A diet held at Prague from November 1421, to determine the question, brought it no nearer to its solution, while it effected the estrangement of Ziska from the Calixtines, who now regarded him and his followers as their enemies. An army was gathered against them; but, as often before, the Taborites were victorious, and the Calixtines severely beaten. Another attempt to reconcile them proved favorable to them, and, thus driven to desperation, Ziska now attempted to crush the Calixtines, who were virtually leagues with the Imperialists. After various victories over his enemies, Ziska appeared before Prague September 1421. Harassed, and having no other issue forth from its gates. When everything was ready to storm the city, a deputation of the Calixtines appeared before him and offered terms of submission, which he readily accepted. Ziska entered Prague with great honors, and was intrusted with the exercise of paramount authority. The emperor's hopes of being king of Bohemia had of late been based upon the divisions of the nation, and, baffled by this new agreement between the Hussites, he now sought to win them over by liberal concessions. He offered to Ziska the government of the kingdom, and asked for himself only the wafer of a rejoinder. "But, at this culminating point of Ziska's fortunes, death overtook him (October 11, 1424). He lived to foil the purposes of Sigismund, and died at the moment when his death, in some respects, another defeat to his hopes. Ziska's death left the Taborites without any real leader. Their successes they chiefly owed to him, and some of them, to indicate their deep sense of the loss they had suffered, took the name of Orphantes (q. v.). Others were absorbed by the Horbites (q. v.), while still others retained their old name, and chose St. Procopius of Plzen (q. v.) as their leader. The Orphantes, however, had relapsed to a belief in transubstantiation: they observed the fasts, honored the saints, and their priests performed worship in robes, all which the strict Taborites continued to reject. Among the Orphante leaders, Procopius "the Lesser" was the most eminent. Vainly did the pope, assisted by the emperor, preach another crusade against the Hussites, who saluted out in force to besiege Prague, and threatened neighboring countries, and, considering always Bohemia as their home, and other places as the land of the Philistines, treated the latter accordingly. Bands of robbers of all nations soon joined them. Frederick "the Valiant" made war against them, and entered Bohemia in 1425, to engage with them. On the second occasion suffering a terrible defeat at the battle of Aush, June 15. A panic now seized all Germany, which was increased by the storming of Mies and Tachow by the Hussites in 1427. Another crusade, instigated against them by the emperor Sigismund in the same year, met with no better success than before. At the opening of 1428, a Convention was called at Beraun to bring about, if possible, a general pacification of the nation. But so varying were the views of the different sects, especially the doctrines of free-will, justification, and predestination, that the Convention was broken up in a confused manner, and the Orphantes, assisted by a portion of the Taborites, made a great invasion into Saxony and Silesia. They took Dresden, marched along the Elbe to Magdeburg, then turned into the province of Brandenburg, and finally burned Berlin. He returned home, and divided himself into different bands in various places, and adopting names according to their fancy. Some were known as Collecta, as Small Capa (Petit Chapeau, says L'Enfant), some as Little Cousins, others as Wolf's-sons. In the spring of 1428 they were ready to undertake another invasion of Bohemia, and together, either in person or by ambassadors. "It was finally resolved to make still another invasion of Bohemia. The papal legate came prepared for the enterprise. He had brought with him a bull of Martin V, ordaining a crusade, which was now opportunely to be published. Indulgences were profusely promised to those who should engage in the enterprise, or contribute to its promotion. Those who should fast and pray for its success should have a remission of penance for sixty days. From other vows interfering with enlistments in the holy war, a dispensation should be freely bestowed." Great efforts were made to insure the successful issue of this, the sixth invasion of Bohemia by the Imperialists (or the third papal crusade urged by the pope). 1431, was the year of the battle of Orlic. But, before it was undertaken, the emperor, to test the spirit of the Bohemians, made again propositions for the crown. The Orphantes were the only Hussites that opposed him. The Calixtines and Taborites returned a deputation of four to confer with Sigismund. But, before they had time to return to Prague, the Hussites became distrustful, and the most cautious and moderate among them felt satisfied that the emperor only intended to mislead them into a state of security, and then surprise and conquer them. "The old leagues and confederate bodies were revived. Old feudS were forgotten. The barons of Bohemia and Moravia, the Calixtines of Prague, and the indomitable Taborites and
Orphans, again united to repel the invader. In a few weeks 50,000 infantry, 7000 cavalry, and 3600 chariots were gathered." The crusading force also had been collecting, and now numbered 80,000 (some say 120,000) men, under the command of the elector of Brandenburg. This army, immense in size, armed with power and invincible as it seemed, was, like its predecessors, completely routed at Tausch, August 14, 1431, and the hopes of the Imperialists of subjecting the Bohemians by force of arms effectually crushed. Sigismund now most earnestly sought by every means in order to conciliate the pope, he caused himself to be crowned by Roman Catholic bishops and to take the religious obedience to the Church and to the pope. During his reign the Calixtines enjoyed full religious liberty; and when Pope Pius II declared the treaty abolished in 1463, George sent the papal legates to prison without further forms. For this he was under the ban, and finally deposed by the pope in 1463. "Meanwhile the warlike Taborites had disappeared from the scene. They no longer formed a national party. But the feeble remnants of that multitude which had once followed the standards of Ziska and Procopius are still clinging to the cherished faith of the old nation, and the Word of God as their only supreme authority, the United Brethren (q.v.) appear as their lineal representatives. How, from such an origin, should have sprung a people whose peaceful virtues and missionary zeal have been so well acknowledged by the world, is a problem only to be solved by another historian. In the future, the Taborites, however, they may have been guilty of fanatical excesses, there was to be found that fundamental principle of reverence for the authority of Scripture alone which they bequeathed as a cherished legacy to those who could understand and act upon it in more favorable circumstances and in more peaceful times." The successor of George, Ladislaus of Poland, who came to the government in 1471, held fast to the conditions of the treaty, though himself a Roman Catholic. In 1485 he concluded the peace of Kuttning, according to which the Utraquists and Subjunctas (Roman Catholics who communed but in one kind) were promised equal toleration; and in 1497 he gave the Utraquists the right to appoint an administrator of the archbishopric of Prague as their ecclesiastical chief. When the Reformation began in Germany, it was gladly hailed by both the Bohemian Catholic and the Utraquist sects, for in 1544 they decided to continue, under the guidance of Luther, the reform begun by Huss. A large part of them now divided themselves into Lutherans and Calvinists, and in 1573 both these united with the Bohemian Brethren in a joint confession and became a strongly Protestant denomination. They were permitted to hold religious liberty until 1612, when they were subjected to many restrictions by the emperor Matthias, and to still more by the emperor Rudolph in 1617. This was the first cause of the Thirty-years' War, and it was only under Joseph II that the Calixtines recovered their religious liberty. See Cocliüs, Hist. Hist. Hussitum (Mayence, 1549, fol.) Theobald, Hussitenskrig (Wittenberg, 1609; Nurem. 1628; Breslaw, 1750, 3 vols.); Geschichte d. Hussiten (Lpz. 1784); Schubert, Geschichte d. Hussitenskriags (Neustadt, 1822); Pfeifer, Universal Lexikon, viii, 686; Köppen, Der adel. Huss. Brethren (Lpz. 1859); The Reformation and Anti-Reformation in Bohemia (London, 1849, 2 vols. 8vo); Patacky, Geschichte v. Böhmen (1846, 3 vols., vol. iii; Beziehungen u. Verhältnisse d. Waldensers d. heutigen Zeit in Böhmen (Prag, 1869); Vorläufer u. Entstehung d. Böhmen (new ed.), 1870; Jean Gochlin and Theobaldus, Hist. de la Guerre d' Hussites; Neander, Church Hist. v, 172; Gindely, Gesch. d. Böhmischen Brüders (Prag, 1857, 2 vols. 8vo); and especially Gillett, Life and Times of John Huss (Boston, 1868, 2 vols. 8vo), from which extracts have frequently been made in this volume.

HITCHENSON, Francis, called by Mackintosh the
father of speculative philosophy in Scotland," was the son of a Presbyterian minister in Ireland, and was born Aug. 8, 1694. He entered the University of Glasgow in 1710, and afterwards became minister of a Presbyterian church in the north of Ireland; but, preferring the study of philosophy to theology, he was induced to open a private academy at Dublin. The publication of some of his works soon procured him the friendship of many distinguished persons, and in 1729 he was called as professor of moral philosophy to the University of Glasgow. He died in 1747. His principal works are, Philosophiae compendiose demonstrato constitutio et jurisprudencia naturalis elementa continuas (Glasgow, 1742, 12mo):-- A Short Introduction to Moral Philosophy, containing the Elements of Ethics and the Law of Nature, translated (Glasgow, 1747, sm. 8vo):--An Essay on the Nature and Conduct of Passions and Affectations (3d ed. Glasgow, 1769, sm. 8vo):--Symposia metaphysica, Ontologia et Pneumatomagium complectens (editio sexta, Glasgow, 1774, sm. 8vo):--An Inquiry into the Original of our Ideas of Beauty and Virtue, in two treatises (5th ed. corrected, London, 1755, 8vo):--Letters between the late Mr. Gilbert Burnet and Mr. Hutcheson concerning the true Idea of Virtue and Virtue (new ed. London, 1735, 8vo). After his death, his System of Moral Philosophy was published by his son, Francis Hutcheson, M.D., with a sketch of his life and writings by Dr. William Leechman (Glasgow, 1755, 2 vols. 4to). In his method, as distinguished from Hume, he rejected the theory of innate ideas and principles, but insisted on the admission of certain universal propositions, or, as he terms them, metaphysical axioms, which are self-evident and immutable. These axioms are primary and original, and do not derive their authority from any simpler and antecedent principles. Consequently, it is idle to seek a criterion of truth, for this is none other than reason itself, or, in the words of Hutcheson, 'meni congesta intelligendi vis.' Of his ontological axioms two are important: Everything exists really; and no quality, affection, or action is real, except in so far as it exists in some object or thing. From the latter proposition, it follows that all abstract hypothetical propositions are psychological, that is, they invariably suppose the existence of some object without which they cannot be true. Truth is divided into logical, moral, and metaphysical. Logical truth is the agreement of a proposition with the object it represents; moral truth is the conformity of the outward act with the inward sentiments; lastly, metaphysical truth is that nature of a thing wherein it is known to God as that which actually it is, or it is its absolute reality. Perfect truth is in the infinite alone. The truth of all our perceptions is imperfect, and, as they are, limited. It is, however, from the finite truth, that the mind rises to the idea of absolute truth, and so forms to itself a belief that an absolute and perfect nature exists, which, in regard to duration and space, is infinite and eternal. The soul, as the thinking essence, is spiritual and incorporeal. Of its nature we have, it is true, but little knowledge; nevertheless, its specific difference from body is at once attested by the consciousness. It is simple and active; body is composite and passive. From the spiritual nature of the soul, however, Hutcheson does not derive its immortality, but makes this to rest upon the properties of God. In moral philosophy he was the first to use the term "moral sense" to denote "the faculty which perceives the morality of actions," and he held it to be an essential part of human nature. He allows the appellation of good to those actions alone which are disinterested and flow from the principle of benevolence. The last of the expediency or personal advantages, nor even to the more refined enjoyments of moral sympathy, the obligations of reason and truth, or of the divine will. It is a distinct and peculiar principle, a moral sentiment or instinct, a great dignity and authority, and its end is to regulate the passions, and to decide, in favor of virtue, the conflict between the interested and disinterested affections. On this foundation Hutcheson erected all the superstructure of the moral duties." See English Cyclopædia; Mackintosh, History of Ethical Philosophy, p. 126; Tennemann, Manual of History of Philosophy, § 260; Stud. u. Krit. 1866, p. 406; Morell, History of Mod. Phil. in Ireland, 79, 80; M'Cosh, Inquiry into the State of Religion, p. 92, 248, 411 sqq. Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 926.

Hutcheson, George, an English Biblical scholar, of whose early life but little is known, flourished about the middle of the 17th century. He was a minister first at Comolennon, and later at Edinburgh, but was ejected for nonconformity about 1660. In 1669 he attempted to reach them, but he continued steadfastly to oppose the use of the Episcopal liturgy. He died in 1678. He wrote, Exposition of the twelve Minor Prophets (Lond. 1655, sm. 8vo)--Exposit. of John (1657, fol.):--Exposition of Job (1669, fol.)--Forty-four Sermons on the 130th Psalm (Edinb. 1681, 8vo).--Kitto, Bibb. Cyclop., ii, 945; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 927. (J. H. W.)

Hutcheson, Anne, an American religious enthusiast, and founder of a party of Antinomians (q. v.) in the New England colony, emigrated from Lincolnshire, England, to Boston in 1636. She claimed to be a medium of divine revelation, and, being a woman of admirable character, and profiting by laborious and painful experience, she won a powerful party in the country, and her enemies could never speak of her without acknowledging her eloquence and ability. She held that the Holy Spirit dwells in every believer, and that the revelation of the Spirit is superior to the ministry of the word. As her doctrines affected not only the religious, but also the political, professions of the people, great controversies ensued; a synod was finally called, in which her teachings were condemned, and she and her associates were banished from the colony. Anne and her friends now obtained from the Chief Justice of the Massachusetts court a legal permission to reside at Rhode Island, but they were, however, prevented from remaining there. Here "they continued to maintain their peculiarities on the highly commendable principle that no one was to be accounted a delinquent for doctrine." After the decease of her husband (who shared her opinions), she removed to a Dutch settlement in the colony of New York. In 1643, she and her whole family of fifteen persons were taken prisoners by the Indians, and all but one daughter barbarously murdered. See Bancroft, Hist. of the United States, i, 388 sq.; Chambers, Cyclop., v, 472; American Preb. Rev., 1860, p. 225. (J. H. W.)

Hutcheson, John, i, a Puritan colonel in the Parliamentary army during the time of the English Civil War. He was born at Nottingham in 1576, and was a nonconformist (Baptist), and, being of a religious turn of mind, much of his time was given to the study of theology. At the outbreak of the Civil War he sided with the Parliament, and was appointed governor of Nottingham Castle. At the trial of the king (Charles I) he concurred in the sentence pronounced on him, having first "addressed himself to God by prayer." Cromwell's conduct after this unfortunate affair Hutchison disapproved; and while various sentiments are entertained on his political conduct, "none question his integrity or piety." At the Restoration he suffered the general fate of the Non-conformists, and died in prison, Sept. 11, 1664. See Neale, Hist. of the Puritans (Harper's edit.), ii, 378 sq.; Appleton's Am. Cyclop., ix, 396.

Hutcheson, John, 2, inventor of a theory of hermeneutics which gave rise to much discussion in the 17th century, and still has a few adherents, was born in 1614, at Spennithorne, in Yorkshire. After private education, he matriculated at the University of Oxford in March, 1637, and after wards to the duke of Somerset, who bestowed upon him many marks of confidence, and finally procured for Hutchison a sinecure appointment of £200 per annum from the government. His time was now mainly devoted to religious study. He was of course a member of the College of Physicians, and died in 1724 he published the first part of a curious work entitled Moses's Principi-
in, in which he attempted to refute the doctrine of gravitation as taught in the Principia of Newton. In the second part of this work, which appeared in 1727, he continued his attack upon the Newtonian philosophy, and, as noted, it was with the publication of this work that the existence of a _plenum_ from this time to his death he published yearly one or two volumes in further elucidation of his views, which evince extensive knowledge of the Hebrew Scriptures. He died August 28, 1737.

According to Hutchinson, the Old Testament contains complete systems of natural history, theology, and religion. The Hebrew language was the medium of God's communication with man; it is therefore perfect, and consequently, as a perfect language, it must be co-extensive with all the objects of knowledge, and its several terms are truly significant of the effects of the things that it indicts, an essential feature of the logicae signum to represent them. Accordingly, Hutchinson, after Origen and others, laid great stress on the evidence of Hebrew etymology, and asserted that the Scriptures are not to be understood and interpreted in a literal, but in a typical sense, and according to the radical inner names that they express. By this plan of interpretation, he maintained that the Old Testament would be found not only to testify fully to the nature and offices of Christ, but also to contain a perfect system of natural philosophy. His editors give the following compendium of the Hutchinsonian doctrine. The Scripture reveals the nature and operations of the body of the sun, or fixleness to the earth; they describe the created system to be a _plenum_ without any vacuum, and reject the assistance of gravitation, attraction, or any such occult qualities, for performing the stated operations of nature, which are carried on by the free and spontaneous energies in the heavens in their condition of fire, light, and spirit, or air, the material agents set to work at the beginning: the heavens, thus framed by Almighty wisdom, are an instituted and visible substitute of Jehovah Elohim, the eternal three, the co-equal and co-eternal Trinity in Unity: the unity of substances in the heavens is as the trinity of the qualities of essence, and the distinction of conditions of the tritheism personality in Deity, without confounding the persons or dividing the substance. From their being made emblems, they are called in Hebrew _sheenim_, the names, representatives, or substitutes, expressing by particular names, any condition or office what it is they are emblems of. As an instance of his etymological interpretation, the word _berith_, which our translation renders _covenant_, Hutchinson construes to signify "he or that which purifies," and so the purifier or purification for "he that purifies." From similar speculations, he drew the conclusion that all the rites and ceremonies of the Jewish dispensation were so many delineations of Christ, in what he was to be, to do, and to suffer, and that the early Jews knew them to be types of his actions and sufferings, and that, by performing them as such, were in so far Christians both in faith and practice.

All his writings are collected in _The Philosophical and Theological Works of the late truly learned John Hutchinson, Esq._ (Lond. 1749, 3d edit. 12 vols. 8vo).

"Hutchinson's philosophical and exegetical views found numerous followers, who, without contributing a doctrinal sect, came to be distinguished as 'Befordianists.' In their number they reckoned several distinguished divines in England and Scotland, both of the Established Church and of Disenting communities. Among the most eminent of these were Bishop Horne, and his biographer, Mr. William Jones, of Stony Stratford, and Julius Berez, to whom the duke of Somerset, on the nomination of Mr. Hutchinson, presented the living of Sutton, in Sussex; Mr. Parkhurst, the lexicographer; Dr. Hodges, provost of Oriel; and Dr. Wetherell, master of University College, Oxford; Mr. Holloway, author of _Letter and Sympathy_; and Mr. Lee, author of _Sophism, or Nature's Characteristic of Truth._ The principles of Mr. Hutchinson are still entertained by many divines without their professing to be followers of Mr. Hutchinson, but the number of professing Hutchinsonians is now very small." See _English Cyclopedia, s. v._; _Jones of Noyland, Works, vols._ iii and xii; _Bishop Horne, Works, vol._ vi (ed. 1809); _Bate, Defence of Hutchinson (Lond. 1751, 8vo)._ Speaman, _Abstract of Mr. Hutchinson's Works_ (Edinb. 1746, 12mo); _Kittel, Bibl. Cyclop. ii, 345._

**Hutchinsonianism.** See Hutchinson, John, 2.

Hutten, Ulrich von, a German knight and Reformer, was born April 20 (or 22), 1488, at Castle Steckelberg, in Hesse-Cassel, and entered the monastery of Fulda in 1434, intending to become a monk, but fled in 1504 to Erfurt, where he continued his theological studies for a while. In 1505 he went to Cologne, and the following year to Frankfurt on the Oder. Hutchinson is said to have been established. Here he applied himself to the study of philosophy and poetry. From Frankfurt he went to Greifswald, and afterwards to Rostock, where he lectured on philosophy. In 1510 he went to Wittenberg, and thence to Vienna, where he remained until 1512. He afterwards visited Pavia and Bologna, studied law, and devoted himself particularly to the humanities and poetry. What he saw in Italy had the effect of making him an enlightened opponent of popery. Later he joined the army of the emperor Maximilian, and returned to Germany in 1517. Taking part in Reuchlin's struggle against the Franciscans of Cologne, he wrote against the state of the Roman Church, and particularly against the pontiff. Bolder, and more open in the expression of his opinions than most men of his age, he did much to prepare the way for the Reformation in Germany; though in some respects he rather than his own attack upon the pope, his great aim being not so much to change the Church as to free Germany from the tyranny of which popery was the basis. In 1522 he made an alliance with Franz von Sickingen, who was chosen chief of the nobility of the Upper Rhine. In that year, those of the new princes did not approve of Sickingen's plan of freeing Germany from the Romish rule, he appealed to the States, and endeavored to make them side with the nobility against the princes. But Sickingen succumbed in 1525, and Hutten was obliged to flee from Germany. In Switzerland, his friend Erasmus was kept from him, and the Council of Zürich drove him out of their territory. He then retired to the island of Ufnau, on the lake of Zürich, where he died, Aug. 29, 1523. Hutten has been very variously judged, according to the different stand-points of his critics; yet it is certain that in what he was he was not convicted of the charge he brought against the Church. As a part of the Reformation from any religious feeling, he did all he could be free to his own land from the subjection to the papacy. For that end he gave Luther all the aid in his power. He was one of the authors of the greater part of the _Epistola obruorum riurum_, and most of his writings were satires against the pope, the monks, and the clergy. Several editions of his works have been published; of the principal are Münch's (Berlin, 1821-29, 6 vols.) and Ed. Bocking's (Lpz. 1835 sq., 9 vols.). See _Epistola ob Ufnau ad D. Crocumen_ (Leipz. 1601); _Bocking, Ein Verzeichnis der Schriften Hutten's, Index bibliographicus Huttenianus_ (Leipz. 1858); _Schubart, Biographie (Lpz. 1791); Tiischer, Biographie (Lpz. 1803); Panzer, Ulrich von Hutten, in literarischer Hinsicht (Nürnberg, 1738); _Gies, H. v. sein Zeitalter_ (1813); E. von Brunner, _Ulrich von Hutten_, in _Lpz._ (1851); _Bronner, Ulrich H., in Lpz._ (1846); _David Friedrich Strauss, Ulrich v. H. (Lpz. 1857, 2 vols.); Revue Germanique, March, 1858, _Eclectic Review_ (Lond., July, 1858, p. 54 sq.; _Fiereer, Universal Lexikon_, vol. viii); _Hase, Ch. History_, § 814; _Ulrich von Hutten, transporte_, in _Chamouard-Kenton, Études sur les Réformateurs du 16ème siècle_, by A. Young (Lond. 1863); _Locky, Hist. of Rationalism_, ii, 188; _Hardwick, Reforma- tion, p. 82 sq.; National Magazine_, 1858, p. 243 sq.; _Lond. Quart. Rev., 1857 (April); 1867 (April)._
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HUTHER, Leonhard, a German Lutheran theologian, was born at Nellingen, near Ulm, in January, 1563, studied philosophy, philology, and theology at Strassburg, Leipzig, Heidelberg, and Jena; became private tutor in the latter university in 1584, and in 1590 professor at Jena. He died there, Dec. 28, 1616. He was a zealous upholder of Lutheran orthodoxy. His Compendium locorum theologiorum (Wittenberg, 1610, etc.), prepared by order of the elector Christian, took the place of Melanchthon's Loci as a text-book, and was translated into many languages (into German, Italian, Latin, French, Polish, Lithuanian, Russian, and by Hutter himself [1613, etc.], into Swedish [Stock, 1618]), and commented on by Candidius (Jena, 1648, etc.), Glassius (1656), Chernnitz (1670), Lachmann (1690), etc. It has lately been republished by Hase under the title Hutteri redactionis (Berlin, 1864), and translated into modern German, under the title of Compilerium Locorum of Lutheran Theology, by the Rev. H. E. Jacobs and the Rev. G. F. Speicker (Thila, 1868, 8vo). He carried out the Compendium further in his Locii communes theolog. (Wittenberg, 1619, fol., etc.). He also wrote against John Sigismund of Brandenburg, who had embraced Calvinism, his Calvinistae aulicopoliticis (Wittenberg, 1609-14, 3 vols.), and against Hospinianus's Cordis discordarum another work, entitled Cordisc concors (Wittenberg, 1614). His other writings are De Voluntate Dei circa eorum temporum praedestinationem salvandorum Decretum (Wittenberg, 1605, 4to) — a work of considerable importance, and which has passed through several editions (Wittenberg, 1609, 1614, and a new edition in 1618, 8vo; twice reprinted) — Institutum versus Christianum, sive tractatus de synodo et unione ecclesiasticoa (Rost, 1616, 4to; 1619, folio), a work which is the foundation of the plan of union between the Lutheran and Reformed churches of France, and especially against the latter's International. See J. G. Erdmann, Lebensbesch. u. Literar. Nachricht. u. d. Wittenbergs Theologen seit 1502 bis 1802 (Wittenberg, 1804); Bayle, Dict. Hist.; J. G. Walch, Bibliothec. Theol. Selecta; Hoefer, Nouv. Bioth. Générale, xxvi, 655; Univ. Lex. i, 576; Hook, Eccles. Bioth. vi, 288.

HUNTER, James, a preacher of the Moravian Brethren, was born in London in 1715. He was the son of a clergyman, and served an apprenticeship to a printer and a bookseller; but, coming under the influence of Mr. Wesley's preaching, he was awakened, and was converted under the labors of the distinguished Moravian, Peter Bohler. Soon after his conversion he visited the brethren at Hurnet, and became a devoted disciple and servant of count Zinzendorf, under whose direction he hencethence devoted all his time and strength to the unity of the Moravian brotherhood in England. "His counsel and aid were afforded it all in its complicated plans of government and projects of usefulness; he held, as years rolled on, every office in it, and preached and labored as a deacon; he was the soul of its missionary labors and a society of the denomination of the Gospel; he defended it in its distresses; helped it by his energy and skill through all its heavy financial embarrassments; travelled for it over Europe; and, towards the close of his life, became, as it were, its representative to the court and people of England." He died in 1755. Hutton was a man of great piety and indomitable energy. The history of the Moravian Brethren in the society of which he was an intimate part, and the history of his own life, is given in Memoirs of James Hutton, comprising the annals of his life, and connection with the United Brethren, by Daniel Benham (London, 1856, 8vo); Lond. Qu. Rev. viii, 239 sq.

Huyghena, Gummarius, a Roman Catholic theologian and philosopher, was born at Lure or Lyre (Brabant) Feb. 1681. When only twenty-one years of age he was appointed professor of philosophy at Louvain, and here he distinguished himself greatly. In 1668 he was honored with the doctorate of theology, and in 1677 was made president of the college of pope Adrian VI. He died at Louvain Oct. 27, 1702. Huyghena wrote a number of works, of which the best are Conferentiae theologicae, in 3 vols.; Breves observat., or a course of divinity, in 15 vols. 12mo. As he refused to favor the peculiar views of some of the French moralists, and opposed the celebrated four articles of the French clergy (1682), he was involved in various controversies. See Huyghenae, Acta, in Acta Sanct., vol. vi, 1783; Bus, Gelehrten Lex. ii, 1794; Hook, Eccles. Bioth. vi, 239, (J. H. W.)

Haus (Gen. xxii, 31). See UZ.

Huzoth See Kirjath-Huzoth.

Huz'zab (Hebrew Hutsheb, הַצִּבָּה, rendered), as a proper name in the Author. Version of Nah. ii, 7, is either Hoph. pret. of הַצִּבָּה to place firmly, and so the clause may be translated, "And it is fixed; she is led away captive," i.e. the decree is confirmed for the overthrow of Nineveh (so the margin, and most interpreters; see Lud. de Dieu; the Sept. and Vulg. both confound with הַצִּבָּה, and render הַצִּבָּה; Comp. 2 Para. 14, 15, et miles evertit abducta est; the Talmud and Hebrew interpreters, confounding with הַצִּבָּה, render "the queen sitting on her couch") or, rather, of הַצִּבָּה to flow, by Chaldaisn, and the meaning will then be (with Gese- nius, Thee. Hebr. p. 1147, who join the word to the last of the preceding verse), "the palace shall be dissolved and made to flow down," i.e. the palaces of Nineveh, inundated and undermined by the waters of the Tigris, shall dissolve; or "the prince of Assur shall stand for Assyria itself, with which it is identified by Pliny (Hist. Nat. v, 12) and Ammianum (xxii, 6). The name Zab, as applied to the rivers, is certainly very ancient, being found in the great inscription of Tiglath Pileser I, which belongs to the middle of the 12th century B.C.; but in that case the name would hardly be written in Heb. with ל. "

Hwind, Andreas Christian, a Danish Orientalist, was born Oct. 20, 1749, at Copenhagen. He was highly educated, and enjoyed great advantages by travel in foreign countries. Thus from 1777 to 1780 he spent in Germany, especially at Göttingen, where he studied under the celebrated Michaelis and Heyne, and in Italy, where he enjoyed the society of several distinguished, although a Protestant in belief. On his return he was appointed professor at the Royal College. He died May 3, 1788. Hwind wrote Specimen indiciæ Versionis Arabico-Samaritanae Pentateuchi (Rom., 1780, 4to); — Belles leçons d'indo du collèges M.S.S. N. T. bibliothèque Commune-Vendôme (Paris, 1785); — Hoefer, Nouv. Bioth. Générale, xxxv, 688.

Hyacinth. See JACINTH.

Hyacinthus de Janua, a Capuchin monk of distinction, who flourished in the first half of the 17th cen-
tury, was named after his native city, Genoa. He was the general preacher of his order and enjoyed the confidence of Maximilian to such an extent that in 1522 he was charged by Gregory XV with a special commission to the Spanish court. He translated Castiglione's history of the Conquest of Persia ( oppressus Persarum vola vol. 1.),—Jocher, Allegm. Gelehr., Lez., ii, 1756; Ranke, Hist. of the Popes, ii, 485.

*HYENA. See HYENA.*

Hyatt, John, a Calvinistic Methodist preacher of considerable talent, was born at Sherborne, in Dorsetshire, in 1677. He became minister of a congregation at Mere, Wiltshire, in 1706, but removed in 1800 to one at Prone, Somersetshire, and soon afterwards to Westminster Abbey, and the Tabernacle, London. Here he was co-pastor with the Rev. Matthew Wilks until his death in 1826. His principal works are, Christian Duty and Encouragement in Times of Distress (2d ed. Lond. 1816, 8vo).—Sermons on select Subjects (2d ed. London, 1811, 8vo).—Sermons on various Subjects, edited by his son, Charles Hyatt, with memoir of the author by the Rev. John Morison, etc. (2d ed. Lond. 1825, 8vo).—Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, i, 1597.

*Hydas’pês (Yehosaphat), a river noticed in Judith i, 6, in connection with the Ephraimites and Tigris, mentioned by Arrian (Ind. 4) and Strabo (xv, 657), which flowed westward into the Indian, and is now called Je-lam (Rawlinson, Herod, i, 558). The well-known Hy- daspes of India is too remote to accord with the other localities noticed in the context. We may perhaps identify it with the Chosapes or Euporas of Susiana, which was called Hydaspes by the Romans (Voss, ad Justin, ii, 14).

Hyde, Alvan, D.D., a Congregational minister, was born Feb. 2, 1768, at Norwich, Conn. He graduated at Dartmouth College in 1788, entered the ministry in June, 1790, and was ordained pastor in Lee June 6, 1792, where he remained until his death, Dec. 4, 1833. Hyde published Sketches of the Life of the Rev. Stephen West, D.D. 1818).—An Essay on the State of Infants (1830); and several occasional Sermons.—Sprague, Annals, ii, 390; Theol. Rev, v, 544.

Hyde, Edward, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in Norwich, Conn., March 31, 1768. He was converted in 1805, entered the New England Conference in 1809, was presiding elder on Boston District in 1822-26, and aged 58, in 1850, and meantime four years on New London District, and in 1851 was appointed steward of the Wesleyan Academy at Wilbraham, where he remained until his death, March 16, 1882. His indefatigable and successful labors were very valuable to the Church. Minutes of Conferences, i, 162; Stevens, Memoirs of Methodist, ii, 201; Funeral Sermon, by Dr. Fisk. (G. T. L.)

Hyde, Levius, a Congregational minister, was born in Franklin, Conn., Jan. 29, 1789. He lost his father while quite young, and was prepared for college by his brother, the Rev. Alvan Hyde, D.D. He graduated at Williams College in 1815, and afterwards pursued a sabbatical course in Law, and in 1830, and meantime four years on New London District, and in 1831 was appointed steward of the Wesleyan Academy at Wilbraham, where he remained until his death, March 16, 1882. His indefatigable and successful labors were very valuable to the Church. Minutes of Conferences, i, 162; Stevens, Memoirs of Methodist, ii, 201; Funeral Sermon, by Dr. Fisk.

Hyde, Thomas, D.D., a learned English divine and Orientalist, was born in Shropshire in 1636. He was educated at King's College, Cambridge. In 1655 he went to Constantinople, and prepared the translation of Walton's Polyglot Bible. He was admitted fellow of Queen's College, Oxford, in 1659, and afterwards became keeper of the Bodleian Library. In 1666 he became prebendary of Salisbury, in 1678 archdeacon of Gloucester, Arabic professor in 1691, and finally regius professor of Hebrew and canon of Christ Church in 1697. He died in 1708. His principal work is Historia ecclesiastica orientis Christiani (Sal., 1685, 8vo.), in fourteen volumes, of which seven were published.

*HYENA. See HYENA.*

Hyssop (Acacia) is a plant of the genus *Hyssopus*, "officers of water," a name given to the Encratites (q. v.) because they avoided wine, and even in the Lord's Supper used nothing but water. See Theoretor, Harv. Fab. i, cxx; Bingham, Orig, Eccles. bk. xv, ch. ii, § 7.

Hyments (winterers, or tossed by a winter blast), an epithet given by the Latin fathers to demons.—Neale's Introd. to the Hist. of the Eastern Ch. i, 209. See ENERGUMENS; EXORCIST.

Hyena (Gaua, Ecclesiastus xiii, 18) does not occur in the A. V. of the canonical Scriptures, but is probably denoted by Zeez (tulba'd, streaked or ravenous, only Jer. xii, 9; so Sept. Sauma, but Vulg. acris discolor, and Author. Vers. speckled bird), as the context and parallelism in the preceding verse require; an identification disputed by some, on the ground that it is not mentioned by ancient authors as occurring in Western Asia before the Macceadian conquest, and was scarcely known by name even in the time of Pliny; it has since been ascertained, however, that in Romain or modern Greek the word ξηρός and its cognates have been substituted for the ancient term *hyena*, and that the animal is still known in those regions by names cognate with the Hebrew (see Rippel, Abyss., ii, 227; Shaw, Tellur. 154; Köpffer, Anim. 411 sqq.; Russ's Alppina, ii, 65 sqq.; comp. Pliny, vili, 44; xi, 67). The only other instance in which a word resembling ξηρός is a proper name, Zebaim (1 Sam. xiiii, 14, the valley of hyenas), Aquila; Neh. xi, 34). See ZEBAIM. The Talmudical writers describe the hyena by no less than four names, of which *tabba* is one (Lev. xxvii, 31). Bochart (Hieros, ii, 168 sqq.) and Taylor (continuation of Calmet) have indicated what is probably the true meaning in the above passage in Jer., of Ζηρων, zeeza, the striped rudder, i.e. the hyena, turning round upon his lair—introduced after an allusion in the previous verse to the lions accompanying the beasts of the field (other hyenas and jackals) to come and devour. This allusion, followed up as it is by a natural association of ideas with a description of the pastoral, would rather occur in the vineyard, trudging down and destroying the vines, renders the natural and poetical picture complete; for
the hyena seeks burrows and caverns for a lair; like the dog, it turns round to lie down; howls, and occasionally acts in concert; is loathsome, savage, insatiable in appetite, offensive in smell, and will, in the season, like canines, devour grapes. The hyena was common in ancient as in modern Egypt, and is constantly depicted on monuments (Wilkinson, i. 218, 219); it must, therefore, have been well known to the Jews, as it is now very common in Palestine, where it is the last and most complete scavenger of carrion (Wood, *Bible Animals*, p. 62 sq.). Though cowardly in its nature, the hyena is very savage when once he attacks, and the strength of his jaws is such that he can crush the thigh-bone of an ox (Livingstone's *Travels*, p. 600).

"Tobacco, therefore, we consider proved to be, generally, the hyena; more especially, the Canis *hynas* of Limn, the *Hyenas vulgaris* of more recent naturalists, the *foeda* of Barbary, the duch, duchu, duhuh, and *kyfunar* of modern Semitic nations; and if, the ancient understood anything by the word, it was also their trookus. The striped species is one of three or four— all, it seems, originally African, and, by following armies and caravans, gradually spread over Southern Asia to beyond the Ganges, though not as yet to the east of the Brahmaputra. It is now not uncommon in Asia Minor, and has extended into Southern Tartary; but this progress is comparatively so recent that no other than Semitic names are well known to belong to it. The head and jaws of all the species are broad and strong; the snout truncated; the ears, like a bat, the teeth robust, large, and eminently formed for biting, lacerating, and reducing the very bone; the neck stiff;

the body short and compact; the limbs tall, with only four toes on each foot; the fur coarse, forming a kind of semi-erectile mane along the back; the tail rather short, with an imperfect brush, and with a fetid pouch beneath it. In stature the species varies from that of a large wolf to much less. Hyenas are not bold in comparison with wolves, or in proportion to their powers. They do not, in general, act collectively; they prowl chiefly in the night; attack asses, dogs, and weaker animals; feed most willingly on corrupt animal offal, dead camels, etc.; and dig into human graves that are not well protected with stakes and brambles. The striped species is of a dirty ash-buff, with some oblique black streaks across the shoulders and body, and numerous cross-bars on the legs; the muzzle and throat are black, and the tip of the tail white." (See Pennyc Cyclopaedia, s. v.) See Jackal; Wolf; Bear.

*Hyginus*, considered as the eighth or tenth bishop of Rome, appears to have held that station from A.D. 137 to 141. According to the Liber pontificum, he was a native of Athens, and before his election to the see of Rome taught philosophy. Nothing is known of his life, and the Liber pontif., merely says of him, "Clerum compositi et distribuit gradum." The Pseudo Decretals [see Decretals] ascribe to him a number of rules on Church discipline, and he is said to have introduced the customs of godfathers and Church consecrations, but this is doubtful. The Martyrologies give some the 10th, others the 11th of January, 142, as the date of his death. Some critics deny his having been more than a simple


*Hykos* (Τύκος), correctly explained [comp. Rawlinson, *Herod. ii. 207*] by Josephus [*Antiq. i. 14*], as being composed of the Egyptian hius, "king," and skos, "shepherd" or "Arab," i.e. *nomad*, a race who invaded Egypt, and constituted the 15th and one or two of the following dynasties, according to Manetho (see Kenrick, *Egypt under the Pharaohs*, ii. 152 sq.), especially as preserved by Josephus (at supra): In the reign of which, there came up to Egypt, the earliest of the line of an ignoble race, who had the confidence to invade our country, and easily subdued it without a battle, burning the cities, demolishing the temples, slaying the men, and reducing the women and children to slavery." They made Salatin, one of themselves, king: he reigned at Memphis, and made the upper and lower region tributary. Of the 17th dynasty also were forty-three shepherd kings, called Hykoses, who reigned, perhaps contemporaneously with the preceding, at Diospolis. In the 18th dynasty of Diospolis a rising took place, and the shepherd kings were overthrown, and the kings of Egypt into the district of Avaris, which they fortified. Amosis besieged and compelled them to capitulate; on which they left Egypt, in number 240,000, and "marched through the desert towards Syria, and built the city of Jerusalem." The last few words seem to render credible the statement of Manetho concerning the Hykoses, who, with the Israelites, is the less surprising, since the Hykoses were, as he rightly calls them, *Phoeniciana* of the ancient, if not original race which inhabited Phoenicia, or Palestine (taken in its widest sense), before the conquest of the country by the Hebrews. Chronological considerations seem to refer the time of the domination of the Hyksos to the period of Abraham and Joseph (say from B.C. 2000 to 1500). When Joseph went into the land he found the name of shepherd odious—which agrees with the hypothesis that places the irruption of the shepherd kings anterior to his time; and which explains the ease with which he subdued the Hyksos, and the fact that Jacob turned towards Egypt for a supply of food when urged by want may be readily accounted for on the supposition that a kindred race held dominion in the land, which, though hated by the people, as being foreign in its origin and oppressive in its character, would not be indispensible to show favor to members of the great Semitic family to which they themselves belonged. The irruption into Egypt, and the conquest of the country on the part of the Phoenician shepherds, seems to have been a consequence of the general pressure of population from the north-east towards the south-west, which led the nomade Semitic tribes first to overcome the original inhabitants of Palestine, and, continuing in the same line of advance, then to enter and subdue Egypt. The invasion of the Hyksos is indeed to be regarded as the result of the movement from the Euphrates westward of the most powerful and (comparatively) most civilized people then found in Western Asia, who in their progress subdued or expelled in the countries through which they not improbably were urged by a pressure from other advancing tribes, nation and tribe one after another, driving them down till finding those who dwelt along the shores of the Mediterranean to seek shelter and safety in the islands of that sea and other distant parts. To conquerors and aggressors of the character of these shepherd hordes Egypt would offer special attractions. They continued sweeping onwards, and at last entered and conquered Egypt, establishing there a new dynasty, which was hateful because foreign, and because of a lower degree of culture than the Egyptians themselves had reached. Nor would these shepherds be less odious because, coming from the east and immediately from the deserts of Arabia, they were from the
HYKSOS

which contains and presents the worship of the heavenly bodies. The two systems, that of the Egyptians before it received inoculation from the East, and that of the Eastern invaders, agreed in this, that they were both the worship of the powers of nature; but they differed in this, and an important difference it was, that the Egyptians represented them as creating and governing the world, and the host of heaven.—Kitto. (See Stud. und Krit. 1889, ii, 398, 408; Saalschütz, Forschungen, arbeit, i, 1849; Schulze, De fontibus historiae Hyksorum, Berlin, 1848; Uhlemann, Israelitum und Hyksos in Egypten, Leipzig, 1856.) See EGYPT; SHEPHERD-KING.

HYLARET, MAURICK, a French theologian, was born at Angoulême, Nov. 10, 1555, 1599. In 1556 he was inducted into the See of Portency. About 1552 he went to Paris to continue his studies, and returned to Angoulême in 1557 to be ordained for the priesthood. He now devoted his time exclusively to the study of theology, and in 1562 was made a professor of philosophy, and a short time later a professor of theology. In 1566 he made himself quite conspicuous by a public controversy with the Calvinist Goelet. In 1568 he was called to the Sorbonne, and was honored with the doctorate two years later. Henceforward he preached much, and the celebrity he gained as a pulpit orator procured him a position as professor of the arts at Orleans in 1570; and in December, 1591. His works are, Sacra Decades quinquaginta, conciones quadragesimales, atque Paschales numero quinguenti (Lyons, 1591, 2 vols. 8vo).—Concomin per adventum Eunedi sacra quatuor, homilies triginta sec commodatum, et quidvis digni septem priones Juseum prophal. explicant, vanum vero posterioris Evangelii adventus et festorum per usum occurrentium explicant (Paris, 1591, 8vo).—Homilie in Evangelio dominicalis per totam annum (Paris, 1604, 2 vols. 8vo)

Hylarct De non conveniunt cum heretics et non conveniunt cum hereticis, a Vincenzo Laffinio di Carlino e Del parrocco

HYLIO (HL, matter), was, according to the doctrines of the Manichaeans (q. v.), the Lord of darkness. They held that the world is governed by two primary principles, viz., "a subtle and a gross sort of matter, or light and darkness, separated from each other by a narrow space," over each of which presided, the former Lord, God they termed the Lord of the world of Light; Hyle the Lord of the world of darkness; and both of these worlds, "although different in their natures, have some things in common. Each is distributed into five opposing elements, and the same number of provinces; both are equal and immortal, and, with the human body, self-existent, both are unchangeable, and exist forever; both are of vast extent, yet the world of light seems to fill more space than the empire of darkness. The condition of the two lords presiding over the two kinds of matter is equal, but they are totally unlike in their natures and dispositions. The Lord of Light, being himself happy, is beneficent, a lover of peace and quietness, just and wise; the Lord of darkness, being himself very miserable, wishes to see others unhappy, is quarrelsome, unwise, unjust, irascible, and envious. Yet they are equal in the certainty of their existence, in their power, in the power of the body; and yet the King of light, or God, excels the Prince of darkness, or the Daemon, in power and knowledge."—Mosheim, C. H. Hist. of the first Three Centuries, ii, § 41, p. 275; Neander, Hist. of the Nations, i, 116, 127, 181, etc.

HYLOZOA (HL, wood, tree), an ancient philosophers to signify the abstract idea of matter; and ζύλος λίβα) is a term for the atheistic doctrine which teaches that life and matter are inseparable. But the forms which have grown out of this doctrine have been rather variable. Thus "Strato of Lampscus held that the ultimate particles of matter were each and all of them possessed of life," approaching, of course, in this sense,
HYMEN
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to pantheism: but "the Stoics, on the other hand, while they did not accord accord or life to every distinct particle of matter, held that the universe, as a whole, was animated by a principle which gave to it motion, form, and life." The followers of Plotinus, who held that the "soul of the universe" animated the least particle of matter, would have entertained a certain material or plastic life, essential and substantial, ingenerable and incorruptible, attributed all to matter, especially favored the Stoical doctrine, and "Sphína has asserted that all things were alive in different degrees ("omniam quamvis diversa gradibus animata tamen sune"). All who favored this doctrine looked for the entire mistake of "force for life. According to Leibnitz, Boscovich, and others, "Matter is always endowed with force. Even the ein metós ascribed to it is a force. Attraction and repulsion, and chemical affinity, all indicate activity in matter; but life is a force always connected with organization, which much of matter wants. Spontaneous motion, growth, nutrition, separation of parts, generation, are phenomena which indicate the presence of life, which is obviously not coextensive with matter." See Fleming, Vocabulary of Philos. (edited by Krauth), p. 219 sq.; Culworth, Intellect. System, i, 106 sq., 144 sq. et al.; Hume, "Hymen, or Hymenæus," 1886.

Hymen, or Hymenæus, in Grecian mythology, is the god of marriage. Originally the word seems to have denoted only the bridal song of the companions of the bride, sung by them as she went from her father's house to that of the bridegroom. The god Hymen is first mentioned by Sappho. "The legends concerning him are various: but he is generally said to be a son of Apollo and some one of the Muses. He is represented as a boy with wings and a garland, a bigger and graver Cupid, with a bridal-torch and a veil in his hand."

—Chambers, Encyclop. v, 494.

Hymenæus (Ὑμηναῖος, hymenaios), a professor of Cynicism at Ephesus, who, with Alexander (1 Tim. i, 20) and Philetus (2 Tim. ii, 18), had departed from the truth both in principle and practice, and led others into apostasy (Neander, Fkh. i, 475). The chief doctrinal error of these persons consisted in maintaining that "the resurrection was past already." The precise meaning of this expression is by no means clearly ascertained: the most general, and perhaps best founded opinion is, that they understood the resurrection in a figurative sense of the great change produced by the Gospel dispensation. See below. Some have suggested that they attempted to soothe the anger of the people by the abuse heaped on the Epistle to the Ephesians (πρὸς—συντριπτόμενους—συντριπτοῖς, etc., ii, 1-5); but this is very improbable; for, if such misconception of his language had arisen, it might easily have been corrected; not to say that one of them appears to have been personally inimical to Paul (3 Tim. iv, 14), and would scarcely have appealed to him as an authority. Most critics suppose that the same person is referred to in both the epistles to Timothy by the name of Hymenæus (see Heidenreich, Pastorallor. i, 111). Mosheim, however, contends that there were two. He seems to lay great stress on the apostle's declaration (1 Tim. i, 20), "Whom I have delivered unto Satan, that they may learn not to blaspheme." But, whatever may be the meaning of this expression, the infliction was evidently designed for the benefit and restoration of the parties (comp. 1 Cor. v, 5), and was therefore far from in- dungent or indulgent to the delinquent. See above.

Nor do the terms employed in the second epistle import a less flagrant violation of the Christian profession than those in the first. If in the one the individuals alluded to are charged with having "disowned a good conscience" and "made shipwreck of faith," in the other we find indulgence in indig- enous fane babblings, which would increase to more ungodliness, as "having erred concerning the truth," and "overthrowing the faith" of others. These can hardly be said to be "two distinct characters, having nothing in common but the name" (Mosheim's Commentaries, i, 804-306). For other interpretations of 2 Tim. ii, 18, see Gill's Commentary, ad loc., and Walchli Misscellanea Stoer, i, 4; De Hymenaeo Philieto, Jen. 1785, and Amstel. 1744. Two points referred to above require fuller elucidation.

1. The Error of Hymenæus.—This was one that had been in part appropriated from others, and had frequently been revived since with additions. What initiation was to the Pythagoreans, wisdom to the Stoics, science to the followers of Plato, contemplation to the Peripatetics, that "knowledge (γνῶσις) was to the Gnostics. As there were likewise in the Greek schools those who looked for a common salvation of all things (διακοινομακρανθείη, see Hesey, ad Virg. Æd. iv, 5; comp. Æsopus, 745), so there was a "regeneration" (Tit. iii, 5; Matt. xix, 28), "a new creation" (2 Cor. v, 7; see Aldred, ad loc.; Rev. xxx, 1), a "kingdom of heaven and of Messiah or Christ" (Matt. xiii; Rev. vii), and herein popular belief among the Jews coincided unequivocally propounded in the N. T.; but here with this remarkable difference, viz., that in a great measure it was present as well as future—the same thing in germ that was to be had in perfection eventually. "The kingdom of God is within you," said our Lord (Luke xvi, 22); He that is spiritual is full of the things of the spirit (1 Cor. ii, 15). "He that is born of God cannot sin," said John (1 Ep. iii, 9). There are likewise two deaths and two resurrections spoken of in the N. T.; the first of each sort, that of the soul to and from sin (John iii, 5-8), "the hour when I shall glorify myself" (ibid. v, 24, 25), on which see above. The time, De Civ. Divi, xx, 5; the second, that of the body to and from corruption (1 Cor. xv, 36-44; also John v, 26, 29), which last is prospective. Now, as the doctrine of the resurrection of the body was found to involve immense difficulties even in those early days (Acts xvii, 32; 1 Cor. xv, 55); how keenly they were pressed may be seen in Augustine, De Civ. Divi, xxii, 12 sq., while, on the other hand, there was so great a predisposition in the then current philosophy (not even extinct now) to magnify the excellence of the soul above that of its earthly tabernacle, it was at once the easier and more attractive course to insist upon and argue from the force of those passages of Holy Scripture which exalt upon the glories of the spiritual life that now is, under Christ, and to pass over or explain away allegorically all that refers to a future state in connection with the resurrection of the body. In this manner we may derive the first erroneous conceptions of whom Hymenæus was one of the earliest. They were spreading when John wrote; and his grand-disciple, Irenæus, compiled a voluminous work against them (ad Ep. Heter.). A good account of their full development is given by Gieseler, E. H., Per. i, Div. i, § 44 sq. See Resurrection.

2. The Sentence passed upon Him.—It has been asserted by some writers of eminence (see Corn. à Lapide, ad 1 Cor. v, 5) that the "delivering to Satan" is a mere synonym for ecclesiastical excommunication. Such can hardly be the case. The apostles possessed many extraordinary prerogatives, which none have since arrogated to themselves. The words of Hymenæus are one of the earliest. They were spreading when John wrote; and his grand-disciple, Irenæus, compiled a voluminous work against them (ad Ep. Heter.). A good account of their full development is given by Gieseler, E. H., Per. i, Div. i, § 44 sq. See Resurrection.
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same lips, "Tabitha, arise," sufficed to raise Dorcas from the dead (ibid. ix, 30). Paul's first act in entering upon his ministry was to strike Elymas the sorcerer with blindness, his own sight having been restored to him through the medium of a disciple (ibid. xix, 14). In the words which we read of Paul's sealing the cripplc of Lystra (ibid. xiv, 8). Even apart from actual intervention by the apostles, bodily visitations are spoken of in the case of those who approached the Lord's Supper unworthily, when as yet no discipline had been established.

On the other hand, Satan was held to be the instrument or executioner of all these visitations. Such is the character assigned to him in the book of Job (i, 6-12; ii, 1-7). Similar allegations are described 1 Kings xxii, 19-22, and 1 Chron. xxi, 1. In Ps. lxixviii, 49, such are the causes to which the plagues of Egypt are assigned.

Even our Lord submitted to be assaulted by him more than once (Matt. iv, 1-10; Luke iv, 18, says, "Departed from him for a season"); and a "messenger of Satan was sent to buffet" the very apostle whose act of delivering another to the same power is now under discussion.

At the same time, large powers over the world of spirits were authoritatively conveyed by our Lord to his immediate followers (to the Twelve, Luke ix, 1; to the Seventy, as the results showed, ibid. x, 17-20). See SATAN.

It only remains to notice five particulars connected with its exercise, which the apostle himself supplies: 1. That it was no mere prayer, but a solemn authoritative sentence pronounced in the name and power of Jesus Christ (1 Cor. v, 5). 2. That it was never exercised upon any without the Church: "Them that are without God judgeth" (ibid. v, 13), he says in express terms: 3. That it was "for the destruction of the flesh, i.e. some bodily visitation; 4. That it was for the improvement of the offender: that his spirit might be saved in the day of the Lord Jesus (1 Cor. xi, 29)." He might not learn to bespale himself while upon earth (1 Tim. iii, 10). 5. That the apostle could in a given case empower others to pass such sentence in his absence (1 Cor. v, 3, 4). See ANATHEMA.

Thus, while the "delivering to Satan" may resemble ecclesiastical excommunication in some respects, it has its own characteristics likewise, which show plainly that one is not to be confounded or placed on the same level with the other. Nor again does Paul himself deliver to Satan all those in whose company he had his converts "not worthy of death" (1 Cor. v, 11). See an above review of the whole subject by Bingham, Anti. vi, 2, 15. See EXCOMMUNICATION.

HYMNA "(Yirm). This term, as used by the Greeks, primarily signified simply a song (comp. Homer, Od. viii, 429; Hesiod, Op. et Dies, 650; Pindar, Cl. i, 170; xi, 74; Isolm, iv, 74; Pth, x, 82; Asch. Elm, 351; Soph. Antig, 809; Plato, Republ. vi, 430, E, etc.); we find instances even in which the cognate verb ἔλαφων is used in a bad sense (ἁρδαῖς ἐδειγμασιν, Eustath. p. 634; comp. Soph. Elect. 582; Ed. Tyr. 1753; Eurip. Med. 429); but usage usually appropriated the term to songs in praise of the gods. We know that the Greeks, as among most of the nations of antiquity, the chanting of songs in praise of their gods was an approved part of their worship (Clem. Alex. Strom. vi, 638, ed. Syburg. Porphyry de Aforis, iv, sec. 8; Phrumatus, De Nat. Deor. c, 14; Alex. ab Alex. Græc. Dies, iv, 17, 1, 8; Fænian in notul Callimachus, p. 2; comp. Meiners, Geschichte aller Reizung, 433; Hrabovský, Die Helioscaris). At the Taurian games such songs were sometimes sung (Athen. Deipn., xiv, 1, 14; Polyb. Hist. iv, 20, ed. Ernesti). Besides those hymns to different deities which have come down to us as the composition of Callimachus, Orpheus, Homer, Lucain, etc., there may with confidence refer to the choral odes of the tragedians as affording specimens of these sacred songs, such of them, at least, as were of a lyric character (Sneiders, De Hymnise Vet. Græc. p. 19). Such songs were properly called hymns. Hence Arrian says distinctly (De Expul. Alex. iv, 11, 2), ὁμοίοι μὲν ἐκ τούτων καὶ τὴν κοίνων, ἑναὶ οὕτως ἐκ τῷ ἀνθρώπου, ἕναὶ οὕτως ἐκ τῆς θεοῦ, ἕναὶ ἐκ τῆς θείας Δείας τῆς θείας, ἕναὶ οὕτως ἐκ τῆς θεοῦ θείας, ἕναὶ οὕτως ἐκ τῆς ἐκ τῆς θεοῦ. Augustine (in Ps. lxvii) thus fully states the meaning of the term: "Hymni laudes sunt Dei cum cantico. Hymni cantus sunt, continentas laudes Dei. Si sit laus, et non sit Dei, non est hymnus. Si sit laus et Dei laus, et non cantatur, non est hymnus. Oportet ergo ut si sit hymnus, sit quod haec traha, et laudem et Dei et canticum." See CHANT.

"Hymn," as such, is not used in the English version of the O. T., and the noun only occurs twice in the N. T. (Eph. v, 19; Col. iii, 16), though in the original of the latter the derivative verb ἔλαφων occurs in four places ("sing a h.e. tham," Matt. xxvi, 38; "sacred songs," Acts xvi, 25; Heb. ii, 12). The Sept., however, employs it freely in translating the Hebrew names for almost every kind of poetical composition (Schleusm. Lex. ίπος). In fact, the word does not seem to have in the Sept. any very special meaning, and hence it calls the Heb. book of Psalms the "book of the songs of Hymnus," not of Hymnu; yet it frequently uses the noun ἔλαφων or the verb ἔλαφων as an equivalent of psalmus (e.g. 1 Chron. xxv, 6; 2 Chron. vii, 6; xxiii, 13; xxix, 80; Neh. xii, 24; Ps. xii, i, and the titles of many other psalms). The word psalm, however, had already for the last many centuries, the meaning, while the word hymn was more or less vague in its application, and capable of being used as occasion should arise. If a new poetical form or idea should be produced, the name of hymn, not being embarrassed by a previous determination, was ready to associate itself with the fresh thought of another literature. This seems to have actually been the case. See SONG.

Among Christians the hymn has always been something different from the psalm; a different conception in thought, a different type in composition. See HYMNOLGY. The "hymn" which our Lord sang with his disciples in the upper room, he might not have been the latter part of the Hallel, or series of psalms which were sung by the Jews on the night of the Passover, comprehending Psa. cxiii-cxiv; Psa. cxiv and cxxiv being sung before, and the rest after the Passover (Buxtorfii Lit. Talon. s. v. 277, quoted by Künzl on Matt. xxxi, 50; Lightfoot's Heb. and Talon. Excerpts, 1656, p. 5; Works. xiv, 204; Smith. B.G. 277); but it is evident from the preceding that a kind of devotional exercise which is not unaologically called a hymn. The prayers Acts iv, 24, 25, are addressed to God, unless we allow metrical as well as metrical hymns. It may have been a hymn as it was originally uttered; but we can only judge by the Greek translation, and this is without metre, and therefore not properly a hymn. In the jail at Philippi, Paul and Silas "sang hymns" (A. V. "praises") unto God. And so was their song that their fellow-prisoners heard them. This must have been what we mean by singing, and not merely recitation. It was, in fact, a veritable singing of hymns. It is remarkable that the noun hymn is only used in reference to the services of the Greeks, and in the same passages is clearly distinguished from the psalm (Eph. v, 19; Col. iii, 16), "psalms, and hymns, and spiritual songs." It has been conjectured that by "psalms and hymns" the poetical compositions of the Old Testament are chiefly to be understood, and that the epithet "spiritual," here applied to "songs," is intended to mark those devout expressions which are suited to the spirit and heart of the primitive Church; yet in 1 Cor. xiv, 26, a production of the latter class is called a "psalm." Josephus, it may be remarked, used the terms ἔλαφων and ἔλαφον in reference to the Psalms of David (Ant. vii, 12, 5). See PSALM.

It is probable that no Greek version of the Psalms, even supposing it to be accommodated to the Greek
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metres, would take root in the affections of the Gentile converts. It was not only a question of metre, it was a question of the quality and Greek turn of the required hymns. So it was in Syria. Richer in tunes than Greece, for Greece had but eight, while Syria had 275 (Benedict, Pref, vol., v. Op. Epk. Syr.), the Syrian hymnographers revelled in the varied luxury of their native music; and the Greek hymnographers should hardly be credited with hymns as moulded by the genius of Bardesanis, Harmonius, and Ephraem Syrus. In Greece, the eight tunes which seem to have satisfied the exigencies of Church music were probably accommodated to fixed metres, each metre being wedded to a particular tune; an arrangement to which the Syriac preference is due. 

In tunes and measures at the end of our English version of the Psalms. This is also the case in the German hymnology, where certain ancient tunes are recognised as models for the metres of later compositions, and their names are always prefixed to the hymns in common use. See Music.

It is worth while inquiring what profane models the Greek hymnographers chose to work after. In the old religion of Greece the word hymn had already acquired a sacred and liturgical meaning, which could not fail to suggest its application to the productions of the Christian church. It is evident that the name of the Greek hymn were various. The Homeric and Orphic hymns were written in the epic style, and in hexameter verse. Their metre was not adapted for singing; and therefore, though they may have been recited, it is not likely they were sung at the celebration of the mysteries. We turn to the Pindaric hymns, and here we find a sufficient variety of metre, and a definite relation to music. These hymns were sung to the accompaniment of the lyre, and it is very likely that they engaged the attention of the early hymn-writers. The dithyramb, with its development into the dramatic chorus, was sufficiently connected with musical traditions to make its form a fitting vehicle for Christian poetry; and there certainly is a dithyrambic savour about the earliest known Christian hymn, as it appears in Clem. Alex. p. 312, 313, ed Potter.

The first impulse of Christian devotion was to run into the moulds ordinarily used by the worshippers of the old religion. This was more than an impulse—it was a necessity, and a twofold necessity. The new spirit was strong; but it had two limitations: the difficulty of conceiving a new music-poetical literature; and the influence of the Hellenic art. 

The old tunes would be a real necessity to the new life, and the exile from his ancient faith would delight to hear on the foreign soil of the new religion the familiar melodies of home. Dean Trench has indeed labored to show that the reverse was the case, and that the early Christian shrank with horror from the sweet but polluted enchantments of his unbelieving state. We can only assent to this in so far as we allow it to be the second phase in the history of hymn. When old traditions died away, and the Christian acquired not only a new belief, but a new social humanity, it was possible, and it was desirable too, to break forever the attenuated thread that bound him to the ancient world. Thus it was broken; and the trochaic and iambic metres, unassociated as they were with heavenly worship, and thus associated with the heathen drama, obtained an ascendant in the Christian Church.

In I Cor. xiv, 26, allusion is made to improvised hymns, which, being the outburst of a passionate emotion, would probably assume the dithyrambic form. But attempts have been made to detect fragments of ancient hymns conformed to more obvious metres in Eph. v. 14; James i, 17; Rev. i, 8 sq.; xx. 3. These pretended fragments, however, may with much greater likelihood be referred to the swing of a prose composition unconsciously culminating into metre. It was in the Latin Church that the trochaic and iambic metres became most deeply rooted, and acquired the greatest depth of tone and grace of finish. As an exponent of Christian feeling they soon superseded the accentual hexameters; that is to say, they were used in monymantically against the heathen and the heretics by Commodianus and Augustine. The introduction of hymns into the Latin Church is commonly referred to Ambrose. But it is impossible to conceive that the West should have been as far behind the East: similar necessities must have produced similar results; and it is most likely that the tradition is due to the very marked prominence of Ambrose as the greatest of all the Latin hymnographers.

The trochaic and iambic metres, thus impressed into the service of the Church, became having when the Church had gained a firm footing on the ground, and are, in fact, the 7th, 8th, 9th, 10th, and 11th. of our modern hymns, many of which are translations, or, at any rate, imitations of Latin originals. These metres were peculiarly adapted to the grave and sombre spirit of Latin Christianity. Less ecstatic than the varied chorus of the Greek Church, they did not soar upon the pinion of a lofty praise so much as they dropped and sank into the depths of a great sorrow. They were subjective rather than objective; they appealed to the heart more than to the understanding; and, if they contained less theology, they were fuller of a rich Christian humanity.

The first hymn-book of the Western Church was called a Psalmodia. The name indicates that the fifth and sixteenth centuries. It is that which is contained in Pliny's celebrated epistle (Ep. x., 97): "Carmen Christo quasi deo, decec secum uricem." (See Augusti, Handbuch der christlichen Archäologie, ii, 1-100; Walchii, Miscellanea Sacri, i, 2; De hymnis ecclesie Apostolicae, Amstel, 1744; and other monographs entitled to Volubling, Indice Programmatum, p. 183.)

HYMNAR or Hymnal is the name by which is designated a Church book containing hymns. Such a hymnar, according to Gennadius, was compiled by Paulinus of Nola (q. v.)—Walctoi, Sacred Archaelol. p. 829; Augusti, Christi Archael. iii, 710 sq.

HYMNAR. See HYMNAL

HYMNAL. "Poetry and its twin sister music are the most sublime and spiritual arts, and are much more akin to the genius of Christianity, and minister more directly to the highest end of the religious vanity than architecture, painting, and sculpture. They employ word and tone, and can speak thereby more directly to the spirit than the plastic arts by stone and color, and give more adequate expression to the whole wealth of the world of thought and feeling. In the Old Testament, as is well known, they were essential parts of divine worship; and so they have been in all ages, and almost all branches of the Christian Church. Of the various species of religious poetry, the hymn is the earliest and most important. It has a rich history, in which the deepest experiences of Christian life are stored. But it attained full bloom (as we will notice below) in the evangelical Church of the German and English tongue, where it, like the Bible, became for the first time truly the possession of the people, instead of being restricted to priest or choir" (Schaff, Ch. History). "A hymn is one of the commonest expressions of things. It should either excite or express feeling. The recitation of historical facts, descriptions of scenery, narrations of events, meditations, may all tend to inspire feeling. Hymns are not to be excluded, therefore, because they are deficient in lyrical form or in feeling; if experience shows that they have power to excite pious emotions. Not many of Newton's hymns can be called poetical, yet few hymns in the English language are more useful" (Beecher, Preface to the Plymouth Collection). The hymn, as such, is not intended to be didactic, and yet it is one of the surest means of conveying "sound doctrine," and
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of perpetuating it in the Church. The Greek and Latin fathers well understood this. Barbeyrac (see below) "diffused his Gnostic errors in Syriac hymns; and till that language ceased to be the living organ of thought, the Syrian fathers adopted this mode of inculcating truth in metrical compositions. The hymns of Arius were great agents in the introduction of his heterodox circular doctrines. Chrysostom found the hymns of Arius worship so attractive that he took care to counteract the effect of them as much as possible by providing the Catholic Church with metrical compositions. Augustine also composed a hymn in order to check the errors of the Eastern Church, and to represent to the readers of the Gospels the grace and beauty of newly-composed hymns for the propagation of their opinions. The writings of Ephraem Syrus, of the 4th century, contain hymns on various topics, relating chiefly to the religious questions of the day which agitated the Church." Yet a mere setting forth of Christian doctrine in verse does not constitute a hymn; the thoughts and the language of the Scriptures must be reproduced in a lyrical way in order to serve the needs of song. The most popular and lasting hymns are those which are most lyrical in form, and at the same time most deeply penetrated with Christian life and feeling. No art can supply the place of imagination, as the proper sense of the world of things must be other than popular. The Romish Church discourages congregational worship, and therefore she produces few hymns, notwithstanding the number of beautiful religious compositions which are to be found in her offices, and the fine metrical parts which are not approved by public authority in the Church. It be extended further, it contradicts the current practice of the whole Church besides, and cannot, in reason, be construed as any more than a private order for the churches of that province, made upon some particular reasons unexplained to us at the present day, of which more in a later portion of this article. Hymns for Protestants, being "composed for congregational use, must express all the varieties of emotion common to the Christian. They must include in their wide range the trembling of the sinner, the hope and joy of the believer; they must sound the solemnity of the judgment, and cheer the afflicted; they must summon the Church to an earnest following of her Redeemer, go down with the dying to the vale of death, and make it vocal with the notes of triumph; they must attend the Christian in every step of his life as a heavenly melody. There can be nothing ecclesiastical in the hymn. Besides this, the hymn, skilfully linked with music, becomes the companion of a Christian's solitary hours. It is the property of a good lyric to exist in the mind as a spiritual presence; and thus, as a 'hidden soul of harmony,' it dwells, a soul in the soul, and rises, once it is caught, into distinct conscious- ness. The worldly Githe advised, as a means of making life less commonplace, that one should 'every day, at least, hear a little song or read a good poem.' Happier he who, from his abundant acquaintance with Christian lyrics, has the song within him; who can follow the.putative counsel of Paul, and 'speak to himself in hymns and spiritual songs, singing and making melody in his heart to the Lord' (Eph. v. 19)" (Methodist Quarterly, July, 1849). For the vocal execution of hymns as a part of Church service, see SINGING; and for their instrumental accompaniments, see MUSIC.

On the question of the use of hymns of human composition in the Church, there were disputes at a very early period. The Council of Braga (Portugal), A.D. 563, forbade the use of any form of song except psalms and passages of Scripture (Canon xii). On this subject, Bingham remarks that it was in ancient times 'no objection to an able man to compose hymns, provided that he sometimes made use of psalms and hymns of human composition, besides those of the sacred and inspired writers. For though St. Austin reflects upon the Donatists for their psalms of human composition, yet it was not condemned. In the psalmody of the Church it was that he sometimes made use of psalms and hymns of human composition, besides those of the sacred and inspired writers. For though St. Austin reflects upon the Donatists for their psalms of human composition, yet it was not condemned the use of the same. It was allowed, and they preferred them to the divine hymns of Scripture, and their indirect way of chanting them, to the grave and sober method of the Church. St. Austin himself made a psalm of many parts, in imitation of the 119th Psalm; and this he did for the use of his people, to preserve them from the errors of Donatus. It would be absurd to think that he who made a psalm himself for the people to sing should quarrel with other psalms merely because they were of human composition. It has been demonstrated that there always were such psalms, and hymns, and doxologies composed by pious men, and used in the Church from the first foundation of it; nor did any but Paulus Samosatensis take exception to the use of these, and he did so not because he thought of human composition, but because they contained a doctrine contrary to his own private opinions. St. Hilary and St. Ambrose made many such hymns, which, when some muttered against in the Spanish churches because they were of human composition, the fourth Council of Toledo must have come to make good to the bishops and other with the doxologies 'Glory be to the Father,' etc., 'Glory be to God on high,' threatening excommunication to any that should reject them. The only thing of weight to be urged against all this is a canon of the Council of Laodicea, which forbids allatemnoo' 2o slash, all private psalms, and all uncannonic books to be read in the Church. For it might seem that by private psalms they mean all hymns of human composition. But it was intended rather to exclude apocryphal hymns, such as went under the name of Solomon, as Sal- namon and many others stand it, one cannot but think that the form of words was not approved by public authority in the Church. If it be extended further, it contradicts the current practice of the whole Church besides, and cannot, in reason, be construed as any more than a private order for the churches of that province, made upon some particular reasons unexplained to us at the present day, of which more in a later portion of this article. Any argument to be drawn from this canon, it is evident the ancients made no scruple of using psalms or hymns of human composition, provided they were pious and orthodox for the substance, and composed by men of eminence, and received by just authority, and not brought in clandestinely into the Church" (Orig. Eccles. bk. xiv, ch. i).

The Christian Church, in all periods, has been accustomed, as we have already stated, to use psalms and hymns in public worship. The psalms are portions of the Psalms of David; the hymns are human compositions. In the history of singing this worship generally, see PSALMODY, under which head will also be given an account of the standard hymn-books in the several evangelical denominations.

1. Ancient Hymns.—A few hymns have come down to us from antiquity, that have arrived at a high degree of excellence. We cite an evening hymn from an unknown author, which he describes as in his time (4th century) very ancient, handed down from the fathers, and in use among the people. Dr. J. Pye Smith considers it the oldest hymn extant. The following is his translation of it: "Jesus Christ, Joyful light of the holy! Glory of the Eternal, heavenly, highly blessed Father! Having now come to the setting of the sun, beholding the evening light, we praise the Father, and the Son, and the Holy Spirit of God. Thou art worthy to be praised of sacred voices, at all seasons, 0 Son of God, who givest life. Wherefore the universe glorifieth thee!" (Colesman, Ancient Christiannity, ch. xvi, § 5). From the letter of the elder Pliny to Trajan we know that as early as the beginning of the 2d century the Christians praised Christ as their God in songs; and from Eusebius (Eccles. Hist. v. 28) we learn that there existed a whole multitude of such sacred hymns. Christ, remaining to us complete from the period of persecution, is that of Clemens Alexandrinus (q. v.). It is given in full, Greek and Latin, in Cole- man (L. c.): see also Piper, L'elementa Hymnica us Salutato- rea (Gotting. 1883), and Bull, Defensio fidei Nicene, § 111, ch. 1. In his latest poetic production, it has little claim to consideration; it shows the strain of the devotion of the early Christians: we see in it the heart of primitive pietie labor- ing to give utterance to its emotions of wonder, love, and gratitude, in view of the offices and character of the Redeemer. It is not found in the later offices of the Church, because, as is supposed, it was thought to re-
Hymnology

seemle, in its structure and antiphonal style, the songs sung in pagan worship" (Coleman, *Prim. Ch. Mus., p. 370). The oldest Christian hymn-writers, however, were mostly Gnostics in their doctrines, and they seem to have used their songs as "a popular means of commending and propa gating their errors." The first of these was Bardesanes, in the Syrian Church of the 2nd century. In the formation of the Psalms in Greek, with Gnostic additions. Valentinus of Alexandria belongs also to the oldest hymn-writers (comp. Münzer, *Odes Gnost.,* Copenh., 1712). The *Gloria in Excelsis* (q.v.), which is still retained in use, is ascribed to the third century. See ANGELICAL HYMN.

1. Of the Therapeutae in Egypt singing in their assemblies old hymns transmitted by tradition. When, under Constantine the Great, Christianity became the religion of the state, the hymns acquired the importance of regular liturgical Church songs. Ephraem Syrus (q.v.), in the 5th century, who may be considered as the representative of the whole Syrian hymnology, sought to bring the heretical hymns of the Gnostics into disuse. In the Eastern Church the hymns of Arius had, by their practical Christian spirit, acquired more popularity than the orthodox hymns, which consisted mostly in the unsyntactical and formulaic content of the Psalms. To oppose this tendency, Gregory of Nazianzum and Synesius composed a number of new Orthodox hymns, but, not being adapted to the comprehension of the people generally, these did not become popular, and thus failed to answer the purpose of the writers. Sacred poetry in hymns was developed among the Greeks; and as in the next century the strife concerning the adoption of Mary and the saints began, the orthodox hymns became mere songs of praise to the saints. Such are the hymns of Cosmas, bishop of Mafjumena (780); Andreas, bishop of Crete (660-702); Germanus, patriarch of Constantinople (620-630); and Theophanes, metropolitan of Nicaea, and Josephus, deacon of Constantinople, in the 9th century.

In the history of hymnology, Schaff distinguishes three periods, both in the Greek and Latin Church poetry: (1.) that of formation, while it was slowly throwing off classical forms and inventing its peculiar style, down to about 650; (2.) that of perfection, down to 820; (3.) that of decline and decay, to 1400, or the fall of Constantinople. The first period, beautiful as are some of the odes of Gregory Nazianzum and Sophronius of Jerusalem, is best seen in the many traces on the Greek school books. The flourishing period of Greek poetry coincides with the period of the image controversies, and the most eminent poets were at the same time advocates of images; pre-eminently among them being John of Damascus, who has the double honor of being the greatest theologian and the greatest poet of the Greek Church. The flower of Greek poetry belongs, therefore, to a later division of our history. Yet, since we find at least the rise of it in the 5th century, we shall give here a brief description of its peculiar character. The earliest poets of the Greek Church, especially Gregory Nazianzen in the 4th, and Sophronius of Jerusalem in the 7th century, employed the classical metres, which are entirely unsuitable to Christian ideas and Church song, and therefore gradually fell out of use. Hymn found no entrance into the Greek Church. In its stead the metrical or harmonic verse was borrowed from the Hebrew poetry and the earliest Christian hymns of Mary, Zacharia, Simeon, and the angelic host. Anatolius of Constantinople († 458) was the first to renounce the tyranny of the classic metre and strike out a new path. The essential points in the peculiar system of the Greek metre of this period are the following: The first stanza, which forms the model of the succeeding ones, is called in technical language *Hirmos,* because it draws the others after it. The succeeding stanzas are called *Troparia* (stanzas), and are divided for chanting, by commas, without regard to the sense. A number of troparia, from three to twenty or more, form an Ode, and this corresponds to the Latin *Sequence,* which was introduced about the same time by the monk Notker in St. Gall. Each ode is founded on a *Hirmos,* and ends with a *troparium* in praise of the holy Virgin. The odes are commonly arranged (probably after the example of such Psalms as the 25th, 112th, and 119th) in acrostic, sometimes in alphabetic order. Nine odes form a *Cassenn.* The older odes on the great events of the incarnation, the resurrection, and the ascension, are sometimes sublime; but the later long canons, in glorification of unknown: martyrs, are extremely prolix and tedious, and full of elements foreign to the Gospel. Even the best hymnological productions of the East lack the healthful simplicity, truthfulness, fervor, and depth of the Latin and of the evangelical Protestant hymn.

"The Greek Church poetry is contained in the liturgical books, especially in the twelve volumes of the Meusa, which correspond to the Latin Breviary, and consist, for the most part, of poetic or half poetic odes in rhythmic prose. These treasures, on which nine centuries have wrought, have hitherto been almost exclusively confined to the Oriental Church, and, in fact, yield but few grains of gold for general use. Neale has lately made a happy effort to reproduce and make accessible in modern English metre many of the choicest and most valuable of the most hymns of the Greek Church. We give a few specimens of Neale's translations of hymns of St. Anatolius, patriarch of Constantinople, who attended the Council of Chalcedon (451). The first is a Christmas hymn, commencing in Greek: Μηνες καὶ παραδοσόν τιμίου.

'A great and mighty wonder, The festal6 makes secure: The Virgin bears the Infant With Virgil-honour pure.'
The Word is made incarnate, And yet remains on high: And cherubim and seraphim To shepherds from the sky, And we with them triumphant Repeat the hymn again: 'To God on high be glory, And peace on earth to men!' While thus they sing your Monarch, Whose breath is angels' voice: Rejoice, ye vales and mountains! Ye oceans, clap your hands! Since all he comes to ransom, By all be he adored.

The Infant born in Bethlehem, By earth and heaven confessed: Now idol forms shall perish, All error shall decay, And Christ shall wield his sceptre, Our Lord and God for e
c

Another specimen of a Christmas hymn by the same, commencing in Βάπτισθαι:

'In Bethlehem is He born! Maker of all things, everlasting God! He opens Eden's gate, Monarch of ages! Thence the fiery sword

Gives glorious passage: thence,
The severing mid-wall overturned, the powers
Of earth and Heaven are one;
Angels and men sing of their ancient league,
The pure rejoin the pure,
In happy union! Now the Virgin-womb

Like some chaste throne beareth Him, Containeth Him, the Uncontainable:
Bears Him, whom while they bear

Who tremble! bear Him, as He comes

To shower upon the world

The fulness of His everlasting love!'}

One more on Christ calming the storm, ζωοφόρα τραπεζική as reproduced by Neale:

'Fierce was the wild billow, Dark was the night; Oars labored heavily; Foam glimmered white; Mariners trembled; Peril was high; Thus said the God of God, "Peace! It is I."

Ridge of the mountain-wave, Lower thy crest!'}
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2. Latin Church.—Of far more importance to the Christian Church, and in the Latin hymns produced in the earlier ages, or the period covering the 4th to the 16th centuries. Though smaller in compass, Latin hymnology far surpasses the Greek in artless simplicity and truth, and in richness, vigor, and fulness of thought, and is much more akin to the Protestant spirit. With objective churchly character it combines deeper feeling and more subjective appropriation and experience of salvation, and hence more warmth and fervor than the Greek. It forms in these respects the transition to the evangelical hymn, which gives the most beautiful and profound expression of the personal enjoyment of the Saviour and his redeeming grace. The best Latin hymns have come through the Roman Breviary into general use, and through translations and reproductions have become naturalized in Protestant churches. They treat, for the most part, of the great facts of salvation, and the hymnody of the pastorals of the Bible and the homilies of Augustine is the most celebrated. There is no doubt that the authorship of a great many hymns is spurious, especially in the case of Ambrose (q.v.), bishop of Milan, who died in 397, and who is generally considered the proper father of Latin Church song. Among his genuine productions we find the grand hymn O lux beata trinitas; Veni redemptor gentium; Deus creator omnium, etc. The so-called authentic hymns of Bishop Paulinus, "by far the most celebrated hymn," formerly ascribed to Ambrose, "which alone would have made his name immortal," and which, with the Gloria in excelsis, is "by far the most valuable legacy of the old Catholic Church poetry, and which will be prayed and sung with devotion in all parts of Christendom to the end of time," he is said to have composed for the baptism of Augustine. But it is now agreed by our best critics that this hymn was written at a later date (Schaff, Ch. Hist. ii, 592). Another distinguished hymn-writer of the Middle Age was Augustine, the greatest theologian among the Church fathers (†490), whose soul was filled with the genuine essence of poetry. He is said to have composed the resurrection hymn, Cunz rei gloria Christiit; the hymn on the glory of Paradise, Ad perennis vitam fontem Morsnulli avitl, and others. Damascius, bishop of Rome (†384), who is said to have been the author of the rhyme of which we spoke above, is perhaps not less celebrated than the preceding names. Very prominently rank also Prudentius, in Spain (†405), whom Neale calls "the prince of primitive Christian poets," the author of Jura maestae quiesce gredulior, and Paulinus of Nola; Sedulius, who composed two Christmas hymns, A solis ortus eri- diisse et Hostia Heroes implevit; Enudios, bishop of Pa- via (†521); and Fortunatus, bishop of Poitiers (about 600), who wrote the passion hymn, Pange lingua glorio-si Fraziln certuniana et Veililia regis praeutor. These hymns (the text and translations of most of which are given by Schaff, l.c) soon became popular, and though many of them, long in use in the Church, were not to be set aside, still the Council of Toledo (633) recommended the use only of such hymns as those of Hilary, Ambrose, etc., in public worship. Gregory the Great, who introduced a new system of singing into the Church [see GREGORIAN CHANT], also composed hymns, among others on the laudes factor Domini; Praise the Lord and King of Com- munium, generally reckoned as his best, etc. After him the most noteworthy hymn-writers are Isidore, bishop of Sevilla; Eugenius, Ildefonsus, and Julianus, bishops of Toledo; and Beda Venerabilis. Charlemagne (8th century), who introduced the Gregorian chant into France and Germany, was an enthusiastic supporter of the Church and a great patron of hymnology, and was an author of over 30 hymns; he also took a leading part in the creation of the Pentecost hymn, Veni creator spiritus, though others ascribe it, and perhaps on better grounds, to Rabanus Maurus. Alcuin and Paulus Dia- consus also composed hymns. Although Christianity, during that century and the next, spread through France, Germany, and northwards, yet Latin hymns re- mained in exclusive use during the whole of the Middle Ages, as the clergy alone took an active part in divine worship. In the 9th century appeared some noteworth- ly hymn-writers. Theodulf, bishop of Orleans, whose Gloria in excelsis was a great success, died on Sunday, Rabanus Mauros; Waladrith Strabo, the first Ger- man hymn-writer; Notker (†912), who introduced the use of sequences and recitatives in the hymns, and composed the renowned alternate chant, Media vita in morte sumus. During the 10th and 11th centuries sacred poe- try was contributed by the Benedictines, among whom Hermann of Veringen (†1054) was especially distinguished. King Robert of France wrote the Pentecost hymn, Vini sanete spiritus; Petrus Damiani wrote also penitential hymns. To the 11th century belongs the alternate hymn to Mary entitled Salve Regina mater dei, and the hymn beginning Salve opus cruentatum; Abelard, writer of the Anunciation hymn, Mater ad adorem; and Bernard of Cluni, author of the "Celsatorio Country," about A.D. 1145. It was, moreover, a practice of conventual discipline to connect hymns with all the various offices of daily life: thus there were hymns to be sung before and after the meals, after the reading of the Gospel, in the intervals of fasting, etc. In the 13th century the sentimentalism of the Franciscans became a rich source of poetry, and the Latin hymns perhaps attained their highest perfection under writers of that order. Francis of Assisi himself wrote sacred poetry. Among the Franciscan hymn- writers are especially to be noticed Thomas of Celano (after 1250), author of the grand Judgment hymn, Dies irae dies illa [see Dies Irae]; Bonaventura; Jacobo- nus, who wrote the Stabat mater dolorosa and Stabat mater specto. See STABAT MATER. Among the Dom- inicans, Thomas Aquinas distinguished himself by his Pange lingua gloriosi and Lenda Siam Solveturrum. After attaining this eminence Latin hymns retrograded again during the 14th and 15th centuries, and became mere rhymed pieces. The mystics Henry Suso (q.v.) and Thomas à Kempis (q.v.) alone deserve mention among the writers of good hymns.

On hymns see also Ancient and Middle Ages, see Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bx. xii, chap. v, and bx. xiv, chap. i; Daniel, Theaurarum Hymnologicus, sacrum hymnorum, etc., collectio amplissimis (Leipzig. 1841-56, 5 vols. 8vo); in a good selection in Kingdom, Lit. Hymnus and Gesang, and in the several editions of the Liturgy which the Latin and German versions are printed face to face, with an intro, and notes by A. W. von Schlegel (Bonn, 1847, x2mo, and second collection 1865, 12mo); Trench, Sacred Latin Poetry, chiefly lyrical, with Notes, etc. (2d Ed. Lond. 1864, 18mo); Coleman, Apostolic and Primitive Church, ch. xi; Coleman, Ancient Christian- 19th, ch. xvi; Walch, De Hymnibus Eccles. Apostolicae (Le- mus, 1837); Rambach, Anthologie Christl. Gesänge (Alto-
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1817-33); Björn, Hymni Vet. Potrum Christ. Eccles. (Halle, 1819); Kehrlein, Latinische Hymnologie (Frankfurt, 1840); (Ultramontane) Mone, Lat. Hymnen des Mittelalters (Freib. 1835 sq., 3 vols. 8vo); Moll, Hymnarium (Halle, 1816, 1820); Wackernagel, Das deutsche Kirchenlied (Lpz. 1864-65, 2 vols.), part of vol. i, p. 9-362; Chandler, Hymns of the Primitive Church (London 1887); Noble, Hymns of Early Christian Hymns, written by many anonymous authors. Among the writers we find not a few of the celebrated knightly minne-singers, as Hartmann von der Aue, Wolfram von Eschenbach, Walther von der Vogelweide, and others. But the German sacred songs of this time, like the old Latin hymns, were confined to the liturgy and to certain times and dates of the year, especially to the seasons of Easter and Christmas, with certain liturgical and ecclesiastical observances. The former class is not very important, either as to number or to quality; but the Marien-Lieder, and, in a minor degree, Amen-Lieder (hymns to Mary said to Anne), constitute a very large and well-known class among the poems of the ante-Reformation times in Germany.

They form a sort of spiritual counterpart to the minne-songs or love-songs addressed to earthly lady by the knight. It was easy to transfer the turn of expression and tone of thought from the earthly object to the heavenly one, and the degree to which this is done is to us very often startling. The honors and titles given to the Virgin Mary are a fine evidence of the reverence and love for the Virgin Mary. "The former class is not very important, either as to number or to quality; but the Marien-Lieder, and, in a minor degree, Amen-Lieder (hymns to Mary said to Anne), constitute a very large and well-known class among the poems of the ante-Reformation times in Germany.
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A marked improvement, however, took place in German hymnology during the 15th century, especially near its close. The chief hymn-writer of this period was Henry of Laufenberg, who was particularly active in transforming secular into religious songs, as was frequent at this time; he also translated for the Germans many of the Latin hymns of the court of the Holy Roman Emperor. One of the best specimens of a religious song transformed we cite here. The original was "Instruck, I must forsake thee."

FAREWELL

O world, I must forsake thee,
And far away betake me
To seek my native shore;
So long I've dwelt in sadness,
I wish not now for gladness.
Earth's joys for me are o'er.
Sore is my grief and lonely,
And I can tell it only
To Thee, my friend most sure!
God, let Thy hand uplift me,
Thy pitying heart enfold me,
For else I am most poor.
My refuge where I hide me,
From Thee shall nought divide me,
No pain, no poverty;
Naught is too bad to fear it,
If Thou art there to share it;
My heart asks only Thee.

Many of these transformed hymns were preserved, like the one above cited, through the Reformation. Another very popular hymn, Den lieben gepflegen den ich han der ist in des Huotes Trone, was transformed from the song "Du hast dein kind." The latter is the first hymn used in the Wittenberg "Keller." The transformation of ballads by the minnesingers into hymns to Mary and Anne we have already spoken. We return, therefore, to Laufenberg, and cite one of his hymns, which well deserves to be called not only one of the best of his age, but one of the loveliest sacred songs that has ever been written. We copy the first stanza of it from Mrs. Winkworth (p. 98):

CRADLE SONG

Ah Jesu Christ, my Lord most dear,
As Thou wast once an infant here,
So give this little child, I pray,
Thy grace and blessings day by day:
Ah Jesu, Lord divine,
Guard me this babe of mine!

Laufenberg also wrote and widely introduced the use of many hymns in mixed Latin and German, a kind of verse which was the favorite amusement of the monks, and which had acquired considerable popularity at his time. The best known of these productions was a Christmas carol, dating from the 14th century, in dulci jubilo, Nu niyet und seid fro. Peter Dresdensis was generally, but erroneously, regarded as the author of these perhaps better termed "Mixed Hymns." His real work, however, lay in the strenuous efforts he made to introduce hymns in the vernacular more freely into public worship, especially into the service of the Mass, from which they had, as we have already had occasion to observe, been excluded. But these efforts met with violent opposition from the Church, and the use of hymns in the vernacular still continued to be almost exclusively confined to festivals and like occasions. Among these vernacular hymns are particularly celebrated "Ein Kindlein so lieblich," "Christ fure zu Himmeln," "Gott sei gelobet und gebenedeit," "Wir danken dir lieber Herr," etc. After the invention of the art of printing, the followers of Huss, who had formed themselves into a separate and organized church of their own in 1467 (Bohemian and Moravian Brethren), and who made it one of their distinctive peculiarities to use hymns in the vernacular, as their service was mainly conducted in their mother tongue, especially their prayers, gave new encouragement to the writing of German hymns. In 1504, Lucas, then chief of the Bohemians, collected 400 of the most popular of the German hymns and had them printed. This is "the first example of a hymn-book composed of original compositions in the vernacular to be found in any Western nation which had once owned the supremacy of Rome." Previous to this time, towards the close of the 15th century, there existed two or three collections of German versions of the Latin hymns and sequences, but they are of very inferior merit.

The Reformation in the 16th century marks the next era in the history of German hymnology. The introduction of the vernacular into the liturgy of the Church gave an impulsion to the German language that was only eclipsed by Luther's translation of the Bible for the edification and education of the entire German people. But it was Luther's aim not only to furnish his followers the Book of Books, but also to introduce every known form of the singing of such hymns as already existed in the vernacular, and by the creation of a taste among the people for German sacred song to promote its cultivation. Of this he set himself the best example. As in the cause of religion he knew how to enlist a large circle of eminent men and scholars to carry out his great designs, so also, with a true appreciation of sacred art, both in poetry and song, he soon gathered about him many friends, who became the compilers of several collections of hymns, that were issued from the press at remarkably short intervals. See PSALMODY. Luther himself, besides translating many known German hymns, "which he counted among the good things that God's power and wonderful working had kept alive amid so much corruption," and, besides transforming or reproducing some of the early German hymns, composed a large number of his own in the vernacular, most of which are known in our own day by way of most of the Protestant nations of the globe, and some of which are particular favorites even with the English-speaking people. The special object of the composition of these hymns, into which Luther threw "all his own fervent faith and deep devotion," was under the stimulus of the people a short, clear confession of faith, easy to be remembered. For the doctrines which Luther propagated were yet too new to be well understood by all as he desired them to be. He wished men to know what they professed. Protestantism meant the profession of a faith by choice, and not by compulsion; a belief that was cherished by the confessor, and not a blind following after the teacher. He required a comprehension of his great doctrines of justification by faith, of the one Mediator between God and man, which gave peace to the conscience by delivering it from the burden of the past sins, and a new spring of life to the soul by showing men that their dependence was not on anything in themselves, on no works of their own performance, but on the infinite love and mercy of God, which he had manifested to all mankind in his Son; of his doctrine of the universal priesthood of all believers, which put a new spirit into the Church, by vindicating for every member of it his right and duty to offer for himself the sacrifice of praise and prayer, and to study for himself God's word in the Scriptures" (comp. Winkworth, p. 105). One of Luther's hymns best known to us is that found on the 46th Psalm, the famous "Marschallise des Reformations," as Heine called it. He is generally supposed to have written it on his way to the Diet of Worms. Some, however, think that it was composed at the close of the second Diet of Spire (1529). It has been again and again translated. Mrs. Winkworth gives us the following:

THE STRONGHOLD

A sure stronghold our God is to be,
A trusty shield and weapon,
Our help he'll be, and set us free,
With all may happen here.

That old malicious foe
Intends us deadly woe,
Aimed with the strength of hell,
And deepest craft as well,
On earth is not his fellow.

Through our own force we nothing can,
Straight were we lost forever,
But for us fights the proper Man,
By God sent to deliver.
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Ark ye who this may be?
Christ Jesus named is he,
Of Schaab the Lord,
Sole God to be adored;
'Tis he must win the battle,
And be the world with devils filled,
Our souls to fear should little yield;
They cannot overpower us,
Their dreaded prince no more
Can harm us as of yore;
Look grim as e'er he may,
Deemed is his ancient way,
A word can overthrow him.

Still shall they leave that world its might,
Yet no thanks shall merit;
Still is he with us in the fight.
By his good gifts and Spirit.
Even should they take our life,
Goods, honor, children, wife,
Though all of these were gone,
Yet nothing has they won—
God's kingdom ours abideth!

Another hymn of Luther's which has gained a world-wide circulation is the one that was written by him on the burning of two martyrs for their faith at Brussels in 1512, and which was translated, or, rather, transformed by D'Aubigné in his History of the Reformation, beginning,

"Flung to the needless winds,
Or on the watery vast,
Their ashes shall be watched,
And gathered at the last," etc.

As an example of the songs he transformed most successfully, we quote the old ditty,

"O thou naughty Judas!
What hast thou done,
To betray our Master,
God's only Son!
Therefore must thou suffer
Hell's agony,
Lazarus' companion
Must forever be.
Kyrle, Elioton!"

This Luther changed to the following:

"Twas our great transgression
And our sore mistaking
Made the Lord our Saviour
On the cross to bleed.
Not then on thee, poor Judas,
Nor on that Jewish crew,
Our vengeance dare we visit—
We are to blame, not you.
Kyrle, Elioton!"

"All hail to thee, Christ Jesus,
Who hungest on the tree,
And bo'st for our transgressious
Both shame and agony.
Now beside thy Father
Reignest thou on high;
Bless us all our lifetime,
Take us when we die!
Kyrle, Elioton!"

(Corpus Eximiae, 1860, p. 239 sq.)

Of the friends whom Luther was successful in enlist ing as writers for his new hymn-books we have space here to mention only the most prominent names. One of them, Justus Jonas, was a colleague of Luther and Melanchthon at the University of Wittenberg. His special service was in the transformation of the Psalms into metrical German versions, "choosing, as one can well understand, those which speak of David's sufferings from his enemies, and his trust in God's deliverance." One of his best is on the 124th Psalm, beginning thus:

"If God were not upon our side,
When foes around us rage;
Were not Himself our Help and Guide,
When bitter war they wage;
Were He not Israel's mighty Shield,
To whom their utmost crafts must yield,
Surely we might have perished.

Another of Luther's colaborers was Paul Eber, whose hymns have "a tone of tenderness and pathos which is much less characteristic of this period than the grave, manly truthfulness of Luther and Jonas." But they became very extensively known, and during the trying period of the Thirty-years' War they were constantly heard both in public and around the family hearth-

"... a special favorite at that time was the one, composed when the imperial armies were besieging Wittenberg (1547), beginning thus:"...

"... When, in the hour of utmost need,
We know not where to look for aid,
When days and nights of anxious thought
Nor help nor comfort yet have brought,
Then this our comfort is alone,
That we may rest before Thy throne,
And cry, O faithful God, to Thee,
For rescue from our misery."

Two of Eber's hymns for the dying have been great favorites by the side of death-beds and at funerals, not only among the German Protestants, but also among the Roman Catholics. The one is Herr Jesu Christ, wahr Mensch und Gott (Lord Jesus Christ, true man and God); the other is the following childlike expression of perfect trust, beautifully rendered by Mrs. Winkworth (p. 121):

DEATH IN THE LORD.

"I fall asleep in Jesus' arms,
Sin washed away, hushed all alarms,
He, whose dear blood, his righteousness,
My jewels are, my glorious dress,
Wherein before my God I stand
When I shall reach the heavenly land.
With peace and joy I now depart,
God's child I am with all my heart:
I thank Thee, Death: Thou leadest me
To that true and pleasant land where I would be;
So cleansed by Christ I fear not Death,
Lord Jesus, strengthen thou my faith!"

But Luther and his associates were only the founders of the new German hymnology, which soon spread over a much more extended field. Hymn-writers became common all over the land, and their number is legion, so that it is almost impossible for us, in our limited space, to give more than a brief account of the most distinguished, and the names only of those of lesser note. Thus Nicholas Decius, a converted monk, produced a translation of the Gloria in Excelsis ("Allein Gott in der Höh', sei Ehr,","

"All glory be to God on high,

which, with its noble chorale, soon came into use all over Germany. Paul Speratus (von Spreuten), the chaplain of the duke of Prussia, is perhaps the most noted of all the hymnologists of this period, and is best known as the author of the hymn on the doctrine of Justification by faith:

"Salvation hath come down to us
Of great grace and love,
Works cannot stand before God's law,
A broken reed they prove.
Faith looks to Jesus Christ alone,
He must for all us stoe stone,
He is our one Redeemer."

This, in Luther's day, was as popular among the Germans as one of his own hymns. Indeed, it is said that when Luther first heard it sung by a beggar on the roadside he gave him the last coin he had. Princes also became sacred poets, such as the margrave of Brandenburg and Hesse, known as the author of

"Grani me, eternus Deus, such grace
That no distress
May cause me e'er to flee from Thee," etc.

The elector John of Saxony was also, at that time, counted among hymn-writers, but it now appears that he never wrote any hymns himself, although he was passionately fond of them. Hans Sachs (1494-1576), the celebrated and popular poet of this period, also wrote sacred verse, and figures not less prominently than the persons whose names we have already mentioned. The most famous of his hymns he wrote during the siege of Nuremberg, his native city, in 1561: "Why art thou thus cast down, my heart?" (Warum betrübest du dich mein Herz?). He wrote also a very beautiful hymn on the explicit confidence in the saving merits of Christ, entitled "The Mediator," which is translated by Mrs. Winkworth (Ch. 84, p. 184). Among the Bohemian Brethren, who, as is well known, were on intimate terms with the Lutherans, Michael Weiss is distinguished both as the translator of Bohemian hymns into German, and as the author of a number of beautiful German hymns. Two of them, "Once he came in
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blessing," and the well-known "Christ, the Lord, is risen again" (Christus erstanden von des Todes Bande), translated into English by Mrs. Winkworth, may be found in her Lyra Germannica, ii, 62, and in Schaff, Christ in Song, p. 15, 259. Not less worthy of notice, though perhaps not quite so prominent in their day, are Johann Matthaeus († 1661) and Nicholas Hermann († 1683), among others, the beautiful morning hymn, "My innermost heart now rises" (Aus meinen Herzen's Grunde), which was a favorite with King Gustavus Adolphus. Hermann's hymns are to be found in nearly all German hymn-books. Among his best known are "Christ, du bist mein Leben," and "Weinen Stimmeleins vorherhört," i.e., Mrs. Winkworth gives Matthaeus's "Miner's Song" (p. 144) and Hermann's "Hymn for the Dying." In the latter half of the 16th, and even at the opening of the 17th century, a gradual decline is manifest in the quality of the hymns, though the quantity continued. They were no longer the simple, spontaneous productions of men of all classes, moved to worship God in songs of praise, but the work of professional hymnologists. Still this period, too, has some very good and fine hymns, but a marked change of tone is perceptible in most of them; the literary mannerisms of the previous century were rather medioc...
his tenderness and fervor never degenerate into the sentimentality and petty conceits which were already becoming fashionable in his days, nor into that morbid dross for which the disappointments of his own life might have furnished some excuse." Other hymn-writers of this period are Andreas Gryphius (1616-64), of the same country as Spitta, and, like him, also a great writer of lyrical literature; Martin Lutken (1620-68), the author of N. ducket alle Gott ("Let all men praise the Lord"); Simon Dach (q. v.), author of Ich bin ja Herr in Deiner Macht; Heinrich Albertus (1604-66), whose best hymn is considered to be Gott d. Himmlis u. d. Erden; Georg Weinrich (1634-84), the author of the 17th-century hymn book die Thir; die Thor macht weis (in Christ in Song, p. 17); the electress Luisa Henrietta of Brandenburg, who composed in 1649, after the death of her first husband, the hymn Jesus, meine Zuversicht, well known in the English dress, "Jesus, my Redeemer, lives" (see Christ in Song, p. 265); Ernst Chr. Humburg (1605-81), whose hymns were published together under the title Geistliche Lieder (Naumb. 1758). Perhaps his best hymn is Jesu, meines Lebens Leben, or "Christ, the life of all the living" (Christ in Song, p. 183), another, hardly less beautiful, is his well-known "Man of Sorrows." Johann Frank (1618-77), a poet and a great writer of sacred music, is also a hymn writer, and, with him, marks the transition from the earlier to the later school of German religious poetry, published his sacred songs under the title of Geistliches Zion (Guben, 1764). One of his best is Schmachte dich o lieber Seele, "Dost thou slight the soul" (Winkworth, Lyra Germanica, ii, 183; Schaff, Christ in Song, p. 240). We also here only George Neumark (q. v.) (1621-81), for a time professor of poetry and poet laureate at the University of Königsberg, whose most famous hymn is Wer nur den leib mit Gott lässt weilen, "Leave God to order all thy ways" (Lyra Germanica, p. 323); J. M. Meyer, 1612-1642, Jerusalem du hochgeboete Stadt, translated in the Christian Examiner, lxix, 254 ("Jersalem, thou high-built, fair abode"), and in Lyra Germanica, ii, 285; Friedrich v. Spee (1591 or 1596-1635), a Roman Catholic, who labored earnestly to introduce vernacular hymns into the Divine service of his church, wrote Auf und; Gott will gelobet sein; Johann Jacob Balde (1603-68), also a Roman Catholic, but he wrote mostly in Latin (his sacred poems being published under the title of Carmina Lyricia); Georg Phil. Harsdorff (1607-58), of Southern Germany; A. H. Buchholz (1607-71); Joh- annes von Liechtenstein and belonging to the same century who were hymn-writers of some note.

Angela Sillesius (1624-77) (as a Lutheran, Johann Scheffer) wrote beautiful hymns, 205 of which were published under the title of Heilige Sedenlust, oder Geist- liche Hirtenlieder (Bresl, 1657, and often). Particularly excellent are his Ich will dich lieben meine Sterbe ("Thee will I love, my strength, my tower"), and Liebe, die Du mich zum Bilde ("O Love, whoformedst the, in Schnaff, Christ in Song, p. 414; Christian Examiner, lxix, 245).

Angela was the founder of the so-called second Silesian School of poets, as Spitta is regarded as the leader of the first. They wrote both secular and religious poetry, but the latter far excels the former. To this school belonged Homburg, mentioned above; the two courtesans of Schwarzbard Radolfstadt; Knorr v. Rosen- roth (1638-89), who wrote the lovely little hymn, Mor- gegegen mit meinem Herz des Herrn, also Tug; O Gott von dem wir Alles haben, and many others. In contrast to the formal and an unspiritual hymns of the second Silesian school stand the poetical writings of the so-called Pietists, originating with Spe- ner, who for nearly a hundred years exerted a most powerful influence both on the religious and social life of Germany." The representatives of this school are Philip Jacob Spener (1635-1705); his friend and assoc- iate, August Hermann Francke (1663-1727), the founder of the Halle Orphan Asylum; Anastasius Freylinghau- sen, a son-in-law of Francke, who wrote 44 hymns, and published (1704) a collection which remained for some generations the complete collection for private reading. Among pious persons in Germany, the period belong J. C. Schade; Fr. von Canitz; Joachim Ne- ander (1640-80), of the Reformed Church, who wrote Lobe den Herrn in den Mächten; Johann C. Schütz, author of Sei Lob u. Ehr dem höchsten Gut; Christian Ti- rion (1640-1706); Sam. Adam, Montanus; Johann Jacob Bach (1675) the world-renowned Was Gott das, das ist wohl- gethan ("Whate'er my God ordains is right"); J. Ad. Haselocher; Christ, Plessiovis; Laur. Laurenti, whose best hymn Dr. Schaff designates Ermutiget euch ihr lern ("Rejoice all ye believers," in Christ in Song, p. 388); J. B. Freisein; C. Günther, Halt in der Gedächtnis Jesum Christ; Sal. Liaskovius; J. T. Breithaupt; J. Laune; J. D. Herrnmschid; Christ, F. Richter; J. G. Wolf; Chr. A. Bernstein; Chr. J. Koitsch; J. Trichbeo- vicius; J. J. Winkler; J. H. Schröder; J. E. Schmidt; P. Lackmann; J. Chr. Lange; L. A. Gott; B. Cruselius, Heligtanze (1686); Christ, A. Plessiovis; H. G. Neuss; A. Creutzburg; J. Muthmann; Ernst Lange (1650-1727), Im Abend blinks der Morgestern, or "The wondering sages trace from far" (Christ in Song, p. 120); L. J. Schlicht; C. H. von Bogatzky, the cele- brated author of the "Golden Treasury" (Aus goldenen Schatzkästlein), also one of the compilers of the "Co- then hymn-book;" J. J. Rambach; T. L. K. Allendorf; L. F. F. Lehr; J. S. Kuntz; E. G. Wolfsdorff, and many others. There were also the Württembergers, the best representatives of the Pietism of South Germany, of whom Albert Bengel (1677-1752) is the most notable. He was also a prominent leader, though as a hymn-writer he was far excelled by another great light of this section of Germany, Philip Friedrich Hiller (1699-1769), who took Paul Gerhardt for his model. He published several volumes of hymns, of which the Casket of Spiritual Hymns {Geistliche Lieder} contains the best of his own sacred songs, "obtained very wide popularity," and is "still the commonest book in Württemberg next to the Bible itself" (Winkworth, p. 283 sqq.). Here desire mention, also, J. R. Hedinger, S. Urispeger, F. O. Miller, Ph. H. Weissensee, E. L. Fischer, J. Chr. Storr, Ph. D. Burk, Chr. H. Roeder, Chr. K. L von Flei, J. T. von Moser, and still others.

The school of Spencer developed the Mystics and Sep- aratists, who also furnished a number of contributors to hynmolody; but, although some of them were quite able, the influence of the new schools, as a whole, on hynmolody "was, for the most part, simply mischiev- ous, and their hymn-books contain about the worst specimens to be found—poor as poetry, fiercely intolerant towards their fellow-Christians, and full of a fantastic- and irreverent adoration of the Redeemer" (Wink- worth, Christian Singers of Germany, p. 290). The only hynmolologists who really deserve praise are Gottfried Arnold (1666-1714) and Gerhard Tersteegen (1697- 1769). The former, although an extensive writer on Church History, etc., is, indeed, best remembered in our day by his hymns, of which he wrote 180, and among them some very great ones. Gerhard Tersteegen's hymns are his deeply thoughtful "How bless'd to all thy followers, Lord, the road," etc. Tersteegen (q. v.), who, although he never actually separated from the Reformed Church to which he belonged, was none the less a Mystic of the purest type, wrote more than 100 hymns; but he has become known to English-speaking Christians by the English dress which Wesley gave to two of his best hymns—"Lo! God is here; let us adore," and "Thou hidden love of God, whose height," etc. Lesser lights of these schools are J. Dippel, J. W. Petersen, G. Arnold, and others.
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Here also, finally, deserve notice the hymn-writers of the Moravians, who have had no despicable influence on hymnology. Of especial credit are a few of count Zinzendorf’s hymns, who, unfortunately, cared more for their quantity than their quality; he wrote more than 2000, many of which, naturally enough, found a place in English hymn-books. His own sect has inserted 128. Charles Wesley, G. Thomas, the Wobsters, G. W. and W. W. Carter, with the last-named poets, were even used in the Roman Catholic Church, of course often in a somewhat modified and even distorted form. The following deserve especial mention: J. M. Sailer (bishop of Ratibon), J. M. Penneberg, J. H. C. von Wessenberg, J. Sperl, and J. Franz. Here deserve notice also the Moravians, Chr. Gregor, H. von Bruniingh, C. von Stübing, A. J. von der Heyde, F. von der Heyde, F. von Wettin, etc.; the Württemburgers, C. F. Hartmann, W. L. Hobsch, Chr. Ad. Daum, M. Hahn, Christ, G. Pregizer; in other German provinces, C. Liebibh, Matth. Claudius, J. G. Schöner; and in the Reformed Church, H. Annoni, F. A. Krammacher, Jung-Stilling, G. Menken; the forerunner of the latter period was the Erich von der Heyde.

Present German Hymnology.—The modern period begins with the war of liberation (1813-15), and with the reawakening of a genuine religious life, which, after all, is slowly gaining the upper hand over that generally supposed dominating scepticism. Although in the modern productions the subjective greatly predominates, and they are still rather the work of art instead of popular songs, yet they do not quite attain to the form and condensed pregnancy of the classic hymns, so that there is very apparent in them a striving after objectivity, and they have at least much sweetness, earnestness, and sincerity. Among the works of the Roman Catholic church Novalis was mentioned below B. M. Arndt, M. von Schenkendorf, F. H. de la Motte Fouqué, Louise Hensel, and Fr. Rückert. Of the other latest Lutheran hymnologists, whose most prominent representatives are Alb. Knapp, Vic. Strauss, J. C. Ph. Spitta, Chr. R. H. Puchta, C. A. Döring, deserve mention. Of the Reformed, J. P. Lang, J. V. Schenfeld, J. F. Bahna Mr., Chr. G. Barth, J. Beutz, Ed. Eyrth, F. A. Feldhoff, G. W. Fink, W. R. Freudenthal, C. von Grüniesen, W. Hey, Christ. G. Kern, J. Fr. Möller, Chr. F. H. Sachse, R. Stier, and Chr. H. Zeller; among the Lutherans, A. Reimund, J. L. Loecker, H. E. Oest rank in this period belongs to J. B. von Albertini, one of whose hymns, which his bishops, whom it is said, Schliebermacher asked to have read to him in his dying hours. C. B. Garve here deserves also high encomia as a hymnologist. Among the Roman Catholics, whose prominent model is Spee, “with all the defects of style, the sacred poetry of the Catholic Church,” the sacred poetry of the Catholic Church, produced no less than 60,000 hymns. The Virgin serving as the most usual theme, M. von Diespeckbrock deserves especial mention. The extent of German hynology may be inferred from the fact that the Evangelical Church alone has produced no less than 60,000 hymns. See PSALMODY.

2. English Hymnology.—Among the English, as is only too evident from the number of English hymn-writers, few have produced any works of real importance. We have already seen that the influence of the English language is less than that of the Latin, and the English church has not produced any great hymns, except for its Scottish and Welsh branches. The English church has had a number of hymn-writers, among whom the most famous is John Henry Newman, who wrote a number of hymns, including the well-known hymn, “A Mighty Fortress Is Our God.”
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Gascoigne, Michael Drayton, Sir Walter Raleigh, Sir Philip Sidney, the Fletcher brothers—Giles and Philo—Edwin, George and William, Ford, John, the countess of Pembroke (sister of Sir Philip Sidney, and joint author with him of a version of the Psalms). Later still we find quaint old Philip Quailes, and Robert Southwell, the martyr monk, and their contemporary, sweet George Herbert. The great dramatists of that golden age have left us the most inviolable poem, and song, which at least show forth their obligations to the Bible and to the Christianity of the period. Haywood, Shirley, and Ben Jonson, Beaumont and Fletcher, and Shakespeare, greatest of all, swell the hymns with the highest poetic talent. The psalms gradually change from lyric poetry, and in the succeeding century we have an increasing number of devout poets, of whom the immortal Milton must always be the chief. Yet the singular fact remains that during all these ages there was “nothing like a People’s Hymn-book in England.” It is true that Christian worship was not without its temple songs. The Psalms of David, the Te Deum, the Magnificat, the Gloria in Excelsis, and the “Song of the Angels,” the “Ambrosian Hymn,” and some of the hymns of the Middle Ages, were chanted in the churches and cathedrals. But the so-called hymns of Spenser and Milton, which are not the least of our literary treasures, entered into the Chris-
tian life, and worship of British Christianity. Germany possessed a classic literature of this sort a century and a half before England had a hymnal. The rude version of the Psalms by Sternhold and Hopkins, the smoother but insipid version of Brady and Tate which superseded it, and the most correct version, which was the work of an English Puritan (Rouse), were sung by those whose stern revolt against Romanism led them to reject even what was really good and scriptural in her order of worship and liturgical books. The faults of the age are conspicuous in its music. The intellectual, metaphysical, and delicate literary, full of “quips, and cranks, and wanton wiles;” cumbrous and overdone. With very few exceptions, there is nothing that people would care to sing, or could sing, for there is little of that elemental element which goes down in the common expression. The rhymes are rude and irregular, and the very art of the poetry seems to defy any attempts to set it to popular music. For “people cannot think and sing: they can only feel and sing.” Even Milton’s magnificient hymn, “On the Morning of Christ’s Nativity,” is not adapted to common Sabbath worship. Yet, few of George Rouse; and the verses that survive in the songs of the sanctuary. The period succeeding this revival of literature pro-duced some Christian poets of note, and a few hymns which survive their authors. Bunyan, and Baxter, and Jeremy Taylor all wrote verses, but their prose had more of poetry in it than their attempts at song. Among those whose good old hymns have stood the test of time, we must not forget the Rev. John Mason, of Wat-er-Stratford, who died in 1694, author of “Come, dearest Lord, and feed thy sheep, on this sweet day of rest,” “Now from the altar of our hearts,” “What shall I render to my God,” etc. He published a volume of “Spiritual Songs” in 1668. Dr. Watts borrowed much from him. The good non-juror, bishop Ken (1637–1711), bequeathed to Christendom his famous “Morning and Evening Hymns,” and that matchless doxology, “Praise God, from whom all blessings flow.” Next comes Joseph Addison, whose life version of the Psalms, beginning “The spacious firmament on high,” first appeared in the Spectator in 1712, at the close of an article on “the right means to strengthen faith,” and about the same time was published his sweet paraphra-
ses of the twenty-third Psalm. Perhaps the most familiar of his hymns is that beginning “When all thy mercies, O my God.” See ADDISON. The Reformation in England did not, as in Germany, grow by the spontaneous utterance of popular Christian song. That was left for the period of the great evangel-
cal revival which crowned the last century with its bless-
ings. All that had been done before was as the broad and deep foundation-work, rude and unadorned, but vast and essential to the majestic structure which has risen upon it. The stream of Christian verse flowed on in its old channels until the publication of the Psalms and Hymns of Dr. Watts began a new era in English hym-
ology. The poet Montgomery says that “Dr. Watts may almost be said to have written the very symphony of language, for he so far departed from all precedent that few of his compositions resemble those of his forerun-
ners, while he so far established a precedent to all his successors that none have departed from it otherwise than to imitate him. No one has ever succeeded him in being so altogether a poet. He has taken the dramatic form of the psalm, and the style of expressing Christian truth employed by the denomination to which he belonged.” Dissenter as he was, his Psalms and Hymns are so catholic in their spirit that many of them have been adopted by all denominations of Protestant Christians in their Sab-
bath worship. His Divine Songs for Children, and some of his Psalms, will live while the language endures. The defects of his style are obvious in many of his lyr-
ics, which evince haste and negligence, faulty rhymes, and a prosing feebleness of expression. Yet he broke bravely through the mannerisms of preceding ages, and inaugurated a style of sacred music unexcelled, but was alike enriched the evangelical poetry of the English tongue, and filled the temples and homes of the race that speaks that language with the most delightful praises of the Most High. His example was soon fol-
lowed with success by others. But to him belongs the credit of having founded, and prepared the way for that immense chorus which he will forever lead in these glori-
ous harmonies. His first hymn was given to the Church under circumstances of prophetic interest. He had complained to some official in the Independent church of Southampton, of which his father was a dea-
con, “that the musick of the church was out of taste.” “Give us something better, young man,” was the reply. The young man did it, and the Church was invited to close its evening service with a new hymn, which commenced, “Behold the glories of the Lamb Amidst His Father’s throne, Prepare new honors for His name, And songs before unknown.” From that time his ever-ready muse gave forth, in strains which are almost divine, “harmonies” for his church, that “inspired a style of songs unknown before. We need only indicate a few of the first lines: “When I survey the wondrous cross,” “My God, the spring of all my joys,” “When I can’t read my title clear,” “Come, ye love that love the Lord,” “Come, let us join our cheerful songs.” “He dies, the friend of sinners dies.” His “Cra-
dle Hymn” has taught countless mothers and children to sing of Jesus, and the angels and manger at Beth-
lehem: “Hush, my dear, lie still and slumber.” It was while looking out from his quiet chamber window at Southampton “upon the beautiful scenery of the harbor and river, and upon the green glades of the New Forest on its farther bank, that the idea suggested itself of the image of the heavenly Canaan,” which he soon embodied in those sweetest of all his verses. “There is a land of pure delight,” etc. See Watts. Only seven years before the first edition of Watts’s Hymns was given to the world, Philip Doddridge was born (1702); and before the sixteenth of great predeces-
sor, whose verses cheered his own dying hours in a dis-
tand land, he had published most of his sweetest hymns. Some of these are imperishable, for they have become part of the spiritual life of our Protestant Christianity. Many of them grew out of and were appended to his sermons, and were popularized into the hymns as “Thine earthly Sabbaths, Lord, we love” (Heb. iv, 9), “Jesus, I love thy charming name” (1 Pet. v, 7). His Rise and Progress of Religion in the Soul, which was written at the suggestion of Dr. Watts, and has been
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translated into the leading languages of Europe, and his
Family Expositor of the New Testament, are monuments of
his wonderful religious power and usefulness. But
his hymns will be sung where his larger works are nev-
er heard of, and the world will never cease to echo the
strains of such songs as "Awake, my soul, stretch every
nerv, and let the strain of the Gospel ring clear."
"Grace, 'tis a charming sound," "Ye golden lamps of
heaven, farewell!" See DODDRIDGE.

The most voluminous and successful of all English
hymnists is the Rev. Charles Wesley. Over seven thou-
sand psalms and hymns were written by his facile pen;
and he soon became one of the ablest and most influ-
cient evangelist, who, with his more celebrated brother
John, himself a hymn-writer of no mean powers,
preached the Gospel in the Old and New worlds, and
gave a new style to Christian song. Their history, la-
bul, persecutions, and triumphs are so well known that
we need only mention their sainted names. John Wes-
ley was the author or translator of several excellent
hymns, and a capital critic on hymnology. Of Charles
Wesley's hymns a large number have taken a more than
classic place in our poetic literature. The Christian
Gazette of 1848 contains a large collection of these

"Come, let us join our friends above," Dr.
Watts said of Charles Wesley's inimitable rendering
of the wrestling of Jacob at Peniel with the angel. "That
Sing to the Lord, O ye saints of his temple; praise him,
and bless his holy name, be true to his commandments,
which I have never written." Doubtless much of the
power of his hymns is attributable to the circumstances
which gave rise to them, and to his facility in giving
them the most fresh and vivid forms of expression.
On the last projecting rock on Land's End, Cornwall, he
stood, and wrote that memorable hymn, "Lo! I stand a
narrow rock of land," etc. His judgment hymn, commencing "Stand,
the omnipotent decree," and two others, were written and
published in 1768, just after the destruction of the city
of Lisbon by an earthquake. "Glory to God, whose sover-
eign grace," was written for the Kingswood colliers, who
wished to sing the magnificent strains of his theological oppo-
tent, Thomas Oliviers (1725-1799), in his judgment
hymn, beginning "Come, immortal King of glory." See
Oliviers. Along with them came William Williams
(1716-1798), the Methodist "Watts of Wales," sing-
ing "Over the mountain and the stream, till I come
home, oh thou great Jehovah!" and John Cennick, the
devout Moravian, to whom we are indebted for two of the
finest hymns ever written—"Rise, my soul, and stretch thy
wings," and "Lo! he comes with clouds descending." The
latter has been erroneously attributed to Oliviers, in
whose judgment hymn it resembles in some respects, but a close inspection shows them to
be entirely different productions. Cennick's hymn
first appeared in a "Collection of Sacred Hymns" in
1762. See CENNICK. Next in order appeared the collec-
tion of hymns by the Rev. Benjamin Beeles (1716-
1750), a Baptist clergyman, whom a London congrega-
tion could not tempt to leave his little flock at Bournon,
where he labored fifty-two years, and preached and
sang of Jesus. He was the author of "Did Christ o'er
sinners weep?" "Faith, 'tis a precious grace," "Let par-
ticipate," etc. The latter, the most celebrated of his
works, received the special favor of the countess of Huntingdon, a theological author of
note, and one of the founders of the London Missionary
Society (1789-1802), was the urs of ov tw o i
undred and fifty hymns, some of which are favorites still; but
to the countess herself, the patron and friend of Whitlead,
and Berridge, and Romane, we are indebted for many
undying hymns as "Oh! when my righteous judge shall
come." "We soon shall hear the midnight cry." She
died in 1791, at the age of eighty-four, having devoted her
fortune and life to the cause of Christ. Some of the sweet-
est hymns for the Church and the home which his age
produced were written by the daughter of a Baptist
clergyman at Broughton, Miss Anne Steele (1716-1778).
She withheld her name from her poems, but the Eng-
lish-speaking Christian world still sings from its myriad
hearts and tongues, "Father, what'ere of earthly bliss,
"Jesus, my Lord, in thy dear name unite thy grace, my
heart calls great, or good, or sweet," etc.; "Come ye
that love the Saviour's name;" and some of her sacra-
mental hymns are fine specimens of Christian song.

The next hymn-book of importance that appeared in
Great Britain was the Olney Hymns, which is the joint
production of Mrs. Isaac Watts and Rev. John Newton,
and is distinguished by the liberal way in which it
enters in their characters and lives, and yet so united in
the love of Christ—the Rev. John Newton and William
Cowper. To this book Newton furnished two hundred
and eighty-six hymns, and Cowper sixty-two. It
was published first in 1779, before Cowper's reputation as a
poet was made. The hymns were written between
1767 and 1779, and doubtless would have contained
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more of Cowper's contributions but for a return of his insanity. The history of these noble coreworkers for Christ is too much neglected to require this allusion. Their deep personal experiences are written in many of their delightful verses, and reflected in the Christian life of succeeding generations. Who that remembereth Newton's marvellous conversion, and his subsequent life of piety and distinguished usefulness, until his death at the age of eighty-two (1807), will not appreciate the fervor with which he sang,

"Amazing grace! how sweet the sound That saved a wretch like me!"

or "How sweet the name of Jesus sounds In a believer's ear!"

or "Sometimes a light appears The Christian while he sings!"

or "Day of judgment, day of wonders, Hark! the trumpet's awful sound!"

See Newton, John. And the English language itself must die before Cowper's plaintive music can vibrate through believers' souls in those almost perfect hymns in which he wrote out and yet veiled the strange, sweet, and attractive experiences of his own religious life: "To Jesus, the crown of my hope," "Far from the world, O Lord, I flee," "Oh! for a closer walk with God!" These and many other strains filled with melody and pathos "move in a mysterious way." It has been well said by Dr. Cheever that "if Cowper had never given to the Church on earth but a single score of those exquisite breathings of a pious heart and creations of his own genius, it had been a bequest worth a life of suffering to acceptable, well known to require more than this allusion.

It was long before another bard arose to take up the lyre which this gentle signer laid down. A few strains come floating through the succeeding years, such as Robinson's "Come, thou fount of every blessing," and "Jesus, and can it ever be, a mortal man ashamed of thee?" written by the Rev. John Witherspoon of Philadelphia, and then a precocious boy of only ten years! Of female hymnists we have at this period Mrs. Barbauld (1748-1825) and Jane Taylor, both of whom left some sweet hymns for the sanctuary. The former will be best remembered by her beautiful lines on the death of a believer—

"Sweet is the scene when Christians die;" the latter by her Hymns for Infant Minds. To them we must add Miss Hannah More (1744-1839), whose practical Christian prose writings possess a masculine vigor and Biblical earnestness, and whose poetry, although not of the highest order, is not overshadowed by a weaker feeling. Her Christmas hymn, "Oh! how wondrous is the story of our Redeemer's birth," is a favorable specimen. Among the minor poets of this period we mention Dr. John Ryland, born in 1758, author of "In all my Lord's appointed ways," "Lord, teach a little child to pray," "Sovereign Ruler of the skies," "O Lord, I would delight in thee;" and the Rev. John Logan, who died in 1788, at the age of forty, a Scottish preacher famed for his eloquence, who wrote such hymns as "Where high the heavenly temple stands," "Oh, city of the Lamb, begin the universal song," "Oh God of Blessings! by whose hand thy people still are fed," "The hour of my departure's come," etc. To the poet of the poor, Rev. George Crabbe, we are indebted for those delightful lines, "Pilgrim, burdened with thy sin, come the way to Zion's gate;" and to Rev. Samuel Medley, a Baptist minister in London (1798-1839), "for God ring lyrics, "Mortals, awake! with angels join," and "Awake, my soul, in joyful lays." The name of Henry Kirke White (1785-1808) will ever live in the splendid hymn in which he sang the story of the birth of the Redeemer and of his own conversion, "When marshaled on the mighty plain." From his pen also flow those characteristic hymns beginning "The Lord our God is full of might," "O Lord, another day is flown," "Through sorrow's night and danger's path." See Henry K. White. The coronation hymn, "All hail the power of Jesus' name," was written by the Rev. Edward Perronet, an English dissenting clergymen, who died at Canterbury in 1795, exclaiming, "Glory to God in the highest, and on earth peace, good will toward men." In the hymnology, we can only refer the reader to the well-known occasional hymns of the great poets, Pope and Dryden, Wordsworth, Campbell, Moore, Southey, and some of their associates.

But the Church Universal owes a greater debt to James Montgomery (1771-1854). No man since the days of Cowper has added so many admirable versions of the Psalms and noble hymns to the English language as this gifted Moravian, whose prolific muse never ceased to lavish its treasures until, at fourscore years, he went up higher. His paraphrase of the seventy-second Psalm, commencing "Hail to the Lord's anointed," is one of the classics of the old Hebrew fire and of the best modern missionary spirit. His "Thrice holy" (Isa. vi, 3), beginning "Holy, holy, holy Lord," seems to blend the voices of "saints and seraphim" in one glorious prophetic anthem. Of his other hymns we need only mention the "same that spread at Easter" "Joy and the love of Jesus," "Christmas choruses," "Angels from the realms of glory," and "Hail to the Lord's anointed;" the song of heaven, "Forever with the Lord;" the hymn on the death of an aged minister, "Servant of God, well done," written in memory of his friend, Rev. Thomas Taylor; and that on the death of the Rev. John Hucott, secretary of the British and Foreign Bible Society, "Go to the grave in all thy glorious prime." His verses, "Prayer is the soul's sincere desire," "Oh! where shall rest be found?" "What are these in bright array?" are only a few of the priceless gems which he has set in the crown of his chief work, "The 1745 Hymn Book." See Moore and Hucott.

In this later period of English hymnology many and very sweet have been the singers and their sacred songs. There is Henry F. Lyte, the rector of Brixham (1793-1847), author of "Jesus, I my cross have taken," and of those delightful "beauty and terror" "My spirit on thy care, blest Saviour, I recline," and the last that he ever wrote, "Abide with me, fast falls the eventide." It was his of his Tales in Verse that professor Wilson, in the "Noctes Ambrosianae," wrote, "Now that is the right kind of religious poetry. He ought to give up his labors as a poet," and instead write "hymns of love and tenderness." Poems, chiefly religious. The female hymnists increase in number and in power in this period. Mrs. Felicia Hemans, Caroline Bowles, and others of great repute, lead the way with their sweet music. We have learned to sing "Nearer, my God, to thee," from Miss Sarah F. Adams, who died in 1849 in her old home, Dorsetshire; and Charlotte Elliott, of Torquay, struck a new chord for all the world when she wrote, in 1836, those inimitable verses, "Just as I am, without one plea." She is the author of several volumes, and furnished one hundred and seventeen hymns to The Kolowalu's Hymn-book, the last edition of which she supervised. Mrs. Barret Browning, Mrs. Charles, of "Schonberg Cotta" fame, Miss Adelaide Proctor, Mary Howitt, and the Brown sisters—Charlotte, Emily, and Anne, Isabella Craig, and Mrs. Craik, formerly Miss Midlow, author of "Oh God, be merciful to me a sinner," "John Witherspoon's Hymn on the Death of the Cloud," the singers of their sex whose verses have enriched our hymnals. Sir John Bowring, born in 1792, author of "In the cross of Christ I glory," "Watchman, tell us of the night;" the dean of St. Paul's, Dr. Henry Hart Milman, archbishop Trench, John Keble, with his Chris- tian Year, the poet leader of the Anglican Catholic movement in the English establishment, Alexander Knox, Allan Cunningham, Robert Pollok, bishop Heber, with his glorious advent, and judgment, and missionary hymns, Bernard Barton, the Quaker poet, canon Wordsworth, and the late dean Allford, of Westminster Abbey,
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Faber, the devout Romish hymnist, and Dr. John H. Newman, once of Oxford and now of Rome, Robert Murray McCreight, and John R. McDuft, the Scottish preachers, with Horatius Bonar, ofKelso, author of the delightful Hymns of Faith and Hope, many of which are already familiar as household words, and Edward H. Bickersteth, M.A., have published some admirable original hymns for Christmas and Easter, and very spirited translations from ancient and mediæval hymns. We specify only his versions, for he has published a column of original English hymns from which his compiler has drawn a thousand from his pen, are given in full in Schaff's Christ in Song. Quite in another line, but not less happy, is a new hymn by the Rev. Hervey D. Ganse, a popular clergyman of the same Church in New York City. It is the story of Bartimaeus, so sweetly told that we recommend it to the faithful. After some space for another hymn in which the language and their mother tongue is the vehicle of Christian praise.

3. American.—Poetry was not cultivated in our heroic age for its own sake, and the singers were few and far between. The churches mostly used the psalms and hymns which they brought with them from the Old World until after the Revolutionary War. President Davids (1724-1761) left some poems, among which his lines on the birth of an infant, and the noble hymn commencing “Great God of wonders! all thy ways,” are most familiar. The celebrated Dr. Timothy Dwight, at the request of the Congregational ministers of Connecticut, Dr. Watts, and added over twenty of his own versifications to the volume. Of all that he wrote, however, none have such beauty and vitality as his rendering of Psalm cxix., “How precious is the Book divine!” Psalm cxxxvii., “I love thy kingdom, O Lord, O God,” and Deut. xxxiii. 17, “In his hand are the deep places of the earth.” These are universal favorites. In his preface to that admirable volume, Christ in Song, Dr. Philip Schaff says, “The Lyra Sacra of America is well represented, although only about thirty years old, it is far richer than our British friends are aware of.” Abundant proof of this richness is furnished in the hymns of Schermerhorn, which the author has gathered into this remarkable collection of Christological poetry, a number of which were furnished by his authors for this work. It is scarcely necessary in these pages to quote at any length those hymns which have been adopted into nearly all of the recent books of praise for the various denominations. We shall therefore only refer to the most noted authors, and give parts of some of the hymns which seem destined to secure a permanent place in our American hymnals. The earlier poets—Percival, Pierpoint, Henry Ware, Jr., Richard H. Dana, Wadsworth, Alston, John Neal, N. P. Willis, Brainerd, J. W. Eastburn, Carlos Wilcox, Hillhouse, with Bryant, Longfellow, Tucker, Whittier, and Whitman, who are still living—have all made occasional contributions to the stock of popular hymns, chiefly of the Unitarian and Universalist bodies. The clergy of the American churches have probably been the most fertile contributors to this department of sacerdotal worship during this period.

The late bishop Doane (q. v), of New Jersey, wrote some very beautiful hymns, which long ago passed beyond the border of which he was a champion into the hymnals of other churches. His evening hymn is worthy of comparison even with that of good bishop Ken: “Softly now the light of day.” There is a trumpet-like music in his majestic lines on the Banner of the Cross which reminds us of Heber and Milman: “Fling out the banner! let it float,” etc. The same Church has also given us Dr. W. Schermerhorn’s well-known hymn, “I would not live always,” and other delightful verses from his now patriarchal muse. Another bishop, Dr. Arthur Cleveland Coxe, among his fine Christian ballads and poems, has rendered into verse, with more spirit and power than any other English writer, those words of Christ, “Behold, I stand at the door and knock.”

To the late Dr. James W. Alexander (q. v) we owe the best version in our language of Gerhardt’s imperishable hymn, “Oh sacred head! now wounded.” One of the most staid and fervid of our hymn-writers was the late Dr. George W. Bethune (q. v), author of “It is not death to die,” “Oh Jesus, when I think of thee, thy manger, cross, and crown,” and many other well-known lyrics. The Rev. Dr. Alexander R. Thompson, of the Reformed Church, New York, has published some admirable original hymns for Christmas and Easter, and very spirited translations from ancient and mediæval hymns. We specify only his verse, for he has published a column of original English hymns from which his compiler has drawn a thousand from his pen, are given in full in Schaff’s Christ in Song. Quite in another line, but not less happy, is a new hymn by the Rev. Hervey D. Ganse, a popular clergyman of the same Church in New York City. It is the story of Bartimaeus, so sweetly told that we recommend it to the faithful. After some space for another hymn in which the language and their mother tongue is the vehicle of Christian praise.

The Rev. Russell S. Cook (q. v) wrote and sent to Miss Elliott, the author of “Just as I am, without one plea, Jesus far from me,” a collection of hymns which, with additions and completions, seems almost as if the same pen had given them both to the world: “Just as thou art! without one trace,” etc. It has since been incorporated with Sir Roundell Palmer’s Book of Praise and several American hymn-books. It would be impossible, in a summary like this, to omit a hearty tribute of acknowledgment to the female hymn-writers of our country. First among these, Mrs. Sigourney, who may be called the Hannah More of America, has an established place among these honored authors, although most of her poetry was written in blank verse, or in metres not adapted to Church music. Yet her anniversary hymns for Sunday-schools and missionary meetings have been very popular. Her verses are full of a tender, devotional spirit, and expressed in chaste and beautiful language. Mrs. Harriet Beecher Stowe, in some of her Religious Poems, published in 1867, has caught the spirit of the inspired word, and rendered its utterances into verse with singular felicity. We may instance the fine hymns commencing “When winds are raging in the upper ocean,” “Life’s mystery—deep, restless as the ocean,” “That mystic word of life,” “O sovereign Lord,” and the one entitled “Stricken, still with thee.” The Cary sisters, Phoebe and Alice, have added a few graceful and touching hymns to our Lyra Americana, and have been particularly successful in their writing for the young. That favorite and delightful hymn (which reminds us of Cowper’s sensitive strains), “I love to steal a while away from every cumbering care,” was written by Mrs. Phoebe H. Brown after being interrupted while at prayer. On giving her only son to preach Christ to the heathen, she wrote that sweet missionary hymn beginning “Go, messenger of love, and bear / The love which trembles on the air. / The song which seraphs love to hear, / And angels joy to sing.”

Many a revival of religion has been sought and promoted in the use of her familiar stanzas:

“O Lord, Thy work revive / In Zion’s gloomy hour.”

These are but specimens of a few of our best female hymnists. Many others we cannot even mention, to whom the whole Church owes a debt of gratitude for her wise, useful, and spiritual song. They have taught her to “make melody unto the Lord.” For additional literature, see Psalmody. (W. J. R. T.)
HYPAPANTE

Hypapante. See Candlemas.

Hypatia of Alexandria, born in the latter half of the 4th century, was the daughter of Theon the young geometrical commentator, and she was the acknowledged mother of philosophy, and professed, like her father, the old heathen doctrines, of which she was one of the most eloquent advocates. So eminent did she become in the ancient philosophy that, in the early part of the 5th century, she publicly lectured on Aristotle and Plato, both men, and was the first woman in Alexandria, with immense success. Socrates (Welles's translation, 1709, of the Latin of Vallesia) thus narrates her history: "There was a woman at Alexandria by name Hypatia. She was daughter to Theon the philosopher. She had arrived to so eminent a degree of learning that she excelled all the philosophers of her own times, and succeeded in that Platonic school derived from Plotinus, and expounded all the precepts of philosophy to those who would hear her. Wherefore all persons who were studious about philosophy flocked to her from all parts. By reason of that eminent degree and perfection of expression wherewith she had accomplished herself by her learning, she frequently addressed even the magistrates with a singular modesty. Nor was she ashamed of appearing in a public assembly of men, for all persons revered and admired her for her extreme modesty. Envy armed itself against her, and also at that time there were frequent conferences with Orestes (the prefect of Alexandria), for this reason a clamyrum was framed against her among the Christian populace, as if she hindered Orestes from coming to a reconciliation with the bishop. Certain persons therefore, of fierce and over-hot nature, who were headed by one Peter, a reader, conspired against the woman, and observed her returning home from some place; and, having pulled her out of her chariot, they dragged her to the church named Cæsareum, where they stripped her and murdered her. And when they had torn her piecemeal, they carried all her members to a place called Cinnarion, and consumed them with fire. This fact brought no small disgrace upon Cyrillus and the Alexandrian Church" (Hist. Eccl. b. vii. c. 15). The death of Hypatia occurred in 415. Suidas (T' varian), iii, 535, puts the guilt of Hypatian's death more directly upon Cyril; but his account is by the best authorities, Gibbon, of course excepted, not thought to be trustworthy (comp. Schaff, Ch. Hist, i, 943). There is a sporadic epistle attributed to Hypatia, addressed to Cyril, in favor of Nestorius (Baluze, Concilia, i. 216). Toland wrote a sketch of Hypatia (London 1742). Kingsley has made light of the subject the story of a novel ("Hypatia"). See Cave, Hist. Lit. anno 415; Wernsdorff, Diss. Acad. de Hypatia (1747); English Cyclopaedia; Ménage, Hist. Phil. Philosoph. p. 52; Münch, Hypatia, in his Vernissch. Schriften (Ludwigsh. 1829), vol. 1; Schaff, Ch. History, i, 67; Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, iv, 503 sq.

Hypatian of Gangara, a distinguished member of the Council of Nice, of whose life but little is known, was stoned to death March 31, 327, in a pass near Gangra, by a gang of Novatian ruffians, in all probability on account of the opposition which he had manifested towards the Novatians (q. v.) at the council. See Stanley, History of the Eastern Church, p. 266.

Hyperbole. Any one who carefully examines the Bible must be surprised at the very few hyperbolic expressions which it contains, considering that it is an Oriental book. In Eastern Asia the tone of composition is pitched so high as to be scarcely intelligible to the sober intellect of Europe, while in Western Asia a medium seems to have been struck between the extraposition of the East and that of the far West. But, even regarded as a book of Western Asia, the Bible is, as compared with almost any other Western Asiatic book, so singularly free from hyperbolic expressions as might well excite our surprise, did not our knowledge of its divine origin permit us to

suppose that even the style and mode of expression of the writers were so far controlled as to exclude from their writings what, in other ages and countries, might excite pain and offence, and prove an obstacle to the reception of divine truth. See Inspiration. Nor is it to be said that the usage of hyperbole is of modern growth. We find it in the oldest Eastern writings which remain to us, and the earlier and earlier writers attest that, in times approaching near to those in which the writers of the New Testament flourished, the Jewish imagination had run riot in this direction, and has left hyperboles as frequent and outrageous as any which Persia or India can produce. See Theology.

The use of hyperbole in all Scripture is that with which the Gospel of John concludes: "There are also many other things which Jesus did, the which, if they should be written every one, I suppose that the world itself could not contain all the books that should be written." This has so much pleased many commentators that they have been disposed to regard it as an unadditional to the sacred text, and to reject it accordingly—a process always dangerous, and not to be adopted but on such overwhelming authority of collated manuscripts as does not exist in the present case. Nor is it necessary to regard hyperbole as a speaking of the Bible, for by many examples in sacred and profane authors. In Numb. xiii, 33, the spies who had returned from searching the land of Canaan say that they saw giants there of such a prodigious size that they were in their own sight as grasshoppers. In Deut. i, 28, cities with which] many] were said to be as the rhetorical manner of speaking is heaven." In Dan. iv, 7, mention is made of a tree whereof "the height reached unto heaven, and the sight thereof unto the end of all the earth: and the author of Ecclesiastical (xlvii., 15), speaking of Solomon's wisdom, says, "Thy soul covered the whole earth, and thou and the children of Israel (A. ui, 24; 22) God is mentioned as promising to Jacob that he would give the land of Canaan to him and his seed; and then it is added, "they shall fill the whole sea and land which the sun shines upon." Wetstein, in his note on the text in John, and Basnage, in his Histoire des Chrétiens (iii, 1-9; v, 7), have cited from the ancient Rabbinical writers such passages as the following: "If all the seas were ink, and every Reed was a pen, and the whole heaven and earth were parchment, and all the sons of men were writers, they would not be sufficient to write all the lessons which God composed." Concerning one Elizer, it is said that "if the heavens were parchment, and all the sons of men were writers, and all the trees of the forest pens, they would not be sufficient for writing all the wisdom which he was possessed of." Homer, who, if not born in Asia Minor, had undoubtedly lived there, has sometimes followed the hyperbolic manner of speaking which prevailed so much in the East: thus, in the Iliad (xx, 246, 247), he makes Enneas say to Achilles, "Let us have done with reproaching one another, for we may throw out so many reproachful words on one another that a ship of a hundred oars would not be able to carry the load." For instances of this are to be found in Oriental writers; yet it is observed that Cicer (Phil. ii, 44) has "Præsentium quum illi eam gloriion consecutæ sint, quæ vix cepit posse videatur," and that Livy (vii, 25) says, "Hæ vives populi Romani, quas vix terrorum cum aliis habere fas est, habebat Paulus, sive a bishop Peter's Commentary on the four Evangelists, 1777, etc. Modern examples of equal hyperbole may be found cited in almost any work on rhetoric.

Hyperclanism. See Calvinism; Ultra-Calvinism.

Hyperduela (iærio, above; diáxia, worship, service), the worship of the Virgin Mary in the Roman Church. The Romanists speak of three kinds of adoration, namely, latírix, hyperdulia, and dulia. "The adoration of latírix," they say, "is that which is due to God alone, and is given on account of his supremacy; hyperduela is worship paid to the Virgin on account of what
the Papists call the maternity of God, and other eminent gifts, and her supernemine sanctity; *ulterius is worship
paid to saints on account of their sanctity." These
distinctions are too refined for the common people;
and it is greatly to be feared that multitudes worship
the Virgin instead of God, or take her as a mediator instead
of Jesus Christ, as the Church always
not free from the charge of encouraging a belief in the
mediation of Mary. A book in common use, called The
Sacred Heart of Jesus and of Mary, which is published
with an indult of pious in favor of its use, contains
the following passages: "Come, then, harden not and in
vocate the Son, for thou art a kind of priest, and the
sins of the world; Venerate Mary, and you shall
come and behold. Mary stretches out her hand, opens
her breast to receive you. Though inexpressible to the great
concerns of your salvation, though unfortunately proof
against the most engaging invitations and inspirations of the
Holy Ghost, cling yourself at the feet of this
powerful advocate." Amm. (p. 256). "Rejoice, O most glo-
rious Virgin, such is thy favor with God, such the power
of thy intercession, that the whole treasury of heaven
is open to thee and at thy disposal. When thou art
pleased to intercede in favor of a sinner his case is in
secure hands. For the Son, justly irritated, crime may be
borne, but not the part of merit. Through Heaven when thy mediation appears in his behalf." "Thou art the great mediatrix between God and man,
obtaining for sinners all they can ask and demand of the
blessed Trinity." Another book in common use, The
Glories of Mary, Mother of God, prepared by Li-
guini, contains the following passage extracted from the
following prayer: "O holy Virgin! deign to man-
ifest your generosity towards me, a miserable sinner.
If you grant me your aid, what can I fear? No, I shall
no longer apprehend either my sins, since you can re-
pair them; or the devils, since you are more powerful
than they; and your Son, justly irritated, since you arise
from you will appease him. I shall only fear myself,
and that, forgetting to invoke you, I may be lost.
But this will not be the case. I promise you to-day to re-
curr to you in all my wants, and that, during life and at
my death, your name and remembrance shall be the de-
light of my soul." (ibid.)

Hypocrify. Andrew Gerhard, an eminent Protos-
thesis, theologian of the 16th century, was born at Ypres,
Belgium, May 15, 1511. His family name was Gerhard,
but he assumed the name Hypcrs from his birthplace.
His father directed his first studies, after which Hypcr-
rius attended the University of Paris during the years
1528-35. After completing his studies he made a short
stay at Louvain, then travelled through the Nether-
lands, and visited Germany. On his return he was de-
prived of a benefice which had been obtained for him,
on the ground that he had embraced the doctrines of the
Reformation. He went to England, where he re-
mained four years with the son of William Mountjoy, a
friend of his father, and was studying at the University of Ox-
ford and Cambridge. The persecutions directed against
the Protestants after Cromwell's death compelled him,
in 1651, to leave England, and he pursued to New-
strast, attracted by the reputation of Bucer; but his
friend Gleichenhauer, professor of theology at Marburg,
persuaded him to remain in the latter city, and he suc-
ceded his friend in 1542 as professor. He died at Mar-
burg Feb. 1, 1564. To profound and extensive learning
Hypcrs joined great intellectual powers, and a remark-
ably mild, yet straightforward disposition. Greatly
in advance of his time as a scholar, held deep and cor-
rect views of the system with which theological re-
searches and studies should be conducted in striking
contrast with the arbitrary proceedings of the exegetes of
the 16th century, as well as the scholastic theories of
contemporary theologians. His views have become the
basis of modern scientific theology. He had also a
clearer and more practical notion of preaching than the
other preachers of his time, who, instead of expounding
Christian doctrines to their hearers in view of edifying
them, brought abstract discussions or irritating con-
troversies into the pulpit. Hypcrs wrote De formulds
Conciliab. sacrifls, seu de interpretatione Scripturarum
popularum (1542); also Comment, in Taur. Demonstr.
d, and containing a biography of the author, Halle,
1781, 8vo.) It is the first complete work on Homiletics,
and one of the best:—De theologo, seu de ratione studii
theologici, Lib. iV. (Basle, 1566, 8vo; often reprinted):
this is a work of great merit, which may have had the most
favorable influence on the theology of that period and not the least
of views and the Zuinglian opinion of the author in regard to the Eucharist rendered it suspicious in the eyes of the orthodox Lutheran party. Laurentius Villa-
centius, an Augustinian monk of Xeres, in Andalasia, made great use of this as well as of the preceding work, in
order, rather caused them to be reprinted almost word for
word, as his own production, with the exception of pas-
sages too favorable to Protestantism, in a work he pub-
lished at Antwerp in 1665, and the plagiarism was not
detected until half a century later:—Elementa Chris-
tist. (revised ed., 1586), the entire work is practically
(Wittembb, 1565, 8vo; Basle, 1578, 8vo) —Methodol Theo-
logicae, sive praecipuorum Christianae religionis locorum
communium, Libri ii (Basle, 1666, 1668, 8vo). This
work was to have had three more parts, but it was left
incomplete:—Opuscula Theologica varia (Basle, 1570, 2
vols, 8vo). He was also the author of several valuable productions in that department by the Reform-
ers, and were frequently used by Blofeld in his notes
on the New Testament. His most important work in
this department, a Commentary on the Epistles of Paul
and the Epistle to the Hebrews (Comm. in Epistol. ad
Timoth., ad Titum, ad Philem., ad Hebr., ad Tim.,
Comment, in Taur. Demonstr. Epistol., 1588; Comment in Eph.
1588; Comment in Epist. ad Hebraon, 1585),
was published after his death by Mylius (Zurich, 1588-8,
4 vols, folio), and under the care of J. Andreas Schmidt
(Helmstät, 1704, 8vo). In it "Hypcrs pursues the grammatico-historical method of interpretation, exam-
ining the meaning of the words, carefully tracing the
connection of the passage, taking note of the analogy
of Scripture, and so arriving at the true sense of the
place. Not until he has thus done justice to the exeg-
esis does he proceed to the doctrinal or practical use of
the passages, which he usually does not incidentally
from the fathers to show the agreement of his conclusions
with the understanding of the ancient Church" (Kitto).
A collection of small pamphlets had been previously
published separately; among them, De Sacro Scriptura
Lectione et MeditatioSUM (Basle, 1581, 8vo). See Bois-
sard, Jean, Fromor, Ilustratur, part iii; Melch. Adam,
Vite Germanorum Theologorum; Bayle, Dict. Hist.; J.
M. Schröck, Lebensgesch. berühm. Gelehrten, vol. i;
LXXVI, 155; Merck, Rev. 1587, 271 sq; Ch. Monthly,
June, 1866; M'Crie, Rem. in Spain, p. 382; Hauck,
Jahrb. d. Theol., 1855, 255. (J. H. W.)

Hypocrisy (ηρωπρις; but in James v, 12, two words, ηρωπριν, as the A. V. simply) is the name for the successful or unsuccessful endeavor of a person to
impart to others, by the expression of his features or
gestures, by his outward actions, and, in fine, by his whole
appearance, a favorable opinion of himself: it is his
good intentions, love, unselfishness, truthfulness, and
conscientiousness, while in reality these qualities are
wanting in him. It is, therefore, a peculiar kind of
untruthfulness, which has its definite aims and means.
It is precisely because these aims refer to the moral
qualifications of the subject that they are so
theoretical, as if an honest man, that hypocrisy has found room and
opportunity in social life, in commerce and industry, in
politics, and, above all, in the field of revealed religion.
This may appear paradoxical, because this, as well as
the religion of the old covenant, places man before the
face of an almighty Being who sees the heart, and who
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penetrates human thought even from its very beginning; so that the hypocrite, even if he should succeed in deceiv- ing men, can certainly have no benefit from his acts in the end. On the other hand, because religion consists not entirely in the performance of outward actions, but rather in the determination of the heart, it is right to think that the true religi- ous state of his heart and mind, it creates the greater desire in him to acquire the reputation of really having these qualities; and because these qualities, though they are of a purely spiritual nature, yet can only be mani- fested by outward acts, which, since they are no more, strik- ing to the world, and not accompanied with the possession of the genuine mental and moral state, it results that there is here such a wide field for hypo- critical actions. We infer, therefore, from what we have said, that there is less opportunity for hypocrisy in heathenism than in Judaism; in Catholicism than in Protestantism. For wherever the principal weight is laid on the outward action, on the operam operaturn, there one experiences far less the inclination to cover the inconsistency of the inner world by the outer world; while, on the other hand, where every thing depends on one's appearance, where, at the slightest mention of outward ceremony, God and conscience cannot be appeased, there originates in the unregenerate man the temptation to do what may give him at least the semblance of a quality which he really does not pos- sess. When a vivacious, reckless fellow kneels at the altar of God and acts in the most fervent manner, brother is his volun- tions, no one would think of accusing him of hypocris- y; while a Protestant, in a similar case, could not es- cape this judgment. Still, this does not fully solve the paradox how the hypocrite can hope to carry on his false game, while he knows very well that the God of truth no one can pass for righteous without possessing simply the semblance of righteousness, but does not connect therewith the belief in its power. It must here be remembered that, in the one case, the person endeavor- ers to acquire for himself, in the community to which he belongs, the epithet of a pious man; and, if he is satis- fied herewith, then, in regard to his future state, in view of that day which will bring every thing to light, he is either thoughtless and careless, or else totally unbeliev- ing.

When his earthly scene has ended, the curtain drops for him, and all is over. But in another case the person endeavor- ers to obtain for himself the hope that his outward acts by which he thinks to do good, his praying, alms-giving, etc., he may prevail before God; this is the true Phariseism, which dim the faculty of know- ing God, and not only deceives men, but counterfeits truth itself, and thereby cheats itself worst of all. A special means of detecting the real hypocrisy is his un- merciful judgment over others. This has its ground in the fact that by such expressions he not only seeks to confirm his own standing, but it is also a self-deceit into which he falls; the more he finds to blame in others, the more confident he grows of his own worth, and the more easily he appreciates his conscience in regard to the inconsistency of his moral state with his actions, and the incorruptibility of his secret with his open ways. Ethics finds among the different gradations of sin a certain state of hypocrisy which is far worse than absolute sub- jection to sin, insinuous as in the latter state there may exist at the same time an inward, if not sincere, desire to make a general contempt of God, and to deceive himself of his faulty, although he no longer possesses the power to do so: the hypocrite, on the other hand, is quite contented with himself, and has no desire whatev- er to repent of the sin so deeply lodged in his heart, but uses it from God, in order to be able to gratify his sinful inclinations the more se- curely under the cover of an assumed sanctity. In cer- tain respects the frivolous sinner is far better than the hypocrite, insinuous as the former has at least no desire to deceive any one about his condition, and does not present himself to the world otherwise than he really is. This formal truthfulness in the open sinner, however, is counterbalanced by the fact that the hypocrite recogni- zes at least a divine law and judgment; he is still alive to the consciousness of the incongruity of his state of mind and heart with this divine law; but yet hypocris- y, as a permanent untruthfulness, as a systematic de- ceit, as a life in dissimulation, must gradually annihilate all sense of his own responsibility in the eyes of God, and so to the world, and so the dissimulation becomes nearer to the kingdom of heaven than Pharisees. — Herzog, Real-Encyklop. xix, 643 sq.

See HYPOCRITE.

Hypocrite (Greek ὑποκριτῆς) signifies one who假装s to be something that he is not; it is a false person, like actors in tragedies and comedies. It is especially applied to those who assume appearances of a virtue without possessing it in reality. Our Saviour accused the Pharisees of hypocrisy. Hypocrisy is vain and foolish; and, through intended to cheat others, is, in truth, deceiving ourselves. No man would flatter or dissemble if he thought that he was seen and discovered. All his hypocrisy, however, is open to the eye of God, from whom nothing can be hid. The ways of man are before the eyes of the Lord, and he seeth all his doings; there is no darkness nor shadow of death where the workers of iniquity are; they are as the light shining on their face; and seems to be what he is not, thinks that he ought to possess such a quality as he pretends to; for to counterfeit and dissemble is to assume the appearance of some real excellence. But it is best for a man to be in reality what he would seem to be. It is difficult to personate, and it is in vain to pretend long; for if the thing not exist, nature will endeavor to return, and make a discovery. Truth carries its own light and evidence with it, and not only compels us to every man's conscious- ness, but to God, the searcher of our hearts. Hence sincerity is the truest wisdom, for integrity has many advantages over the ill-deserving false and deceitful and deceit. On the contrary, a dissembler must be always upon his guard, lest he contradict his own pretences. He acts an unnatural part, and puts a continual force and restraint upon himself. Truth always lies uppermost, and will be apt to make its appearance; but he who acts sincerely has an easy task, and needs not invent pretences before, or excuses after, for what he says or does. Insincerity is difficult to manage; for a liar will be apt to contradict at one time what he said at another. Truth is always consistent with itself, needs nothing to assist it, and is sufficient in itself. The word of God is its real voice; it is the voice of the living God; it is the voice of the living testimony; it sets a man's invention upon the rack, and is frequently the occasion of many more. Truth and sincer- ity in our words and actions will carry us through the world, when all the arts of cunning and deceit shall fail and deceive us. In the day when God shall judge the secret thoughts of men by Jesus Christ, plainness and sincer- ity will appear the most perfect beauty; the craftiness of men, who lie in wait to deceive, will be stripped of all its colors; all specious pretences, all the methods of de- ceit, will then be disclosed before men and angels, and no artifice to conceal the deformity of iniquity can there take place. Then the ill-designing men of this world shall with shame be convinced that the upright simplicity which they despised was the truest wisdom, and that those dissembling and dishonest arts which they so high- ly esteemed were in reality the greatest folly.

Hypocracies have been divided into four sorts: 1. The worldly hypocrite, who makes a show of religion, and pretends to be religious merely from worldly con- siderations (Matt. xxiii, 5); 2. The legal hypocrite, who relinquishes his vicious practices in order thereby to merit heaven, while at the same time he has no more love to God (Matt. vi, 5); 3. The enthusiastic hypocrite, whose religion is nothing more than a bare courting of sins; who rejoices under the idea that Christ died for him, and yet has no desire to live a holy life (Matt. xiii, 20; 2 Pet. ii, 20); 4. The enthusiastic hypocrite, who has an imaginary sight of his sin and of Christ; talks of remark- able impulses and high feelings, and thinks him- self very wise and good while he lives in the most scan-
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dalous practices (Matt. xiii, 39; 2 Cor. xi, 14).—Robinson, Theol. Dictionary; Buck, Theol. Dictionary; Warner, System of Morality, iii, 323; Grove, Moral Philosophy, ii, 258; Giffilman, Essays on Hypocrisy (1820); Ellis, Self-Deceiver discovered (1781); Edwards, Works (see Index). See HYPOCHRYSY.

HYPONOIA (ὑπόνοια, under sense), a term applied to the language unconsciously supposed by some to underlie the language of Scripture. If by this is understood a signification totally different from the plain statements, the theory is to be condemned as savoring of mysticism (q.v.); but if it is only intended to designate the collateral and ulterior application of language which has likewise a more obvious and literal import, it may be regarded to a limited degree. See DOUBLE SENSE. The Scriptures themselves authorize such a view of the deeper significance of Holy Writ, especially of prophecies, which necessarily await their fulfilment in order to their complete elucidation (1 Pet. i, 11); and the apostle John accordingly invites his readers to the close examination of his symbols, under which, for prudential considerations, was couched a somewhat enigmatical allusion (Rev. xiii, 18).

See INTERPRETATION. To infer from this, however, that the sacred writers were not themselves aware of the usages of their language, is tantamount to taking an unworthy and false view of their intelligent instrumentality (Stier, Words of Jesus, i, 432 sqq., Am. ed.). See INSPIRATION.

HYPOPSALMA. See ACROSTIC.

HYPOSTASIS (from ὑπό, under, and ἐπιστήμη, to stand; hence substantia), a term used in theology to signify person. Thus the orthodox hold that there is but one nature or essence in God, but three hypostases or persons. This term is of very ancient use in the Church. Cyril, in a letter to Nestorius, employs it instead of πρωτόσωμον, person, which did not appear to him sufficiently expressive. The term occasioned great dissensions, both among the Greeks and Latins. In the Council of Nicea, hypostasis was defined to mean essence or substance, so that it was heresy to say that Christ was of a different hypostasis from his Father. Custom, however, altered its meaning. In the necessity they were under of expressing themselves strongly against the Sabellians, the Greeks used the word hypostasis, the Latin persona, which proved a source of great disagreement. The barbarousness of the Latin language allowed them only one word by which to translate the two Greek ones ὑπόστασις and ὑπόστασις, and thus prevented them from distinguishing essence from hypostasis. An end was put to these disputes by a synod held in Alexandria about A.D. 318. A Latinian assent was given to the fact that it was determined to be synonymous with πρωτόσωμον. After this time the Latins made no great scruple in saying tres hypostases, or the Greeks three persons.—Farrar. See TRINITY; HOMOJIAN.

HYPOSTASTICAL UNION, the substantia (ὑπόστασις) of two natures in one person, Christ. While the reality of such a union is established by the Scriptures, and is on that account maintained by our Church (see 2d Article of Religion, "So that two whole and perfect natures," etc.), it is to be lamented that many intricate and fruitless metaphysical questions have been debated among different sects of Christians as to the divine nature of our Lord, and the manner of the union between the Deity and a man—the parties engaged in these questions being too often hurried into presumptuous as well as unpardonable speculations—on points as far beyond the reach of the human intellect as colors to a man born blind; and for the most part, rising out of the upper part of the soul and body of any one among us can neither be explained nor comprehended by himself or any other, and appears the more mysterious the more we reflect upon it (Eden). See TRINITY; CHRIST, PERSON OF; MONOPHYSITES; NESTORIAN.

HYPOTHETICAL BAPTISM is a phrase sometimes used to denote, in the Church of England, a baptism administered to a child of whom it is uncertain whether it has already been baptized or not. The rubric states that "if they who bring the infant to the church do make such certain answers to the priest's questions as that it cannot appear that the child was baptized with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, then the priest, on performing the baptism, is to use this form of words, viz.:. "If those art not already baptized, N——, I baptize thee in the name, etc.”

HYPOTHETICAL UNIVERSALISM. See HYPOTHETICAL.

HYPOTHETICI, a name given to the followers (French Protestants) of Amaranz, who, while they asserted a praetiosa universalis, or "Most Holy God," as such, a sect mentioned by Gregory of Nazianzus, whose father was a member of it before his conversion to Christianity. They are represented as combining in their doctrines the elements of Judaism and paganism. They assigned a place to fire and light in their worship, but rejected circumcision and the worship of images; they received the eucharist, and abstained from the eating of certain kinds of meats. Gregory of Nyssa also mentions the Hypothetici, to whom he gives the surname Ψυχοθετικοί. He says that, like the Christians, they acknowledge only one God, whom they call Christ, but they differ from them in not considering him as Father. All that subsequent writers have said of this sect is derived from the above statements. The Hypothetici do not appear to have extended outside of Cappadocia, and they seem to have existed but a short time there, for no mention is made of them either before or after the 4th century. Contrary to the statement of the ancient writers, who described them as Monotheists, Bohmer concludes from the remark made by Gregory concerning his father, ἑαυτός θεός, that, though the Hypothetici worshipped but one God, they did not formally deny the existence of more. It is not to be wondered at, in view of the scanty information we possess concerning this sect, that very great differences of opinion should exist in regard to them. Mosheim considers them as belonging to the Gnostic school; J. J. Wetstein (in Prolegomen, i, 7, p. 31, 380) considers them as the same sect, with the Colossians (q.v.), regarding them as descendents from the worshippers of Thor; others trace a resemblance between their doctrines and those of Zoroaster. That they were not a Christian sect is proved by the fact of Gregory of Nazianzus's father having belonged to it before his becoming a Christian. Ullmann considers them as Eclecists, combining the elements of Judaism with the Persian religion, while Bohmer looks upon them as identical with the Ephrimites, which Neander (Ch. Hist, ii, 567) also thinks probable. Their morals are described as having been corrupted, so that Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s. v.; Fuhrmann, Handwörterb. d. Kirchengesch. ii, 380 sqq.; Walch, Hist. d. Ketzerreim. ii, 180 sqq.; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. xii, 278 sqq.; C. Ullmann, De Hypotheticis (Heidelberg, 1885); G. Böhmer, De Hypotheticis (Berol. 1895).

HYRCANUS (Ὑρκάνος, see HERCANCUS), the name of two of the high priests and kings of the Maccabean line of Israel. See MACCABEES.

1. JOHN HYRCANUS, the son of Simon Maccabaeus, who sent him with his brother Judas to repel Cendebeus, the general of Antiochus VII, B.C. 187. On the assassination of his father and two brothers, John ascended the throne, B.C. 185. During the first year of his reign Jerusalem was besieged by Antiochus Sidetes,
and at length Hyrcanus was obliged to submit. The walls of Jerusalem were destroyed, and a tribute imposed upon the city. Hyrcanus afterwards accompanied Antiochus in his expedition against the Parthians, but returned to Jerusalem before the defeat of the Syrian army. After the defeat and death of Antiochus, B.C. 180, Hyrcanus took several cities belonging to the Syrian kingdom, and completely established his own independence. He strengthened his power by an alliance with the Romans, and extended his dominions by the conquest of the Idumæans, whom he compelled to submit to circumscription and to observe the Mosaic law; and also by taking Samaria, which he levied to the government of, and built on a scale it had stooped. The latter part of his reign was troubled by disputes between the Pharisees and Sadducees. Hyrcanus had originally belonged to the Pharisees, but had quitted their party in consequence of an insult he received at an entertainment from Eleazar, a person of importance among the Pharisees. By uniting himself to the Sadducees, Hyrcanus, notwithstanding the benefits he had conferred upon his country by his wise and vigorous government, became very unpopular with the common people, who were mostly attached to the Pharisees. Hyrcanus died B.C. 106, and was succeeded by his son Aristobulus, B.C. 73, 1 Macc. xvi; Justin, xxxvi; 1; Diodorus, Exc. Hasch. xxxiv; 1; Plut. Apophth. p. 184 sqq.; Eusebius, Chron. Arm. p. 94, 167. See Smith, Dict. of Classical Biography, s. v. See Antiochus.

2. Hyrcanus II., son of Alexander Janneus, and grandson of the preceding. On the death of his father (B.C. 78) he was appointed high-priest by his mother Alexandra, who ruled Judea herself for the next nine years. After her death (B.C. 69), his younger brother, Aristobulus, a braver and more energetic man, seized the government and forced Hyrcanus to take a raw private life. Induced by the Idumæan Antipater, and aided by Aretas, king of Arabia Petraea, he endeavored to win back his dominions, but was not successful until Pompey began to favor his cause. After some years of tumultuous fighting, Aristobulus was poisoned by the partisans of Phasaelus (B.C. 49), and Hyrcanus, who had for some time possessed, if he had not enjoyed, the dignity of high-priest and ethnarch, was now deprived of the latter of these offices, for which, in truth, he was wholly incompetent. Caesar (B.C. 47), on account of the services rendered to him by Antipater, made the latter governor of Judea, and thus left in his hands all the real power, Hyrcanus busying himself only with the affairs of the priesthood and Temple. Troubles, however, were in store for him. Antipater was assassinated, and Antigonus, son of Aristobulus, with the help of the Parthian king, Orodes I, invaded the land, captured Hyrcanus by treachery, cut off his ears, and thus disqualified him for the office of high-priest, and carried him off to Seleucia, on the Tigris. Some years later, Herod, son of his old friend Antipater, obtained supreme power in Judea, and invited the aged Hyrcanus home to Jerusalem. He was allowed to depart and return and find some time lived in ease and comfort, but, falling under suspicion of intriguing against Herod, he was put to death (B.C. 30) (Josephus, Ant. xiii. 16; xiv. 1-13; War, i. 6-11; Dio Cass. xxxvii. 15, 16; xlviii. 26; Diod. xi. Exc. fast. p. 128; Euseb. Chron. Arm. p. 54). See Smith, Dict. of Classical Biography, s. v.

Hyssopus ( planta), of uncertain etymology; Gr. ἱσσοπος, a plant difficult to define, especially as the similarity of the above terms has early led to their confusion. As the ἱσσοπος of Greek authors is generally acknowledged to be the common hyssop (Hyssopus officinalis of botanists), it has been inferred that it must also be the same as the Old Testament  אֱּשֶׁת, as that referred to in the New Testament. This inference has not, however, been universally accepted in; for Celsius enumerates no less than eighteen different plants which have been adduced by various authors as the hyssop of Scripture. The chief difficulty arises from the fact that in the Sept. the Greek ἱσσοπος is the uniform rendering of the Hebrew  אֱּשֶׁת, and that this rendering is inodorous in the Epistle to the Hebrews (ix. 19, 21), when speaking of the ceremonial observances of the Levitical law. Whether, therefore, the Sept. made use of the Greek ἱσσοπος as the word most nearly resembling the Hebrew in sound, as Stahlin has supposed (S. et Paul. p. 21, note), or as the true representative of the plant indicated by the latter, is a point which, in all probability, will never be decided. Botanists differ widely even with regard to the identification of the ἱσσοπος of Dioscorides. The name ἱσσοπος is given to several plants, the Valeriana, to neither of which it is appropriate, and the hyssop of Italy and South France is not met with in Greece, Syria, or Egypt. Dauben (Lect. on Rom. Husbandry, p. 318), following Sibthorpe, identifies the mountain hyssop with the Hydrocotyle sylvatica, but this conjecture is disapproved by Kuhn (Comm. in Diosc. iii. 27), who in the same passage gives it as his opinion that the Hebrews used the Origania λίβυκον in Egypt, the O. Syriacum in Palestine, and that the hyssop of Dioscorides was the O. Smyrnenum. The Greek botanist describes two kinds of hyssop, δαμάνι and κυανώτατον, and the Hebrews made the χαλίνα their Egyptian equivalent. The Talmudists make the same distinction between the wild hyssop and the garden plant used for sacrifice. The hyssop is of three species, but only one of these is cultivated for use. The common hyssop is a shrub, with low bushy stalks, growing in the wild state, and a half high; small, pear-shaped, close-setting, opposite leaves, with several smaller ones rising from the same joint; and all the stalks and branches terminated by erect, whorled spires of flowers, of different colors in the wild state. They are very hardy plants and may be propagated either by slips or cuttings, or by seeds. The leaves have an aromatic smell, and a warm, pungent taste. It is a native of the South of Europe and the East.

The first notice of the scriptural plant occurs in Exod. xii. 22, where a bunch of hyssop is directed to be dipped in blood and stuck on the lintels and the two side-posts of the doors of the houses in which the Israelites resided. It is next mentioned in Lev. xiv. 4, 6, 52, in the ceremony for declaring lepers to be cleansed; and again in Numb. xix. 6, 16, in preparing the water of separation. The place of the apostle alights in Heb. ix. 19: "For when Moses had spoken every precept to all the people, according to the law, he took the blood of calves, and of goats, with water, and scarlet wool, and hyssop, and sprinkled both the book and all the people." From this we learn that the Greek name ἱσσοπος was considered synonymous with the Hebrew  אֱּשֶׁת; and from the preceding that the plant must have been leafy, and large enough to serve for the purposes of sprinkling, and that it must have been found in Lower Egypt, as well as in the country towards Mount Sinai, and onwards to Palestine. From the following passage we get some information respecting the habits and the supposed properties of the plant. Thus, in 1 Kings iv. 33, it is said, "Solomon spoke of trees, from the cedar-tree that is in Lebanon, even unto the hyssop that springeth out.
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of the wall; and in the penitential psalm of David (II, 7), "Purge me with hyssop, and I shall be clean: wash me, and I shall be whiter than snow." In this last passage, it is true, the word is thought by some commentators to be used in a figurative sense; but still it is possible that the plant may have possessed some general cleansing properties, and thus come to be employed in preference to other plants in the ceremonies of purification. It ought, at all events, to be found growing upon walls, and in Palestine. In the account of the crucifixion of our Saviour, the evangelist John says (xix, 29), "Now there was set a vessel full of vinegar, and they filled a sponge with vinegar, and put it upon hyssop, and put it to his mouth." In the last two passages of Matthew (xxvii, 48) and Mark (xv, 36) it is stated that the sponge filled with vinegar was put upon a reed or stick. To reconcile these statements, some commentators have supposed that both the sponge and the hyssop were tied to a stick, and that one evangelist mentions only the hyssop, because he considered it as the more important; while, for the same reason, the other two mention only the stick; but the simplest mode of explaining the apparent discrepancy is to consider the hyssop and the stick to be the same thing—in other words, the hyssop was an inflorescence of the hyssop plant.

Of the different plants added by Celsius as having more or less claims to be regarded as the hyssop of Scripture, some belong to the class of fennels, as *Copula Veneris*, maiden-hair, and *Ruta muraria*, or wall-rue, because they will grow upon walls; so also the Polytrichum, or hair-moss, the *Kloster hyssops*, or pearlwort, and *Selinum procumbens* are suggested by others, because, from their growing on rocks or walls, they will answer to the passage in I Kings iv, 38, and from their smallness contrast well with the cedar of Lebanon, and are a proof of the minute knowledge of Solomon. Some again contend for species of wormwood, as being from their bitterness, most likely to have been added to the winegar in the sponge, that it might be more distasteful to our Saviour. The majority, however, have selected different kinds of fragrant plants belonging to the natural family of Labiate, several of which are found in dry and barren situations in Palestine, and also in some parts of the desert. (See Rauwolf, *Trav.* p. 59, 456; Hasselquist, *Trav.* p. 554, 517; Burckhardt, *Trav.* ii, 913; Robinson, *Researches*, i, 162, 157.) Of these may be mentioned the rosemary, various species of lavender, of mint, of marjoram, of thyme, of savory, of thyme, and others, all of which are found in Palestine, and are of a character as well as in properties; but it does not appear that any of them grow on walls, or are possessed of cleansing properties; and, with the exception of the rosemary, they are not capable of yielding a stick, nor are they found in all the required situations. If we look to the most recent authors, we find some other plants added, though the generality adhere to the common hyssop. Sprengel (H. *Hei Herb.*, i, 14) seems to entertain no doubt that the *Thymbra Spicata* found by Hasselquist on the ruins about Jerusalem is the hyssop of Solomon, though Hasselquist himself thought that the *Thymbra Drimia* found in the plain of Jordan by the Lady Calcott asks "whether the hyssop upon which St. John says the sponge steeped in vinegar was put, to be held to the lips of Christ upon the cross, might not be the hyssop attached to its staff of cedar-wood, for the purposes of sprinkling the people, lest they should contravene the law on the eve of the Sabbath, which was a high-day, by being in the field of execution" (Scripture Herbal, p. 208). Rosenmuller, again, thinks that the Hebrew word *ezob* does not denote our hyssop, but an aromatic plant resembling it, the wild marjoram, which the Germans call *Doenert, Oder Wohlgemuth, the Arabs Zinzar, the Arabs Zinzera, the Egyptians Oriza, the Hebrew Ezob* (i, 161). Mr. Kitto observes that "the hyssop of the sacred Scriptures has opened a wide field for conjecture, but in no instance has any plant been suggested that, at the same time, has a sufficient length of stem to answer the purpose of a wand or pole, and such detegent or cleansing properties as to render it a fit emblem for purification;" and he suggests it as probable that "the hyssop was a species of *Pityolacca*, as combining length of stem with cleansing properties, from the quantity of potash which is yielded by the ashes of the American species, *P. Decandria*, of this genus." *P. Asystenica* grows to the size of a shrub in Arabia. Wisner (*Bibl. Real-"wörterbuch*, s. v., *Ysp.*) observes that the Talmudists distinguish the hyssop of the Greeks and Romans from that mentioned in the law. He then adds the *Origanum*, mentioned in the quotation from Rosenmuller, as the *ezob of the Hebrews*; but he states also that a more accurate examination is required of the hyssop and *Origanum* of that part of Asia before the meaning of the Hebrew term can be considered as satisfactorily determined. Five kinds of hyssop are mentioned in the Talmud. One is called *Ymim*, simply, without any epithet: the others are distinguished as Greek, Roman, wild hyssop, and *Origanum of Cochil (Mishna, *Negiyin*, xiv, 6). Of these, the *Ymim* and the two profane kinds that are, not to be employed in purifications (Mishna, *Paruh*, xi, 7). *Maimonides* (de *Voca Rafta*, iii, 2) says that the hyssop mentioned in the law is that which was used as a condiment. According to *Porphyry* (De *Abatin*, i, 7), the *ezob* was employed on certain occasions, when the bread mixed with hyssop; and the *zaatar*, or wild marjoram, with which it has been identified, is often an ingredient in a mixture called *cukkeh*, which is to this day used as food by the poorer classes in Egypt (*Lane, Mod. Eg.* i, 200). It is improbable, therefore, that this may have been the *ezob* of the Hebrews. So, indeed, it is written in Egypt; more especially as R. D. Kimchi (*Lez., s. v.*), who reckons seven different kinds, gives it as the equivalent the Arabic *zaatar, origanum, or marjoram*, and the German *Dozetn oder Wohlgemuth* (Rosenmuller, *Handb.*). With this agrees the *Tanchum* Hieros, MS. quoted by Robinson, *Researches*, i, 162. So too in the judaico-gentile *Exod.* xii, 22 is translated "y tomarèdes manojo de *oríganos.* This is doubtless the species of *hyssopus* (zaatar) shown to Dr. Thomson, who describes it as "having the fragrance of thyme, with a hot, pungent taste, and long slender stems" (*Land and Book*, i, 161). But Dioscorides makes a distinction between *origanum* and *hyssopus* when he describes the leaf of a species of the former as resembling the latter (comp. *Linn. xx, 67), though it is evident that he, as well as the Talmudists, regarded them as belonging to the same family. In the *Syriac* of I Kings iv, 38, the hyssop is rendered *hishnakh", "houseluck," although it is in other passages is represented by *zyfth*, which the Arabic translation follows in *Psa.* ii, 9, and Heb. iv, 19, while in the Pentateuch it has *zaatar* for the same. Patrick (on I Kings iv, 38) was of opinion that *ezob* is the same with the Ethiopic *awzob*, which represents the hyssop of *Psa.* ii, 9, as well as *hishnakh*, or mint, in Matt. xxiii, 38. The monks on Jebel Musa give the name of *hyssopus* to a fragrant plant called *juldeh*, which grows in great quantities on that mountain (Robinson, *Bibl. Rev.*, i, 157). It has been reserved for the ingenuity of a German to trace a connection between *aszop*, the Greek for hyssop, and the Arab *ezob*. "Die Sprache Salomo's", Einl. § 2. (See Celsius, *Herobot*, i, 407 sqq.; comp. Bochart, *Hieros.*, i, 589; Plent, *Plant. Med., tab.*, 465; Olle, *Lex. Rabb.*, p. 284 sqq.; Faber, in Keil's *Anecd.*, i, 8 sqq.; Geiger, *Pharmac. Institut*, i, 491; Gesenius, *Thesaur.*, i, 57 sqq.; Sprengel, *ed Dison*, ii, 506 sqq.; Proxenoff, *Alexand.* in *Bibl. Rev.*, i, 15, 13; and the Talmudical, classical, and other authorities there cited.)

The latest result is that of Dr. J. F. Royle (communicated in a paper read before the Royal Asiatic Society, and published in their journal for November, 1844), who has since infers from the *Exod.* that the plant required should be found in Lower Egypt (Exod. xii, 22); in the desert of Sinai (Lev. iv, 4, 5, and 9; Num. xi, 6, 18); in the neighborhood of Jerusalem (Josh. xix, 22); secondly, that it should be a plant growing on walls or
the heathen to study them. More particular information in regard to their contents is given us by Clement of Alexandria (Stromata, v, § 43, ed. Potter, p. 761). But so varying have been the interpretations of this passage that it is difficult to determine definitely whether the book is of older origin than the first half of the 2nd century or of later date. The same conclusion is indicated by the relations of the Greek text to the Latin (see Real-Encyclop.) inclusions. The information which Clement furnishes us is: 1. There existed in the 2nd century a βιβλίον Ελλάδας, a work written in Greek, and circulated in Christian and heathen circles, entitled ο Τοιχισμός. 2. The Christians found in it, even more than the heathen, the books of Homer and of other authors relating to Christ and the future of his kingdom, and especially a reference to Christ's divine sonship, to the sufferings which awaited him and his followers, to the inexhaustible patience of the Christians, and the final return of Christ. The third and last of the Church fathers, who make mention of the Hystaspes is Leontius. He speaks of it in three different passages (Instit. div. viii, cap. 15, cap. 18; Epitom. ii, 69). In the first passage Laetantius speaks of the Hystaspes in connection with the Sibyl, and in the two other passages he speaks of it in connection with the Sibyl and Hermes Trismegistus. According to Laetantius, the Sibyl, who lived in a Babylon near the convent of Mar Saba (Excerpta, p. 388), is said to have been the possessor of a work of the Hystaspes in three volumes, which predicted the extinction of the empire and name of Rome. According to the second passage, the Sibyl and the other authors which shall precede the fall of the world have prophesied of the prophetae ex Dei vivit in libro extra naturam. The third passage, which states that this work, known as the Hystaspes is said to have predicted and described the iniquitas secvrae hujus extremi, how a separation of the just from the unjust shall take place, how the pious, amid cries and sobbing, will stretch out their hands and implore the protection of Jupiter (imploretur); how gods and heroes shall descend upon the earth, hear the cry of men, and destroy the wicked.

With regard to the person of Hystaspes, who is said to be the author of the work containing these predictions, Justin and Clement of Alexandria have left us no information, and we depend, therefore, solely on Laetantius, according to whom he was an enemy of the Medes, who flourished long before the Trojan war, and after whom was named the river Hystaspes. In all probability, Laetantius here thinks of the father of king Darius I, known to us from the writings of Herodotus, Xenophon, and other Greek authors, but to whom the prophetic talent of Hystaspes is ascribed. As Justin names Ammianus Marcellinus (xiii, 6), who flourished in the 4th century of our era, informs us that one Hystaspes had studied astronomy with the Brahmas of India, and had even informed the Magi of his ability to know the future. Agathias, the Byzantine historian of the 6th century, knows of a Hystaspes who was a contemporary with Zoroaster, but he does not dare to assert that this Hystaspes was the same as the one spoken of as the father of Darius I. See PARISIUS. In view of the uncertainty of the authorship, it is well to impossible to determine fully the origin, content, form, and tendency of the Vaticina Hystaspes. We know not even whether it emanated from Jewish, Christian, or heathen writers, although all our present knowledge points to the last as its probable origin. That the author was a Greek, as Huetius thinks (Quest. Abbet. i, iii, ep. 21, p. 290), is impossible, as the language he employs is Greek. But at all proved: beyond this, the only answer left us to all questions that might be put is a non liquet. See Herzog, Real-Encyclop. xix, 660 sq.; Walch, De Hystaspes ejusque rationibus, in the Comment. Societ. Gotting. hist. et phil. (1777), ii, 1-18; Fabricius, Bibl. hist. i, 53 sq.; Luecke, Einleitung in d. Oedipus, J. (2d ed. 1848), p. 287; Reuss, Geschichtle d. heil. Schriftn. d. N. T. (4th edit. 1864), p. 270; Neander, Ch. Hist. i, 176 sq. (J. H. W.)

Hyyttavanes, in the mythology of the Finns, is the name of the god of the chase, especially of hares. — Plietsch, Ueber. lex. viii, 509.
Iamblichus. See Jamblichus.

Ibarra, Joaquin, a Spanish printer celebrated for his magnificent editions of the Bible and Arabic literature, was born at Saragossa in 1725, and died at Madrid in 1785. His printing-house was established at the latter place.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xuv, 724.

Ibas (†324), bishop of Edessa, in Syria, from 435 to 457, distinguished himself by the translation of the works of Theodorus of Mopsuestia into the Syriac. His lenient policy towards the Nestorians, and the fact that he distributed the translation of Theodore extensively throughout Persia and Syria, caused several priests of his diocese to accuse him before the emperor Theodosius II, and before the archbishops of Antioch and Constantinople, for favoring Nestorianism. The emperor appointed the bishops Uranius of Hiermara, Photius of Tyre, Eustathius of Berytus, and the prefect of Damascus a commission to try him. Two Synods, held respectively at Berytus and Tyre in 448, failed to convict him, and he was left undisturbed until the Robber-Synod of Ephesus (A.D. 449), when he was finally deposed from his diocese. He appealed to the Council of Chalcedon, and was restored to his bishopric in 451. Long after his death, in 553, the fifth general Council of Constantinople condemned him as a Nestorian, in spite of the efforts of pope Vigilius.

Ibbetson, James, D.D., an English divine, was born in 1717, and educated at Exeter College, Oxford. He filled successively the rectorate of Bushley, in Herefordshire, and the archdeaconry of St. Alban's, and died in 1781. His works are, Epistola ad Philo-Hebros Omoines (1746).—Short History of the County of Cheshire; and several other theological treatises and sermons.—Hook, Eccles. Bibl. vi, 241.

Iboton, Benjamin, D.D., a learned English divine, born at Beachamwell, Norfolk, in 1680, was educated at Clare Hall and Corpus Christi College, Cambridge. He became treasurer of Wells Cathedral and rector of St. Vedast, London, in 1708; was some time after appointed rector of St. Paul, Shadwell; chaplain of George I in 1716; and, finally, prebendary of Westminster in 1724. He died April 15, 1725. His principal works are, A Course of Sermons preached for the Boyle Lecture (1718, 1714), in which he refutes the infidel objections of Collins (Lond. 1727, 8vo);—Thirty-six Discourses on practical Subjects (Lond. 1776, 2 vols, 8vo); and a translation of Puffendorf's De Habitu Religionum Christianarum ad vitam civillem (1719). See Chalmers, Gen. Biog. Dict.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xuv, 727; Darling, Cyclop. Bibliographica, ii, 1601.

Ibiers, an Asiatic nation inhabiting the Caucasian isthmus, described by Virgil, Horace, and Lucan as a warlike, cruel, and uncivilized people, while Strabo speaks of them as a very quiet and religious people. Rutilius and Moses of Chorene relate that, during the reign of the emperor Constantine, the great Christian, probably a Christian woman (some call her Xino, others Nuna), was made prisoner by the Ibiers, and became a slave. Her pretty son won for her the esteem and consideration not only of her master, but of the Ibiers generally; and being on one occasion asked to cure a sick child of royal rank, she told the people that Christ, her God, alone could effect the cure. She prayed for the child, and it recovered. She is next said to have cured the queen by her prayers. The king, Mirus, and his queen were converted, and did their utmost to spread Christianity through their dominions. The country has since remained Christian, though the true religion was long mixed with many old superstitions. Some claim that Christina was from Byzantium, on the ground that Propocius (v, 9) mentions an old convert preserved in Jerusalem, and rebuilt by Justianin in the 6th century, which was called Iberian or Iverian. Moses of Chorene, moreover, says that she was an Armenian, and that teachers were demanded of the Armenian bishop Gregory, not of Rome. The Iberians spread Christianity among the surrounding nations. Their country is now called Georgia (q. v.), and they hold ecclesiastical relations with the Greek Church (q. v.).—Herzog, Real-Encyclop., a. v.; Pierer, Universal Lexicon, a. v.; Schröck, Kirchengesch. vi, 27 sq.

Ibex, the ancient name of the Bouquetin or Steinbok of the Alps, an animal generally thought to be designated by the Heb. בֶּן קָדָר (always in the plur., A. V. "wild goats"), represented as well known, and inhabiting the highest and most inaccessible steeps (see Job xxxi, 1; Psal. civ, 18). Several species have been described by naturalists as inhabiting the different mountain ranges of the East (e.g. Arabia, Forskal, Descrip. Anim. pref. 4; Rupell, Abyss. i, 126; and Palestine, Seetzen, xviii, 435), all of them slightly varying from the European form (Capra ibex), and known among the Arabs by the general name of beden. Among the Sinai mountains the chase is pursued in much the same manner and under much the same circumstances as that of the chamois in the Alps and the Tyrol. The hunters exercise great vigilance and hardihood, taking the circuits to get above their quarry, and especially aiming to surprise them at early day. Like most mountain quadrupeds that are gregarious, they have a leader who acts as sentinel, and gives the alarm on the occurrence of any suspicious sight, sound, or smell, when the whole flock makes off for a loftier peak. Their numbers are said to have much decreased of late years; for the Arabs report them so abundant fifty years ago, that if a stranger sought hospitality at a Bedouin's tent, and the owner had no sheep to kill, he would without hesitation take his gun and go confidently to shoot a beden. The flesh is excellent, with a flavor similar to

Caucasian Ibex.
that of venison. The Bedouins make water-bottles of their skins, as of those of the domestic goats, and rings of their horns, which they wear on their thumbs. Dogs easily catch them when surprised in the plains, but in the abrupt precipices and chasms of the rocks the ibex is said to elude pursuit by the tremendous leaps which it makes. It is likely that this species is identical with that which bears the name of posey (Caprus aegagrus), and which inhabits all the loftier ranges that traverse Asia, from the Taurus and Caucasus to China. It is very robust, and much larger than any domestic goat; its general color iron-gray, shaded with brown, with a black line down the back and across the withers, and a white patch on the crupper. The horns of the male are very large, compressed, and slightly diverging as they arch over the back; their front side makes an obtuse edge, and is marked by a series of knobs, with deep hollows between. See Wild Goat; Hind, etc.

Ib'har (Heb. יְבָ חַ, יְבָ חַ, chosen; Sept. Ἰβάχα, Ἰβάχα [cod. Val. Ἰβάχα, Ἰβάχα]); Josephus Ἰβάχα, Ant. vii., 3, 3), one of the sons of David (by a secondary wife, 1 Chron. i., 9) born to him in Jerusalem, mentioned next after Solomon and before Elishua (2 Sam. v., 15; 1 Chron. iii., 6; xiv., 5). B.C. post 1044. See David.

Ibisa, a genus of birds of the family Ardeidae, or, according to some ornithologists, of Scopoliaceae, and perhaps to be regarded as a connecting link between them. The bill is long, slender, curved, thick at the base; the point rather obtuse; the upper mandible deeply grooved throughout its length. The face, and generally the greater part of the head, and sometimes even the neck, are destitute of feathers, at least in adult birds. The neck is long. The legs are rather long, naked above the tarsal joint, with three partially united toes in front and one behind; the wings are moderately long; the tail is very short. The Sacred or Egyptian ibis (Ibis religiosa) is an African bird, two feet six inches in length, although the body is little larger than that of a common fowl. It was one of the birds worshipped by the ancient Egyptians, and called by them Habh or Hih, and by the modern Egyptians Abu-Hames (i.e. Father John). It is represented on the monuments as a bird with long beak and legs, and a heart-shaped body, covered with black and white plumage. It was supposed, from the color of its feathers, to symbolize the light and shade of the moon, its body to represent the heart; its legs described a triangle, and with its beak it performed a medical operation; from all which esoterial ideas it was the avatar of the god Thoth or Hermes (q. c.), who escaped in that shape the pursuit of Typhon, as the hawk was that of Is, or Horus, the sun. Its feathers were supposed to scare, and even kill, the crocodile. It appeared in Egypt at the rise, and disappeared in the inundation of the Nile, and was thought, at that time, to deliver Egypt from the winged and other serpents which came from Arabia in certain narrow passes. As it did not make its nest in Egypt, it was thought to be self-engendering, and to lay eggs for a lunar month. According to some, the basin was occupied by it. It was celebrated for its purity, and only drank from the purest water, and the most strict of the priesthood only drank of the pools where it had been seen; besides which, it was fabled to entertain the most invincible love of Egypt, and to die of self-starvation if transported, else its flesh was thought to be incorruptible after death, and to kill it was punishable with death. Ibises were kept in the temples, and unmolested in the neighborhood of cities. After death they were mummied, and there is no animal of which so many remains have been found at Thebes, Memphis, Hermopolis Magna, or Eshmun, and at Ibis or Ibleum, fourteen miles north of the same place. They are made up into a conical shape, the wings flat, the legs bent back to the breast, the head placed on the left side, and the beak under the tail; were prepared as other mummies, and wrapped up in linen bandages, which are sometimes ornamented in patterns or figured. At Thebes they are found in linen bandages only; well preserved at Hermopolis in wooden or stone boxes of oblong form, sometimes in form of the bird itself, or the god Thoth; at Memphis, in conical sugar-loaf-shaped red earthenware jars, the tail downwards, the cover of convex form, sometimes itself of ibises of embalmed ibises—a smaller one of the size of a corn-crake, very black, and the other black and white—the Ibis Numinis, or Ibis religiosa. This last is usually found with its eggs, and sometimes with its insect food, the Plebeus pipiens. Attimes it feeds, and particularly its young, in the stomach. (Wilkinson, Manners and Customs, v., 7, 217; Passolgoesu, Catalogue Raisonné, p. 255; Petti- grew, History of Mummies, p. 205; Horapollo, i. c. 80, 86.)

Ib'leam (Heb. יְבָ לֶאְמָ, יְבָ לֶאְמָ, people-waster; Sept. Ἰβάλαμφ, Ἰβάλαμφ [but some codd. occasionally omit]; a city (with suburban towns) within the natural precincts of Issachar, but (with five portions) assigned to Manasseh (Josh. xvii. 11, where it is mentioned between Beth-shean and Dor), but from which the Israelites were unable to expel the Canaanites (Josh. i. 27, where it is mentioned between Dor and Megiddo); lying near the pass of Gur, in the vicinity of Megiddo, where it is mentioned (Josh. xxi. 27). It was assigned as a Levitical city to the family of Kohath (1 Chron. vi. 70, where it is less correctly called Bileem, and mentioned along with Aner as lying within Manas- seh); compare Josh. xxxi. 25, where it is called Gath- Rimmon (apparently by error; see the Sept., and comp. 1 Chron. vi. 69). According to Schwartz (Palast. p. 131), it is the modern village Jobhat, south-west (north-west) of Beth-shean, and about two English miles south of the village Kefrah; but no map has this place, and the indications require a different position. See Gih. The site is probably represented by that of Jelameh, a small village about two and a half miles north of Jenin (Robinson, Researches, iii., 161).

Ibn-Aknin, Joseph ben-Tshehahal, called in Arabic Abbakaq Juanf Ibn-Jahsh Ibn-Shim'un Abna Abaz'maghri, a Jewish philosopher and commentator of some note, was born at Ceuta (Arab. Sbtrn), in Arabia, about 1160. His first religious training was, at least to all outside appearances, in the Mohammedan religion, but he was as such a youth and fully also taught and instructed in the Talmud and Hebrew Scriptures, so that, as soon as he arrived at years of maturity, he might forsake the religion forced upon him by the law of the country that gave him birth, and return to the faith of his fathers. About 1185, having previously decided in favor of the Jewish religion, he fled to Jerusalem, and there became a zealous disciple of the great Moses Maimonides, whose attention had been called to Ibn-
Akkin by a scientific work of his, and by his Makamen, which he had sent to Maimonides. Although he remained with this celebrated Jewish savant only a little over a year, then removing to Aleppo to practice medicine, he had written many books so much to his honor that Maimonides loved him as his own son, and ever afterwards labored to promote the interests of his beloved disciple, and the philosophical work Moreh-Nebockin (Doctor perplexorum), which Maimonides (q. v.) published in 1190, is often asserted to have had for its purpose, among other things, to justify and popularize much of the philosophy of Ibn-Akkin that cherished at that time. In 1192, notwithstanding the frequent councils of Maimonides to the contrary, Ibn-Akkin went to Bagdad, and there founded a Rabbinic college. After the decease of his great master he figured quite prominently at the court of the sultan Azzahir (thirteenth of Damascus) and delivered lectures at the high schools on medicine and philosophy. He died about 1226. Besides a number of works on medicine and metaphysics, he wrote Commentaries on the Songs of (in Arabic), now in the Bodleian Library, Oxford (Focouhe, p. 198). He espouses the notion that these are the Songs of the Lord, and that the ten song-books of the O. T., and accordingly explains it allegorically as representing the relationship of God to his people Israel.

"There are," he says, "three different modes of explanation in the Song of Songs: 1. The literal, quoted by the literalists or grammarians, e. g. Saadit, Abu Salama Yahiya, David El Fasi (Chajjag), Abulwalid Ibn Hanach of Saragossa (Ibn-Ganach), the Nagid R. Samuel Ha-Levi ben-Negevit, Abu-Ibrahim ben-Haran (Isaac ben-Joseph), Jehuda ben-Babana (Ibn-Balan), and Ibn El-Abn (Abel El-Abn), 2. the allegorical, to be found in the Midrash Chasid, the Talmud, and in some of the ancient interpretations; and, 3. the philosophical interpretation, which regards this book as referring to the active intellect [νοημική νοημωσή], here worked out for the first time, and which, though not the only point of this discussion, is of all in point of merit. These three different explanations correspond, in reverse order, to the three different natural interests of man, namely, to his physical, vital, and spiritual natures. Ibn-Akkin always gives the first and second explanations first, and then the philosophical interpretation. The Song of Songs is in the history of Biblical literature and exegesis, inasmuch as all the interpreters therein enumerated have, with the exception of Saadit, hitherto not been known as commentators on the Song of Songs. These expositors form an important addition to the history of interpretation given by Jo. Mercier, Histoire et Critique des Commentaries du Song of Songs, Longman, 1857). See Gritz, Gesch. der Juden, vi, 534, 322; vii, 4, 37; Jost, Geschichte des Jeduthums u. s. Sekten, ii, 457; iii, 11; Kii, Cyclop. Biblical. Liter. ii, 319 sq.: the ably written monograph of Munk, Notizen sur Joseph ib. Jekuba (Paris, 1842); and the very elaborate article of Steinmainer, in Erasmii und Gruber's Allgemeine Encyclopädie, s. v. Joseph Ibn-Akkin.

Ibn-Balaam, JEHUDAH (in Arabic Jobha Abu-Zakaria), a very distinguished Jewish philologist and commentator, was born at Seville, in Spain, about 1080. He was especially prominent as a defender of the authority of the Talmud (q. v.). He died about 1160. His works (in Hebrew) are: 1. On the Accents of the Text, edited by Jo. Mercier (De accentibus scripturae proemii, Paris, 1365). Some portions of this book Heidenheim (q. v.) incorporated in his works סְפָר הַנְּצָרָה: 2. On the poetical Accent of Job, Proverbs, and the Psalms (Paris, 1556). It has recently been reedited, with remarks of the most ancient grammarians upon these three books, and notes, and an introduction, by J. G. Polak (Amsterdam, 1858).—3. On the poetical Latin Conunin-}

in Arabic. This work has not yet been published, but specimens of it, in Hebrew, have been printed by Leopold Dukes in the Literaturblatt des Oriens, 1846, No. 42: 4. A Treatise on the Hebrew Punctuation, in alphabetical order. This work is too old, however, to be of much use, but specimens of it have been published both by Dukes and Flurst in the Literaturblatt des Oriens, Nos. 29 and 42.—5. A Treatise on the Hebrew Isauronomy, in alphabetical order, of which extracts have been published by Dukes in the Literaturblatt des Oriens, 1846, No. 4:—6. Commentaries on the Pentateuch, which have been all published. Though this work has long been known through Aben-Ezra, who quotes it in his commentary on Gen. xlix, 6; Exod, v, 19, yet it is only lately (1851) that Dr. Stein- schneider discovered a MS. in the Bodleian Library containing a commentary on Numbers and Deuteronomy.

"Ibn-Balaam always gives the grammatical explanation of the words first; then he enters into a minute disquisition on Saadita's translation and exposition of the Pentateuch, which he generally rejects, then explains the passage according to its context, and finally sets forth the Halachic and the judicial interpretation of the Talmud. A specimen of this commentary, which is extremely important to the Hebrew text and the Massora, has been communicated by Adolph Neubauer in the Journal Asiaticque of December, 1861. It is on Deut. v, 6, upon which Ibn-Balaam remarks, 'As to the two different readings of the two different rabbis, the massorists, and the philologians or grammarians, e. g. Saadit, Abu Salama Yahiya ben-David El Fasi (Chajjag), Abulwalid Ibn Hanach of Saragossa (Ibn-Ganach), the Nagid R. Samuel Ha-Levi ben-Negevit, Abu-Ibrahim ben-Haran (Isaac ben-Joseph), Jehuda ben-Babana (Ibn-Balan), and Ibn El-Abn (Abel El-Abn), 2. the allegorical, to be found in the Midrash Chasid, the Talmud, and in some of the ancient interpretations; and, 3. the philosophical interpretation, which regards this book as referring to the active intellect [νοημική νοημωσή], here worked out for the first time, and which, though not the only point of this discussion, is of all in point of merit. These three different explanations correspond, in reverse order, to the three different natural interests of man, namely, to his physical, vital, and spiritual natures. Ibn-Akkin always gives the first and second explanations first, and then the philosophical interpretation. The Song of Songs is in the history of Biblical literature and exegesis, inasmuch as all the interpreters therein enumerated have, with the exception of Saadit, hitherto not been known as commentators on the Song of Songs. These expositors form an important addition to the history of interpretation given by Jo. Mercier, Histoire et Critique des Commentaries du Song of Songs, Longman, 1857). See Gritz, Gesch. der Juden, vi, 534, 322; vii, 4, 37; Jost, Geschichte des Jeduthums u. s. Sekten, ii, 457; iii, 11; Kii, Cyclop. Biblical. Liter. ii, 319 sq.: the ably written monograph of Munk, Notizen sur Joseph ib. Jekuba (Paris, 1842); and the very elaborate article of Steinmainer, in Erasmii und Gruber's Allgemeine Encyclopädie, s. v. Joseph Ibn-Akkin.

Ibn-Balaam, JEHUDAH (in Arabic Jobha Abu-Zakaria), a very distinguished Jewish philologist and commentator, was born at Seville, in Spain, about 1080. He was especially prominent as a defender of the authority of the Talmud (q. v.). He died about 1160. His works (in Hebrew) are: 1. On the Accents of the Text, edited by Jo. Mercier (De accentibus scripturae proemii, Paris, 1365). Some portions of this book Heidenheim (q. v.) incorporated in his works סְפָר הַנְּצָרָה: 2. On the poetical Accent of Job, Proverbs, and the Psalms (Paris, 1556). It has recently been reedited, with remarks of the most ancient grammarians upon these three books, and notes, and an introduction, by J. G. Polak (Amsterdam, 1858).—3. On the poetical Latin Conunin-}
IBN-CASPI or CASPE, JOSEPH BEN-ABBAS MARY (also called D. Argenteiro by the Sephardic writer, was born of wealthy family about 1250 at Argenteiro, in France. He removed while young quite to Tarascon, and devoted his time mainly to Biblical studies. When only seventeen years old, he published as a result commentaries on Aben-Ezra’s exposition of the Pentateuch, and on Ibn-Ganach’s grammatical work. When about thirty years old he extended his range of study to metaphysical subjects, and thereafter became an ardent admirer of Maimonides, whose method of interpretation he also adopted. Indeed, so far was he carried away in his admiration for the great philosopher that he emigrated to Egypt, having decided to study under the disciples of Maimonides. But he failed to meet there that great fountain of knowledge which he supposed the followers of the second great Moses capable of supplying, and, after a few months’ travel in Egypt and the East, he returned to France. In 1257 he again set out on a journey to promote his studies by a residence at a foreign high-schools, and he visited Catalonia, Mallorca, Aragonia, and Valencia, and at one time even desired to go to Fez, having been informed that in that African city several noted Jewish scholars resided, whose instructions he coveted. Towards the latter part of 1332 Ibn-Caspi returned to his native country, and devoted himself to the production of a number of valuable exegetical works. He died about 1340.

In all he wrote some thirty-six works, most remaining to us only in MS. form, of which lists may be found in S. Jellineck, ידיעת בעלי התנ”ך, vol. ii, 1846; Delitzsch and Zunz, Catal. MS.; and in First, Biblioth. Jud. i, 147. Besides a commentary on Maimonides’ More Nebuchim, his most valuable works are, תורה על הפסוקות (or תורה על הפסוקות, only the word תורה, silver, being an allusion to his own name, תורא, which is found in the titles of all his works) (small silver chain or root), a Hebrew Dictionary, which is one of his most interesting and important works. It starts from the principle that every root has one only general idea as its basis, and not in the sense of the phrase of meaning. A copy of this work in MS. 2 vols. 4to, is by the Paris library, and another in the Angelica at Rome. Abrabanel frequently quotes it in his commentary on the Pentateuch (comp. p. 7), on Isaiah (comp. xliv, 3; xvi, 17), etc.; Wolf gives a specimen of it (Bibliothea Hebraica, l, 1858); and Richard Simon used the Paris MS. (Hist. Crit. Bibl. i, cap. xxxii), and Leopold Dukes printed extracts from it (Literaturblatt des Orientes, 1847, p. 480)—A Commentary on Proverbs, the Song of Songs, and Ecclesiastes. “Of the commentary on Proverbs, which is one of Ibn-Caspi’s most valuable contributions to Biblical exegesis, the beginning and end have been published by Werblum (comp. תורת הפסוקות, 1846, p. 19, etc.); an analysis of the commentary on Ecclesiastes is given by Ginsburg (compare Historical and Critical Commentary on Ecclesiastes, Longman, 1861, p. 60, etc.), and the brief commentary on, or, rather, introduction, to the Song of Songs, which was published in 1877, but which is far inferior to the MS., has been republished with an English translation by Ginsburg in his Historical and Critical Commentary on the Song of Songs (London, 1857, p. 47, etc.).”—תורה על הפסוקות (silver stars), or commentary on eight prophets, in which he attacks with great severity those who explain these prophecies as referring to the Messiah [see IBN-DANAN]-יקב יבש (a silver cup), or commentary on the miracles and other mysteries found in the Pentateuch, Prophets, and Hasidographies. His principles of interpretation he laid down clearly in his commentary on the Proverbs above mentioned in these words: “The sacred Scriptures must be interpreted according to their plain and literal sense; and a recondite meaning can as little be introduced into them as into Aristotle’s writings on logic and natural history. Only where the literal meaning is not sufficient, and reason rejects it, a deeper sense must be sought. If we once attempt to allegorize a simple and intelligible passage, then we might just as well do it with the whole contents of the Bible.” “The logical division of sentences is the most indispensable and best auxiliary to the right understanding of the Bible, and the criterion to the proper order of the words are the Masora and the accents.” It is evident from this extract that Ibn-Caspi anticipated the hermeneutical rules of modern criticism at a time when the schoolmen and the depositaries of Christian learning were engaged in hair-splitting and in allegorizing every fact of the Bible. It is greatly to be regretted that most of his exegetical works are lost or unpublished.

IBN-CHAJIM, AARON, a Jewish commentator, was born at Fez, Africa, about 1570. But little is known of his personal history. His works are, a Commentary on Joshua (Venice, 1608-9), from which a selection was made by Frankfurter (q.v.) in his great Rabbinic Bible—a commentary on Sifra (tradition of Leviticus), published under the title of The Obligation of Aaron (Venice, 1699-11)—The Rules of Aaron, a treatise on R. Ishmael’s (q.v.) thirteen rules for interpreting the O.T. Scriptures (Ven. 1609, Dres. 1712)—Ibid., Bibl. Cycl. ii, 352.

IBN-DANAN, SAADIA BEN-MAIMON, a Jewish writer of some distinction, was Rabbi to the congregation at Granada, and the first of the succession of this country by the Moors to Ferdinand and Isabella, and the expiration of the Jews. He was born in the first half of the 15th century, and flourished at Granada from 1460 to 1502. He was especially given to the study of the Talmud and history, and as a result of the former we have several works of learned significance, and the elucidation of the language of the original. His exegetical works are, a Commentary on Isaiah liii, 13 (MS. Michael, 412), in which he takes ground against Ibn-Caspi (q.v.)—אבראהי לוחם אדום (written in Arabic). This work, which he is thought to have completed in 1468, also remains only in MS. form, but an extract from it has been printed by Pinskier in his Likute Kadmonoth (Vienna, 1860), p. 74. His historical works are, A short History of the Jews to the Days of Moses Maimonides (יהוה נ Además), which he originally intended for his own pupils, of whom he seems to have had a number. See Grätz, Geschichte d. Juden, viii, 345 sq.; Edelmann, Chenuda Genez, Introd. p. xvii sq.; and Text, p. 13 sq.;, and Text, Ibid., Bibl. Cycl. ii, 352. (J. H. W.)

IBN-DAUD. See CHAJIM.

IBN-DJANAH. See IBN-GANACH.

IBNEYAH (Heb. יבש, יבש, Jehoreh will build him up; Sept. Ἰβαρά, a son of Jerahmeel, who, with other Benjamites, returned to Jerusalem after the Captivity (1 Chron. ix, 8). B.C. 586.

IBN-EZRA. See ABEN-EZRA.

IBN-GANACH, ABULWALID MERWAN OF JONAH
IBN-GANACH

DIYANAH (in Hebrew called Jonah), one of the most distinguished Jewish scholars of the Middle Ages, was born at Cordova about 955. While yet a boy he evinced his fondness for Hebrew by writing verses in that language. He was continu’d in this habit to the determined determination to devote his whole life to the advancement of the Hebrew as a philological study, and even abandoned the practice of medicine, which he had chosen as his profession after his removal to Saragossa in 1015, whither he had been forced by the persecutions which the Jews of Cordova were subjected to at the hands of Al-Mostad. He determined to make his establishment at Malaga, in Spain, about 1021. When only nineteen years of age he evinced his great skill as a poet, and his thorough acquaintance with Hebrew grammar by writing a grammar of the Hebrew language in Hebrew characters. It was never printed entire, but parts of it have been published by Parchon in his Hebrew Lexicon (Paris, 1844), and by Leop. Dukes, in his Shire Sholomo (Hannover, 1858). About 1045 Ibn-Gebirol published his first philosophical work, which was translated by Ibn-Tibbon into Hebrew, entitled קבוצת ירח בנות קסם (published in 1550 and often). He propounds in this work a peculiar theory of the human temperament and passions, in which twenty prophecies corresponding to the four dispositions multiplied by the five senses, and shows how the leaning of the soul to the one side may be brought to the moral equipollence by observing the declarations of Scripture, and ethical sayings of the Talmud, which he largely quotes, and which he interprets with the help of "divine" Socrates, his pupil Plato, Aristotle, the Arabic philosophers, and especially with the maxims of a Jewish moral philosopher called Chezez Al-Kute, who is the author of an Arabic paraphrase of the Psalms in rhyme (Steinacheter, Jewish Literature [London, 1867], p. 101). But this work contained also personal allusions to the different men of Saragossa, he was expropriated in 1046. After travelling from one place to another, he finally found a protector in the celebrated Samuel Ha-Nagid, a Jew also, then prime minister of Spain, and he was enabled to continue his philosophical studies, as the result of which he produced The Fountain of Life, his greatest work. Fragments of a Hebrew translation and an entire Latin version of it were published by Munk in his Mélanges de philosophie Juive et Arabe (Paris, 1857-59). He died in 1070. The influence which Ibn-Gebirol exerted on Arabic and Jewish philosophy cannot be too highly estimated. He certainly deserves to be called "the Jewish Plato," as Gritzat chooses to name him; but the assertion that he was the first philosopher of the Middle Ages, and that his philosophical treatises were used by the scholastic philosophers, is an error, as Lewis (Lehrs über die Philosophie, ii, 65) fully proves, although Munk, and after him Gritzat, fell into the same mistake, as also Ginsburg, the writer of the article on Ibn-Gebirol in Kitto (Bibl. Cycl. ii, 356). From frequent quotations in Aben-Ezra’s commentaries, it seems that Ibn-Ganach also have written some expositions of the Old-Test. Scriptures, though none such are known to us at present existing. Ibn-Gebirol also had a natural talent for verse-making. One of his hymns, entitled The royal Diadem, “a beautiful and pathetic poetical composition of profound philosophical sentiments and great eloquence, forms an important part of the divine service on the evening preceding the great Day of Atonement with the devout Jews to the present day.” See Gritzat, Geschichte d. Juden, vi, 31 sq.; Sachs, Religions Poesie d. Juden i. Spanien (Berlin, 1845), p. 3 sq., 315, etc.; Zunz, Synagoge Poesie der Mittelalter, [p. 129]; Flügel, Geschichte des jüdischen Nations, ii, 490. Ibn-Gebirol, ISAAC BEN-JEHUDAH, a Jewish Rabbi of a very distinguished family who resided in Lucena, not far from Cordova, was born about 1080. He was a very able philosopher and hymnologist, and well conversant with the Talmud. He is said to have written a Commentary on Genesis, which has not as yet come to light. From the frequent quotations and allusions to his writings by the best interpreters and lexicographers, it appears that it contained important contributions to the critical exposition of this difficult book. From the references to his writings made by Aben-Ezra (comp. comment on Deut, 7; Ps. civii, 9), Kimchi (Lexicon, under articles
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his creation. The divine is in everything, and every-thing in the divine. He also believed in the power of prayer, but that man, in order to be accepted of God, must approach at least perfection; hence the most perfect of men, the prophets, interceded by prayer for the people. The development of the idea of the divine world, of the spirits, spheres, and bod-ies, Ibn-Butif, explains by mathematical formulas. He died about 1290. Of his works, which are quite numerous, the following have been printed: Igeroth hat-To-sheba, replies to the questions of Judah ben-Nassan (Prague, 1878); Seder Bnei Yisrael (Constantinople, s. a. 8vo). See Gritz, Geschichte d. Juden, vii, 220; Fürst, Biblioth. Judaisca, ii, 224; Car-moly, Reuev Orientale, i, 61 sq.

Ibn-Bibar. See DUNASH.

Ibn-Balqash. See IZACHAKI.

Ibn-Sargado, Aaron, also called Aaron Ha-Cohen ben-Joseph, a Jewish scholar, flourished in Bag-dad towards the middle of the 10th century. He was a wealthy merchant, but very fond of study, and, taking ground against Saadia (q. v.), whose deposition from the "Gaonate" he expended large sums of money, shortly after Saadia's death he was elected Gaon (spiritual head) of the academy at Pumbedita (945), and by his zeal for learning and his great wealth greatly furthered the interests of the academy at this time and the Su-ran school, over which Saadia had presided. Ibn-Sar-gado, during the eighteen years of his presidency, devoted himself not only to the exposition of the O.-Test. Scriptures, but also quite extensively to the study of philosophy (comp. Munk, Guide des érudits, i, 462). He wrote a philosophical work and a Commentary on the Pentateuch, but they are not as yet known to us. From the fragments of the latter preserved by Aben-Ezra (Gen. xxviii, 38; xxxiv, 90; xlii, 6; Exod. xii, 16; Lev. xxviii, 6), we see that, though abiding by the traditional explanations of the Hebrew Scriptures, Ibn-Sargado was by no means a slavish follower of ancient opinions. See Gritz, Gesch. der Juden, v, 335 sq.; Kittro, Cyclop. Bibl. Lit. ii, 357; Fürst, Biblioth. Jud. iii, 246; Geiger, Jüdische Zeitschrift für Wissenschaft und Leben (1862), p. 297; Zunz, in Geiger's Zeitschrift, vol. iv (Stuttg. 1859), p. 209. See NACHMAN.

Ibn-Saum. See NACHMAN.

Ibn-Shoeib, Jacob, a Jewish commentator, flourished at Tadura in the latter half of the 15th century. But little is known of his personal history. His works show him to have been a man of considerable culture and great liberality of mind. He wrote commentaries on the Pentateuch, entitled The Holocaust of Sabbath (Veen. 1573); on the Psalms, entitled Frawy in Praxis (Salonica, 1568-69); on the Song of Songs, entitled A brief Exposition (Salonion, 1558); and an Exposition of Lamentations (Venice, 1589). In his commentary on the Psalms he maintained that pious Gentiles would have a share in the world to come, which, when we consider the severe persecutions they often had to endure at this time on the Jews, is by no means a small concession on the part of Ibn-Shoeib. —Kittro, Cyclop. of Bib. Lit. ii, 358; Zunz, Zur Gesch u. Literatur (Berl. 1845), p. 384. (J. H. W.)

Ibn-Sitta (יבן סיטא), a distinguished Jew, flourished at Irak towards the close of the 9th century. He wrote a commentary on the Scriptures, of which fragments only are left.Such was the nature of the work; but useful to the contemporary interpreters, while Aben-Ezra exercises his withering sarcasm upon him. —Kittro, Cyclop. of Bib. Lit. ii, 358; Pinsker, Likutei Kolomishon (Vienna, 1860), p. 83; Fürst, Gesch. d. Kirdharbene (Lpz. 1852), pp. 100, 172. Ibn-Thofel, an Arabic philosopher who flourished in the 12th century, wrote a work in which the existence of God is proved in so able a manner that the argument remains unrefuted to this day. It was translated into Persian, Hebrew, and Latin. The last-named, by Ed. Pococke, was entitled Philosophus autodidactus, sine epistola Abi Jassur Ebne-Tophaili de Hai Ebne-Yok- dam (Oxf. 1671 and 1700, 4to); and also in English by S. Cockley, Lond. 1708, 1731, 4to, and other modern languages. —Hosea, Newe. Bibl. Gen. xxv, 732.

Ibn-Tibbon, Jehudah ben-Saul, a Jewish scholar of Spanish descent, was born at Lunel, France, about 1120. He was educated a physician, but his ardent love for the study of Hebrew led him to abandon the practice of his profession, and he devoted himself main-ly to the translation into Hebrew of some of the most beautiful works of the ancient rabbis written in Arabic. He died about 1190. His translations are The Duties of the Heart of Joseph b. Bechah, the Ethics of Ibn-Gebirol, the Kusari of Judah Ha-Levi, the Moral Phi-losophy of Saadia Gaon, and the grammatical and lexi-co-graphical work of Ibn-Gazach (q. v.). All his trans-lations bear his own pedantic character; they are literal, and therefore clumsy, and we can hardly see why he should have gained the surname of prince of translators, unless it was for the service which he rendered by present-ing the Jews translations of works not otherwise accessible to them. He is also said to have written a work on the purity of the Hebrew language (יודיל יודיל), which is lost. See Kittro, Cyclop. Bibl. Lit. ii, 358; Steinheinsdeiter, Catalogus Libr. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana (col. 1374-76); Gritz, Gesch. d. Juden, vi, 241; Fürst, Biblioth. Jud. iii, 401 sq.

Ibn-Tibbon, Samuel, son of the preceding, was born about 1160. He was educated by his father both in the Hebrew and cognate languages, and followed him in the practice of medicine. He resided for a time reckless in his youth, but finally became interested in his studies, and evinced greater skill as a translator than his father. He died about 1230. Besides translating philosophical works both of Jewish and heathen authors, among whom were Aristotle and Alfarabi, he wrote a commentary on Ecclesiastes (תהלים יב), which exists in MS. in several of the European libraries; and a commentary on Gen. i, 1-9, entitled "Mesechet ha-Tiferet" (Prasburg, 1837), being a dissertation on the creation. —Gritz, Gesch. d. Juden, vi, 242; Kittro, Cyclop. Bibl. Lit. ii, 358; Fürst, Biblioth. Jud. iii, 402 sq.

Ibn-Tumart, AbdaLlah, a religious enthusiast, flourished in the second half of the 12th century in Northern Africa. He appeared before the simple-minded herd of Barbary, and preached against the Summi-tical doctrine of the Mohammedan ortho-doxy (see EX- NITRES), and the literal interpretation of the verses of the Koran, and the Mohammedan belief that God feels and acts like man. His followers, on account of their belief in the strict unity of God without corporeal re-presentation ( ולדה-ימ, called themselves Almoravids, or Almohads. Ibn-Tumart they recognised as Malhut, or the God-sent Imam of Islam. Like Mohammed, he went forth to conquer by the sword the territories of the Almoravids, and his doctrine soon found followers throughout North-west Africa. See MOHAMMEDANS. (J. H. W.)

Ib'ri (Heb. 'Ibri, יברון, an Eberite or "Hebrew," Sept. has יברון v. מזרחי), the last named of the sons of Merari by Jazaniah, i. e., apparently a descen-dant of Levi in the time of David (1 Chron. xxvi, 27). B.C. 1014.

Ibun is a name for the Jewish ceremony of the marriage of a childless widow by the brother of the de-ceased husband. See LEVIHATE LAW.

I'bzan (Heb. Ibsan, יבזן, from יבז, to shine, hence illustrious; but accord. to Gesen. perf. of יבז, or shining, from the Chald.; Sept. ἄραζαν v. Αβαζαν, Αβαζαν, Αβαζαν, Αβαζαν, the tenth "judge of Israel" (Judg. xii, 8-10). He was of Bethlehem,
probably the Bethlehem of Zebulon (so *Michælis and Hezel*, and not of Judah (as *Josephus* says). He governed seven years, B.C. 1249-1243. The prosperity of *Izban* is marked by the great number of his children (thirty sons and thirty daughters), and his wealth by their marriages—for they were all married. Some have held, and this is very possible, that *Izban* was the same with Boaz—*Kitto*.

**Icard, Charles**, a French Protestant divine, was born at St. Hippolyte, Languedoc, in February, 1636. He attended school at Anduze, Orange, and Nîmes, and concluded his theological studies at Geneva from 1655-58. He was installed in the provincial synod of Ay he was appointed pastor of La Norville, where he remained until 1668, when he accepted a pastorate at Nîmes. Under the influence of the persecutions which heralded the approaching revocation of the edict of Nantes, the Protestants, at the suggestion of Claude Brossieu, formed a central committee for the protection of their general interests, and Icard was chosen to represent it at the Synod of Lower Languedoc, assembled at Uzes in 1632. In the mean time, the population of a part of Vivarais and Lower Languedoc having risen in arms to resist the persecution, the insurrection was met with blood, and the members of the central committee, accused of being the instigators, were proceeded against with the utmost severity. Icard succeeded in reaching Geneva, and thence went to Neuchâtel for greater security. While on his way, he learned that he had been condemned, June 25, 1682, as contaminous, to die on the rack. He remained as pastor at Neuchâtel until 1688, when he went to Bremen, and supplied a French congregation there. He died June 9, 1715. Icard wrote two *Sermons, Avis salutaire aux Églises réformées de France* (Amst. 1683, 12mo), exhorting the Protestants not to give way under persecution. He also edited an edition of the *Instituts de Calvijn* (first two books, Bremen, 1696, 1697, 1to; the whole, Bremen, 1718, fol.) and an edition of the *Extrait de l'Usage et de son Fils sur le Chamanement de Religion, par Joseph de La Place*. He also edited, *AviM abrégé de la Vie de Charles Icard* (in Hist. crit. de la République des Lettres [1717], xiv, 288-301; Haag, La France Protestante; Hoefer, Nouv. Bibl. Générale, xxxv, 768.

**Ice** ('ïç), *be'roach*, so called from its smoothness, Job vi, 16; xxviii, 29; elsewhere cold, "frost," Gen. xxi, 40; Jer. xxxvi, 30; i.e. ice, Job xxvii, 10; but *"crysta- nal" in Ezek. i, 2; or *"icy*, *be'roach*, id., poet. for hail, Ps. cvii, 17. See the above terms, and climate under *ALLELUYA*

**Iceland**, an island belonging to Denmark, situated between the North Atlantic and the Arctic Oceans, distant 130 miles from the south-east coast of Greenland, and about 850 miles west of Norway, extending between lat. 63° 24' and 66° 35' N., and long. 19° 31' and 24°. The area is 89,726 square miles, of which only 15,900 are cultivated. The total population of Iceland was, according to the statistics of 1888, about 72,000 souls.

As early as 793 the eastern coast of Iceland was inhabited by some Irish monks, but it did not receive a settled population until 880, when king Harald Haf- fagr, of Norway, after conquering the other kings, made himself sole sovereign of the country, and induced large numbers of the malcontents to emigrate to Iceland. Nearly all the new-comers were pagans, and thus the republic which was established by them was thoroughly pagan. But in 922 it is said that the Althing, an assembly of the wisest men of all districts, which met annually to discuss the affairs of the country, and to give the necessary laws. The first Christian missionary among the Icelanders was Thor- vald Kodransson (981-985), with the same Vidforl (*"Vidforl", wide journey") supported by Frederick, according to the legend, a Saxon bishop. With great vigor the missionary work was subsequently continued by king Ólaf Tryggvason of Norway, who not only tried by persuasion, bribery, and intimidation to gain for the Christian religion all the Icelanders who came to Norway, but also sent missionaries to Ice- land, and supported their labors by the whole influence which he could command. The first to go was the Icelan- der Landgud (986-997) supported by the Saxon priest Dankbrand, who, after many adventures, had become court chaplain of the king (997-999); two noble Icelanders, the "White Gizur," and Hjalmar Skegga- sson, succeeded finally in effecting a compromise with the pagans. The missionary of the island, Thorfinn of Ljóvatn, according to which Christianity was made the state religion of Iceland, while many reservations were made in favor of paganism (1000). The whole people were then baptized, part of them reluctantly, yet with- out open resistance. A few years later, king Ólaf Har- aldson caused the last remnants of the pagan cult as- faced from the laws. Some traces, however, of the for- mer religion remained in the faith and usages of the Christian Icelanders, particularly in their Church con- stitution. During the pagan period the erection and possession of a temple had been a private affair; as there were no stelae or other marker of property, no temple had been held in every temple by its owner; subse- quently, when the political constitution of the island was regulated (965), a limited number (thirty-nine) of temples obtained a political importance, and every Ice- lander was obliged to connect himself with the owner of the temple. The king's temple seems his chief con-tribution for the maintenance of the temple. Private temples were maintained beside the public, and the latter remained likewise the private property of the chiefs. The idea of chief temples ceased with the introduc- tion of Christianity, but erection, dedication, and main- tenance of the temples remained a private affair. The law only provided that the erection of a church in- volved the duty of maintaining it; and the clergy could compel the dotation of a church by delaying its conse- cration until dotation was provided for. Otherwise the administration of the property of the church by its own was very arbitrary, and he had only to take care of the maintenance of the church and of the holding of divine worship. He either could take orders himself or hire another priest. In the former case the priest was more of a peasant, merchant, or a judge than a clergy- man; in the latter case he was financially dependent upon the owner of the temple, and, like other servants, obliged to perform domestic or military services. Iceland re- ceived its own and native bishop in 1055, having up to that time been only visited by missionary bishops. The bishop enjoyed the benefit of the old temple duties; otherwise he had to live out of his own means. Under the second bishop, Gizur, the see was endowed, and per- manently established at Skalhol; subsequently (about 1105) a second see was established at Holar, to which was given the jurisdiction of the northern district, while the three other districts remained subject to the bishop of Skalhol. The bishops were elected by the people; the priests by the owners of the several churches. Thus the clergy were less independent than in other countries, and consequently less powerful. Their influence some- what increased when bishop Gizur, in 1097, prevailed upon the National Assembly to confirm the privileges of the Church, and which became in main in many particulars different from that of other church- es. Lay patronage was recognised to its fullest extent; no celibacy separated the clergy from the people; even the bishops were generally married. The bishops, though they had a seat in the National Assembly, had no separate ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and marriage and other affairs were regulated contrary to Church law.
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The Church of Iceland was at first subordinate to the archbishopric of Bremen and Hamburg; when the archbishopric of Lund was established (1108), Iceland was transferred to it; finally, it was transferred to the new archbishopric of Nidaros. About the middle of the 12th century the island became subject to the crown of Norway, and was consequently affected by the conflicts between the Church and State which took place in that country. This chiefly concerned the patronage of laymen, and ended with the adoption of a new Church law introduced about 1297 by bishop Arnl. (This Church law was published in 1777 by Grim Jóh. Thorókelin, under the title Jus ecclesiasticum nostrum sive Arnoneum, or Kristinnrettinn í nýri.)

The inner condition of the people was anything but satisfactory, as immorality and other vices appear to have prevailed to a large extent among the laity as well as among the clergy. The convents which had arisen since the 12th century fully participated in the general degeneration. Externally all classes of the people showed a strong attachment to the Church of Rome, and three natives of the island obtained a place among the saints of the Church—Thorlak, Jon, and Gudmund; the last named, however, was not formally canonized.

The Reformation soon found a number of adherents: among the earliest and most devoted was Oddr Gotteschalksson, the author of the first translation of the New Testament into Icelandic (printed at Rooskilde, 1540). The Danish government, which had established a dependency since the union of Norway with Denmark (1397), endeavored to introduce the Reformation, which in 1536 had been declared to be the religion of the state by the Diet of Copenhagen, by force; but the bishop, especially Arason of Holar, made a determined and length and armed opposition, which was successful, finally (1550) ended in his capture and execution. This put an end to the Church of Rome in Iceland, and in the next year (1561) the Reformation was fully carried through.

The gradual improvement in the condition of the Church was, however, only gradual. Many of the customs of the medi eval Church, such as the use of the Latin language at divine service, maintained themselves for a long time, and the same was the case with the ignorance and the immorality of the clergy and the people. But the Reformation had swept away the established habits of the past, and with the establishment of learned schools in connection with the two cathedrals (1552), by the establishment of a printing-press at Holar by the excellent bishop Guðmundr Thorlaksson (1574); and in particular by the new translation of the Bible by this bishop, a service that contributed largely to a thorough reform of the Church, which now belongs to the best-educated portions of the Protestant world.

As regards the present constitution of the Church of Iceland, it resembles in its principal features that of Denmark, yet not without preserving some of its own peculiarities. The sovereign is the chief bishop (summus episcopus), who exercises his authority partly through the bishops, partly through secular officers. The bishops, in the election of whom the people take part, occupy the position of superintendents, and still have an extended jurisdiction. At the close of the 18th century the see of Skalafold was transferred to Reykjavik, and somewhat later (1825) a cathedral was established at Langanes, near Reykjavik. The episcopal see of Holmar had previously (in 1801) been abolished, and the whole island placed under one bishop. Next to the bishops are the two provosts, who are the Middle Ages chiefly of a financial nature, and therefore sometimes occupied by laymen. Since the Reformation (1573-1574) the dignity has been wholly of an ecclesiastical character, and includes the right and duty of superintending the large districts. On the whole, there are 16 provosts, each of whom is placed over a number of parishes. The pastors were at first appointed by the bishops, contrary to the provisions of the Danish Church constitution, but since 1868 they have been elected, in accordance therewith, by the congregation, under the superintendence of the provost. To the royal bailiff was reserved the right of investing the pastor elect with his office. Subsequently the manner of appointment was somewhat modified, the bishops being given to the bailiff, and a right of co-operation to the bishop. To the king of Denmark was reserved the right of sanctioning the appointment to one of the forty-seven benefices, whose yearly income is from 40 to 100 dollars annually. Only five of the 298 churches yield an income higher than 100 dollars. Some clergymen have an income of no more than five dollars annually.

All have therefore to depend for their support chiefly on fees and on the proceeds of the lands connected with the churches. See Maerur, in Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, vii, 90; Finnu-myndamenn, Histor. Eccles. Islandiæ (tom. iv, Havnæ, 1772-78; extending to the year 1780 and continued till 1840 under the same title by Petur Peturson, Copenhagen, 1841); Münzter, Kirchengesch. von Danmark und Norwegen, vol. i-iii (Leipzig, 1828-33); Maerur, Die Beklebung des norweg. Stammes zum Christenthume (Leipzig, 1852); Christ, L. M., Reformationen i Island (Copenhagen, 1848). (A. J. S.)

Icb'abob (Heb. יekyllב) יִכְּלָבּ, Where is the glory? i. q. There is no glory, i.e. ignoble; Sept. ἵκα-καφίδικα v. τ. ἐκκαθαρισθεί, and even οὐκ ἐκκαθαρισθεί, etc.), the son of Phinehas and grandson of Eli. The pains of labor came upon his mother when she heard that the ark of God was taken, that her husband was slain in battle, and that these tidings had proved fatal to his father Eli. They were death-pangs to her; and when those around sought to cheer her, saying, "Fear not, for thou hast borne a son," she only answered by giving him the name of I-čabob, adding, "The glory is departed from Israel!" (1 Sam. iv, 19-22). B.C. 1126. The same again occurs in 1 Sam. xiv, 5, where his son Ahitub is mentioned as the father of the priest Ahiah.

Icy'hys (Grek. ἱχθύς, a fish), in Christian archaeology a symbol of Christ. The word is found on many seals, rings, lamps, and tombeaux belonging to the earliest Christian times. It is formed of the initial letters of our Saviour's name and titles in Greek: Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, Νικηφόρος, θέος Υἱός, Σωτήρ, Ἰησοῦς Χριστός, τὸν θεὸν τοῦ σαβατοῦ. Territorial speeches of Christians accustomed to replace these monograms with the name πιστικοὶ, "fishes," to denote that they were born again into Christ's royal family of water. He says, "Xe πιστικοὶ sekundium ἵππου, nostrum Jesum Christum, nam unam simum" (De Epyt. i, 2). See First. Baptismal fonts were ornamented with the figure of a fish; several such remain in French cathedrals. Optatus, bishop of Milevisa, in the 4th century, first pointed out the word ἱχθύς as formed of the initials of Christ's title as above given, and from that time forward "Oriental subtilty repeated to satiety" religious similitudes drawn from the sea. Julius Africanus calls Christ the great fish taken by the fish-hook of God, and whose flesh nourishes the whole world." Augustine says that "ἵππος is the mystical name of Christ, because he draws men deep into the depths of this mortal life—into the abyss of water" (De Civit. Dei). See Didron, Christian Iconography, i, 344 sqq.; Münter, Simboller d. alt Christm. (Alt. 1825); Augusti, Archäol. i, 121 sqq.; Pearson, On the Creed; Riddle, Christ. Antiquität, p. 184. See Iconography.

Ico'nium (Ἰκόνιον, of unknown derivation), a town, formerly the capital of Lycaonia (according to Ptol. v, 6, 16; but Ptolemy according to Strabo, xii, 568; Xenoph. Anab. i, 2, 19; Pliny, v, 25; and even Psidius according to Ammian, Marcell. xiv, 2), as it is now, by the name of Koniyeh, of Karamania, in Asia Minor. It is situated in N. lat. 37° 21' E. lon. about 120 miles inland from the Mediterranean. It was on the
great line of communication between Ephesus and the western coast of the peninsula on one side, and Tarsus, Antioch, and the Euphrates on the other. We see this indicated by the narrative of Xenophon (L.c.) and the letter of Cicero (ad Fam. iii, 8; v, 20; xv, 4). When the Roman provincial system was matured, some of the most important of these roads was established, and on this line, as may be seen from the map in Leake's Asia Minor. These circumstances should be borne in mind when we trace Paul's journeys through the district. Iconium was a well-chosen place for missionary operations. The apostle's first visit was on his first circuit, in company with Barnabas; and on this occasion he approached it from Antioch in Pisidia, which lay to the west. A.D. 44. From that city he had been driven by the persecution of the Jews (Acts xiii, 50, 51). There were Jews in Iconium also; and Paul's first efforts here, according to his custom, were made in the synagogue (xiv, 1). The results were considerable both among the Hebrew and Gentile population of the place (ibid.). We should notice that the working of miracles in Iconium is emphatically mentioned (xiv, 3). The intrigues of the Jews again drove him away; he was in danger of being stoned, and he withdrew to Lystra and Derbe, in the eastern and wilder part of Lycaonia; and Thither also the enmity of the Jews of Antioch and Iconium pursued him; and at Lystra he was actually stoned and left for dead (xiv, 19). After an interval, however, he returned over the old ground, revisiting Iconium, and another circuit the Churches of which he had founded there (xiv, 21, 22). A.D. 47. These sufferings and difficulties are alluded to in 2 Tim. iii, 11; and this brings us to the consideration of his next visit to this neighborhood, which was the occasion of his first practically associating himself with Timothy. Paul left the missionary work to the native sons of Lycaonia; but he remained on in the region around (iv, 19); and he was there on his second missionary circuit; and, travelling through Cilicia (xiv, 41), and up through the passes of Taurus into Lycaonia, approached Iconium from the east, by Derbe and Lystra (xiv, i, 2). Though apparently a native of Lystra, Timothy was evidently well known to the Christians of Iconium (xiv, 9); and it is not improbable that his circumcision (xvi, 8) and ordination (1 Tim. i, 18; iv, 14; vi, 12; 2 Tim. i, 6) took place there. On leaving Iconium, Paul and his party travelled to the north-west; and the place is not mentioned again in the sacred narrative, though there is little doubt that it was visited on the apostle's return journey in the early part of his third circuit (Acts xvm, 23). From its position it could not fail to be an important centre of Christian influence in the early ages of the Church. The curious apocryphal legend of St. Thecla, of which Iconium is the scene, must not be entirely passed by. The "Acts Pauli et Thecæ" are given in full by Graber (Spicil. vol. i), and by Jones (On the Canon, i, 438-411); and in brief by Conybeare and Howson (St. Paul, i, 197). The Church planted at this place by the apostle continued to flourish (Hierocles, p. 675) until the persecution of the Saracens, and afterwards of the Seljukites, who made it one of their strongholds, it was nearly extinguished. But some Christians of the Greek and Armenian churches, with a Greek metropolitan bishop, are still found in the suburbs of the city, not being permitted to reside within the walls.

Koniyeh is situated at the foot of Mount Taurus (Mannert, vi, 1, p. 195 sq.), upon the border of the lake Trogitis, in a fertile plain, rich in valuable productions, particularly apricots, wine, cotton, flax, and grain. The circumference of the town is between two and three miles, and beyond these are suburbs not much less populous than the town itself, which has in all about 80,000 inhabitants, but according to others 80,000. The walls, strong and lofty, and flanked with square towers, which, at the gates, are placed close together, were built by the Seljukians between the ninth and the sixteenth century. At this point, as may be seen from the map in Leake's Asia Minor. These circumstances should be borne in mind when we trace Paul's journeys through the district. Iconium was a well-chosen place for missionary operations. The apostle's first visit was on his first circuit, in company with Barnabas; and on this occasion he approached it from Antioch in Pisidia, which lay to the west. A.D. 44. From that city he had been driven by the persecution of the Jews (Acts xiii, 50, 51). There were Jews in Iconium also; and Paul's first efforts here, according to his custom, were made in the synagogue (xiv, 1). The results were considerable both among the Hebrew and Gentile population of the place (ibid.). We should notice that the working of miracles in Iconium is emphatically mentioned (xiv, 3). The intrigues of the Jews again drove him away; he was in danger of being stoned, and he withdrew to Lystra and Derbe, in the eastern and wilder part of Lycaonia; and Thither also the enmity of the Jews of Antioch and Iconium pursued him; and at Lystra he was actually stoned and left for dead (xiv, 19). After an interval, however, he returned over the old ground, revisiting Iconium, and another circuit the Churches of which he had founded there (xiv, 21, 22). A.D. 47. These sufferings and difficulties are alluded to in 2 Tim. iii, 11; and this brings us to the consideration of his next visit to this neighborhood, which was the occasion of his first practically associating himself with Timothy. Paul left the missionary work to the native sons of Lycaonia; but he remained on in the region around (iv, 19); and he was there on his second missionary circuit; and, travelling through Cilicia (xiv, 41), and up through the passes of Taurus into Lycaonia, approached Iconium from the east, by Derbe and Lystra (xiv, i, 2). Though apparently a native of Lystra, Timothy was evidently well known to the Christians of Iconium (xiv, 9); and it is not improbable that his circumcision (xvi, 8) and ordination (1 Tim. i, 18; iv, 14; vi, 12; 2 Tim. i, 6) took place there. On leaving Iconium, Paul and his party travelled to the north-west; and the place is not mentioned again in the sacred narrative, though there is little doubt that it was visited by the apostle again in the early part of his third circuit (Acts xvm, 23). From its position it could not fail to be an important centre of Christian influence in the early ages of the Church. The curious apocryphal legend of St. Thecla, of which Iconium is the scene, must not be entirely passed by. The "Acts Pauli et Thecæ" are given in full by Graber (Spicil. vol. i), and by Jones (On the Canon, i, 438-411); and in brief by Conybeare and Howson (St. Paul, i, 197). The Church planted at this place by the apostle continued to flourish (Hierocles, p. 675) until the persecution of the Saracens, and afterwards of the Seljukites, who made it one of their strongholds, it was nearly extinguished. But some Christians of the Greek and Armenian churches, with a Greek metropolitan bishop, are still found in the suburbs of the city, not being permitted to reside within the walls.

Koniyeh is situated at the foot of Mount Taurus (Mannert, vi, 1, p. 195 sq.), upon the border of the lake Trogitis, in a fertile plain, rich in valuable productions, particularly apricots, wine, cotton, flax, and grain. The
the devil, a Manichae, and a Docetist." The pope himself, Gregory III, put all the opponents of images under ban; but, despite this and other efforts on his part, Leo's successor, Constantinus Copronymus, went even further than Leo. Having obtained the condemnation of images by the Synod of Constantinople in A.D. 754, he enforced it against the clergy and the most noted of the monks. Many monks, who, together with the patriarchs of Alexandria, Antioch, and Jerusalem, were in favor of the images, and were unwilling to subscribe to the decrees of the council, were cruelly persecuted. The emperor also enforced this law; but his widow, Irene, one of the basest of women, used the tenderness of the people in favor of image-worship to enable her to ascend the throne. With the aid of the newly-elected patriarch of Constantinople, Terasios, she called a synod at Nicea in 787, wherein the adoration of images by prostration, kissing, and incensing was re-established. Matters remained in this state during the reigns of the emperors Nicephorus and Michael (802–813), although there still were Iconoclasts to be found. But, as during the strife, the adoration of images had made great progress (see D. 837–889), it was caused to be abolished by the Synod of Constantinople, and punished those who persisted in it (mostly monks, with Theodorus Studita at their head). Michael II (821–824), who overthrew Leo, tolerated the worship of images without thereby satisfying the image-worshippers; but, Theophilos, his successor, not only restored them to the government, renewed all the edicts against them. After his death, his widow restored image-worship in 842, and instituted the festival of the Orthodoxy, which is yet kept by the Greek Church in remembrance of this restoration (see Buderus, De festo orthodoxo, Jena, 1729). The Greeks have since retained images in their churches, but without worshipping them. The Latins also decided that the images should be retained, but not worshipped; while the French Church declared most positively against image-worship in the Synod of Gentilicium in 787, and it is on this occasion that St. Bernard presents to the Council of Nicaea a memorial, De ingano imaginum culto (Libri Carolini). Thereupon images were allowed to be retained for purposes of education only. At the Synod of Frankfort in 794, Charlemagne, with the assent of the English Church, caused image-worship to be condemned. After the 9th century there were gradually introduced into the imperial churches image-worship, and it soon became general throughout the West. The Roman Catholic Church continued to favor the practice, and the Council of Trent decided formally in its twenty-fifth session that the images of Christ, of the holy Virgin, and of other saints are to be put in churches; that they ought to receive due veneration, not because they have any divinity or virtue in them, but because honor is thus reflected upon those whom they represent; so that the people, by kissing the images, bowing to them, etc., pray to Christ and honor the saints whom the images represent. This image-worship led to pilgrimages to the shrines of saints great in repute for their power. The Greek Church admits only the painted and raised images, not carved figures, like the Church of Rome. All the Christian sects in the East are given to image-worship with the exception of the Nestorians, the Christians of St. Thomas, and the Russian Rossokhodni. The German Reformers, although opposing image-worship, held somewhat different opinions on the subject: thus Luther tolerated images as an ornament, and also as edifying mementoes, and condemned the destruction of the images and the altars at Wittenberg in 1523. The Swiss have long since abandoned images in any form, or for any purpose, and had them taken out of all the churches—often with great violence, as in the Netherlands. They are not even now tolerated in the Reformed Church, nor in the particular denominations that have sprung from it. Mohammedanism professed image-worship; it even forbids the reproduction of the image of any living being, though it be not for the purpose of worshipping it. See Wessenberg, Die christlichen Bilder, Ein Befür- derung mittel d. christl. Sinnen (Constance, 1827, 2 vols.); Schlomann, Gesch. der Bilderrührmenden Kaiser (Frankf. a. M. 1812); Marx, Der Bilderstreit der Dystantischen Kaiser (Trier, 1829); Ketzer Lex. ii, 267; Milman's Gibbon, Decline and Fall of Rom. Empire, i, 16, 19; Milman, Latin Christianity, ii, 293 sq.; Pierer, Universal Lexikon, s. v. Bilder; Bingham, Orig. Eccles. book viii, ch. viii; Butler, Eccles. Hist. (Phila. 1868), i, 860 sq.; Ranke, History of the Popes, i, 19–28. See Image-Worship. IV. J. H. W.

Iconoclasts. See Iconoclastm. Iconoclasts. See Image-Worship. Iconography (sceu, image, and graphe, I describe), the science of so-called "Christian art" in the Middle Ages. It includes, therefore, the history and description of images, pictures, mosaics, gems, emblems, etc. There exist in our day many exquisite specimens of Christian iconography, which are preserved in libraries and museums, and are invaluable to us in determining the exact history of this "Christian art." The chracter of the illustrations, the form of the letters, suffice to determine the age and country where the work was produced. Thus a comparison of MSS. of Eastern and Western Europe brings us the several stages which mark the growth of Christian iconography. See Illumination, Art of. The most important modern work on the subject is Didron, Manuel d'iconographie Chrétienne (Paris, 1845, 8vo); trans., into English, Christian Iconography, vol. i (London, 1851, 12mo). Older works are, Pauli, De imag. sacr. et profana (Ingolst. 1594, 4to); Molanus, De pict. et imag. Sacrae (Leuven, 1570); De Historia Sacr. Imagg. et Ficturarum (1619, 12mo); Minter, Simboller der Alten Christen (Altona, 1829, 2 vols. 4to); Wessenberg, Die Christl. Bilder (Constance, 1827). See Image-Worship. J. H. W.

Iconolatry (sceu, image, and larypseus, worship), the worship of the adoration of images. Hence image-worshippers are called Iconolaters, or Iconolasts. See Image-Worship.

Iconomachy. See Iconoclasm.

Iconostasia (skevostasia) is that part of an Eastern Church which corresponds to the altar-rails in English churches. It is often mistaken for the rood-screen (q. v.), which in its general arrangement it resembles, only (the mystery being absolutely to be veiled from the eyes of the people) the panels are solid to the top. The rood-screen separates nave and choir; the iconostasis, however, separates choir and bema. "It has three doors; that in the centre conducting directly to the bema; that to the right of the diakonikon; that of the left to the proteaxis; through which, of course, the great entrance is made. On the right of the central door, on entering, is the throne of our Lord; on the left, that of the mother of God; the others are arranged according to the taste or devotion of the architect or founder. The earliest iconostasis is believed to be the one remaining of the Arian church of the Emperor Constantine, in the Crimea, which probably dates from about A.D. 350. —Neale, Hist. Eastern Church, i, introd. i, 191 sq.

I'da, first abbes of the convent of Argensol, flourished in the first half of the 13th century. She was a remarkable woman, very learned, and acknowledged to have disputed with the most celebrated doctors with great ability. She died in 1226. Her life was written by a monk of Citeaux, but remains in MS. form. —Histoire Lit. de la France, xvii, 251; Hocquet, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxvi, 174.

Id'alah (Heb. 'idyâlah, 'idâlîn, probably eroded; Sept. 'înapa'â), a city near the western border of Zebulon, mentioned between Shimron and Bethlhelm (Josh. xix, 15). According to Schwatka's map, this is the city called Chisd in the Talmud, and is identical with the village Kellâh al-
Chirch, six English miles south-west of Shimron or Semumie (Palexstene, p. 172). He doubtless refers to the place marked on Robinson's map as Kultat el-Kerib, in the valley of the Kishon, south-west of Semumie or Semumieh; a position not improbable, especially if marked by the ruins on the north side of the river. Dr. Robinson, who afterwards visited it, calls it "Jeidi, a miserable village with no traces of antiquity" (Lateran Researches, p. 113); but Van de Velde shows that it actually has many marks, although now much obliterated, of being and form, and so goes (Memorie, p. 322).

Idacius or Idathius, named Claritas, a Spanish priest, was born in the first half of the 4th century. After his accession to the bishopric of Emerita he distinguished himself by the intertemperate zeal with which, together with Ithacius (q. v.), bishop of Osonoba, he opposed the heresy of Priscillian (q. v.). He wrote a refutation of the latter's doctrine under the title Apologiaegeticus, which is now lost. In 388, after the death of the emperor Maximiianus, who had persecuted the Priscillianists, Idacius resigned his bishopric. Having subsequently attempted to regain it, he was exiled, and died about the year 392. According to Sulpicius Severus, Idacius' success was less due to his own contemporaries than that of Ithacius. The writings ascribed to him are given in the Bibliotheca Patrum, vol. v. See Sulpicius Severus, Historia Sacra; Isidore of Seville, De Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis; Antoninus, Bibl. Historiae, iv, 172; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxix, 775; Neander, Ch. Hist., ii, 111 sq.; Kuutz, Ch. Hist., i, 214 sq. See Priscillianists.

Idacius of Lamego (Lamecensis), who became bishop of Galicia in 427, distinguished himself by his opposition to the Manicheans, whom he sought to drive from Spain. He is supposed to have died in 468. He is the author of a history, a continuation of the Chronicles of St. Hieronymus, beginning with the year 387 and ending with 468. The assertion that this work originated with Pelagius, bishop of Osied, in the 12th century, is by no means satisfactorily proved. It has often been printed and annotated, as by Sirmond, Opp. vol. ii; Bouquet, Script. Fratm, vol. i; and best by Florence Esp. Sarrada, iv, 945 sq. He is also supposed to be the author of Patri consolares.—Asbach, Kirch.-Lex. iii, 402.

Id'bash (Heb. Yid'bash, יִדְבָּשׁ, prob. honeyed); Sept. ίαυνήβατις v. r. יָבָֽשָׁא, Vulg. Jdebaso, a descendant of Judah, who, with his two brothers and a sister (the Tadepovites), are said (1 Chron. iv, 5, according to the Authorized Version) "of the fathers of the fathers, probably meaning of the lineage of the founder of that place, or perhaps they were themselves its settlers. B.C. cir. 1612. See JEHIZKIEL 2.

Id'do, the name of several men in the Old Testament, of different forms in the Hebrew.

1. Id'do (2 Chr. 7, timely, or born to a festival); Sept. 'Addi, Vulg. Addo), a Levite, son of Joah and father of Zerah (1 Chron. vi, 21); called more accurately perhaps ADAIAH in ver. 1.


3. Id'bo (772), a prolonged form of No. 1; Sept. 'Addo, Vulg. Addo), the father of Ahinadab, which latter was Solomon's purveyor in the district of Mahanaim (1 Kings iv, 14). B.C. cir. 995.

4. Id'bo (772), same as first name, 2 Chron. xii, 15; xiii, 22; Sept. 'Addo, Vulg. Addo) or Yedo (772), 2 Chron. ix, 29, margin, but Yedo (772), text; but less accurate forms for the last name; Sept. 'Iwob, Addo, A. Vers. 'Ido), a prophet of Judah, who wrote the history of Reboam and Abijah; or rather, perhaps, who, in conjunction with Seraiah, kept the public rolls during their reigns (2 Chron. xii, 15); and who in that capacity recorded certain predictions against Jeroboam (2 Chron. ix, 29; although Bertheau, ad loc., and Ewald, Int. Gesch., 3d ed., i, 216, think this a different person). B.C. post 553. It seems from 2 Chron. xiii, 22 that he named his book Yodo, Midrash, or "Or Exposition." Josephus (Ant. xvi, 9, 1) states that this Idbo was the same as the Iddo who was sent from Shechem to Bethel, and consequently the same that was slain by a lion for disobedience to his instructions (1 Kings xiii); and many commentators have followed this statement.—Kitto. He is also identified with Oded (see Jerem. on 2 Chron. xv, 1).

5. Yido' (772), same name as last, Zech. i, 5, elsewhere Yod2, id.; but Yodo', id., apparently by error, in Neh. xii, 16; Sept. 'Addo, but 'Ido in Neh. xii, 4, and 'A'da in Neh. xii, 16; Vulg. Addo, but 'Ido in Neh. xii, 16), the father of Barachiah and grandfather of the prophet Zechariah (Zech. i, 1, 7; comp. Ezra v, vi; iv, 14; Neh. xii, 16). He was one of the chief priests who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh. xii, 1). B.C. 536.

6. Id'do' (772), mishap; Sept. omits, Vulg. Eddo), chief of the Jews of the Captivity established at Cæsiphia, a place of which it is difficult to determine the position. It was to him that Ezra sent a requisition for Levites and Nethinim, none of whom had yet joined his caravan. Thirty-eight Levites and 250 Nethinim responded to his call (Ezra viii, 17-20). B.C. 465. It is not improbable that this Iddo was the same as that of the Nethinim, descended from those Gibeonites who were charged with the servile labors of the tabernacle and Temple. This is one of several circumstances which indicate that the Jews, in their several colonies under the Exile, were ruled by the heads of their nation, and allowed the free exercise of their worship.

7. See JADAN.

Idealism (from идеa), a term given to several systems of philosophy, and therefore varying in its significance according to the meaning which they severally attach to the word идеa. Until the 17th century, when Descartes came forward with his Discourse on Method (1637), it had the significance which Plato gave to it, and was understood to refer to the Platonic doctrine of eternal forms (идей) existing in the divine mind, according to which the world and all sensible things were framed. "Plato agreed with the rest of the ancient philosophers in this—that all things consist of matter and form, and that the form, the matter of which all things were made existent from eternity without form; but he likewise believed that there are eternal forms of all possible things which exist without matter, and to those eternal and immaterial forms he gave the name of ideas. In the Platonic sense, then, идеa were the patterns according to which the deity fashioned the phenomenal or etypical world" (Reid, Intellectual Powers, Esq. i, chap. ii). The word was used in this sense not only in philosophy, but also in literature, down to the 17th century, as in Spenser, Shakespeare, Hooker, and Milton. Thus Milton, in his Paradise Lost:—

"God saw his works were good, Answering his fair идеа."
word which could only properly suggest an a priori scheme, deducing our knowledge from the intellect, has in France become the name peculiarly distinctive of that philosophy of mind which exclusively derives our knowledge from the intellect. In the terms sensation, phantasm, etc., with reference to the mental representation of external things, as had previously been done, Descartes adopted the word idea.

In this use of the word he was followed by other philosophers, as Leibnitz and Locke, who desired the word to stand for the thing in itself, without any reference to the mind, or to any sensation, ever a man thinks." Hence the mental impression that we are supposed to have when thinking of the sun, without seeing the actual object, is called our idea of the sun. The idea is thus in contrast with the sensation, or the feeling that we have when the senses are engaged, and immediately call the object.

The sensation is the result of the pressure of the object, and declares an external reality; the impression persisting after the thing has gone, and recoverable by mental causes without the original, is the idea. Although the word in this application (289) is thus so guarded as to lead to no bad consequences, Reid (Jusfur. Ew. Ed., i, chap. i) most vehemently protested against its use in such a sense, holding that it gave countenance to the setting up of a new and fictitious element in the operations of the mind. But this raises the great question of the nature of knowledge, of the knowledge of an external world. Bishop Berkeley (q. v.), however, must be regarded as the true representative of modern idealism. He held that "the qualities of supposed objects cannot be perceived distinct from the mind that perceives them; and these qualities, it will be allowed, are all that we can call of such objects. If, therefore, there were external bodies, it is impossible we should ever know it; and if there were not, we should have exactly the same reason for believing there were as we now have. All, therefore, which really exists is spirit, or "the thinking principle"—ourselves, our fellow-men, and God. What we call ideas are not imparted to us by God in a certain order of succession, which order of successive presentation is what we mean by the laws of nature." This mode of speculation of bishop Berkeley, which he defended with so much acuteness, and which Lewis (Hist. of Phil., 1819, ii. 519) at least was led to believe that the bishop's critics misunderstood him, he held to be the only possible true view of our nature and the government of God. But there is no question that, whatever benefits it may have bestowed upon the bishop and his immediate disciples, it has been found by every one of us, as we take away the grounds of a belief which is both natural and universal, and which cannot, at first, be even doubted without a severe exercise of thought, it shook men's faith in all those primary truths which are at once the basis of their knowledge and the guides of their conduct. It seemed to throw on distrust of the evidence of the senses, as if really invalidated the spontaneous conclusions which every man inevitably forms from that evidence. This theory is conclusively proved by the conduct of Hume; for, if a main pillar of the edifice could so easily be shaken, what was there to hinder from the same result the whole fabric of our knowledge, where Berkeley began, Hume proceeded much farther, and left unassailed hardly one article of human faith. He denied the reality not only of the object perceived, but of the mind perceiving. He reduced all thinking and action to a succession of rapidly flowing ideas, one being knowing only at the instant it is interfused to consciousness, and then fading away, leaving no surely recognizable trace of itself on the memory, and affording no ground for an anticipation of the future. We do not even keep, he maintains, that any one thing depends upon another in the relation of an effect to its cause.

We know no true cause whatever, and our only idea of power is a fiction and a blunder. The conclusion of the whole matter, according to his philosophy, is, not the mere negation of this or that positive belief, but universal distrust of the human faculties, considered as means for the acquisition of truth. They contradict each other, and leave nothing certain except that nothing can be known.

In 1771 Kant, Fichte, and Schelling, who are often classed among the idealistic school, used the word idea in the Platonic or transcendental sense. Hegel, on the other hand, modified the use of the word to such an extent that his idealism does not only deserve to be called absolute-idealism, but much more so, because it is no less than the doctrine of the Eleatics anciently, or of Spinoza in modern times. It is thus apparent, from the looseness of the application of the word idea, and the danger of its not conveying a definite signification, that we need a general word in the English language which may more accurately express contrast to sensation or to actuality. But, as no better has yet been found, it is difficult to avoid the use of ideality, "being what is common to memory and to imagination, and expressing the mind as not under the present impression of real objects, but as by its own tenacity and associating powers, having those objects to all practical ends before its view. Thus all our sensations, whether of sight, hearing, touch, taste, or smell, and all the feelings that we have in the exercise of our moving energies, become transformed into ideas when, without the real presence of the origin of the one or the other, we are of the way of pursuit or avoidance, or can discriminate and compare them, nearly as if in their first condition as sensation." Sir W. Hamilton, in his Lectures on Logic (1, 126), has endeavored to avoid employing the word, but other writers on mental philosophy have freely adopted it in the above acceptance. See Chambers, Cyclop. v, 510 sq.; Krauth's Elements, Vocab. of Philos. p. 222 sq.; Brande and Cox, Dict. of Science, Lit. and Art, ii, 189; Morell, History of Philos. p. 55 sq.; Lewis, Hist. of Philos. (enlarged ed.), see Index; Farrar, Crit. Hist. of Free Thought, p. 422; M'Cosh, Hist. of Philos., Mind, p. 317 sq.; Morell's Elements, Hist. of Philos. see Index; N. A. Rev., No. LXXVII, p. 60 sq.; Jour. Soc. Lit., XXII, 298 sq. See Nilhism; Realism. (J. H. W.)

Idee (ἰδέα, private men), a term applied by some early writers to laymen in distinction from ministers (κληρικοὶ). Chrysostom (Homil. 55) and Theodoret (Comm. in 1 Cor. employed the word in this signification, and show that in the first instance Paul (1 Cor. vii. 13) designates a private person, whether learned or unlearned. So also Origen, Contra Cels. vii, p. 334. See Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. i, ch. v, § 6. See Laity.

Ideea (Γ. ἰδέας) is a term sometimes used in the orthodox doctrine of the Trinity of the Godhead to designate the property (Lat. proprietas) of each divine person. This must, however, not be confounded with the divine attributes (eternity, omnipotence, omnipotence, etc.), for they are inherent in the divine essence, and are the common possession of all the divine hypostases, while the ideiotes, on the other hand, is a peculiarity of the hypostataxia, and therefore cannot be communicated or transferred from one to another.—Schaaf, Ch. Hist. iii, 675. See Trinity.

Idie (ἰδεῖν, to see, to behold), also deceitful; ἴδιος, to be weak, in Niph. to be lazy, Exod. v, 8, 17; ἴδιος, indulgence, Prov. xxxix, 27; ἴδιος, remitting, Eccles. x, 18; ἴδιος, to rest, Ezek. xvi. 49; ἴδιος, quaintly. Matt. xxi. 13; being known only at the instant it is interfused to consciousness, and then fading away, leaving no surely recognizable trace of itself on the memory, and affording no ground for an anticipation of the future. We do not even keep, he maintains, that any one thing depends upon another in the relation of an effect to its cause.

We know no true cause whatever, and our only idea of power is a fiction and a blunder. The conclusion of the whole matter, according to his philosophy, is, not the
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equivalent to vain, and hence wicked language. J. A. H. Titman, in an extended criticism (On the principal Causes of Forced Interpret. of the N. T., printed in the Amer. Jib. Repa, for 1881, p. 481-484), objects that it violates the native meaning of the word, which rather denotes an empty, inconsiderate, and hence insincere conduct, appearance, context, which is aimed at the hypocritical Pharisees. On the other hand, the usual interpretation is supported by the actual occurrence of παραπαντα, wicked, in the parallel verse 35, and by the usage of other Greek writers, e. g., Symmachus in Lev. xix, 7, for בָּשָׁם, where Sept. δικαστήριον; Xenoph. Mem. i, 1, 57; Cicero, de Fatt. 12. (See Kuinol, ad loc.) The term is probably intended to be of wide significance, so as to include both these senses, namely, lewdy and calumny, as being both species of untruth and heedlessly uttered, yet productive of mischief.

Idleness, aversion from labor. The idle man is, in every view, both foolish and criminal. He lives not to God. Idleness was not made for man, nor man for idleness. A small measure of reflection might convince every one that for some useful purpose he was sent into the world. Man is placed at the head of all things here below. He is furnished with a great preparation of facilities and powers. He is enlightened by reason with much wisdom and discoveries; and even to himself he is revealed to consider himself as ransomed by the death of Christ from misery, and intended to rise to a still higher rank in the universe of God. In such a situation, thus distinguished, thus favored, and assisted by his Creator, does he answer the end of his being if he aim at no improvement? If he pursue no useful design, is he to live for no other purpose than to indulge in sloth, to consume the fruits of the earth, and spend his days in a dream of vanity? Existence is a sacred trust, and he who thus misemploys and squanders it away is treacherous to the great Giver of all good. He who will not look around him, and consider the whole universe full of active powers. Action is, so to speak, the genius of nature. By motion and exertion, the system of being is preserved in vigor. By its different parts always acting in subordination to each other, the perfection of the whole is carried on. The heavenly bodies perpetually revolve. Day and night incessantly repeat their appointed course. Continual operations are performing on the earth and in the waters. Nothing stands still. All is alive and stirring throughout the universe. In the midst of this animated and busy scene, is man alone to remain idle in his station? It is not sufficient for him to be inattentive and slothful being in the creation, when in so many ways he might improve his own nature, might advance the glory of the God who made him, and contribute his part to the general good? The idle live not to the world and their fellow-creatures any more than to God. If any man had a title to stand alone, and to be independent of his fellows, he might consider himself as at liberty to indulge in solitary ease and sloth, without being responsible to others for the manner in which he chooses to live. But there is no such person in the world. We are connected with each other by various relations, which create a chain of mutual dependence that reaches from the highest to the lowest station in society. Without a perpetual circulation of active duties and offices, which all are required to perform in their turn, the order and happiness of the world could not be maintained. Such offices are not for the benefit of the superiors than those of the inferiors. Each have demands and claims upon the other; and he who, in any situation of life, refuses to act his part, and to contribute his share to the general stock of felicity, deserves to be proscribed from society as an unworthy member. "If any man will not work," says Paul (2 Thess. iii, 10), "neither shall he eat." If he will do nothing to advance the purposes of society, he has no right to enjoy its benefits.

The idle man lives not to himself with any more advantage than he lives to the world. Though he imagines that he leaves to others the drudgery of life, and betakes himself to enjoyment and ease, yet he enjoys no true pleasure. He shuts the door against improvement of every kind, whether of mind, body, or fortune. Sloth enfeebles equally the bodily and the mental powers. His character falls into contempt. His fortune is consumed. His name is confounded, and his nameless contempt spread itself over his whole situation. Idleness is the inlet to licentiousness, vice, and immorality. It destroys the principles of religion, and opens a door to sin and wickedness. Every man who recollects his conduct must know that his hours of idleness always proved the hours most dangerous to virtue. He knew that this criminal desire of slothful and guilty passions were suggested, and designs were formed, which, in their issue, dishonour his whole life. Habitual idleness, by a silent and secret progress, undermines every virtue in the soul. More violent passions run their course and terminate. They are like moody torrents, which foam, and swell, and bear down everything before them; but, after having overflowed their banks, their impetuosity subsides, and they return, by degrees, into their natural channel. Sloth resembles the slowly-flowing putrid stream, which stagnates in the marshy places, where venomous animals and poisonous plants, and infects with pestilential vapours the whole surrounding country. Having once tainted the soul, it leaves no part of it sound, and, at the same time, it gives not to conscience those alarms which the eruptions of bolder and fiercer emotions often occasion. Nothing can return to the soul an esteem for the enjoyment of life as a relaxed and indolent habit of mind. He who knows not what it is to labor, knows not what it is to enjoy. The happiness of human life depends on the regular prosecution of some laudable purpose or object, which keeps awake and enlivens all our powers. It is agreeable, but it is only from preceding labors that rest acquires its true relish. When the mind is suffered to remain in continued inaction, all its powers decay: it soon languishes and sickens; and the pleasures which it proposed to obtain from rest terminate in tedium and insipidity. See Blair, Sermons, ii, 493; Warner, System of Practical Morality, iii, 151; Logan, Sermons, Sermon iv; Robinson, Theological Dictionary, s. v.

Idol, properly an outward object adored as divine, or as the symbol of deity. See Idolatry.

I. Classical and Scriptural terms: Having physical reference to such objects.—As a large number of different Hebrew words have been rendered in the A. V. either by idol or image, and that by no means uniformly (besides one or more in Greek more uniformly translated), it will be of some advantage to attempt to discriminate between them, and assign, as nearly as the two languages will allow, the English equivalents for each. See Image.

(I) Abstract terms, which, with a deep moral significance, express the degradation associated with idolatry, and stand out as a protest of the language against its enormities.

(i) General terms of doubtful significance.—1. בָּאֶל, idol, is thought by some to have a sense akin to that of בָּאֶל, sheker, "falsehood," with which it stands in parallelism in Job xiii, 4, and would therefore much resemble ārem, as applied to an idol. It is generally derived from the unused root בָּאֶל, to be empty or vain. Deitzlach (on Hab. ii, 18) derives it from the negative particle בָּאֶל, of, "die Nichitigen"; but according to Frisat (Handw. s. v.) it is a diminutive of בָּאֶל, "god," the additional syllabic indicating the greatest contempt. In this case the signification above mentioned is a subordinate one, and does not mean the deity, but only a small image of the god, which was consulted as an oracle among the Egyptians and Phenicians (Isa. xix, 3; Jer. xiv, 14). It is certainly used of the idols of Noph or Memphis (Ezek. xxx, 18). In strong contrast with Jehovah, it appears in Ps. x. 5; xviii, 7, the
contrast probably being heightened by the resemblance between διλις and δελίον. A somewhat similar play upon words is observable in Hab. ii, 18, διλις δελίον, "useless idols." See El.

2. διλις, διλιτία, διλιίτις, also a term of contempt, of uncertain origin (Ezek. xxx, 13), but probably derived from דַּלְלָה, to roll, as dungh, hence refuse. The Rabbinical authorities, referring to such passages as Ezek. iv, 2; Zeph. i, 17, have favored the interpretation given in the margin of the A.V. to Deut. xxix, 17, "dungy gods" (Vulg. "somnolentes, sordes idolorum," 1 Kings xv, 13); Jahn, connecting it with דַּלְלָה, דַּלָּה, "to roll," applies it to the stocks of trees of which idols were made, and in mockery called διλιίτις, "rolling things" (a volendo, he says, though it is difficult to see the point of his remark). Gesenius, repudiating the derivation from the Aramaic דיל, "to be great, illustrious," gives his preference to the rendering "stones, stone gods," thus deriving it from דל, "a heap of stones," and in this he is followed by Fitts, who translates דילית by the German "Steinhäufen." The expression is applied, principally in Ezekiel, to false gods and their symbols (Deut. xxix, 17; Ezek. vii, 10, etc.). It stands side by side with other contemptuous terms in Ezek. xvi, 56; xx, 8, as, for example, שְּכֶקֶת, "filth," or "abomination" (Ezek. vii, 10), and cognate terms. See Dung. May not דל also mean sarabæi, the commonest of Egyptian idols? The sense of dung is appropriate to the dung-barrow, the meaning of rolling is doubtless, for, if the meaning of the verb be retained, we should, in this form, rather expect a passive sense, "a thing rolled," but it may be observed that these grammatical rules of the sense of derivatives are not always to be strictly insisted on, for, Sidon, דַּלְלָה, though held to signify "the place of fishing," is, in the list of the Nephilim, the name of a man, "the fisherman," (A.V. "seaorman") 1 Chron. iv, 17. That this application of the word is used may perhaps be conjectured from the occurrence of דל or דיל, which, if meaning little gods, would aptly describe the pigmy פְּתֵחַ-סֵקְרָרִיס, Ptahe Sokar-Octaris, of Memphis. Ezekiel uses the term וֹלֶל of the idols of Egypt which the Israelites were commanded to put away at or about the time of the Exodus, but did not, and seem to have carried into the Desert, for the same word is used, unqualified by any word to signify any one of the worshiped by them in the Desert (xx, 7, 8, 16, 18, 24); it is, however, apparently employed also for all the idols worshipped in Canaan by the Israelites (ver. 31; xxiii, 37). Sarabæi were so abundant among the Egyptians and Phoenicians that it may be well to warn them that they may not have been employed also in the worship of the Canaanitish false gods; but it cannot be safely supposed, without further evidence, that the idols of Canaan were virtually termed sarabæi. See Brittle.

(ii.) General terms of known signification.—8. דִּבְנָה, d'ben, rendered elsewhere "nought," "vanity," "impotence," "wickedness," "sorcery," etc., and only once "idol" (Isa. lxvi, 3). The primary idea of the root seems to be εὐπροσφέρεσθαι, nothingness, as of breath or vapor; and, by a natural transition, in a moral sense, wickedness in its active form of mischief; and then, as the result, sorrow and trouble. Hence הָרָע denotes a vain, false, wicked thing, and expresses at once the essential nature of idols, and the consequences of their worship. The character of the word may be learnt from its associates. It stands in parallelism with וֹלָל, ephes (Isa. xii, 29), which, after undergoing various modifications, comes at length to signify "nothing," with הָרָע, הָרָע, "breath" or "vapor," itself applied as a term of contempt to the objects of idolatrous reverence (Deut. xxxii, 21; 1 Kings xv, 13; Ps. xxvi, 6; Jer. vii, 19; x, 8); with יָרָע, shadr, "nothingness," "vanity," and with לֹא, lek. "falsehood" (Zech. x, 2); all indicating the utter worthless-

lessness of the idols to whom homage was paid, and the false and delusive nature of their worship. It is employed in an abstract sense, to denote idolatry in general, in 1 Sam. xv, 25. There is much significance in the change of name from Bethel to Beth-aven, the great center of idolatry in Israel (Hos. iv, 15). See Beth-Aven.

4. דִּבְנָה, דִּבְנָה, "filth," "impurity," especially applied, like the cognate הָרָע, הָרָע, to that which produced ceremonial uncleanness (Ezek. xxxvii, 25; Nah. iii, 6), such as food offered in sacrifice to idols (Zech. ix, 7; comp. Acts xv, 20, 29). As referring to the idols themselves, it primarily denotes the obscene rites with which their worship was surrounded; and, hence, by metonymy, is applied both to the objects of worship and also to their worshippers, who partook of the impurity, and thus "became loathsome like their love," the foul Baal-Peor (Hos. ix, 10). See Abomination.

In the same connection must be noticed, though not actually rendered "image" or " idol," פֶּה, פֶּה, "shame," or "shameful thing" (A.V. Ye. 'amer, 8; Hos. ix, 10), applied to Baal or Baal-Peor, as characterizing the obscenity of his worship. See Baal-Peor.

5. יָרָע, יָרָע, "horror" or "terror," and hence an object of horror or terror (Jer. i, 88), in reference either to the hideousness of the idols or to the gross character of their worship. In this respect it is closely connected with—

7. רָעָה, רָעָה, "sheepfold," a "fright," "horror," applied to the idol of Maachah, probably of wood, which Aaz cut down and burned (1 Kings xv, 13; 2 Chron. xv, 16), and which was unquestionably the Phallus, the symbol of the productive power of nature (Movers, Phon. i, 571; Selden, De Dīa Syr. ii, 5), and the nature-goddess Asbe- ra. Allusion is supposed to be made to this in Jer. vi, 5, and Epist. de Phil. 70. In 2 Chron. xxxiv, 15, the Vulg. render "simulacrum Priapi" (comp. Horaeon, "torments", unque maximum formosum"). The Sept. had a different reading, which it is not easy to determine. They translate, in 1 Kings xv, 13, the same word both by הָרָעָה (with which corresponds the Syriac id, "a festival," reading, perhaps, מֶפֶּה, a seraph, as in 2 Kings x, 20; Jer. ix, 2) and sarabæa, while in Chronicles it is סָּךַּבָּה. That the word is used may perhaps be conjectured from the occurrence of רָעָה, which, if meaning little gods, would aptly describe the pigmy פְּתֵחַ-סֵקְרָרִיס, of Memphis. Ezekiel uses the term וֹלָל of the idols of Egypt which the Israelites were commanded to put away at or about the time of the Exodus, but did not, and seem to have carried into the Desert, for the same word is used, unqualified by any word to signify any one of the worshiped by them in the Desert (xx, 7, 8, 16, 18, 24); it is, however, apparently employed also for all the idols worshipped in Canaan by the Israelites (ver. 31; xxiii, 37). Sarabæi were so abundant among the Egyptians and Phoenicians that it may be well to warn them that they may not have been employed also in the worship of the Canaanitish false gods; but it cannot be safely supposed, without further evidence, that the idols of Canaan were virtually termed sarabæi. See Brittle.

We now come to the consideration of those words which more directly apply to the images or idols as the outward symbols of the deity who was worshipped through them.

(i.) Terms indicating the form of idols.—8. דִּבְנָה or דִּבְנָה, dc mel, with which Gesenius compares as cognate מָשָּׂך, מָשָּׂך, and דִּבְנָה, telem, the Lat. simulacrum and Gr. θηματικόν, signifies a "likeness," or "semblance." The Tar- gum in Deut. iv, 16 gives מְשָּׂך, מְשָּׂך, "image," as the equivalent of דִּבְנָה. In Ezek. viii, 3, 5 it is rendered by דִּבְנָה, telem, "image." In the latter passages the Syriac has קְוָצָת, "a statue" (the stàtus of the Septuagint), which more properly corresponds to ματαιότης (see No. 13, below); and in Deut. genis, "kind" (γίγων). The passage in 2 Chron. xxxiiii, 7 is rendered "images of four faces," the latter words representing the one under consideration, instead of the three which Ezek. xxxiii, 18 applies as "carved images," following the Sept. τοῖς ἄνθρωποις. On the whole, the Gr. εἰκὼν of Deut. iv, 16; 2 Chron. xxxiii, 7, and the "simulacrum" of the Vulg. (2 Chron. xxxiii, 15) most nearly resemble the Heb. semel. See Carved.

9. דִּבְנָה, telem (Chald. id., and דִּבְנָה, telem), is by all lexographers, ancient and modern, connected with ד, ד, "falsehood." It is the "image" of God in which man was created (Gen. i, 27; comp. Wisd. ii, 23), distin-
guished from מִדָּמִית, demmith, or "likeness," as the "image" from the "idea" which it represents (Schmidt, De Imag. Dei in Hom. p. 84), though it would be rash to insist upon this distinction. In the N. T. έικόν appears to represent the latter (Col iii. 10; compare the Sept. at Gen. v. 1), as οὐαμοία the former of the two words (Rom. i. 23; viii. 29; Phil. ii. 7), but in Heb. x. 1, έικόν is opposed to κάτα as the substance to the unsubstantial form, of which it is the perfect representative. The Sept. render demmith by οὐαμοίας, οὐαμοία, "image," but in John and Taddem most frequently έικόν, though οὐαμοίας, εἰκὼν, and εἶκος also occur. But whatever abstract term may best define the meaning of τάσις, it is unquestionably used to denote the visible forms of external objects, and is applied to figures of gold and silver (1 Sam. vi. 5; Numb. xxxiii. 52; Dan. iii. 1), such as the golden image of Nebuchadnezzar, as well as to those painted upon walls (Ezek. xxxiii. 14), "image" perhaps most nearly represents it in all passages. Applied to the human countenance (Dan. iii. 19), it signifies the "expression," and corresponds to the idea of Matt. xxviii. 5, though demmith agrees rather with the Platonic usage of the latter word. See GRAVEN.

10. מִדָּמִית, rendered "image" in Job iv. 16; elsewhere "similitude" (Deut. iv. 12), "likeness" (Deut. v. 8),"or shape" would be better. In Deut. iv. 16 it is in parallelism with רָבָּן, tabniḥ, literally "build," hence "plan" or "model" (2 Kings xvi. 10; compare Exod. xx. 4; Numb. xii. 8).

11. מִדָּמִית, ataš, atâb, atāb, eitāb (Jer. xxii. 28), or מַדָּמִית, madām (Isa. xlvii. 5), "a figure," all derived from a root מָדָט, "to work" or "make" (akin to בָּטָה, batâh, and the like), are terms applied to idols as expressing that their origin was due to the labor of man. In this verb its derived senses indicates the sorrow and trouble consequent upon severe labor, but the latter seems to be the radical idea. If the notion of sorrow were most prominent, the words as applied to idols might be compared with what above. Isa. livii. 8 is rendered in the Peshito Syriac "idols" (A. V. "labors"), but the reading was evidently different. In Psa. LXXXIX.

24. מִדָּמִית is "idolatry."

12. מִדָּמִית, tibr, once only applied to an idol (Isa. xvii. 16; Sept. נַכְּלָא, as if מִדָּמִית, igim). The word usually denotes "a pang," but in this instance is probably connected with the roots מִדָּמִית, tibr, and מִדָּמִית, gaddar, and signifies a "sign" or "mark," and hence an "idol."

13. מִדָּמִית, matstebhā, anything set up, a "statue (= מִדָּמִית, netib), Jer. xliii. 18,) applied to a memorial of stones like those erected by Jacob on four several occasions (Gen. xxviii. 18; xxxi. 45; xxxiv. 14, 20) to commemorate a crisis in his life, or to mark the grave of Rachel. Such were the stones set up by Joshua (Josh. iv. 9) after the passage of the Jordan, and at Shechem (xxix. 26), and by Samuel when victorious over the Philistines (1 Sam. vii, 12). When solemnly dedicated they were anointed with oil, and libations were poured upon them. The word is applied to the obelisks which stood at the entrance to the temple of Baal at Heliopolis (Jer. xlix. 13), two of which were a hundred cubits high and eight broad, each of a single stone (Herod. i. 111). It is also used of the statues of Baal (2 Kings iii. 2), whether of stone (2 Kings x. 27) or wood (id. 26), which stood in the innermost recess of the temple at Samaria. The occurrence of Chabab as the name of Baal in the Phoenician and Palmyrene inscriptions in the sense of "Dominus Solaris," and its after application to the statues or columns erected for his worship. Spencer (De Legg. Heb. ii. 25), and after him Michaelis (Suppl. ad Lex. Hebr. s. v.), maintained that it signified statues or columns set up in honor of him and his grandson. The Movers (Phin. i. 441) concludes with good reason that the sun-god Baal and the idol "Chabman" are not essentially different. In his discussion of Chabman...
says, "These images of the fire-god were placed on foreign or non-Israelite altars, in conjunction with the symbols of the nature of Asherah, or ash'taroth (2 Chron. xiv, 3, 5; xxxiv, 4, 7; Isa. xvi, 9; xxvii, 9), as was otherwise usual with Baal and Asherah. They are mentioned with the Asherim, and the latter are coupled with the statues of Baal (1 Kings xiv, 28; 2 Kings xxiii, 14). The echummaim and statues are used promiscuously (compare 2 Kings xxiii, 14, and 2 Chron. xxxiv, 4; 2 Chron. xiv, 3 and 5), but are never spoken of together. Such are the steps by which he arrives at his conclusion. He is supported by the Palmyrene inscription at Oxford, alluded to above, which has been thus rendered: 'This column (なぜ, Chummadnī), and this altar, the sons of Malcho, etc., have erected and consecrated, to Baal and Asherah, or σεραθων καὶ κυρια’ and leaves the word untраналanged in the strange form ἀκι-βατης. From the expressions in Ezek. vi, 4, 6, and Lev. xxvi, 80, it may be inferred that these columns, which perhaps represented a rising flame of fire and stood upon the altar of Baal (2 Chron. xxxiv, 4), were of wood or stone. See ASHTEIA.

15. מְשַׁלָּח, maskitāh, occurs in Lev. xxvi, 1; Num. xxvii, 52; Ezek. xliii, 12: "dovice," most nearly suits all passages (compare Psal. lxxxii, 7; Prov. xvii, 11; xxv, 11). This word has been the fruitful cause of as much dispute as the preceding. The general opinion appears to be that מְשַׁלָּח signifies a stone with figures graven upon it. Ben-Zeb explains it as "a stone with figures or hieroglyphics carved upon it," and so Michaelis; and it is maintained by Movers (Psefib, ii, 100) that the bas-tylos, or columns with painted figures, the "lapides effigii" of Minucius Felix (c. 8), are these "stones of device," and that the characters engraved on them are the ιπα σοσια, or characters sacred to the several deities. The invention of these characters, which is ascribed to Tammuz, he conjectures originated with the Sirene. Genesius explains it as a stone with the image of an idol, Baal or Astarte, and refers to his Mon. Phen. p. 21-24, for others of a similar character. Rashi (on Lev. xxxi, 1) derives it from the root נְשָׁל, "to cover," "because they cover the floor with a pavement of stones." The Targum and Syriac, Lev. xxvi, 1, give "stone of devotion," and the former, in Num. xxxvii, 30, "the stone which is set up for the sacrifices." The Syriac renders "their objects of devotion." For the former the Sept. has λόγος σοσια, and for the latter τας σοσιας αὐτῶν, connecting the word with the root נְשָׁל, "to look," a circumstance which has induced Saalschütz (Mos. Rech. p. 582-585) to conjecture that enen maskith was originally a smooth elevated stone employed for the purpose of obtaining from it a free erect, vi, and of offering prayer in prostration upon it to the deities of heaven. Hence, generally, he concludes it signifies a stone of prayer or devotion, and the "chambers of imagery" of Ezek. viii, 7 are "chambers of devotion." The renderings of the last mentioned passage in the Sept. and Targum are curious as pointing to a various reading, נְשָׁל, or, more probably, נְשָׁל. See IMAGERY.

16. מְשַׁל דֵּש, teraphim. See TERAPEHM.

(ii.) The terms which follow have regard to the material and workmanship of the idol rather than to its character as an object of worship.

17. פָּסֵל, pe'el, usually translated in the Authorized Version "graven or carved image." In two passages it is ambiguously rendered "quarries" (Judg. iii, 19, 26), after the Targum, but there seems to be no reason for departing from the ordinary signification. In the majority of instances the Sept. has χρυσωρί, once χρυσωρία. The verb is employed to denote the finishing which the stone received at the hands of the masons after it had been rough-hewn from the quarries (Exod. xxxiii, 4; 1 Kings v, 32). It is probably a later usage which has applied pesel to a figure cast in metal, as in Isa. xi, 9; xiv, 10. (More probably still, pesel denotes by anticipation the molten image in a later stage, after it had been trimmed into shape by the caster.) These "sculptured" images were apparently of wood, iron, or stone, covered with gold or silver (Deut. vii, 25; Isa. xxx, 22; Hab. ii, 19), the more costly being of solid metal (Isa. xi, 19). They could be burned (Deut. vii, 5; Isa. xiv, 20; 2 Chron. xxxv, 4), or cut down (Deut. vii, 25), or destroyed (2 Chron. xxxiv, 7), or broken in pieces (Isa. xxi, 9). In making them, the skill of the wise iron-smith (Deut. xxvii, 15; Isa. xlv, 20) or carpenter, and of the gold-smith, was employed (Judg. xvii, 5, 4; Isa. xli, 7), the former supplying the rough mass of iron beaten into shape on his anvil (Isa. xxxvii, 12), while the latter overlaid it with plates of gold and silver, probably from Tarshish (Jer. ix, 9), and decorated it with silver chains. The image thus formed received the further adornment of embroidered robes (Ezek. xvi, 18), to which possibly allusion may be made in Isa. iii, 19. Brass and clay were among the materials employed for the same purpose (Dan. ii, 33; v, 23). (Images of glazed pottery have been found in Egypt [Wilkinson, Anc. Eq. iii, 90; comp. Wiss. xix, 8].) A description of the three great images of Babylon on the top of the temple of Belus will be found in Jer. xxxix, 1-3 (comp. Jer. xxxiv, 3). Such images, mentioned in Ezek. xvi, 10-20, that it is only necessary to refer to that passage, and we are at once introduced to the mysteries of idol manufacture, which, as at Ephesus, "brought no small gain unto the craftsmen." See SHEMIK.

18. פָּסֵל or נְשָׁל, nsel, and פָּסֵל, masaketh, are evidently synonymous (Isa. xii, 29; xlvi, 5; Jer. xiv, 14) in later Hebrew, and denote a "molten" image. Masakoth is frequently used in distinction from pesel or pelīn (Deut. xxvii, 15; Judg. xvii, 3, etc.). The golden calf which Aaron made was fashioned with "the girdle," מְשַׁל גֶּרֶב, but it is not quite clear for what purpose the graver was used (Exod. xxxiii, 4). The cheret (comp. καρατταῖα) appears to have been a sharp-pointed instrument, used like the stylos for a writing implement (Isa. viii, 1). Whether then Aaron, by the help of the cheret, gave to the molten mass the shape of a calf, or whether he did it with the help of the girdle, is a question of little importance, as the carving hieroglyphics upon it, has been thought doubtful. The Syr. has ṭāpāh (ὕπαστος), "the mould," for cheret. But the expression פָּסֵל, ray-gater, decides that it was by the cheret, in whatever manner employed, that the shape of a calf was given to the metal. See MOLTE.
IDOLATRY

IDOLATRY is divine honor paid to any created object. It is thus a wider term than image-worship (q. v.). For many of the earlier and more primitive forms of idolatry, see Volbeck, Index Programmatis, p. 108 sq.

We find the idea of idolatry expressed in the O.T. by צב (a lie, Psa. xiv. 5; Amos ii. 4), or נָן (nunnity), and still often by תָּנָא (abomination). In after times the Jews designated it as רֶפֶנִים (foreign worship). Thus we see that it had no name indicative of its nature, for the Biblical expressions are more a monothetic qualification of divine worship than a denunciation of it; the last Hebrew expression, however, shows idolatry as not being of Jewish origin. The word θυσιαστεία in the N.T. is entirely due to the Septuagint, which, wherever any of the heathen deities are mentioned, even though designated in the sacred text only as δεῦτας (nothing), translates by ἱερατεύς, an idol; a practice generally followed by later versions.

A special sort of idolatry, namely, the actual adoration of images (idolatria) thus gave name to the whole species (1 Cor. x. 14; Gal. v. 20; 1 Pet iv. 5). Subsequently the more comprehensive word κακοσεβεία (idolatria) was adopted, which included the adoration of effigies, as of the gods, with sacrifices paid to them; and the serpents (deity ἵππος) besides those due to the statutory art—Herzog.

I. Origin of Idolatry.—In the primeval period man appears to have had not alone a revelation, but also an implanted natural law. Adam and some of his descendants, as the time of the Flood and of the Patriarchs, were held under a revealed system, now usually spoken of as the patriarchal dispensation, and Paul tells us that the nations were under a natural law (Rom. ii. 14, 15). “Man in his natural state must always have had a knowledge of God sufficient for the condition in which he had been placed. Although God ‘times past, suffered all nations [or, rather, all the Gentiles,’ πάσας τὰ ἐθνών] to walk in their own ways, nevertheless he left not himself without witness, in that he did good, and gave us rain from heaven, and fruitful seasons, filling our hearts with food and gladness’ (Acts xiv. 17). For the invisible things of him, from the creation of the world, are clearly seen, being understood by the things that are made, [even] his eternal power and godhead’ (Rom. i. 20). But the people of whom we are speaking ‘changed the glory of the incorruptible God into an image made like to corruptible man, and to birds, and four-footed beasts, and creeping things;’ and worshipped and served every creature as god, for the creature more than the Creator, who is blessed forever’ (Rom. i. 21–25). Thus arose that strange superstition which is known by the term Feticism [or low nature-worship], consisting in the worship of animals, trees, rivers, hills, and stones” (Poole, Genees of The Earth and of Man, 2d ed. p. 160, 161). Paul speaks of those who invented this idolatry as therefore forsaken of God and suffered to sink into the deepest moral corruption (Rom. i. 28). It is remarkable that among highly-civilized nations the converse obtains; moral corruption being very frequently the cause of the abandonment of true religion for infidelity. —Kitto. That theory of human progress which supposes man to have gradually worked his way up from barbaric ignorance of God to a so-called natural religion is contradicted by the facts of Biblical history.

Nothing can be supposed in the Bible as to any antediluvian idolatry. It is, however, a reasonable supposition that in the general corruption before the Flood idolatry was practised. There is no un doubted trace of heathen divinities in the names of the antediluvians; but these apparent discrepancies may be accounted for in the post-diluvial worship of some of the antediluvian patriarchs. It has been supposed that the Σέτ or Σύρρη of the Egyptian Pantheon is the Hebrew Seth. The Cainite Enoch was possibly commemorated as Annocus; or Numacus at Iconium, though, this name being

When the process of adorning the image was completed, it was placed in a temple or shrine appointed for it (οἰκία, Epist. Jer. 12, 19; ἱερατεύς, Wisd. xiii. 15; τιθήμιος, 1 Cor. viii. 10; see Stanley's note on the latter passage). In Wisd. xiii. 15, οἰκία is thought to be used contemptuously, as in Tibulli i. 10, 15, 20, 'Cum pauperes milui Stabat in cæstu lignos aede devo' (Fritsche and Grimm, Handb.), but the passage quoted is by no means a good illustration. From these temples the idols were sometimes carried in procession (Epist. Jer. 4, 26) on festival days. Their priests were maintained from the idolatry treasury, and feasted upon the meat offerings brought to them (Bel for the Dragon, 3, 13). These sacrificial beasts formed an important part of the idolatrous ritual, and were a great stumbling-block to the early Christian converts. They were to the heathen, as Prof. Stanley has well observed, what the observance of circumcision and the Mosaic ritual were to the Jewish converts, and it was for this reason that Paul especially directed his attention to the subject, and laid down the rules of conduct contained in his first letter to the Corinthians (vii-x). See Idolatry.
identified with Enoch, the reference may be to Enoch of the line of Seth. It is reasonable to suppose that the worship of these deities, though Abrahamic, stemmed from the Flood, for it is unlikely that it would have been instituted after it. Some Jewish writers, grounding their theory on a forced interpretation of Gen. iv, 26, assign to Enoch, the son of Seth, the unenviable notoriety of having been the first to pay divine honors to the host of demons which existed in his infancy, and was the traditional tree beneath which Abraham dwelt. It was regarded with great reverence, and was made an object of worship by the heathen. Modern Palestine abounds with sacred trees. They are found "all over the land covered with bits of clay." From the grottos of the villages, hang up as acknowledgments, or as deprecatory signals and charms; and we find beautiful clumps of oak-trees sacred to a kind of beings called Jacob's "daughters." (Thomson, *The Land and the Book*, ii, 151.)

See Grove. As a symptom of the rapidly degenerating spirit, the oak of Shechem, which stood in the sanctuary of Jehovah (Josh. xxiv, 26), and beneath which Joshua set up the stone of witness, perhaps appears in Judges (ix, 37) as "the oak (not "plain" as in the A. V.) of soothsayers" or "augurs." This, indeed, may be a relic of the ancient Canaanitish worship; an older name associated with idolatry, while the remaining Hebrews were commanded and endeavored to eliminate (Deut. xii, 3).

2. Shamanism, or the magical side of fetishism, the worship of the sun, moon, and stars, and of the supposed powers of nature. The old religion of the Semitic races consisted, in the opinion of Movers (Phön., i, c. 5), in the deification of the powers and laws of nature; these powers being considered as independent of and not derivations from one supreme and all-ruling being. In most instances the two ideas were co-existent. The deity, following human analogy, was conceived as male and female: the one representing the active, the other the passive principle of nature; the former the source of spiritual, the latter of physical life. The interchange of the attributes of the one to the other resulted either in their mystical conjunction in the hermaphrodite, as the Persian Mithra and Phoenician Baal, or the two combined to form a third, which symbolized the essential unity of both. (This will explain the occurrence of the name of Baal with the masculine and feminine articles in the Sept.; comp. Hos. xi, 2; Jer. xix, 5; Rom. xi, 4. Philochorus, quoted by Macrobius [Sat. iii, 8], says that men and women sacrificed to Venus or the Moon, with the garments of the sexes interchanged, because she was the mediator between earth and heaven [see Selden, *De Dies Syriae*, ii, 2]. Hence *Luna* and *Luna*.) With these two supreme beings all other beings are identical; so that in different nations the same nature-worship appears under different forms, representing the various aspects under which the idea of the power of nature is presented. The sun and moon were early selected as outward symbols of this all-pervading power, and the worship of the heavenly bodies was not only the most ancient, but the most prevalent system of idolatry. Taking its rise, according to a probable hypoth-


cis, in the plains of Chaldea, it spread through Egypt, Greece, Scythia, and even Mexico and Central America, and it is worthy of notice that even the religion of remote India presupposes a grand symbolic representation of the divine by the worship of these great physical pow-


er (compare *Lassen, Ind. Alterth.,* i, 706 sq.; Roth, *Geschichte der Religion*, ii, 3). See *Baal*. It was regarded as an offence amenable to the civil authorities in the days of Job (xxxi, 26—28), and one of the statues of the Mosaic law was directed against its observance (Deut. iv, 19; xvii, 3); the former referring to the star-worship of Arabia, the latter to the concrete form in which it appeared among the Syrians and Persians.

It is probable that the Israelites learned their first lessons in sun-worship from the Egyptians, in whose religious system that luminary, as Osiris, held a prominent place. The city of On (Bethshemesh or Heliopolis) took its name from his temple (Jer. xiii, 19), and the
wife of Joseph was the daughter of his priest (Gen. xlii. 46). She interceded for him under the title of "Lord of heaven," רֵעֹת הָאֱלֹהִים רָאוּאָלְוָא דָּוִד הָאֱלֹהִים, Rual-edahaym (יוֹדָאָבֹא, acc. to Sanchoniathon in Philo Byblius), and Adon, the Greek Adonis, and the Tammuz of Ezekiel (viii. 14). See TAMMUZ. As Malech or Milcom, the sun was worshipped by the Ammonites, and as Cheemos by the Moabites. The Hadad of the Syrians is the same deity, whose name is traceable in Benhadad, Hadad, Adal, Haddad, Hadad or Hadad, the Edomite. The Assyrian Bel or Belus is another form of Baal. According to Philo (De Vit. Cont. § 3), the Essenes were wont to pray to the sun at morning and evening (Joseph. War, ii, 8, 5). By the latter kings of Judah, sacred horses and chariots were dedicated to the sun-god, as by the Persians (2 Kings xxiii, 11; 1 Chron. xxix. 26, pt. i, bk. ii, c. xi; Seelen, De Dis Syr. ii, 8), to march in procession and greet his rising (R. Solomon Jarchi on 2 Kings xxiii, 11). The Massagetae offered horses in sacrifice to him (Strabo, xi, p. 518), on the principle enunciated by Macrobius (Sat. i, 14, 9), "the sun is in like," "similis simila gaudent;" compare Herod. i, 216, and the custom was common to many nations.

The moon, worshipped by the Phoenicians under the name of Astarte (Lucian, De Dea Syræa, c. 4), or Baalat, the passive power of nature, as Baal was the active (Upper Asatyr or Assyro-Persian), and was equally known to the Phoenicians as Asheroth or Ashthoreth, the tutelary goddess of the Zidonians, appears early among the objects of Israelite idolatry. But this Syro-Phoenician worship of the sun and moon was of a grosser character than the pure star-worship of the Magi, which Movers distinguishes as Upper Asiatic or Assyro-Persian, and was equally removed from the Chaldean astrology and Zabianism of later times. The former of these systems tolerated no images or altars, and the contemplation of the heavenly bodies from elevated spots constituted the greater part of its ritual.

But, though we have no positive historical account of star-worship before the Assyrian period, we may infer that it was early practised in a concrete form among the Israelites from the allusions in Amos v, 26, and Acts vii, 42, 43. Even in the desert they are said to have been given up to worship, "the host of heaven, while Chaim and Remphan, or Rephan, have on various grounds been identified with the planet Saturn. It was to counteract idolatry of this nature that the stringent law of Deut. xvii, 3 was enacted, and with a view to withdrawing the Israelites from undue contemplation of the material universe, Jehovah, the God of Israel, is constantly placed before them as Jehovah Sabaoth, Jehovah of Hosts, the king of heaven (Dan. iv, 35, 37), to whom the heaven and heavens of heavens belong (Deut. x, 14). However this may be, Movers (Phœn. i, 65, 66) contends that the later star-worship, introduced by Ahaz and followed by Manasseh, was purer and more spiritual in its nature than the Israelitish-Phoenician worship of the heavenly bodies under symbolic forms, as Baal and Asherah; and that it was not idolatry in the same sense that the latter was, but of a simply contemplative character. He is supported, to some extent, by the fact that we find no mention of images of the sun or moon or the host of heaven, but merely of vessels devoted to their service (2 Kings xxiii, 4). But there is no reason to believe that the divine honours paid to the "Queen of Heaven" (Jer. vii, 18; xlix, 19; or, as others render, "the frame of heaven," שֹׁמַר הַשָּׁמַיִם; LXX, ἡνίκα τοῦ οὐρανοῦ) were representative of a sun-cult, from image-worship. Mr. Layard (Nin. ii, 451) discovered a bas-relief at Nimroud which represented four idols carried in procession by Assyrian warriors. One of these figures he identifies with Hera, the Assyrian Astarte, represented with a star on her head (Amos v, 25), and with the "queen of heaven," who appears on the rock-tablets of Pterium "standing erect on a lion, and crowned with a tower, or mural coronet," as in the Syrian temple of Hierapolis (ib. p. 456; Lucian, De Dea Syræa, 81, 32). But, in his remarks upon a figure which resembles the Rhine of Diodorus, Layard adds, "The representation of a human woman, and of celestial bodies, themselves originally but a type, was a corruption which appears to have crept at a later period into the mythology of Assyria; for, in the more ancient bas-reliefs, figures with caps surmounted by stars do not occur, and the sun, moon, and planets stand alone" (ib. p. 457, 458). The Babylonian text of Job xxxii, 31, 32, and the later literature of the time, seem to allow any inference to be drawn as to the mysterious influences which were held by the old astrologers to be exercised by the stars over human destiny, nor is there sufficient evidence to connect them with anything more recondite than the astronomical knowledge of the period. The sun was said to be the emanation of the Moon, of which the Deborah's chant of triumph, "the stars from their highways warred with Sisera" (Judg. v. 20). In the later times of the monarchy, Massaloth, the planets, or the zodiacal signs, received, next to the sun and moon, their share of popular adoration (2 Kings xxiii, 5); and the history of idolatry among the Hebrews shows at all times an intimate connection between the delification of the heavenly bodies and the superstition which watched the clouds for signs, and used divination and enchantments. It was but a step from such culture of the idle powers to the worship of God and Meni, Babylonian divinities of Venus and Mercury or the moon, or the goddess of luck or fortune. Under the latter aspect the moon was reverence by the Egyptians (Macrobi. Sat. i, 19), and the name Baal-Gad is possibly an example of the manner in which the worship of the planet Jupiter, as the bringer of luck, was grafted on the old faith of the Phoenicians. The false gods of the colonists of Samaria were probably connected with Eastern astrology: Atrammelech Movers regards as the sun-fire— the solar Mars, and Anammelech the solar Saturn (Phœn. i, 410, 411). The Vulg. rendering of Prov. xxvi, 8, "Sicur qui mititur Mercurium..." foliates the Midrash on the passage quoted by Jarchi, and requires merely a passing notice (see Selden, De Dis Syræa, ii, 15; Maim. de Idol. iii, 2; Buxtorf, Lex. Talm. s. v. מְדִינָא). 4. Hero-worship, the worship of deceased ancestors or leaders of a nation. Of pure hero-worship among the Semitic races we find no trace. Moses, indeed, seems to have entertained some dim apprehension that his countrymen might, after his death, pay him more honors than were due to man, and the anticipation of this led him to review his own conduct in terms of strong repugnation (Deut. iv, 21, 22). The expression in Ps. cxi, 28, "The sacrifices of the dead," is in all probability a reference to hero-worship, and is constantly practiced by the Papuans as a means of escape from the general practice due to Greek influence. The Rabbinical commentators discover in Gen. xlviii, 16 an allusion to the worshipping of angels (Col. ii, 18), while they defend their ancestors from the charge of regarding them in any other light than mediators, or intercessors with God (Lewis, Orig. Hebr. v, 3). It is needless to add that their inference and apology are equally groundless. With like probability has been advanced the theory of the demon-worship of the Hebrews, the only foundation for it being two highly poetical passages (Deut. xxxii, 17; Ps. cxi, 37). It is possible that the Persian duality is hinted at in Isa. xxiv, 9.

5. Idolatry, the worship of abstractions or mental qualities, such as justice, a system never found unmixed. This constituted the mythology of the Greeks and Romans, as also of the Scandinavarians. See Muth.

III. Idolatry of certain ancient Heathen Nations in Detail.—All idolatry is in its nature heathenish, and it has in all ages been a characteristic mark of heathendom, so that to the present day the vivid description of Rom. i. remains the most striking portrature of heathenism. I proceed to consider the heathen nations in review only of those early nations whose contact with the Hebrew race was the means of the importation of idolatry among the chosen people. See Polytheism.

1. Mepopatamian Mythology. The original idolatrous
condition of the kindred of Abraham (q.v.) himself in the great plain of Aram is distinctly alluded to in Judg. xxi, 2. According to Rawlinson (Essay in his Herod.), the Pantheons of Babylon and Nineveh, though originally dissimilar in the names of the divinities, cannot as yet be treated separately. The principal god of the Assyrians was Assur, a deity of the sun, whose name is read II or Ra. The special attributes of Assur were sovereignty and power, and he was regarded as the special patron of the Assyrians and their kings. It is the Semitic equivalent of the Hamitic or-Semitic Ra, which suggests connection with Egypt, although there is no reason to suppose that the same name may perhaps be traced in the probably Canaanite gods. Next to Assur or II was a triad, consisting of Anu, who appears to have corresponded to Pluto, a divinity whose name is doubtful, corresponding to Jupiter, and the name of the Negeve, whose fetishism corresponds perfectly with this low nature-worship of the ancient Egyptians.

Connected with fetishism was the local character of the religion. Each nome, city, town, and probably village, had its god. Originally, the name of the god was associated with the name of the town or village; but in the later periods the name of the gods was due to the importance of their cities than any powers or qualities they were supposed to have. For a detailed account of the Egyptian deities, with illustrative cuts, see Kitto's Pictorial Bible, note on Deut. iv. 16; compare Also Egypt.

The Egyptian Pantheon shows three distinctive elements. Certain of the gods are only personifications connected with low nature-worship. Others, the great gods, are of Shemitic origin, and are connected with high nature-worship, though showing traces of the worship of ancestors. In addition, there are certain personifications of abstract ideas. The first of these classes is evidently the result of an attempt to connect the old low nature-worship with some higher system. The second is a form of nature-worship with which we ultimately formed a part. The last class appears to be that of later invention, and to have had its origin in an endeavor to construct a philosophical system.

In addition to these particulars of the Egyptian religion, it is important to notice that it comprised very remarkable doctrines. Man was held to be a responsible being, whose future after death depended upon his actions done while on earth. He was to be judged by Osiris, ruler of the West, or unseen world, and either rewarded with felicity or punished with torment. Whether these future states of happiness or misery were held to be of eternal duration is not certain, but there is little doubt that the Egyptians believed in the immortality of the soul.

The religion of the Shepherds, or Hyksos, is not so distinctly known to us. It is, however, clear from the monuments that their chief god was Set, or Suteh, and we learn from a papyrus that one of the Shepherd-kings, Apepi, probably Manetho's "Apophis," established the worship of Set in his dominions, and revereenced no other god, raising a great temple to him in Zaan, or Avaris. Set continued to be worshipped by the Egyptians until the time of the 22nd dynasty, when we lose all trace of him on the monuments. At this period, or afterwards, his figure was effaced in the inscriptions. The change took place long after the expulsion of the Hyksos; and it appears to be the result of a change in the dynasties, which was probably of Assyrian or Babylonian origin; it is, therefore, rather to be considered as a result of the influence of the Median doctrine of Ormuzd and Ahirman than as due to the Egyptian hatred of the foreigners and all that concerned them. Besides Set, other foreign divinities were worshipped in Egypt—the god Renep, the godesses Ken, or Keter, Ana, and...
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ASTARTA. All these divinities, except Astarta, as to whom we have no particular information, are treated by the Egyptians as powers of destruction and war, as Set was considered the personification of physical evil. Set was always identified by the Egyptians with Baal; we do not know whether he was worshipped in Egypt before the Shepherd-period, but it is probable that he was. His worship in Egypt was probably never reduced to a system. What we know of it shows no regularity, and it is not unlike the imitations of the Egyptian idols made by Phoenician artists, probably as representations of Phoenician divinities. The gods of the Hyksos are foreign objects of worship in an Egyptian setting. See Hyksos.

8. Idolatry of Canaan and the adjoining Countries. The centre of the idolatry of the Palestinian races is to be sought for in the religion of the Rephaimites and the Canaanites. We can distinctly connect the worship of Baal and Ashtoreth with the earliest kind of idolatry; and, having thus established a centre, we can understand how, for instance, the same infernal rites were celebrated to the Ammonitic Molech and the Carthaginian Baal. The most important document for the idolatry of the Hittites is the treaty concluded between the branches of the Hittite confederacy at Ben-Hor, and the Ammonites. From this we learn that Suwekh (or Set) and Astartat were the chief divinities of these Hittites, and that they also worshipped the mountains and rivers and the winds. The Suwekh of several forts are also specified. See Hittites. Set is known from the Egyptian inscriptions as Baal used in the two chief divinities we discover Baal and Ashtoreth, the only Canaanite divinities known to be mentioned in Scripture. The local worship of different forms of Baal well agrees with the low nature-worship with which it is found to have prevailed. Both are equally mentioned in Scripture, and thus the peculiar contemporary worship of Baal-ben-hur, and Mount Hermon itself seems to have been worshipped as Baal-Hermon, while the low nature-worship may be traced in the reverence for groves, and the connection of the Canaanite religion with hills and trees. The strongest feature of this system was the sacrifice of children by their parents—a feature that shows the origin of at least two of its offshoots.

The Bible does not give a very clear description of Canaanite idolatry. As an abominable thing, to be rooted out and cast into oblivion, nothing is needlessly said of it. The opposition of Baal, ruler, or possessor, of Mount Hermon, implies the divinity of his worshipers, worshipped Baal-ben-hur, and Mount Hermon itself seems to have been worshipped as Baal-Hermon, while the low nature-worship may be traced in the reverence for groves, and the connection of the Canaanite religion with hills and trees. The strongest feature of this system was the sacrifice of children by their parents—a feature that shows the origin of at least two of its offshoots.
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Ba'al-Peor, which would not have been repugnant to the pagan Arabs; the latter finds some support in the name Shittim, the accacias, as though the place had its name from some acacias sacred to Baal, and, moreover, we have no certain instance of the application of the name of Baal to any non-Canaanitish divinity. Had such vile worship in the wilderness of Sin proceeded from the Sinaitic Canaanites, and the Habnbal of the Carthaginians, the identity of the religious system of the two nations, as widely distinct in the time of their existence as in their geographical position" (Nisene, ii, 490). The hint which he has given can be but briefly followed out here. Traces of the sun-worship of the ancient Canaanites in the nomenclature of their country. Beth-Shemesh, "house of the sun;" En-Shemesh, "spring of the sun;" Ir-Shemesh, "city of the sun," whether they be the original Canaanitish names or their Hebrew renderings, attest the reverence paid to the source of light and heat, the symbol of the fertilizing power of nature. Samson, the Hebrew national hero, took his name from the same luminary, and was born in a mountain village above the modern 'Ain Shems (En-Shemesh: Thomson, The Land and the Book, ii, 361). The name of Baal, the sun-god, is one of the most common occurrences in compound words, and is associated with the Canaanitish Ca-phecur-Dagon, near Jamnia, and Beth-Dagon, the latter applied to two places, one in Judah and the other in Asher. The derivation of the name Dagon, דגון, as that of a fish-god, is from דג, a fish. Gesenius considers it a diminutive, "little fish," used by way of endearment and honor (Thes. s. v.), but this is surely hazardous. Dagon was represented as a man with the tail of a fish. There can be no doubt that he was connected with the Canaanitish system, as Derceto or Atargatis, the same as Ashurtho, was worshipped under a like mixed shape at Ashkelon (אשקלון) περισσὡν εκεί γενώσας, τὁ ε ἐλευθεράν εἰς ὅποιον, Diod. Sic. ii, 4). In form he is the same as the Assyrian god supposed to correspond to the planet Saturn. The house of Dagon at Gaza, which Samson overthrew, must have been very large for about 3000 men and women then assembled on its roof. It had two principal, if not only, pillars in the midst, between which Samson was placed and was seen by the people on the roof. The inner portion of some of the ancient Egyptian temples consisted of a hypostyle hall, supported by two or more pillars, and inner chambers. The overthrow of these pillars would bring down the stone roof of the hall, and destroy all persons beneath or upon it, without necessarily overthrowing the side-walls.

The idolatry of the Phoenicians is not spoken of in the Bible. From their inscriptions and the statements of profane authors we learn that this nation worshipped Baal and Ashtoreth. The details of their worship will be spoken of in the article PHOENICIA.

Baal, as a sun-god, appears in a few places in Scripture. Tammuz, whom the women of Israel lamented, is no doubt Adonis, whose worship implies that of Astarte or Ashtoreth. Rimmon, who appears to have been the chief divinity of the Syrian kings rule owing to Damascus, may, if his name signifies high (from דָּבָשׁ, be a local form of Baal, who, as the sun-god, had a temple at the great Syrian city Heliopolis, now called Baalbek.

The book of Job, which, whatever its date, represents a primitive state of society, speaks of cosmic worship as though it was practiced in his country, Idumea or northern Arabia. "If I beheld a sun when it shined, or a splendid moon progressing, and my heart were secretly enjoined or even mainly derived from the Canaanitish source. At Ekron, Baal-zebub was worshipped, and had a temple, to which Ahaziah, the wicked son of Ahaz, sent to inquire. This name means either the lord of the fly, or Baal the fly. It is generally held that he was worshipped as a driver-away of flies, but we think it is more probable that some venerous fly was sacred to him. The use of the term Baal is indicative of a connection with the Canaanitish system. The national divinity of the Philistines seems, however, to have been Dagon, to whom there were temples at Gaza and at Ashdod, and the general character of whose worship is evident from the words, and is associated with the Canaanitish Ca-phecur-Dagon, near Jamnia, and Beth-Dagon, the latter applied to two places, one in Judah and the other in Asher. The derivation of the name Dagon, דגון, as that of a fish-god, is from דג, a fish. Gesenius considers it a diminutive, "little fish," used by way of endearment and honor (Thes. s. v.), but this is surely hazardous. Dagon was represented as a man with the tail of a fish. There can be no doubt that he was connected with the Canaanitish system, as Derceto or Atargatis, the same as Ashurtho, was worshipped under a like mixed shape at Ashkelon (אשקלון) περισσὡν εκεί γενώσας, τὁ ε ἐλευθεράν εἰς ὅποιον, Diod. Sic. ii, 4). In form he is the same as the Assyrian god supposed to correspond to the planet Saturn. The house of Dagon at Gaza, which Samson overthrew, must have been very large for about 3000 men and women then assembled on its roof. It had two principal, if not only, pillars in the midst, between which Samson was placed and was seen by the people on the roof. The inner portion of some of the ancient Egyptian temples consisted of a hypostyle hall, supported by two or more pillars, and inner chambers. The overthrow of these pillars would bring down the stone roof of the hall, and destroy all persons beneath or upon it, without necessarily overthrowing the side-walls.
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goddesse of fortune, and identical with Gain (Hesodex. s. v.). But there are fragments of ancient idolatry in other names in which it is not so palpable. Ishbosheth is identical with Eshbaal, and Jerubbesheth with Jerubbaal, and Mephibosheth and Meribaal are but two names for one person (comp. Jer. xi. 15). The worship of the Syrian Rimmon appears in the names Hadadrimmon, Rimmon, and Tabrimmon; and if, as some suppose, it be derived from הָרָמִים, רָמִים, "a pomegranate-tree," we may connect it with the towns of the same name in Judah and Benjamin, with En-Rimmon and the prevailing tree-worship. It is impossible to pursue this investigation to any length: the hints which have been thrown out are more suggestive. See each of these names in its place.

5. Idolatrous Images.—Mountains and high places were chosen spots for offering sacrifice and incense to idols (1 Kings xi. 7; xiv. 25), and the retirement of gardens and the thick shade of woods offered great attractions to their worshippers (2 Kings xviii. 4; Isa. i. 29; Hos. iv. 13). It was the ridge of Carmel which Elijah selected as the scene of his contest with the priests of Baal, fighting with them the battle of Jehovah as it were on their own ground. See Carmel. Carmel was regarded by the Roman historians as a sacred mountain by the Jews (Tacitus, Hist. iv. 79; Suetonius, Vesp. 7). The host of heaven was worshipped on the houseset (2 Kings xxiii. 12; Jer. xix. 3; xxxix. 29; Zeph. i. 5). In describing the sun-worship of the Nabataeans, Strabo (xvi. 764) mentions two characters which strikingly illustrate the worship of Baal. They built their altars on the roofs of houses, and offered on them incense and libations daily. On the wall of his city, in the sight of the besieging armies of Israel and Edom, the king of Moab offered his eldest son as a burnt-offering. The Persians, who worshipped the sun under the name of Mithra (Strabo, xv. 792), sacrificed on an elevated spot, but bare no altars or images. See Mount.

The priests of the false worship are sometimes designated Chemarin, a word of Syriac origin, to which different meanings have been assigned. It is applied to the non-Levitical priests worshippers (2 Kings xviii. 4; Isa. i. 29; Hos. iv. 13) as well as to the priests of the calves (Hos. x. 5); and the corresponding word is used in the Peshito (Judg. xviii. 30) of Jonathan and his descendants, priests to the tribe of Dan, and in the Targum of Onkelos (Gen. xlvi. 22) of the priests of Egypt. The Babbis followed by the Gezerans, have derived it from a root signifying "to be black," and without any authority assert that the name was given to idolatrous priests from the black vestments which they wore. But while these were distinctive color in the priestly garments of all nations from India to Gaul, and black was only worn when they sacrificed to the subterranean gods (Bühl, Symb. ii. 87, etc.). That a special dress was adopted by the Baal-worshippers, as well as by the false prophets (Zech. xiii. 4), is evident from 2 Kings x. 22 (where the rendering should be "the apparel"): the vestments were kept in an apartment of the idol temple, under the charge of one of the inferior priests. Micaiah's Levite was provided with appropriate rods (Judg. xvi. 11). The "foreign apparel" mentioned in Zeph. i. 8, doubtless refers to a similar dress, adopted by the Israelites in defiance of the sacrificial law in Num. xv. 38, 39. See Carmel.

In addition to the priests, there were other persons intimately connected with idolatrous rites, and the impurities from which they were inseparable. Both men and women consecrated themselves to the service of idols: the former as הַנְשָׁהּ, kedeshim, for which there is reason to believe the A.V. (Deut. xxiii. 17, etc.) has not given too harsh an equivalent; the latter as נְשֵׂאָה, kedeshbim, who wore priestly from the Assyrians (2 Kings xxiii. 7, and resembled the ḫraen of Corinth, of whom Strabo (vii. 578) says there were more than a thousand attached to the temple of Aphrodite. Egyptian priests consecrated themselves to Isis (Juvenal, vi. 487; ix. 22-24). The same class of women existed among the Phoenixians, Armenians, Lydians, and Babylonians (Herod. i. 90, 199; Strabo, xii. p. 532; Epist. of Jerome, v. 49). They are distinguished from the public prostitutes (Hos. iv. 14), and associated with the performances of sacred rites, just as in Strabo (xii. p. 569) we find the two classes co-existing at Comana, the Corint of Pontus, much frequented by pilgrims to the shrine of Aphrodite. The wealth thus obtained flowed into the treasuries of the temple, and supplied the means to making the service in Deut. xxiii. 18 is directed. Dr. Maitland, anxious to defend the moral character of Jewish women, has with much ingenuity attempted to show that a meaning foreign to their true sense has been attached to the words above mentioned; and that, though stronger or more positive than the language in which they indicate such foul corruption (Essay on False Worship). But if, as Movers, with great appearance of probability, has conjectured (Phon. i. 679), the class of persons alluded to was composed of foreigners, the Jewish women in this respect need no such advocacy. That such customs may remain in foreign nations for ages, this evidence to prove (Lucian, De Syra Dea, c. 5); and from the juxtaposition of prostitution and the idolatrous rites against which the laws in Lev. xix. are aimed, it is probable that, next to its immorality, one main reason why it was visited with such stringency was its connection with idolatry (compare 1 Cor. vi. 9). See Harlot.

But besides these accessories there were the ordinary rites of worship which idolatrous systems had in common with the religion of the Hebrews. Offering burnt sacrifices to the local gods (2 Kings x. 17), burning incense in their honor (1 Kings xi. 8), and bowing down in worship before their images (1 Kings xix. 18) were the chief parts of their ritual, and, from their very analogy with the ceremonies of true worship, were more seductive than the grosser forms. Nothing can be more assuredly associated with idolatry from which these ceremonies were denounced by Hebrew law. Every detail of idol-worship was made the subject of a separate enactment, and many of the laws, which in themselves seem trivial and almost absurd, receive from this point of view their true significance. We are told by Macrobius (Sat. iii. 8) that the prohibition against sowing a field with mingled seed, and wearing garments of mixed material, were directed against the practices of idolaters, who attributed a kind of magical influence to the mixture (Lev. xix. 19; Spencer, De Leg. Hebr. ii. 19). Such, too, were the restrictions of the sexes should be interchanged (Deut. xxiii. 5; Maimonides, De Idol. xii. 9). According to Macrobius (Sat. iii. 8), other Asiaties, when they sacrificed to their Venus, changed the dress of the sexes. The priests of Cybele appeared in women's clothes, and used to mutilate themselves (Creuzer, Symb. ii. 34, 42): the same custom was observed "by the Ithymball in the rites of Bacchus, and by the Athenians in their Ascophoria" (Young, Idol. Cor. in Rel. i. 105; comp. Lucian, De Dea Syyra, c. 15). To preserve the Hebrews from contamination, they were prohibited for three years after their conquest of Canaan from entering the fruit-trees of the land, whose cultivation had been attended with magical rites (Lev. xix. 23). They were forbidden to "round the corner of the head," and to "mar the corner of the beard" (Lev. xix. 27), as the Arabians did in honor of their gods (Herod. iii. 8, iv. 175). Herod. iii. 8, 175, of the worship of the "[holy] tree," is especially applied to idolatry (Jer. ix. 26; xxiii. 23). Spencer (De Leg. Hebr. ii. 9, § 2) explains the law forbidding the offering of honey (Lev. ii. 11) as intended to oppose an idolatrous practice. Strabo describes the Magi as offering in all their sacrifices libations of oil mixed with honey and milk (xv. p. 788). Offerings in which honey was an ingredient were made.
to the inferior deities and the dead (Homer, Od. x, 519; Porph. De Anfr. Nymph. c. 17). So also the practice of eating the flesh of sacrifices "over the blood" (Lev. xix, 26; Ezek. xxxii, 25, 26) was, according to Maimonides, common among the Zabils. Spencer gives a daemoniac spirit the name of "Blood." The law of divination, and divination of the worst kind, a species of necromancy by which they attempted to raise the spirits of the dead (comp. Horace, Sat., 1, 8). There are supposed to be allusions to the practice of necromancy in Isa. lxv, 4, or, at any rate, to superstitions in connection herewith in Isa. ix, 19, and there is no strict distinction between the two. The law of one tree grown upon another was forbidden, because among idolaters the process was accompanied by gross obscenity (Maimon. Mor. Nef. c. 12). Cutting the flesh for the dead (Lev. xix, 28; 1 Kings xvii, 28), and making a baldness between the eyes (Deut. xiv, 1), were associated with idolatrous rites, the latter being a custom among the Syrians (Sir G. Wilkinson in Rawlinson's Herod. ii, 138 note). The thrice-repeated and much-vaunted passage, "Thou shalt not seethe a kid in his mother's milk" (Exod. xxiii, 19; xxxiv, 26; Deut. xiv, 21), interpreted by some as a protest of humanity, is explained by Codrus to be worth in a very different manner. He quotes from a Karaite commentary which he had seen in MS.: "It was a custom of the ancient heathens, when they had gathered in their fruit, to take a kid and boil it in the dam's milk, and then in a magical way go about and eat thereof, and the beast is preserved and the greatest good is reaped, and it is caught in the网, and dispersed and the fruit ripens and the grain is produced, and the king of holy things is preserved, and the gods and the stills." (Exod. xvi, 31). The laws which regulate clean and unclean meats (Lev. xx, 23-26) may be considered both as a sanitary regulation and also as having a tendency to separate the Israelites from the surrounding idolatrous nations. It was with the same object, in the opinion of Michaelis, that while in the wilderness they were prohibited from killing any animal for food without first offering it to Jehovah (Laws of Moses, art. 208). The mouse, one of the unclean animals of Leviticus (xi, 29), was sacrificed by the ancient Magi (Isag. lxvi, 17; Movers, Phain. i, 219). It may have become some sort of a species of humanity, by which was meant that of "eating the flesh of the Egyptian deity, which gave rise to the prohibition in Deut. xxi, 18. Movers says (i, 404) the dog was offered in sacrifice to Moloch, as swine to the moon and Dionysus by the Egyptians, who afterwards ate of the flesh (Herod. iii, 47; Isa. lv, 4.) Eating of the things offered to Moloch (Lev. xxv, 27) was offered to Moloch (Lev. xxiv, 12; xxxii, 6; xxix, 15; Numh. xxv, 2, 5, etc.) Among the Persians the victim was eaten by the worshippers, and the soul alone left for the god (Strabo, xv, 782). Hence it is that the idolatry of the Jews in worshipping other gods is so often described евочко as being under the notion of feasting. Isa. vii, 7. "Upon a high and lofty mountain thou hast set thy bed, and thither wendest thou up to offer sacrifice; for in those ancient times they were not wont to sit at feasts, but lie down on beds or couches." Ezek. xxiii, 41: "Amos li, 8. "They laid the Book i, 133") The law which forbade the living by every altar, i.e. laid themselves down to eat of the sacrifice that was offered on the altar; compare Ezek. xviii, 11 (Cudworth, ut supra, c. 1; comp. 1 Cor. xii, 10). The Israelites were forbidden "to print any mark upon them" (Lev. xix, 28), because it was a custom of idolatry and marked the flesh of the deity they worshipped, as the ivy-leaf of Bacchus (Pisc. ii, 29). According to Lucian (De Dea Syria, 59), all the Assyrians wore marks of this kind on their necks and wrists (comp. Isa. xiv, 5; 1 cor, vi, 17; Rev. xiv, 1, 11). Many other practices of false worship are alluded to. And many of these were not the introduction of heathenism, but grew out of theCanaanites through whose land they passed, and the animists
and charms which were worn as the appendages of their worship (Gen. xxxv, 2, 4). See Jacob.

During their long residence in Egypt, the country of symbolism, they deified themselves with the idols of the land so as to reconcile the tenets of the God of Abraham, iv, 14; Ezek. xxv, 7). To these gods Moses, as the herald of Jehovah, flung down the gauntlet of defiance (Kurtz, Gesch. d. Alt. B. ii, 59), and the plagues of Egypt amote their symbols (Num. xxxii, 4). Yet, with the memory of their deliverance fresh in their minds, their lead and derision the Israelites adapted the song in which they might worship the God who had brought them up out of Egypt (Exod. xxxiiii). The Is-raelites, as dwellers in the most outlying and separate tract of the Semitic part of Lower Egypt, are more likely to have followed the corruptions of the shepherds' strange, than those of the Egyptians, more especially as, saving Joseph, Moses, and not improbably Aaron and Miriam, they seem to have almost universally preserved the manners of their former wandering life. There is a trace of Egyptian influence beyond that seen in the names of Moses and Miriam perhaps of Aaron also, for the only other name besides the former two that is certainly Egyptian, and may be reasonably referred to this period, that of Harnepher, evidently the Egyptian har-nephu, "Horus the good," in the genealogies of Ascher (1 Chron. vii, 98), probably marks an Egyptian name taken into the Semitic by marriage into the Semitic by marriage into the Semitic. Ascher whether a proselyte or not we cannot attempt to decide. There has been a difference of opinion as to the golden calf, some holding that it was made to represent God himself, others maintaining that it was only an imi-tation of an Egyptian idol. We first observe that this and another golden calf are carved in the form of a ram, and that their being identical in intention with which they were made, by the circumstance that the Israelites addressed the former as the God who had brought them out of Egypt (Exod. xxxiiii, 4, 8), and that Jeroboam proclaimed the same of his idols (1 Kings xxi, 29). We next re-main that Aaron called the calf, not only got out the Lord (Exod. xxxiiii, 5); that in the Psalms it is said "they changed their glory into the similitude of an ox that eateth hay" (ery, 29); that no one of the calf-worship- ping kings and princes of Israel bears any name con-nected with idolatry, while many have names compound ed with the most sacred name of God; and that in no place is any foreign divinity connected with calf-worship in the slightest degree. The adoption of such an image as the golden calf, however, shows the strength of Egyptian associations, else how would Aaron have fixed upon the obvious form as the one in which the God who had brought Israel out of Egypt? Only a mind thoro-ugly accustomed to the profound respect paid in Egypt to the sacred bulls, and especially to Apis and Mnevis, could have hit upon so strange a representation; nor could any people who had not witnessed the Egyptian practices have found, as readily as did the Israelites, the fulfilment of their wishes in such an image. The feast that Aaron celebrated, when, after eating and drinking, the people arose, sang, and danced naked before the idol, is strikingly like the festival of the finding of Apis, which was celebrated with feasting and dancing, and also, apparently, though this is not customarily at least does not seem to have been part of the public festivity, with indecent gestures. See Golden Calf. The golden calf was not the only idol which the Israelites worshipped in the Deut. The prophet Amos speaks of others. In the Masoretic text as follows: "I have the tent [or tabernacle] of your king and Chien your images, the star of your gods [or your god], which ye made for yourselves" (v, 26). The Sept. has Mooloi for "your king," as though their original Heb. had been Σμολογον instead of Σμολογον, and Parapin for Chien, be- sides a transposition. In the Acts the reading is almost the same, Σμολογος τος μου, "Yea, ye took up the tab- ernacle of Moolot, and the star of your sign, the banner of your God, figures which ye made to worship them" (vii, 43). We cannot here discuss the probable causes of these diffe- rences except of the more important ones, the substition of Moolot for "your king," and Raiphan or Rem- phan for Chien. It should be observed, that if the pas- sage relating to Amonites is taken by the Masoretes to be more likely than that Molech should have been spoken of by an appelleative, in which case a strict rendering of the Masoretic text would read as does the A. V.; a freer could follow the Sept. and Acts; but, as there is no re- ference to the Ammonites or even Canaanites, it is more reasonable to suppose that the Sept. was not, as in the text in which, as above suggested, the reading was Σμολογον, Mal- cham, or "your king." The likelihood of this being the true reading must depend upon the rest of the pas- sage. Remphan and Chien are at once recognised as two foreign divinities worshipped together in Egypt, Rempu, probably pronounced Rempu, and Ken, the for- mer a god represented as of the type of the Egyptian, and apparently connected with war, the latter a goddess represented naked standing upon a lion. They were worshipped with kheh, the Egyptian god of produc- tiveness, and the foreign war-goddess Anata. Exclud- ing Kheh, who is probably associated with ken from being connected with war, we shall see, with the exception of these names, Rempu, Ken, and Anata, are clearly not, except in orthography, Egyptian. We can suggest no origin for the name of Rempu. The goddesses Ken, as naked, would be connected with the Babylonian Mylita, and as standing on a lion, with a goddess so repre-sented in the cuneiform inscriptions of Mallow, Maltseby, and the like. The former similarity connects her with generation; the latter, perhaps, does so likewise. If we adopt this sup- position, the name Ken may be traced to a root connect- ed with generation found in many varieties in the Ir- anic family, and not of that family at all. It is sufficiently evident to cite the Greek yv-owos, yw-po: she would thus be the goddess of productiveness. Anata is the Persian Anaitis. We have shown earlier that the Baby- lonian high nature-worship seems to have been of Aryan origin. In the present case we trace an Aryan idola- try connected, from the mention of a star, with high na- ture-worship. If we accept this explanation, it becomes doubtful that Molech is mentioned in the passage, and we may rather suppose that some other idol, to whom a kingly character was attributed, is intended. Here we must leave this difficult point of our inquiry, only sum- ming up that this false worship was not brought in from the shepherds in Egypt, and may possibly indicate the Aryan origin of at least one of these tribes, almost certainly its own origin, directly or indirectly, from an Aryan source.

The next was a temporary apostasy. The charms of the daughters of Moab, as Balsam's bad genius forewarn, were potent for evil: the Israelites were "yoked to Baal-Poar" in the trammels of his fair worshippers, and the character of their deviations is not obscurely hinted at (Num. xxxv). The great and terrible retribution which followed left so deep an impress upon the hearts of the people that, after the conquest of the promised land, they looked with an eye of terror upon any indication of de- fection from the worship of Jehovah, and denounced as idolatrous a memorial so slight as the altar of the Reu- benites at the passage of Jordan (Josh. xxi, 16).

2. It is demonstrable in the words of the song, and under the strong rule of Joshua, the idolatry learnt in Egypt was so destroyed as to be afterwards utterly forgotten by the people. But in entering Palestine they found them- selves among the monuments and associations of anoth- er false religion, less attractive indeed to the reason than that of Egypt, which still taught, notwithstanding the wretched fetishism that it supported, some great truths of man's present and future, but of a religion which, in its dedication of nature, had a strong hold on the imagi- nation. The genial sun, the refreshing moon, the stars, that shine in the firmament, the breasts full of milk and of honey, natural were reverenced in that land of green hills and valleys, which were fed by the water of heaven. A
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nation thrown in the scene of such a religion and mixed with those who professed it, at that period of national life when impressions are most readily made, such a nation, almost living while the remembrance of the deliverance from Egypt and the wonders with which the Law was given was yet fresh, soon fell away into the practices that it was strictly enjoined to root out. In the first and second laws of the Decalogue, the Israelites were commanded to worship but one God, and not to make any idols to worship; they and their children should fall under God’s heavy displeasure. The commands were explicit enough. But not alone was idolatry thus clearly condemned: the Israelites were charged to destroy all objects connected with the religion of the inhabitants of Canaan. They were to destroy utterly all the heathen places of worship, “up the high mountains, and upon the hills, and under every green tree.” They were to “overthrow” the altars of the heathen, “break their pillars,” “burn their groves, hew down the graven images of their gods, and destroy the names of them out of that place” (Deut. xii, 2, 5), a passage we cite on account of the fulness of the enumeration. Had the conquered nations been utterly extirpated, their idolatry might have been annihilated at once. But soon after the lands had been apportioned, that separate life of the tribes began which was never interrupted, as far as history tells us, until the time of the Israelites’ conquest. The tribes were unable to cope with the remnant of the Canaanites, and either dwelt with them on equal terms, reduced them to tribute, or became tributaries themselves. The Israelites were thus surrounded by the idolatry of Canaan; and since they were for the most part confined to the mountain and hill districts, where its associations were strongest, they had but to learn from their neighbors how they had worshiped upon the high hills and under every green tree. From the use of plural forms, it is probable that the Beals and Ashoreths of several towns or tribes were worshiped as Baal-Peor and Baal Berith; and the berith afterwards was. It does not seem, however, that the people at once fell into heathen worship: the first step appears to have been adopting a corruption of the true religion.

During the lives of Joshua and the elders who outlived his, they kept true to their allegiance, but the generation following, who knew not Jehovah, nor the works he had done for Israel, revered from the plain path of their fathers, and were caught in the toils of the foreigner (Judg. ii). From this time forth their history becomes little more than a chronicle of the increasing attacks of the tribes unable to cope with the remnant of the Canaanites, and either dwelt with them on equal terms, reduced them to tribute, or became tributaries themselves. The Israelites were thus surrounded by the idolatry of Canaan; and since they were for the most part confined to the mountain and hill districts, where its associations were strongest, they had but to learn from their neighbors how they had worshiped upon the high hills and under every green tree. From the use of plural forms, it is probable that the Beals and Ashoreths of several towns or tribes were worshiped as Baal-Peor and Baal Berith; and the berith afterwards was. It does not seem, however, that the people at once fell into heathen worship: the first step appears to have been adopting a corruption of the true religion.

The narratives of the book of Judges, contemporaneous or successive, tell of the fierce struggle maintained against their hated foes, and how women forgot their tenderness and forsook their retirement to sing the song of victory over the oppressor. By turns, each conquering nation strove to establish the worship of its national god. During the rule of Midian, Joshua, the father of Gideon, sent an altar to Baal (Judg. vi, 35), though he proved but a lukewarm worshipper (ver. 31). Even Gideon himself gave occasion to idolatrous worship; yet the ephod which he made from the spoils of the Midianites was perhaps but a votive offering to the true God (Judg. vii, 27). It is not improbable, however, that the Israelites again returned to the service of the Baalim, as, if in solemn mockery of the covenant made with Jehovah, chose from among them Baal Berith, “Baal of the Covenant” (comp. Zebišĕnu, as the object of their special adoration (Judg. vii, 18). Of this god we know only that his temple, probably of wood (Judg. ix, 49), was a stronghold in time of need, and was protected with the silver of the worshippers (ix, 4). Nor were the calamities of foreign oppression confined to the land of Canaan. The tribes on the east of Jordan went astray after the idols of the land, and were delivered into the hands of the children of Ammon (Judg. x, 8). But they were not without a warning; for God, in his presentation of their case, prefaced it by what, ever-recurring phrase, so mournfully familiar, “the children of Israel did evil again in the eyes of Jehovah, and Jehovah gave them into the hands of the Philistines.” Thus far idolatry is a national sin. The episode of Micah, in Judg. xvi, xvii, sheds a lurid light on the secret practice in the villages, who, without formally renouncing Jehovah, though ceasing to recognize him as the theocratic king (xvi, 7), linked with his worship the symbols of ancient idolatry. The house of God, or sanctuary, which Micah made in imitation of that at Shiloh, was decorated with an ephod and teraphim, and the image consecrated to some inferior deities (Selden, De Bib Syrja, synt. i, 2). It is a significant fact, showing how deeply rooted in the people was the tendency to idolatry, that a Levite, who, of all others, should have been familiar with the elements of the true worship in its purity, was found to assume the office of priest in the images of Micah; and that this Levite, priest afterwards to the idols of Dan, was no other than Jonathan, the son of Gershom, the son of Moses. Tradition says that these idols were destroyed when thePhilistines defeated the Israelites, and was an incident of the covenant of Jehovah (1 Sam. iv). The Danites are supposed to have carried them into the field, as the other tribes bore the ark, and the Philistines the images of their gods, when they went forth to battle (2 Sam. v, 21; Lewis, Orig. Hebr. v, 9). But the Snider Olum Roberts (c. p. 199) interprets “Baal of the capitivity of the land” (Judg. xviii, 3), of the captivity of Mannasseh; and Benjamin of Tudela mistook the remnants of later Gentile worship for traces of the altar or statue which Micah had dedicated, and which was worshiped by the treachery of (Selden, P. Bib. Syrja, synt. i, 2; Stanley, S. and T. and other editions). In later times, secret idolatry was carried to greater lengths. Images were set up on the corn-floors, in the wine-vats, and behind the doors of private houses (Isa. i, viii, 2; Hos. ix, 1, 2); and to check this tendency the statute in Deut. xxvii, 15 was originally promulgated. It is noticeable that they do not seem during this period to have generally adopted the religions of any but the Canaanites, although in one remarkable passage they are said, between the time of Jair and that of Jephthah, to have forsaken the Lord, and served Baalim, and Ashhtaroth, and the gods of the Canaanites, of the south and of the north, and of the Sidonians, and of the Hittites, and of the Philistines (Judg. x, 6), as though there had then been an utter and profligate apostasy. The cause, no doubt, was that the Canaanitish worship was borrowed in a time of amity, and that but one Canaanitish oppressor was spoken of, whereas the abrahamicites of the east who, from which it was always enemies of the Israelites. Each time of idolatry was punished by a servitude, each reformation followed by a deliverance. Speedily as the nation returned to idolatry, its heart was fonder than that of the ten tribes which followed Jeroboam, and never seem to have had one thorough national reformation again until 3. The notices of their great wars show that the enmity between the Philistines and the Israelites was too great for any idolatry to be tolerated. From the fore
mer by the latter, though at an earlier time this was not the case. Under Samuel's administration a fast was held, and purificatory rites performed, to mark the public renunciation of idolatry (1 Sam. vii, 3-6). Saul's family were, however, tainted, as it seems, with idolatry, for the tabernacle of Bahosheth or Ebh-baal, and Mephibosheth or Merib-baal, his brothers, were sacrificed but in honor of Baal. From the circumstances of Michal's stratagem to save David, it seems not only that Saul's family kept teraphim, but, apparently, that they used them for purposes of divination, the Sept. having "living" for "pillow," as if the Hebr. had been מֵי instead of the present מי. See PILLOW. The circumstance of having teraphim, more especially if they were used for divination, lends especial force to Samuel's reproof of Saul (1 Sam. xxv, 28). During the reign of David idolatry in public is unmentioned, and no doubt was almost unknown. See DAVID.

The earlier days of Solomon were the happiest of the kingdom of Israel. The Temple worship was fully established, with the temple, while the high places, and there was no excuse for that worship of God at high places which seems to have been before permitted on account of the constant distractions of the country. But the close of that reign was marked by an apostasy of which we ript to prophesy. Neither the people had been the sinners, their leaders reformers; this was the king, led astray by his many strange wives, preferred the people, and raised high places on the Mount of Corruption, opposite God's temple. He worshipped Ashloareth, goddess of the Zidonians, Chemosh, the god of the Moabites, and Moloch, the Philipization of the Ammonites, building high places for the latter in Jerusalem, as well as for all the gods of his strange wives. Solomon, no doubt, was very tolerant, and would not prevent these women from following their native superstitions, even if it were only to burn their and his children before Molech. For Molech, openly and publicly in the presence of the sumity of Olivet were crowned with the high places of Ashloareth, Chemosh, and Molech (1 Kings xi, 7; 2 Kings xxii, 13), and the fourth, in memory of his great apostasy, was branded with the opprobrious title of the "Mount of Corruption." Calamity speedily followed this great apostasy; the latter years of Solomon were troubled by continual premonitions of those political reverses which were the inevitable penalty of this high treason against the theocracy. This is clearly brought out by the marked and frequent denunciations of the later prophets. See SOLOMON.

Rehoboam, the son of an Ammonitish mother, perpetuated the worst features of Solomon's idolatry (1 Kings xiv, 22-24); and in his reign was made the great schism in the national religion—when Jeroboam, fresh from his recollections of the Apis worship of Egypt, erected golden calves at Bethel and at Dan, and by this crafty state policy severed forever the kingdoms of Judah and Israel (1 Kings xii, 26-33). To their use were temples consecrated, and the service in their honor was studiously copied from the Mosaic ritual. High-priest himself, Jeroboam ordained priests from the lowest ranks (2 Chron. xv, 13), and sacrifices were offered, and a solemn festival appointed, closely resembling the festival of tabernacles (1 Kings xii, 23, 33; comp. Amos iv, 4, 5). See JEROBOAM. The worship of the calves, "the sin of Israel" (Hos. vi, 8), which was apparently associated with the great-worship of Menes (2 Chron. xii, 15; Herod. ii, 14), the Gentile Zalath, Megiddo (Orig. Hebr. v, 3), and the Asherim (1 Kings xiv, 15; A.V. "groves"), ultimately spread to the kingdom of Judah, and centred in Beersheba (Amos v, 5; vii, 9). At what precise period it was introduced into the latter kingdom is not certain. The Chronicles tell us how Abijah taunted Jeroboam with apostasy, while the less partial narrative in 1 Kings represents his own conduct as far from exemplary (1 Kings xv, 3). Asa's sweeping reform spared not the idol of his grandmother Maachah, and, with the exception of the high places, he removed all relics of idolatrous worship (1 Kings xv, 12-14), with its accompanying impurities. His reformation was completed by Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xvii, 6). See each in alphabetical order.

The successors of Jeroboam followed in his steps, till Ahab, who married a Zidonian princess, at her instigation (1 Kings xxi, 25) built a temple and altar to Baal, and reigned over the abominations of the Amorites (1 Kings xxi, 26). For this he attained the circumference of having done more "to provoke Jehovah, the God of Israel, to anger than all the kings of Israel that were before him" (1 Kings xxi, 33). Compared with the worship of Baal, the worship of the calves was a venial sin, probably because it was morally less de-testable, and also less anti-national (1 Kings xxi, 27; 2 Kings x, 28-31). See ELIJAH. Henceforth Baal-worship became so completely identified with the northern kingdom that it is described as walking in the way or statutes of the kings of Israel (2 Kings xvi, 3, 5), as distinguished from the sin of Jeroboam, which ceased not till the Captivity (from the sin of Ahab), and the corruption of the ancient inhabitants of the land. The idolatrous priests became a numerous and important caste (1 Kings xviii, 19), living under the patronage of royalty, and fed at the royal table. The extirpation of Baal's priests was a pledge of his fidelity to the Lord (2 Kings x, in which the royal family of Judah went to Zecora, § 24.27), was a death-blow to this form of idolatry in Israel, though other systems still remained (2 Kings xii, 6). But, while Israel thus sinned and was punished, Judah was morally more guilty (Ezek. xlv, 51). The alliance of Jehoshaphat with the family of Ahab was transferred to the southern kingdom, during the reign of his son and grandson, all the appurtenances of Baal-worship (2 Kings viii, 18, 27). In less than ten years after the death of that king, in whose praise it is recorded that he "sought not the Baalim, nor walked after the deed of Israel," there was been built for the idol, statues and altars erected, and priests appointed to minister in his service (2 Kings xix, 18). Jehoiada's vigorous measures checked the evil for a time, but his reform was incomplete, and the high places still remained, as in the days of Asa, a nucleus for any fresh system of idolatry (2 Kings xxi, 8). Much of this might be due to the influence of the king's mother, Zibiah of Beersheba, a place intimately connected with the idolatrous defection of Judah (Amos viii, 14). After the death of Jehoiada, the princes prevailed upon Joash to restore at least some portion of his father's idolatry (2 Chron. xxiv, 4). The conquest of the Edomites by Amaziah introduced the worship of their gods, which had disappeared since the days of Solomon (2 Chron. xxv, 14, 20). After this period, even the kings who did not lend themselves to the encouragement of false worship had to contend with the corruption which still lingered in the hearts of the people (2 Kings xxv, 21; 2 Chron. xxvii, 2). Hitherto the temple had been kept pure. The statues of Baal and the other gods were worshipped in their own shrines; but Athaz, who "sacrificed unto the gods of Damascus, which smote him" (2 Chron. xxiv, 22), and built altars to them at every corner of Jerusalem, had high places established, and replaced the brazen altar of burnt-offering by one made after the model of "the altar" of Damascus, and deaced it to his own uses (2 Kings xvi, 10-15).

The conquest of the ten tribes by Shalmaneser was for them the last scene of the drama of abominations which had been so perpetually for upwards of 250 years. In the northern kingdom reform arose to vary the long line of royal apostates; whatever was effected in the way of reformation was done by the hands of the people (2 Chron. xxxii, 1). But even in their captivity they helped to perpetuate the corruption. The captives found a place of worship at the hand of their conquerors in the cities of Samaria, brought with them their own gods, and were taught at Bethel, by a priest of the captive nation, "the manner of the god of the
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The first act of Hezekiah on ascending the throne was the restoration and purification of the Temple, which had been dismantled and closed during the latter part of his father's life (2 Chron. xxviii, 24; xxx, 3). The multitudes who flocked to Jerusalem to celebrate the Passover, so long in abeyance, removed the idolatrous altars outside the walls of the city, and as Ahaz had closed the Temple gates (2 Chron. xxx, 14). The iconoclastic spirit was not confined to Judah and Benjamin, but spread throughout Ephraim and Manasseh (2 Chron. xxxi, 1), and to all external appearance idolatry was extirpated. But the reform extended little below the surface (Isa. xxix, 18). Among the leaders of the people there were many in high position who conformed to the necessities of the time (Isa. xxviii, 14), and under Manasseh's patronage the false worship, which had been merely driven into obscurity, broke out with tenfold virulence. Idolatry of every form, and with all the accessories of enchantments, divination, and witchcraft, went on with great licentiousness; the Temple itself was polluted by public courses and sacrifices of burnt-offering and peace-offering, the place was too sacred, no associations too hallowed, to be spared the contamination. If the conduct of Ahaz in erecting an altar in the temple court is open to a charitable construction, Manasseh's was of no doubtful character. The two courts of the Temple were profaned by altars dedicated to the host of heaven, and the image of the Asherah polluted the holy place (2 Kings xi, 7; 2 Chron. xxxiii, 15; comp. Jer. xxxii, 34). Even in his late repentance he did not entirely destroy all traces of his former wrong. Tradition states that the remains of the aged Isaiah (q.v.) only served to secure his place (Gen. vi, 4, v. Yehonoth, iv.). The people still burned incense on the high places; but Jehovah was the ostensible object of their worship. The king's son sacrificed to his father's idols, but was not associated with him in his repentance, and in his short reign of two years restored to the idolatry of his fathers the images of the Asherah. With the death of Josiah the last effort to revive among the people a purer ritual, if not a purer faith. The lamp of David, which had long shed but a struggling ray, flickered for a while, and then went out in the darkness of Babylonian captivity.

It will be useful here to recapitulate the main varieties of the idolatry which so greatly marred the religious character of this monarchical period of the Jewish state. It has been a question much debated whether the Israelites were ever so far given up to idolatry as to lose all knowledge of the true God. It would be hard to assert this of any nation, and still more difficult to prove. That there always remained among them a faithful few, who in the face of every danger adhered to the worship of Jehovah, may readily be believed, for even at a time when Baal-worship was most prevalent there were those who maintained their belief and had not bowed before his image (1 Kings xix, 18). But there is still room for grave suspicion that among the masses of the people, though the idea of a supreme Being—of whom the images they worshipped were but the distorted representatives—was not entirely lost, it was so obscured as to be but dimly apprehended. And not only were the ignorant multitude thus led astray, but the priests, scribes, and prophets became leaders of the apostasy (Jer. ii, 8). Warburton, indeed, maintained that they never formally renounced Jehovah, and that their defection consisted in "joining foreign worship and idolatry to the ritual worship of the true God" (Ut. Leg. b. v, § 8). But one passage in their history, though obscurely obscure, seems to point to a time when, under the rule of the judges, "Israel for many days had no true God, and no teaching priest, and no law" (2 Chron. xxv, 3). The correlative argument of Codsworth, who contends from the teaching of the Hebrew doctors and rabbins "that the pagan nations anciently, at least the intelligent amongst them, acknowledged one supreme God of the whole world, and that all other gods were but creatures and inferior ministers," is controverted by Moosheim (Intell. Sacri, i, 4, § 50, and notes). There can be no doubt that much of the idolatry of the Hebrews consisted in worshipping the true God under an image, such as the calves at Bethel and Dan (Josephus, Ant. viii, 5, 8; ἵππαρ θεον καθαρί βαθμος, and by associating his worship with idolatrous rites ( Jer. xii. 5) and places consecrated to idols (2 Kings xviii, 2). From the peculiarity of their position, they were not surprised at their being guised as the inventors of a new pantheon, nor did they adopt any one system of idolatry so exclusively as ever to become identified with it (so the Moabites with the worship of Chemosh [Num. xxvi, 29]); but they no sooner came in contact with other nations than they readily adapted themselves to their practices, the old spirit of antagonism died rapidly away, and intermarriage was one step to idolatry.

a. Sun-worship, though mentioned with other kinds of high nature-worship, as in the enumeration of those suppressed by Josiah, seems to have been practiced alone amongst the Canaanites, and as well as with the adoration of other heavenly bodies. In Ezekiel's vision, under the vision of the Temple in Jerusalem, he saw about four-and-twenty men between the porch and the altar of the Temple, with their backs to the Temple and their faces to the east, worshipping the sun (Ezek. viii, 16). Josiah had before this taken away "the horses that the kings of Judah had given to the sun, at the entering in of the house of the Lord," and had burned the chariots of the sun with fire (2 Kings xxiii, 11). The same part of the temple is perhaps here meant. There is nothing to show whether these were images or living horses. The horse was sacred to the sun among the Persians, but the worship of the visible sun instead of an image looks rather like a Persian or an Arab custom. See SUN.

b. In the account of Josiah's reform we read of the abolition of the worship of Baal, the sun, the moon, Mazzaloth, also called Mazzaroth (Job xxxviii, 82), which we hold to be the homes of the moon [see Heaven]. The avowal of the sun and moon as the hosts of heaven, and of the stars as gods (Jer. xiv, 18). In this prophet's time the people of Judah and Jerusalem, among other abominations, made cakes for "the queen of heaven," or "the worship of heaven:" a different form justifying the latter reading. The usual reading is פִסָל יָאִサービス, queen, which the Sept. once follows, the Vulg. always; some copies give פָּרָס וּלְעָשׁוּר, worship, that is, "a deity or goddess." The former reading seems preferable, and the context in two places (Isa. i, 29, Jer. ii, 8) shows that the worship of Baal had long been continuous, and was therefore not admissible (xliv, 17, 18, 19, 25). In Egypt, the remnant that fled after the murder of Gidaliah were warned by the prophet to abandon those idolatrous practices for which their country and cities had been desolated. The men, conscious that they had burned incense to false gods in Egypt, declared that they would certainly burn incense and pour out drink-offerings to the queen of heaven, as they, their fathers, their kings, and their princes had done in a time of plenty, asserting that since they had left off these practices they had been convicted and reprimanded by the priests of Jehovah. A fresh doom was pronounced upon them (ch. xlv). It is very difficult to conjecture what goddess can be here meant: Ashthoreth would suit, but is never mentioned interchangeably: the moon must be rejected for the same reason. Here we certainly see a strong resem-
blance to Arab idolatry, which was wholly composed of cosmic worship and of fetishism, and in which the mansions of the moon were reverenced on account of their connection with seasons of rain. This system of cosmic worship may have been introduced from the Natathas-ians or Ezechiel of Petra, from the Sabians, or from other Arabs or Chaldeans. Ezechiel Qalav Nahoum is, Fate, or Fate, he or it divided, assigned, numbered, are spoken of in a single passage in the later part of Isaiah (xxv, 11). Gesenius, depending upon the theory of the post-Asian authorship of the latter chapters of the prophet, makes these to be idols worshipped by the Jews in Babylon, but it must be remarked that their names are not traceable in Babylonian and Assyrian mythology.

Gesenius has, however, following Pococke (Spec. Hist. Arabum, p. 98), compared Meni with Mimmah, a goddess of the pagan Arabs, worshipped in the form of a stone between Mekkeh and El-Mediteh by the tribes of Hishyel and Kibzah. But El-Beydawat, though deriving the name of this idol from Mekkeh, set it cut"), supposes it was thus called because victims were slain upon it (Comment. in Coran. ed. Flischner, p. 298). This meaning certainly seems to disturb the idea that the two idols were identical, but the mention of the sword and slaughter as punishment of the idolaters who worshipped Gad and Meni is perhaps meant to suggest that the first was an antique form of the second, under a different name. Gad may have been a Canaanitish form of Baal, if we are to judge from the geographical name Baal-gad of a place at the foot of Mount Hermon (Isa. xi, 17; xii, 7; xiii, 6). Perhaps the grammatical form of Meni may throw some light upon the origin of this idolatry. The worship of both idols resembles that of the cosmic divinities of the later kings of Judah. See Meni.

d. In Ezekiel's vision of the idolatries of Jerusalem he beheld a chamber of imagery in the Temple itself, having "every form of creeping things, and abominable beasts, and all the host of heaven," portrayed upon the wall round about," and seventy Israelish elders offering incense (Ezek. viii, 7-12). This is so exact a description of an Egyptian sanctuary, with the idols depicted upon its walls, dimly lighted, and filled with incense-offering priests, that we cannot for a moment doubt that these Jewsi from Egypt, that their fetishism, for such this special worship appears mainly, if not wholly to have been. See Imagery, Chamber of.

e. In the same vision the prophet saw women weeping in the temple of Tammuz (ver. 13, 14), known to be the same as Asmodea, from whom the fourth month of the Syrian year was named. This worship was probably introduced by Azaz from Syria. See Tammuz.

f. The image of jealousy, יִנְקָה יַרְדֵּנָה, spoken of in the same passage, which was placed in the temple, has not been satisfactorily explained. The meaning may only be that it was an image of a false god, or there may have been a play in the second part of the appellation upon the proper name. We cannot, however, suggest any name that might be thus intended. See Jealousy, Image of.

g. The brazen serpent, having become an object of idolatrous worship, was destroyed by Hezekiah (2 Kings xv, 17). See Brazen serpent.

h. Moloch-worship was not only celebrated at the high place Solomon had made, but at Topheth, in the valley of the sons of Hinnom, where children were made to pass through the fire to the Ammonitish abomination. This place, as well as Solomon's altar, Josiah defiled, and we read of later worship of Moloch, Chemosh, and Ashoreth. See Moloch.

i. For the supposed divinity תָּרָה of Is. lxvi, 17 (compare Meier, De uno diei Asyriorum, Helmst. 1734), see Achar.

The new population placed by the king of Assyria in the cities of Samaria adopted a strange mixture of religions. Terrified at the destruction by lions of some of their number, they petitioned the king of Assyria, and an Israelitish priest was sent to them. They then adopted the old worship at high places, and still served their own idols. The people of Babylon, and of Suscubbenoth; the Cuthites, Nergal; the Hamathites, Asshima, the Avites, Nibhaz and Tartak, and the people of Sepharvaim burned their children to their native gods, Admur, and Manames, and Anammelech. Nergal is a well-known Babylonian idol, and the occurrence of the element melech (king) in the names of the Molech of Sepharvaim is very remarkable (2 Kings xxiv, 24-41).

4. The Babylonian Exile was an effectual rebuke of the national sin. It is true that even during the captivity the practice of false worship did not disappear, but they lost their craft as prophets and diviners (Jer. xxix, 8; Ezek. xii, 12) and the Jews who fled to Egypt carried with them recollections of the material prosperity which attended their idolatrous sacrifices in Judah, and to the neglect of which they attributed their exiled condition (Jer. xlv, 17, 18). One of the first difficulties, indeed, with which Ezra had to contend, and which brought him wellnigh to despair, was the haste with which his countrymen took them foreign wives of the people of the land, and followed them in all their abominations (Ezra ix). The priests and Levites, with whom he looked for assistance in his great enterprise, were amongst the first to yield to this temptation (Ezra ix, 2; x, 18; Neh. vi, 17, 18; xiii, 23). Still, the post-exilic prophets speak of idolatry as an evil of the past, Zechariah foretelling the time when the very names of the false gods would be forgotten (xiii, 2). In Malachi we see that a cold formalism was already the national sin, and such was ever after the case with the Jewish people. The Babylonian Exile, therefore, may be said to have purified the Jews from their idolatrous tendencies. How this great change was wrought does not appear. Partly, no doubt, it was due to the pious example of Ezra and Nehemiah; partly, perhaps, to the Persian contempt for the lower kinds of idolatry, which insured a respect for the Hebrew religion on the part of the government; partly to the sight of the fulfillment of God's predicted judgments upon the idolatrous nations which the Jews had either sought as allies or feared as enemies. See Exile.

5. Years passed by, and the names of the idols of Canaan had been forgotten, when the Hebrews were assailed by a new danger. Greek idolatry under Alexander and his successors was practiced throughout the civilized world. The conquests of Alexander in Asia caused God to be extensively felt, and Greek idolatry to be first tolerated and then practised by the Jews (1 Macc. i, 43-30, 54). Some place-hunting Jews were base enough to adopt it. At first the Greek princes who ruled Palestine wisely forbore to interfere with the Hebrew religion. The political earlier Ptolemies even encouraged it; but when the country had fallen into the hands of the Seleucids, Antiochus Epiphanes, reversing his father's policy of toleration, seized Jerusalem, set up an idol-altar to Jupiter in the Temple itself, and forbade the observance of the law. Weakly supported by a miserable faction, he had to depend wholly upon his auxiliary power. The attempt of Antiochus to establish this form of worship was vigorously resisted by Mattathias (1 Macc. ii, 23-26), who was joined in his rebellion by the Assidians (ver. 42), and destroyed the altars at which the king commanded them to sacrifice (1 Macc. ii, 33, 45). The erection of synagogues has been assigned as a reason for the commutative purity of the Jewish worship after the Captivity (Prideaux, Com. ii, 574), while another cause has been discovered in the hatred for images acquired by the Jews in their intercourse with the Persians. The Maccaean revolt, small as its beginning, had the national heart on its side, and, after a long and varied struggle, achieved more than the nation had ever before effected since the days of the Judges. Thenceforward idolatry was to the Jew the religion of his enemies, and naturally made no converts.
6. The early Christians were brought into contact with idolaters when the Gospel was preached among the Gentiles, and it became necessary to enact regulations for preventing scandal by their being involved in pagan practices, when joining in the private meals and festivities of the heathen (1 Cor. viii). In these cases the converts did not seem to have been in any danger of reverting to idolatry, and the cruel persecutions they underwent did not tend to lead them back to a religion which their more refined contemporaries despised. It is, however, not impossible that many who had been original worshippers of a false god, but who have renounced idolatry, really abandon all their former superstitions, and that we may thus explain the very early outbreak of many customs and opinions not sanctioned in the N. T.

V. Ethical Views respecting Idolatry. That this is a cardinal sin, and, indeed, the highest, if not the principal principle of all sin, as aiming a direct blow at the throne of God itself, is evident from its prohibition in the very fore-front of the Decalogue. Hence the tenacity with which the professors of all true religion in every age have opposed it, under every disguise and at whatever cost to themselves. He who has always denied the association of polytheism, and those corrupt forms of Christianity, such as the Roman and Greek Churches, which have endeavored to apologize for the adoration of pictures, images, etc., on the flimsy pretext that it is not the worship of objects themselves, but the object, that is disapproved, but only the beings thus represented, are but imitators in this of the sophistry of certain refined speculators among the grosser heathen, e. g. of Egypt, Greece, etc., who put forth similar claims. See Isma-'Urwah.

Three things are condemned in Scripture as idolatry:—
1. The worship of a false God; 2. The worshiping of the true God through an image; 3. the indulgence of those passions which draw the soul away from God, e. g. covetousness, lust, etc.

The Israelites were guilty of the first when they bowed the knee to Baal; of the second when they set up the golden calves; and both Israelites and Christians are often guilty of the third.

1. Light in which idolatry was regarded in the Mosaic Code, and the penalties with which it was visited. — If one member of the Hebrew polity was to teach the unity of God, the extermination of idolatry was but a subordinate end. Jehovah, the God of the Israelites, was the chief of the deities. He was the only real king of the people, who had delivered them from bondage, and to whom they had a willing oath of allegiance. They had entered into a solemn league and covenant with him as their chosen king (comp. 1 Sam. viii, 7), by whose obedience was required with temporal blessing and retribution with temporal punishment. This original contract of the Hebrew government, as it has been termed, is contained in Exod. xix, 3-8; xxx, 2-5; Deut. xxxi, 10-33; the blessings promised to obedience are enumerated in Deut. xxvii, 1-14, and the withering curses on disobedience in verses 15-58. That this covenant was strictly insisted on it needs but slight acquaintance with Hebrew history to perceive. Often broken and often renewed on the part of the people (Judg. x, 10; 2 Chron. xvii, 12, 13; Neh. ix, 38), it was kept with unwavering constancy on the part of Jehovah. To their kings he stood in the relation, so to speak, of a feudal superior: they were his representatives upon earth, and with them as with the people before, his covenant was made (1 Kings iii, 14; xi, 11). Idolatry, therefore, to an Israelite was a state offence (1 Sam. xv, 25), a political crime of the gravest character, high-treason against the majesty of the king, a transgression of the covenant (Deut. xvii, 2), "the evil pre-eminent in the eyes of Jehovah (1 Kings xxix, 25, opp. "תַּמָּם," the right," 2 Chron. xxvii, 2). But it was much more than all this. While the idolatry of foreign nations was merely considered as an abomination in the sight of God, which called for his vengeance, the sin of the Israelites is regarded as of more glaring enormity, and greater moral guilt. In the figurative language of the prophets, the relation between Jehovah and his people is represented as a marriage bond (Isa. liv, 5; Jer. iii, 14), and the worship of false gods, with all its accompaniments (Lev. xx, 25), becomes then the greatest of all abominations (Hos. iii, 1). This is beautifully brought out in Hos. ii, 16, where the heathen name Baal, my master, which the apostle Israel has been accustomed to apply to his foreign possessor, is contrasted with his, my man, my husband, the native word which she is to use when restored to her rightful husband, Jehovah. Much of the significance of this figure was unquestionably due to the impurities of idolaters, with whom such corruption was of more lively spiritual character (Exod. xxxiv, 16; Num. xxxvi, 1, 2, etc.), but manifested itself in the grossest and most revolting forms (Rom. i, 26-28).

Regarded in a moral aspect, false gods are called "stumbling-blocks" (Ezek. xiii, 8), "lance" (Amos ii, 4, Rom. i, 25), "horror" or "fright" (1 Kings xv, 13; Jer. i, 38), "abominations" (Deut. xxix, 17; xxxii, 16; 1 Kings xi, 5; 2 Kings xxiii, 18), "guilt" (abstract for concrete, Amos viii, 14, נַעַרֶשׁ, נַעַרֶשׁ; comp. 2 Chron. xxix, 18, perhaps with a play on Ashima, 2 Kings xvii, 30); and with a profound sense of the degradation consequent upon this worship, they are characterized by the prophets, as they were to the people against them (Jer. xiv, 4), as "shame" (Jer. xi, 13; Hos. ix, 10). As considered with reference to Jehovah, they are "other gods" (Josh. xxiv, 2, 16), "strange gods" (Deut. xxxii, 16), "new gods" (Judg. v, 8), "devils—not God" (Deut. xxvii, 17; 1 Cor. x, 20) and, as denoting their foreign origin, "gods of the foreigner" (Josh. xxix, 14, 15). Their powerlessness is indicated by describing them as "gods that cannot save" (Isa. xiv, 20), "that made not the heavens" (Jer. x, 11), "nothing" (Isa. xii, 24; 1 Cor. viii, 4), "wind and emptines" (Isa. xxv, 6), "vanities of the Gentiles" (Ecclus. xix, 22; Acts xiv, 15); and yet, while their deity is denied, their personal existence seems to have been acknowledged (Kurtz, Gesch. d. A. B. ii, 86, etc.), though not in the same manner in which the pretensions of local deities were reciprocally recognized by the heathen (1 Kings xx, 22, 29; 2 Kings xvii, 26). Other terms of contempt are employed with reference to idols, מַעֲלָקָה (Lev. xix, 4), and בִּילָל, בִּילָלִים (Deut. xxix, 17), to which different meanings have been assigned, and many which indicate ceremonial uncleanness. See Idol.

Idolatry, therefore, being from one point of view a political offence, could be punished without infringement of civil rights. No penalties were attached to mere opinions. For aught we know, theological speculation may have been as free among the Hebrews as in modern times, though such was not the tendency of the Shemitic mind. It was not, however, such speculations, heterodox though they might be, but overt acts of idolatry, which were made the subjects of legislation (Michaelis, Leben d. Moses, ii, 245, 246). The first and second commandments are directed against idolatry of every form. Individuals and communities were equally amenable to the rigorous code. The individual offender was devoted to destruction (Exod. xxii, 20); his nearest relatives were to be bound to him, and deliver him up to punishment (Deut. xii, 2-10), but their hands were to strike the first blow when, on the evidence of two witnesses at least, he was stoned (Deut. xvii, 2-5). To attempt to seduce others to false worship was a crime of equal enormity (Deut. xiii, 9-10). An idolatrous state was a similar crime, and was more strongly declared in the Old Test, than that the extermination of the Canaanites was the punishment of their idolatry (Exod. xxxiv, 15, 16; Deut. vii, xii, 39-41; xx, 17), and that the calamities of the Israelites were due to the same cause (Jer. ii, 17). A city guilty of idolatry was looked upon as a cancer of the state; it
was considered to be in rebellion, and treated according to the laws of war. Its inhabitants and all their cattle were put to death. No spoil was taken, but everything it contained was burnt with itself; nor was it allowed to be rebuilt (Deut. xiii, 18-16; Josh. vii. 7). Samson was born to a poor and humble family, and his feats were remarkable for transgressing this law (1 Sam. xv; Josh. vii; i Kings xvi, 34). The silver and gold with which the idols were covered were accusd (Deut. vii, 25, 26). Not only were the Israelites forbidden to serve the gods of Canaan (Exod. xxiii, 24, 25), but even to mention the names of those gods, or to call upon them in prayer or any form of worship (Exod. xxiii, 13; Josh. xxiii, 7). On taking possession of the land they were to obliterate all traces of the existing idolatry; statues, altars, pillars, idol- temples, every person and every thing connected with it, were to be swept away (Exod. xxiii, 24, 32; xxxiv, 18; Deut. vii, 5, 25; xii, 1-3; xx, 17), and the name and worship of the idols blotted out. Such were the precautions taken by the framers of the Mosaic code to preserve the worship of Jehovah, the true God, in its purity. Of the manner in which his descendants have "put a fence" about these "laws" we will say nothing; it is evident that many instances will be found in Maimonides (De Idol.). They were prohibited from using vessels, scarlet garments, bracelets, or rings, marked with the sign of the sun, moon, or dragon (Deut. vii, 19); trees planted or stones erected for idol-worship were forbidden (viii, 5, 17), nor was it permitted that the possession of a dead totem, if the image of an idol were found among other images intended for ornament, they are all to be cast into the Dead Sea (vii, 11).—Smith. See ANATHEMA.

2. NEW-TEST. Definitions on the Subject.—(1.) The name "idolater" is given not only to persons who worship with idols, but to owners of any form of image, as such as worship idols of their own mind. Acts xvii, 16: "Now, while Paul waited for them at Athens, his spirit was stirred within him when he saw the city wholly given to idolatry." 1 Cor. v, 10, 11: "Yet not altogether with the fornicators of this world, or with the covetous, or extortioners, or idolaters; for they have need of these things: but we by the sight of the Lord and of the Father, who is the true God, made these the objects of their veneration and worship. Thus they came to worship their progenitors (as in China) and their heroes, which latter worship is by some (Boss, for instance) considered as the only source of mythology. How from thence they passed to the worship of symbolic animals, thence to anthropomorphism, and finally to the adoration of statues as images of the deities, has been best explained by Creuzer in his Symbolik u. Mythologie d. alten Völker (5d edit. i, 5 sq.). The fathers did not fail to perceive the influence which the worship of statues and images had on the development of the symbolism and myths of the heathen religious systems. Lacantius (De falsa relig. i, 11) considers the consensus gentium in the belief in gods as a proof that they are touched by them. The early Protestant theologians had especially to contend against naturalism, who maintained that the recognition of a supreme God is innate in man, and denied our knowledge of the unity of God being due either to revelation or to tradition, since it is found at the foundation of the learned polytheistic systems. They considered all further developments in these systems as resulting from intentional additions made in support of their hierarchy by an interested priesthood, or by rulers from motives of policy (see Herbert of Cherbury, De relig. gentium, p. 6, 168 sq.). These views were ably opposed by Gerard Jo. Veselius (De theologia gentilis et physiologia Christiana i, 3 sq.), Van Dale (De origine et prog. idolatros), Thomas J. of Huntingdon (De idolatria, 160, 150, 25 sq.). They however meant, as did also Farmer (The General Prevalence of the Worship of Human Spirits in the Ancient Heathen Nations (London 1783)), that the demons, whether evil spirits or departed human souls, had very early become the objects of veneration on the part of the heathen, and that the idea that the heathen deities were not cotemplices, as the prophets had stated them to be, but really existing evil spirits, a view which was continued by the fathers, especially in relation to the so-called oracles. The earliest German theologians maintained that the recognition of a worship of demons. This, however, was gradually discarded after the researches of S. J. Baumgarten (Gesch. d. Re-
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Rome and Greek Churches.—Hertzog, Real-Encyclop. s. v. Abgötterei. On this last point, see MARIOLOTRY; SAINT-WORSHIP, etc.

Idol (IΔΟΝ), the second name of the leading Jewish sect who sought to procure the aid of the Gentiles in the return from exile (1 Esd. viii, 48); evidently the ARIEL (q. v.) of the Hebrew text (Ezra viii, 16).

Idumea's (IΔΟΥΜΑodable), the Gr. form of the Heb. name Edom, as found in the Sept., the N. Test., and Josephus. According to Josephus (Ant. i. 1, 1), however, it is only a more approved name of pronouncing what would otherwise be AΔΩΜΑ (comp. Jerome on Ezek. xxv, 12). In the Sept. we sometimes meet with 'Edom, but more generally with 'Idoumaia (the people being called 'Idou-

mataio), which is the uniform orthography in the Apoc-

rypha (1 Mac. i, 15, 29, 1, v.; vi, 1, 2; 2 Mac. xii, 8), as well as in Mark iii, 8, the only passage in the N. T. where it occurs. Our Auth. Ver. has in three or four places (Is. xxxvii, 15; Ezek. xxxiv, 15; xxxvii, 5) substituted for Edom "Idoumaia," which is the name employed by the writers of Greece and Rome, though it is to be noted that they, as well as Josephus, include under that term Edomites in general, but sometimes Palestine itself, because a large portion of that country came into possession of the Edomites of later times.

The Heb. גד, Edom, as the name of the people, is mascu-

line (Numb. xxii, 20); as the name of the coun-

try, feminine (Jer. xxii, 4). We often meet with the

phrase גד, Edom, the "Land of Edom," and once with the poetic form גד, Edom, "the Field of Edom" (Judg. v, 4). The inhabitants are sometimes styled גד, Edomites, "the Children of Edom," and poetically גד, "Bath-Edom, "the Daughter of Edom" (Lam. iv, 21, 22). A single person was called גד, "Adom," an "Edomite" (Deut. xxiii, 3), of which the feminine גד, "Adomith," occurs in 1 Kings xi, 1.

1. Origin of the Name.—The name was derived from Isaac's son Edom, otherwise called Esau, the elder twinbrother of Jacob. See ESau. It signifies red, and seems first to have been suggested by his appearance at his birth, when "he came out all red." I. e. covered with red hair (Gen. xxv, 25), and it was afterwards more formally and literally applied to him, perhaps impressed on him by his father of Edom, his unwholesome disposal of his birthright for a mess of red lentils (Gen. xxvi, 30): "And Esau said to Jacob, Feed me, I pray thee, from the red, that red (גד, Edom, "red") for I am faint; therefore was his name called Red (Edom, גד)."

In the East it has always been usual for a chief either to give his name to the country which he conquers, or over which he rules, or to take a name from it. Esau, during the life of his father, seized the mountainous region occupied by the Horites. He had two names; but one of them was peculiarly applicable to the newly-acquired territory. The mountains of Seir were remarkable for their reddish color; hence, doubtless, the name Edom, "red," was given to the whole country. The most ancient Edom there were various stages. While the majority of the heathen are either on the brink or in the midst of fetishism, the more enlightened part look upon the idols only as symbols, sometimes of several deities, and sometimes of one God. Idolatry was formerly considered as divided into two distinct classes, according to the number of the gods venerated: absolute polytheism—the belief in the real divinity of the images—while the latter was either (Bauern) the worship of the several deities as subordinate to one, or (G. H. Voisius) the considering of the images worshiped as mere symbols of the invisible God. In Col. iii. 5 we find a metaphorical use made of the word idolatry to express undue attachment to earthly possessions and advantages. The same name has also been given, with good reason, to the use made of images in the
10: Ezek. xxxv, 8, etc.). The aborigines were called Horites (Sept. Ἰχαρίας; Gen. xiv, 6): that is, Trogodytes, or “cave-dwellers,” from the nature of their habitations. See Horites. The mountains of Edom, as all travellers know, are filled with caves and grottoes hewn in the soft sandstone strata.

2. History and geography.—Edom proper, or Idumea, is situated on the south-eastern border of Palestine, extending from it to the northern extremity of the Elatitic Gulf. It was bounded on the west by the great valley of the Arabah, on the south by a line drawn due east from the modern fortress of Akaba, on the east by the Arabian desert, and on the north by the ancient kingdom of Moab. Its length from north to south was about 100 miles, and its breadth averaged 20. These boundaries are nowhere directly defined, but we can ascertain them from various incidental references in Scripture. When the Israelites encamped at Kadesh-barnea they were close to the border of Edom (Num. xxx), and Mount Hor is said to be within its border (xxxiii, 37). Hence, as Kadesh was situated in the valley of the Arabah, and as Mount Hor is only a few miles to the east of it, we conclude that the Arabah is the western boundary. The Israelites asked, but were refused admission through either Edom or Moab, so as to go direct from Kadesh to the east side of the Jordan (Num. xx, 14-20; Judg. xi, 17, 18). In consequence of this refusal, they were obliged to march south along the Arabah to Edom-geber, and thence eastward by the wilderness as far as the territories of the Arabah and Moab (Num. xxxii, 4). Hence we conclude that Edom and Moab occupied the whole region along the east side of the valley of the Arabah, from the Dead Sea to the Elatitic Gulf. Edom was wholly a mountainous country, as may be inferred from the names given to it in the ancient writers (Herodotus, ii, 1; ii, 5; Josephus, Ant. ii, 1, 2; Eusebius, Onomast. s. v. Idumea). The foot of the mountain range, therefore, may be regarded as marking its eastern border. On the north it appears to have been separated from Moab by the “brook Zered” (Deut. ii, 13, 14, 18; Num. xxxii, 12), which is probably identical with the modern wady el-Ahsay. These views are corroborated by other and independent testimony. In the Samaritan Pentateuch the word Gaba is substituted for Seir in Deut. xxxii, 2; and Eusebius and Jerome state that Idumea was in their time known as Yabala, which is a Greek (Ἀβαλλα) corruption of the Hebrew Gebal, “mountain” (Onomast. id. et al. s. v. Seir), and is retained to this day in the Arabic form Jebel. The modern province of Jebel is bounded on the west by the Arabah, and on the north by wady el-Ahsay (Robinson, Bib. Res. ii, 151; Burchardt, Trav. in Syria, p. 410). We may safely conclude from this that the ancient province had the same boundaries, as it had the same name. Thus Josephus writes (Ant. v, 1, 22): “The lot of Simeon included that part of Idumea which bordered upon Egypt and Arabia;” and, though this is true, it does not contradict the language of Scripture—“I will not give you of their land, no, not so much as a footestool, because I have given Mount Seir unto Esau for a possession” (Deut. ii, 5). Not a footestool of Edom Proper, or Mount Seir, was ever given by divine sanction to the Jews.

Josephus divides Idumea into two provinces, Gobalit and Amalek (Ant. ii, 1, 2). The modern province of Idumæa Proper, being identical, as the name would indicate, with “Mount Seir,” the other embraced a portion of Southern Palestine, with the desert plain south of it, which was originally occupied by the Amalekites (Num. xiii, 29), and subsequently, as we shall see, by the Edomites. Pliny places Idumea to the south of Palestine, bordering upon Egypt (Hist. Nat. v, 14).

Strabo (xvi, 2, 86, p. 760) states that the Idumæans were originally Nabathæans, but, being driven out thence, they joined themselves to the Jews. See Smith, Dict. of Class. Geog. s. v.

5. History.—The first mention of Mount Seir is in Gen. xiv, 6, where the confederate kings are said to have smitten the “Horites in their Mount Seir.” B.C. cir. 2060. These Horites appear to have been a tribe of the gigantic aborigines of Western Asia, so called from dwelling in caves (Gen. xxxxi, 20-30). They were a pastoral people, divided into tribes and independent chief tribes called Alloph (ירוק, ver. 29). Esau’s marriage with the daughters of Canaan alienated him from his parents, and he then obtained a settlement among the Horites, where he acquired power and wealth as early as the time of Jacob’s return from Padan-aram (Gen. xxvii, 46). Probably his close alliance with Ishmael tended to increase his influence in that Central country (Gen. xxxvi, 32, 33; xxxvii, 3 sq.). Though then established in Edom, Esau had still some part of his flocks in Western Palestine, in connection with those of his father; but on the return of Jacob he removed all his property from Canaan and dwelt in Mount Seir (xxxvi, 6-8). He gradually subdued and finally exterminated, or perhaps rather supplanted, the Horites (Deut. ii, 12, 22), and a distinct tribe of his descendants, the Amalekites, leaving Edom, took possession of the desert plateau south of Canaan (Gen. xxxvi, 12; Exod. viii, 14 sq.). The earliest form of government among the Idumeans, as like that of the Horites, was, like that of the A. V. rendering “dukes,” but manifestly the same as the modern Arab sheikah), exercising independent authority over distinct tribes (Gen. xxxvi, 15-19). It appears, however, that the various tribes were, at least in times of general war, united under one leader, to whom the title of king (덱) was given. The names of eight of these kings (only one of whom is spoken of as related to any other, Anah, the son of Zibeon) are mentioned in Gen. xxxvi, 31-39, who are said to have reigned in Edom “before there reigned any king over the children of Israel,” that is, apparently before the time of Moses (see Deut. xxxiii, 5; Exod. xviii, 16-19). Most of the large nomadic tribes of Arabia have now an acknowledged chief, who is styled emir, and who takes the lead in any great emergency, while each division of the tribe enjoys independence under its own sheik on all ordinary occasions. Such would seem to have been the case with the Edomites, and this affords an easy solution of the apparent confusion in the account of the invasion of Edom (Gen. xxxvi, 31), recorded again in Exod. xv, 15, where it is said “the dukes of Edom shall be amazed,” and Judg. xi, 17, where Moses is represented as having sent “messengers from Kadesh unto the king of Edom.” The primitive and pastoral character of the people is incidentally brought out by their custom of abiding with their flocks (Gen. xxi, 31). Anah was in the habit of tending his father’s asses (Gen. xxxvi, 24). It was when thus employed that he found in the wilderness נָגַס, ko-genin, rendered in the Eng. Vers. by “the mules,” but meaning more probably “the hot springs.” There is in the country to the south-east of the Dead Sea (which formed part of the Seirite possessions) a place, Calneh, celebrated among the Greeks and Romans for its warm baths, which has been visited by modern travellers (Josephus, War, i, 33, 5; Pliny, Hist. Nat. v, 5, 17; Legh’s Travels).

Though the Israelites and Edomites were closely related, and though the former were commanded “not to abhor an Edomite, for he is thy brother” (Deut. xxi, 7), yet the bitterest enmity appears to have existed between them at every period of their history, as a perpetuation of the unbrotherly feud between their progenitors. When the Israelites asked permission to pass through the territory of Edom on their way to Canaan, they were rudely refused by its king (Deut. xvi, 1). The road by which it was sought to penetrate the country was termed “the king’s highway” (ver. 17), supposed by Dr. Robinson (Researches, ii, 556; but see a different explanation in De Saulcy's Narrative, i, 392; comp. 273, 276) to be wady el-Ghuweir, for it is almost the only valley that affords direct and easy passage through those
mountains. From a comparison of these incidents it may be inferred that the change in the form of government took place during the wanderings of the Israelites in the Desert, unless we suppose, with Rosenmuller, that it was only this north-eastern part of Edom which was seized as a conquest, the rest of the country remaining under the way of the Amorites. But whether the regal power at this period embraced the whole territory or not, perhaps it did not supplant the ancient constitution, but was rather grafted on it, like the authority of the Judges in Israel, and of Saul, the first king. This did not materially interfere with the government that previously existed. It further appears, from the list of Idumean kings, that the monarchy was not hereditary, but elective (for no one is spoken of as the son or relative of his predecessor); or probably that chiefman was acknowledged as sovereign who was best able to vindicate his claim by force of arms. Every successive king appears to have selected his own seat of government: the places mentioned as having enjoyed that distinction are Dinhalah, Avith, Pagu or Pai. Even forefathers were not excluded from the throne, for the successor of Samlah of Masrekah was Saul, or Chaun, "son of Recab," near "the river." These meanings, literally, streets, and was a not uncommon name given to towns; but the emphatic addition of the river points evidently to the Ephrathites, and between Rakkah and Anah, on that river, there still are the remains of a city called by the Arabs Rababah Malik Ibn-Tauk. In the reign of Solomon, the king of Israel, and of Hadad, who was of the king's seed in Edom (1 Kings xi, 14); from which some have conjectured that by that period there was a royal dynasty of one particular family; but all that the expression may imply is that he was a blood relation of the last king of the country. Hadad was the name of one of the early sovereigns whom smote Midian in the field of Moab (Gen. xxxvi, 35).

The country was attacked by Saul with partial success (1 Sam. xiv, 47). A few years later David overthrew the Edomites in the "valley of Salt," at the southern extremity of the Dead Sea (Robinson, Bib. Res. ii, 100), and put garrisons in their cities (2 Sam. vii, 14; 1 Chron. xxvii, 11-13; 1 Kings xi, 15). Comp. the inscription of Psa. ix. and v, 8, 9; cviii, 9, 10, where "the strong city may denote Selah or Petra). Then were fulfilled the prophecies in Gen. xxv, 32 and xxvii, 40, that the elder should serve the younger; and also the prediction of Is. (viii, 24; xxxvii, 36; Jer. xxv, 21; Ezek. xlv, 13, 14; Obad. 10-11). From the language of Malachi (i, 2, 3), and also from the accounts preserved by Josephus (Ant. x. 9, 7), it would seem that the Edomites did not wholly escape the Chaldean scourge; but instead of being carried captive, like the Jews, they not only retained possession of their own territory, but in the rapid turnovers of the state, were carried far as Helbon (1 Macc. v, 65, comp. with Ezeke. xxxvi, 10; xxxvi, 5). Probably as a reward for the assistance afforded by them to the Chaldeans, the Edomites were permitted to settle in Southern Palestine, and in the country lying by it and the borders of Egypt. The name Idumaea was now given to the whole country, from the valley of the Aralah to the Mediterranean (Joseph. Ant. vi. 1, 22; Strabo, xvi, 2), and from Elytheropolis to Elath (Jerome, Comment. in Obod.); hence arose the mistakes of Roman writers, who sometimes give the name Idumea to all Palestine, and call the Jews Idumaeans (Virgil, Georgy, iii, 12; Juvenal, xiv, 180).

While the Edomites thus extended their conquests westward, they were driven out of their own country by the Nabataeans (q. v.), who, leaving the nomad habits of their ancestors, settled down amid the mountains of Edom, engaged in commerce, and founded the little kingdom of Arabia Petraea. Some of their monarchs took the name Aretas (2 Macc. v, 8; Joseph. Ant. xv, 1, 2), and some Obodas (Joseph. Ant. xiii, 5, 1). One of them was that Aretas whose daughter Herod Antipas married (Matt. iv, 5, 4); and it was the same king of Arabia who captured Damascus, and who was killed by the forces of Paul's conversion (Acts ix, 25; 2 Cor. xi, 32). Idumaea was taken by the Romans in A.D. 165, and under their paternal government the enterprise inhabitants increased greatly in wealth and power. A lucrative transport trade thrived between India, Persia, and the Levant which was in their hands. Roads were made across the desert of Arabia, through the deserts of Edom, and westward and northward to the Mediterranean and Palestine. Traces of them still remain, with ruinous settlements at intervals, and fallen milestones of the times of Trajan and Marcus Aurelius (Peregr. Tauris; La borde's Voyage; Burckhardt's Syria, p. 374, 43, 198; and Mangles's Travels, p. 571, 371, 1st ed.). The magnificent rock-temples, palaces, and tombs of Petra were then constructed, which still continue to be the wonder and admiration of Eastern travellers. They are not the
works of the Edomites, but of the descendants of Nebaioth, Ishmael's oldest son and Esau's brother-in-law (Gen. xxv, 13; xxxvi, 3; Joseph. Ant. i, 12, 4; Diod. Sic. 19.)

On the revival of Jewish power under the Ammonites, that part of Southern Palestine to which the name Idumea had been given by Benevento, they were finally subdued by John Hyrcanus, who compelled them to submit to circumcision and other Jewish rites, with a view to incorporate them with the nation (1 Macc. v, 8, 65; 2 Macc. x, 16; xi, 32; Joseph. Ant. xii, 9, 1; 15, 4). The small-gamma, however, before these two races seems never to have been perfected. The country was governed by Jewish prefects, and one of these, an Idumean by birth, became procurator of Judea, and his son was Herod the Great, "king of the Jews" (Joseph. Ant. xii, 8, 6; xiii, 9, 2; xiv, 1, 8 and 8; xv, 7, 9; xvii, 11, 4). Not long before the siege of Jerusalem by Titus, 20,000 Idumeans were called in to the defence of the city by the Zealots, but both parties gave themselves up to rapine and murder (Joseph. War, iv, 4, 5; 5, 1; vii, 8, 1). This is the last mention made of the Edomites in history. The author of a work on Job, once ascribed to Origen, says that their name and language had perished, and that, like the Ammonites and Moabites, they had all become Arabs. In the second century Ptolemy limits the name Idumea to the country west of the Jordan.

In the first centuries of the Christian era Edom was included in the province of Palaestina Tertia, of which Petra was metropolis (S. Paulo, Geogr. Sac. p. 207; Reland, Palest. p. 218). After the Mohammedan conquest its commercial importance declined, its flourishing port and inland cities fell to ruin. The Mohammedans were the instruments by which the fearful predictions of the Scripture were finally fulfilled. The Crusaders made several expeditions to Edom, penetrating it as far as Petra, to which they gave the name "Valley of Moses" (Gesta Dei per Francos, p. 518, 555, etc.), a name still existing in the Arabic form Wady Mita. On a commanding hill some twelve miles north of Petra they built a fortress, and called it Monastery; its modern name is Shobek (ib. p. 611). The Crusaders occupied and fortified Kerak, the ancient Kir Moab, and raised it to the dignity of an episcopal see, under the impression that it was Petra (ib. p. 812, 885, 1119). From the age of the Crusaders until the present century nothing was known of Idumea to the traveller who had passed through it, and as a country it had disappeared from history. Volney heard some vague reports of its wonders from Arabs. Seetzen also heard much of it in the year 1806, but he was unable to enter it. Burckhardt was the first to traverse the country. In 1812 he travelled from Kerak south by Shobek to Petra (Trav. in Syr. p. 372 sq.; Robinson, Bib. Res. ii, 165). In 1828, Laborde, proceeding northward from Akabah through the defiles of Edom, also visited Petra, and brought away a portfolio of splendid drawings, which proved that the descriptions of Burckhardt had not been exaggerated. Many have since followed the footsteps of the first explorers, and a trip to Petra now forms a necessary part of the Eastern traveller's grand tour.

4. Physical Geography.—Idumea embraces a section of a broad mountain range, extending in breadth from the valley of the Arabah to the desert plateau of Arabia. "Along the base of the range on the east side the Arabah is a low and barren tract, and the mountains, low and barren, are low and barren. To these succeed lofty masses of igneous rock, chiefly porphyry; over which lies the red and variegated sandstone in irregular ridges and abrupt cliffs, broken by deep and wild ravines. The latter strata give the mountains their most striking feature. (Burckhardt, for S. and Petra, p. 373. "The first thing that struck me," says Stanley, "in turning out of the Arabah up the defiles that lead to Petra was, that we had suddenly left the desert. Instead of the absolute nakedness of the Sicantic valleys, we found ourselves walking on grass, sprinkled with flowers, and the level platforms on each side were filled with sprawling corn; and this continues through the whole descent to Petra, and in Petra itself. The next peculiarity was when, after having left the summit of the pass, or after descending from Mount Hor, we found ourselves insensibly encircled with rocks of deepening and deepening red. Red, indeed, even from a distance, the mountains of 'red' Edom appear, but not more so than the granite of Sinai; and it is not till one is actually in the midst of them that this red becomes crimson, and that the wonder of the Petra colors fully displays itself" (Sin. and Pal. p. 88). The ravines which intersect these sandstone mountains are very remarkable. Take them as a whole, there is nothing like them in the world, especially those near Petra. "You descend from wide down . . . and before you opens a deep cleft between rocks of

Ravine in Idumea.
16; Gen. xxvii, 40), yet Isaac, in his prophetic blessing, promised his disappointed son that his dwelling should be "of the fatness of the earth, and of the dew of heaven from above" (Gen. xxvii, 39). But many critics are of opinion (e.g. Vetter, De Wette, Geddes, Von Bohlen) that שָׂרָה should there be rendered from, i.e. "far away from, or destitute of," the fatness of the earth, etc.; and it is thus made to agree with the Hebrew word, by the addition שָׁרוּת, "the sword." and it does not appear that Edom was ever particularly noted for its fertility. Some other passages of Scripture are also illustrated by a glance at the towering precipices and peaks of Edom. The border of the Ammonites was the "southern border of the land of Edom, from the rock"—that is, from the rock boundary of Edom (Judg. i, 36). We read that Amaziah, after the conquest of Sear, took ten thousand of the captives to the "top of the cliff," and thence cast them down, dash- ing them all to pieces (2 Chron. xxxv, 11, 12).

5. Present State of the Country.—Idumaea, once so rich in its flocks, so strong in its fortresses and rock-hewn cities, so extensive in its commercial relations, so renowned for the architectural splendor of its temples and palaces—is now a deserted and desolate wilderness. Its whole population is contained in some three or four thousand scattered walled villages, barely sufficient for the purpose of their small flocks and herds. Its forests disappear from its borders; its highways are untraveled, its cities are all in ruins. The predictions of God's Word have been fulfilled to the very letter (see Est. 11, 7, 32; Jer. viii, 17). "Thorns shall come up in her palaces, nettles and briers in the fortresses thereof. . . . When the wolf shall dwell with the lamb, and the bear shall eat straw with the goat, and the weak shall be the ruler in the land, then the wilderness shall prosper like the garden, and the fruitful land shall grow desolate. . . . Thou shalt be desolate, O Mount Seir, and all Idumaea, even all of it. . . . Edom shall be a desolation; every one that goeth by it shall be astonished" (Isa. xxxiv, 15; Ezek. xxxvi, 14; Jer. xi, 17). Idumaea is divided into two principal districts, Jabal and Edom, including the northern section as far as wady el-Ghuweir, and Edom-Sheerah, embracing the southern part (Burchardt, Trav. in Syria, p. 410; Robinson, Bib. Res. ii, 154). Burchard mentions a third district, Jebel Heema; but Robinson says that though there is a sandy tract, el-Hamma, with mountains around it, on the east of Akabah, it does not constitute a separate division. The site of the ancient capital Bozrah is now marked by the small village of Busaireh, and Petra, the Nabatean capital, is well known as wady Musa. The whole of this region is at present occupied by various tribes of Bedouin Arabs. The chief tribe in the Jabal is the Hejaysa, with a branch of the Kaabineh, while in edh-Sheerah they are all of the numerous and powerful tribe of the Haweitain, with a few independent allies. The Bedouins in Idumaea have of late years been partially subject to the pacha of Egypt, paying an annual tribute, which, in the case of the Beni Sukhr, is one camel for two tents. The fellahin, or peasants, are half Bedouin, inhabiting the few villages, but dwelling also in tents; they pay tribute to the Egyptian government, and furnish supplies of grain.

6. The character of the Edomites was drawn by Isaac in his prophetic blessing to Esau—"By thy sword shalt thou live" (Gen. xxvi, 40). War and rapine were the only professions of the Edomites. By the sword they got Mount Seir—by the sword they exterminated the Horites—by the sword they long battled with their brethren of Israel, and finally bought off their yoke—by the sword they won Southern Palestine—and by the sword they performed the last act in their long historic drama, massacred the guards in the Temple, and pillaged the city of Jerusalem.

Little is known of their religion, but that little shows them to have been idolatrous. It is probable that Esau's marriage with the "daughters of Canaan," who were" a grief of mind" to his father and mother (Gen. xxvi, 34, 35), induced him to embrace their religion; and when Esau and his followers took possession of Mount Seir, they seem to have followed the common practice among ancient nations of adopting the country's gods, for we read that Amaziah, king of Judah, after his conquest of the Edomites, "brought the gods of the children of Seir, and set them up to be his gods" (2 Chron. xxv, 14, 15, 20). Josephus also refers to both to the idols (one of which he named Kose) and priests of the Idumaeans (Ant. xv, 27).

7. Literature.—With respect to the striking fulfilment of the prophetic denunciations upon Edom, we need only refer the reader to the well-known work of Keith, who frequently errs, however, in straining the sense of prophecy beyond its legitimate import, as well as in seeking out too literally minute an accomplishment. On Idumaea generally, see C. B. Michaelis, Die Antiquitaeten, Idumaeor. Hist. in Pott and Ruperti's Sylvico Comment. Theol. part vi, p. 121; J. D. Michaelis, Comment. de Troglodyia Seirithis, in the Syntagma Commentum, part i, p. 194. For the ancient geography, Reland's Palæstina; Forster's Geography of Arabia; Bittner's Palæstina und Syria. For the history and commerce, Nolde, Hist. Idumaeae, Frank. 1726; Vincent's Commerce and Navigation of the Ancients, vol. ii. For modern geography, the travels of Burchardt, Laborde, Wilson, Stanley, and Porter's Hand. for Syria and Pal.; but especially, Sketches of Idumaea by the present Israel Robinson, in the Amer. Bib. Repository for April, 1833, p. 247, and his Bib. Researches, ii, 551. See EDOMITE, etc.

Idumææ (Ἰδομαίας), an inhabitant of the land of Idumaea (q. v.) (2 Mac. x, 15, 16).

I'yál ( Heb. יִֽיאַל, יִֽיאֲלָא,  Translate, a name of three men.


3. (Sept. "iyadh, Vulg. Igal, A. V. "Igal"). Son of Nathan of Zobah, and one of David's famous warriors (2 Sam. xxv, 15; 1 Chron, vii, 9). In the parallel list of 1 Chron., the name is given as "Joel the brother of Nathan" (xii, 38, 39). Kennicott, after a minute examination of the passage, both in the original and in the ancient versions, decides in favor of the latter as most likely to be the genuine text (Dis. brev. p. 212-214).

3. (Sept. "Iyadh, Vulg. Igal, A. V. "Igal"). One of the sons of Shemaiah, of the descendants of Zerubbabel (1 Chron. iii, 22). The number "six" there given is that of the grandchildren of Shechaniah (see Strong's Hark. and Expos. of the Gosp. p. 17). B.C. ante 406.

Igdáli'áh (Heb. יִֽגְדָלָיָּה, but only in the prolonged form, יִֽגְדָלָיָּה, 77, 77, whom Jerocho will make great; Sept. "Pacholak, Vulg. Jegyhala"). the father of Hanan, into the chamber of which latter Jeremiah brought the Rechabites to propose the test of their temperance (Jer. xxxvi, 4). B.C. ante 606.

Iเก'יל (1 Chron. iii, 22). See Igal 8.

Igmatian Epistles. See IGNIATIUS OF ANTIOCH.

Ignatius of Antioch, one of the apostolical fathers (q. v.), called also Theophorus (ὅς ὁθωφροῦς), a title which he explained to the emperor Trajan as meaning "one who has Christ in his heart." We have no trustworthy accounts of the life and ministry of Ignatius. The chief authority is the Martyrium Ignatii (written below), but that those who assert the genuineness of that work admit that it is greatly interpolated. There are several unsupported stories in the fathers, e.g. that Ignatius was the child whom Christ took into his arms (Mark ix, 36), that he had seen Christ, etc. Abapharagyn (Pehnac. vii, 75, etc.) and Hesychius (Strom. ii, 12) were understood below), but that those who assert the genuineness of that work admit that it is greatly interpolated. There are several unsupported stories in the fathers, e.g. that Ignatius was the child whom Christ took into his arms (Mark ix, 36), that he had seen Christ, etc. Abapharagyn (Pehnac. vii, 75, etc.), and Hesychius (Strom. ii, 12) were understood.
but Eusebius fixes the date of his ordination at A.D. 69, when several of the apostles were dead. According to the same historian, he was the second successor of St. Paul, Evodius having been the first. The Apostolic Constitutions, on the other hand, say that Ignatius and Evodius held the office together, Evodius by appointment from Peter, Ignatius from Paul. So say, also, Bar- romelaus and John Chrysostom, while Ignatius, bishop of the Jews, and Ignatius of the Gentiles. “Of the episcopate of Ignatius we know little. He appears to have been over-earnest in insinuating upon the prerogatives of the clergy, especially the bishops. The Martyrdom Ignatii has him as an earnestness of his flight during the persecution said to have taken place in Domitian’s reign, and incessant in watch- ing and prayer and in instructing his people, fearing lest the more ignorant and timid among them should fall away. On the cessation of the persecution he rejoiced at the little injury the church at Antioch had sustained. When the emperor Trajan, elated with his victories over the Dacians and other nations on the Danubian frontier, began to persecute the Church, the anxiety of Ignatius was renewed, and, eager to avert the violence of persecution from his flock, and to obtain the crown of martyrdom and offered himself, the correct version brought before the emperor, then at Antioch on his way to the eastern frontier to attack the Armenians and Parthians. The conference between Trajan and the bishop is given in the Martyrium Ignatii; it ended in an order of the emperor that Ignatius should be taken to Rome as a witness to the wild beasts. He was led thither by a long and tedious route, but was allowed to have communication with his fellow-Christians at the places at which he stopped. He was thrown to the wild beasts in the Roman amphitheatre, at the feast dis- tinguished as the feast of the thir- teenth” (Smith, Dict. of Class. Antig., s. v. Saturnalia). Such parts of him as remained were collected by his sorrowing friends, and taken back to Antioch, where in Jerome’s time they were resting in the cemetery outside the gate toward Daphne. From thence they were re- moved to the crypt of St. Jerome (Evagr. Hist. Eccle. i, 16). Their subsequent removals are uncertain. The martyrdom of St. Ignatius is commemorated by the Rom- an Church on the 1st of February; by the Greek Church on the 20th of December. The Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians is generally called the Epistle of St. Ignatius. The year of Ignatius’s death has been much disputed. Many of the best writers (following the Martyrium Ignatii) place it in A.D. 107; but, as it is now generally conceded that Trajan did not visit the East till 114, and as he probably spent the win- ter 114–115 at Antioch, the best critics agree on A.D. 115 as the most probable date.

Epistles of Ignatius.—On his way from Antioch to Rome, Ignatius is said to have written seven epistles. These are enumerated both by Eusebius (Hist. Eccle. iii, 36) and Jerome (De Viris Illustribus, 16). At present, however, there are fourteen epistles extant, a number which is equal to Ignatius. Seven of these are considered by many to be genuine, namely, 1. Pro’s Ερυθεῖος, Ad Ephesios; 2. Μαθητικός, Ad Magnesiam; 3. Τραγανάκιος, Ad Trallianos; 4. Ραγματικός, Ad Romanos; 5. Φίλιππος, Ad Philadelphias; 6. Συμβάσιος, Ad Smyrneos; and 7. Προς Πάλαισιον, Ad Polycarpum. The titles of these epistles agree with the enumeration of Eusebius and Jerome. The book has two recensions of them—a longer, now regarded as an interpolated one, first published by Pusey (1557), and a shorter form, which is considered as tolerably uncorrupted. Many doubt the genuineness of either (see below). Two ancient Latin versions are extant, corresponding in a great degree to the two forms or recensions of the Greek text: the longer, known as the common (mutila) version, the other first discovered and published by archbishop Usher (1644) (see below). The epistle to the Ephesians, Ro- manos, and Polycarp were published, with a translation, in a still shorter Syriac version, by Cureton (1845). Many of the interpolations found in the larger form are of passages from the N. T.

Five other epistles, though extant in Greek, are regarded by nearly all classes of critics as spurious, name- ly, 8. Pro’s Μαρίων with Ευσημία τῆς πρὸς τοῦ Σαρώφ, 9. Ad Magnesiam, 10. Προς Κολωνίαν, and 11. Pro’s Πατριάρχας, and 12. Pro’s Αἰγύπτιος, Προς Αἰγύπτιος. Some copies add to the title of this last epistle the words περὶ Βασιλείας, De Basiileia, an addition which by no means describes the contents. Four of these spurious epistles two ancient Latin versions are extant, the com- mon version, and that published by Usher. Of that to the Philippian there is but one version, namely, the common. The epistle to Polycarp in the common Latin version is defective, containing only about one third of the original text, what is given by the common version, is printed in the Greek and in the two Latin versions, an epistle of Mary of Cassobeia (called also Πορφύριος, Prose- lyta) to Ignatius, to which his letter professes to be an answer.

The remaining three epistles ascribed to Ignatius are found only in Latin. They are very short, and have long been given up as spurious. They are, 13. S. Ioanni Evangelista; 14. Ad Evrem; and, 15. Beata Virgo. With these is found a letter of the Virgin to Ignatius, Beata Virgo Ignatius, professing to be an answer to his letter.

The controversy respecting the genuineness of these writings began at an early period. In A.D. 1405 the three Latin epistles and the letter of the Virgin were printed at Paris, subjoined to the Vita et Processus S. Thomas Cantuariensis Martyris super Libertate Ecclesi- asticae. In A.D. 1498, three years after the appearance of these letters, another collection, edited by J. Faber, of Staples (Stampulensis), was printed at Paris in folio, con- taining the common Latin version of eleven letters, that of Mary of Cassobeia not being among them. They were published with some of the works ascribed to Dionysius Areopagite and an epistle of Polycarp. These epistles were reprinted at Ven. 1502; Paris, 1515; Basel, 1520; and Strasburg, 1527. In 1516 the preceding fourteen epistles, with the addition of the letter to Mary of Cassobeia, were edited by Simplicianus Chamerius of Lyons, and published at Paris in 4to, with seven letters of St. Antony, commonly called the Great. In A.D. 1557, the twelve epistles of Ignatius, in Greek, were published by Valentinus Paeus, or Paeus, in 8vo, at Dillin- gen, in Suabia on the Danube, from an Augsburg MS. They were reprinted at Paris, 1558, with critical emen- tations. The same twelve Greek epistles, from another MS, from the library of St. Mark at Venice, was pub- lished by Andreas Gisner, with a Latin version by Jo- annes Brunner, Zirich, 1559, folio. In these editions the Greek text of the seven epistles was given in the larger form, the shorter form, both in Greek and Latin, being omitted. The genuineness of these remains was now called in question. “The authors of the Centuriae Magdeburgenses were the first to express their doubts, though with caution and moderation. Cal- vin, in his Institutiones (i, 8), declared that “nothing could be more sily than the stuff (sanie) which had been brought out under the name of Ignatius, and ren- dered the impulse of those persons more insufferable who had set themselves to deceive people by such phantoms (larvae).” The controversy grew warm, the Roman writers and the Episcopalian commonly con- tending for the genuineness of at least a part of the epistles, and the Presbyterian denying it. The three epis-
supply this clue. Mr. Cureton discovered, among a most important collection of Syriac MSS., procured for the British Museum by archdeacon Tatam, in the year 1843, from the monastery of St. Mary Deipara of the Syrians, in the Desert of Nitria, three entire epistles which he published in the year 1845. This publication naturally excited great attention on the part of those who felt an interest in the subject already changed apart from the other five epistles; he marked, also, in the genuine epistles, the parts which he regarded as interpolations. In 1844 archbishop Usher's (4to, Oxford) edition of the epistles of Polycarp and Ignatius appeared. It contained the epistles to the Philippians, Smyrna, and six of the supposed genuine epistles of Ignatius; 2 Epistolæ B. Ignatii ascendit a Medio Ætatis Graecæ See (Six Epistles ascribed to St. Ignatius by the Greeks of the Middle Age). The epistle of Polycarp was included in this class, with the five spurious epistles extant in Greek. The common Latin version was also printed with these in parallel columns, and the three epistles which are extant only in Latin were subjoined; 3. A Latin version of eleven epistles (that to the Philippians being the one only), was translated by Usher, and now first printed. This corresponds, in the main, to the shorter text of the so-called genuine epistles. The work of Usher contains also a valuable introduction and notes to the epistles of Ignatius and Polycarp, the Apostolical Constitutions, and the Canon of Polycarp. The epistles of Ignatius were published by Isaac Vossius (4to, Amst.), from a MS. in the Medicin Library at Florence. The MS., which is not accurately written, and is mutilated at the end, is valuable as the only one containing the shorter version of the genuine epistles; it was, however, referred, by Martynus, in the longer form, as in the former editions. The five spurious epistles, and that of Mary of Cassopolis to Ignatius, from the Medicin MS., the text of which differs materially from that previously published; the three Latin epistles, published by Usher in the Latin version of the eleven Greek epistles; and the common version of that to the Philippians, were all given by Vossius. In 1647 Usher published his Appendix Ignatiana, containing the Greek text of the seven epistles, and two Latin versions of the Martyrium Ignatii. He gave the Medicin text of six of the epistles, that to the Romans, with the common text, with the interpolations expunged, as determined by a collation of the epistle contained in the Martyrium, both in the Greek of Symon Metaphrastes and the Latin version published by Usher. After the controversy had been carried on for some time, and great progress had been made towards the settlement of the text, the most formidable attack on the genuineness of the epistles was made by Dalli (Dalleus), one of the most eminent of the French Protestants, in his work De Scriptis qui sub Dionysii Apostolop et Ignatii Antiocheni circumssecutur Liber duo (Gen. 1666, 4to). The works of Ignatian form the subject of the second book. This attack of Dalli called forth the De circvit Ignatianae of bishop Pearson (Cambridge, 1672, 4to), which was long supposed to have settled the controversy. But it has recently been reopened with fresh vigor and interest. Archdeacon Usher, in his edition of the Ignatian Epistles published at Oxford in 1644, declared that he could not venture to promise that the genuine Ignatius could be recovered without the aid of another Greek text, which he hoped to obtain from a MS. in the Medicin Library at Florence, or at least without the aid of a Syriac copy, which he did not deem as of preeminent from that of Iliome. The Medicin MS. was published, but the difficulties remained the same. The Syriac version, which was then looked to as affording the only probable clue to the solution, eluded the most diligent and anxious search for a period of 290 years. It was reserved for the Rev. William Cureton, a canon of We-the-Kin, to
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epitaphe in pronouncing such a decisive judgment. But he saw distinctly, and he therefore spoke fearlessly. There is a far more intimate connection than many are disposed to believe between sound theology and sound criticism, for a right knowledge of the Word of God strengthens faith. 6. The more careful the detection of error wherever it may reveal itself. Had Pearson enjoyed the same clear views of Gospel truth as the reformers of Geneva, he would not have wasted so many precious years in writing a learned vindication of the nonsense attributed to Ignatius. Calvin knew that an aposporous silence about the Eucharist must have been associated with apostolic doctrine, and he saw that these letters must have been the production of an age when the pure light of Christianity was greatly obscured. Hence he denounced them so emphatically; and time has verified his deliverance. His language respecting them has been often quoted, but we feel we must appropriately close our observations on this subject than by another repetition of it, 'There is nothing more abominable than that trash which is in circulation under the name of Ignatius.' Dr. Killen's positive arguments against the genuineness of all the epistles are as follows: 1. The style is suspicious; 2. The Ignatianism of the Word's Person has never done by any of the genuine writings of the early fathers; 3. They contain chronological blunders; 4. They use words in meanings which they did not acquire till long after the time of Ignatius; 5. They abound in puerilities, vapors, and logorrheas; 6. They thirst after martyrdom, and insane desire for martyrdom. Baur and Hilgenfeld also hold them all not to be genuine, but think that the seven of the shorter Greek recensions were the first to be forged after A.D. 150, and that the Syriac three are simply fragmentary translations from the Greek. With Uhlig and Schurmann also many able and sound critics of the Romanists and Protestants, as Möhler, Hefele, and Gieseler.

The most complete edition of Ignatius is that contained in the Patras Apostolici of Cotelerius, the second edition of which, Le Clerc (Amst. 1724, 2 vols. folio), contains all the genuine and spurious epistles (Greek and Latin), with the epistles of Mary of Cassobele and of the Virgin, the two ancient Latin versions (the common one and Usher's), the Martyrium Ignatii, the Dissertations (i.e. the Introduction) of Usher, the Indicibus of Pearson, in Latin of Cotelerius Epistolae by Le Clerc, and various other notes. A useful edition of the genuine epistles, with those of Clement of Rome and Polycarp, and the Martyria of Ignatius and Polycarp, was published by Jacobson (Oxford, 1838, 2 vols. 8vo). There are versions in several languages of modern Europe, including French translations, by the bishop Wake (Genuine Epistles of the Apostolic Fathers, Lond. 1693, 8vo), and a modern one by Clementson (1827, 8vo). Wake's translation has been repeatedly published.

The Martyrium Ignatii, which is our chief authority for the circumstances of Ignatius's death, professes to be written by eye-witnesses, the companions of his voyage to Rome, supposed to be Philo, a deacon of Tarasus or some other church in Cilicia, and Rheus Agathopus, a Syrian, who are mentioned in the epistles of Ignatius (Ad Philadelph. c.11; Ad Smyrnenses, c.10). Usher adds to them a third person, Gaius, but on what authority we know not, and the traditional add to Ignatius (Ad Romanares, c.10). The account, with many interpolations, is incorporated in the work of Symeon Metaphrastes (Dec. A.D. 20), and a Latin translation from him is given by Surisus, De Probata Sanctorum, Vetus, and in the Acta Sanctorum, under the date of the 1st of February. The Martyrium was first printed in Latin by archbishop Usher, who gave two distinct versions from different MSS. The Greek text was first printed by Ruinart, in his Acta Martyrum Sincera (Par. 1689, 4to), from a MS. in the Colbertine library, and in a revised edition by Cotelerius, with part of the preface by Jacob, and by most of the later editors of the epistles. Its genuineness is generally recognised, but it is thought to be interpolated. See the remarks of Grabbe, quoted by Jacobson at the end of the Martyrium. A considerable fragment of an ancient Syriac version of the Martyrium of Ignatius has been published by Mr. Cureton.


Ignatius, patriarch of Constantinople, flourished about the beginning of the 9th century. The schism of the Greek and Roman churches, which began under Photius (q.v.), who persecuted Ignatius and usurped his see, was consummated. The following account of him is (necessarily) chiefly from Roman sources, and must be taken with allowance. He was born in 799, and was the son of the emperor Michael Ceuropalates; his mother, procopia, was the daughter of the emperor Nicephorus. On the revolt of Leo the Armenian, in 802, Michael Ceuropalates, and his son, honored with the title of Cezar, occupied for the short period of a year and nine months only, and embraced monastic life. His sons followed the example of their father, and the youngest, Nicetas, then aged fourteen, changed his name to Ignatius. The new emperor, in order not to be disturbed in the possession of power, summoned to the council the members of the family of Michael, and caused his two sons, Eustathius and Nicetas, to be made eunuchs. During the reign of the three emperors, Leo, Michael II, and Theophilus, the young men were allowed to enjoy in tranquility the monastic life to which they had devoted themselves. Ignatius was admitted into the order of priestlyhood by Basil, bishop of Paros, in the Hellespont, a prelate who had suffered great persecution in opposing the Iconoclasts, and to whom Ignatius was much attached. On the death of Theophilus, the empress Theodora was declared regent in the name of her son, Michael III, and gaining power over the emporium of the empire, she was crowned, and became the patriarch of Constantinople, and caused Methodius to be elected in his place. Four years after, on the death of Methodius, the patriarchal dignity was bestowed upon Ignatius. But he did not long enjoy this honor. Barathius, then the emperor, made a second attempt to extirpate the Iconoclasts, and communicated on account of his scandalous excesses, having obtained considerable influence on the mind of the young emperor Michael, whose vices he flattered and encouraged, induced him to take the reins of government, and to compel his mother to withdraw to a convent, and to accept the vows. Ignatius, when summoned to lend his authority to this unfillial act, did not content himself with remonstrating against it, but gave a stern refusal. He was, in consequence, banished to the isle of Terebinthos, and deprived of his see, which he had held for eleven years. Photius, a eunuch related to Barathius, and a fancied rival of Ignatius, who favored the Iconoclasts, was by the will of the emperor, but without the consent of the Church, appointed to the patriarchate of Constantinople. For the controversy of Photius with the Church of Rome and its issue, see Porphirian. All is expressed to indicate Barathius, who sign remaining ineffective, his death was finally determined upon, and he was murdered in 866. Basil the Macedonian now became possessed of the supreme pow- er. One of the first acts of his reign was to banish Photius and recall Ignatius, who was triumphantly re- instated in his patriarchal dignity Nov. 4, 867. At his suggestion a council was assembled at Constantinople, which ranks in the Roman Church as the eighth occu-
Ignatius Loyola.

Ignatius Loyola. See Loyola.

Ignorance, the want of knowledge or instruction. It is often used to denote illiteracy. Mr. Locke observes that the causes of ignorance are chiefly three: 1. want of ideas; 2. want of a discoverable connexion between the ideas we have; 3. want of tracing and examining our own ideas. As respects religion, ignorance, Mr. Locke says, has been divided into three sorts: 1. An imbecile ignorance, in which the will has no part. It is an insult upon justice to suppose it will punish men because they were ignorant of things which they were physically incapable of knowing. 2. There is a wilful and obstinate ignorance; such an ignorance, far from exculpating, aggravates a man's crimes. 3. A sort of voluntary ignorance, which is neither entirely wilful nor entirely invincible, as when a man has the means of knowledge and does not use them.—Loecke, On the Understanding, ii. 178; Grove, Moral Philosophy, ii. 26, 29, 64; Watts, On the Mind: Henderson's Back, Theology. Dict. s. v. See Knowledge.

Ignorantines (Latin, Fratres Ignorantiae; French, Frères Ignorantins), also known as the Congregation of Christ's Instruction and Christian Schools, is the name of a Jesuitical foundation for the gratuitous instruction of poor children in sacred as well as secular learning, which was founded in France in the early part of the 18th century (1724) by the abbé de la Salle. As the object is to confine the instruction to such branches as do not conflict with, but even favor, the religious views of the Roman Catholics, virtually preparing the young, by the exclusion of all books by Protestants, to remain true to the church of their fathers, they have gradually been introduced into every Catholic country of Europe. In France this society shared at the Revolution the fate of all the other religious bodies; but, under the name of Brothers of the Christian Schools, they were re-established under Napoleon in 1806. They are now exceedingly numerous in France, Italy, and in some parts of Bohemia and Germany. Many branches exist also in England and Ireland. In the latter country they have large educational establishments, with a series of school-books specially designed for their own religious instruction. The scheme of instruction is a dress very similar to that of the Jesuits.—Chambers, Cyclop. s. v., 517; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. vi. 632.

Igment or Hegumen is the title of an abbey in the male monasteries of the Greek Church, more especially in Russia.

Theo, Johann von, a Swedish philologian, was born March 3, 1707, at Lund, and educated at the universities of Upsala, Greifswald, Jena, and Halle. At the last-named university he afterwards devoted himself with great success on the Oriental languages, then travelled extensively in Germany, Holland, England, and France, and on his return to his native country was appointed librarian at Upsala University. In 1737 he was appointed professor of poetry, and the year following professor of rhetoric. He continued in both, of which he became rector for many years, 1746, 1748. He distinguished himself greatly by his thorough investigations into the philological merits of his mother tongue, and by his labors on the Gothic version of Utillia, the results of which are left us in Scripta versionem Ulpianam et Aug. Mose-poeticam illustri- tia, which were collected and edited by A. F. Bütscbing (Berl. 1775, 4to). This collection (which is very rare, as only 138 copies were printed) contains I. Ulpianus illu- stratus, a series of critical observations on the readings of the Codex Argenteus, with a preface, in which he attempts to prove that the Vulgate, and other Latin versions produced by an encaustic process, the surface of the parchment having been covered with wax, on which silver-leaf was laid, and the form of the letter stamped thereon with a hot iron; 2. Fragmenta vers. Ulp., containing the portions of the Epistle to the Romans published by him with a Latin translation (in accordance with the originalis Ling. Lat. et Gr. inter Masopothos repriemendis; 4. De verbis Masopothos; Analecta Ulp., i.e. Cod. Argent. et litt. Goth. ii, de nominis sublat. et adjunct. Masopothos; 5. De Ling. Cod. Arg. 6. Specimen Gloss. Ulp., cum prefationibus. An Appendix to the work contains tables for the scholars. He also De usu LXX Interpretum in N. T. (Upsal. 1730): De usu accentuum Hebraeorum (ibid. 1738). See Kittto, Cyclopaedia Bib. Li., ii, 377; Jörcher, Geschichte L., Addend. Add. ii, 2270 sq.

I. H. S. is an inscription or monogram which has probably been used by the Church of Christ from an early date among the sacred symbols on church furniture, and in painted windows of the house of God, but its use has by no means been confined to ecclesiastical buildings. On tombs, roofs, and walls of houses, on sofas, and all the ornaments of Christian edifices. The monogram has been, and is even now, frequently impressed, especially among the adherents of the Roman, Greek, and Anglican churches. The interpretations which have been given of this mystical title are three. One is that they are the initials of the words "In Hoc Signo," borrowed from the luminous cross which was miraculously displayed in the sky before Constantine and his army. Others make them the initials of the words "Jesus Hominum Salvator," especially the Jesus, who used it for their badge and motto in the form i. i. s.; and still another, that they are the first three letters of the Greek ΙΗΔΠΟΥ, Jesus. This last opinion has been espoused by the late "Cambridge Camden Society" in a work which they published on this subject: Argument for the Greek Origin of the Monogram I. H. S. (London, 1841). The earliest Christian emblems found also seem to confirm this opinion, as they are in every case written in the Greek language, and "the celebrated monogram inscribed by Constantine's order on the Libera- rum, or standard of the cross, was undoubtedly Greek." Eusebius (Eccles. Hist.), in describing the famous standard, says, "A long spear, overlaid with gold, formed the figure of the cross, the letters being placed on it above and over it. On the top of the whole was fixed a crown, formed by the intertexture of gold and precious stones; and on this two letters indicating the name of Christ symbolized the Saviour's title by means of its first char- acters, the letter P being intersected by a Χ exactly in its centre, so that the letters the emblems the emblems the habit of wearing on his helmet at a later period." In regard to the shape of the letter S being Roman, and
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not Greek. The Church, a paper of the Church of England in Canada, says, "it might easily have become corrupted (i.e. the Greek Σ into a Latin S)—it would not, indeed, have been intelligible except to a few of the best scholars unless it was corrupted—and so could scarcely have escaped translation with the rest of the Greek. From which we are certified was the case, forfeited, or very nearly so, during the Middle Ages in the Western Church."—Staunton, Eccl. Dict. p. 382; Blunt, Eccles. Dict. i, 375. See LABARUM.

I'tam (Heb. Iyim, ייִימ, ruins, as in Jer. xxxvi, 18, etc.), the name of two places.
1. (Sept. Asait, Vulg. Ilim.) A city in the extreme south of Judah, mentioned between Baalzeb and Azem (Josh. xv, 29), and therefore doubtless included within the territory set off to Simeon, as the associated places were (Josh. xix, 3), which afford the only means for a conjectural position nearly midway from the Dead Sea towards the Mediterranean.
2. (Sept. I'nt, Vulg. Jeboara, both reading the same as I'tam.) One of the stations of the Israelites not long before reaching the Jordan (Num. xxxiii, 45), usually called fully LEB-ABARIM (ver. 44).

Ijar. See YAR.

Iy'eb-ab'arin (Hebrew Iyeb ha - Abarim, יֵיֶב עבּּראים, ruins of the Abarim, or regions beyond; Sept. Ayyayi, but in Num. xxxiii, 44 simply T'ai; Vulg. Jeboara and Iyebabarim), the forty-seventh station of the Israelites after departing Canaan, lying north of the Jordan as between Obot and Dibon-gad, "in the border of Moab" (Num. xxxiii, 44), or between Obot and the brook Zered, "in the wilderness which is before (i.e. east of) Moab, towards the sun-rising" (Num. xxxii, 11), and therefore not far from Ainek, a little south of wady el Ali, which forms a long, low scar or line on the boundary of the Moab-Jabesh territory, and lies near the southern end of the range of Abarim, that give this compound form to the name (simply I'm in Num. xxxiii, 44), to distinguish it from the I'm of Judah (Josh. xv, 29). See Abarim.

I'yon (Heb. Iy'on, ייִון, place of ruins; Sept. A'v, A'v, Atow), a frontier city of the kingdom of Israel, mentioned as being captured, along with Abel-Beth-Minnah and other places, by Nahum, king of Babylon (Jer. xxxii, 49), and afterwards by Tiglath-pileser of Assyria (2 Kings xv, 29). The associated names and circumstances render the supposition of Dr. Robinson (Researches, iii, 346) very probable, that this locality corresponds to a large ruin-covered hill called Tell el-Abyad (Thomson, Land and Book, i, 332), in the present Jerj Myum (meadow of fountains), a fine meadow tract between wady et-Teim and the Litany, north of Lake Huleh (comp. Bibliotheca Sacra, 1846, p. 204, 214; new edition of Researches, iii, 375; Schwarz, Palestine, p. 96).

Iken, Konrad, a German Protestant theologian and Hebraist, born at Bremen Dec. 25, 1690, was professor of theology at the gymnasium of that city, and pastor of one of the Reformed churches. He died June 80, 1733. Iken wrote, Antiquitates Hebraicae (Bremen, 1730, 4to; 5th ed., annotated by J. H. Schacht, 1810, 8vo) — Theaurus Noe, Theol.-Philol. Dissertationum exeget- icarum et Mixtorum scolast. (Bremen, 1742, 4to) — Dissertationes Talmudicarum de cultu quae s. illudino Templi, quern nominem Latinam donatum et nota illustratum eruditorum examini subiectit Conrad. Ikenius (Bremen, 1736, 4to) — Symbola literaria ad incrementum scieniarum omnis generis, a variis amicis collata (Bremen, 1744-45, 3 vols. 8vo) — Harmonia Katararum principum (Bremen, 1740, 4to; 2d ed., Ulm, 1754) — Dissertationes philo-theol. in diversa sac.

cool. utrinque instrumentalis loca (Leyden, 1740, 4to; 2d ed., augmented, pub. by J. H. Schacht, Utrecht, 1770, 4to) — De Institutis et Caritatis Libro Mesonica ante Moesen (Bremen, 1732, 2 parts, 4to) — Hoefner, Nova. Diss. Gen. xxv, 6 sq.; Kitto, Cyclopaedia Bib. Lat. ii, 377. (J. N. F.)

Ike'keah (Heb. I'kekeah, יֵיקְּכֶה, perverse, as in Ps. ci, 4, etc.; Sept. E'xex, E'xex, E'xex), the father of Ira the Tekoite, which latter was one of David's family's warriors (2 Sam. xxii, 26; 1 Chron. xi, 28), and captain of the sixth regiment of his troops (1 Chron. xxvii, 9). B.C. ante 1046.

Ikonobortai is the name of a small sect of Russian dissenters who are opposed to paintings, both in churches and in private houses. See Russia.

Icriti, Shenmarja Ben-Elia, a Jewish philosopher and commentator, originally from Rome, flourished at the court of the Grand Agras and probably of Roger of Sicily in the beginning of the 14th century. His father Elias was a distinguished scholar of the island of Crete, whence he derived his name. Shenmarja devoted his early years to the study of philosophical writings, but later he gave his time almost exclusively to the study of Talmudic and the results of his learned and careful commentaries on all the books of the O. T., with the exception of Leviticus, Numbers, and Deuteronomy. His edition of Genesis, to which, according to his own statement, he devoted no less than twenty-five years, he dedicated, with other works of his, to his king Roger. Another object of writing these commentaries, which have never yet been published, was to reconcile the Rabbanites and Karaites. Himself a Rabbinite, he held that the Karaites were in the wrong to set aside altogether the Talmudic traditions; and the Rabbanites, he asserted, missed the mark also by not only assigning the first place to the Talmud, but by disregarding the Bible (comp. Ostar Nechmad, Venet, 1857, ii, 93). But, whatever his success may have been with the Rabbanites, he certainly failed to convince the Karaites, who read his works extensively, that the Talmudic Additions contained a deep meaning unrevealed to the superficial student, or to persuade them that the Bible and Talmud both deserved a philosophical interpretation. Another aim which Shenmarja is said to have had in writing his commentaries was the union of the followers of Maimonides (q. v.) with the old school. After the Greek style, and a Hebrew Grammar. See Gritz, Gesch. d. Juden, vii, 318 sq.; Carmoly, in Jost's Annalen (1889), p. 69, 155; Dukes, Shir Shelomo (Hannover, 1886), ii, 4; Kitto, Cyclopaedia Bib. Liter. ii, 377; Fürst, Biblioth. Jud. iii, 27 sq. (J. W. C.)

I'tal (Heb. I'y, יֵי, i. q. Chal. יָל, supreme; Sept. H'ai), an Ahohite, and one of David's chief heroes (1 Chron. xii, 29), called Zalmon in the parallel list (2 Sam. xxiii, 29). B.C. 1046.

Idelfonso, Sr., archbishop of Toledo, was born in that city in 607. He studied under Isidore of Seville, became monk, then abbot of the convent of Agli, near Toledo, and was finally made archbishop of his native city in 688. According to Julian of Toledo, Idelfonso composed a large number of works, most of which, however, were left unfinished. The only writings supposed to be authentic that we now possess under his name are, De libieta b. Virginiae virginitate (in the Biblioth. Patr., Lugd., xii) — two books, De cognitione beatissimi et de iXiere deserti quore perpurit post beatissimam, a rule of faith and conduct for converts—a continuation of Isidore's book De viris illustribus, beginning with Gregory the Great, and containing notices of thirteen other writers, mostly Spanish bishops (in Fabricius, Bibl. eccles. p. 60 sq.). One of his successors in the see of Toledo, St. Julian (680-690), added to this a Vita Idelfonso Tolerante, from which almost all our information concerning Idelfonso is derived. Two letters of his, with answers by Quirinus bishop of Barcelona, are found in D'Achéry, Spicil. The
Tilatiis, a term used in old rituals of the Mass for prosphoro.

Jilescas, Jacob de (Jacobus), a Jewish philosopher and commentator, flourished in the 14th century at Ilescas, not far from Madrid, whence his family derived their name. He wrote a Commentary on the Pentateuch (contained in Frankfurters great Rabbiner Bibel) in an allegorical, cabalistic sense, with many unpalatable grammatical explanations of difficult passages. He also paid particular attention to obscure passages of Rashi and Aben-Ezra's expositions on this portion of the Hebrew Scriptures, and freely quotes other celebrated Jewish authors, as Lach. Tob. Joseph, Tam, Bechor Shor, Jehuda, etc. He was from the Plon, Isaac, Coney, Aaron, Eljaksim, the Tosafoth, etc. See Kitto, Cyclop. Biblical Lit. ii, 378; Furst, Biblioth. Jud. ii, 91.

Ilegen, Christian Friedrich, a German theologian, was born at Chemitz, in Saxony, Sept. 16, 1786, studied at the University of Leipsig, where he first lectured, and then became extraordinary professor of theology in 1818, of theology in 1823, ordinary professor of theology in 1825, and finally canon. He was particularly distinguished for his knowledge of theological history. He died Aug. 4, 1844. His principal works are, Littus Soyinum, Leipsig (Lpz. 1818), 4to.—Memorie uruglous colectirum Luther (Leipsig, 1829-30);—Historia collegii philologic (1836-40);—Abhandlungen, den Werther der christlichen Dogmengeschichte (1817); and a collection of Preussen: die Verklarung d. irdischen Lebens durch d. Evangelium (1825). He founded the Historical Theological Society, and from 1825 to the time of his death he edited the Zeitschrift für hist. Theol. See S. Bruno Lindner, Erinnerungen an Dr. Ilegen in the Zeitschrift d. historische Theologie (1845), p. 3, Hefter, Neue Bib. Gén. xxv, 814; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. viii, 365.

Illuminato (φωτιστής) was a term used in the early Christian Church for the baptized. See Baptism. The apostle Paul writes in two places (Heb. vi. 4; x, 32) of those who were ήπια φωτιστής; and the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 372), in its third canon, calls the newly baptized προσβάσις φωτιστής. Justin Martyr, in his second Apology, expressly refers to the spiritual knowledge acquired by those who were baptized, and there was probably an association between the term and the ritual use of lights in the baptismal service. See Blunt, Cyclop. of Theol. i, 328. By some, however, the title "illuminated" is supposed to have been given to one of the newly baptized at the early Church, because a lighted taper was put into their hands as a symbol of their enlightenment. See Lights. (J. H. W.)

Illumināti, a name assumed at different periods by sects of Mystics or Enthusiasts and Theosophs, who claim a greater degree of illumination or perfection than other Believers. 1. The first sect known under this name was a party of mystic enthusiasts who made their appearance in Spain about 1675, and who also bore the name of Alumbrados or Alumbradores. They considered prayer as such an efficacious means of union with God that the soul of man could by it become entirely identified with the nature of God, so that its actions would therefore be really the actions of God himself; and they further held that for such persons good works, the sacraments, etc., are superfluous as a means of sanctification. (We invite the reader to compare the history of the Illuminati with that of the Jesuits, when first instituted by Ignatius Loyola. See Ranke, History of the Popes, trans. by Mrs. Austin, i, 190.) They were persecuted by the Inquisition, and then disappeared from Spain; but in 1623 they reappeared in France, under the name of Guerrinets, a sect very similar to the Alumbradores. The Alumbradores became Illuminatis, but who, in addition to the mystic belief of the Alumbradores, believed in a special revelation of perfecti-
bility, made to one of their number, a friar, whose name was Bouquet. But they also soon became extinct, and were no longer known in France in 1635.

Another very similar sect arose in Belgium.

2. But the name of "Illuminati" was really first given to an association which the Republic of Venice, which was founded May 1, 1779, by Adam Weishaupt, professor of canon law at the University of Ingolstadt. This "order," which, by its founder, was first called the Order of the Perfectibilists, was established on a mosaic foundation like that of the organization of the Jesuits. They aimed to elevate the highest possible degree of moral purity, and to lay the foundation for the reformation of the world by organizing an association of the best men to oppose the progress of moral evil. Practically, however, the "order" soon evinced tendencies dangerous alike to Church and State. In their opposition to religious and political Judaism, which at that time, in Roman Catholic Germany, imposed unbearable restraints on the human mind, they aimed at nothing less than revolutionizing religion, abolishing Christianity in order to substitute reason in its place, deposing all civil powers, and establishing a nation of philosophers. And although all this, however, was a very honorable man, actuated by the purest motives, and zealous for the religious and political improvement of mankind. The most active disciple, through whose influence the society increased with extraordinary rapidity, was the bishop of the Mystics, it had found its highest form of development in Freemasonry. Only a small number of the elect were allowed an insight into the ultimate object of the new organization, but the whole system was made profusely attractive to a certain class of minds by mysterious ceremonies and forms. The order aimed steadfastly at obtaining the control of the higher offices in Church and State; and, although liberty and equality were proclaimed as its fundamental principles, it sought absolute supremacy. With a view to reach that end, Weishaupt, who had himself been a Jesuit, finally made use of the same means by which the Jesuits had been so successful. Thus he sought to win over to his side all persons of any influence; and blinds were made effective in the minds of the proselytes of men weak in mind but strong of purse, while at the same time he excluded such as, on account of their pride or their strength of character, would be unlikely to prove plant subjects, or whose want of discretion might injure the order. Strict, unquestioning, and blind obedience was made the first duty of a member; every one was under the direct control of his immediate superiors, and knew, in fact, no other member of the order. Aside from this, each member was subject to a private supervision, which extended to the head of the society; and the Illuminati were soon involved in a system of mutual espionage, confession, and the like, essentially inconsistent with true freedom, but calculated to place the threads all in one hand, by which the holy legion was to be led on, as it was imagined, to the benefaction of mankind." Only such persons were distinguished for piety, wisdom, complete subjugation for self, and zeal for the interest of the society, were admitted to the higher degrees, wherein the mysteries of the higher order were revealed to them, while those of the lower degrees hardly suspected their existence. These mysteries related to religion, on which a small number were distinguished for piety, wisdom, and free-thinking; and to politics. In regard to which the aim was to replace monarchy by republicanism and socialism. An active correspondence was kept up between the chief and the members of the order in the different districts where lodges were established. It was carried on by means of a cipher, generally of the usual figures; but the higher orders also made use of other signs. The months were designated by particular names; thus January became Dune, February denh; and Germany was called the Orient, Bavaria Achaisia, Munich Athen. The order was represented by a cipher by --. The letters addressed to a superior were signed, O, to designate the first letter, which was marked O, if the second letter was one of the higher degrees, it was marked S. Soli; and if to one still superior, Primo. Each one of the Illuminati was, besides, known in the order by some particular name. Thus the founder went by the ominous appellation of Spartacus; Knigge by that of Philo, etc. The attentions which the order paid to its mystic, mysterious secret forms, and the extraordinary energy and Jesuitical acumen which the leaders brought to bear on their undertaking, soon swelled its numbers, and, during its most prosperous period, the association consisted of over 2000 members, among them some of the most prominent names of Germany; three of whom, who, however, could only be initiated into the lower orders, as the higher mysteries of the order inculcated republicanism. The head-quarters of the order were in Bavaria, which, with Suabia and Franconia, formed the first province of the association in Germany, and it was not until 1783 that the order was established in Hanover, Germany, but also gained a foothold in France, Belgium, Holland, Denmark, Sweden, Poland, Hungary, and Italy.

As regards its interior organization, the order was established on the lines of the Society of Jesus; as we have already observed, Weishaupt had once been a member. In 1777 he had joined the freemasons. From the first it had been his aim to connect his new society with freemasonry, for the purpose of giving it a firmer foundation, and with the ultimate object of finally absorbing the latter in the former. Knigge, as the order's activity and enterprise finally succeeded in bringing the Illuminati to be considered as freemasons by the craft, but this step made new enemies for the Illuminati, and ultimately caused their overthrow. Knigge modelled the material organization of the society after that of freemasonry, dividing the members into three classes, each of which was again composed of several degrees. The first, a preparatory class, was composed of novices, Minervites, and Illuminati minores. Any man eighteen years of age could become a novice, and on his conduct depended his promotion to the next degree, which could be divided into three classes, or that of freemasons, embraced apprentices, masters, and master-masons, besides the two higher grades of Illuminatus major and of Illuminatus dirigens, or Scottish knights. These latter had the control of the Minervite lodges. The third class, or that of the "Mysteries," was divided into higher and lower mysteries; the latter embraced the priests and the regents, or members to whom had been imparted the mysterious aims of the society in regard to religion and politics. The initiation to the degree of regent was conducted with great solemnity, and was very impressive. The adepts of the higher mysteries were also of two degrees, the Magnus and the Rer, to whom the principles of naturalism, republicanism, and socialism were further developed. These were the Areopagites of the order, and had no superiors but the secret council, presided over by the general of the order, his deputy, and his assistant. The latter was the highest court of appeal for all members of the order.

A jealous feeling and contention for leadership which sprang up between Weishaupt and Knigge, and a difference of opinion of the two greatest heads of the society on many points of organization and discipline, hastened the order's decline. The council, on the 11th of July, 1784. As soon as the State and Church-disturbing tendency, which for a time had remained hidden, became known, the order was vehemently denounced. June 22, 1784, the elector of Bavaria issued an edict for its suppression. But the society continued to exist in secret. When, however, the authorities had succeeded in obtaining further evidences of the danger-
ous tendency of the order by securing some of the pa-
pers of the association (which they published), they
punished the members by fine, imprisonment, and exile.
Many quit the country, among them Weihaupt (Feb.
16, 1785), on whose head a price had been set. He fled
to Germany (see note, Haller, 1738). After his death,
Nov. 18, 1809, Edicts were again published by the elec-
tor of Bavaria, March 2 and August 16, 1785, which,
by the severe punishment which it threatened
members, caused the rapid decline of the order, and
they disappeared altogether towards the close of the
last century.
"Great interest was at one time attached to the order of the Illuminati, whose
secret influence was regarded as a principal cause of
many of the political events of the time of the French
Revolution, and the works of Abbé Barral and of Pro-
fessor Robison of Edinburgh upon this subject were en-
gVy read, but the highly exaggerated character of
their views is now generally acknowledged." See Her-
zog, Real-Encyclopedia, vi, 636; Chambers, Cyclop. v, 519;
Grosse Abichten d. Ordens d. Illuminaten, etc., von vier
ehemaligen Mitgliedern (Munich, 1786); Nachtrag z. d.
großen Abichten (Munich, 1786); Grundsatze, Verfassung u.
Statuten d. Illuminati (Frankfurt, 1790); Weihaupt, Apologie d. Illuminaten (Frank, 1796); same,
Einzelding u. seiner Apologie (Frank, 1787); same, Des
verbesserten System d. Illuminaten, etc. (Frank, 1787);
Philo's (Krinige's) Einfache Erklärung und Anser, etc.
(Hamov, 1788); Die neuen Arbeiten, etc. (Frank, 1793);
Pamphlet, Uber die Illuminatenordern (1799); Einige Originalechriften d. Il-
uminatenordens, etc. (Frank, 1797); Henke, Kirchengesch. vii, 206 sq.; Zeitrieb des
hist. Theol. vi, art. ii; Ersch und Gruber, Allgen. Encyclopa,
sect. ii, xvi, 206 sq.; Kaminka, German Protestantism, p. 59 sq. See Mystics. (J. H. W.)
Illumination. Art. Or. The art of illuminating manuscripts with gold and color seems to prevail in
countries where the art of printing is unknown. It has
been erroneously supposed to have been originated by
Christianity; it is certain, however, that under its sway
it was brought to its known perfection. The time when
the art of illumination was adopted and the art of illumi-
nation so perfectly adapted to the art of the Calligrapher is impossible to determine definitely, but it most probably
dates from the time when the ancient fashion of rolled
manuscripts (comp. the article Thora), which the Jews
still preserve, was changed for the present book form.
The earliest specimens extant are from the first half of
the 8th century; and we find St. Jerome living in Italy
more than the 4th century, complaining of the abuse of filling up books with ornamental capital letters of an enormous size. In
the 5th century many of the MSS. were illuminated, especially copies of the Gospels and other Scriptures.
They were written on a blue ground in silver, with the name of God in gold. By the influence of Byzantine
luxury there were even produced some copies on a gilded
ground in letters of black. One of the best specimens of the perfection to which the art had been brought in that
century is the Codex Aratorum, or copy of the Gothic
(Ulphias's) version of the N. T. in letters of silver, with
the initials in gold, now preserved in the royal library
at Upsala. It is also supposed that at that time the var-
ious schools of illumination originated. "Rome had
succumbed to barbarian violence, and her arts, though
decaying, still exerted an influence in this new style of
painting, that was natural to her infancy. That was
naturally stronger in Italy, and therefore the early illumina-
tions of the Italian school bear traces of the old Roman
style. In France the same influence was manifest, mix-
ed up with national peculiarities, and this school was
consequently called the Franco-Roman." But, remark-
able as it may appear, it is now found that Ireland was far
in advance of other nations in the knowledge of this
art, as she was generally in advance of them in the
scale of civilization. "Her fame had extended over
Europe, her monasteries were adorned with men of
great piety and learning, who were the trainers of the
leading spirits of the age. She was the first to break
down the wall of ignorance; and, after her death, the
monks gave Christianity to Scotland, so she also imparted
to the Saxons the art of illumination." The first illumina-
tor seems to have been Dagaeus, abbot of Innkehtura,
who flourished in the second half of the 8th century.
Of English illumination, the finest specimen extant is
the 10th century, the so-called "Benedictional" by St.
Ethelwold, bishop of Winchester, written and painted
between 963 and 984. In the 13th century, and even
down to its decline three centuries later, the art
was greatly furthered by Bonaventura's series of mediti-
tions on the life of Christ, which gave minute descripti-
tive time of his death and to MSS. of almost any sort.
The invention of printing seemed to sound its death-knell, and it is not to be
wondered at that the monks, who, being cut off from
secular business, and having found employment by the
application of this art, then made a strong resistance
to the introduction of the printing art, and perhaps delayed it
sooner or later, of their own employment. But
the popular mind had become so accustomed to the illumina-
tion of works, that its extinction was much more
gradual than had been anticipated, and the earliest
printed books were not only illuminated, but the print-
ers even attempted, by a process of their art, to super-
seede manual labor. Perhaps the latest effort of this
kind was an edition of the Liturgy, brought out in 1717
by John Short, entirely engraved on copper plates.
"The pages were surrounded by borders, and emblis-
hed with pictures and decorated initial letters." See Hill, English Monasticism, ch. xii, where may also be
found the details of the work as it was carried on
for centuries in the various monasteries of Europe.
—Braude and Cox, Dict. of Science, Literature, and Art, ii, 193 sq.
Illuminism. See Illuminati; Rationalism.
Illyes, Andreas, a Hungarian prelate, was born at
Szent-Gyorgy (now Csergocvari), in Transylvania, in
the first half of the 17th century, and educated at Rome.
On his return to his native country he filled several
positions of trust, then went to Posen as canon, and later became bishop of
Weissenburg. On account of the political distur-
ances in Transylvania he removed to Vienna. The time
of his death is not generally known. He published
ed Verbum adversarium, 74 sermons in Hungarian (Vi-
enna, 1693, 4to) — vice sanctorum (ibid. 1698), in Hun-
garian (Tyrran, 1705, and often), etc.—Johcher, Gebetl.
I. Add. ii, 2276.
Illyrica, Council of (Concilium Ilyricum), held in
the year 856, according to Cellier and Hefele, by order of the emperor Constans. It was attended by a large
number of bishops, who met to consider the doctrine of the
consistency of the three divine persons, as it had
been set forth at Nicaea. They issued a synodal
letter to the churches of Asia, etc., confirming the doc-
trine with great emphasis, and they further decreed
that the homoeopatistic art anathema. It was attended by a large
number of bishops, who met to consider the doctrine of the
consistency of the three divine persons, as it had
been set forth at Nicaea. They issued a synodal
letter to the churches of Asia, etc., confirming the doc-
trine with great emphasis, and they further decreed
that the homoeopatistic art that doctrine should be
everywhere taught, and all those who should reject it be
punished by anathema. See Hefele, Concilium Greg. i, 716 sq.; Landon, Mon. of Councils, p. 256 sq. See Ani-
aimism.
Illyricum (Illyrisapolis, Illyria), lit. Illyria, but the word is
of unknown though prof. native etymology), or Illyria,
was a country lying on the north. It was attacked by a large
army that was delivered at that point, to which is present called Del-

ILLRICUS 499 IMAGE OF GOD

"No one doubts that the phrase 'image of God' denotes in general a likeness of God; but the opinions of contemporary theologians have always been different according to the particular points of resemblance which Moses intended to express by the phrase. Nor is this strange, since Moses does not explain what he means by it, and it is used in very different significations in the Bible, a fact that has never sufficiently been noticed. The common opinion is, that this phrase indicates the part which man originally possessed, but which he lost, in part at least, by the fall. The principal texts cited in behalf of this opinion are Gen. i. 26; compare ii, 15 sq.; and from the N. Test., Col. iii. 19; compare Eph. iv. 24, where a similar meaning is understood to mean a restoration of this image, implying that man must have lost it; also 2 Cor. xi. 3. Against this common opinion it may be objected that the image of God is described in many passages as existing after the fall, and as still discoverable in men; as Gen. ix. 6; James iii. 9; 1 Cor. xi. 7, and especially Gen. v. 1-3, from which it appears that Seth, being made in the likeness of Adam, must have had the same image of God, whatever it was, which Adam possessed" (Knappe, Christian Theology, bk. i. art. vii, sec. 58, p. 168).

In the works of the fathers we find great diversity of opinion on this subject. (For an account of these image theories see homin. opif. c. iv, v, xvi.) Some of the early Latin fathers also maintained a bodily likeness to God (Irenæus, Adv. Haer. v. 6). The Aulæans (q. v.) admitted only the physical resemblance (Theodoret, Hist. Eccles. iv. 9), while Augustin and the Church of Alexandria rejected it altogether (Clemens, Strom. ii. 19). The term "image" is found in making the divine image, in a moral point of view, to consist in uprightness before God, and in the harmony between the higher and the lower faculties of the soul; as also physically in the immortality of the body, and the mastering over all others the two to admit a confirmation and strengthening of the image of God in man by the indwelling of the Holy Spirit, which they consider not only as a gift of free grace, but also as necessary to the completeness of man (Cyr. Alex. Theol. xxxiv, dist. iv). These different parties make great use of the distinction between the image of God and simul tude; the scholastics maintaining that by the image (which, though weakened by the fall, was still extant) is to be understood the essence of the innate, natural attributes of the spirit, especially reason and liberty; and by the simul tude (which was obliterated by the fall, and has only been restored in the human soul) is to be understood agreeable to God, or, in other words, the thorough uniformity with the divine will originating in the divine grace (Hugo Vict., De Suav. i. 1, p. 6, c ii.; Petri. Lomb. Sent. l. ii., dist. 10, D). The creed of Trent makes no positive mention concerning the image of God, but the Catechismus Romanus considers it as consisting in the peculiar inherent dispositions of the human soul, for after its definitions concerning Adam's body it says, "Quod autem ad animam pertinet, eum (hominem) ad imaginem et simul tudem;" the scholastics maintaining that this was the same, or at least coextensive with the "image of God" in the soul. It also leaves undecided the question whether the consequent submission of the desires to the dictates of reason is also to be considered as forming part of this image of God; the word similitudo being used, which means that the originalis justitiae admixtures donum is something independent, not inherent (Cat. Rom. i. 2, 19). The Romish theologians still endeavor to maintain the distinctions made by the scholastics between image and simul tude. The 'original justice' is further considered as a supernatural gift, which man possessed at the moment of creation, so that it is made to counterbalance the natural division between the higher and the lower forces (the spirit and the flesh, reason and sensuality), thus directing the forces towards God, and introducing the simul tude in the image (Bellarmine, De Grat. Prin. Homines, de..."
IMAGE OF GOD

v. 5). Thus the Roman Catholic Church starts in its theory from the present state of man, as resulting from the fall, in regard to which state communion with God is something superadded. Some Romanist theologians distinguish between original justice and original holiness (communion with God), maintaining the former to be the state of man by nature; as it came from the hands of the Creator, and holding the latter to be exclusively the gift of superadded and supernatural grace. The evangelical Church, on the contrary, by considering the image of God as belonging to Adam's true nature, as he came from the hands of his Creator, obtains a doctrine at the same time more positive and less controversial. The body is full of natural carnal propensities, and tends downwards. The soul, as rational and immortal, tends upwards. But there is no harmony between the two by creation. An act subsequent to that of creation, and additional to it, is necessary to bring this harmony about. We must release the soul from the burden of original righteousness, which is superadded to the gifts of creation. In and by this act the higher part is strengthened to acquire and maintain dominion over the lower, and a positive perfection is imparted to human nature that was previously lacking in it. Original righteousness is thus, in return, to the created and natural character of man, a supernatural gift.

"The second peculiarity in the papal anthropology, as it comes from God, is imperfect. He is not created sinfull indeed, but neither is he created holy. To use the papal phrase, he is created in partes naturalibas; without positive or negative power about purposes. The soul is full of natural carnal propensities, and tends downwards. The body, as rational and immortal, tends upwards. But there is no harmony between the two by creation. An act subsequent to that of creation, and additional to it, is necessary to bring this harmony about. We must release the soul from the burden of original righteousness, which is superadded to the gifts of creation. In and by this act the higher part is strengthened to acquire and maintain dominion over the lower, and a positive perfection is imparted to human nature that was previously lacking in it. Original righteousness is thus, in return, to the created and natural character of man, a supernatural gift."

"The second peculiarity in the papal anthropology consists in the tenet that apostasy involves the loss of a supernatural, but not of a natural gift. By the act of transgression, human nature lapse back into that condition of conflict between the flesh and the spirit in which it was created. In losing its original righteousness, therefore, it loses nothing with which it was endowed by the creative act, but only that superadded gift which was bestowed subsequently to this. The superadded gift not the lower, but the higher part, by the Adamic transgression, and the two parts of man, the flesh and the spirit, fall into their primitive and natural antagonism again. Original righteousness being a supernatural gift, original sin is the loss of it, and, in reality, the restoration of man to the state in which he was created (Shed. Job. of Dec. ii. 14)."

The "image," or likeness of God, in which man was made, has, by some, been assigned exclusively to the body; by others simply to the soul; others, again, have found its essence in the circumstance of his having "dominion" over the other creatures. As to the body, it is not necessary to take up any large space to prove that, in no instance can that literally bear the image of God, that is, be "like" God. Descant ever so much or ever so poetically upon man's upright and noble form, this has no more likeness to God than a prone or reptile one: God is incorporeal, and has no lower form; but our analogy is to the antitype of anything material. Not more tenable is the notion that the image of God in man consisted in the "dominion" which was granted to him over this lower world. Limited dominion may, it is true, be an image of large and absolute dominion; but man is not said to have been made in the image of God, but in the image of his likeness, which is accident merely, for, before any creatures existed, God himself could have no dominion but in the image and likeness of God himself, of something which constitutes his nature. Still further, man, according to the history, was evidently made in the image of God, in order to his having dominion, as the Hebrew connective particle ("and") imports. He who was to have dominion must necessarily be made before he could be invested with it, and therefore dominion was consequent to his existing in the "image" and likeness of God, and could not be that image itself.

The attempts which have been made to fix upon some one essential quality in which to place that "image" of God in which man is said to be created in the image of God, as required for by any scriptural requirement, but are even contradicted by various parts of Scripture, from which alone we must derive our information on this subject. It is in vain to say that this "image" must be something essential to human nature, something only which cannot be lost. We shall find, and that it is essential to human nature, that it is essential to human nature; but that it should comprehended nothing else, or one quality only, has no proof or reason; and we are, in fact, taught that it comprises also what is not essential to human nature, and what may be lost and be regained. As to both, the evidence of Scripture is explicit. (1.) When God is called "the Father of spirit," a likeness is certainly intimated between man and God in the spirituality of their nature. This is also implied in the striking argument of Paul with the Athenians: "Forasmuch as all live, after the likeness of God, who hath created us after his own image" (Rom. xi. 7). We ought not to think that the godhead is like unto gold, or silver, or stone graven by art, and man's device; plainly referring to the idolatrous statues by which God was represented among heathens. If likeness to God in man consisted in bodily shape, this would not have been an argument for man's moral character. (2.) "Forasmuch as all live, after the likeness of God, who hath created us after his own image" (Rom. xi. 7). Plainly referring to the idolatrous statues by which God was represented among heathens. If likeness to God in man consisted in bodily shape, this would not have been an argument for man's spiritual character. (3.) To these correspondences we are to add that of intellectual powers, and we have what divines have called, in perfect accordance with the Scriptures, the natural image of God in his creature, which is essential and inseparable. He was made capable of knowledge, and he was endowed with liberty of will. (4.) This natural image of God, in which man was created, was the foundation of that moral image by which also he was distinguished. Unless he had been a spiritual, knowing, and willing being, he would have been wholly incapable of moral qualities. That he had such qualities eminently, and that in them consisted the image of God, as well as in the natural attributes just stated, we have also the express testimony of Scripture. "Lo this only have I found, that God made man upright, but they have sought out many inventions." There is also an express reference to the image of God in which man was first created, in Col. iii. 10. "And have put on the new man, which is renewed in knowledge after the image of him that created him;" and in Eph. iv. 24, "Put on the new man, which after God is created in righteousness and true holiness. This also may be finally argued from the satisfaction with which the historian of the creation represents the Creator as viewing
the works of his hands "as very good." This is pronounced with reference to each individually as well as to the whole: "And God saw everything that he had made, and beheld, it was very good." But as to man, this goodness must necessarily imply moral as well as physical qualities. Without them he would have been imperfect as an end; and, had they existed in him, in their first and original form and end, he must have been an exception, and could not have been pronounced "very good."—Watson, *Institutes*, ii, 9-18.

From this point of view we may arrive at a correct apprehension of the idea of the divine image. God, as such, is immensely beautiful and holy, but such beauty and holiness cannot but manifest himself in an eternal object of this love, of the same essence with himself. This is the Son, the eternal, absolute, immanent image of God. But as God, by virtue of his unchangeable, overflowing love, calls also forth (or creates) other beings, to whom he wills to impart his blemishless life, the establishing and organizing of his kingdom, he, the type of all perfection, cannot create them but after his own image, as he sees it from all eternity in the Son. This created image of God is man in his primitive condition. Man was the real object of God's creative activity, as is seen in God's special decree concerning creation (Psal. cxxiv. v, viii), and mankind are called to be the real population of his kingdom. The whole universe (and even in some sense the angels, Heb. i, 14) was only created for man, which is the reason why he was not created till all other things were ready for him. The faculties which over the outer world ascribed to him in Scripture (Psal. cxxiv. v, viii), and mankind are called to be the real population of his kingdom. He extended also to the body as the outward image of the life, the dwelling and organizing of the soul. Man was created the image of God in the totality of his being. But, while man was thus made of the image of God to himself, he was also made the image of God to the world before which he stands as the representative of God, a relation by which the mastery over the outer world ascribed to him in Scripture (Psal. cxxiv. i, 28-30) is shown to have an inner foundation. Thus the image of God was innate in man and inalienable. This innate state, however, bespoke a corresponding habitual state. Inasmuch as God the Spirit is love, man was destined to a life of love, and was at once brought into it by communion with God. From the heart, however, as the centre of individual life, the power of love manifests itself in the direction of knowledge as truth and wisdom (objective and subjective directions), and in the direction of the will, as freedom and sanctity (formal and material directions), yet so that these spiritual conditions in their original form produced a state partly of unrestrained innocence and partly of unfolding development. To the body, the image of God procured immortality (poste non muri), as the outward dissolution of the forces (death) is but the result of an inward dissolution of the principle of life. With regard to the world, however, man obtained by it a power, in consequence of which the world becomes subject to him by love, and not by force; and by his knowledge of its nature (Gen. ii, 19; 20), he is enabled to carry out God's will in it.

This habitual resemblance to God, which, with the image of God innate in man's nature, formed the natural, original state of man, was lost by sin, as the life of love, coming from God, which formed its basis, was destroyed by selfishness coming from the heart of man. It could only be restored by the absolute image of God the Son, source of the life of love for the world, assuming himself the form of man. Jesus Christ, the Son of God, made flesh, is the real, personal restoration of the image of God in humanity. Since in the flesh he overcame sin for us by his death, and raised our nature to glory in his resurrection, man can again become partner of the righteousness and spiritual glory which belong to him. By the Holy Spirit, which fills our hearts with love, man and image of God must have been an exception, and could not have been pronounced "very good."—See C. Sartorius, *Lch. d. h. heiligen Liebe* (Stutt. 1843), i, 84 sq.; J. T. Beck, *Die christl. Lehrewissenschaft nach den bld. Urkunden* (Stutt. 1841), i, 19; H. Martensen, *D. christl. Dogmatik* (Kiel, 1850), p. 129; J. C. Ch. Dunker, *Die Selbstheilung* (Nordlingen, 1851), i, 248-254; G. Thomasius, *Christl. Bekenntn. u. Werk* (Erlangen, 1856), i, 147-224; Herzog, *Real-Encyclopad. iii, 614; Knapp, *Theologie*, III. 83 et sq.; Winer, *Comparat. Darstellung*, p. 35; Watson, *Institutes*, vol. ii. ch. i. i: *Critici Sacri*, "De Imaginis Def.*, i, 40; Fawcett, *Sermons*, p. 224; Dwight, *Theology*, i, 345; South, *Sermons*, i, 45; Grinfield, *Inquiry into the Image of God* in *Mum* (Lond. 1837, 8vo); Harness, *Sermons on the Image of God* (Lond. 1841, 8vo); *Bibliotheca Sacra*, viii, 409; Jackson, *Theos*, *Original State of Men*, in *Works* i. 1; Van Millert, *Works* v, 143; Harris, *Man Primoral* (N. Y. 1861, 12mo).

**Image of Jealousy.** See JALOYU, IMAGE OF.

**Imagery (אַלְפָּם, maskibh*), an image, as rendered Lev. xxvi, i; or picture, as rendered Numb. xxxiii, 52), only in the phrase "chambers of his imagery" (Ezek. xxi. 12). The Hebrew word is the feminine form of a root which means "to bring forward" or "to apprise." The connexion of this word with the image of God as the special subject to be brought forward to this phrase are connected with an instructive passage in the history of Ezekiel and the Jewish exiles, who were stationed in Assyria, on the banks of the Chebar. At one of their interesting prayer-meetings for the special restoration of Israel, which had been held so often and so long without any prospect of brighter days, and when the faith and hopes of many of the unfortunates were waxing dim and feeble, Ezekiel, in presence of his friends, consisting of the exiled elders of Judah, was suddenly rapt in mystic vision, and graciously shown, for his own satisfaction, as well as that of his associates, the reasons of God's protracted controversy with Israel, and the sad necessity there was for still dealing hardly with them. Transported by the Spirit (not bodily, indeed, nor by external force, but in imagination) to the city and Temple of Jerusalem, he there saw, as plains而言it had been with the eye of sense, atrocities going on within the precincts of the holy place—the perpetuation of which in the very capital of Judea, the place which God had chosen to put his name there, afforded proof of the woful extent of national apostasy and corruption, and was sufficient to justify, both to the mind of the prophet and his circle of pious associates, the severity of the divine judgments on Israel, and the loud call there was for prolonging and increasing, instead of putting a speedy end to, the dire calamities they had so long been suffering (Ezek. viii).

See IMAGERY.

The first spectacle that caught his eye as he perambulated, in mystic vision, the outer court of the Temple—that court where the people usually assembled to worship—was a colossal statue, probably of Baal, around which crowds of devotees were performing their frantic rites and idolatries and all sorts of degenerate practices, enthroning the god and placing their offerings on his golden altars, dancing on the walls and portals of the house of him who had proclaimed himself a God jealous of his honor (ver. 3; Louth, ad loc.). Scarcely had the prophet recovered from his astonishment and horror at the open and undisguised idolatry of the multitude in that sacred enclosure, when his celestial guide bade him turn another way, and he would see greater abominations. Leading him to that side of the court along which were ranged the houses of the priests, his conductor pointed to a mud wall (ver. 7), which, to screen themselves from observation, the apostate servants of the true God had raised; and in that wall was a small chink, by widening which
he discovered a passage into a secret chamber, which was completely impervious to the rays of the sun, but which he found, on entering it, lighted up by a profusion of brilliant lamps. The sides of it were covered with numerous paintings of beasts and reptiles—the favorite devices of Egypt; and with their eyes intensely fixed on these decorations was a conclave of seventy persons, in the garb of priests—the exact number, and, in all probability, the individual members of the Sanhedrin, who stood in the attitude of adoration, holding in their hands each a golden censer, containing all the costly and odoriferous materials which the pomp and magnificence of the Egyptian ritual required. "There was every form of creeping things and abominable beasts, and all the idols of the house of Israel portrayed round about." The scene described was wholly formed on the model of Egyptian worship; and every one who has read the works of Wilkinson, Belzoni, Richardson, and others, will perceive the close resemblance that it bears to the outer walls, the sanctuaries, and the hieroglyphical figures that distinguished the ancient mythology of Egypt (see Kitto, Piet. Bibb., note ad loc.). What were the strange and unsightly images engraved on the walls of this chamber discovered by Ezekiel, and that formed the objects of the profane reverence of those apostate councillors, may be known from the following metrical description, which the late Mr. Salt, long the British consul in Egypt, has drawn of the gods worshiped in the temple of Philae in the island of that name, "Egypt," in Hall's Life of Salt, ii, 416. Those who have prosecuted their researches among the rubbish of the temples, he says, have found in the deep-sequestered chambers they were able to reach—

"The wildest images, unheard of, strange,
That ever puzzled antiquarians' brains:
Genii, with heads of birds, hawks, ibis, ducks,
Of lions, foxes, cats, fish, frogs, and snakes,
Bulls, rams, and monkeys, hippocomati,
With knife in paw, suspended from the sky;
Gods perambulating men, and men turned gods,
Seated in honor, with gilt crooks and rods;
Vast scarabsae, globes by hands upheld,
From chaos springing, 'mid an endless field;
Of forms grotesque, the sphinx, the crocodile,
And other reptiles from the slime of Nile."

Interior of the Temple at Medinet-Abu.

In order to show the reader still further how exactly this inner chamber that Ezekiel saw was constructed after the Egyptian fashion, we subjoin an extract from the work of another traveller, descriptive of the great temple of Edifi, one of the admirable relics of antiquity, from which it will be seen that the degenerate priests of Jerusalem had borrowed the whole style of the Egyptian in which they were celebrating their hidden rites—its form, its entrance, as well as its pictorial ornaments on the walls—from their idolatrous neighbors of Egypt:

"Considerably below the surface of the adjoining building," says he, "my conductor pointed out to me a chink in an old wall, through which he told me he could see the gods on my hands and feet; the aperture was not two feet and a half high, and scarcely three feet and a half broad. My companion had the courage to go first, thrusting in a lamp before him: I followed. The passage was so narrow that my nose and face were almost buried in the dust, and I was nearly suffocated. After proceeding about ten yards in utter darkness, the heat became excessive, the breathing was laborious, the perspiration poured down my face, and I would have given the world to have got out; but my companion, whose person I could not distinguish, though his voice was audible, called out to me to crawl a few feet further, and that I should find plenty of room. I joined him at length, and had the inexpressible satisfaction of standing once more upon my feet.

"We found ourselves in a splendid apartment of great magnitude, adorned with an incredibly large number of sacred statues and pictures" (Madden's Travels in Turkey, Egypt, etc.; see also Maurice, Indian Antiq., ii, 212). In the dark recesses of such a chamber as this, which they entered like the traveller through a hole in the outer wall, in which was painted to the eye the grotesque and motley group of Egyptian divinities, were the chief men of Jerusalem actually employed when Ezekiel saw them. With minds highly excited by the dazzling splendor, and the clouds of fragrant smoke that filled the apartment, the performers of those clandestine rites seem to have surpassed all others in devotion and zeal. Their ancestors in the days of Moses, when, crowding round the pedestal of the golden calf, they rent the air with their cries of "These be thy gods, O Israel!" Beneath a calmer exterior, the actors in the scene pointed out to Ezekiel concealed a stronger and more intense passion for idolatry. Ezekiel's form of animal life, from the most vulgar of the Nile, bred to the most loathsome reptile that spawned in Egypt, received a share of their insane homage; and the most extraordinary feature of the scene was that the individual who appeared to be the director of these idol mysteries, the master of ceremonies, was a Jew, a descendant of the sacred inhabitants of that most illustrious city, the city of the gods, who had gained so much renown as the principal adviser of the good king Josiah, and whose family had for generations been regarded as the most illustrious for piety in the land. The presence of a son of this venerable house in such a den of impurity struck the prophet as an electric shock, and showed, better than all the other painful spectacles this chamber exhibited, to what a fearful extent idolatry had invaded the land. See Idolatry.

It might have been supposed impossible for men to have sunk to a lower depth of superstition than that of imitating the Egyptians in worshipping the generative principles of the Nile, or the vegetable produce of their fields and gardens, had not the prophet been directed to turn yet again, and he would see greater abominations that they did. "Then he brought me to the gate of the Lord's house, which was towards the north; and behold, there sat women weeping for Tammuz" (ver. 14). This, the principal deity of the Phcenians, and who was often called also by that people Adoni, that is, My Lord, became afterwards famous in the Grecian mythology under the well-known name of Adonis; and the circumstance of the being so long and so generally regarded as one of the most beautiful fictitious persons by so many of the classic poets is a sufficient proof of the great popular interest his name and ritual excited among the idolaters of the ancient
world. It is said to have originated in a tragic adventure that befell an intrepid and beautiful prince of Pho
nicia, who was killed while hunting a wild boar, by which that land was infested, and whose untimely death in the cause of his country was bewailed in an annual festal held to commemorate the disastrous event. During the seven days that Jehovah abode, the Phoenicians appeared to be a nation of mourners; and in every town and village a fictitious representation of Tammuz was set up for the occasion, and the whole population assembled to pour forth their unbounded sorrow for his hapless fate, more especially at Byblos, in Syria, where they erected a high commanded pillar, dedicated to the national deity. A strange imposture was practised to in
fluence the public lamentations. There was in this temple a gigantic statue of the god, the eyes of which were filled with lead, which, on fire being applied within, of course melted and fell in big drops to the ground, a signal for the loud wailings of the by-standers, whose eyes, in sympathetic imitation, were dissolved in tears. Conspicuous among the crowd on such occasions, a band of mercenary females directed the orgies; and, in con
formity with an ancient custom of bewailing the dead on the seven days after their decease, (Antig., bk. iv, ch. iii), others took their station at the gate, with their faces directed northwards, as the sun was said to have been in that quarter of the heavens at the time when Tammuz died. These violent efforts in mourning were always followed by scenes of the most licence, and, as is frequently, such as were not mentioned, are manifestly implied among the "greater abominations" which degraded this other group of idol
aters. See TAMMUN.

Besides the hieroglyphics of Egypt and the orgies of Tammuz, there was another form of superstition still, which in Jerusalem, then almost wholly given to idolatry, had its distinguished patrons. "Turn thee yet again," said his celestial guide to the prophet, "and thou shalt see greater abominations than these" (ver. 16). So he brought him "unto the inner court of the Lord's house, and behold, at the door of the temple of the Lord, between the porch and the altar, were about five-and
twenty men, with their backs towards the temple of the Lord, and their faces towards the east; and they wor
shipping the sun towards the east." Perhaps of all the varieties of superstition which had crept in among the Hellenic races of the East, the most pronounced dis
played such flagrant diabolism to the God of Israel as this (Clem. Alexandriaus, Strom. vii, 590); for, as the most holy place was situated at the west end of the sanctu
ary, it was impossible for these twenty-five men to pay their homage to the rising sun without turning their backs on the consecrated place of the divine presence, and accordingly this fourth circle is introduced last, as if their employment formed the climax of abominations
—"the worst and most woful sign of the times. Could stronger proofs be wanted that the Lord had not for
saken Israel, but was driven from them? This was the lesson intimated, and actually accomplished by this vic
tion; for while the prophet was made aware by this mystic scene of the actual state of things among his de
generate countrymen at home, he saw himself—and in
structed the pious circle around him to see—a proof of the desolate state of the church in the great de
ing the contrary to have been the cause of the great averse, especially in the East, where images were
made the object of especial adoration: they were kissed, lamps were burned before them, incense was offered to them, and, in short, they were treated in every respect as the heathen were wont to treat the images of their gods. Some of the heathen had grown prominent in these practices from motives of policy, while the more enlightened and evangelical portion strongly opposed them. This gave rise to the Iconoclasts (q. v.). Neander describes the origin of the use of images in churches, as it "is not in the Church, but in the family, that religious images first came into use among the Christians. In their daily intercourse with
men, the Christians saw themselves everywhere sur- rounded by the objects of pagan mythology, or, at least, by objects offensive to their moral and Christian senti- ments. Representations of this sort covered the walls in shops, and were the ornaments of drinking-vessels and seal-rings, on which the pagans frequently had en- graved the likeness of gods, or the figure of a ship sailing under the symbol of our Saviour rescuing the repentant sinner, according to the Gospel parable. Clement of Alexandria says, in refer- ence to the seal-rings of the Christians, 'Let our signets be a dove (the symbol of the Holy Spirit), or a fish, or a ship sailing towards heaven; the images of the Christian Church and of the individual Christian soul, or a lyre (the symbol of Christian joy), or an anchor (the symbol of Christian hope); and he who is a fisherman will not be forgetful of the apostle Peter, and of the children taken from the water; for no images of gods should be seen. So, with regard to the rings of those who are forbidden all intercourse with idols; no sword or bow on the rings of those who strive after peace; no goblets on the rings of those who are the friends of sobriety.' Yet religious emblems passed from domestic use into the church, as the Christianized century advanced. The walls of them were painted in this manner. The Council of Elvira, in the year 303, opposed this innova- tion as an abuse, and forbade the objects of worship and adoration to be painted on the walls' (Neander, Church History, i, 292).

In Image-Worship the Roman Catholic Church. The Romanists deny the charge of worshipping images, or idolatry, which has often been and is still made against them by Protestants. They have always care- fully refrained from such doctrinal definitions on the subject as would fully convict the Church of idolatry. In this respect the course of the Roman Church is simi- lar to its procedure with regard to the doctrine of good works, which it presents in such a manner as might lead one to think that it strictly asserts the merits of Christ as alone rendering our works useful, whilst in practice the believer is pointed to good works as the means of salvation. So with regard to the prayers to the Virgin and the saints, it draws a clear distinction between the adoration and the worship of saints, but practically the prayers of the Roman Catholics are more generally addressed to the saints than to Christ. The same takes place with regard to the veneration of saints. The Council of Trent (Sess. xxi, De invocationis Sanctorum, etc.) states that 'the images of Christ and of the ever virgin Mother of God, and in like manner of other saints, are to be kept and retained, and that done honor and veneration is to be awarded to them. Not that it is believed that any divinity or power resides in them, on account of which they are to be worshipped, or that any benefit is to be sought from them, or any confidence placed in images, as was formerly done by the Gentiles, who fixed their hope in idols. But the honor with which they are regarded is referred to those who are represented by them; so that we adore Christ and venerate the saints, whose likenesses these images bear, when we kiss them, and uncover our heads in their presence, and prostrate our- selves.' The council quotes on this subject the second Synod of Nicaea. To this "honor and veneration" belong the solemn consecration of the images, offering up incense before them, the special prayers accompanying these ceremonies as contained in the Pontificale Romanum, other prayers for private use to be repeated before the images, and the indulgences granted to those who fulfill that duty, etc. All this shows that the Roman Church does not intend, in form, the veneration of images as worship, has introduced the practice among the people. The masses do not and cannot understand the subtle distinction made by the Church, and not always strictly observed even by the clergy. The Church knows of this evil, but places it among things she tolerates for the sake of charity, though she does not approve them. Yet some Roman Catholic theologians appear to have come very close indeed to the same conception as the masses on this point. Thomas Aquinas expressed his views of images in a dilemma: 'A picture considered in itself is worthy of no veneration, but if we consider it as an image of Christ it may be allowable to make an internal distinction between the image and its subject, and these are adorati in Christi imago et Christi.' (Syll. dist. 9, q. 1, art. 2; Summa, qu. 28, art. 4, 5.) Bonaventura drew a correct conclusion from the princi- ple: 'Since all veneration shown to the image of Christ is shown to Christ himself, then the image of Christ is also entitled to be prayed to' ('Cultus laetitiae', i, dist. 9, art. 1, qu. 2). Bellarmine says that 'the images of Christ and the saints are to be adored not only in a fig- urative manner, but quite positively, so that the prayers are directly addressed to them, and not merely as the representatives of the original (Ita ut ipsi [imagines] terminent venerationem, ut in se considerantur et non in Christo, qui est omnipotens, sive in Christo qui est Deus et in Christo qui est Deus,' (ibid., i, x, 1, s. 4, n. 2), i.e. the difference between the divine worship and images of degree or condition of nature or quality. Such theories, although far overstepping the limits of the decree of Trent, are yet freely permitted by the Romish Church; it neither openly ad- mits nor officially condemns them, and thus leaves an opening for all possible degrees of idolatry, over which many an honest Roman Catholic priest mourns in se- cret.

History shows that the first tendency to image-worship was the result of a slow but continued degeneracy. The same arguments now used by the Romish Church to defend image-worship were rejected by the Church of the first three centuries when used in the defence of idol-worship. The heathen said, We do not worship the images themselves, but those whom they represent. To this Lactantius answers (Inst. Diet. lib. ii, c. 2), 'You worship them; for, if you believe them to be in heaven, why do you not cause your eyes to fix upon Christ, as you look at the wood and stone, and not up, where you believe the originals to be?' The ancient Church re- jected the use of all images ('Symod of Elviro, 305, c. 38: 'Placuit, picturam in ecclesiis esse non debere, ne quod ob fidem, ob tradi, neque quod ob indicium religiosum.' The early Christians evidently feared that pictures in their churches would eventually become objects of prayer. The admission of images into the church in the 4th and 5th centuries was justified on the theory that the ignorant people could learn the facts of Christianity from them better than from sermons or books. But the people soon lost sight of this use of the images, and made them the objects of adoration. This took place earlier in the East than in the West; but the abuse gained ground in the latter region in a short time. Severus, bishop of Marseilles, broke several images, and had them taken out of the churches, and the people who had been used to the images were displeased. Gregory the Great proclaims that he does not allow any praying to (adorant) the images, and adds to this that Paulinus of Nola and Nilus had already said that paintings were placed in the church only in order that the uneducated might read the walls what they were unable to read in books (ibid., ep. 105). He also laid down, as a general principle, in his letter to Secundinus, that it was expedient to use the visible to represent the invisible (lib. ix, ep. 52). But he shows evidently that he is not speaking of a mere object of representation, and that he prostrates himself (prostratus) before the images, making the well-known Roman Catholic condition that...
he thus really prays to Christ. The second Council of Nicea (A.D. 787) decreed the validity of image-worship, and anathematized all who opposed it. The Frankish Church, on the other hand, though it did not forbid the use of images from the earliest experiments, made their being worshipped. Charlemagne opposed to the decrees of the synod the so-called Caroline books (q. v.), in which it is expressly said that images are allowed in the church, but not to be prayed to, only to excite the attention on the subjects they commemorate, and adorn the church; and very agreeable it says for the future, "if some enlightened persons, who do not pray to the image itself, but to him it represents, should pray before the image, it would mislead the ignorant, who pray only to what they see before their eyes" (lib. iii. 16). The Synod of Frankfurt (summoned by Charlemagne, A.D. 794, and consisting of 33 bishops) and the Synod of Paris (892) solemnly condemned image-worship. The latter council even ventured to reject the pope's contrary opinion in very strong terms. During the whole of the 9th century the matter was thus at rest, Claudia of Turin, Agobard, and other of the most important theologians of that period approving the action of the synod. At the time of the crusades, an opponent of Claudia, expressly says, in his De cultu imaginum, that images are placed in the church "solummodo ad instructas necesariam mentes." The Council of Trent, as cited above, recommends images as means of instructing the people, and to incite the faithful to contemplate the saints. We find that even three times the Roman Church has added to this what the Frankish Church of the 8th and 9th centuries had so wisely rejected.—Hertzog, Real-Encyclopid., ii. 233-235. The fluctuations of opinion and variations of discipline in the Roman Church on the subject of image-worship are well exhibited by Faber (Difficulties of Romanism, p. 10 et seq.). See White, Bampton Lectures, p. 8; Coleman, Ancient Christianity, chap. xiii., § 14; Spanheim, Hist. Imaginum, Opera, tom. ii.; Bingham, Orig. Eccles., book viii, ch. viii.; Tenison, On Idolatriy, p. 395 et seq.; Winer, Comp., comp. i., 416. The subject is variously treated in Schleiermacher: Iconography; Greek Church; Roman Church.

Imagination (Lat. imaginatio).—"The meaning of this word enters into many relationships, and is thereby rendered difficult to define. The principal meaning is doubtful: what connects it with poetry and fine art, from which the opposite signification is derived by a synecdoche is a mode of explaining this complicated relationship will be to state in separation the different constituents of the power in question. We shall then see why and where it touches upon other faculties, which still require to be distinguished from it."

1. Imagination has for its objects the concrete, the real, or the individual, as opposed to abstractions and generalities, which are the matter of science. The full coloring of reality is implied in our imagination of any scene of nature. In this respect, there is something common to imagination and memory. If we endeavor to imagine a volcano, according as we succeed, we have before the mind everything that a spectator would observe on the spot. Thus, sensation, memory, and imagination alike deal with the fulness of the actual world, as opposed to the abstractions of science and the reasoning faculties.

2. The faculty called conception, in one of its meanings, has also to do with this concrete fulness, although, in what Sir William Hamilton deems the original and proper meaning of that word, this power is excluded. In popular language, and in the philosophy of Dugald Stewart, it is reduced to the idea or the fanciful description of actual life, as given in history or in poetry. When we completely enter into a scene portrayed by a writer or speaker, and approach the situation of the actual observer, we are often said to conceive what is being to mind, and also to imagine it; the best word for this signification probably is "reconceive."
IMANI

mon humanity, and adorned with more than excellence. This is our 'ideal,' what satisfies our emotions, and the fact of its so doing is the determining influence in the concept of REALISM. IMANI is the name of the third sacred book of laws of the Turks, containing the directions for a reasonable conduct of life. — Pierier, Univ. Lex. viii, 830.

Imaum or Imān is the title of a person belonging to a class of the Mohammedan Ulema (q.v.) or priestly body, but not set apart from the rest of the world like the clergy or priesthood, with whom he is usually classed. He is not ordained, nor is any sacred character conferred upon him. The name is Arabic and signifies "he who is at the head." In this sense it is applied even to the sultan, "Imaum ul-Muslemin," or simply "Imam," and is given to the most honored teachers of Mohammedanism, who in the first centuries of Islam were considered as the religious leaders of the community. — Taylor, History of Mohammedanism, ch. viii; Pierier, Univ. Lex. viii, 830. (J. H. W.)

Imitation of Christ. See Example.

Im'ils (Heb. Yimlah', יִמָּלָהּ; Sept. 'I'mala), the father of Miahah, which latter was the prophet who ironically foretold the defeat of the ablest kings of Judah and Israel against Ramoth-Gilead (2 Chron. xxviii, 8, 9). In the parallel passage (1 Kings xxii, 8, 9) his name is written Imla (Heb. Yimlah', יִמָּלָה, id.; Sept. 'I'mal). B.C. ante 896.

Im'lah (1 Kings xxii, 8, 9). See IMLA.

Immaculate Conception of the VIRGIN MARY, a doctrine, early broached in the Roman and Greek churches, that the Virgin Mary was conceived without the stain of original sin. Bernard, in the 12th century, rejected this doctrine in opposition to the canons of Lyons, but it was not much agitation until (1801) the Franciscan Duns Scotus took strong grounds in favor of the doctrine, and henceforward it became a subject of vehement controversy between the Scotists and Thomists. The Dominicans espoused the cause of the Thomists, who impugned the dogma; the Franciscans that of the Scotists, who defended it. Sixtus IV, himself a Franciscan, in 1483 declared himself in favor of toleration on the point. The Council of Trent (Sess. v) declared that the doctrine of the conception of all men in sin was not intended to include the Virgin. The controversy was revived in the University of Paris towards the close of the 16th century. During the pontificates of Paul V and Gregory XV, such was the division it occasioned in Spain, that both Philip and his successor sent special embassies to Rome in the vain hope that this contest might be terminated by a bull. The dispute ran so high in that kingdom that, in the military orders of St. James, of the Sword, of Calatrava, and of Alcántara, the knights, on their admission, vowed to maintain the doctrine. In 1708, Clement XI appointed a festival to be celebrated throughout the Catholic Church in honor of the Immaculate Conception. It is firmly believed in the Church of England, in which the feast is celebrated under the name of the Conception of St. Anne; but it was not till 1854 that it was made a dogma in the Roman Catholic Church.

Three Pius IX, during his whole pontificate, has showed himself a decided advocate of the worship of Mary. In his exile at Gaeta in 1849 he addressed the famous "Encyclical on the Mystery of the Immaculate Conception" (Feb. 2) to the patriarchs, primates, archishops, and bishops of the whole Catholic Church, affirming the existence of an ardent desire throughout the Catholic world that the apocryphal see should be lifted; by some solemn judgment, define that the most holy Mother of God, the most loving mother of us all, the immaculate Virgin Mary, had been conceived without original sin. These desires, he adds, have been most acceptable and delightful to us, who, from our earliest years, have had nothing to do but to rever the most blessed Virgin Mary with especial piety and homage, and the most intimate affections of our heart, and to do everything which might seem likely to procure her greater glory and praise, and to amplify her worship. A commission was appointed for the examination of the question, under the presidency of cardinal Fornarini; cardinal Labruschi produced his tract, and Perrone the work De Immaculato B. V. Mariae conceptu; Passaggio also wrote a large essay, and the results of these investigations were issued by the Pope in a papal bull. The special commission reported, in a full concave of the Sacred Congregation, May 27, 1854. Answers had come from 602 bishops, all favorable to the dogma, though 52 doubted the opportuneness, and four the possibility of a decision. The special congregation demanded the definition with expediency and expediency of it. A majority of the cardinals and bishops, by proclamation, and held at Rome Nov. 4, 1854; it was not a general council, nor was any authority attributed to it. Fifty-four cardinals, 46 archbishops, and about 400 bishops are reported to have been present at these deliberations; 576 votes are said to have been cast for the dogma, and only four against it; among the latter were the archbishop de Sibour, of Paris, on the ground that the pope had no power to decide such a question; and also the bishop Olivier, of Evreux, lately deceased, who sent in his vote by proxy. On the 8th of December, in St. Peter's, in the midst of the celebration of the 'Conception', the pope read the decree of more than an imperial dignity, and in answer to a petition presented by the Sacred College of the Cardinals, the supreme pontiff, with a tremulous voice, read in Latin the following decree: 'We declare, pronounce, and define that the doctrine which holds that the blessed Virgin Mary, at the first instant of her conception, by a singular privilege and grace of the omnipotent God, in virtue of the merits of Jesus Christ, the Saviour of mankind, was preserved immaculate from all stain of original sin, has been revealed by God, and therefore should firmly and obstinately be held by all the faithful. At the castle of St. Angelo, the joyful chime of all the bells of Rome, the enthusiastic plaudits of the assembled thousands, the magnificent illumination of St. Peter's church, and the splendor of the most gorgeous festive rites, gave response to the infallible decree. It was a day for the grand procession of the pontificate. The pope reposed in his palace with a trembling joy, crowned the image of the Virgin; medals of Australian gold were struck, and distributed in her honor. 'Rome,' say the beholders, 'was intoxicated with joy.' An infallible voice had spoken; a religious article of faith was announced by di- vine authority; the people rejoiced in the most beautiful way, and propitious, that her 'prevalent intercession would give peace and plenty, would stay the power of infidelity, put an end to insurrection, and crown
Rome with higher honor and success. The controversy of seven hundred years is brought to a final decision; Rome is committed irrevocably to the worship of the Virgin mother of God, conceived without original sin. This controversy, however, in the final analysis, was more than a theological dispute about the service of the doctrine, and, as in the case of the "Protestantism" of the O.T., they offer no real support of it whatever. As for other passages of a mystical type which are used as a secondary evidence, they would be of value only as confirming and illustrating any in which the fact was directly and undoubtedly stated. Certain it is that in the gospels Mary is represented as she is, and not as an immaculate being; that neither in the Acts nor in the Epistles, notwithstanding Paul's minute description of Christ's scheme of salvation, is she mentioned. The great trouble, in short, with Roman Catholic theologians, is that they transfer the sayings of the prophets and of the apostles concerning Jesus Christ, and all the passages which point to one mediator between God and man, virtually to Mary, the mother of Christ, instead of assigning this position to Christ, the Son of God.

The comparative novelty of the doctrine in theology is proved by history. There is not one great teacher of the Christian Church who, before the breaking out of the controversy between Lyons and Bernard in 1140— that is, for the first eleven centuries of our era— was favorable to the doctrine as now propagated by the Church of Rome. The question does not hang on them; they know nothing of this specific doctrine; they speak in respect to original sin and the need of redemption in such a way as to prove that the immaculate conception of Mary could not have been any part of their creed. Their praises of the Virgin Mary are in moderation, their attitude toward her perpetual virginity (Ephesians, Haur. 78; Jerome, adv. Helvidianum, etc.); many of them believe that she was "sanctified" in the womb; most of them declare that she never was guilty of actual sin; but they do not know anything about her exemption from all infection of original sin. Augustine defends her only against the charge of actual sin (De Natura et Gracia, c. 36): "Excepta sancta Virgine Maria, de qua quapra honorum Dominii nullum prorsus, cum de peccato agitari, haberi velo questionem." This passage is quoted in favor of the dogma, but it plainly refers only to actual sin. Jerome, of course, is merely in a reply to the position of Pelagius, that there were saints who had not sinned. In his treatise on the Resurrection of the Body he says explicitly that Christ alone was without sin: "Solus ergo ille etiam, homo factus, marcescens Deus, personæ, in verba quæ信任, in actione quæ definit, in intima, in toto, in omni, in omni. In his de Genesi, ad Ul. c. 18, n. 82, he speaks of the body of Christ as taken from the flesh of a woman, who was conceived of a mother with sinful flesh; and he indicates a clear distinction between Mary's nature and Christ's nature in this respect. Augustine's followers make similar statements. Eusebius Emesinus (supposed by some to be Hilary) on the 'Nativity' says, 'From the bond of the old sin is not even the mother of the Redeemer free. Fulgentius writes, 'The flesh of Mary, which was conceived in unrighteousness in a human way, was truly sinful flesh,' and he adds that 'this flesh is in itself truly sinful.' referring to Paul's use of the term 'flesh' to designate our common hereditary sinfulness. Others of the fathers make use of similar statements, irreconcilable with a belief in the immaculate conception. (See Perrone, p. 40.)
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about it. The doctrine is declared, A.D. 1140, by Bernad, to be a 'noveltv,' and he says that the festival is 'the mother of presumption, the sister of superstition, and the daughter oflevity' (Ep. 174, ad Canon Logi, $ 5 sq.; comp. Serm. 76 in Canz.). Other phrases are even earlier. A Pilgrim of Mary in so such a way is absolutely irremediable with the idea that they believed in her immaculate conception. Hilary (Psa. cxxix, lib. 3, $ 12; comp. Tracts for the Times, No. 79, p. 36) declares that she is exposed to the fire of judgment. Tertullian, Tertullian, Origen, Basil, and Chrysostom do not hesitate to speak of faults of Mary, of her being rebuked by Christ. 'If Mary,' says Origen, 'did not feel offence at Our Lord's sufferings, Jesus did not die for her sins;' Chrysostom ascribes to her 'excessive ambition at the marriage festival at Cana;' Basil thinks that she, too, was 'neglected in the time of the circumcision;' all of which statements are utterly inconsistent, not only with the dogma of the immaculate conception, but also with a belief in her perfect innocence (comp. Gieseler, Ch. Hist., $ 99, note 30, with the references to Origen, ibi, 18; Tertullian, De Carne Christi, 7; Origen, in Lucam, 17, 6 (ed. Baldu.); Chrysostom, Hom. 317, (318), in Matt. and Hom. 21 in John). Tertullian, De Carne Christi, $ 16, declares that 'Christ, by putting on the flesh, made it his, and made it sinless;' Tertullian, that 'Christ made human nature pure by taking it;' Irenæus, on the 'Incarnation,' says, that the Church, 'not Christ, sanctified his own body,' and that 'he hath purified the body, which was in itself corruptible.' Of course, the body he assumed was not in and of itself sinless. Gregory of Nazianzum, and John of Damascus (780), teach expressly that the Virgin was sanctified by the Holy Ghost, but Christ by assuming human nature in Mary, 'made it sinless,' it was not so before his immaculation" (Smith, ut sup.). The view which some hold on the title of Svorocr, given to Mary at the Council of Ephesus, we think bears so wholly on the immaculation of Christ that we refrain from introducing it here. See also Sústhéni $ 93, and the liturgies of offices of the Church. "They exalt Mary and her conception, but they do never call it an 'immaculate' conception. It is only in the latest years that the term 'immaculate' has been introduced into the Western offices of the highest authority. The office in the Roman Missal (n Scott 2422 (2421-3) of the Mass, which our Lord assumed, that is, that it is necessarily odious to sin, like the other flesh of the Virgin, but by the operation of the Spirit it was cleansed.' The Holy Spirit, coming into Mary, purified her from sin, and from all desire of sin." Very explicit is also the testimony of the Bishop of Norwich, who has become the assistant and master of St. Bonaventura, the commentator on Lombard: "It was necessary that the blessed Virgin, in her generation, should contract sin from her parents; she was sanctified in the womb." Bonaventura, the seraphic doctor, the glory of the Franciscans, who died in 1274, and was canonized in 1482, is exhausted in the praise of Mary in his Speculum and Corona. He sanctifies her in all the most rapturous terms. Yet on this question he is also decided, explicitly declaring that "the sanctification of the Virgin was after she had contracted the sin; she was sanctified in the womb" (Lib. iii, Hist. 2, p. 2, 3). A Franciscan, who taught in Cologne in 1260 to 1280, made the same avowals. Bonaventura was the pupil of Alexander of Hales, Albertus Magnus of Bonaventura, and next succeeds the greatest of all the scholastic theologians, Thomas of Aquino (1225-1274), who died in 1274, was canonized in 1233, and in 1567 was declared by Pius V to be 'teacher of the Church." In his Summa Theologiae, p. iii, qu. 27, art. 1, it stands, 'Mary was sanctified in the womb.' Art. 2. 'Not before the infusion of the soul; for if she had been she would not have incurred the stain of original sin. The soul needed the redemption of Christ.' Art. 3. The complete deliverance from original sin was only given her when she conceived Christ (' Ex prole redundanter in matrem
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totaliter fomiti subtraho." About the festival of the Conception, he says that the Roman Church does not observe it herself; yet it tolerates the custom of other churches: "Unde talis celebratissim ne est totaliter reprobanda." Such is the testimony of the most eminent mediaval divines, to which we need not add names of later date. Perrone, for instance, was well aware of the difficulties to be encountered by the modern defenders of the immaculate conception, cardinal Perrone, "the general rector of the Roman College," and "the prince of contemporary theologians," is led to argue that if these scholastic divines had reasoned correctly from the symbolic facts about the Virgin, they would have made her conception immaculate; also, that what they teach can all be best explained in harmony with the doctrine; or, if not so, that they taught what they did as private teachers; as also that they were ignorant of antiquity; and again, that their views on original sin were such as allowed them to speak as they did; in fine, that they did not have any guidance from an infallible decision in what they uttered; and that while they were wrangling in the schools, the dogma was making its way among the people. All this goes to show that the mediabal testimony is against it. This, according to Lucas Aquinas, is a controlling, or isolated opinions are for the doctrine, and the weight of authority is against it. The only distinct argumentative attempt which Perrone makes to parry the force of their authority and arguments is the assertion that these doctors of the schools, when they speak of the conception, mean the act of conception, and not to the passive, or the infusion of the soul into the seed. But this explanation is irrelevant, for two reasons: one, that many of these doctors do not make this distinction, and, of course, they include the passive, in it; in this, they make the distinction between "conception" and "sanctification," and say that all that precedes sanctification belongs to the "conception," and is infected with original sin; this, of course, includes the "passive" conception. Another reason that invalidates this mode of explanation is, that some of these doctors do make the very distinction in question, and yet maintain that the whole conception, both active and passive, was in original sin. Thus Alexander of Hales says that "the Virgin after her nativity, and after the infusion of the soul into the body, was sanctified;" Bonaventura asserts that the infusion of grace may have been soon after the infusion of the soul, and Aquinas declares expressly that the cleansing can only be from original sin; that the fault of original sin can only be in a rational creature, and, therefore, that before the infusion of the rational soul the Virgin was not sanctified. In fact, this mode of meeting the difficulty can only be carried through by supposing that the mediabal divines believed that original sin could exist in the mere fleshly material derived from parents, an opinion widely abhorrent to their well-known views. We may therefore well say that the doctrine of the immaculate conception of Mary in the statements of Christ, is a "novelty in theology," for the historical records of antiquity are silent; in the Middle Ages the great authorities are divided; and in modern times, as our historical sketch has shown, there have been perpetual contests and divisions. Twenty years ago hardly a single part of the controversy in this subject was concerned by the Catholics of Germany would have pronounced in its favor. Spain, it is true, continued her deviations, but France was indifferent, until the Ultramontane party began to gain power, and to look about for the means of arousing popular feeling in behalf of the papacy. There remains for us now only to consider the doctrine as opposed to the doctrine of original sin. The very necessity for a miraculous conception in the case of him who was to be without sin [see INCARNATION] is in itself a proof that every person conceived in a natural manner must be conceived in sin [see NATURE, HUMAN], and the Bible is too express and unmistakable on this point, that all are conceived in sin [see ORIGINAL SIN]. In the position which the Roman Catholic Church thus assumes, we encounter again the vital defects of her theology on original sin, that semi-Pelagianism against which all the Protestant Confessions have protested as unscriptural. "The Roman Catholic doctrine of original sin is in the opinion of some, that it makes it negative; asserting that it is only the want of that righteousness in which Adam was created; this, is, in scholastic usage, the 'formal' part, or the very essence of original sin. Concurrence is not of the nature of sin. This is the doctrine of original sin, which Perrone endeavored to drive down the throats of the Ultramontane theologians (p. 2, 3 sq.), 'that the essence of original sin is in the defect of grace or of original righteousness.' This is the only view of the matter with which the dogma of the immaculate conception can possibly be reconciled. If this view is false—if original sin, as Protestants hold, according to the Scriptures, be positive and not negative, and come by descent, then the conclusion is irresistible that Mary, by descent, must have had a part therein. The dogma of her immaculate conception is possible only with a false view of the nature of the 'sin of birth.' Augustine could not have held it, nor could he have used Aquinas. The doctrine is diametrically opposed to the conception of original sin. Yet again, even with this defective view of original sin, the dogma is involved in difficulties and internal conflicts by what it asserts and implies as to the origin of the soul of Mary. The theory on which it rests is, that Mary's soul was directly created by God. But, in the words of Virgil, 'Mary, at the first instant of her conception,' was preserved immaculate. What is meant by 'conception' here? It is the so-called 'passive conception,' or the infusion of the soul into the seed, the union of the soul of Mary with the body. And, in this view, immortality is in the soul. Then, now, this soul? It was 'created.' The 'Letters,' in another passage, say that Mary was the 'tabernacle created by God himself.' Pius IX also cites the formula of Alexander VII as having 'decisive' authority, and that formula declares 'that Mary's soul, at the first instant of creation and of infusion into the body,' was preserved free from original sin. This hypothesis of 'creatianism' is also the only hypothesis consonant with the doctrine. But now put these two positions together, namely, that original sin consists essentially in privation; that is, in the defect of original justice; and that Mary's soul was directly created by God, and does not arrive at the following difficulties and dilemmas. The position is this: When Mary's soul was created and infused into her body, she was by grace preserved free from original sin. Would the original sin, from which she was kept, have come to her from her mother?—for it must have come from one or the other. If one says that it would have come from the soul, this involves the consequence that God usually creates original sin in the soul before it is united with the body, and, of course, before it is connected with Adam by descent. If one says, on the other hand, that original sin would have come to Mary from her 'active conception,' that is, from her prepared body, then it was already there, in germ and seed, before the infusion of the soul. God either creates the human soul with original sin, or the original sin is from the parents. If the former, we have original sin without Christ; and the Catholics of Germany would have pronounced in its favor. Spain, it is true, continued her deviations, but France was indifferent, until the Ultramontane party began to gain power, and to look about for the means of arousing popular feeling in behalf of the papacy.
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is no theological or rational ground for saying that, as far as her creation was concerned, she was liable to sin, or could be saved from it through Christ's merits. Nor can any relief be found by joining the two points, and asserting that the exemption from original sin concerns the time or point of union of the soul with the seed, the conjunction of the active with the passive conception. Fered great question is, and must be this: In the union of the soul with the body, from which of the two, soul or body, would the original sin have come, if grace had not prevented?—for it must have come from one or the other. If from the soul, then you have original sin without any connection with Adam; if from the body, you will have had to be there; if from both together, this simply dodges the question, or else resolves original sin into some act consequent upon the union—that is, into actual transgression. Nor is the matter helped by saying that original sin is essentially negative, privative; for the privation has respect to either the soul or the body, or to both conjoined, and the same dilemma result. The 'Letters Apostolic,' in other passages, speak of the dogma in this wise: that the 'Blessed Virgin was free from all contagion of body, soul, and mind;' that she had 'come without original sin of her own nature;' that it is their fault;' and that 'the flesh of the Virgin taken from Adam did not admit the stain of Adam, and on this account the most blessed Virgin was the tabernacle created by God himself, formed by the Holy Spirit.' These expressions imply that the fault in the case could have come either from the body or from the soul, but not from both. That is the sense of the dogma might have been of the 'body;' that the 'stain from Adam' would, under other circumstances, have come to her through the 'flesh.' But in her 'active conception,' before the infusion of the soul and of grace, the 'nature,' the 'body,' was already extant, ere the 'passive conception' took place: were they connected with or without the fault? If with the fault, then you have original sin; if without, then it would follow that the flesh, the body, the nature, before the passive conception, had been already delivered from the bondage of corruption. In short, if original sin came from the 'active conception,' then Mary must have had it; if it come from the 'passive conception,' then God is its direct author in every individual case. This dogma of the immaculate conception, then, contains contradictory elements; it rests on a false view of original sin. Even that false view, when not well recognized, gives rise to the theory that souls are directly created, and here again it involves itself in inextricable difficulties in relation to original sin. It is opposed to Scripture, to tradition, and in itself is self-contradictory.

In conclusion, there is left to us only the present attitude of the Roman pontifil, who, since his declaration of infallibility, more than ever, is forced into a position which puts the matter of papal infallibility in a disagreeable dilemma and dualism. 'The decree of Pius IX is in opposition to the express declarations of preceding councils,' the 'body,' the 'flesh,' were already present; infallibility is inconsistent with infallibility. Not only has 'probable opinion become improbable,' but Peter's chair is divided against itself; and how, then, can that kingdom stand? The Jansenist Launoy, in his 'Prescriptions,' has collected the opinions adverse to, or irreconcilable with the above, of several of the successors of St. Peter, who never change. From pope Leo (440-461), the greatest and most learned of the early bishops of Rome, he cites four passages in which Leo declares that Christ alone 'was innocent in his birth,' alone was 'free from original sin,' and that Christ received from his mother 'her nature, but not her fault;' and he asserts that Mary obtained 'her own purification through her conception of Christ.' This is wholly averse to the dogma. Innocent III, who called the Lateran Council in 1213, in a sermon on the 'Assumption of Christ,' comparing Eve and Mary, writes: 'Ilia fuit sine culpa producta, sed in culpa produxit;' hæc autem fuit in culpœ produce, sed in culpa produxit.' Gregory says (590-604), 'John the Baptist was conceived without sin.' Christ alone was conceived without sin.' Innocent V (1276), in his Commentary on the Matter of Sentences: 'Non convenit tante Virginii ut diu moraret sibi in pecatâ,' and he adds that she was sanctified quickly after the animation (that is, of the body by the soul), although not in the very moment. This is directly against the dogma. John XXII or Benedict XII (c. 1340) says that Mary 'passed at first from a state of original sin to a state of grace.' Clement VI (1342-52), 'I suppose, according to the common opinion as yet, that the blessed Virgin was in original sin' modicum morui, 'because, from my side, according to my knowledge, I was sanctified as soon as she could be sanctified.'

"Thus the papacy, in committing itself to this new and idolatrous dogma, is in hostility to Scripture, to universal consent, and also to itself. It explains the sense of Scripture by tradition; and it explains the sense of tradition by an infallible expositor, and that infallible expositor contradicts itself. The new dogma makes the whole of the early Church to have been ignorant of a truth which is now declared to be necessary to the faith; it makes Leo, Innocent III, Innocent V, and the Roman pontiffs of all ages, who have taught by word and writing, scholastics and divines under the ban; and, while doing this, it declares that what is now decreed has always been of the faith of the Church, and that it is a part of the revelation of God, given through Christ and the apostles, and handed down by constant succession and general acceptance.'


Immaculate-Conception Oath is among the Roman Catholics the assurance by oath of a belief in and support of the doctrine of the immaculate conception of the Virgin Mary. It was introduced by the Sorbonne in consequence of the disputes on this subject between the Franciscans and Dominicans [see Immaculate Conception], as a test oath for those who had obtained an academic degree. The Jesuits made this a test oath also for other privileges.—Theol. Univ. Lex. i, 404. (J. H. W.)

Immanent Activity or God, the pantheistic tenet that God does not exist outside of the world, as a free personal (transcendental) being, but inside of it, as the highest unity of the world, because God cannot, according to it, be conceived of without the world. Saisset (Mod. Pantheism, ii, 91) thus sums it up: "He (God) creates the world within himself, and thenceforth there is no separation of the Creator and the creature, for the creature is a part of the Creator considered in his eternal and necessary action." See Pantheism.

Imman'oi'li (Heb. Immanu'el, יְמָנָעוֹל, sometimes separately יַמְנָאוֹל, God with us, as it is interpreted separately by עַמְנָאוֹל, God with us, as it is interpreted Matt. i, 23, where it is written Epyavov, as in the Sept., and Anglicized "Emmanuel;" the Sept. however, in Isa. viii, 8, translates it μετὰ σιγῆ νυκτός; Vulg. Eum'manuvel, a figurative name prescripted through the prophet for a child and a sign born, it is the speedy downfall of Syria (B.C. cir. 739: see 2 Kings xvi, 9) and violent interregnum of the kingdom of Israel (B.C. 737-728: see 2 Kings xx, 30; comp. xvii, 11), before the infant should become capable of distinguishing between wholesome and improper kinds of food. The name occurs only in the celebrated verse of Isaiah (vii, 14), "Behold a [rather the] virgin shall conceive
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and bear a son, and shall call his name Immanuel," and in another passage of the same prophet (Isa. viii. 8), where the child to be born is described as ere loqo to "all the breadth of thy land, O Immanuel, i. e. Juleas, with evident allusion to the former declaration. See AHAZ. In the name itself there is no difficulty; but the verse, as a whole, has been variously interpreted. From the manner in which the word God is used in the Hebrew Scriptures, and in consequence of the application of the whole verse, by the evangelist Matthew (i, 23), to our divine Saviour. Even if this reference did not exist, the history of the Nativity would irresistibly lead us to the conclusion that the verse—whatever may have been its intermediate signification—had an immediate reference to Christ. See ISAAC.

The state of opinion on this point has been thus concisely summed up by Dr. Henderson in his note on the text: "This verse has long been a subject of dispute between Jews and professedly Christian writers, and among the latter mutually. While the former reject its application to the Messiah, the Jewish expositors of the earlier Rabbins explaining it of the queen of Ahas and the birth of his son Hezekiah, and the later, as Kimchi and Abanbash, of the prophet's own wife—the great body of Christian interpreters have held it to be directly and exclusively a prophecy of our Saviour, and have considered themselves fully borne out by the inspired testimony of the evangelist Matthew. Others, however, have departed from this construction of the passage, and have invented or adopted various hypotheses in support of such dissent. Grofius, Faber, Lienbihl, Hein, Botan, Frusceba, Puschke, Gieseler, and Hitzig, suppose it to refer to the birth of the wife of Isaiah to be the 'wir.' almah [rendered 'virgin'], referred to.

Eichhorn, Paulus, Hengel, and Ammon are of opinion that the prophet had nothing more in view than an ideal virgin, and that both she and her son are merely imaginary personages, introduced for the purpose of prophetic illustration. Bauer, Cube, Steudel, and some others, think that the prophet pointed to a young woman in the presence of the king and his courtiers. A fourth class, among whom are Richard Simon, Lowth, Koppe, Dathe, Williams, Von Meyer, Olehausen, and Dr. J. Pye Smith, admit the hypothesis of a double sense (q. v.), on which the words apply primarily to the time of living in the temple, and only secondarily to her giving birth to a son according to the ordinary laws of nature; or, as Dathe holds, to some virgin, who at that time should miraculously conceive; and the other, in which they received a secondary and plenary fulfillment in the miraculous conception and birth of Jesus Christ." (See the monographs enumerated by Volbeiding, Index, p. 14; and Fürst, Bibl. Jud. ii, 60; also Hengstenberg, Christol. des A.T. ii, 69; and the commentators in general; compare the Stud. u. Kr. 1836, iii, 538.)

This last seems to us the only consistent interpretation. Thus the conjunctive and disjunctive clauses are here understood to mean: I shall be born and already spoken of is clear from the entire context and drift of the prophecy. It can be no other than the Mahur-shalal-hash-baz (q. v.), the offspring of the prophet's own marriage with the virgin prophets, who thus became an eminent type of the Messiah's mother (Isa. viii. 35, 36).

Immanuel, HEN-SALOMON ROMI, a Jewish philosopher, commentator, and poet, was born at Rome about 1265. Endowed with great natural ability, and with a fondness for study, he soon made himself master of Biblical and Talmudic, as well as of Grecoan and Latin literature. He was deeply versed in grammar, having been much given to a cultivation of the same art in which Dante immortalized his name, "the two spirits, kindred, and yet different in many respects, formed a mutual attachment." He died about 1380. Immanuel wrote commentaries on the whole Jewish Bible, excepting the Apocrypha and the New Testament, and he enriched not only by valuable grammatical and archaeological notes, but contain also some able remarks on the nature and spirit of the poetical books. "It is greatly to be regretted that of all his exegetical works, which are in different public libraries of Europe, the Commentary on the Song of Songs is the only ones as yet published, the former in Naples in 1486, and the latter in Parma in 1806. The introduction of his commentary on the Song of Songs has been published, with an English translation, by Ginsburg: "Historical and Critical Commentaries on the Hebrew Songs (Lond. 1857, p. 49-52)" (Ginsberg in Ktitt). He wrote also some philosophical treatises, and translated for his Jewish brethren the philosophical writings of Albertus the Great, Thomas Aquinas, and other celebrated philosophers. See Gritz, Gesch. der Juden, viii, 307 sq.; Geiger, Wissenschaftliche Zeitchrift, 1885, iv, 194 sq.; Fürst, Bibl. Jud. ii, 92 sq. (J. H. W.)

Immateriality is a quality of God and of the human soul. The immateriality of God denotes that he forms an absolute contrast to matter; he is simple, and has no parts, and so cannot be dissolved; matter, on the other hand, is made up of parts into which it can be resolved. God is immanent from the limits of space and time.

The immateriality of God is therefore the basis of the qualities of eternity, omnipresence, and unchangeableness. Thus the immateriality of the soul includes likewise simplicity as another of its qualities. This, of course, does not absolutely set it above the limitations of space and time, since the soul needs the body for a necessary organ of its life; nor does it set aside any further development, but it certainly includes indestructibility, and thus serves as a proof of immortality (q. v.).

Immateriality of the body is a doctrine assented to by Tertullian, Arnobius, and others, during the first three centuries. Near the close of the fourth, the immateriality of the soul was maintained by Augustine, Nemesius, and Mamertus Claudianus. See Guizot, History of Civilization, i, 894; Krauth, Vocab. of Philos. p. 245. See also IMMORTALITY OF GOD; SOUL, TRANSDUCTION OF.

Immediate Imputation of Sin. See IMPUATION.

Immortality of God is explained by Dr. J. Pye Smith (First Lines of Christ, Theol. p. 138) to be the absolute necessity of being, considered in relation to space. "There is with God no diffusion nor contraction, no extension nor retraction, no production, or growth, as belongs to limited natures. God is equally near to, and equally far from, every point of space and every atom of the universe. He is universally and immediately present, not as a body, but as a spirit: not by motion, or penetration, or filling, as would be predicated of a diffused fluid, or in any way as if the infinity of God were composed of a countless number of finite parts, but in a way peculiar to his own spiritual and perfect nature, and of which we can form no conception."

In the passages of Job xi. 7-9; 1 Kings viii. 27 (exc. v. 1); Ps. cxlv. 18; Isa. xxix. 13; Ezk. xxxii. 23, 24; Amos i. 2, 3; Matt. xvi. 4, 6; Acts xvii. 24, 27, 28; also Isa. xli. 12-15, 21, 22, 25, 26, "the representations are such as literally indicate a kind of diffused and filling subtle material; but this is the condescending manner of the Scriptures; and is evidently to be understood in the translation of the word, metaphysical or philosophical precision is not in the character of scriptural composition, nor would it ever suit the bulk of mankind; and no language or conceptions of men can reach the actual expression of the truth, or be any other than analogical. When the Scriptures speak of 'the immensity of his spirit' they mean his supremacy in all perfection, and his universal dominion."

Immutability and omnipresence, again, are distinguished in that "the former is absolute, being the necessary in-
PERFECTION of the Deity in itself, as infinitely exalted above all conception of space; and that the latter is relative, arising out of the position of a created world. The moment that world commenced, or the first created portion of it, there was and ever remains the divine presence (aurorana, adaequatio). The essence and divinity are those of body, not of a pure, proper, highest spirit. Socinus and his immediate followers denied a proper ubiquity, immensity, or omnipresence to the essence or substance of the Deity, and represented the universal presence of God spoken of in Scripture as denoting only the acts and effects of his power, fame, and name. Dea Carne and his followers held "that the essence of the Deity is thought, and that it has no relation to space." See J. P. Smith, First Lines of Christian Theology, edited by W. Farrar (2d ed. Lond. 1861); Augustine, De Ciu. Dei, 20; Brentscheider, Dogmatik, i, 398 sq. See OMNIPRESENCE OF GOD.

IMMER (Heb. Immer, סנדא, talkative, or, according to First, high; Sept. Εὑρισκων), the name of several priests, mostly near the time of the Exile.

1. The head of the sixteenth sacerdotal division, according to David's appointment (1 Chron. xxiv, 14). B.C. 1014.

2. The father of Pashur, which latter so grossly misused the prophet Jeremiah (Jer. xx, 1). B.C. ante 607.

By many the name is regarded here as put patronymically for the preceding.

3. One of whose descendants to the number of 1052 returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Ezra ii, 57; Neh. vii, 40). It is very possible the same with the father of Mushillemoth (Neh. xi, 13) or Meshillemoth (1 Chron. ix, 12), certain of whose descendants took a conspicuous part in the sacred duties at Jerusalem after the Exile; and probably the same with the one some of whose descendants divided their time between the instance of Ezra (Ezra x, 50). B.C. much ante 530. By some he is identified with the two preceding.

4. One who accompanied Zerubbabel from Babylon, but was unable to prove his Israelitish descent (Ezra ii, 59; Neh. vii, 61). B.C. 536. It does not clearly appear, however, that he claimed to belong to the priestly order, and it is possible that the name is only given as that of a place in the Babylonian dominions from which some of those named in the following verses came.

5. The father of Zadok, which latter repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem opposite his house (Neh. iii, 29). B.C. 536. He was, perhaps, the same as No. 8.

IMMERSION, the act of plunging into water, especially the person of the candidate in Christian baptism, as performed by the Baptist, (q. v.) denomination, and occasionally by others. There are two controversies that require to be noticed under this head.

1. Is this mode or act essential to the validity of the ordinance itself? The affirmative of this question is maintained by those denominationally styled "Baptists," and is denied by nearly all other classes of Christians. For the arguments on both sides, see the article Baptism.

II. Are the terms "immerse," "immersion," etc. preferable or more correct in a version of the Scriptures, than "baptize," "baptism," etc.? The affirmative of this question is taken by many, but not by all Baptists, and it is approved, to some extent at least, by certain scholars in most other denominations, while the negative is held by the vast majority of Bible readers. The change was actually made by Dr. Campbell in his work on the Gospels, and recently a systematic effort has been made on a large scale to give currency to the alteration by the translations put forth under the auspices of the American (Baptist) Bible Union. See Buell, Socinianus. The arguments for this rendering are set forth in all their strength by Dr. Conant, in a note to his translation of Matthew, at ii, 6, as follows (to each of which we subjoin the counter arguments):

"1. This word expressed a particular act, viz. immerse in a fluid or any yielding substance. See the Appendix to this volume, sections i-iii." The Appendix thus refers to is Dr. Conant's treatise On the Meaning and Use of Baptism, etc. The proofs there given, however, do not seem to sustain this precise point; the passages cited do indeed show that Baptizō means to submerge or immerse a body or thing in a fluid, but do not indicate any uniform method, such as dipping, plunging; nor do they necessarily imply motion on the part of the subject into the fluid, as "immersion" clearly does.

"2. The word had no other meaning; it expressed this act, either literally or in a metaphorical sense, through the frequent use in Greek literature. Append. sect. iii." This assertion is palpably refuted by the fact that Dr. Conant himself, in but a part of these very quotations here appealed to, has ventured to render ἄτομον by "immerse;" for he is very frequently constrained to translate it "immerge," "submerge," "dip," "plunge," "imbathe," "wet," etc. These words, it is true, have the same general signification; but, supposing that they were in every case suitable renderings (which in many cases they are not), yet they do not establish the identical point in dispute, namely, the exclusive translation by "immerse," etc., as if "the word had no other meaning."

"3. Its grammatical construction with other words, and the circumstances connected with its use, accord entirely with this meaning, and exclude every other. Append. sect. iii." On the contrary, the prepositions and cases by which it is followed, being generally in, with the subject very precisely the same as the comparator of the comparison; insomuch that in even the comparatively few instances where "immerse" can be given as a rendering at all, it is scarcely allowable except by the ambiguity "immersed in," which in English is used for "immersed into."

In the Greek language, as every scholar knows, no such word as "immers in water," etc., is used. "iv. In the age of Christ and his apostles, as in all periods of the language, it was in common use to express the most familiar acts and occurrences of everyday life: as, for example, immersing an axe in water, to harden it; wool longdy, to color it; sail submerged, to drown it; a ship submerged in the waves; rocks immersed in the tide; and (metaphorically) immersed in cares, in sorrow, in ignorance, in poverty, in debt, in stupor and sleep, etc. Append. sect. iii." Rather these examples should be rendered, an axe tempered by cold water, etc., or, perhaps, the same as No. 8. The familiarity of the word is another matter, belonging to the next argument.

"v. There was nothing sacred in the word itself, or in the act which it expressed. The idea of sacredness belonged solely to the relation in which the act was performed. Append. sect. iv, 7." This fact is no good reason why, when it is manifestly employed in such sacred relations, it should not be rendered by a term appropriate to such a sacredness. This argument applies only to those passages in which the word occurs in a secular sense; about these there is no dispute.

"vi. In none of these respects does the word baptize, as used by English writers, correspond with the original Greek word. This has already been met in substance above. The remainder of the arguments, with one exception, need not be reproduced, as they are of a doctrinal nature, and the novelty of a word is a method of reasoning inconclusive, if not altogether worthless in a philological question.

"ix. In rendering the Greek word by immerse, I follow the example of the leading vernacular versions, made from the Greek, in the languages of Continental Europe and America, and of the Bible of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the use of the learned. Facts, however, do not support this claim with any uniformity. The modern versions, of course, render according to the theological leanings of their authors, and, were they unanimous, they could not be permitted to decide a question of this kind by au-
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thority. The best and oldest guides, the early Latins, foolishly transfer the term baptism, giving it a regular terminology like other native verbs; they rarely, if ever, render by "immergo," "immerso," etc., but usually give "tingo," or at most, "mergeo." See Dale, Classic Baptism (Phila., 1867.), which thoroughly reviews the instances of the use of \( \text{baptiz\ae} \) in a subsequent volume (Phila., 1870). Dr. Dale meets the whole controversy in question, and proves conclusively the incorrectness of translating \( \text{baptiz\ae} \) by "immerse."

There are other positive arguments against the substitution of "immerse" as an equivalent to \( \text{baptiz\ae} \): 1. The word is no more English than "baptize;" one is of the "Good News" and the other is of Saxon origin. Yet both are perfectly intelligible, and it is pretty certain that, but for the advantage which "immerse" gives to one party in polemics, it would never have been thought worth while to make the exchange.

2. "Immerse," as a compound word, does not correspond etymologically with the Greek. There is nothing answering to the "im" in \( \text{baptiz\ae} \); it should have been \( \iota \mu \beta \alpha \pi \zeta \zeta \iota \zeta \) (which seldom occurs), or, rather, \( \iota \omega \beta \alpha \pi \zeta \zeta \zeta \zeta \) (which is never used at all, obviously on account of the incongruity between the native force of the word and the accentual inflections applied in \( \gamma \).)

3. The outrageous awkwardness of such phrases as "will immerse you in holy spirit and fire" (sic Conant), rendered necessary by this change, is a sufficient critical objection to the proposed rendering, were there no other argument against it. A theory that breaks down in this particular and the others may be dismissed, if not without hope, as only a summary rejection. 4. These translators are consistent with themselves in rejecting the expression "John the Baptist," calling him instead "John the Immerser." But they ought to go one step further, and themselves abjure the title of "Baptist," which they pre-empt, and adopt a title more appropriately \( \text{the Immersionists}. \)

It is highly creditable that the mass of that large denomination are not disposed to be drawn into this specious innovation.

Immolation (Lat. \( \text{immolatio} \)) is the name of a ceremony performed in the sacrifices of the Romans. It consisted in throwing some sort of corn or frankincense, together with the mola or salt cake, and a little wine, on the head of the victim. See Brande and Cox, Dict. of Science, Lit., and Art, ii, 197. See SACRIFICE (J. H. W.)

Immorality. See Morals.

Immortality is the perpetuity of existence after it has once begun (Lat. \( \text{immortalitas}, \) not dying). "If a man die, shall he live again?" is a question which has naturally agitated the heart and stimulated the intellectual curiosity of man, wherever he has risen above a state of barbarism, and commenced to exercise his intellect at all. Without such a belief, Max Muller (Chips from a German Workshop, i, 45) well says, "religion surely is like an arch resting on one pillar, like a bridge ending in an abys." It is very gratifying, therefore, to the believer, and a fatal misfortune to the adherents of that affirmative on this question is assumed more or less by all the nations of earth, so far as our information reaches at the present day, although, it is true, their views often assume very vague and even materialistic forms.

1. Ideas of rude Nations.—We concede that the views of most rude heathen nations, both ancient and modern, respecting the state of man after death are indeed dark and obscure, as well as their notions respecting the nature of the soul itself, which some of them regard as a kind of aerial substance, resembling the body, though of a flimsy material. Still it is found that the greatest part of mankind, even of those who are entirely uncultivated, though they may be incapable of the higher philosophical idea of the personal immortality of the soul, are yet inclined to believe at least that the soul survives the body, and continues either forever, or at least for a very long time. This faith seems to rest in uncultivated nations, better perhaps, races, 1, upon the love of life, which is deeply imprinted on the breast, and leads to the wish and hope that life will be continued even beyond the grave; 2, upon traditions transmitted from their ancestors; 3, upon dreams, in which the dead appear speaking or acting, and thus confirm both wishes and traditions. See NEMRODANCY. (J. R. H.)

It is a strange fact that in the Brahminical religion, as well as in the Veda, "immortality of the soul, as well as personal immortality and personal responsibility after death, is clearly proclaimed" (Muller, Chips, i, 45). We have here a refutation of the opinion that has hitherto been entertained, that the goal of Hinduism is absorption (q. v.), in which all the attributes of the individual existence, and that the Hindus as well as Brah- manes believe in the trasmigration (q. v.) of the soul, and a refutation by a writer who is most competent to speak. Professor Roth, another great Sanscrit scholar, in an article in the Journal of the German Oriental Society (iv, 427), corroborates Prof. Muller in these words: "We here [in the Veda] find, not without astonishment, beautiful conceptions on immortality expressed in unadorned language with childlike conviction. If it were necessary, we might find here the most powerful weapons against the destruction of the individuality which has lately been so energetically proclaimed as new, that Pericles was the only birthplace of the idea of immortality, and that even the nations of Europe had derived it from that quarter. As if the religious spirit of every gifted race was not able [which Muller (ii, 267) holds] to arrive at it by its own strength, and that the idea of immortality is given alms goes to the highest place in heaven; he goes to the gods" (Rv. i, 125, 56). "Even the idea, so frequent in the later literature of the Brahmanes, that immortality is secured by a son, seems implied, unless our translation deceives us, in one passage of the Veda (vi, 64, 23). 10 Maruts, may there be to us a strong son, who is a living ruler of men; through whom we may cross the waters on our way to the happy abode; then may we come to your own house!" One poet prays that he may see again his father and mother after death (Rv. ii, 24, 1); and the fathers are invoked almost like gods, to be offered to them, and are among the things believed to enjoy, in company with the gods, a life of never-ending felicity (Rv. x, 15, 16). We find this prayer addressed to Soma (Rv. ix, 115, 7): "Where there is eternal light, in the world where the sun is placed, in that immortable, imperishable world place me, O-Soma! Where king Vaitars is residing, where the secret of heaven is, where these mighty waters are, there make me immortal! Where life is free, in the third heaven of heavens, where the worlds are radiant, there make me immortal! Where wishes and desires are, where the bower of the bright Soma is, where there is food and rejoicing, there make me immortal! Where there is happiness and delight, where joy and pleasure reside, where the desires of our desire are attained, there make me immortal!"

2. Chinese.—While it is true that Confucius himself not expressly teach the immortality of the soul, say, that he rather purposely seems to have avoided entering upon this subject at all, taking it most probably like Moses, as we shall see below, simply for granted (comp. Muller, Chips, i, 308), it is nevertheless implied in the worship which the Chinese pay to their ancestors. It seems to us to be founded upon the absence of the word death from the writings of Confucius (q. v.). When a person dies, the Chinese say "he has returned to his family." The spirits of the good were, according to him (Confucius), permitted to visit their ancient habitations on earth, or such ancestral halls or places as were appointed by the ancestors, to receive homage and confer benefactions. Hence the duty of performing rites in such places, under the penalty, in the case of those who, while living, neglect such duty, of their spiritual part being deprived after death of the supreme bliss flowing from the homage of de
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ascendants" (Legge, Life and Teachings of Confucius, Philadelphia, 1867, 122mo).

3. Egyptians.—Perhaps we may say that the idea of immortality assumed a more definite shape among the Egyptians, for they clearly recognized not only a dwell-
ing-place of the dead, but also a future judgment. "Osiris, the beneficent god, judges the dead, and, 'hav- ing observed the scales of justice, he sends the wicked to regions of darkness, while the just are sent to dwell with the god of light.' The latter, we read on an inscription, 'found favor before the great God; they dwell in glory, where they live a heavenly life; the bones of the dead will forever lie in their tombs, while they rejoice in the life of the supreme God.' Immortality was thus plainly taught, although bound up with it was the idea of the preservation of the body, to which they attached great importance, as a condition of the soul's continued life; and hence they built vast tombs, and embalmed their bodies, as if to last forever."

4. Persians.—In the religion of the Persians, also, at least since, if not previous to the time of Zoroaster, a prominent part is assigned to the existence of a future world, with its governing spirits. "Under Ormuz and Ahriman, its roots down to their habitation, of spirits engaged in a perpetual conflict; and the soul passes into the kingdom of light or of darkness, over which these spirits respectively preside, according as it has lived on the earth well or ill. Whoever has lived in purity, and has not suffered the dire (evil) spirits to have any power over him, will, when he dies, ascend, and receive his share in the light.""\n
5. American Indians.—The native tribes of the lower part of South America believe in two great powers of good and evil, but likewise in a number of inferior deities. These are supposed to have been the creators and ancestors of the different families, and hence, when an In- dian dies, his soul goes to live with the deity who presides over his particular family. These deities have each their separate habitations in vast caverns under the earth, and thither the departed repair to enjoy the happiness of being eternally drunk (compare Tyler, Researches into the early History of Mankind, and the De- velopment of Civilization, Lond, 1868). Another American tribe of Indians, the Mandan's, have with their belief in a future state connected this tradition of their origin: "The whole nation resided in one large village under ground near a subterranean lake. A grape-vine extended its roots down to their habitation, and gave them a view of the light. Some of the most adventurous climbed up the vine, and were delighted with the sight of the earth, which they found covered with buff-falo, and rich with every kind of fruit. Returning with the grapes they had gathered, their countrymen were so pleased with the taste of them that the whole nation resolved to leave their dull residence for the charms of the upper region. Men, women, and children ascended by means of the vine; but when about half the nation had reached the surface of the earth, a corpulent woman who was clambering up the vine broke it with her weight, and closed upon herself and the rest of the na- tion the light of the sun. Those who were left on earth expect, when they die, to return to the original seats of their forefathers, the good reaching the ancient village by means of the lake, which the burden of the souls of the different families, and hence, when an In- dian dies, his soul goes to live with the deity who pre- sides over his particular family. These deities have each their separate habitations in vast caverns under the earth, and thither the departed repair to enjoy the happiness of being eternally drunk (compare Tyler, Re- searches into the early History of Mankind, and the De- velopment of Civilization, Lond, 1868). Another Ameri- can tribe of Indians, the Mandan's, have with their belief in a future state connected this tradition of their origin: "The whole nation resided in one large village under ground near a subterranean lake. A grape-vine extended its roots down to their habitation, and gave them a view of the light. Some of the most adventurous climbed up the vine, and were delighted with the sight of the earth, which they found covered with buff- falo, and rich with every kind of fruit. Returning with the grapes they had gathered, their countrymen were so pleased with the taste of them that the whole nation resolved to leave their dull residence for the charms of the upper region. Men, women, and children ascended by means of the vine; but when about half the nation had reached the surface of the earth, a corpulent woman who was clambering up the vine broke it with her weight, and closed upon herself and the rest of the na- tion the light of the sun. Those who were left on earth expect, when they die, to return to the original seats of their forefathers, the good reaching the ancient village by means of the lake, which the burden of the souls of the different families, and hence, when an In- dian dies, his soul goes to live with the deity who pre- sides over his particular family. These deities have each their separate habitations in vast caverns under the earth, and thither the departed repair to enjoy the happiness of being eternally drunk (compare Tyler, Re- searches into the early History of Mankind, and the De- velopment of Civilization, Lond, 1868). Another Ameri- can tribe of Indians, the Mandan's, have with their belief in a future state connected this tradition of their origin: "The whole nation resided in one large village under ground near a subterranean lake. A grape-vine extended its roots down to their habitation, and gave them a view of the light. Some of the most adventurous climbed up the vine, and were delighted with the sight of the earth, which they found covered with buff- falo, and rich with every kind of fruit. Returning with the grapes they had gathered, their countrymen were so pleased with the taste of them that the whole nation resolved to leave their dull residence for the charms of the upper region. Men, women, and children ascended by means of the vine; but when about half the nation had reached the surface of the earth, a corpulent woman who was clambering up the vine broke it with her weight, and closed upon herself and the rest of the na- tion the light of the sun. Those who were left on earth expect, when they die, to return to the original seats of their forefathers, the good reaching the ancient village by means of the lake, which the burden of the souls of the different families, and hence, when an In- dian dies, his soul goes to live with the deity who pre- sides over his particular family. These deities have each their separate habitations in vast caverns under the earth, and thither the departed repair to enjoy the happiness of being eternally drunk (compare Tyler, Re- searches into the early History of Mankind, and the De- velopment of Civilization, Lond, 1868). Another Ameri-

6. Polyneissians.—The natives of Polyneissia "imagine that the sky descends at the horizon and incloses the earth. Hence they call foreigners 'palangi' or 'heav- en-bursters,' as having broken in from another world outside. According to their views, we live upon the ground floor of a great house, with upper stories rising one over another above us, and cellars down below. If we are here and the other parts of the house are above, and as men are supposed to visit the dwellers above, the dwellers from below are believed to come sometimes up to the surface, and likewise to receive visits from men in return."

7. New Hollanders.—The native tribes of Australia believe that all who are good men, and have been properly buried, enter heeren after death. "Heaven, which is the abode of the two good divinities, is represented as a delightful place, where there is abundance of game and food, never any excess of heat or cold, rain or of sleep, no malady, no sickness, death, nor plenty of rolling, singing, and dancing for evermore. They also believe in an evil spirit who dwells in the nethermost regions, and, strange to say, they represent him with horns and a tail, though one would think that, prior to the introduction of cattle into New Holland, the cow and the horse had never been seen."

8. New Zealanders.—"The Greenlander believes that when a man dies his soul travels to Torgnarsuk, the land where reigns perpetual summer, all sunshine, and no night; where there is good water, and birds, fish, seals, good game, with water and land, and to be free from care, trouble, or are found cooking alive in a huge kettle. But the journey to this land is difficult; the souls have to slide five days or more down a precipice, all stained with the blood of those who have gone down before. And it is especially grievous to the poor souls that the journey must be made in winter or in tempest, for then a soul may come to harm, or suffer the other death, as they call it, when it perishes utterly, and nothing is left. The bridge Ka-Sisat, which stretches over the midst of the Mosten hill, finer than a hair, and sharper than the edge of a sword, conveys a similar sensation." Tyler, on whose works we mainly rely for the information here conveyed on rude nations, traces the idea of a bridge in Java, in North America, in South America, and he also shows how in Polyneissia the bridge is re- placed by canoes, in which the dead were to pass the other world. And it is noteworthy that the Jews, when they first established a firm belief in immortality, im- agined a bridge of hell, which all unbelievers were to pass.

II. Ideas of more cultivated Nations.—Wherever pa-
gan thought and paganism prevail at the highest per-
fection, we find their ideas of the immortality of the soul gradually approaching the Christian views. The first trace of a belief in a future existence we find in Homer's Iliad (xxiii, 103 sq.), where he represents that Achilles first became convinced that souls and shadow forms have a real existence in the kingdom of the shades (Hades) by the appearance to him of the dead Patroclus in a dream. These visions were often regard-
ed as divine by the Greeks (comp. II, i, 68, and the case of the rich man and Lazarus in Luke xvi, 27). Compare also the article Hades. But, while in the early thought of the Greeks preeminently the idea of Hades was melancholic, Hades, or the realms of the dead, being to their imagination the emblem of gloom, as may be seen from the following: "Achilles, the ideal hero, declares that he would rather till the ground than live in pale Elysium," we find that, with the progress of Hellenic thought, a higher idea of the future is found to charac-
terize both the poetry and philosophy of Greece, till, in the Platonic Socrates, the conception of immortality shines forth with a clearness and precision truly impres-
sive. "For we must remember, O men," said Socrates, in his last speech, before he drank the poison cup, "that it depends upon the immortality of the soul
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whether we have to live to it and to care for it or not. For the danger seems fearful they do not care for it at all. To speak, he pointed out that care for it is not the mere possession, the possession, but the care that can happen to the unbeliever be that he be right, and the worst that can happen to the believer be that he be wrong, who in his madness would dare to run the venture? Yea, were death to be the end of all, it would be a truly a fortunate thing for the wicked to get rid of their beauty. "The soul, the immortal part, being of a nature so superior to the body, can it," he asks in the Phaedo, "as soon as it is separated from the body, be dispersed into nothing, and perish? Oh, far otherwise. Rather will this be the result. If it take its departure in a state of purity, not carrying with it any clinging impurities of the body, impurities which already are not unwillingly shared in, but always avoided, gathering itself into itself, and making the separation from the body its aim and study—that is, devoting itself to true philosophy, and studying how to die calmly: for this is the highest, not? And indeed, so prepared, the soul departs into that invisible region which is of its own nature, the region of the divine, the immortal, the wise, and then its lot is to be happy in a state in which it is freed from fears and wild desires, and the other evils of humanity, and spends the rest of its existence in the worship of the gods." This would be a better doctrine of the immortality of the soul, held by Socrates and his disciple Plato, implied a double immortality, the past eternity as well as that to come. They certainly offer a very striking contrast to the popular superstitions and philosophy of their day, which in many respects are not much held by the Socratic party. The people, especially those who held the most enlarged views up to this time, had "entertained what might be termed a doctrine of semi-immortality. They looked for a continuance of the soul in an endless futurity, but gave themselves no concern about the eternity which is past. But Plato considered the soul, not only as actually but also as eternally existing, the present life being only a moment in our career; he looked forward with an undoubting faith to the changes through which we must hereafter go" (Draper, Intel. Development of Europe, p. 118; compare his Chap. 11, Plato, Arg. 6).

III. Ideas of the Jewish Nation.—1. It has frequently been asserted that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul is not taught in the O.T. The Socinians in the 16th and 17th centuries took this ground. Some have gone so far as to construe the supposed silence of the O.T. Scriptures on this subject into a formal denial of the possibility of a future life, and have furthermore fortified their positions by selecting some passages of the Old Testament that are rather obscure, e. g. Eccles. iii, 19 sq.; Isa. xxxviii, 18; Psa. vii, 6; xx, 10; lxvi, 11; cvx, 17; Job vii, 7-10; xiv, 22-26; xiv, 7-12; xiv, 22. In the most obvious manner were these objections raised by the "Wolffensbütten Fragmente" (see the fourth fragment by Lessing, Beiträge z. Gesch. u. Lit. a. d. Wolffensbüttenischen Bibliothek, iv, 484 sq.). Bishop Warburton, on the other hand, derived one of his main proofs of the immortality of the soul from this supposed silence on the subject of immortality. He argued, "being sustained in his legislation and government by immediate divine authority, had not the same necessity that other teachers have for a recourse to threatenings and punishments drawn from the future world, in order to enforce obedience." In a similar strain argues professor Ernst Stübelin in an article on "The immortality of the soul (in the Foundations of our Faith, Loud, and N. York, 1866, 12mo, p. 224 sq.): "Moses and Confucius did not express the teaching of the immortality of the soul, they seemed purposely to avoid entering upon the subject; they simply took it for granted. Thus Moses spoke of the tree of life in Paradise, of which if the man took he should live forever, and called God the God of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, thus implying their continued existence, since God could not be a God of the dead, but only of the living; and Confucius, while in some respects avoiding all mention of future things, nevertheless enjoined honors to be paid to departed spirits (thus assuming their future existence). But in the case of the chief duties of a religious man." Another evidence of the belief of the Jews at the time of Moses and in subsequent periods in the immortality of the soul, as a doctrine self-evident, and by them universally acknowledged and received, is the fact that the Israelites and their Pseudo-reasons for the belief. But in the case of the chief duties of a religious man. Another evidence of the belief of the Jews at the time of Moses and in subsequent periods in the immortality of the soul, as a doctrine self-evident, and by them universally acknowledged and received, is the fact that the Israelites and their ancestors were taught the doctrine in the city of the Levites, among whom the laws were read and explained. This doctrine is frequently found in Moses as well as in subsequent writings of the O.T. That Moses did not in his laws hold up the punishments of the future world to the terror of transgressors is a circumstance which redounds to his praise, and cannot be alleged against him as a matter of reproach, since to other legislators the charge has been laid that they were either deluded or impostors for pursuing the very opposite course. Another reason why Moses did not touch the question of the immortality of the soul is that he did not intend to give a system of theology in his laws. But so much is clear from certain passages in his writings, that he was by no means ignorant of this doctrine. Compare Michaelis, Argументa pro Immortalitate Animi e Mose Collecta, in the Syntagma, Comment. i (Gottingen, 1759); Luderwald, Unters. von d. Kennniss eines künstigen Lebens i. u. T. Test. (Helmstedt, 1781); Semler, Beiträge d. Fragen d. Wolfsbüttenischen Umgang. Biel, Obers. des psychologischen Erzeugens (Erlangen, 1779).

"The following texts from the writings of Moses may be regarded as indications of the doctrine of immortality, viz. Gen. v, 22, 24, where it is said respecting Enoch, that because he lived a pious life God took him, so that he was no more among men. This was designed to be the reward and consequence of his pious life, and it points to an invisible life with God, to which he attained without previously suffering death. Gen. xxvii, 35, Jacob says, 'I will go down to the grave' (ךלמה ותא) unto my son. We have here distinctly exhibited the idea of a place where the dead dwell connected together in a society. In conformity with this idea we must explain the phrase to go to his fathers (Gen. xv, 15), or to be gathered to his people (more literally, to enter into their habitation or abode) (Gen. xxv, 8; xxxv, 29; Numb. xx, 24, etc.). In the same way many of the Indian savages (as we have already seen) express their expectation of an immortality beyond the grave. Paul argues from the text Gen. xvi, 5, and similar passages where Jesus speaks of the resurrection, that we may expect a life after death (Heb. xi, 13-16; yet he says, very truly, πωροθον ἐκδοσις τῆς ζητηγέλας). In Matt. xxii, 23, Christ refers, in arguing against the Sadducees, to Exod. iii, 6, where Jehovah calls himself the God of Isaac and Jacob (i. e. their protector and the object of their worship), but not the God of the dead, and could not be that their ashes and their dust should worship God; hence he concludes that they themselves could not have ceased to exist, but that, as to their souls, they still lived (comp. Heb. xi, 13-17). This passage was in-
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interpreted in the same way by the Jews after Christ (Westein, ad loc.). In the subsequent books of the O. T. the texts of this nature are far more numerous. Still more definite descriptions are given of רָבָּה (ra'ah), and the condition of the departed there; e.g. Isa. xiv, 9 sq.; also in the Psalms and in Job. Even in these texts, however, the doctrine of the reward of the righteous and the punishment of the wicked in the kingdom of the dead was not so clearly developed as it is in the N. T.; this is true even of the book of Job. All that we find here with respect to this point is only obscure intimation, so that the Pauline πνευματική διάταξις is applicable, in relation to this doctrine, to the other books of the Old Testament also. As to those of the Psalms and the Psalms there are some plain allusions to the expectation of reward and punishment after death, particularly Psa. xvii, 15; xlix, 15; lxii, 23. There are some passages in the prophets where a reification of the dead is spoken of, as Isa. xxvi, 19; Dan. xii, 1, 2; Ezek. xxxvii; but, although these do not teach a literal resurrection of the dead, but rather refer to the restoration of the nation and land, still these and all such figurative representations presuppose the proper idea that an invisible part of man survives the body, and will be hereafter raised. Very clearly also is the language of the New Testament (Phil. iii, 20; Col. iii, 1; 1 Thess. iv, 2; 1 Cor. xv, 52). The body must return to the earth from whence it was taken, but the spirit to God who gave it, evidently alluding to Gen. iii, 19. See SHEOL.

From all this we draw the conclusion that the doctrine of the immortality of the soul was not unknown to the Jews before the Babylonian exile. It appears also from the fact that a general expectation existed of rewards and punishments in the future world, although in comparison with what was afterwards taught on this point there was at that time very little definitely known respecting it, and the doctrine, therefore, stood, by no means in that near relation to religion and morality into which it was afterwards brought, as is often the case in other wholly uncultivated nations. Hence this doctrine is not so often used by the prophets as a motive to righteousness, or to deter men from evil, or to console them in the midst of suffering. But on this very account the pietv of these ancient saints observes the more regard and admiration. It was in a high degree unpretending and disinterested. Although the prospect of what lies beyond the grave was, as Paul said, the promised blessing which they saw only from afar, yet they had pious dispositions, and trusted God. They held merely to the general promise, that God will keep watch over them. That God will cause it to be well with them even after death (Psa. lxxiii, 25, 28, "When my strength and my heart faileth, God will be the strength of my heart, and my portion forever"). But it was not until after the Babylonian captivity that the ideas of the Jews on this subject appear to have become enlarged, and that this doctrine was brought by the prophets, under the divine guidance, into a more immediate connection with religion. This result becomes very apparent after the reign of the Grecian kings over Syria and Egypt, and their persecutions of the Jews. The prophets and teachers living at that time (according to the writings, however, this comes down to us) must therefore have given to their nation, time after time, more instruction upon this subject, and must have explained and unfolded the allusions to it in the earlier prophets. Thus we find that after this time, more frequently than before, the Jews sought and found in the sacred writings their immortality, their retribution, consolation, and encouragement under their trials, and a motive to piety. Such discourses were therefore frequently put in the mouths of the martyrs in the second book of Maccabees, e.g. vi, 26; vii, 9 sq.; comp. xii, 48-49; see also the Book of Wisdom, i, 1 sq.; and especially iii, 1 sq. and the other apocryphal books of the O. T. At the time of Christ, and afterwards, it was universally received and taught by the Pharisees, and in this, was, indeed, the prevailing belief among the Jews, as is well known from the testimony of the N. T., of Jospeh, and also of Philo. Tacitus also refers to it in his history, "Animas praedix aut supplicia peremptorum aeternas putant." Consult an essay comparing the ideas of the apocryphal books of the O. T. on the subjects of immortality, resurrection, judgment, and retribution, with those of the N. T., written by Friche, in Eichhorn's Bibliothek der Schriften, vol. ii. See also W. Abhandl. pt. ii. No. 4; Flugle, Geschichte des Glaubens an Unsterblichkeit, etc. p. 1. The Sadducees, boasting of a great attachment to the O. T., and especially to the books of the Moses, were the only Jews who denied this doctrine, as well as the existence of a "gathering distinct from the body" (Knaup, Theology, § exilis). See Johanness, Vet. Heb. notions de rebus post mortem, Hafn. 1826. See RESURRECTION.

2. Among the modern Jews, the late celebrated Jewish savant and successor to Reiman at the Sorbonne, professor Munk, regarded as one of the strongholds of the O. T. affords a doctrine for a profession of the immortality of the soul the expression "He was gathered to his people," so frequent in the writings of the O. T. The Rev. D. W. Marks, in a series of Sermons (Lond. 1861), p. 109 sq., says of it: "It has generally been supposed that when it is said, 'He was gathered to his people,' it is a metaphor which the sacred historian employs in order to convey the idea that the person to whom it is applied lies buried in the place where the remains of the same family are deposited. But whoever attentively considers all the passages of the Bible where this expression occurs will find Dr. Munk, that the last word of a man's life is to one's ancestors is expressly distinguished from the rite of sepulture. Abraham is 'gathered unto his people,' but he is buried in the cave which he bought near Hebron, and where Sarah alone is interred. This is the first instance where the expression is 'to be gathered to one's people' is to be met with; and that it is evident that Abraham's bones reposed in the same cave with those of his fathers is very clear, since the ancestors of the patriarch were buried in Chaldea, and not in Canaan. The death of Jacob is related in the following words: "And when Jacob had finished charging his sons, he gathered up his feet upon the bed, and he expired, and was gathered unto his people." (Gen. xlvi, 30). It is equally certain that the phrase 'he was gathered unto his people' cannot refer to the burial of the patriarch, because we learn from the next chapter that he was embalmed, and that the Egyptians kept him seventy years; and it is only after these three score and ten days of mourning are ended that Joseph transports the remains of his father to Canaan, and inter them in the cave of Machpelah, where the ashes of Abraham and Isaac repose. What the inspired penman alludes to the actual land of Canaan, Joseph uses very different terms. He makes no mention then of the patriarch 'being gathered to his people,' but he simply employs the verb גלך, 'to bury.' And Joseph went up to bury his father. 'The very words addressed by Jacob on his deathbed to his sons, I am about to be gathered unto my people; bury me with my fathers, afford us sufficient evidence that the speaker, as well as the persons addressed, understood the expression 'being gathered to one's people' in a sense totally different from that of being lodged within a tomb. But a stronger instance still may be advanced. The Israelites arrive at Mount Hor, near the borders of Edom, and immediately is issued the divine command, 'And Aaron shall be gathered unto his people; for he shall not come into the land which I have given to the children of Israel . . . Strip Aaron of his garments, and clothe in them Eleazar his son. And Aaron shall be gathered, and he shall die.' No member of his family shall be buried on Mount Hor; and still Aaron is said to have been there buried, 'unto his people.' Again, Moses is charged to chastise severely the Midianites for having seduced the Israelites to follow the abominable practices of מזֶּבֶּחַ (Beal Peor); and, this act accomplished, the legislator is told "that he will be gathered unto his people." This passage occur-
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tainly cannot mean that Moses was to be gathered in the grave with any of his people. The Hebrew law
giver died on Mount Abarim; and the Scripture testi-
ifies 'that no one ever knew of the place of his sepul-
chre;' and still the term to be gathered to his people in there likewise employed. Sufficent instances have
now been cited to prove that מָּשָּׁה נַעֲלֵי is to be
understood in a different sense from the rise of sepul-
chres, and in the Hebrews' idea Moses did entertain the belief in another state of existence, where spirit
joined spirit after the death of the body.

"But, although the position here assumed seems very
tenable, it is nevertheless true that the Israelites cer-
tainly did not have a very clear conception of the future
existence of the soul, and that life and immortality
were not brought to light very distinctly before Christ
came, for whom the office was reserved of making clearly
known many high matters before but obscurely indi-
cated" (Journal of Sacred Literature, viii, 179).

IV. Neo-Testament Views.—When Jesus Christ ap-
peared in this world, the Epicurean philosophy (q. v.),
the fables of poets of a lower world, and the corruption
which was prevalent among the nations had fully de-
stroyed the hope, to say nothing of a belief, in future
existence. It was left for him to declare the existence of
eternal life, and the immortality of the soul, and to
abolish the doctrine of the unchangeable state of the
human soul (Matt. x. 28; Mark xii, 18 sq.; Luke xx. 28 sq.). Jesus Christ, said Paul,
"hath abolished death, and hath brought life and im-
mortality to light" (2 Tim. i, 10), and "will render to
every man according to his deeds. To them that
by patience, and joy in tribulation, have power for
glory, and honor, and immortality, eternal life" (Rom.
ii, 6 sq.). The original for eternal life here used (αἰ
ματονία) denotes nothing else than the immortality of
the soul, or a continuation of the substantial being, of
man's person, of the ego, after death, by the destruction
of the body (comp. Matt. x. 28; Luke xii. 4). See the
article ETERNAL LIFE; and on the origin of the soul,
and its pre-existence to the body, the article SOUL.

It is evident from the passages cited that Christ and
his apostles did more to illustrate and confirm the belief
in the immortality of the soul, as cherished at the pres-
et day, than by being developed by any nation, even
the Jews included. "He first gave to it that high practical
interest which it now possesses," and it is owing to
Christianity that the doctrine of the soul's immortality
has become a common and well-recognized truth—no more result of speculation, as are those of the heathen
and Jewish philosophers, nor a product of priestly in-
vention—but a light to the reason, and a guide to the
conscience and conduct. "The aspirations of philoso-
phy, and the materialistic conceptions of popular my-
thology, are found in the Gospel transmuted into a liv-
ing, spiritual, and divine fact, and an authoritative
influence, not only touching the present life, but gov-
erning and directing it."

V. Christian Views.—In the early Christian Church
the views on the immortality of the soul were very va-
ried. There were none that actually denied, far from it,
the idea of immortality. But some of them, e. g. Justin,
Tatian, and Theophilus, on various grounds, supposed that the soul, though mortal in itself, and at least indifferent in relation to mortality or immortality, either acquires immortality as a promis-

ed reward, by its union with the spirit and the right use of its liberty, or, in the opposite case, perishes with
the body. They were led to this view partly because they
laid so much stress on freedom, and because they thought
that likeness to God was to be obtained only by this freedom; and partly, too, because they supposed
(according to the trichotomic division of human na-
ture) that the soul (ψυχή) receives the seeds of immor-

tal life only by the union with the spirit (σωφροσύνη),
as the higher and free life of reason." This view was also
afterwards introduced into the Greek Church by Nicho-
las of Methone (compare Hagenbach, Doctrine, ii, 16).

"And, lastly, other philosophical hypotheses concerning the
nature of the soul, it is clear, had less effect on the
Church. But the apologetic writers have entertained
the immortality of the soul a theological truth; but their chief
leaders, Thomas Aquinas and Duns Scotus, were at
issue on the question whether reason furnishes satisfac-
tory proof of that doctrine... "As Anselm of Canter-
bury had inferred the existence of God himself from the
idea of God, so Thomas Aquinas proved the immortality
of the soul, in a similar manner, by an ontological argu-
ment: 'Intellectus apprehendit esse absolute et secun-
dum omne tempus. Unde omne habens intellectum naturale deserit esse semper, naturale autem deseri-
derium non potest esse innato. Omnis igitur existentia est substantialis incorruptibilis' (compare Engelhardt,
Dogmengesch. ii, 125 sq.). On the other hand, Scotus,
whose views were more nearly allied to those of the
Nominalists, maintained: 'Non posses demonstrari, quod
animal sit immortalis' (Com. in M. Sentent. bk. ii, dist.
17, qua. i; contra Osu. ad hanc quaest. 43, qua. 2, qua.
24, qua. 4, contra) on the contrary, asserted: 'Animam esse immortalen; auctoritate ostentatur et rationale' (De Nat. Ded. ii, 55).
Concerning the further attempts of Moneta of Cremona
(13th century), William of Auvergne (bishop of Paris
from 1228 to 1249), and Raimund Martini (Fugio Fide
in Contr. p. 419), we will prove the immortality of the
soul, compare Münchener, Dogmengeschichte, ed. by Von
Collin, p. 92 sq. (Hagenbach). On the views since
the Reformations, see SOUL, IMMORALITY OF.

VI. Philosophical Argument.—There are many
writers, both in philosophy and theology, who deny that
the immortality of the soul can be proved apart from
revelation. E. Stähelin (Foundations of our Faith, p. 232) says: "We might take up a line of argument
used by philosophy both in ancient and modern times—from
Socrates down to Fichte—to prove the immortality of
the inner being; an argument derived from the asser-
tion that the soul, being a unity, is, as such, incapable
of division, and that, therefore, when the body perishes,
that a falling to pieces, or a dissolution, is conceivable." "But," he continues, "the abstruse nature of this meth-

do leads us to renounce a line of argument from which.
we freely confess, we expect little profitable result. For,
after all, what absolute proof have we of this unity of
the soul? Can we subject it to the microscope or the
scalpel, as we can the visible and tangible? It must

But, for the present simply to indicate that the
instinct and consciousness of immortality have nothing
to fear from the most searching examination of the rea-
sor, but from the abstruse nature of our confirmation of that proof than of contradiction in the profound thinking.
Further, that this instinct and consciousness do actually
exist, and are traceable through all the stages and ram-
ifications of the human race, . . . is confirmed to us by
our opponents themselves . . . that there is in man
something which is not in the body, and which we
term immortality. "But according to our actual

of a self-invented nobility, namely, the divinely-crea-

ted nobility of his nature, the inherent breath of
life, breathed into him by God, the relation to the Eter-
nal, which secures to him eternity." (Watson (Insti-
tute, ii, 2) goes even further, and declares that nowhere
else but in the Christian religion there is a "real and

on its immortality, or "any facts or principles so obvious as to enable us confidently to infer it. All
observation lies directly against the doctrine of man's
immortality. He dies, and the probabilities of a future
life which have been established upon the unequal dis-
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obvious at once; but, as they have nothing to sustain, their insufficiency is the less apparent; our belief continues, notwithstanding the falseness of the arguments on which many up to this time have been, and the very defects of the proof illustrate the strength of the conclusion, which remains firm in despite of them. That the immortality of the soul has been firmly believed in by men destitute of a written revelation will not be denied by fair-minded scholars. It probably would never have been generally adopted by the ingenious theologians on this subject, by the skeptics, by the theological view according to which the soul is a separate person, and by the philosophers who held that the soul is a substance distinct from the body, and that its immortality is a consequence of its being a substance.

The first attempt of a philosophical tenet on the doctrine of immortality is offered in Plato's Phaedo. On it the New Platonists have added many fanciful additions. All scientific attempts throughout the Middle Ages, and up to our own day, have been modified views, allied more or less to Platonism. In opposition to these, the French materialists of the 18th century attempted to destroy, or at least undermine, the doctrine of immortality. The materialist is the position of the Pantheists, headed by Spinoza. "These hold that the World-Soul, which, in their opinion, produces and fills the universe, also fills and rules man; nay, that it is only in him that it reaches its special end, which is self-consciousness, and attains to thought and will. It is true, this idea goes on to say, that at the death of the individual this World-Soul retreats from him, just as the setting sun seems to draw back its rays into itself; and that self-consciousness now sinks once more into the great, unconscious, undistinguished mass of the universe, of which the world is a part. This ridiculous position has been best given by M'Cosh (Intuitions of the Mind, p. 392 sq.): "We can conceive of air thus rushing into air, and of a bucketful of water losing itself in a river; and why? Because neither air nor water ever had a separate and conscious personality. The soul, as long as it exists, must retain its personality as an essential property, and must carry it along with it wherever it goes. The moral conviction clusters round this personal self. The being who is judged, who is saved or condemned, is the same who sinned and continued in his sin, or who believed and was justified when he first became a believer. Kant, Locke, and other metaphysicians, on the other hand, like some theologians, as we have seen above, also exclude the immortality of the soul from the province of natural theology. 'They deem it impossible to prove our future existence from the creation, or even from the admitted attributes of the Creator, and are thus in singular opposition to the ancient Platonists, who regarded the eternal continuance of our being as the more obvious doctrine of natural theology, and inferred from it the divine existence as the less direct indication of nature. It is said that much of the reasoning employed by pagan writers to prove the immortality of the soul is unsound. This is a fact, and yet by no means invalidates their right to believe in the conclusion which they deduced illogically. There are many truths, the proof of which lies so near to us that we overestimate their belief in immortality. Many are satisfied with the mere pretense of an argument for its support; and searching in the distance for proofs which can only be found in immediate contact with us, we discover reasons for the belief which, long before we had discovered them, was a part of our own minds; and yet we deem these reasons sufficient to uphold the doctrine, although, in point of fact, the doctrine does not make trial of their strength by resting upon them. If they were the props on which our belief was in reality founded, their weakness would be

1. From the capacity and desirability of the soul for knowledge, beyond what in this life it ever attains; 2. From the law of contraries, according to which the part that prepares for labor and the part that rests prepares for rest; as light ends in darkness, and darkness in light; so life, leading to death; death must, in turn, terminate in life; 3. From the reminiscences of a previous existence, which the soul brings with it into the present life; 4. From
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the simple and indivisible nature of the soul; only compound substances undergo dissolution; 5. From the essential vitality of the soul itself. He adds that although these arguments did not amount, in the estimation of Socrates, "to an absolute proof of the doctrine, he thought them sufficient not only to deprive death of all terror, but also to awaken in the mind of a good man, when approaching death, the calm and cheerful hope of a better life." These arguments, however, are far behind the present state of science. The second and third rest on purely imaginary foundations; the fourth and fifth are inconclusive; and the first only, we grant, has a certain authority. From the principles from which it is drawn, should not have awakened in the cautious mind of Butler a suspicion of their soundness, and led him to seek other means of establishing the truth in question. These he would have found, and, as we think, far better suited to his purpose, in the example of pagans and primitive Christians, who set forth in his chapters on the moral government of God, and on probation considered as a means of discipline and improvement. Indeed, we have always been of the opinion that these two chapters contain the only real and solid grounds for belief in a future life which the present writings of the immunitarians afford in the one particularly appropriated to that object serving at first only to answer objections to the doctrine."

Professor Chaucer found his own argument chiefly upon the gradual and progressive development of life in our planet, from the epoch of its earliest inhabitant down to the present hour, which development, taken in connection with the capacities and endowments of the soul, indicates, on the part of the Creator, a purpose to continue it in being.

estats des églises," vols. 12mo, i, 140 sq., 268; ii, 86 sq.; Alger, History of Future Life (3d ed. Phila. 1864); Schneider, "Die Unsterblichskeit," etc. (Regensb. 1870, 8vo); Brinton, "Myths of the New World" (N. Y. 1868, 12mo). (J. H. W.)

Immoveable Feasts. See Feasts.

Immunities of the Clergy. See Immunity.

Immunity, Ecclesiastical. In ecclesiastical jurisprudence a distinction is made between ecclesiastical immunity (immunitas ecclesiastica) and the immunity enjoyed by the Church from the right of refuge or asylum (q. v.), the former denotes the exemption of the Church from the general obligations of the community. The ministers of religion have at all times and in all countries enjoyed particular privileges and liberties. This was the case with the priests of the Church in ancient times, those of pagan religions and the Christian clergy by Constantine. Among these privileges we notice particularly exemption from taxes (census), from menial service (murnera servitio), etc. To this was added also the privilege of separate spiritual jurisdiction. See JURISDICTION, ECCLESIASTICAL. These privileges belonged to the ministers of religion, of their wives, children, domestics, and to the goods of the Church, but did not extend to their private property, or to persons entering the clergy simply to free themselves from civil charges. In 532 Justinian added to these privileges that of guardianship, permitting presbyters, deacons, and subdeacons to act as guardians or trustees, but not extending the privilege to bishops or monks (Nov. xcvii, cap. 3; Anth. Presbyteros C. cit. i, 3). The ancient Germans also granted great privileges to their priests. Julius Caesar considered them as the next class to the nobility, and said, "Magna (Druos) et apud eos honoris et privilegiis sunt; ubi consul (ib. vi, 13)." Does a bello abesse consueverunt, neque tributa una cum reliquiis quisque possessorum nostrorum, nullius tibi remanet" (ib. cap. 14). When Germany was Christianized, the clergy preserved the same privileges, and not only besides those granted them by the Roman law, which was recognized as the standard (secundum legem Romanam ecclesiam vivit [Lex Rhabnia, tit. viii, § 1, etc.]). The stipulation of the third Council of Toledo in 589, can. 21 (c. 69, can. xxi., qu. ii) that the auditors, bishops, and clergy should not be subject to compulsory services, was also granted afterwards (Capitularia n. 744, cap. 7; compare Benedict's Capitularies-sammlung, lib. iii, cap. 290). The protection which the Church granted to all who connected themselves with it soon became a source of great profit; it was known in the 6th century under the name of mitium, or mitium legitimum (Koht, Gesc. d. Beneficiatum, 1859, p. 113 sq.). To this right of protection of the Church was subsequently added that of collecting and appropriating to its own use the taxes which would otherwise have been levied on its properties by the fiscal officers: this right was called ecclesiastum, and was conferred by the Church by the laws, which were, in general, the taxes included fines, etc., of which the holders of immunities became the recipients. In after times the Church obtained also the right of assembling armies, which was called territorium (see Formula Aegaeenses, 4, 8, 21, 22, etc.), and which laid the foundation of the subsequent ecclesiastical principalities (see Retberg, Kirchenrechtliche Deutscgland, vol. ii, § 97; Waits, Deutsche
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Verfassungs geschichte, ii, 390 sq., 570 sq.). These immunities were further specified in the laws of the French kingdom (see Capitula synodi Vermissae a. 755, c. 19, 28; Cap. Metop. a. 756, c. 8, etc.), as were also those of the individual members of the clergy, and of the Church properties. St. Louis decided that each church should have a patron saint (Pope, il.; Capit. a. 816, c. 10, 25; canon, xxix, qu. viii). Such properties subject to taxes as did come into the hands of the Church did not, however, become free on that account, unless by an especial favor of the king (Capit. ii, Carlo M. a. 813, c. 11; Capit. vi, Ludor a. 819, c. 2). This was not, however, the case in his kingdom, and long after the abandonment of their importance, notwithstanding the decisions of the Council of Trent, Sess. xxv, cap. 20 ("Ecclesiae et ecclesiasticum personorum immunitatem Dei ordinatio et canonize sanctionibus constitutam esse"), and the bull In conso Domino (q. v.). To what extent the properties of the clergy and of the Church are now free has been settled by subsequent decrees. As a rule, the clergy are free from the general taxes, and from the personal duties of private citizens. The candidates for priests' orders and students in theology are usually exempt from military service, and their property enjoys generally the same privileges as the government buildings and state property. Personal immunity from taxes, military services, etc., is regularly granted to the clergy, as also to teachers, in Protestant as well as in Roman Catholic countries. See Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, vi, 649; Mysteries and Their Popes (an Index); Augusti, Handbuch d. christl. Archäol., i, 908 sq.

IMMUTABILITY, the divine attribute of unchangeableness indicated in the great title of God, I AM. So James i, 17: "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, who cannot change, and hath not respect of persons." Psa. xxxiii, 11: "The counsel of the Lord standeth forever, the thoughts of his heart to all generations." cii, 25-27: "Of old hast thou laid the foundation of the earth, and the heavens are the work of thy hands. They shall perish, but thou shalt endure; yes, all of them shall wax old like a garment; as a vesture shalt thou change them, and they shall be changed: but thou art the same, and thy years shall have no end." God is immutable as to his essence, being the one necessary being. He is immutable also in ideas and knowledge, since it cannot change. If it did, we should not know who God is, that he is a self-existent and independent Being, the great Creator and wise Governor of all things; that he is a spiritual and simple Being, without parts or mixture such as might induce a change; that he is a sovereign and uncontrollable Being, whom nothing from without can affect or alter; that he is an eternal Being, who always has and always will go on in the same tenor of existence; an omniscient Being, who, knowing all things, has no reason to act contrary to his first resolves; and in all respects a most perfect Being, who can admit of no addition or diminution; we cannot but believe that, both in his essence, in his knowledge, and in his will and purposes, he must of necessity be unchangeable. To suppose him otherwise is to suppose him an imperfect being; for if he change it must be either to a greater perfection than he had before or to a less; if to a greater perfection, then was there plainly a change, and a privation of something better than what he had or was; then again, was he not always the best, and consequently not always God: if he change to a lesser perfection, then does he fall into a defect again; lose a perfection he was possessed of, and so ceasing to be the best being at the same time to be God. The sovereign perfection of the Deity, therefore, is an invincible bar against all mutability; for, whichever way we suppose him to change, his supreme excellency is null or impaired by it. We esteem changeableness in men either an imperfection or a fault: their natural changes, as to their persons, are from weakness and vanity; their moral changes, as to their inclinations and purposes, are from ignorance or inconstancy, and therefore this quality is no way compatible with the glory and attributes of God" (Charnock, On the Divine Attributes).

Various speculations on the divine immutability occur in the writings of divines and others, which, though of necessity attended with some caution, and sometimes even rejected as bewildering or pernicious. Such are the notions that God knows everything by intuition; that there is no succession of ideas in the divine mind; that he can receive no new ideas; that there are no affections in God, for to suppose he can love or hate is absurd; that he is not subject to diversions; that if there are affections in God, as love, hate, etc., they always exist in the same degree, or else he would suffer change: for these and similar speculations, reference may be had to the schoolmen and metaphysicians by those who are curious in such subjects; but the impression of the divine character, thus represented, will be found very different from that conveyed by those inspired writings in which God is not spoken of by men, but speaks of himself; and nothing could be more easily shown than that most of these notions are either idle, as assuming that we know more of God than he reveals to us; or absurd, as tend to represent the divine Being as rather a necessary than a free agent, and his moral perfections as resulting from a blind physical necessity of nature more than from an essential moral excellence: or, finally, as unintelligible or absurd. The true immutability of God is acknowledged in his essence, as one of his essential properties, but in his never changing the principles of his administration; and he may therefore, in perfect accordance with his preordination of things, and the immutability of his nature, purpose to do, under certain conditions dependent upon the free agency of man, what he will not do under others; and for this reason, that if an immutable adherence to the principles of a wise, just, and gracious government requires it. Prayer is in Scripture made one of these conditions; and if God has established it as one of the principles of his moral government to accept prayer in every case in which he has given us authority to ask, he may, we are assured, entangled his actual government of the world with the bonds of such an eternal predestination of particular events as to either reduce prayer to a mere form of words, or not to be able himself, consistently with his essence, in his will, to do otherwise. If there be an eternal Being, who always has and always will go on in the same tenor of existence; an omniscient Being, who, knowing all things, has no reason to act contrary to his first resolves; and in all respects a most perfect Being, who can admit of no addition or diminution; we cannot but believe that, both in his essence, in his knowledge, and in his will and purposes, he must of necessity be unchangeable. To suppose him otherwise is to suppose him an imperfect being; for if he change it must be either to a greater perfection than he had before or to a less; if to a greater perfection, then was there plainly a change, and a privation of something better than what he had or was; then again, was he not always the best, and consequently not always God: if he change to a lesser perfection, then does he fall into a defect again; lose a perfection he was possessed of, and so ceasing to be the best being at the same time to be God. The sovereign perfection of the Deity, therefore, is an invincible bar against all mutability; for, whichever way we suppose him to change, his supreme excellency is null or impaired by it. We esteem changeableness in men either an imperfection or a fault: their natural changes, as to their persons, are from weakness and vanity; their moral changes, as to

IMPANATION

Latin, impanatio; from in and panis, bread; otherwise assimilatio, a name given to one of the many different shades of the doctrine of the real presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Eucha-
IMPOSSIBILITIES

The theory was first presented in the 12th century by Ruprecht of Deutz in the following shape (Opera. ed. Col. 1602, i. 267; Comm. in Exod. ii. 10): "As God did not alter human nature when he incarnated divinity in the womb of the Virgin Mary, uniting the Word and the flesh into one being, so he does not alter the substance but that we should have the same grace in the Church as in the Womb. Therefore, which still retain the material properties by which they are known to our senses (sensus subactuum), while by his Word he brings them (the component elements) into combination with the identical body and the identical blood of Christ. As the Word descended from on high into the Virgin's womb, so the flesh (sussusendo carnem), so are the bread and wine, from their inferior (ab ino) position, raised into becoming flesh and blood of Christ, without, therefore, being transmuted (non mutatum) in such a manner as to acquire the taste of flesh or the appearance of blood, but do, on the contrary, imperceptibly become identical with both in their essence, partaking of the divine and human immortal substance, which is in Christ. It is not the effect of the Holy Ghost's operation (affectus) to alter or destroy the nature of anything used for his purpose, but, on the contrary, to add to that substance some, which was not at first possesso (De Opus Spirit. s. iii, p. 21, 22). In his work De divinis Officis (ii. 9; Opp. ii, 762), he says: "The Word of the Father comes into the flesh and the blood which he received from the womb of the Virgin, and the bread and wine in the form from the altar and, as is made and a joint offering. When the priest puts this into the mouth of the believer, bread and wine are received, and are absorbed into the body; but the Son of the Virgin remains whole and unabsorbed in the receiver, united to the Word of the Father in heaven. Such as do not believe, receive only the form of bread and wine, but none of the offering." His contemporary, Alger, or Adelpher, of Littich, writing in defense of the dogma of transubstantiation (L. iii. De sacrarum corp. et sang. D. in Bibl. Max. Patr. l. xxxi, Lugdun. 1677), was the first to make use of the expression impossio in this sense (p. 131), "in praecipio Christiana impossio sub Deum in carne personaliter incarnatur." Before him, however, Guimard of Avena had, in 1190, used the same word to express the probable meaning of Berengar (Bibl. Max. Patr. Lugdun. xvii, 441), whose supporters are sometimes called Aedenseans (q. v.) (from aldeus, to be present).

The doctrine of impanation was afterwards, in the Reformation period, but wrongly, attributed to Osianer by Carlstadt. Some Roman Catholic writers, e. g. Belzane (Dissert. de impan. et consubstant. Jena, 1677), Du Caunes, and others, accused Luther of having reviled the old error of impanation. The Formula Concilii at Trent (1777) declares that the "mode of union between the body of Christ and the bread and wine is a mystery," and does not decide positively what that mode is, but only negatively what it is not. "It is not a personal union, nor is it consubstantiation; still less is it a union in which change of substance is wrought (transubstantiation), nor a union in which the body and blood of Christ are included in the bread and wine (impanatio), but a union which exists only in this sacrament, and therefore is called sacramentia." See Herzog, Real-Encyklo. vi. 300; Knapp, Theol. v. 146; and the articles of THIS JOURNAL, Consubstantiation; Transubstantiation. Immeasurable, a name given to certain heretics in the ancient Church, who boasted that they were incapable of sin, and that there was no need of repentance; such were some of the Gnostics, Priscillianists, etc. See IMMEASURABILITAS.

Immeasurability, the state of a person who cannot sin, or who, by grace, is delivered from the possibility of sinning. Some speculations have appeared in the world upon the supposed immeasurability of the human nature of Christ, founded chiefly on certain expressions in the Epistle to the Hebrews (iv. 15) and elsewhere, asserting that Christ was "in all points tempted like as we are." It is argued, on the other hand, that as the Scripture has been silent on this point, it is both needless and presumptuous to attempt to draw any inferences from such expressions as that above cited; and that the Scripture is full of instances that we should satisfy with the declaration that "in him is no sin" (1 John iii. 5). See Art. xv of Church of England, Of Christ alone without sin. Immeasurability, or, at least, sinless perfection, has also been claimed for every true child of God upon the authority of 1 John iii. 5, though improperly, the word "carnum" requiring to be taken in the sense of the passages of Scripture) in such a latitude as to express, not an absolute impossibility of sinning, but a strong diminution, in the renewed nature, to sin in such a manner and to such a degree as others."—Eden, Thes. Diet. s. v.; Ullmann, Sindneses of Jesus (Edinb. 1858, 12mo), p. 46; Haag, Hist. des Dogmas Chrest. (see Index). See CHRIST, SINLESSNESS OF; PERFECTION; SANCTIFICATION.

Imperial, Laurent, a Roman Catholic prelate of whose early life nothing is known, was born about the year 1612, and was created cardinal in 1632 by Pope Inocent XI. He died Sept. 21, 1673.—Migne, Encyclop. Théol. xxxi, 1094.

Imperial, Joseph René, an Italian prelate of the Roman Catholic Church, was born at Ori, April 26, 1651. Descending from a high family, and enjoying the intercession of great prelates, he took orders in his Church, and was rapidly promoted. In 1690 Inocent XI created him cardinal, and he was sent as ambassador to Ferrara. At the papal conclave in 1730 he came within one vote of being elected the incumbent of the papal throne. He died Jan. 15, 1787.—Hoefler, Nour. Bieag. Générale, xxv, 838; Migne, Encyclop. Théol. xxxi, 1094.

Implicit Faith. See Faith.

Impluvium, an ancient area or spot of ground between the great porch of the church and the church itself. Because uncovered and exposed to the air, it was called atrium or inundarium. Eusebius called it apsidos. "In this court or church-yard was the station of the emperors (q. v.), and that class of penitents called ποροπλακας or flentes. These persons were commonly entitled χιμαζόντως or χιμαζόνυμοι, from the circumstance of their standing in the open air, exposed to all changes of the weather" (Riddle, Christian Antiq. p. 198). The practice of using the impluvium in the bapistry was initiated in the 4th century, but it did not become general until after the 6th century. There were also frequently buildings auxiliary to the church edifice placed in the impluvium, such as the baptisteries, places where the candidates of the Church were instructed and prepared for baptism, etc. See BAP

Importunity (ἀπαντία), in prayer, an important element of success (Luke xii, 8), as evincing earnestness, a faith that takes no denial, and especially a perseverance that continues to intercede until the request is granted (compare Luke xviii, 1; 1 Thess. v, 17). See Prayer.

Imposition of Hands, a ceremony used by most Christian churches in ordination, and by others in confirmation. The expressions generally used in the Scriptures for the rite of imposition of hands are: ἐπιστίλλω, or ἐπιστίλλουσα (ἐπιστίλλομαι), with τῷ, τῷ, etc., in the O. T.; and ἐπιτίθημι, ἐπιτίθεμα ὑμῖν, ἐπιτίθεμαι, ἐπιτίθεσις χειρός in the N.T. The word to...
IMPOSITION OF HANDS

IMPOSITION OF HANDS

are that some gift should be bestowed. It may be an evil
thing that is symbolically bestowed, as when guilt-
iness was thus transferred by the high-priest to the
scape-goat from the congregation (Lev. xiv, 21); but,
in general, the gift is of something good which God is sup-
posed to have in a blessing. The blessing, therefore, is
that the gift is bestowed in the name of Christ, and in the
name of the church. The principle of the practice seems
to rest on the importance of the hand itself, both in the bodily or-
humanism and in the moral activity of man, in its power
and in its action. Thus we find the hand raised in an-
ger, extended in pity, the avenging hand, the helping
hand, in this or that blessing or prayer. The hand is
to shelter or protect (χειρα ὑποτήτως); and the hand
held out imploiring (χειρὰς ἀναργύρως); consequently between
the powerful, directing hand of God, and the impowering
hand of man. The Biblical sign-
ification of the imposition of hands rests, in general, on
the consideration of the hand as the organ of transmis-
sion, both in the real and in the symbolic sense. This
result from the fact that not only did the party offer-
ing sacrifice bless the offering by the imposition of
hands, but by the same act he, as sinner, imparted to it
also his sin and his curse (see Lev. xvi, 21, 24). Bühler
(Symbolik d. mosaiischen Cultus, ii, 339) rejects this idea
of transmission of sin by the laying on of hands on the敬性 victim; he consider-
ies it only as a symbol of "renunciation of one's own," and
argues from the fact of a like imposition of hands in
the offering in connection according to
Hofmann (Schriftbeweis, ii, 1, p. 155), the imposition
of hands in sacrifices signified the power of the party
offering it over the life of the victim. Baumgarten,
on the contrary (Commentar z. Pentateuch, 1, 2, p. 180), and
892), maintain the idea of transmission. The
imposi-
tion of hands on all offerings presents no difficulty when
we adhere to the general notion of transmission; the
thanksgiving offering is by it made the recipient of the
giver's feelings. This idea of transmission is especially
manifest in the imposition of hands in consecration or
blessing. Thus, "in the Old Testament, Jacob accom-
plices his blessing to Ephraim and Manasseh with im-
position of hands (Gen. xlvi, 14); Joshua is ordained
in the room of Moses by imposition of hands (Num.
xxvii, 18; Deut. xxxiv, 9); cures seem to have been
wrought by imposition of hands (2 Kings v, 11); and
the high-priest, in giving his solemn benediction,
stretched out his hands over the people (Lev. ix, 22).
The same form was used by our Lord in blessing,
and occasionally in healing, and it was plainly
regarded as customary by his followers (Matt. 
xix, 18; Mark viii, 23; x, 16). One of the promises at
the end of Mark's Gospel to Christ's followers is that
they should cure the sick by laying on of hands (Mark
xvi, 18); and accordingly we find that Saul received his
sight (Acts ix, 17), and Publius' father was healed of
his fever (Acts xxviii, 8) by imposition of hands."

II. Classification of Biblical Uses.

More particularly, the imposition of hands in the O.T.,
may be divided into (1) the patriarchal-typical laying on
of hands in blessing; (2) the legal-symbolical, in consecration to
office; and (3) the prophetic-dynamical in healing.
The former (Lev. iv, 14) is a typical legal trans-
mission of a promised hereditary blessing continued,
through the party thus blessed, on his posterity; the second
(see Exod. xxi, 10; Num. xxvii, 18) is a legal
figurative imparting of the rights of office, and a promis-
ging of the blessing attached to it; the third is the trans-
mission of the power of healing over the restoration
of life (2 Kings iv, 34). Yet in the latter case we
must notice that the prophet put his hands on the hands
of the child, and covered it with his whole body.
Thus this transmission points u, in its yet imperfect
state, to the N.T. by the N-Th. of the trans-
mission being symbolical of the transmission of spirit and life. Here,
as in the O.T., we find three uses: (1) the spiritual-pa-
triarchal imposition of hands by our Lord and the apo-
tles; (2) the spiritual-legal, or official imposition of
hands; (3) the healing imposition of hands. Christ lays
his hands on the sufferers, and they are cured. But
the bodily gifts he thus transmits are joined to spiritual
gifts; he cures under the condition of faith (Mark 
v, 31 seq.; John v, 14). This is more in keeping with the
idea that the curative effects are connected with the ma-
terial imposition of hands, the more he operates without
it (Mark v, 23, 41; vii, 32). Sometimes he healed only
by a word. The full grant of his Spirit and of his call-
ing he represented in a real, but symbolical manner,
when he blesses the disciples in the upper room
sitting at the Mount of Olives (Luke xxiv, 50). This
imposition of the hands of the Lord on his apostles,
in connection with the imparting of his Spirit, is the source
of the apostolic imposition of hands. It was also
brilliantly a blessing of the symbol and title (see Acts v, 17),
as well as of the bodily and spiritual imparting of life
(Acts ix, 17). From this general im-
position of hands, under which Christians received the
baptism of the Spirit, came the official, apostolic im-
position of hands (Acts xii, 3; 1 Tim. iv, 14). At the
same time the same impulse (see Acts v, 17; vii, 43
seq.; xvi, 21, 24) shows that the apostolic imparting of the Holy Spirit was not restricted to the forms of official or even general im-
position of hands.

III. Ecclesiastical Uses.

In the early Church, the imposition of hands was practised in receiving catechu-
menus, in ordaining bishops (see Acts viii, 14; 
1 Tim. iii, 6, 7). The Cyprian derives its use from apostolic practice (Ep.
72, ad Stephan.; Ep. 73, ad Jubeau.); so also does Au-
togine (De Bapt. iii, 16). That the imposition of hands in receiving catechumens was different from that used in baptism, cf. is shown by Bingham (iii, ch.
1). Its use in baptism was general as early as Toledo-
lian's time (Coleman, Ancient Christianity, ch. xii, § 4).
This probably gave rise to confirmation. After
that rite was introduced, imposition of hands became its chief
ceremony. It was generally performed by the
bishop, but elders were authorized to do it in certain
cases, in subordination to the bishop. See Con-
firmation. In ordination, the imposition of hands was essen-
tial to the impartation of grace, and was thus
an essential part of the ceremony from an early period, but not
in the ordination of any class below deacons. See Or-
dination.

In the modern Church, imposition of hands is consid-
ered by the Romanists as an essential part of the
sacraments of baptism, ordination, and confirmation (Concil.
Trident. Sess. xxi.). As in the ancient Church this
rite existed in two forms: laying on of hands, which
was called chirosthesia; and the crowning of the
head on the persons, which was styled chiro-
notonia—so in the Roman Catholic Church the former
is retained as an essential part of the sacraments of con-
firmation and holy orders; the latter is employed in the
administration of the priesthood in consequence of its
continuation of the ancient order.

Baptism in the Church is therefore
imposed on the person or by the sign of the cross,
and it is therefore considered as a symbolical act, in confirmation and ordination;
the Methodist Episcopal, the Presbyterian, and Congre-
gional churches employ it only in ordination. Great
stress is also laid on the performance of this rite in the
Greek Church; and in the Russian Church they
impose some persons without priests, "because in their idea the
baptism of the Spirit was bestowed by the apostles and the clergy, and the church is called ecclesia—so in the
Church of England. The Greek Church,
"the body of Christ"—so in the Roman Catholic Church.

In the Romish Church, the
Church of England.

This rite has been held to be necessary in the administra-
"the body of Christ"—so in the Roman Catholic Church.

In the Romish Church, the
Church of England.

This rite has been held to be necessary in the administra-

enable at least the performance of the rite of marriage, which they do not legalize unless performed by an accepted priest. The Jews assert that the laying on of hands, together with the Sanhedrin, ceased after the death of Rabbi Hillel, the "prince," who flourished in the 4th century. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop., v. 504; Bingham, Orig. Eccles. bk. ii. ch. xxii.; bk. iii. ch. i.; bk. xii. ch. iii.; Coleman, Ancient Christianity, p. 122, 369, 411.; Apost. and Primit. Ch. (Phila. 1869, 12mo), p. 185 sq.; Augusti, Handb. d. Archäologie, iii, 222.; Hall, Works, ii, 376.; B. Bardenhewer in the Stud. und Krit. 1865, p. 340 sq.; Roth, Aufsätze d. christ. Kirche, p. 161, etc. For monographs, see Volbeding, Index, p. 74, 145. See Bene-diction.

Impost (Lat. impositus) is an architectural term for the horizontal mouldings or capitals on the top of a pilaster, pillar, or pier, from which an arch springs. In classical architecture the form varies in the several orders; sometimes the entablature of an order serves for the impost of an arch. In Middle-Age architecture imposts vary according to the style; on pillars and the small shafts in the jambs of doorways, windows, etc., they are usually complete capitals." See Parker, Concise Glossary of Architecture, p. 128; Wolcott, Sacred Archæology, p. 325.

Barton Seagrave, clr. 1160.

Impostor, Religious, a name appropriately given to such as pretend to an extraordinary commission from heaven, and who terrify the people with false denuncia-
tions of judgments. Too many of these have abounded in almost all ages. They are punishable in some countries with fine, imprisonment, and corporeal punishment.

Impostoribus. See Impostors, The Three.

Impostors, The Three (Impostoribus, De tribus), Towards the end of the 16th century a rumor became current that there had appeared a book under the above title, in which the author attempted to prove that the world had been grossly deceived three times (by the founders of the three principal religions). In the latter part of the 18th century this supposed work attracted great attention among theologians and savants, particularly on account of the mystery which shrouded its origin, its author, and even its contents, for it was not only well-nigh impossible to procure a copy of the book, but even the contents were hardly known definitely to anybody. Towards the close of the 16th century the rumors concerning this book were again set on foot. The most extravagant ideas prevailed, and the authorship of the unknown work was in turn attributed to the emperors Frederick I and II, Averroes, Petrus a Vinete, Alphon-so X, king of Castile, Boccaccio, Poggio, L. Aretin, Pomponazzo, Machiaveli, Erasmus, P. Aretino, Ochino, Servetus, Rabelais, Gruetius, Barnard, Muret, Nachtri-gall, Giordano Bruno, Campanella, Milton, etc. It is no wonder that soon a number of books, entirely different from each other, made their appearance, each claiming to be the original work. The four most important were: 1. Vincentii Panurghi Epitola ad cl. eirum Ioannem Baptisatum Moriam de tribus impostoribus (Paris, 1644); 2. De tribus Nubiolomus (namely, Thomas Angello, Oliver Cromwell, Julius Mazarinus); 3. History of the three famous Impostors (London, 1667); 4. Christiani Kyrgholdi Liber de tribus morgia impostoribus (nemme Eduardo Herbert de Cherbury, Thomas Hobbes, et Ben-dectico de Spinossa) (Rome, 1690). In 1716 however, the person of Haag claimed to possess the original in his library, and that it was the work of Petrus a Vincis, containing the thoughts of the emperor Frederick II, and written in 1250. Several copies of this work appeared soon after in French; the owner claimed to have made a copy not to copy the book, which he did not prevent him from translating it. A German cher-
ailer d'industrie named Ferber finally published a work under the title of De tribus impostoribus, des trois imposteur (Francfort sur le Main, 1721), but it was found to be only the work De impostoribus (another title that was published in MS. at the beginning of the 18th century) under a new name. In the mean time there appeared a Latin work of the same title, the MS. of which bears the date of 1698. This may be the original work, though probably the date has been altered, as it bears internal evidence of having been written before 1650. Nothing is known of its author, except that, judging from the bad Latin in which it is written, he could not have belonged to the educated classes. Some think that the original title could hardly have been De tribus impostoribus, as it does not call either of the founders of the three religions—Moses, Christ, and Mohammed—outright impostors, but that the real title must have been De impostoria religionum. The existing MSS. present two different recensions: one, the shortest, bears the latter title; the other, which is longer, and is evidently an enlarged and altered edition, is the title De impostoriis in infinitum. Yet, with the exception of a few unimportant passages, the two are essentially alike.

The author attacks the morality of the Jews and of the Christians, saying that Abraham wished to honor God by offering up human sacrifices, and that the Christians wickedly continued the practice of sacrifices by a system of idolatry; and counter-witnesses, forming a regular processus in infinitum. See Rosenkranz, Der Zerfall am Glauben (Halle, 1880); F. W. Genthe, De impostor religie, brevem compendium (Lpz., 1833); Prosper Marchand, Dict. Historique, i, 312 sq.; Farrar, Crit. Hist. of Free Thought, p. 212 sq.; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. bk. iii, cent. xiii., pt. i, ch. ii, p. 384, note 5; Herzog, Theol. Encyklop., vi, 645; Am. Preb. Rev. Jan. 1862, p. 164 sq. (J. H. W.)

Impotency, the want of procreative power, is, according to the ecclesiastical law of the Roman Catholic Church, a good ground for either of the two parties an-
nulling the marriage, if the impotence existed at the time the contract was entered into (cap. 2, 8, 4, X, De frigidis, 4, 15). But the defect must not only be proved by competent medical advisers, but also pronounced by them as incurable (cap. iv, 14, X, De profectionibus, ii, 19; cap. iv, 15, X, De profectionibus, i, 29, Sess. 24 of the Tridentine Council of 1731, 1732, in the Leipzig edition by Richter, p. 258 sq.). If any doubt arises the marriage contract continues in force three years longer, to further test the impotency of the person so accused. At the expiration of this three years, or, both of the parties is necessary to obtain permission for separation. The oldest ecclesiastical laws of the Protestants follow in the main
IMPRISONMENT

Imprisonment. See Prison; Punishments.

Impropriation. (Lat. proprius). (1) Reproaches of Jesus against the Jewish people. See Capernaum; Jerusalem.

(2) In the Roman Catholic ritual, certain verses which reproach the Jews with ingratitude, and which, while the priest and other ecclesiastics present kiss the cross, are chanted by two persons singing Christ, in such a manner that after each verse one chorus replies in the Greek and another in the Biblical, in the manner of the Psalms, in Psalms, i. 97, etc.

Impropriation, in Great Britain, a parsonage or ecclesiastical living, the profits of which are in the hands of a layman; in which case it stands distinguished from appropriation, which is where the profits of a benefice are in the hands of a bishop, college, etc., though the terms are now used promiscuously in England.

Impulse. The desires or sensations of the soul are manifested by impulses, which tend either to the realization of some idea, the acquisition of something exterior to ourselves, or the repulsion of something disagreeable or hurtful. The impulses accompanying divers thoughts and feelings may, according to their expression, be corporeal, spiritual, or intellectual. We must be careful how we are guided by impulses in religion. "There are many," as one observes, "who frequently feel singular impressions upon their minds, and are inclined to adopt them. But it is a matter of some doubt as to how far these things are to be regarded, or attended to by us, and how we may distinguish any divine impulses of this kind from the delusions of the tempter, or of our own evil hearts. But whoever makes any of these things his rule and standard, forsakes the divine word; and nothing can be more pernicious than to make ourselves unhealthy, restlessly, or dangerously deluded in their practice, than paying a random regard to these impulses, as communications of the divine will."—Buck, Theology, Dictionary, s. v.; Kant, Grundlegung zu Metaphysik der Sitten (pref. p. 16, 63); Evang. Kirchenzeitung (1858, No. 3), Encykl. Hebr. Recht; Encyclopédie, i. 126. See Enthusiasms; Providence.

Impurity, want of that regard to decency, chastity, or holiness which our duty requires. Impurity, in the law of Moses, is any legal defilement. Of these there were several sorts: some were voluntary, as the touching

IMPUTATION

these practices (compare Giselen, Doctrina de matrimonio, note 6, p. 102–106; Eichhorn, Kirchenrecht, ii, 548; Permaneder, Kirchenrecht, p. 697; Walter, Kirchenrecht, p. 305). In Great Britain this practice is sensationism, the land of chance (Chambers, Encyclop. v, 597). See Herzog, Real-Encyclop. iii, 474. See also Matrimony. (J. H. W.)

Imprisonment, an appeal to God, invoking his curse upon (1) either one's self or (2) another. For the former, see Oath. The latter, which occurs frequently in the so-called "impracticable Psalms" (see Edwards, On the Impracticability of Psalms, in the Bible, and in his Ps. Arts, p. 97, etc.), is expressly justified by the law of God, as the law of God, or the accusation as uttered by the priests is repeated on the part of the choir.—Pierer, Univ. Lex. viii, 836. (J. H. W.)

Impropriation, in Great Britain, a parsonage or ecclesiastical living, the profits of which are in the hands of a layman; in which case it stands distinguished from appropriation, which is where the profits of a benefice are in the hands of a bishop, college, etc., though the terms are now used promiscuously in England.

Impulse. The desires or sensations of the soul are manifested by impulses, which tend either to the realization of some idea, the acquisition of something exterior to ourselves, or the repulsion of something disagreeable or hurtful. The impulses accompanying divers thoughts and feelings may, according to their expression, be corporeal, spiritual, or intellectual. We must be careful how we are guided by impulses in religion. "There are many," as one observes, "who frequently feel singular impressions upon their minds, and are inclined to adopt them. But it is a matter of some doubt as to how far these things are to be regarded, or attended to by us, and how we may distinguish any divine impulses of this kind from the delusions of the tempter, or of our own evil hearts. But whoever makes any of these things his rule and standard, forsakes the divine word; and nothing can be more pernicious than to make ourselves unhealthy, restlessly, or dangerously deluded in their practice, than paying a random regard to these impulses, as communications of the divine will."—Buck, Theology, Dictionary, s. v.; Kant, Grundlegung zu Metaphysik der Sitten (pref. p. 16, 63); Evang. Kirchenzeitung (1858, No. 3), Encykl. Hebr. Recht; Encyclopédie, i. 126. See Enthusiasms; Providence.

Impurity, want of that regard to decency, chastity, or holiness which our duty requires. Impurity, in the law of Moses, is any legal defilement. Of these there were several sorts: some were voluntary, as the touching

a dead body, or any animal that died of itself; or any creature that was esteemed unclean; or touching things holy by one who was not clean, or was not a priest; the touching one who had a leprosy, one who had an emission, one who was an unclean person, one who was in a state of leprosy, or any polluted, or fell into such diseases as pollute, as the leprosy, etc. The beds, clothes, and movables which had touched anything unclean, contracted also a kind of impurity, and in some cases the defilement passed to others. These legal pollutions were generally removed by bathing, and lasted no longer than the evening. The person polluted plunged over head in the water, and either had his clothes on when he did so, or washed himself and his clothes separately. Other pollutions continued seven days, as that which was contracted by touching a dead body. Some impurities lasted forty or fifty days, as that of women who were lately delivered, who were unclean forty days after the birth of a boy, and fifty after the birth of a girl. Others, again, lasted till the person was cured. Many of these pollutions were expiated by sacrifices, and others by a certain water or lye made with the ashes of a red heifer sacrificed on the great day of expiation. When the leper was cured, he went to the Temple and offered a sacrifice of two birds, one of which was killed, and the other set at liberty. In the parable of the fig tree, he who had tarryed, and then being present at a funeral, was to be purified with the water of expiation, and this upon pain of death. The woman who had been delivered offered a turtle and a lamb for her expiation; or, if she was poor, two turtles, or two young pigeons. These impurities, which the law of Moses has expressed with the greatest accuracy and care, were only figures of other more important impurities, such as the sins and iniquities committed against God, or faults committed against our neighbor.

The sins and prophets of the Old Testament were sensible of this; and our Saviour, in the God, h to strong, was present at a funeral, was to be purified with the water of expiation, and this upon pain of death. The woman who had been delivered offered a turtle and a lamb for her expiation; or, if she was poor, two turtles, or two young pigeons. These impurities, which the law of Moses has expressed with the greatest accuracy and care, were only figures of other more important impurities, such as the sins and iniquities committed against God, or faults committed against our neighbor.

The sins and prophets of the Old Testament were sensible of this; and our Saviour, in the God, h to strong, was present at a funeral, was to be purified with the water of expiation, and this upon pain of death. The woman who had been delivered offered a turtle and a lamb for her expiation; or, if she was poor, two turtles, or two young pigeons. These impurities, which the law of Moses has expressed with the greatest accuracy and care, were only figures of other more important impurities, such as the sins and iniquities committed against God, or faults committed against our neighbor. The sins and prophets of the Old Testament were sensible of this; and our Saviour, in the God, h to strong, was present at a funeral, was to be purified with the water of expiation, and this upon pain of death. The woman who had been delivered offered a turtle and a lamb for her expiation; or, if she was poor, two turtles, or two young pigeons. These impurities, which the law of Moses has expressed with the greatest accuracy and care, were only figures of other more important impurities, such as the sins and iniquities committed against God, or faults committed against our neighbor.
when he actually punishes the sin of men (τῇ βασανίᾳ, λογικῶς ἄγαραντι, Psa. xxxii, 2). The one punisher is called τῷ θεῷ in opposition to one to whom ἀρνήτης, who is rewarded (Psa. cvi, 81; Rom. iv, 3)" (Knapp, Theology, § 76).

1. The stronghold of the doctrine of imputation, with the same Paul, is Romans v. This theorem is the well-known Calvinitism of that in- tent, is Rom. v, 12-19. "The greatest difficulties with respect to this doctrine have arisen from the fact that many have treated what is said by Paul in the fifth of Romans—a passage wholly popular, and anything but formally exact and didactic—in a learned and philosophical manner. They have hidden it in the dense and loose and popular way by logical and scholastic distinctions. Paul shows, in substance, that all men are regarded and punished by God as sinners, and that the ground of this lies in the act of one man; as, on the contrary, deliverance from punishment depends also upon one man, Jesus Christ. If the words of Paul are not perverted, it must be allowed that in Rom. v, 12-14 he thus reasons: The cause of the universal mortality of the human race lies in Adam's transgression. He sinned, and so became mortal. Other men are regarded and treated by God as punishable, because they are the posterity of Adam, and not as a transgressor, and consequently they too are mortal. Should it now be objected, that the men who lived from Adam to Moses might themselves have personally sinned, and so have been punished with death on their own account, it might be answered that the man who lived in the time of Moses had no express and positive law which threatened the punishment of sin, like those who lived after Moses. The positive law of Moses was not as yet given; they could not, consequently, be punished on account of their own transgressions, as no law was as yet given to them (ver. 14). Still they must die, like Adam, who after expressing a positive law. Hence their mortality must have another cause, and this is to be sought in the imputation of Adam's transgression. In the same way, the ground of the justification of man lies not in himself, but in Christ, the second Adam.

I have found that the passage in Rom. v was never understood in the ancient Grecian Church, down to the 4th century, to teach imputation in a strictly philosophical and judicial sense; certainly Origen, and the writers immediately succeeding him, exhibit nothing of this opinion. They regard bodily death as a consequence of the sin of Adam, and not as a transgressor, in the strict and proper sense of this term. Thus Chrysostom says, upon Rom. v, 12, Ἐκείνου πάντως (Ἄδαμ), καί οἱ μόι ψυχήν ἐπί τοῦ ἔθους, γεγόναν ἐς ἴκινων Ἡσυρᾷ. Cyril (Ad. Anthropom. c. 8) says, Οἱ γεγονότες ἐς αἰ- τοῦ (Ἄδαμ), ὡς πάντα φθαρόντο, φθαρότες γεγονότες.

"The Latin Church, on the other hand, was the proper seat of the strict doctrine of imputation. There they began to interpret the words of Paul as if he were a scholastic and logical writer. One cause of their misconception so entirely the spirit of this passage was, that the word unction (a word in common use among civilians and in judicial affairs) had been employed in the Latin versions in rendering ver. 15 of Rom. v, and that ip' qu' (ver. 12) had been translated in quo, and could refer, as they supposed, to nobody but Adam. This opinion was then associated with some peculiar philosophical deductions, that Adam was prevalently in the West, and from the whole a doctrine de imputatione was formed, in sense wholly unknown to the Hebrews, to the N. T., and to the Grecian Church. This clearly proves that the Grecian teachers, e. g. those in Palestine, took sides with Pelagius against the teachers of the African Church. 2. Many have inferred the justice of imputation from the supposition that Adam was not only the natural or seminal, but also the moral head of the human race, or even its representative and federal head. They suppose, accordingly, that the sin of Adam is imputed to us on the same principle on which the doings of the head of a family, or of the plenipotentiary of a state, are imputed to his family or state, although they had no personal agency in his doings. In the same way they suppose Christ took the place of all men, and that what he did is imputed to them. According to this theory, God entered into a league or covenant with Adam, and so Adam represented and took the place of the whole human race. This theory has been adopted by many in the Romish and Protestant Church since the 16th century, and was defended even in the 18th century by some Lutheran theologians, as Pfaff of Tubingen, by some of the followers of Wolf (e. g. Carpazar, in his Comm. de Imputatione facti proprii et alieni), and these Witsius, in his De imputatione de imputatione pecatis Adamitis. But it was more particularly favored by the Reformed theologians, especially by the disciples of Cocceius, at the end of the 17th and commencement of the 18th century, e. g. by Witsius, in his Oeconomia faderarum. They appeal to Hos. vi. 7, 'They transgressed the covenant, like Adam,' i.e. broke the divine law. But where is it said that Adam was the federal head, and that his transgression is imputed to them? On this text Morus justly observes,'Est mera comparatio Judaeorum peccatum cum Adamo pecante.' Other texts are also cited in behalf of the theory of the imputation of Adam's sin, but in vain.

"But, for various reasons, this theory cannot be correct. For (α.) the descendants of Adam never em- powered him to be their representative and to act in their name. (b.) It cannot be shown from the Bible that Adam was the representative of God, who was involved in his own. (c.) If the transgression of Adam is imputed, by right of covenant, to all his pos- terity, then, in justice, all their transgressions should be again imputed to him as the guilty cause of all their misery and sin. What a mass of guilt, then, would come upon Adam? But of all this nothing is said in the Scriptures. (d.) The imputation of the righteousness of Christ cannot be alleged in support of this theory; for this is imputed to men only by their own will and consent. This theory has been opposed, with good reason, by John Taylor, in his work on original sin.

"Others endeavor to deduce the doctrine of imputation from the scientia medici of God, or from his fore- knowledge of what is conditionally possible. The sin of Adam, they say, is imputed to us because God fore- saw that each one of us would have committed it if he had been in Adam's place and situation. Even Augustine says that the sin of Adam is imputed to us propter consensionem, or consensum praevisionem. This theory has been advanced, in modern times, by Reusch, in his Introductio in Theologiam revelatam, and in Breuschel's work Die gute Stube Gottes, bei Zureck- zung des Friles (Jena, 1749). But it is a new sort of justice which would allow us to be punished for sins which we never committed, or never designed to commit, but only might possibly have committed under certain circumstances. Think a moment how many sins we all should have committed if God had suffered us to come into circumstances of severe temptation. An in- nocent man might, by this rule, be punished as a mur- derer because, had he lived at Paris on St. Bartholomew's night, in 1572, he might, from mistaken zeal, have killed a heretic. 2. Similar to these hypotheses satisfactorily explain the matter, the greater part of the moderate and Biblical theologians of the Protestant Church are content with saying, what is manifestly the doctrine of the Bible, that the imputation of Adam's sin consists in the prevailing mortality of the human race, and that this is not to be regarded as imputed in the strict and judicial sense, but rather as the consequence of Adam's transgres- sion" (Knapp, Theology, § 76).

III. "The enlightened advocates of imputation do af- ter all disclaim the actual transfer of Adam's sin to his posterity. They are well aware that the human mind
cannot be forced up to such a point as this. But they do still urgently contend for the idea that all Adam's posteriority are punished for his sin, although they did not, in fact, commit it; and that in this sense, therefore, they are all guilty of it. Turrettin's view is, that Adam's sin is imputed to the ground or cause why men are born with original sin, and not with natural depravity. And this is, in his view, the punishment inflicted because of Adam's sin imputed to them. And with him many others agree. But Calvin, Edwards, Stafper, and others, reject the doctrine of the real imputation of Adam's sin to his posteriority, while they maintain that native inherent sin is the consequence of which is charged to us as sin. This Turrettin declares to be no imputation at all, i.e. a real rejection of his doctrine. Rejecting these views of Turrettin, then, Edwards, in order to account for it how all men came to be born with inherent sin, labor to show that there is a physical and psychological unity between Adam and all his posterity. According to him, this would account for the commencement of native depravity, and when commenced it is imputed to us as sin, and therefore punishable, on legal ground, with temporal and eternal evil. But Turrettin makes all this to flow from the doctrine that "of the ground of the sin of Adam, which is actually imputed to his descendants" (Stuart on Romana, v. 19, p. 592), Dr. H. B. Smith, in an article in the Christian Union, takes the advanced ground that while it must be conceded "that there is a proper interpretation," and that Adam's sin is imputed, "it flows from there that of the ground of the sin of Adam, which is actually imputed to his descendants." In his article in Religious Essays (i. 138 sq.), a member of the Presbyterian Church takes even more liberal ground. "We know that it is often asserted that Augustine and his followers held the personal unity of Adam and his race. . . . Let it be admitted that Augustine did give this explanation of the ground of imputation. Do we reject the doctrine because we reject the reason which he gives to justify and explain it? . . . It is no special concern of ours what Augustine held on this point. . . . Any man who holds that there is such an ascension of the sin of Adam to his posteriority as to be the ground of their bearing the punishment of that sin, has, in his doctrine of imputation, whether he undertakes to justify this imputation merely on the ground that we are the children of Adam, or on the principle of representation, or of scientia media: or whether he chooses to philosophize on the matter of unity until he confounds all notions of personal identity, as President Edwards appears to have done."

IV. The question of the imputation of Christ's active obedience to believers is very skilfully treated by Watson (Theological Institutes, pt. ii, chap. xxiii), himself a believer in the doctrine of imputation in a modified way. We give here a summary of his statement of the subject.

There are three opinions as to imputation. (L.) The high Calvinistic, or Anthemian scheme, which is, that "Christ's active righteousness is imputed unto us as ours." (2.) The answer to this, we say, is no, where stated in Scripture. The doctrine here attached to Christ's representing us is wholly gratuitous. 3. There is no weight in the argument that, "as our sins were accounted his, so his righteousness was accounted ours." This is a misstatement of the case. And that he did them. 4. The doctrine involves a fiction and impossibility inconsistent with the divine attributes. 5. The acts of Christ were of a loftier character than can be supposed to be capable of being the acts of mere creatures. 6. Finally, and fatally, this doctrine shifts the burden of Christ's justification from Christ's "obedience unto death" to Christ's active obedience to the precepts of the law.

(II.) The opinion of Calvin himself, and many of his followers, adopted also by some Arminians. It differs from the first in not separating the active from the passive righteousness of Christ, for such a distinction would have been inconsistent with Calvin's notion that justification is simply the remission of sins. This view is adopted, with certain modifications of which is charged to us as sin. Arminian of the following passages will show that this latter notion has no foundation in Scripture: Psa. xxxii, 1; Jer. xxxiii, 6; Is. xlv, 24; Rom. iii, 21, 22; 1 Cor. i, 80; 2 Cor. v, 21; Rom. v, 18, 19. In connection with this last text, it is sometimes attempted to be shown, as Adam's sin is imputed to his posterity, so Christ's obedience is imputed to those that are saved; but (Goodwin, On Justification), (1.) The Scripture nowhere affirms either the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity, or of the righteousness of Christ to those that believe. (2.) To impute sin, in Scripture, is to charge it upon a man, with a purpose to punish him for it. And (3.) as to the imputation of Adam's sin to his posterity—"if by it is meant simply that the guilt of Adam's sin is charged upon his whole posterity, let it pass; but if the meaning be that all Adam's posterity are made, by this imputation, in a formal likeness, then the Scriptures do not justify it.

(III.) The imputation of faith for righteousness. (a.) Proof of this doctrine.—1. It is expressly taught in Scripture (Rom. iv, 3-24, etc.): nor is faith used in these passages as an object of the imputation, that is, the righteousness of Christ. 2. The testimony of the Church to this doctrine has been uniform from the earliest ages-Tertullian, Origen, Justin Martyr, etc., down to the 16th century. (b.) Explanation of the terms of the imputation that "faith is imputed for righteousness." 1. Righteousness. To be accounted righteous is, in the style of the apostle Paul, to be justified, where there has been personal guilt. 2. Faith. It is not faith generally considered that is imputed to us for righteousness, but faith (trust) in an atonement offered by another in our behalf. 3. Imputation. The word imputation is used here expressly called "the imputation of righteousness without works;" the imputation of righteousness is, then, the non-punishment or pardon of sin; and by imputing faith for righteousness, the apostle means precisely the same thing. (c.) The objections to the doctrine of the imputation of faith for righteousness admit of easy answer. 1. The popists err in taking the term justification to signify the making men morally just. 2. A second objection is, that if believing is imputed for righteousness, then justification is by works, or by somewhat in ourselves. In this objection, the term works is used in an equivocal sense. 3. A third objection is, that this doctrine gives occasion to boasting. But (1) this objection lies with equal strength against the doctrine of imputed righteousness. (2.) The faith itself is the gift of God. (3.) The blessings which follow faith are given in respect to the death of Christ. (4.) Paul says that boasting is excluded by the law of faith. (IV.) The theologians who assert the extreme doctrine of imputation are ably answered by the closing words of the present chapter and of the first chapter of Cyprian, v. 529: "To impute sin is to deal with a man as a sinner, not on account of his own act, or at least not primarily on this account, but on account of the act of another; and to impute righteousness is to deal with man as righteous, not because he is so, but on account of the righteousness of another, as Abraham was accounted righteous by faith alone. The act of another stands in both cases for our own act, and we are adjudged—in the
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one case condemned, in the other acquitted—not for what we ourselves have done, but for what another has done for us.

"This is a fair illustration of the tyranny which technical phrases are apt to exercise in theology as in other things. When men coin an imperfect phrase to express a spiritual reality, the reality is apt to be forgotten, or rather lies in a logical counter, having a force and meaning of its own. Imputation of sin and imputation of righteousness have in this way come to represent legal or pseudo-legal processes in theology, through the working out of the mere legal analogy which begets by the word. But the true spiritual reality which lies behind the phrases in both cases is simple enough. Imputation of sin is, and can be nothing else than, the expression of the spiritual unity of Adam and his race. Adam 'being the root of all mankind, the stock which has grown from this root must share in its degeneracy. The law of spiritual life, of historical continuity, implies this, and it requires no arbitrary or legal process, therefore, to account for the sinfulness of mankind as derived from a sinful source. We are sinners because Adam fell. The fountain having become polluted, the stream is polluted. We are incapable of goodness by nature, not because of anything so by the conditions of our historical existence; but, nevertheless, his sin is not our sin, and cannot, in the strict sense, be imputed to us, for sin is essentially voluntary in every case—an act of self-will, and not a mere quality of nature; and my sin, therefore, cannot be another's, nor another's mine. In the same manner, the highest meaning of the imputation of the righteousness of Christ lies in the spiritual unity of the believer with Christ, so that he is one with Christ, and Christ one with him, and in a true sense he becomes a partaker of the divine nature. The notion of legal transference is an after-thought—the invention of polemical logic—and the fact itself is deeper and truer than the phrase that covers it. The race one with Adam, the believer one with Christ, are the ideas that are really true in the phrases imputation of sin and imputation of righteousness.

See Watson, Institutes, ii, 215, 241; Knapp, Theology, $76, 115; Whitby, De imputacione Peccati Adamatici; Taylor, Doctrine of Original Sin; Wesley, Sermons, i, 171-4; Edwards, On original Sin; Walch, De obedientiis Christi Actio (Gottingen, 1754, 4to); Walch, Nuova Raccolta Delle Poesie e delle Lettere de' Gentili (Bail, The First and Second Adam (Philadelphia, 1860, 12mo); Princeton Repertory, 1880, p. 425; Whately, Difficulties of St. Paul, Essay vi; Stuart, On Romans, Exкурvus v, vi. See also the articles OBFIDENCE OF CHRIST; JUSTIFICATION.

Imr'ah (Heb. 'Imr'ah, יִמְרָה, refractoriness; Sept. 'Iomri), one of the sons of Zophah, of the tribe of Asher (1 Chron. viii, 36). B.C. post 1012. See HOTHAM.

Im'rî (Heb. 'Imrî, יִמְרִית, eloquent), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. omits either this or the preceding, name, giving only 'Appi; Vulg. Omarti). The son of Bani, and father of Omri of Judah (1 Chron. ix, 4). B.C. much ante 536.

2. (Sept. 'Ampi, Vulg. Amri). The "father" of Zacchaeus, who latter repaired part of the walls of Jerusalem after the Exile (Neh. iii, 2). B.C. ante 446.

Ina, king of the Anglo-Saxon kingdom of Wessex from 699 to 729, celebrated as the principal legislator of the Anglo-Saxons, deserves mention here on account of his enactments in favor of religious observances. He was the first in that portion of England who made the laws of Christianity the basis of all civil and social relations. Particular regard was paid to the observance of the Sabbath day; the rite of baptism was ordered to be performed on infants within thirty days after their birth, etc. His relation with the see of Rome was very intimate. He made several journeys to the Eternal City, and originated in his dominions the payment of the annual tribute of the "Peter's pence." See Riddle, Hist. of the Papacy, i, 810; Baxter, Ch. Hist. p. 98 sq. (J. H. W.)

Inability, in theology, is generally used to denote want of power to do the will of God. It is natural inability when the hindrance is physical; moral inability when the hindrance is in the heart. In this latter case, human inability has special prominence in American theology, and has been the subject of a great deal of controversy among New-school and Old-school Calvinists, and also between Calvinists and Arminians. The New-school contend that man is naturally able to do God's will; the Old-school deny both natural and moral ability. The Arminians deny natural and moral, but assert gracious ability on the part of man to accept Christ, and so to obey God.

The following paragraphs present well the Old-school view of the subject. "It has long been a boast, in certain quarters, that it is the glory of American theology that it has enabled us to hold fast to the doctrine of inability, and yet so to explain it as to make the sinner inexcusable, and to prevent him from abusing it to purposes of carnal apathy and desperation. This happy result, which is not the result of our theology, but is supposed to be accomplished by showing men that they have full natural ability to fulfill God's requirements; that they have no inability, but simply a want of will, or purpose, or inclination, to obey the Gospel, which they have full power to remove, y' they will. While this language is acceptable to none in America, which is explained by themselves, at all events coheres with the doctrine that man has lost all ability of will to any spiritual good accompanying salvation, it is used by others to express and vindicate the dogma that men are perfectly able to make themselves Christians, and to believe in the Gospel, without even a decent disguise. Yet it is this very class who make the most of the distinction in question. They think it a convenient and safe shelter for their doctrines that man can make himself a new heart. This class claim that Edwards was the inventor of this distinction; that it is the distinguishing characteristic and special property of his followers; that therefore they are the true Edwardsians, because they are the patrons and inheritors of this his grand discovery in theology. It can easily be shown, however, 1. That whatever of truth is connected with this distinction was in Edwards; that he is the first to have foretold the time of Edwards, but not only before the time from the heresies of Pelagius first occasioned thorough discussion of the subject of sin and grace. 2. That Edwards did not regard himself as introducing any novel doctrines or discoveries on the subject. A formerly distinguished champion of New-school doctrines recently said in a public speech, with great truth, that the common idea that the power of Edwards's system lies in the distinction of natural and moral inability is a fallacy. This was well understood before his day. It lies in his views of spiritual light, which constitute the key to his whole treatise on the Religious Affections. All who have read this treatise, or his sermons on the 'Natural Blindness of Men in Religion,' and on 'The Reality of Spiritual Light,' must concede the justness of this statement. The general principle of his work on the Affections is that 'tily arise from divine illumination.' The amount of truth contained in the proposition that man is naturally able, but morally unable, to obey God's commands, may be thus stated: 1. Man is really unable to do things spiritually good without divine grace. But this inability is moral, because it pertains to our moral nature. It does not excuse, because it is our sin; and the greater it is, the greater is our sin. 2. This corruption and inability do not destroy any of the faculties of will, affection, or intelligence, which are essential to humanity, moral agency, or responsibility. They only vitiate the state and action of those faculties with reference to things moral and spiritual. All power remains which would
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The requisite to the fulfillment of God's commands if we were holy. Any hindrance, or want of power or opportunity, which would prevent us from fulfilling any command of God if we were morally good, excuses the non-performance of it, and this alone. So far, then, as there is no innate nature in us to express the fact that we have no disability but our sin, or that is excusable, it expresses an important truth.

So far as it is used, or is adapted to convey the idea that we have ability to remove our sinful corruption without the prevenient and efficacious grace of God, or that we have some natural ability, it is intended to express the fact that we have no disability but our sin, or that is excusable, it expresses an important truth.

The corrupt tree cannot bring forth such good fruit. Nay, as all Christians find to their sorrow, they cannot, although partially sanctified, by any power of their wills, exclude all corruption from their souls. The flesh lusteth against the spirit, so that they cannot do the things they would, and when they would do good evil is present with them. Though they love the law of God after the inward man, they have a law in their members warring against the law of their minds. How, then, is this indwelling corruption, having the entire mastery of the sinner, removable by his will? And does the grace of natural ability, which is due to its natural import, fairly express, or, rather, does it not express more than the truth, in regard to the power of the sinner? Is it not, unless carefully explained, adapted to mislead him? That cannot properly be called ability to do things spiritually good, to purify our corrupt nature, which is not inadequate to preserve the result also has not such an ability, whatever adjectives we affix to the word. He has only the faculties which would enable him to do his duty if he were holy. Is it not best, in plain terms, to say so? Have we a right to do otherwise than speak the truth in love?—Princeton Review, July 1847, No. 3, p. 513.

The Arminian doctrine is (1) that the unregenerate have complete ability, through the efficient grace of Christ, to comply with the conditions of justification as offered under the covenant of grace; (2) that the regenerate have, through the same grace, the will of God, i.e., to avoid voluntary transgression thereof. The following criticism of the Arminian view, by an eminent New-Englander, with a comment on it, is taken from the Christian Advocate, Dec. 15, 1859. The parts in brackets are added by the commentator.

The Calvinistic theory of power is the same [as the Calvinistic], excepting a vain attempt to conceal its revolting aspect by the still greater absurdity of what is called a gracious ability. The advocates of this theory plainly subvert and virtually deny the grace of God in their very attempt to magnify it; for if man has not ability or power to obey God without grace [divine operation, or favor to sinners], then he does not sin in not obeying, since a being who cannot act morally right cannot act morally wrong. Such a being cannot be truly said to receive or be capable of receiving grace, for grace is founded upon, what does God, into whose presence is God [here evidently in the sense of divine efficiency] do? Does it give man power to obey? Then man has power to obey, as he must have before he obeys. But even this is no security that he will obey. [What Arminian ever pretended that it is?] Adam sinned with this power. The grace [exercise of divine efficiency], then, does not meet the exigency of the case. [Is invisible obedience essential, then, to a proper human ability? In that case, what would become of Dr. Taylor's own theory?] Is it said he has power to use the means he has, but the word means? But what power is this? Until man has power to obey, it is absolutely incomprehensible that he should obey, for the act of obedience is his own act, done in the exercise of his own power to obey. Thus the grace of God [the Holy Ghost], according to this scheme, must, by a direct act of creation, impart some new essential mental faculty or power to the soul of man to qualify it to act morally. Grace is intended to express the fact that God has not a human soul, for he has not the true and essential nature of such a soul—the power requisite to moral action. [We have been wont to think of power as an attribute, not as a 'nature.'] He cannot be a sinner, and of course grace to him cannot be grace to a sinner. We should be careful not to confuse this with the moral government, cf. Lectures on the Moral Government of God, i.123. The comment is as follows: "In the first place, Dr. Taylor falsely represents the Arminian as asserting the gracious ability of man, in general terms, to keep the divine law, whereas we only affirm this of the regenerate. In the second place, he continually shuffles in his use of the term, grace, as will be seen by our bracketed insertions of equivalents, wherever the context fixes the sense. In the third place, we see no possible relevancy in his argument against a divinely imparted 'power to obey,' from the fact that the sinner would do good even if evil is present with them. Though they love the law of God after the inward man, they have a law in their members warring against the law of their minds. How, then, is this indwelling corruption, having the entire mastery of the sinner, removable by his will? And does the grace of natural ability, which is due to its natural import, fairly express, or, rather, does it not express more than the truth, in regard to the power of the sinner? Is it not, unless carefully explained, adapted to mislead him? That cannot properly be called ability to do things spiritually good, to purify our corrupt nature, which is not inadequate to preserve the result. Also has not such an ability, whatever adjectives we affix to the word. He has only the faculties which would enable him to do his duty if he were holy. Is it not best, in plain terms, to say so? Have we a right to do otherwise than speak the truth in love?—Princeton Review, July 1847, No. 3, p. 513.


In antis, a term for a temple which has upon the facade two columns, detached, standing one over two that terminate the side walls of it. Specimens are the temples at Rhamnus and Sunicium.—Brandt and Cox, Dict. of Science, Lit. and Art, ii. 200.

Incantation (Lat. incantatio; incantum, to chant a magic formula, compound of is, intensive, and cano, to sing) is a magical formula, word, or prayer, in species of spell, it implies the use of certain aspiring modes of magic (q. v.), viz., that resting on a belief in the mysterious power of words solemnly conceived and passionately uttered. "There is in the human voice, especially in its more lofty tones, an actual power of a very wonderful kind to stir men's hearts. When to this we add that poetic utterance is a special and exceptional gift; that the language of primitive nations is crude and unmanageable, the words being as difficult to weld together as pieces of cast iron; that it is only when the poet's mind has risen to unusual heat that he can fuse them into whole sequences that please the ear and hang together in the mind, that, in short, his art is a mystery to himself—an inspiration—we need not wonder at the feeling with which everything in the form of verse or metre was viewed. The singing or saying of such compositions which could thus stir the blood of the beholders, they knew not what other effects might it produce?" To the power which the superstitious belief of the people, up to and even through the Middle Ages, gave to incantations, especially when accompanied, as they generally were, with the concocting of drugs and other magical rites, we must have attributed the effects which are thus ascribed to the word. If they could not raise from the dead, they could make the dead speak, or call up spirits from the vasty.
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Deep in order to unveil the future. They could extinguish fire; darken the sun or moon; make fetters burst, a door or a mountain fly open; blunt a sword; make a limb powerless; destroy a crop, or charm it away into another's barn. It is especially the heathenish nations that in their prayers, whether for blessings or for curses, partake largely of these superstitious incantations. "They are not supposed to act as petitions addressed to a free agent, but by an inherent force which even the gods cannot resist. This is very marked in Hinduism and Buddhism, but it actually pervades all superstitious worship, and is quite disguised. 'They think they shall be heard for their much speaking.' For almost every occasion or operation of life there were appropriate formulas to be repeated in order to secure success; and many of these, with that reverence for antiquity and conservative tendency which always characterize superstition, continue to live in popular memory, although often the words are so old as to be unintelligible. Thus, among the Romans, in the days of Cato, incantations were common for curing dislocations, full of words the meaning of which had been lost. A form of words used to this day in Shetland for healing a strain can be traced back to the 15th century. In its earliest form, as found in an old German manuscript, it narrates how their native gods, Woden and Baldr, riding out to hunt, Baldr's horse dislocated its foot, and how Woden, using charmed words, set bone to bone, etc., and so healed the foot. The repetition of this rhymed mode of words to the church of magical incantations. A modern version of this tradition, current in Norway even in our day, makes the accident happen to the horse of Jesus, and Jesus himself perform the cure—in Shetland, also, the Lord (Jesus) is substituted for Woden; and the formula is applied to the healing of persons' limbs as well as those of horses. The operation is thus described in R. Chamber's Popular Rhymes of Scotland: 'When a person has received a strain, it is customary to apply to an individual practiced in casting the wreathing-thread. This is a thread spun from black wool, on which are cast the knots, and tied round a sprained leg or arm. During the time the operator is putting the thread round the affected limb, he says, but in such a tone of voice as not to be heard by the bystanders, nor even by the person operated upon: "O Lord, take pity, Hov's foot is slanted; Down he highted. Hov's foot is righted. Bone to bone, Sdefine to sdefine, Blood to blood, Flesh to flesh. Heal, in the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost."

See MAGIC; WITCHCRAFT.

Incapacity, in the ecclesiastical sense, is absolute unfitness for ordination. Thus women (Gen. iii. 16; 1 Tim. ii. 12; 1 Cor. xiv. 34, 35) and unbaptized persons are incapacitated from ordination. Baptism is essential to church membership, and therefore the basis of further advancement in the Church: 'Cum baptismis sit fundamentum omnium sacramentorum ante receptionem baptismi non sacramentum aliquud existens' (c. 60, can. i., qu. i., Capit. Theodori Canterbi.); also c. 1, x, De presb. eto non baptizato (iii. 48); c. 5, x, cod. (Innocent III a. 1306); c. 2, De cognitione spirituali in iv (iv.3) Bonifaci VIII. So the early Church declared that he who has not received in due form the baptism of water is not a member of the Church, and cannot therefore be ordained. The Council of Nicaea, A.D. 325, in c. 19 (c. 52, can. i., qu. i., directs that the clergy of the Paulinists (who did not perform baptism regularly) and of other sects were to be rebaptized and ordained on their return to the Catholic Church, and that such persons as had previously been ordained, but not baptized, should, at once receive baptism, and then be reordained (c. 112, dist. iv., De consecr.). [Leo a. 458]; c. 60, can. i., qu. i., comp. IV.—L.

(Capit. lib. vi. c. 94, and other quoted passages), although, according to the decision of pope Innocent II (c. 2, x, De presb. non bapt., c. 34, 151, dist. iv., De consecr.), the subordination of a baptized priest ordained by an unbaptized did not necessarily follow. See INFALLIBILITY.

The Sacrament of ordination for ecclesiastics was believed to be so fully authorized by the passages above cited from the Bible that it was never questioned by the Church. God had made woman subject to the rule of man; she could therefore not instruct a congregation likely to be composed also of men (Conc. Carthag. iv. a. 378, c. 36, in c. 29, dist. iv., De consecr.). It is from this point of view that Tertullian regards this question when he says (De velarum virginitatis, c. 8): 'Non permettitar mulieri in ecclesia loqui, sed nocto ducere, nec tingere, nec offerere, nec allius virilis munera et alia sodalistatis officii sortem ubi vindicare. In a like strain argue Augustine (c. xvii, can. xxiii, qu. v.) and others. The early Church therefore declared that no woman should be ordained presbytera (vidua) (Conc. Laodic. a. 372, c. 11 in c. 19, dist. xxiiii), nor deacona, or diaconissa (Conc. Aquisgr. a. 141, can. xxxvi.; Epaphras, a. 517, can. xxii; Aureliani, a. 359, can. xxvii; see Conc. Nic., c. 129, dist. iv., De consecr.; Conc. Carthag. iv. a. 378, c. 36 in c. 29, dist. xxiiii; c. 20, dist. iv., De consecr.). Abbesses were not to bless the nuns, to hear confessions, or to preach (Conc. Laodic. a. 129, can. xii, De consecr.; v. 38, Innocent III a. 1210). The Evangelical Church teaches the necessity of baptism (Augsb. Conf. art. ix, etc.), and also that 'the female sex was not ordained by God to rule, either in the Church, or in secular positions where a strongly pronounced understanding and good counsel are requisite. But they are ordered to take care of their household, and to see after it diligently' (Luther, in Walch's Werke, i. 1006). The ground which the Reformers took on this question was up to our day approved by the Protestant churches at large. Among the Friends, however, no such distinction has ever been recognized; indeed, the tendency of the present age is to abolish the rule altogether, and females in several instances have actually been installed as pastors in this country, while in other cases their ability in the pulpit has been freely acknowledged even among evangelical denominations. Yet even this barrier has been thrown down by the advocates of 'woman's place in the world' (q.v.). See Herzog, Real-Encyklop., vi. 617. (J. H. W.)

Incandescere, in the language of the Church of the Middle Ages, is the appointment of any strange bishop, presbyter, deacon, or a person of some other class of the priesthood, to this or that church, in which he was to perform services in part or exclusively, or even the appointment to one particular church. The election of the cardinal was also called incardinare.—Fuhrmann, Handwörterbuch d. Kirchengesch., ii. 485.

Incardinati clericii, fugitive or foreign priests appointed to a church, in contrast with the appointment of a native and regular priest.—Pierer, Universal Lexicon, viii, 840.

Incarnation (Lat. in, and coro, flesh), the permanent assumption of human form by a divine personage. 1. False or Pretended Incarnations of Heathen Religions.—The mythologies of most nations afford stories, although faint, of the idea of incarnation. If, as Vitæ suggestions, and of other sects to be rebaptized and ordained on their return to the Cathol Church, and that such persons as had previously been ordained, but not baptized, should, at once receive baptism, and then be reordained (c. 112, dist. iv., De consecr.). [Leo a. 458]; c. 60, can. i., qu. i., comp. IV.—L.
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The Greek and Roman mythologies, or the wilder worship of the aborigines of America. The earlier Christian apologists attributed these caricatures of the true incarnation to Satan, and alleged that "he invented these fables by imitating the truth." Neander makes the profound suggestion, that "the objects of these may have been either a holy desire, inseparable from man's spirit, for participation in the divine nature as its true life—its anxious longing to pass the gulf which separates the God-derived soul from its original—its wish, even though unconscious, to secure that union with God which the human nature in Christendom shows us as a living reality. Nor can we be astonished to find the facts of Christianity thus anticipated in poetic forms (embodying in imaginative creations the innate yet indistinct cravings of the spirit) in the mythical elements of the old religions, when we remember that human nature itself, and all the forms of its development, as well as the whole course of human history, were intended by God to find their full accomplishment in Christ" *(Life of Christ, chap. ii, sec. 12)*.

The want that thus expresses itself in these fabled avatars lies at the foundation of idolatry. The unsatisfied sacred bull of Memphis, the secret desire of those who have never known their God, has thrust itself upon him—should dwell with him. It first leads him to represent the Deity by the work of his own hands, and then to worship it (see Tholuck, *Predigten*, i, 148). Or we may look upon these avatars as so many faint and darkened fringes of the holy light which came upon the Garden through the first promise given to man. On the contrary, Kitto denies "that there is in Eastern mythology any incarnation in any sense approximating so that of the Christian, and that least of all is there any where it has been most insisted on" *(Daily Bible Hints, on John i, 14)*. Cocker, in his late work *(Christianity and Greek Philosophy, N. Y. 1870, 8vo, p. 512)*, advances the theory that the idea of a "pure spiritual essence, without form and without emotion, pervading all and transcending all, is too vague and abstract to yield us comfort," and that therefore the need of an incarnation "became consciously or unconsciously 'the desire of nations'" by "the education of the race" and 'by the dispensation of philosophy.' . . . The idea of an incarnation was not unfamiliar to human thought, it was *new or strange idea to the heathen mind. The numberless metaphysical phases of Greek mythology, the incarnations of Brahma, the avatars of Vishnu, the human form of Krishna, had naturalized the thought (Young, *Christ of History*, p. 248)." See Dörner, *Lehre v. der Person Christi*, i, 7 sq.; *Biblisch. Sacrum*, ix, 250; Weber, *Indische Studien*, ii, 411 sq.

"*Theo-Christians, Apis or Horup, "the living bull," was esteemed to be the emblem and image of the soul of Osiris, who, as Pliny and Cicero say, was deemed a god by the Egyptians. *Didoros* derives the worship of Apis from a belief that the soul of Osiris had migrated into this animal; and he was thus supposed to manifest himself to man through successive ages;" while Strabo calls "Apis the same as Osiris" (Wilkinson, *Anc. Egypt. abridg'd*, i, 290, 291). "About the time when Cambyses arrived at Memphis, Apis appeared to the Egyptians." Their great rejoicings led that prince to examine the officer who had charge of Menephtah. The latter responded "that... their gods had appeared to them—a god who, at long intervals of time, had been accustomed to show himself in Egypt" *(Herod. iii, 27)*.

Mnevis, the sacred bull of Heliopolis, was also a representative of Osiris, and with Apis, the sacred bull of Memphis, was worshiped as a god throughout the whole of Egypt. Ammianus says that Mnevis was sacred to the sun, while Apis was sacred to the moon (see Rawlinson's *Herod.*, ii, 354, Eng. edition). Hardwick, however, adds Wilkinson as regarding it "a merit of the old Egyptians that they did not humanize their gods, but preserved them in their sacred animals; as admiring rather the elevation of animals and emblems to the rank of deities." Hardwick denies that the idea of incarnation is to be found in the old Egyptian creed *(Christ and other Masters*, ii, 551). See *Apis.*

The mythology of the Hindus presents a vast variety of incarnations, the inferior avatars which have appeared in various ages being innumerable. The object of these avatars is declared by Vishnu, in his original form of Krishna, thus addressing Arjuna: "Both I and thou have passed many births; mine are known to me, but thou knowest not thine. Although I am not in my nature subject to birth or decay, and am the lord of all created beings, yet, having command over my own nature, I am also subject to birth. As I, therefore, as there is a decline of virtue, and an insurrection of vice and injustice in the world, I make myself evident. Thus I appear from age to age for the preservation of the just, the destruction of the wicked, and the establishment of virtue" *(Bhagavad-Gita*, p. 40). With this declaration accord, for the most part, the objects of ten more conspicuous avatars of this deity, although the details of them abound in puerilities and obscenity. In the *Matya*, or *Fish avatar*, Vishnu took the form of a human being issuing from the body of a fish, for the recovery of the sacred books which had been stolen from Brahma by the magic deer of the goddess *Kurma*, or Tortoise avatar, supported the earth sinking in the waters. The prayer of Brahma for assistance when the whole earth was covered with water called forth a third avatar of Vishnu, that of the *Yadarho*, or Bear, of which the earth was made, and when the author of *Ramayana*, or *Rama*, the supreme animal, he began to smell around that he might discover the place where the earth was submerged. At length, having divided the water and arriving at the bottom, he saw the earth lying a mighty and barren stratum; then he took up the ponderous globe (freed from the water), and raised it high up in his hands, and said, 'thus it was a beautiful lotus blossoming on the tip of his tusk' *(Hist. of Hindustan*, i, 575 sq.). There can be but little doubt that these three avatars are perversions of the Hindu traditions of the Deluge. The next incarnation burst forth from a pillar as a man-lion for the purpose of destroying a blasphemy of the *Vāmana*, or Dwarf, in the next avatar, rebuked the pride of Mahā Bali, the great Balī. In human form the divine *Paranarmlama*, in twenty pitched battles, expatriated the Kettir tribe to prepare for the Brahmin the way to empire. There was a third avatar of Vishnu that was generally admitted to have been the abolition of sacrifice, which was said to be the cause, "Buddhism stands conspicuous in the midst of heathenism as a religion without sacrificial cult." Upon the tenth, the *Kali avatar*, which is yet to take place, the destruction of the universe will ensue (see Maurice, *History of Hindostan*, passim; Hardwick, i, 278; *New Englisher*, iii, 183-185). For the astounding events connected with the birth and infancy of *Goutama* (q.v.), see *Buddha*. See also *Hardy’s Manual of Buddhism*, p. 140 sq. Compare *Avatar: Hinduism*.

Lammas. The name has many features in common with Buddhism, so much so that it may be considered one of its outgrowths. It "differs fundamentally from Chinese Buddhism in the doctrine of hereditary incarnations. The great thought of some intelligence issuing from the Buddha world assuming the conditions of a god for a while, for the sake of mari frail humanity, and for a time prevailing over some one favored group of Buddhist monasteries, had long been familiar to the natives of Tibet." In the latter half of the 18th century arose the idea of perpetual incarnations. Then it was that one chief abbott, the "perfect Lama," inspired with the wondrous knowledge of his ultimate condition, determined for the benefit of mankind to sejourn longer on the earth, and be continu-
The notion that prevailed in Egypt was similar, "save only that the symbolical bull was substituted for the literal man, and as Buddha is still held to be successively born in each infant lama, so the god Osiris was equally thought to be successively born in each consecrated, living infant. Nor was this doctrine of a human incarnation by any means lost in that country. Dio- dorus gives a curious account of an infant in whose person Osiris was thought to have been born into the world in order that he might thus exhibit himself to mortals; and what Herodotus says of the Egyptian Persians, who were worshipped in the person of Osiris, it may be supposed that at certain intervals a man was brought forward by the priests as an incarnation of their god" (Diod. Sic. lib. i. p. 20; Herod. Hist. ii. ch. xci.; G. S. Faber, Eight dissertations, i. 61 sq.; see Wilkinson's note ad loc. cit. in Rawlinson's Herodotus). On the general subject, see also Aker's Origin of pagan industry, vi. ch. vi; Eight dissertations, i. 67 sq.

Under the head of classical metamorphoses it will be sufficient to refer to Baur in Baumgarten (on Acts, i. 446, transl.), to Ovid, Metamorphoses, Baucis et Philemon; and to the name of Jupiter bore of Zeus karašaža (Biscoe, On the Acts, p. 236).

"Passing over to the American continent, whether by way of Iceland to Labrador, or eastward from Asia, we find the wilderness, from the frozen shores of the Arctic Ocean to the Mexican Gulf, resounding with the deep refrain of the thunders in the desert of history; and names with the Wodin and Buddha of the eastern continent... His grandmother descended from the moon, which, in the symbolic language of the early traditions, always represents the Noachian ark. The only daughter of this Nokomis, in the bloom of her maidenhood, without the concurrence of mortal agency, and in a miraculous manner, gave birth to a son, who became conscious, as he advanced to manhood, that he was endowed with supernatural powers for the redemption of the world from evil. All his stupendous exploits were directed to that end. His name in the Indian dialects was Hósho, Bocoku," etc. (Metk. Quart. Rev. 1869, p. 206; compare Schoolcraft's Algon. Reg. i. 135; and Kingsborough's Mex. Antiq. vi. 175). The remarkable story of the birth of Huitzilopochti from a virgin mother is given by Squier, American Archaeological Reg. p. 196. For the reputed incarnations of the highest god, Teccapancon, Mr. Miraglia has nothing to be analogous to Buddha, Zoroaster, Osiris, Taut in Phoenicia, Odin in Scandinavia, etc., see Hardwick, ii. 152, with his remarks.—Brinton (Daniel G.), Myths of the New World (N. Y. 1868), 120mo, chap. ii and iv.

The doctrine of the incarnation is in the Christian Scheme. —In the evangelical sense, incarnation is that act of grace whereby Jesus Christ, the Son of God, took upon himself the nature of man. "By taking only the nature of man, he still continued one person, and changed but the manner of his subsisting, which was before in the mere glory of the Son of God, and is now in that habit of our flesh" (Hooker, Ecc. Pol. v. § 52). In the assumption of our nature he became subject to the consequences of sin, except that he was without the accident of sin (see Ebrard, in Herzog, Real-Encyclop. a. v. Jesus Christ). "That Christ should have taken man's nature shows that corruption was not inherent in its existence in such wise that to assume the nature was to assume the sin" (Ebrard, loc. cit.). The essential features of the incarnation are peculiar to Christianity, and when we speak of the incarnation, that of Christianity is at once understood; for the incarnation of Vishnu as found in Krishna, which is admitted to be the most perfect of all heathen incarnations, and the only parallel instance known to us, according to Hardwick (Christ and other Masters, i. 291), "when purged from all the lewd and Bacchanalian adjuncts which disfigure and debase it, comes infinitely short of Christianity." "Nothing can be more absurd than to compare the incarnations of this Indian deity with that of Christ. They are by their very identity alone tinctured with the pantheistic idea. The human personality is destitute of reality, since it is taken up and laid down as a veil or mask with which the divinity invested himself for a moment. Moreover, the degradation and corruption which were carried by it were called "true evil, and participated in human corruption" (Plessensee, Rel. before Christ, p. 61). Although, therefore, the idea of the union of the divine and human natures was not foreign to heathenism, yet that the divine Logos should become flesh belonged to Christianity alone. False religion is the mixture of the two, the incarnation of the Deity. Judaism itself had never risen to the conception of an incarnate God. The antagonism between the Creator and the creature was too sharply defined to admit such an interpretation of the first promise as the incarnation has given. See Martensen, Christ. Dogm., § 293; Neander, Church Hist., 3 vols., iv. 70 sq.; Kittto, Daily Bible Illustr. 29th week, evening.

The use of the term incarnation (later Latin) may be traced back to Irenaeus, A.D. 180, as in the expression "incarnatio pro nostra salute" (Contra Herr. i, 10).

III. Theory.—The doctrine of the incarnation is fundamental to Christianity, and is the basis upon which the entire fabric of revealed religion rests. It is presented to our faith from the plane of the miraculous, and is to be considered as the one all-encompassing miracle of Christianity. It contains within itself essentially and to its core the mystery of holy communion. These miracles are the fruit, after its kind, which this divine tree brings forth. Faith sees in the fallen estate of so noble a being as man, and his restoration to purity, immortality, and God, objects commensurate with the sacrifice and humiliation that are implied in the incarnation, and accepts the doctrine in consequence of looking to the wants and necessities of human nature; but a divine revelation elevates our vision, and meets all objections founded upon the comparative insignificance of our race by indicating that in some mysterious manner the influences of the atonement may beneficially affect the entire universe. See Garbett, Christ as Prophet, i. 12; Kurtz, Astron, and the Bible, transl. p. 95 sq.; Calvijn on Col. i. 20; Olshausen, Stier, and Harless on Eph. ii. 20. The blending together of two natures implied in an incarnation presupposes some element of nature common to both. As far as we can see, "things absolutely dissimilar may not exist together, or rather that we cannot coalesce with fire; water cannot mix with oil" (F. W. Robertson on Matt. v. 48). "Forasmuch as there is no union of God with man without that mean between both which is both" (Hooker), we see in the incarnation, reflected in the temple, those true nobility of man's nature, and the secret of the fact that the incarnation took place in the seed of Abraham rather than in angels. "For verily he taketh not hol of angels, but of the seed of Abraham he taketh hold" (Heb. ii. 16, marginal rend.); "The most common mode of presenting the doctrine is to say that the image assumed our human nature. But by this, we are told, is not to be under-
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stood that he assumed an individual body and soul, so that he became a man, but that he assumed generic humanity, so that he became the man. By generic humanity is to be understood a life-power, that peculiar law of life, corporeal and incorporeal, which develops itself in individual form. The Son, therefore, became incarnate in humanity in that objective reality, entity, or substance in which all human lives are one. Thus, too, Oshasuman, in his comment on John i, 14, says, 'It could not be said that the Word was made man, which would imply that the Redemptor was a part of Adam, in his梓 plight. Therefore being the second Adam, he represented the totality of human nature in his exalted comprehensive personal- ity.' To the same effect he says, in his remarks on Rom, v, 15, 'If Christ were a man among other men, it would be impossible to conceive how his suffering and obedience could have an essential originality on mankind: he could then only operate as an example; but he is to be regarded, even apart from his divine nature, as the man, i.e., as realizing the absolute idea of humanity, and including it potentially in himself spiritually as Adam did corporeally.' To this point archdeacon Whately refers in his defense of the Incarnation, and represents the whole value of Christ's work as depending upon it. If this be denied, he says, 'the doctrines of atonement and sanctification, though confessed in words, become a mere empty phraseology. In all its essential part, the ethical influence of Christianity is p. 210, says, 'The Word became flesh: not a single man only, as one among many, but flesh, or humanity, in its universal conception. How else could he be the principle of a general life, the origin of a new order of existence for the human world as such?' (Eadie). This fine distinction was, however, very obvious to the early church. It is a transcendental philosophy to be capable of clear apprehension or general reception. It is sufficient to say that the divine Logos actually assumed a human body and soul, not precisely such as fallen men have, but like that of the newly-created Adam, or rather became himself the archetypal man after whom, as a pattern originally in the mind of Deity, the human race was primarily fashioned. See Image of God.

The question whether there would or could have been an incarnation without the fall of man has especially engaged the speculative minds of German mystics, most of whom maintain the affirmative. "If, then, the Redeemer of the world stands in an eternal relation to the Father and to humanity—if his person has not merely a historical, not merely a religious and ethical, but also a metaphysical significance, a soul alone cannot have been the object of his love, for there is a physical necessity for sin entering the world, and Christ could not be our Redeemer if it had been eternally involved in the idea that he should be our Mediator. Are we to suppose that what is most glorious in the world could only be reached through the medium of sin? that there would have been no room in the human race for the glory of the only-begotten One but for sin? If we start with the thought of humanity as destined to bear the image of God, with the thought of a kingdom of individuals filled with God, must we not necessarily ask, even if we for the moment suppose sin to have no existence, Where in this kingdom is the perfect Godman? No one of the individuals by himself expresses more than a relative union of the divine and human natures. No one participates more than partially in the "fulness of him that filleth all" (Eph. i, 20). All, therefore, the speculative minds of German mystics, most of whom maintain the affirmative.

IV. Objections to the 'Bible doctrine of the incarnation worthy of consideration are more easily resolved, perhaps than those against any other doctrine of Scripture, for they are mostly, if not altogether, to be comprehended under the head of its deep mysteriousness. Many writers, however, have adduced as parallel the mystery of creation, which is in itself the embodiment of the divine essence, and the theses of this discussion are essentially as being as man, not to speak of mysteries with which our entire economy is crowded. A priori, it is not more difficult to conceive of the union of the divine with the human, or the taking up of the human into the divine, than to comprehend the incarnation of an immaterial essence, such as the material form like that of the body. "If even in our time the idea of the incarnation of God still appears so difficult, the principal reason is, that the fact itself is too much isolated. It is always the impulse of spirit to embody itself, for corporeity is the end of the work of God; every phenomenon an idea descends from the world of spirit and embodies itself here below. It may therefore be said that all the nobler among men are rays of that sun which in Christ rose on the firmament of humanity. In Abraham, Moses, and others, we already discover the coming Christ (Whately)."

The strictest of the third charter is Whately's with respect to the substance of Deity, etc., may hold good of dogmatism upon the incarnation: "But as to the substance of the supreme Being and of the human soul, many men were (and still are) confident in their opinions, and dogmatism in framing them: if every one of these subjects they could not be refuted by an appeal to experiment... Philosophical divines are continually prone to forget that the subjects upon which they speculate are confessedly and by their own account beyond the reach of the human faculties. This is no reason, indeed, against our believing anything clearly revealed in Scripture; but it is a reason against going beyond Scripture with metaphysical speculations of our own," etc. (Cyclop. Brit. ii, 517, 8th ed.). On objections, consult Liddon, Bampton Lecture, lect. v; Sadler, Emerson, chap. ii, v; Forsyth, System of Christianity, ii, ch. xxv; Thoms, Meditations on the Creed, in Works, iii, 235; Martensen, Christ. Dogmat., § 182.

V. History of Views.—The true theory of the nature of Christ was of gradual development in the history of the Church. Not unlike the best and most enduring growths of nature, it sprang up and matured amid the conflicts of doubt and the tempests of faction. (See § VIII, below.) The efforts to harmonize the divine and human natures of Christ gave rise to a series of fluctuations of doubt, which illustrate in a signal manner the tendencies of the human mind to recoil from one extreme, pass over to the opposite, and then return to the first. The change of opinion in the council of Sardica (341) witnessed the maturing of correct views as to the twofold nature in the one person of Christ, and their embodiment in the creed, which, subjected to the test of centuries, is still the expression and symbol of the faith of the Church. See CREED, NICENE AND CONSTANTINOPOLITAN, vol. ii, p. 562. "If we would correctly apprehend the ancient Church doctrine of the two natures, we must take φύσις in the abstract sense in which it was used. The divine nature consists in this, that Christ is God, the predicate 'God' belongs to him, that he is this, that the predicate "man" is assigned to it. His divine nature is the divine essence which subsists in the Logos from eternity, and which in his becoming man he still retained. His human nature is the man's nature or mode of being and constitution, which for itself does not subsist, but as a unire in Christ as this, that, another man, and, since his incarnation, also in him—the nature hominum. To have human feeling, will, and thought, and as a human soul to animate a human body, is human nature. We must, however, never think of human nature as a separate subsistence, a unire of Mary, with which the Son of God united himself, or mixed himself up" (Ehrhard, in Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, e. v. Jesus Christ).
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With the explanation thus given, we proceeded to remark that the earliest controversies of the Church revolved around the physical nature of Christ. The result of these contests established the essential oneness of Christ's body with ours. The pungency of the arguments employed may be illustrated in the words of Irenee (quoted by Hooker, Eccl. Polity, v, sect. 58): "If Christ's body had no other than a mere universal abstraction, it would not have coveted those earthly nourishments wherewith bodies taken from thence are fed. This was the nature which felt hunger after long fasting, was desirous of rest after travel, testified compassion and love by tears, gnawed in heaviness, and with extremity of grief melted, of which substance, which he was, the truth of him was not the exception of Justin Martyr, held the opinion that Christ assumed only a human body, or, if he had a soul, it was animal, or, which was more common, they quite ignored the question of his human soul. The views of Justin, however, were colored by the Platonistic philosophy, which led him to attribute to other bodies, soul, and spirit, but in such a mode of union with the Logos as to furnish the germ of the future error of Apollinaris the younger. Tertullian, about the end of the 2d century, first ascribed to Christ a proper human soul, but represented the soul of the Word as a peculiar whole, which had arisen from the teaching that connected the Logos immediately with the body of Christ. The doctrine of the human soul of Christ was more fully developed and illustrated by Origen. But, in comparing the connection between the Logos and the human nature in Christ to that of which our flesh is formed, the Word, in the fourth century, had himself the objection that he made Christ a mere man. (See further, Knapp, Lectures on Christian Theology, sect. cii, note by the translator.) Ambrose (De Incarnatione, p. 78) may more properly serve as the connecting link between Tertullian and the Arianus Creed, the latter ascribing to Christ, with Origen, a soul of a union of the Word with the human substance, while slowly attaining the following words: "Perfectus Deus, perfectus homo, ex anima rationali et humana carne subsistens." Thus Ambrose reasons: "Do we also infer division when we affirm that he took on him a reasonable soul, and endowed with intellectual capacity? For God himself, the Word, was not to be the flesh as the reasonable intellectual soul; but God the Word, taking upon him a reasonable intellectual soul, human, and of the same substance with our souls, the flesh also like our own, and of the same substance with that which is formed from matter, but without any taint of sin. . . . Wherefore his flesh and his soul were of the same substance with our souls and our flesh." Questions in connection with the nature of the human soul of Christ came into greater prominence towards the close of the 4th century than ever before in the history of the Church. Apollinaris the younger revived the opinion which extensively prevailed in the primitive Church, that Christ connected himself only with a human body and an animal soul (Hase, Ch. Hist. sect. 104). "Two beings persisting in their completeness, he conceived, could not be united into one whole, the perfect human nature with the Deity one person never could proceed; and, more particularly, the rational soul of the man could not be assumed into union with the divine Logos so as to form one person" (Neander, iv, 119, Clarke's edition). Further, in the 9th century, when the Adoptionists sank into oblivion, the Council of Constance condemned a finite material creatur. But, as might have been presumed, the era of scholastic theology, which was inaugurated at about the commencement of the 12th century, and continued into the 15th, although the attention of the schoolmen was more directed to other subjects, did not pass by one that so readily admitted the exercise of dialectic subtlety. The nominalism of Roscelinus, "which regarded the appellation God, that is common to the three persons, as a mere name, i.e. as the abstract idea of a genus" (Hagenbach), had perverted the true idea ofFather, Son, and Spirit into that of three individuals or things, in contradistinction to one thing (una res). In response to the idea that, as every universal is a mere abstraction, and particulars alone have reality, so "if only the essence of God in the Trinity was una res, and the three persons not tres res, the latter could not be considered as anything real. Only the one God would be the real; all besides would become a mere non-existence, in which case the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost would have become man" (Neander, viii, 92). "The daring assertions of Roscelinus exposed him to the charge of Tritheism, while those of Abelard exposed him to that of Sabellianism. The distinction was afterwards enlarged by Gilbert of Poitiers, whose phrase "quod est et quod est" gave to his doctrine the semblance of Tetratheism" (see Hagenbach, History of Doct. i, sect. 170). Though his starting-point was Realism, he arrived at the same goal as the Nominalist Roscelinus. "The Scholastics had much to say of the relation of the Number to the divine unity. Since Boethius had put forth the canon, 'Vere unum esse, in quo nullus sit numerus,' Peter the Lombard sought to avoid the difficulty by saying that number, in its application to God and divine things, had only a negative meaning; these are not 'signs of number' in the sense of number, but rather than to assert what is'" (Theol. Lect. by Dr. Tweiten, transl. in Bib. Sac. iii, 770). "Considered as an act, according to Thomas Aquinas, the incarnation is the work of the whole Trinity; but in respect to its terminus, that is, the personal union of the divine and human nature, it is wholly proper only to the union of the person of the doctrine of the Church, it is first and properly not the nature, but a person, and that the second person, which has assumed humanity." (For the accordance of this with the confession of faith of the eleventh Council at Toledo, A.D. 676, see Bib. Sac. iv, 50, note.) "Duns Scotus, inclined to the doctrine that the Word of God is proper if not an independent existence. This fundamental view of the Middle Ages Luther also adopted, and designated the divinity and humanity as two 'parts'; and upon this he built his theory of the impar- tation of the divine attribute to the human" (Hagenbach). The Age of the Reformation contributed nothing or but little new on the subject of the incarnation. The most that it did was to repeat some of the more pestilent errors of the past, and, in the mean time, through the conflicts of mind, bring into bolder relief the lineaments of truth. Thus, when Calvin restored the doctrine of the flesh of Christ as consubstantial with God, but the same would hold true in reference to all flesh. Nevertheless, he did not say it in reference to all flesh. "In his opinion, Christ alone is the Son of God; nor is that name to be given to any one else." (Hagenbach.) The Son, considered in his essence, still was the right, and is supported by Lutheran theologians. In another point of view, that is, considered in his personal substance, the Son cannot be called αὐτός, but only the Father, since he alone is αὐτός, but the αὐτός of the person is not to be confounded with the absoluteness of the essence." (See further, Tweiten, in
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The Incarnation is a theological concept in Christianity that affirms the union of the divine and human natures in Jesus Christ. The term "Incarnation" comes from the Latin words "incarnatus" (incarnated) and "incarnatus" (incarnation). The doctrine of the Incarnation is based on the belief that Jesus Christ was the divine Son of God who voluntarily took upon himself a human nature without losing his divinity.

The concept of the Incarnation is central to Christian doctrine and is celebrated in many of the major Christian holidays and liturgies. It is celebrated as a manifestation of the divine love for humanity, the ultimate example of self-sacrifice, and the means by which humanity is saved from sin and death.

The Incarnation is also a key theme in the New Testament, with many passages in the Gospels and the Epistles. The concept is also central to many Christian traditions and practices, including the Eucharist, the liturgy, and the celebration of Christmas.

In popular culture, the Incarnation is often associated with the birth of Jesus Christ, which is celebrated on December 25th as Christmas. The Incarnation is also a popular topic in art, literature, and music, with many depictions and interpretations of the event.
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poor, thus signifying, perhaps, the meagerness of their religious system, or, more properly, the poverty of its followers. They denied the divinity of Christ, but ascribed to him a superior legal piety and the elevated wisdom of a prophet. Eusebius says (Hist. Eccles. iii, 7), "The common Ebionites themselves suppose that a high degree of sanctity was attached to the soul of Jesus after his baptism." The Ebionites, whose views are represented by the Clementine Homilies, differed from the former by asserting that Jesus had from the beginning been pervaded with the same power; in their opinion he ranks with Adam, Enoch, and Moses (Hagnerbahn, Hist. Eccles. iii, 11). This error has been called, not improperly, the Socinianism of the age, revived and embittered the sentiments concerning the Messiah current among the Jews during his life. The views of the Nazarenes, who are generally regarded as a species of Ebionites, while they more nearly approached the orthodox faith, agreed with them in regarding Christ as only a superior man.

2. Gnosticism.—The Ebionite heresy that rose within the infant Church, from its necessary association with Judaism, was paralleled by another (Gnosticism), which springs from the pagan philosophy of the age. The assumption of the Gnostics was that knowledge for illumination in the name the Gnostics bore (προσώπος), 1 Cor. viii, 1; 1 Tim. vi, 20; Col. ii, 8), probably self-assumed, indicated the transcendental speculations which they ingrafted on the tender plant of Christian faith. They claimed to possess the secret of union with the divine, and held that the Deity had existed from all eternity in a state of absolute quiescence, but finally he began certain beings or ανθρώπινα after his own likeness, of whom Christ was one; and that he was allied to the lower angels and the δυσσυνευρίσκεσθαι, Demiurge, to whom this lower world was given. Moreover, he had no reality as such, not as a material body, but became united with the man Jesus at his baptism, and abode with him until the time of his death. (See Mosheim, Commentaries on the first three Centuries, sec. 62.) The tenets of Gnosticism can be traced even to the apostolic age. Simon Magus appears to have represented himself as an incarnation of the demiurgic power (Acts viii, 10). The ancient fathers regarded him as the father of the Gnostics (Iren. ad. Mar. i, 23). On the other hand, Tittmann (De vestigia Gnosticiorum, etc.) holds that nothing was known of the Gnostics until the 3d Century. However, the opening chapter of St. John's Gospel seems to be directly re
cpected against Gnostical perversions of the doctrine of the incarnation, which is not impossible if we admit the well-known tradition that Cerinthus disputed with that evangelist. (See Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, iii, ch. xxv.

3. Docetism.—This was one of the forms of Gnosticism denying the reality of Christ's human nature, and representing whatever appertained to his human appearance to be mere phantasm—διάφορος. Jerome tells us that while the apostles were still living there were those who taught that his body was no more than a phantom. This particular form of Gnostical error was censured by Ignatius in his Epistles, and therefore unquestionably arose early in the Church. (See Lardner, iii, 441.) "If the Son of God (said the Docetist) has been crucified for me, I may as well be in appearance, than am I bound down by the chains of sin?" He appears to be themselves a mere show." For modern Docetism, as illustrated in the mystical treatment of the doctrines of sacred history by Schelling, and the Rationalists generally, see Martines, Dogmatics, p. 244.

4. Montanism (about A.D. 150-200), μοναρχία, so called either from its regard to the doctrine of the divine unity, or from a regard to Christ's dignity. (See Hase, sec. 90.) According to its teachings, Christ was a mere man, but born of the Virgin by the power of the Holy Spirit, and exalted to be the Lord of the whole Church. A certain efflux from the divine essence dwelt in Christ, and this constituted his personality, while this personality originated in the hypothesis of a divine power. (See Nead, iii, 849, Clark's ed.)

5. Sabellianism (about 258) taught that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were one and the same—all so many different manifestations of the same being—three denominations in one substance. (See Hagenbahn, i, 263.) Thus the personality of Jesus did not exist prior to the incarnation, nor does it exist now, as the divine ray which had been incorporated in Christ has returned to its source. In the words of Burton, "If we seek for a difference between the theory of Sabellius and those of his predecessors, we are perhaps not far from the line of error. The whole divinity of the Father to be inherent in Jesus Christ, whereas Sabellius supposed it to be only a part, which was put forth like an emanation, and was again absorbed in the Deity. Noetus acknowledged only one divine Person; Sabellius divided this one dignity into three; but he supposed the Son and the Holy Ghost to have no distinct personwal existence, except when they were put forth for a time by the Father." The views of Sabellius reappear in the dogmas of Schleiermacher (who regarded the eternal and absolute Monas as unres
cogent), the Father, Son and Holy Spirit as God revealed, and in a modified form in the Dogmata of the Incarnat

6. Manichæism (circa A.D. 274).—Mani or Manes, who was probably educated in the religion of Zoroaster, upon his adoption of the Christian faith, transferred to it the principles of his Manicheism. In this, he held that the evil had existed from all eternity in a state of absolute quiescence, but finally he began certain beings or ανθρώπινα after his own likeness, of whom Christ was one; and that he was allied to the lower angels and the δυσσυνευρίσκεσθαι, Demiurge, to whom this lower world was given. Moreover, he had no reality as such, not as a material body, but became united with the man Jesus at his baptism, and abode with him until the time of his death. (See Mosheim, Commentaries on the first three Centuries, sec. 62.) The tenets of Gnosticism can be traced even to the apostolic age. Simon Magus appears to have represented himself as an incarnation of the demiurgic power (Acts viii, 10). The ancient fathers regarded him as the father of the Gnostics (Iren., ad. Mar. i, 23). On the other hand, Tittmann (De vestigia Gnosticiorum, etc.) holds that nothing was known of the Gnostics until the 3d Century. However, the opening chapter of St. John's Gospel seems to be directly re
ncpected against Gnostical perversions of the doctrine of the incarnation, which is not impossible if we admit the well-known tradition that Cerinthus disputed with that evangelist. (See Eusebius, Ecclesiastical History, iii, ch. xxv.

3. Docetism.—This was one of the forms of Gnosticism denying the reality of Christ's human nature, and representing whatever appertained to his human appearance to be mere phantasm—διάφορος. Jerome tells us that while the apostles were still living there were those who taught that his body was no more than a phantom. This particular form of Gnostical error was censured by Ignatius in his Epistles, and therefore unquestionably arose early in the Church. (See Lardner, iii, 441.) "If the Son of God (said the Docetist) has been crucified for me, I may as well be in appearance, than am I bound down by the chains of sin?" He appears to be themselves a mere show." For modern Docetism, as illustrated in the mystical treatment of the doctrines of sacred history by Schelling, and the Rationalists generally, see Martines, Dogmatics, p. 244.

4. Montanism (about A.D. 150-200), μοναρχία, so called either from its regard to the doctrine of the divine unity, or from a regard to Christ's dignity. (See Hase, sec. 90.) According to its teachings, Christ was a mere man, but born of the Virgin by the power of the Holy Spirit, and exalted to be the Lord of the whole Church. A certain efflux from the divine essence dwelt in Christ, and this constituted his personality, while this personality originated in the hypothesis of a divine power. (See Nead, iii, 849, Clark's ed.)

5. Sabellianism (about 258) taught that the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost were one and the same—all so many different manifestations of the same being—three denominations in one substance. (See Hagenbahn, i, 263.) Thus the personality of Jesus did not exist prior to the incarnation, nor does it exist now, as the divine ray which had been incorporated in Christ has returned to its source. In the words of Burton, "If we seek for a difference between the theory of Sabellius and those of his predecessors, we are perhaps not far from the line of error. The whole divinity of the Father to be inherent in Jesus Christ, whereas Sabellius supposed it to be only a part, which was put forth like an emanation, and was again absorbed in the Deity. Noetus acknowledged only one divine Person; Sabellius divided this one dignity into three; but he supposed the Son and the Holy Ghost to have no distinct personal existence, except when they were put forth for a time by the Father." The views of Sabellius reappear in the dogmas of Schleiermacher (who regarded the eternal and absolute Monas as unres
ncogent), the Father, Son and Holy Spirit as God revealed, and in a modified form in the Dogmata of the Incarnat
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for the same reason, the inseparable union of two perfect natures in one person; both denied that Christ was perfect man: the Patrician, no less than the Apollinarist, having considered that the divine nature supplied the place of a human soul (Harvey, Crofts, ii, 649).

9. Nestorianism (about 428) furnished the knotted root from which sprang ultimately the antagonistic heresies of the Monophysites and Monothelites. To the phrase Soterios, mother of God, applied to the Virgin, Nestorius maintained that Mary had given birth to Christ, and not to God. Thus arose the long-protracted controversy respecting the two natures of Christ (Socrates, Eccl. Hist. vii, ch. xxxii). Nestorius maintained that a divine and human nature dwelt in Christ as separate entities, but in closest connection—en eidos—where the figure of the Son of God, "heavenly man," are glued together. His own admission, "Divido naturas sed conjungo reverentiam," justified the allegation brought against his doctrines that Christ is really a double being. The humanity of Christ was the temple for the indwelling God, and the separate basis of personality in his human nature.

10. Monophysitism (about 446).—The doctrine of Nestorius, that there must be two natures if there be two persons in Christ, led Eutyches, by the law of contrarieties, to an exact counterpart, that there is but one person of Monophysitism, a local union of person, substance, and but one nature. The logic was the same in both heresies. Liddon has properly said, "The Monophysite formula practically made Christ an unincarnate God;" for, according to Monophysitism, the human nature of Christ had been absorbed in the divine. "We get, as it were, a Christ with two heads, an image which produces the impression not merely of the superhuman, but of the monstrous, and which is incapable of producing any moral effect" (Marten, Christian Dogmatics, sec. 136). Soon after the condemnation of this error by the fourth General Council at Chalcedon, it branched out into ten leading schools of doctrine, which were subsequently the sources of the controversies and, through discourses of the incarnation (Grundzüge d. Christlichen Dogmatik, § 325, 326): "As spirit, by renouncing individuality, man is in truth elevated above himself, without having abandoned the human nature; as spirit renouncing absoluteness, God has lowered himself to human nature; and through the abandonment of his own existence as divine Spirit. The unity of the divine and human nature is but the unity in that Spirit whose existence is the knowledge of the truth with which the doing of good is identical. This spirit, as God in the human nature, and man in the divine nature, is the God-man. The man in the divine will cease, and holy in its wisdom, is the God-man. As a historical fact, this union of God with man in manifest and real in the person of Jesus Christ; in him the divine manifestation has become perfectly human. The conception of the God-man, in the historic loom of Jesus Christ, contains in itself two phases in one: First, that God is manifest only through man, and in this relation Christ is yet placed on an equality with all other men; he is the Son of Man, and therein at first represents only the possibility of God becoming man; secondly, that in this man, Jesus Christ, there is the manifest man is the manifest God; but the manifest God is the Son of God, and, in this relation Christ is God's Son; and this is the actual fulfillment of the possibility or promise; it is the reality of God becoming man." For further quotations from German Rationalists, see Man- sel, Limits of Religious Thought, p. 154–156, 378-388.

While, as regards the question of antecedency, the propriety of introducing Swedish in the company of Rationalists might be questioned, we regard his views on the incarnation as entitling him to consideration in this connection. He has taught that "in a trinity of persons (act forth in the persons of the Church) we must hold a trinity of persons, by which he understand that which is the divine in the nature of Christ is the Father, that the divine which is united to the human is the Son, and the divine which proceeds from him is the Holy Spirit," etc. (Hagenbach, ii, 419). For the literature of Rationalism and its polemics, consult Hagenbach, Encyclop. der Theologischen Wissenschaften, p. 90–98. We cannot but suggest that all speculations upon the incarnation, which on the one hand rob Christ of his divinity as the true God, or on the other of his humanity, in the name of the letter, or of the desire to hold themselves to the severe strictures of Coleridge (Works, Am. ed., v. 552; comp. also, v. 447): "That Socinianism is not a religion, but a theory, and that, too, a very pern-
incipio erat Verbum"), in Opera, xii, 571; Zanchiis, De Incarnazione Filii Dei, in Opera (1619, folio), viii, i; Gregory Nazianzen, Oratio in nativitatem Christi (transl. by H. S. Boyd, in The Fathera not Papis, 1834); G. F. Baehr, Die Chr. Lehre v. d. Dreieinigkeit u. Menschensbildung Gottes (1841); J. Mai, Incarnatio (in Dignitate et Veritate Incarnationis Filii Dei, in his Opuscula Theologica (1792); Gass, Geschichte der Prot. Dogm. i, 111 sq.; A. Hahn, Lehrbuch des christlichen Glaubens (1828), p. 448 sq.; Duguat, Principes de la Foi Chrétienne (1745); J. B. de Jesus, by his countrymen Freppel, Bp. Planitzer, and Potenzo. W. Dornerr, Entwicklungsgeschichte der Lehre für die Person Christi, i, passim; ii, 51 sq., 432-442, 591 sq. (transl. also in Clark's Lib.); Thomasius, Christi Person und Werk (Erlangen, 1867); J. F. Lange, Leben Jesu, ii, 66 sq.; Karl Werner, Geschichte der Apostolischen und Politischen Literatur der Christlichen Theologie (1861), i, 387 sq., 566 sq.; ii, 175 sq.; M. F. Sadler, Emmanuel, or the Incarnation of the Son of God the Foundation of immutable Truth (1867); John Owen, Χριστός Χριστός, or a Declaration of the glorious Mystery of the Person of Christ God and Man (1689), ii, 1-33; As Loder, The Creed, Burnet, On the 39 Articles, Art. ii; Archbishop Usher, Emmanuel, or the Mystery of the Incarnation of the Son of God (Lond. 1846, fol.); Thos. Goodwin, Christ the Mediator, in Works (1681, fol.), ii, i, 427; R. J. Wilberforce, Doct. of the Incarn., of our Lord Jesus Christ in Relation to the Hypostatica, and of the Creed, in the Doctrine of the Doctrine of the Incarnation opened (in Sermons); Rott. Turnbull, Theophany, or the Manifestation of God in Christ Jesus; John Farrer, Rampton Lecture (1803), p. 59 sq.; Robert Fleming, The Logophreres, or a Discourse concerning Christ as the Logos (Lond. 1705), i, 100-108; Volume ii of Christianity; Thomas Chalmers, Mysteries of Godliness considered in 61 Sermons (Edinb. 1795); Wm. Sherlock, Vindication of the Doctrine of the Trinity and the Incarnation of the Son of God (Lond. 1691); Marcus Dods, On the Incarnation of the Eternal Word, with rec. notices by Dr. Thomas Chalmers (2d ed. 1840). Bib. Rep. 1832, p. 1; 1843, p. 636 sq.; Brownson's Quart. Rev. ser. iv, 166; v, 137 sq.; vi, 287 sq.; Church Rev. iv, 428 sq.; Biblioth. Sacra, xi, 729; xii, 52; xiv, 41 sq. (an able art. on the theory of Incarnation, April, 1854); Methodist Quart. Rev. 1851, p. 114; 1866, p. 290; Kitto's Journal of the Literature of the Church, First Warmth; Theological Expositor, ii, 184; Massillon, "Les caractères de la grandeur de Jesus Christ," in (Evres Complet), vi, 107; on i Cor. ii, 7, 8; vii, 8; Bp. Stillingfleet, Sermons, i, 336; Bosseult, three Sermons, Evvers, vi, 1; Bp. Atterbury, Sermons, iv, 61; Joseph Benson, Sermons, ii, 456. J. Spiby, Tillotson, Beveridge, Works, ii, 564; Bp. Horne, Disc. i, 193; Bp. Van Mildert, Works, v, 859; J. H. Newman, Sermons, ciii, 296; C. Simeon, Works, xix, 170; Richard Duke, The Divinity and Humanity of Jesus Christ (1730), p. 29; Thomas Arnold, Sermon on 1 Tim. iii, 16, at Rugby (1833) p. 111; W. A. Butler, The Mystery of the Holy Incarnation (After Bp. ed.), i, 58; George Rawlinson, Sermon on John iii, 11, p. 1; Biggenbach, Sermon on the Person of Jesus Christ, transl. in Foundations of our Faith, for other sermons on the incarnation, see Darlington's Cyclopaedia Bibliographica, col. 1059, 1068, 1064, 1546, 1547, 1592-3; also Malcolm's Theological and Comparative Study, East. Ch. 279, 592; Baptist Quart. 1870 (July); Amer. Chr. Rev. 1870, p. 82; Am. Presb. Rev. 1886, p. 924; Bib. Soc. 1870, p. 1; Mercurer Rev. 1885, p. 419; Brit. and For. Rev. 1861 (Jan., art. iv); 1866 (Jan.); 1868 (July); Theol. Exeget. iii, 167; Bullôt. Théol. 1867 (Jan.). p. 389; See also, for more or less extensive, in Lives of Christ, by Sepp, Kuhn, Baumgarten, Wald, Van Osterzee, Neander, Jeremy Taylor, Ellcott, Pressmen, Young, Andrews; Lichtenstein's Jesus Christus, Abriss seines Lebens, in Herzog's Real-Encyclop. vol. vi; also Bibliography of Life of Jesus in Hase's Leben Jesu, 2d (Lpz. 1858), alphabetical under CHRIStology, vol. ii, p. 284. (K. B.)
INCANTATI, a term for the certificates of liberation given to serfs or slaves of churches and monasteries who were liberated.—Pierer, Univ. Lex. viii, 841.

Incastratūra (sepulcrum) is a name in the Roman Catholic Church for a small place in the altar-stones set apart for the storage of saints' relics.—Pierer, Univ. Lex. viii, 841.

Incensarium (or Incensorium) is the name of the vessel used in the Romish and some of the Oriental churches for containing the incense to be burned. See INCENSE.

Incensation is the lighting and burning of the incense. See INCENSE.

Incense (יוּנֶסֶן, ketorah, Deut. xxxiii, 10; usually יֹנֶסֶן, ketroth, which is once applied likewise to the fat of rams, being the part always burned in sacrifice; once יֹנֶסֶן, kitter, Jer. xxlv, 21; all forms of the verb יָנָס, prop. to smoke, hence to cause an odor by burning, often itself applied to the act of burning incense; Greek, λαθρεία and cognate terms; sometimes יַנָּס, Isa. xxiii, 29; Is, lxvi, 3; Jer. vi, 20; xvii, 26; Chal. frankincense, as elsewhere rendered), a perfume which gives forth its fragrance by burning, and, in particular, that perfume which was burned upon the Jewish altar of incense. (See Weimarn, De suffusi aromata, Jen, 1678.) See ALTAR. Indeed, the burning of incense seems to have been considered among the Hebrews so much of an act of worship or sacred offering that we read not of any other use of incense than this among them. Nor among the Egyptians do we discover any trace of burned perfume except in sacerdotal use; but in Persian sculptures we see incense burned before the king. The offering of incense has formed a part of the religious ceremonies of most ancient nations. The Egyptians burned resin in honor of the sun at its rising, myrrh when at its meridian, and a mixture called khoput at its setting (Wilkinson, Anc. Egypt, v, 515). Plutarch (De Is. et Os. c, lii, lxxv) describes khoput as a mixture of sixteen ingredients. "In the temple of Siva incense is offered to the Lingam six times in twenty-four hours" (Roberts, Oriental Illustr. p. 368). It was also an element in the idolatrous worship of the Israelites (Jer. xi, 12, 17; xlvi, 35; 2 Chron. xxiv, 25).

1. The incense employed in the service of the tabernacle was distinguished as בּכֵרְתָה יְנֶסֶן (ketroth hynsen) or בּכֵרְתָה יְנֶסֶן הקָשַׁר (ketroth hynsen haksher). Exod. xxv, 6, incense of the aromas; Sept. יִסְדָּחֶנ תָּוָו יִשְׂמָךְ וּזֵעַהוֹר; Vulg. thyrcinamata boni odores; A. V. "sweet incense"). The ingredients of the sacred incense are enumerated with great precision in Exod. xxx, 34, 35: "Take unto thee sweet spices, stacte (נַתְנָה, nethaph), and onycha (וניתהלת, shekelath), and galbanum (גֵּלָבָן, chelbonah); these sweet spices with pure frankincense (גַּלְבָּן, lebonah) of each shall be there a like weight. And thou shalt make of it a perfume, a confection for the art of the apothecary, tempered together, pure and holy." See each of these ingredients in its alphabetical place. All incense which was not made of these ingredients was called יָנָס יָנָס (ketroth ketroth), "strange incense," Exod. xxx, 9, and was forbidden to be offered. According to Rashi on Exod. xxx, 34, the above-mentioned perfumes were mixed in equal proportions, seventy manehs being taken of each. They were compounded by the skill of the apothecary, to whose use, according to Rabbinical tradition, was devoted a portion of the Temple, called, from the name of the family whose especial duty it was to prepare the incense, "the house of Abitines." So in the large temples of India is retained a man whose chief business it is to distill sweet waters from flowers, and to extract oil from wood, flowers, and other substances." (Roberts, Oriental Illustr. p. 82). The priest or Levite whose incense was intrusted was one of the fifteen (memmim), or prefects of the Temple. Constant watch was kept in the house of Abitines that the incense might always be ready in time. (Buxtorf, Lexicon Talmud. s. v. יָנָס נָסִים). In addition to the four ingredients already mentioned, Archi enumerates seven others, thus making eleven, cut off of the earth: This is the incense which was offered to Moses on Mount Sinai. Josephus (War, v, 5, 3) mentions thirteen. The proportions of the additional spices are given by Maimonides (Citehammokhadim, ii, 5, § 3) as follows: myrrh, cassia, spikenard, and safflower, each: of costus, twelve manehs; cinnamon, nine manehs; sweet thorn, three manehs. The weight of the whole confection was 368 manehs. To these was added the fourth part of a cask of salt of Sodom, with amber of Jordan, and an herb called the "smoke-raiser" (בּשָׁנָה, modak dahab), known only to the cunning in such matters, to whom the secret descended by tradition. In the ordinary daily service one manch was used, half in the morning and half in the evening. Allowing, then, one manch of incense for each day of the solar year, the three manehs which remained were again pounded, and used by the high-priest on the day of atonement (Lev. xvi, 12). A store of it was kept in the temple in the time of Josua (I Chr. vi, 8, 3). The further directions are that this precious compound should be made or broken up into minute particles, and that it should be deposited, as a very holy thing, in the tabernacle "before the testimony" (or ark). As the ingredients are so minutely specified, there was nothing left for the high-priest but to take a similar perfume for private use: this, therefore, was forbidden under pain of excommunication: "Ye shall not make to yourselves according to the composition thereof: it shall be unto thee holy for the Lord. Whosoever shall make like unto that, to smell thereto, shall even be cut off from among his people" (ver. 31). So in some part of India, according to Michaelis (Mosaisches Recht, art. 249), it was considered high treason for any person to make use of the best sort of colambuck, which was for the service of the king alone. The word which describes the various ingredients as being "tempered together" literally means salted (בּכֵרְתָה יָנָס וֵאֵל). The Chaldee and Greek versions, however, have set the example of rendering it by mixed or tempered, as if their idea was that the different ingredients were to be mixed together, just as salt is mixed with any substance over which it is sprinkled. Ainsworth contends for the literal meaning of the word, as the law (Lev. ii, 13) expressly says, "With all thine offerings thou shalt offer salt." In support of this he cites Maimonides, who affirms that there was not anything offered on the altar without salt, except the wine of the drink-offering, and the blood, and the wood; and of the incense he says, still more expressly, that "they added it to it a cask of salt." In accordance with this, it is supposed, our Saviour says, "Every sacrifice shall be salted with salt" (Mark ix, 49). Ainsworth further remarks: "If our speech is to be always with grace, seasoned with salt, as the apostle teaches (Col. iv, 6), how much more should our incense, which is offered to God, be thus seasoned?

It is difficult, however, to see how so anomalous a substance as salt could well be combined in the preparation; and if it was used, as we incline to think that it was, it was probably added in the act of offering. See SALT. The expression בּכֵרְתָה יָנָס (bad behrod), Exod. xxx, 34, is interpreted by the Chaldee "weight by weight," that is, an equal weight of each (comp. Archi, ad loc.); and this rendering is adopted by our version. Others, however, and among them Aben-Ezra and Maimonides, consider it as signifying that each of the spices was separately prepared, and that all were afterwards mixed.

2. Aaron, as high-priest, was originally appointed to offer incense, but in the daily service of the second Temple the office devolved upon the inferior priests, from among whom one was chosen by lot (Mishna, Yoma, i, 35).
4; Luke 1, 9) each morning and evening (Abarbanel, On Lev. x, 1). A peculiar blessing was supposed to be attached to this service, and in order that all might share in it, the lot was cast among those who were "new to the incense," if any remained (Mishna, Yoma, L c 1; Bar- tenora, On Talmud, v, 9). This explanation was given for their preservation in attempting to infringe the prerogatives of the descendants of Aaron, who were consecrated to burn incense (2 Chron. xxvi, 16-21; Joseph. Ant. ix, 10, 4). The officiating priest appointed another, whose office it was to take the fire from the brazen altar. According to Maimonides (Yad. Kiuth., ii, 8; iii, 6), this altar fire was taken from the second pile, which was over against the S.E. corner of the altar of burnt-offering, and was of fig-tree wood. A silver shovel (כתרת) was first filled with the live coals, and afterwards emptied into a golden one, smaller than the former, so that some of the coals were spilled (Mishna, Tamid, iii, 6; Yoma, iv, 4; comp. Rev. viii, 5). Another priest cleared the golden altar from the cinders which had been left at the previous offering of incense (Mishna, Tamid, iii, 6; 9; vi, 1).

The times of offering incense were specified in the instructions first given to Moses (Exod. xxx, 7, 8). The morning incense was offered when the lamp was trimmed in the holy place, and before the sacrifice, when the watchman set for the purpose announced the break of day (Mishna, Yoma, iii, 1, 5). When the lamps were lighted "between the evenings," after the evening sacrifice and before the drink-offerings were offered, incense was again burnt on the golden altar which "belonged to the oracle" (1 Kings vi, 22), and stood before the veil which separated the holy place from the Holy of Holies, the throne of God (Rev. viii, 4; Philo, De Anim. Ideon. § 8).

When the priest entered the holy place with the incense, all the people were removed from the Temple, and from between the porch and the altar (Maimonides, Tamid, Umas, iii, 3; compare Luke i, 10). The incense was then brought from the house of Abtinus in a large vessel of gold called נֵכֶד (copah), in which was a phial (יעליא, hebrewy property "a sufferer" containing the incense (Mishna, Tamid, v, 4). The assistant priests who attended to the lamps, the clearing of the golden altar from the cinders, and the fetching fire from the altar of burnt-offering, performed their offices singly, bowed towards the ark of the covenant, and left the holy place before the priest, whose lot it was to offer incense, entered. Profound silence was observed among the congregation who were praying with him (Exod. xxviii, viii, 1), and at a signal from the prefect the priest cast the incense on the fire (Mishna, Tamid, vi, 3), and, bowing reverently towards the Holy of Holies, retired slowly backwards, not prolonging his prayer that he might not alarm the congregation, or cause them to fear that he had been struck dead for offering unworthily. (Lev. xvi, 13; Luke i, 21; Mishna, Yoma, vi, 1). When he came out he pronounced the blessing in Numb. vi, 24-26, the "maggrehaph" sounded, and the Levites burst forth into song, accompanied by the full swell of the Temple music, and with a sound which, says the Rabbins, could be heard as far as Jericho (Mishna, Tamid, iii, 8). It is possible that this may be alluded to in Rev. viii, 5. The priest then emptied the censer in a clear place, and hung it on one of the horns of the altar of burnt-offering. See Censer.

On the day of atonement the service was different. The high-priest, after sacrificing the bullock, went to the offering for himself and his family, took incense in his left hand, and a golden shovelful filled with live coals from the west side of the brazen altar (Jarchi, On Lev. xvi, 12) in his right, and went into the Holy of Holies. He then placed the shovelful upon the ark between the two bars (Buber, On Lev. xvi, 12) and into the Holy of Holies. He then took a stone and substituted it. Then, sprinkling the incense upon the coal, he stayed till the house was filled with smoke, and, walking slowly backwards, came without the veil, where he prayed for a short time (Maimonides, Yoma hikkippur, quoted by Ainsworth, On Lev. xvi; Ou- tran, De Sacrificio, i, 8, § 11). See ATONEMENT, DAY OF.

3. With regard to the symbolic meaning of incense, opinions have been many and widely different. While Maimonides regarded it merely as a perfume designed to counteract the effluvia arising from the beasts which were slaughtered for the daily sacrifice, other interpreters have allowed their imaginations to run riot, and vied with the wildest flights of fancy. "(Quis rer. div. her. ntu. § 41, p. 501) conceives the stacte and onycha to be symbolical of water and earth; galbanum and frankincense of air and fire. Josephus, following the traditions of his people, believed that the ingredients of the incense were chosen from the produce of the sea, the inhabited and the uninhabited parts of the earth, to indicate that all things are of God and for God (War, v, § 5). As the Temple or tabernacle was the palace of Jehovah, the theocratic king of Israel, and the ark of the covenant his throne, so the incense, in the opinion of some, corresponded to the perfume worn by the luxurious monarchs of the East delighted. It may mean all this, but it must mean much more. Grothius, on Exod. xxx, 1, says the mystical signification is "aurum habenda corda." Cornelius à Lapide, on Exod. xxx, 94, considers it as an apt emblem of propitiation, and finds a similar symbolical meaning in the several ingredients. Fairbairn (Typology of Scripture, ii, 320), with many others, looks upon prayer as the reality of which incense is the symbol, founding his conclusion upon Ps. cxlii. 2; Rev. v, 8; viii, 3, 4. Bahr (Symb. d. Mosa. Cult. vol. i, c. vi, § 4) opposes this view of the subject on the ground that the chief thing in offering incense is not the producing of the smoke, which presses like prayer towards heaven, but the spreading of the fragrance. His own exposition may be summed up as follows. Prayer, among all Oriental nations, signifies calling upon the name of God. The oldest prayers consisted in the mere enumeration of the several titles of God. The Scripture places incense in close relationship to prayer, so that offering incense is synonymous with worship. Hence incense itself is a symbol of the name of God. The ingredients of the incense correspond severally to the perfections of God, and is impossible to divorce to which of the four names of God each belongs. Perhaps stacte corresponds to רַכְב (Jacobok), onycha to רְחֵן (Flakim), galbanum to רְחֵן (Chat), and frankincense to רְחֵן (Khadis). Such is Bahr’s exposition of the symbolism of incense, rather ingenious than logical. Looking upon incense in connection with the other ceremonial observances of the Mosaic ritual, it would rather seem to be symbolical, not of prayer itself, but of that which makes prayer acceptable, the intercession of Christ. In Rev. viii, 3, 4, the incense is spoken of as something distinct from, though offered with, the prayers of all the saints (comp. Luke i, 10); and in Rev. viii, 5 it is the golden vials, and not the odors or incense, which are said to be the prayers of saints. Ps. cxli, 2, at first sight, appears to militate against this conclusion; but if it be argued that the passage teaches that prayer is an element of prayer, it must also be allowed that the burning sacrifice has the same symbolical meaning. See PERFUMES.

INCENSE, CHRISTIAN. The use of incense in worship was not carried over from the Jewish to the Christian Church; it is still employed in the characteristic usages, in the Roman Church, and in some of the Oriental churches. The incense used is either the resinous gum olibanum, brought from Arabia or the East Indies, or an imitation of it manufactured by the chemists. The latter is most common now. 1. It is certain that incense was used in the first three ages of the Christian Church. Indeed the use of it was a mark of paganism, as is fully evinced by the
enactments of the Christian emperors against its use. "The very places or houses where it could be proved to have been done were, by a law of Theodosius, confiscated by the government" (comp. Gothof, De Statu Pug., pag. 200). In Greece, the laws of the empires of the Byzantine period showed a strong bias against the practice of incense, which was used in religious ceremonies, suggesting a deep-seated suspicion of its use.

The argument is worthless. The principal argument of the Romanists rests upon Rev. v. 8: "Golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of saints!" as if anything could be argued, for personal and public gain, against the abhorrent laudable use of that beautiful passage. Censers are not mentioned among the sacred vessels of the first four centuries. The first clear proof of the use of incense at the communion occurs in the time of Gregory the Great, in the latter part of the 6th century. After that, the practice became common in the Latin Church. Its mystical representation is according to Roman Catholic authorities, (1) contrition (Eccles. xlvii); (2) the presencing of the Gospel (2 Cor. ii, 14); (3) the prayers of the faithful (Psa. cxli, 2; Rev. v, 8-24); (4) the virtue of saints (Cant. iii, 6). See above. Incense is chiefly used in the solemn (or high) mass, the consecration of churches, solemn consecrations of objects intended for use in public worship, and in the burial of the dead. There are, however, also minor incensations, and some of the monastic associations even differed in its use. Those Cistercian monks used incense only on feasts, while the Benedictines and Cluniacs introduced its use on most public occasions.

2. The censer (thuribulum) is a brazen pot holding coals on which the incense burns. The censer is held by three chains, varying in length, but generally about three feet long. When local, the use of them by the boys who act as censer-bearers becomes quite a feat of gymnastics. During the mass, the incense is thrown over the altar and over the "sacrificing priests" by the deacon who serves, kneeling. The Roman writers justify this incensing of the priest on the theory that he represents Christ, and that therefore the oblation offered by the faithful, is rendered to Christ through his representative at the altar. A curious rule with regard to "incensing" the pope is, that "when the pope is standing, the servitor who incenses him must stand; when the pope is sitting, the incenser must kneel." No symbolical or mystical meaning has been found for this rule: the real one doubtless is, that when the pope is standing, a kneeling boy could not so manipulate the censer as to make the incense reach the pontiff's nostrils. After the altar and officiating priest are incensed, the incense is directed toward the other priest and toward the public for the present, and last of all towards the congregation. As incense is a mark of honor, and as "human vanity creeps in everywhere" (Bergier, a. v. Encens), kings, great men, and public officials are incensed separately, and before the mass of the people. See Bergier, Dict. de Théolo- gie, etc. de l'Abbe Joseph de Grignon, Orig. Eccles. book viii, ch. vi, § 21; Coleman, Ancient Christianity, xxii, 12; Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, p. 325 sq.; Adolphus, Compendium Theologicum, p. 747; Dighton, Bibliotheca Hist. Sacra, i, 527; Middleton, Letter from Rome, p. 12; Riddle, Christian Antiq. p. 589 sq.; Smidt, Handb. der Christl.-Kirchl. Alterthümer, ii, 441 sq. See Censers.

Incest (Lat. in, not; costas, chaste), the crime of sexualcommerce with a person within the degrees forbidden by the (Legal) law (see Trier, De legislat. Mosaic. de incestu, Fret. &. Oder, 1726). See Affinity: Consanguinity. "An instinct almost innate and universal," says Gibbon (Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ii, 644), "an irresistible passion, which makes commerce of parents and children in the infinite series of ascending and descending generations. Concerning the oblique and collateral branches, nature is indifferent, reason mute, and custom various and arbitrary. In Egypt, the marriage of brothers and sisters was admitted with general approbation; in Rome, it began to be disapproved in order to purify the air of the unwelcome chambers, cemeteries, etc., in which Christians were compelled to worship, just as candles were employed necessarily, even by day, in subterranean places. Even Romanist writers (e. g. Claud. de Veris) assert this. Cardinal Bona, indeed (Litteris, i, 35), seeks to derive the use of incense in worship from apostolic times, but his argument is worthless. The principal argument of the Romanists rests upon Rev. v, 8: "Golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of saints!" as if anything could be argued, for personal and public gain, against the abhorrent laudable use of that beautiful passage. Censers are not mentioned among the sacred vessels of the first four centuries. The first clear proof of the use of incense at the communion occurs in the time of Gregory the Great, in the latter part of the 6th century. After that, the practice became common in the Latin Church. Its mystical representation is according to Roman Catholic authorities, (1) contrition (Eccles. xlvii); (2) the presencing of the Gospel (2 Cor. ii, 14); (3) the prayers of the faithful (Psa. cxli, 2; Rev. v, 8-24); (4) the virtue of saints (Cant. iii, 6). See above. Incense is chiefly used in the solemn (or high) mass, the consecration of churches, solemn consecrations of objects intended for use in public worship, and in the burial of the dead. There are, however, also minor incensations, and some of the monastic associations even differed in its use. Those Cistercian monks used incense only on feasts, while the Benedictines and Cluniacs introduced its use on most public occasions.

2. The censer (thuribulum) is a brazen pot holding coals on which the incense burns. The censer is held by three chains, varying in length, but generally about three feet long. When local, the use of them by the boys who act as censer-bearers becomes quite a feat of gymnastics. During the mass, the incense is thrown over the altar and over the "sacrificing priests" by the deacon who serves, kneeling. The Roman writers justify this incensing of the priest on the theory that he represents Christ, and that therefore the oblation offered by the faithful, is rendered to Christ through his representative at the altar. A curious rule with regard to "incensing" the pope is, that "when the pope is standing, the servitor who incenses him must stand; when the pope is sitting, the incenser must kneel." No symbolical or mystical meaning has been found for this rule: the real one doubtless is, that when the pope is standing, a kneeling boy could not so manipulate the censer as to make the incense reach the pontiff's nostrils. After the altar and officiating priest are incensed, the incense is directed toward the other priest and toward the public for the present, and last of all towards the congregation. As incense is a mark of honor, and as "human vanity creeps in everywhere" (Bergier, a. v. Encens), kings, great men, and public officials are incensed separately, and before the mass of the people. See Bergier, Dict. de Théolo- gie, etc. de l'Abbe Joseph de Grignon, Orig. Eccles. book viii, ch. vi, § 21; Coleman, Ancient Christianity, xxii, 12; Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, p. 325 sq.; Adolphus, Compendium Theologicum, p. 747; Dighton, Bibliotheca Hist. Sacra, i, 527; Middleton, Letter from Rome, p. 12; Riddle, Christian Antiq. p. 589 sq.; Smidt, Handb. der Christl.-Kirchl. Alterthümer, ii, 441 sq. See Censers.

Incest (Lat. in, not; costas, chaste), the crime of sexualcommerce with a person within the degrees forbidden by the (Legal) law (see Trier, De legislat. Mosaic. de incestu, Fret. &. Oder, 1726). See Affinity: Consanguinity. "An instinct almost innate and universal," says Gibbon (Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ii, 644), "an irresistible passion, which makes commerce of parents and children in the infinite series of ascending and descending generations. Concerning the oblique and collateral branches, nature is indifferent, reason mute, and custom various and arbitrary. In Egypt, the marriage of brothers and sisters was admitted with general approbation; in Rome, it began to be disapproved in order to purify the air of the unwelcome chambers, cemeteries, etc., in which Christians were compelled to worship, just as candles were employed necessarily, even by day, in subterranean places. Even Romanist writers (e. g. Claud. de Veris) assert this. Cardinal Bona, indeed (Litteris, i, 35), seeks to derive the use of incense in worship from apostolic times, but his argument is worthless. The principal argument of the Romanists rests upon Rev. v, 8: "Golden vials full of odors, which are the prayers of saints!" as if anything could be argued, for personal and public gain, against the abhorrent laudable use of that beautiful passage. Censers are not mentioned among the sacred vessels of the first four centuries. The first clear proof of the use of incense at the communion occurs in the time of Gregory the Great, in the latter part of the 6th century. After that, the practice became common in the Latin Church. Its mystical representation is according to Roman Catholic authorities, (1) contrition (Eccles. xlvii); (2) the presencing of the Gospel (2 Cor. ii, 14); (3) the prayers of the faithful (Psa. cxli, 2; Rev. v, 8-24); (4) the virtue of saints (Cant. iii, 6). See above. Incense is chiefly used in the solemn (or high) mass, the consecration of churches, solemn consecrations of objects intended for use in public worship, and in the burial of the dead. There are, however, also minor incensations, and some of the monastic associations even differed in its use. Those Cistercian monks used incense only on feasts, while the Benedictines and Cluniacs introduced its use on most public occasions.

2. The censer (thuribulum) is a brazen pot holding coals on which the incense burns. The censer is held by three chains, varying in length, but generally about three feet long. When local, the use of them by the boys who act as censer-bearers becomes quite a feat of gymnastics. During the mass, the incense is thrown over the altar and over the "sacrificing priests" by the deacon who serves, kneeling. The Roman writers justify this incensing of the priest on the theory that he represents Christ, and that therefore the oblation offered by the faithful, is rendered to Christ through his representative at the altar. A curious rule with regard to "incensing" the pope is, that "when the pope is standing, the servitor who incenses him must stand; when the pope is sitting, the incenser must kneel." No symbolical or mystical meaning has been found for this rule: the real one doubtless is, that when the pope is standing, a kneeling boy could not so manipulate the censer as to make the incense reach the pontiff's nostrils. After the altar and officiating priest are incensed, the incense is directed toward the other priest and toward the public for the present, and last of all towards the congregation. As incense is a mark of honor, and as "human vanity creeps in everywhere" (Bergier, a. v. Encens), kings, great men, and public officials are incensed separately, and before the mass of the people. See Bergier, Dict. de Théolo-
Inchoncata (beginner) is one of the names by which the catechumens of the early Christian Church were called. See Catechumen.

Inclination is the propensity of the mind to any particular object or action; a kind of bias by which it is carried towards certain actions previous to the exercise of thought and reasoning about the nature and consequences of them. Inclinations are of two kinds, natural or acquired. 1. Natural are such as we often see in children, who from their earliest years differ in their tempers and dispositions. Of one we may say he is naturally revengeful; of another, that he is patient and forgiving. 2. Acquired inclinations are such as are superinduced by custom, which are called habits, and these are either good or evil. See Habit; Will.

Incense. See Anachoeris.

In Cena Domini (Lat. at the Lord's Supper, the opening words of the document) is the name of a celebrated papal bull. "It is not, as other bulls, the work of a single pope, but, with additions and modifications at various times, dates back from the Middle Ages; some writers tracing it to Martin V, others to Clement V, and some to Boniface VIII. Its present form, however, was made by the popes Pius II and Paul III, and, finally, from Urban VIII, in 1627, from that time it continued for a century and a half to be published annually on Holy Thursday," whence its name; afterwards Easter Monday was substituted. The contents of this bull have been a fertile subject of controversy. It may be briefly stated as a summary of ecclesiastical censures, especially against all heretical sects, which are cursed in it by their several designations, their excommunication renewed, and the same punishment threatened to all who should be guilty of schism, sacrifice, usurpation of the rights of the Church or of the pope, forgery, unlawful seizure of Church property, personal violence against ecclesiastics, unlawful interruption of the free intercourse of the faithful with Rome, etc. The bull, however, although, as indicated, mainly dealing with offences against the Church, also denounces, under similar censures, the crimes of piracy, plunder of shipwrecked goods, forgery, etc. This bull, being regarded by most of the crowned heads of Europe as an infringement of their rights, was in the 17th century opposed by nearly all the courts, even the most Roman Catholic; and at length, in 1770, according to some authorities (e. g. Drury, History of the Church, 1790; Clement XIV discontinued its publication). Januar. (Pope and Council, p. 387), however, says that it is still treated in the Roman tribunals as having legal force, and, according to the accounts of some eminent travelers who have visited Rome, it appears that the sentence of excommunication is still read, though in a more simple form. Eliza von der Recke (Tagbueck einer Reise durch einen Theil Deutslands u. d. Italien, Berlin, 1817, 4, 95), under date of April 6, 1806, relates that after the pope had blessed the people from the balcony of the church of St. Peter, "he read out a paper, then tore it, and threw the fragments down among the people. A great tumult then arose, every one striving to secure a piece of the paper, but I do not know for what purpose, for, as I was told, the paper contained nothing but the form of excommunication always pronounced on this occasion against all who are not Romanists. This concluded the festival." This bull is confirmed three times, 1728, 1749, 1791, by cellor Gotting, of Jena, relates as having seen in his journey in 1829 (in Rahr, Kritische Predigerbibliothek, xi, 379 sq.). It thus seems proved that the bull itself, whose § xxii says: "Volentes presents nostros processus se omnibus et quoscumque simile bonum ac aliis quidem sortis," is not completely abolished yet. No pope has so far substituted a new bull for the old, and its principles concerning the cases re-
served for the pope are yet in full force. In the *Historisch-politische Blätter* of Phillips and Gorres (Munich, 1847, vol. xxi) we find it stated that "In foro conscientiae, the bull is only valid yet in so far as its stipulations have not in other acts been altered by the Church herself." Its efficiency in former times, however, is everywhere opposed in self-defense by the civil powers. For the special history of this bull, and proofs of its present validity in the Romish Church, see Biber, Bull in Canon Domini, trans. (London 1848); Biber, Papal Diplomacy and the Bull in Canon Domini (London 1848); Lebrecht, Geschichte d. Bullen (Leips. 1768, 4 vols.); Herzog, Real-Encyklop. viii, 945; Chambers, Cyclop. v. 530; Schirrmüller, Gesch. des. Reriform. iii, 266, 387; Janus, Pope and Council, p. 384 sq.; cardinal Erkine to Sir J.C. Hipplesey, in Rep. of Comm. of House of Commons on the Laws regarding the Regulation of the Roman Cath. subjects (1816, p. 216). (J. H. W.)

**Incommunicableness or Gon.** The divine attributes have been variously divided. One of the divisions sets the attributes of God forth as communicable and incommunicable. As the former are regarded such attributes as can be imparted from the Creator to the creature, e.g., those of holiness, wisdom, love, etc., and as the latter such are considered as cannot be imparted, as independence, immutability, immensity, and eternity. See Dorner, Person of Christ, div. ii, i, 185 sq.; ii, 193 sq. See also the article God (Dogmatical Treatment of the Doctrine of) vol. iii, p. 587 sq.

**Impersonality of God.** This is a relative term, and indicates a relation between an object and a faculty; between God and a created understanding; so that the meaning of it is, that no created understanding can comprehend God; that is, has a perfect and exact knowledge of him, such a knowledge as is adequate to the perfection of the object (Job xxii, 7; Is. xi). God is incomprehensible. 1. As to the nature of his essence; 2. The excellency of his attributes; 3. The depth of his counsels; 4. The works of his providence; 5. The dispensation of his grace (Eph. iii, 8; Job xxxvii, 25; Rom. vii, 25)." (The Incomprehensibility of God follows.)

1. From his being a spirit endowed with perfections greatly superior to our own. 2. There may be (for anything we certainly know) attributes and perfections in God of which we have not the least idea. 3. In those perfections of the divine nature of which we have some idea, there is no resemblance to us inbedad, and with which, the more deeply and attentively we think of them, the more we find our thoughts swallowed up, such as his self-existence, eternity, omnipresence, etc. This should teach us, therefore, 1. To admire and reverence the divine Being (Zech. ix, 17; Neh. ix, 6); 2. To be humble and modest (Ps. viii, 1; 4; Job xxvii, 19); 3. To be serious in our addresses, and sincere in our behavior toward him. (Caryl, On Job xxxiv, 25; Tillotson, Sermons, sermon clvi; Abernethy, Sermons, vol. ii, nos. 6, 7; Dodgshire, Lectures on Divinity, lecture 69; Martens, Dogmatik, p. 96; Buch, Theolog. Dictionary, s. v.) See God.

**Incomprehensible.** This word, as occurring in the English Prayer-book, is understood, at the present day, in a sense quite different from what was designed when it was first introduced into the formularies. The word first used in the Athanasian Creed is said, "The Father incomprehensible," etc., the meaning is, "the Father is (immemor. i.e.) infinite," etc.: a Being not to be comprised (comprehendens) within the limits of space.

**Incognitability.** The quality of both natures in Christ, which does not admit of a change of either into the other.

**Incorporatus.** A title in monasteries of the priest who has the administration of the convent estates, the collection of interest and other monies due the monastery, etc.

**Incorporation.** The incorporation of a church benefice consists in its being joined quod spiritualia of temporalia with a spiritual corporation, such, for instance, as a convent or a monastery. We find many instances of such incorporations in the 9th century, and they were most generally the result of efforts to increase the revenues of the corporations. The modus operandi was to make the separate office connected with the benefice, and to graft the temporal advowson of the corporation, which also added the additional offices connected therewith to its other duties, supplying them with ministerial services. For instance, a regular pastor (prio- rockus principalis) was appointed, who committed the care of souls to a vicar apostolic, under the immediate supervision of the bishop. This vicar then filled the office of cura animarum actualis, whilst the convent or monas- ty had but a cura habitualis. The canon laws in such cases soon prescribed the appointment of permanent vicars (vicarii perpetui), although in many in- stances, especially in Germany, many convents appoint- ed only temporary vicars, and even intrusted the care of souls to members of their order who did not reside in the parishes. Essentially different from these "pigna juris" or "urotage juris" incorporations were exclusively temporal unions of the revenues of livings with spiritual corporations. Such incorporations were known as *incorporationes quoad temporalia*. In these cases the in- come only of the livings went to the convents, together with all the revenues accruing therefrom, they in ex- change undertaking to give to the incumbent minister in an unparochial character spiritual office, *spiritualia*, remained unaffected by this arrange- ment, and was filled by the bishop, according to the wishes of the convent. The numerous abuses which were introduced in both these kinds of incorporations were denounced by the Council of Trent (Sess. 7, c. 7. De reform.). The council also forbade the union of parish churches with convents, monasteries, hospitals, etc. (Sess. 24, c. 13; Sess. 7, De reform. c. 6). In conse- quence the secularization of convents and monaster- ies, the whole organization has mostly fallen into dis- use; the parish administrators are about the only re- mains of the incorporation system. See Nelle *Iuris- ribus parochii primiaries* (in Schmid, Theolur. jur. exc. 11. 441 sq.); Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, vol. iv, 649.

**Incorporeality of God, is being without a body.** That God is incorporeal is evident; for 1. Materiality is incompatible with self-existence, and God, being self-existent, must be incorporeal. 2. If God were corporeal, that which is not present in all parts of the world where body is; yet his presence is necessary for the support and motion of body. 3. A body cannot be in two places at the same time; yet he is everywhere, and fills heaven and earth. 4. A body is to be seen and felt, but God is invisible and impalpable (John xiv, 9). See Charnock, Works, i, 117; Gill, Body of Divinity, i. 45. See: Dodgshire, Lectures on Divinity, lect. 41. See God.

**Incorruptibilities.** An extreme sect of Euchthians (q. v.), who held that the body of Christ was incorruptible, i.e. "that from the time that his body was formed it was not susceptible to any change or corruption; that he was not even subject to innocent passions or appettites, such as hunger or thirst, but that he ate without any occasion both before his death and after his resurrection." See APHTHARTODOTICA; MONOPHYSITES.

**Incorruptibility.** See INCORRUPTIBILITIES.

**Incredulity.** See INDIFFERENCE; UNBELIEF.

**Incumbent.** A clergyman in the Church of England who is in present possession of (incomitendi, is close to, rentas upon, as its immediate occupant) a benefice (Eden). Sir E. Coke, however, says that the title means that the clergyman "in possession of a benefice ought diligently to bend all his study to the care of his church."
treated it so much at length that we insert his remarks on this subject, which he treats under the two heads of (1) Perpetuity, and (2) Inerrancy and Infallibility. The former, he argues, frees the Church from failure in succession of members; the latter two free it from failure in the world and declaring the truth. *Both* these flow from the essence and nature of the mystical body of Christ. The Scriptures, in their essence and in their office as the voice of Christ, are John xv; 1 Cor. vi, 19; xii, 12; Eph. i, 23; iv, 12; v, 80; Col. i, 18, and cannot be explained away into metaphor. As Christ's natural body was incorruptible, and yet before the resurrection was liable to human infirmity and death, its mystical body, the Church, not glorified, is liable in each one of its many members to sin and falling from grace; but nothing can touch the life of the body itself. *As also the fulness of the Spirit dwells in Christ, and Christ was the Truth, so the Spirit, by virtue of whose indwelling he is one, and one with its Head, guides the Church into all truth.*

I. Perpetuity of the Church.—Plain promises of this are made in Isa. lxi, 8, 9; Dan. ii, 44; Matt. xvi, 18; xxviii, 20; John xiv, 16, 17. There are also arguments to be drawn for it from the consideration of God's counsel and purpose. The consummation of all things is declared in God by Christ, and his church (2 Pet. iii, 7; Rev. vi, 9-11). When faith fails in the earth, the end will be (Luke xviii, 8). This is as regards God, in whose work we cannot suppose an interruption. So, too, as regards man. God will have all men to be saved, and will come to theknowledge of the truth. The Church, which is the pillar and ground of the truth, will fail without a failure of God's mercy. So long as there are men capable of salvation (and all men are capable of salvation, since Christ died for all), so long will the Church be preserved, that it may be added both of salvation to the church (1 Cor. i, 24). The Spirit of God is given to the Church as a whole. Each branch of the Church is on its probation, as is each individual member. And the law of probation, the law of their participation in the promise, is the same: *He that hath, to him shall be given.* To argue that because each particular church may fail, therefore the whole may fail, is not only a fallacy in logic, but a denial of Christ's power to impart to the whole that which he does not impart to each particular member.*

II. Inerrancy and Infallibility of the Church.—The following premises and arguments show that the Church will not fail either by dying out or by infallibility. As the work of the Spirit will not fail in bringing sons to God, so it will never fail in providing that there shall always be a body persevering in the faith according to the election of grace. This is to be considered more particularly as regards the truth of doctrine as well as of life. For this also, there are promises, e.g. John xvi, 13; 1 John ii, 27. The spirit which dwells in the Church is likewise declared to be the spirit of knowledge and understanding (Col. i, 9; ii, 3; iii, 10). Less can be implied in these words than that the Church shall always have a tenure of the truth sufficient for salvation. They show further, that any doctrine which can be said to be the decreed and ascertained voice of the Church must be from God, whose Spirit is in the Church. But they cannot be pressed so far as to prove that the Church may not for a time hold such an error as does not directly deny the foundation of faith, even if it does not directly involve an error, which by logical consequence denies the foundation of faith, is not to be taken as such a denial. The consequence may not be perceived, and if perceived the premises would be at once rejected. The case is doubtful as to the probability, but its possibility must be conceded. Whether we can say that the voice of the Church is sufficiently ascertained? This leads us on from the inerrancy, or passive infallibility, to the active infallibility, or declaration of the faith. No actual limits of time can be set for which, if a doctrine has been held, it must be considered as the ascertained decision of the Church. The circumstances of the Church may not be such as to lead to investigation. Ten years in one period may cause more shifting of the truth than a hundred years of another period. It is the condition of the Church militant to be always under trial, sometimes by persecution from the world, sometimes by blasts of contrary doctrine within itself. In different degrees these are blended, and with very different degrees of speed, will the truth of the Church be preserved. Holiness also, and above all, will regulate the discovery and reception of truth. For knowledge and understanding in spiritual things are the flower and fruit; the plant itself is holiness springing from the root of faith. The Spirit, then, of a doctrine ascertained by the Church is a growing certainty, varying in amount with the time the doctrine has been held, the degree of investigation to which it has been subjected, and the degree of holiness in the Church. Thus the decrees of a council which we may believe to be eccumenical can only be known to be the genuine voice of the Church by their acceptance. We may agree to the abstract proposition that a truly eccumenical council cannot err; but the proposition is of little practical value at the time of holding a council, for none can prove that the council has not in some respects failed of eccumenicity. The truth and authority of its decisions rests on their acceptance. For the Spirit of God is given to the whole body of the Church; and that can only be known to be the true voice of the Church which is expressed by sufficient delibration of generation after generation. In this sense the infallibility of the Church is a reasonable doctrine, and one, in fact, it would be unreasonable for any Christian to disbelieve.

Indefectible Grace is, according to the Calvinists, grace which cannot be lost, or fail of its intended purpose, the salvation of those on whom it is bestowed, i.e. the elect, and is held to be irresistible by the person so elected, the procedure requiring no salvation. See Calvinism; Election; Grace; Will.

Indelible Character. See Character, Indelible.

Indemnity (Latin *indecimus*, compensation) is in some churches a pension paid to the bishop in consideration of discharging or indemnifying churches, united or appropriated, from the payment of procurations, or by way of recompense for the profit which the bishop would otherwise have received during the time of the vacation of such churches.

Independence of Churches. "It is an admitted fact, as clearly settled as anything can be by human authority, that the primitive Christians, in the organization of their assemblies, formed them after the model of the Jewish synagogue. . . . They disowned the he- reditary aristocracy of the Levitical priesthood, and adopted the popular government of the synagogue. . . . Their government was voluntary, elective, free, and administered by rulers or elders elected by the people. The ruler of the synagogue was the moderator of the college of elders, but only *primus inter parres*, holding no official rank above them. The people, *concilia* (Heb. *synagogoi*, lib. iii, p. 1, c. xv, p. 828-825) has shown, appointed their own officers to rule over them. They exercised the natural right of freemen to enact and execute their own laws, to admit proselytes, and to exclude plebeious unworthy members from their communion. Theirs was a democratic form of government, and it is so described by one of the most able expounders of the constitution of the primitive churches (see Rothe, *An- fange d. Christl. Kirche*, p. 14). Like their prototype, therefore, the primitive churches also embodied the principle of a popular government and the enlightened religious liberty" (Coleman, *Apostol*, i, p. 270, n. 3; p. 43 sq.). The reason, however, why the primitive Chris- tians had this peculiar organization, reintroduced in the modern church by the Congregationalists, and in part also by the Presbyterians, is, that the members of the early Christian Church mostly came from the Jewish.
church, and naturally adopted methods of worship, government, etc., to which they were accustomed. But this by no means goes to prove that it was the intention of the early Christians to perpetuate their mode of government, but rather that, engaged as Christ and his disciples had been in founding a Church, needing no other than their own persons, to the mode of government to which they had been accustomed was chosen for the time being, "the disciples not having yet attained to a clear understanding of that call which Christ had already given them by so many intimations to form a Church, and raised from the existing Jewish economy. . . . We are disposed to believe that the Church was at first composed entirely of members standing on an equality with one another, and that the apostles alone held a higher rank, and exercised a directing influence over the whole, which arose from the original position in which Christ had placed them in relation to other believers; so that the whole arrangement and administration of the affairs of the Church proceeded from them, and they were first induced by particular circumstances to appoint other church officers, as in the instance of deacons" (Neander, Apostol. Kirche, 3d edit. p. 41, 88; comp. p. 172, 189). In John vi. 1; xi. 80. Christ also evidently did make some provision for a government of his Church on earth independent of Jewish and pagan customs by constituting apostles, who should authoritatively command and teach. (See ACTS.) The church of the early Christians also, unlike the Jewish, were independent one of the other. History, sacred or profane, relating to this period, records not a single instance in which one church presumed to impose laws of its own upon another. The first traces of associations between several churches, from which councils can be said to have taken their origin, we find in the 2d century (Colesman, De Robus Christi, sec. i. § 48). Indications of this original independence are distinctly manifested even after the rise of the episcopacy. Every bishop had the right to form his own liturgy and creed, and to settle at pleasure his own time and mode of celebrating the religious festivals (compare Crelling, Apostolische Christengemeine, p. 16). Cyprian strongly asserts the right of every bishop to make laws for his own church. Indeed, it is to this original independence of the churches of each other, to the war of all against all, that the Socrates (Eccles. Hist. lib. v., c. xxii.) attributes the endless controversies which agitated the Church in the early ages with regard to the observance of certain festivals, especially Easter. See, besides the authorities already cited, Sack, Comment. ad Theol. Inst. p. 141; Bunsen, Hippolytus, c. 19; Dr. Hirsch, in the Amer. Preb. Rev. Jan. 1867. See also Episcopacy, vol. iii., p. 263, 264, 266 (iv). (J. H. W.)

Independence of God is his existence in and of himself, without depending on any other being. "His being and perfections," as Dr. Ridgely observes (Body of Divinity, p. 7), "are undervived, and not communicated to him, as all finite perfections are by him to the creation. This attribute of independence belongs to all his perfections. 1. He is independent as to his knowledge. He doth not receive ideas from any object out of himself, as intelligent creatures do. This is elegantly described by the prophet, Isa. xli. 13, 14. 2. He is independent in power. As he receives strength from no one, so he doth not act dependently on the will of the creature (Job xxxvi. 23). 3. He is independent as to his holiness, hating sin necessarily, and not barely depending on some reasons out of himself inducing him thereto; for it is essential to the divine nature to be infinitely opposite to sin. 4. He is independent as to his bounty and goodness. He communicates blessings not by constraint, but according to his sovereign will. Thus he gave being to the world, and all things therein, which was the first instance of bounty and goodness; and this not by restraint, but by his free will: 'for his pleasure they are and were created.' In like manner, whatever instances of mercy he extends to miserable creatures, acts independently and not by force. He shows mercy, because it is his pleasure to do so (Rom. ix. 18). That God is independent, let it be further considered, 1. That all things depend on his power which are any way dependent on any cause. If, therefore, all things depend on God, then it would be absurd to say that God depends on anything, for this would be to suppose the cause and effect to be mutually dependent on and derived from each other, which involves a contradiction. 2. If God be infinitely above the highest creature, he must be infinitely independent of all creatures, for dependence argues inferiority (Isa. xl. 15, 17). 3. If God depend on any creature, he does not exist necessarily; and if so, then he might not have been; for the same will by which he is supposed to exist might have determined that he should not have existed, which is altogether inconsistent with the idea of a God. From God's being independent, we infer, 1. That we ought to conclude that the creature cannot lay any obligation on him, or do anything that may tend to make him more happy than he is in himself (Rom. xi. 35; Job xxii. 2, 3). 2. If independence be a divine perfection, let it be esteemed above all others, or by any consequence, be attributed to the creature; let us conclude that all our springs are in him, and that all we enjoy and hope for is from him, who is the author and finisher of our faith, and the fountain of all our blessings." See God.

Independent Baptists. See Baptists.

Independents, a name given to certain bodies of Christians who assert that each Christian congregation is independent of all others, and from all ecclesiastical authority except its own. Some writers inaccurately use this name as synonymous with "Congregationalists," and others are thus led to consider the latter as the independent of individual character. "The churches of New England are congregational. They do not approve the name of 'Independent,' and are abhorrent of such principles of independence as would keep them from giving an account of their matters to neighboring churches, regularly demanding it of them" (Mather). See Congregationalists.

I. History.—After the reformation of religion in England, the greater body of Protestants adopted the Episcopal form of Church polity, and this was finally established as the religion of the nation. But the smaller body, the Independents, opposed episcopacy, and maintained that it too nearly resembled the Roman Catholic form of Church polity, and these so-called Nonconformists (q.v.) came to be stigmatized by the derisive name of Puritans, which the followers of Novatian had borne in the third century. To this class (i.e. Nonconformists) belong the Independents, who claim that their system is substantially the same as that of the apostolic churches, which had been corrupted by the tendencies that culminated in papacy, and that traces of dissent from the episcopal power may be found in every age back to the 4th century (see Purchas, History of Congregationalism). They are supposed to have originated in England about the year 1581, under the leadership of Robert Brown, bearing the name of Brownists (q.v.); but Richard Fitz is generally named as the first pastor of the first Independent church in England (compare 'The Life of the Rev. Charles Fox, by himself'). The persecution which they were obliged to endure from the Established Church soon necessitated the emigration of these first Independents, and they removed to the Netherlands. Deserted by Brown, who conformed, and became attached to the Church of England, they chose as their leader John Rolle, who was called the chief merit of a better organization of them. Brown, who, by the persecutions which, as a Nonconformist, he had to endure, had become greatly embittered, had, with hardly less bigotry than his persecutors, declared all other forms of Church government not only inconsistent, but denounced them in the severest terms, even...
branding them as anti-christian. Robinson, however, while holding his own to be the most apostolical form, counselled recognition of all other forms and Christian fellowship, looking upon charity as the end of the commandments. The names also which they had hitherto borne, in no case accorded with that of independent, in his apology, having affirmed "Cestum quibiis particularem, esse totum, integram, et perfectam ecclesiam ex sua partibus constantem immediate et independente [quoad alias eccles. sub ipso Christo]."

In 1616, a friend and colaborer of Robinson, Henry Jacob, removed to London, and in the same year incorporated an Independent Church at London, which has oftentimes, though incorrectly, been termed "the first Independent Church in England" (compare vol. ii, p. 476). "From this, as a nucleus, Independency gradually spread through England, and, in spite of the harsh measures of Laud and the court, came, in the middle of the 17th century, to occupy a dominant place among the powers by which the destinies of England were swayed."

A prominent place was occupied by the Independents at the Westminster Assembly, they taking an active part in the debates as to the proper order of Church government; "deating all things," says Beilie, "which came within twenty miles of their quarters," and evidently astonishing the "churchmen" by their "great learning, quickness, and eloquence, together with their great courtesy and discretion in speaking." Sketches of the Westminster Assembly show that "unofficially" the representatives of the Independents, some five or six in number, "prayed to be inducted into the proposed National Church, the conditions being that the power of ordination should be reserved to their own congregations, and that they might be subject, in Church matters, to Parliament, but not to any superior authority." As they were unsuccessful in this attempt, however, it is believed that, though few in number, they yet prevented the Presbyterians from accomplishing at least their object, standing "in the breach against the advance of a new State Church, which, if better in many respects than the old national, would have been worse in other respects." But it was only after the accession of Oliver Cromwell (himself an Independent) to the protectorate that the Independents gained the ascendancy, and became "the most powerful and important part of the commonwealth of God in England, life of Samuel Rutherford, chap. viii.). The greatest statesmen of England were Independents; the army was Independent in the main; and Independent ministers held appointments as chaplains, or filled leading positions in the universities; among them, most prominently, William Sydney and Godfrey."

"In the course of time these synods were strengthened among themselves, an Assembly was decided to be held at the Savoy. Ministers and deacons of more than a hundred congregations thereupon convened, Sept. 29, 1658, and on Oct. 12 (a few weeks before Oliver Cromwell's death) they adopted and issued a confession of faith and discipline, which was named a "Declaration." Of this declaration the following were fundamental propositions: "A particular Church consists of officers and members: the Lord Christ having given to his called ones—united in Church order—liberty and power to choose persons fitted by the Holy Ghost, and elected in their stead by the Lord, appointed by Christ to be chosen and set apart by the Church are pastors, teachers, elders, and deacons. The way appointed by Christ for the calling of any person unto the office of pastor, teacher, or elder in a church is that he be chosen thereunto by the consistory or session of the Church itself, and solemnly set apart by fasting and prayer, with the imposition of hands of the eldership of that Church, if there be any before constituted therein; and of a deacon, that he be chosen by the like suffrage, and set apart by prayer, and the like imposition; and these offices being thus constitut
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like other nonconforming "sects," suffered from illiberal enactments, especially from the "Act of Uniformity," which was passed in 1662. "Independents" was a term used to describe these religious groups. The Act of Uniformity, however, was the most severe of all enactments against dissenters. Some 2000 of the ablest and best of England's clergy were forced to leave the Church. They included Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, and not a few whom it would be difficult to reduce entirely under any of those denominations; both Calvinists and Arminians, with other divines scarcely belonging to either of those schools. In point of learning, eloquence, reasoning, and imagination, they are the most remarkable of the dissenting bodies. They have been so great that they have become the largest dissenting body in England except the Wesleyan Methodists. In 1831 a "Congregational Union of England and Wales" was formed, and their "Declaration of Faith, Order, and Discipline" was adopted in 1833. According to the report of 1860, the number of their churches in England, Ireland, and Wales, is given at 4726, of which 294 were vacant. The sittings provide for 1,563,919 persons. The Independents, who have always evinced great interest in education, at present control 61 colleges and training colleges, with a staff of twenty-six professors.

These are,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Date of Conclusion</th>
<th>No. of Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western College, Plymouth</td>
<td>1725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotherham College</td>
<td>1726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brecon College</td>
<td>1760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester College</td>
<td>1767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airedale College, Bradford</td>
<td>1784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hackney College</td>
<td>1785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster College</td>
<td>1838</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring Hill, Birmingham</td>
<td>1884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New College, London</td>
<td>1850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavenham College, Newcastle</td>
<td>1860</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cong. Institute, Nottingham</td>
<td>1861</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. Doctrines.—"In support of their scheme of Congregational churches, the Independents observe that the word εὐκαστία, which we translate 'church,' is always used in the New Testament in a significant and distinctive sense, and not in the ordinary language, or the place where a single congregation meets. Thus that unlawful assembly at Ephesus, brought together against Paul by the craftsmen, is called ἐκκλησία, a church (Acts xix, 32, 39, 41). The word, however, is generally applied to a more sacred use, but still it signifies either the body assembling, or the place in which it assembles. The whole body of the disciples at Corinth is called the Church, and spoken of as coming together into one place (1 Cor., iv, 23). The place into which they came together we find likewise called a church: 'When ye come together into one place, Paul said, do not eat beforehand' (1 Cor., x, 29). But there were more congregations than one, there were likewise more churches than one. Thus, 'Let your women keep silence in the churches, iv τὰς ἐκκλησίας (1 Cor., xiv, 34). The whole nation of Israel is indeed called a church, but it was no more than a single congregation, for it had but one place of public worship, namely, first the tabernacle, and afterwards the temple. The catholic Church of Christ, his holy nation and kingdom, is likewise a single congregation, having one place of worship, that is, heaven, where all the members assemble by faith and hold communion; and in which, when they shall all be fully gathered together, they will in fact be one glorious assembly. Accordingly we find it called 'the general assembly and church of the first-born, whose names are written in heaven.' Besides these, the Independent can find no other distinction of a church from the Testament, except that of the outward assembly or presbytery consisting of several congregations, all subject to one jurisdiction. The number of disciples in Jerusalem was certainly great before they were dispersed by the persecution in which Paul bore so active a part. Yet they are never mentioned as forming distinct assemblies, but assembling in two's and three's, elders in one place—sometimes in the Temple, sometimes in Solomon's porch, and sometimes in an upper room. After the dispersion, the disciples who fled from Jerusalem, as they could no longer assemble in one
place, are never called a Church by themselves, or one church, but the churches of Judea, Samaria, and Galilee (Acts ix, 31; Gal. i, 22). Hence the Independent concludes that in Jerusalem the words church and congregation were of the same import; and if such was the case, the phrase 'called by of his own accord,' was not intended, but this means we may reasonably expect to find it so in other places. Thus, when Paul, on his journey, calls the elders of the Church of Ephesus to Miletus, he speaks to them as the joint overseers of a single congregation: 'Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers,' (Acts xx, 28). Had the Church at Ephesus consisted of different congregations, united under such a jurisdiction as that of a modern presbytery, it would have been natural to say, 'Take heed to yourselves, and to the flocks over which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers of such.' But this is a way of speaking of which the Independent finds no instance in the whole of the New Testament. 

The sacred writers, when speaking of all the Christians in a nation or province, never call them the Church of such a nation or province, but 'the church of Galatia' (Gal. i, 2), 'the sheep of Christ's pasture' (1 Cor. ii, 2), 'the church of Asia' (1 Cor. xvi, 19). On the other hand, when speaking of the disciples in a city or town who might ordain or assemble in one place, they uniformly call them a Church as, 'the Church of Antioch,' 'the Church at Corinth,' 'the Church of Ephesus,' and the like. 

In each of these churches or congregations there were bishops, sometimes called 'elders,' and deacons; and in every church there seems to have been more than one elder, and in some a great many, 'who all labored in word and doctrine.' Thus we read (Acts xvi, 20) of Paul and Barnabas ordaining elders to be bishops and deacons in every church; and (Acts xx, 17) of a company of elders in the Church of Ephesus, who were exhorted to 'feed the flock,' and to take heed to themselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers of such. 

But this is a finding in modern Presbyterian churches, wherein neither teacher nor are fit to teach, the Independent finds no vestige in the Scriptures, nor in the earliest uninspired writers of the Christian Church. The rule or government of this presbytery or eldership in a church is not their own, but Christ's. They are not, 'guardians of the heritage, nor can they pretend to power over the churches than the apostles possessed. But when the administration of the apostles in the Church of Jerusalem, and other churches where they acted as elders, is inquired into by an Independent, it does not appear to him that this is the case. He did not go to God's Church without the consent of the multitude; nay, it seems they thought it necessary to judge and determine in discipline, in presence of the whole Church (Acts vi, 1-6; xvi, 22; 1 Cor. v, 3, 4, 5). 

Excommunication and absolution were in the power of the Church at Corinth, and not of the elders as distinguished from the congregation (1 Cor. v, 2; 2 Cor. xi). The apostle, indeed, speaks of his delivering some unto Satan (1 Tim. i, 20); but it is by no means clear that he did it by himself, and not after the manner pointed out in 1 Cor. v, 4, 5; even as it does not appear from his saying the same in the epistle, 'that the gift was given unto Timothy by putting on of his hands,' that this was not done in the presbytery of a Church, as in the other epistle we find it actually was. 

The trying and judging of false apostles was a matter of the first importance, but it was done by the elders of the Church, not by the apostles. They conformed to the public churches, not to the private ones. 

The power of binding and loosing, or the power of the keys, as it has been called, was by our Saviour conferred, not upon a particular order of disciples, but upon the church of the whole world (Matt. xvi, 19; etc.); and that whole flock did, in the days of Ignatius, all partake of the Lord's Supper, and pray together in one place. Even the power of binding and loosing, or the power of the keys, as it has been called, was by our Saviour conferred, not upon a particular order of disciples, but upon the church of the whole world (Matt. xvi, 19; etc.).

As to the statement that 'in every place where we have been two or three, God is in the middle' (Matt. xvii, 20), it is certainly not to be applied to the office of a bishop or pope. The phrase is spoken by Christ not to the church as a whole, but to the disciples who persevered in prayer and fasting, and were instructed by the Holy Spirit to perform miracles (Acts x, 38). Thus, when Paul, on his journey, calls the elders of the Church of Ephesus to Miletus, he speaks to them as the joint overseers of a single congregation: 'Take heed to yourselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers,' (Acts xx, 28). Had the Church at Ephesus consisted of different congregations, united under such a jurisdiction as that of a modern presbytery, it would have been natural to say, 'Take heed to yourselves, and to the flocks over which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers of such.' But this is a way of speaking of which the Independent finds no instance in the whole of the New Testament. 

The sacred writers, when speaking of all the Christians in a nation or province, never call them the Church of such a nation or province, but 'the church of Galatia' (Gal. i, 2), 'the church of Christ's pasture' (1 Cor. ii, 2), 'the church of Asia' (1 Cor. xvi, 19). On the other hand, when speaking of the disciples in a city or town who might ordain or assemble in one place, they uniformly call them a Church as, 'the church of Antioch,' 'the church of Corinth,' 'the church of Ephesus,' and the like. 

In each of these churches or congregations there were bishops, sometimes called 'elders,' and deacons; and in every church there seems to have been more than one elder, and in some a great many, 'who all labored in word and doctrine.' Thus we read (Acts xvi, 20) of Paul and Barnabas ordaining elders to be bishops and deacons in every church; and (Acts xx, 17) of a company of elders in the Church of Ephesus, who were exhorted to 'feed the flock,' and to take heed to themselves, and to all the flock over which the Holy Ghost has made you overseers of such. But this is a finding in modern Presbyterian churches, wherein neither teacher nor are fit to teach, the Independent finds no vestige in the Scriptures, nor in the earliest uninspired writers of the Christian Church. The rule or government of this presbytery or eldership in a church is not their own, but Christ's. They are not, 'guardians of the heritage, nor can they pretend to power over the churches than the apostles possessed. But when the administration of the apostles in the Church of Jerusalem, and other churches where they acted as elders, is inquired into by an Independent, it does not appear to him that this is the case. He did not go to God's Church without the consent of the multitude; nay, it seems they thought it necessary to judge and determine in discipline, in presence of the whole Church (Acts vi, 1-6; xvi, 22; 1 Cor. v, 3, 4, 5). 

Excommunication and absolution were in the power of the Church at Corinth, and not of the elders as distinguished from the congregation (1 Cor. v, 2; 2 Cor. xi). The apostle, indeed, speaks of his delivering some unto Satan (1 Tim. i, 20); but it is by no means clear that he did it by himself, and not after the manner pointed out in 1 Cor. v, 4, 5; even as it does not appear from his saying the same in the epistle, that the gift was given unto Timothy by putting on of his hands,' that this was not done in the presbytery of a Church, as in the other epistle we find it actually was. 

The trying and judging of false apostles was a matter of the first importance, but it was done by the elders of the Church, not by the apostles. They conformed to the public churches, not to the private ones. 

The power of binding and loosing, or the power of the keys, as it has been called, was by our Saviour conferred, not upon a particular order of disciples, but upon the church of the whole world (Matt. xvi, 19; etc.).
the most holy people on earth, yet, if he answer not the New-Testament description of a minister, he is not call
ed to that office, and is no minister of Christ, but is indeed running unseen. No form of ordination can pretend to such clear foundation in the New-Testament as the description of the person who should be elders of the Church; and the laying on of hands is of small importance in the mission of a minister of Christ; for now, when the power of miracles has ceased, it is obvi-
ous that such a rite, by whomever performed, can only be a special form of ordinary or express work. Indeed, it appears to have been sometimes used, even in the apostolic age, without any such intention. When Paul and Barnabas were separated to the particular employ-
ment of going out to the Gentiles, the prophets and teachers at Antioch 'prayed, and laid their hands on them.' But did this ceremony confer upon them, or any new power or authority to act as ministers of Christ? Did the imposition of hands make those shining lights of the Gospel one whist better qualified than they were before to convert and baptize the nations, to feed the flock of God, to teach, rebuke, or exhort, with all long-
suffering and doctrine? In answer, it cannot be pretended that there was any special virtue in this ceremony. Paul and Barnabas had undoubtedly received the Holy Ghost before they came to Antioch; and, as they were apostles, they were of course authorized to discharge all the functions of the inferior and ordinary ministers of the Gospel. God never provided, however, the imposition of hands appears to have been a mark of recognition of the parties as qualified for the work to which they were appointed, so Independents usually impose the hands of the bishops with the same intent. In a word, whoever in his life and conversation is conformable to the charac-
ter which the inspired writers give of a bishop, and is likewise qualified by his 'rightness in the Scrip-
ture' to discharge the duties of that office, is fully au-
thorized to administer the sacraments of baptism and the Lord's Supper, to teach, and exhort, and rebuke, with all long-suffering and doctrine. And has all the call and mission which the Lord now gives to any man; while he who wants the qualifications mentioned has not God's call, whatever he may have, nor any author-
ity to preach the Gospel of Christ, or to dispense the ordinances of his religion. From this view of the In-
dependent and patristic method, it is evident that the whole of their own writers, it appears that, according to them, even the election of a congregation conveys upon the in-
dividual whom they may choose for their pastor no new powers, but only creates a new relation between him and a particular flock, giving him an influence, and a right, either personal or in conjunction with other pastors constituted in the same manner, to exercise among them that authority which he derives immediately from Christ, and which, in a greater or less degree, is pos-
sessed by every sincere Christian according to his gifts and abilities' (Encyclop. Bibr. xii, 370-372).

III. Scottish, or New Independents.—In Scotland Inde-
pendence originated with John Glash (q. v.). The Bap-
tists there, as elsewhere, are Independents. The regular Congregationalists are also numerous. See Congre-
gationalists. Apart from these, there is a body called 'New Independents.' 'In December, 1727, Robert Hal-
dane (q. v.) formed a Society for Propagating the Gos-
pel at Home.' The object of this society was to send forth men to preach the Gospel in those parts of Scotland where they conceived that this blessing was not enjoyed in its purity, or where it was not regularly dispensed. Admitting that it is the Christian who knows the Gos-
pel, and is duly qualified, to preach it to his fellow-sinners, James Haldane, brother of Robert, Mr. Aikman, and others, travelled through the greater part of Scotland, and preached. In a short time the Messrs. Haldane separated from the Church of Scot-
land, and were joined by other ministers of the National Church, Innes and Ewing, resigned their charges, and united with the Haldanes and their associates. A dis-
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\[\text{distinct society was soon formed, at the head of which were the Haldanes; and hence its members have been also called Haldinists, or Haldinists Independents. Large places of public worship, denominational Tabernacles, were erected in Edinburgh, Haddington, and other principal towns, where the Word of God was declared to numerous assemblies, both by these ministers and others from various denominations in England. At the expense chiefly, if not solely, of Robert Haldane, academies were also formed at Edinburgh, Dundee, and Glasgow, for the ed-
ification of the young, from the 11th to the 18th century, who, when deemed qualified for preaching the Gospel, were to be employed as itinerants, under the inspection and countenance of the 'Society for Propagating the Gospel at Home.' Thus a succession of teachers was secured.}\]

\[\text{The doctrines of the Scottish Independents are Cal-
vinistic, and weighing against articles of faith of human com-
position. They say that the Scriptures are a divine and infallible standard, and that consistent Inde-
pendents dare not adopt any other. They insist that the Scri-
ptures contain a full and complete model and system of doctrine, government, discipline, and worship, and that in them may we find a universal rule for the direction of Christians in their associated state, as well as all necessary instructions for the faith and practice of individuals. They require Scripture for everything, even for such things as could not be contained in Scrip-
ture. For this, they reject the authority of the civil mag-
istrate in matters of religion, and respect the Scripture and nothing else, as binding in the worship of God. They conceive the Church of Christ, as exhibited in Scripture, to be an association which has no head on earth, and which, as a body, can receive no laws from any one, except from Christ alone. But this National Church as 'the very essence of Antichrist.' They lay it down as a fundamental principle that a Christian Church ought to consist of believers, or of those who give evidence of their knowing and believing the Gospel, united together on the profession of its truths, except from Christ alone.}\]

\[\text{As to Church government, they believe that the apo-
sitolic churches, according to the model of which it is their great and professed object to conform, were entirely independent of each other. Therefore, they have no con-
nection with any ecclesiastical or civil authority, but one from the more early Independents in admitting Chris-
tians of all religious denominations to communicate with them in the Lord's Supper, provided they have reason to think them real Christians, and in considering all asso-
ciation of ministers, for giving council and advice to the church in matters of doubt, as unnecessary and un-
scriptural.}\]

\[\text{According to them, when the word Church in Scripture, in its religious sense, does not denote a single congregation of saints, it always refers to the whole body or kingdom of Christ, part of which is in heaven and part on earth; which body does not consti-
tute two churches, a visible and invisible, but one church or family, consisting of different parts. They ad-
mit that all churches, that is, congregations, are con-
}
they are appointed. They insist that ordination is not represented in Scripture as conferring an office, or giving any person a right to discharge that office; it is only the manner of setting him apart to discharge the duties of his office. It gives him no jurisdiction in any church except in that which appointed him; and as soon as he lays down, or is removed from his office in that church, his jurisdiction ceases. They say there is a distinction of departments in the pastoral office, and that teaching and ruling are different branches of that office. Both elders and deacons are ordained by imposition of hands; and though ordination is part of the elder’s province, yet, when churches are newly formed, or when new elders are wanted, they are chosen by the members, who have always the right of election, may ordain church officers for themselves, or, at least, set them apart to their respective offices.

"In worship, the New Independents do not differ much from other non-liturgical churches. They read a large but indefinite portion of the Scriptures at each meeting; in many of their chapels they use Dr. Watts’s version of the Psalms; and in most of them they stand while singing. They adopt weekly communions; and, as they make no real distinction between clergy and laity, their elders and deacons, on an occasional occasion, in any of their chapels, is not thought a sufficient reason for preventing the administration of the holy communion on the first day of the week. They contend, that, by the approved practice of apostolic churches, it is demonstrated to be the appointment of Christ himself, and therefore observable of the highest importance, to Supper the Lord’s Supper on every first day of the week. A division has taken place among these Independents, chiefly in consequence of the adoption of Baptist principles, and the introduction of Church discipline, and of mutual exhortation and prayer by the brethren, into the public service on Sunday mornings."

See Haldane, View of Social Worship; Adams, Religious World, ii, 200 sq.; Robinson, Theological Dictionary, s. v.; Kinneburn, Historical Survey of Congregationalism in Scotland; and the articles Haldane; Congregationalists. Some of the Scotch Independents have embraced the Moravian doctrine. See Moravians.

Index, the name given to certain catalogues of books and authors either wholly prohibited, or censored and corrected, by the Romish Church. An Index of the former kind is called Index Librorum Prohibitorum of the latter, Index Exsurgatorius. An Index Prohibitorum exists also in the Russo-Greek Church, to which, no doubt, is due the weakness of the Russian literary productions on theological subjects.

1. Before the Reformation. — Prohibitions of heretical or dangerous books are as old as the attempts of the popes to usurp universal supremacy. In fact, such prohibitions flow naturally from the theory that "out of the Church there is no salvation." It was Cyprian (q. v.) who first fully stated this theory; and even in his hands it logically led to the conclusion that all heretical opinions (c. such as differ from those announced by the Church authorities) must be punished and suppressed, if possible. As the claims of the hierarchy grew in magnitude, it became necessary to put down all doctrines that might diminish the power of the priesthood. To do this was a proof of zeal. This zeal was at first directed against heathen and Jewish writings, as it was feared that the reading of such might even endanger Christianity. The Council of Carthage (A.D. 400) forbade in Can. 16 the reading of heathen books. The Church, however, did not remain satisfied with forbidding heretical books, it commanded them to be burned. This was first attempted by Decrees of the Synod of Sardis (813 C.E.) which directed that all that circulated forbidden books should be anathema (libelli famosi). It even came to be held that any one who had read a forbidden book was guilty of all the heresies therein contained, and incapacitated for readmission into the Church until the performance of such penance as the Church enjoined. Especially did the hierarchy consider the reading of translations of the Bible as dangerous for the laity. Thus Gregory VII (1080) denounced the practice of reading the Bible in the vernacular in his letter to the king Wratislav of Bohemia and Emperor Henry IV (SS. Cong. 12, Collectio, xx, 296). Innocent III. it is true, said (see his Epistola lll. xii, in lib. ii, ep. cxii, p. 1199) that the searching of the Scripture is to be commended, not forbidden; but added: "Tanta est divinae Scripturae profunditas ut non solum simelips et illicitari, sed etiam annis et annis potentiores, quibus alii gentes indagandam. Ut recte fuit olim in lege divina statutum, ut bestia, que montem tetigerit, lapide tur; ne videlet simplex aliquis et indocutus presumat ad substantiam Scripturae sacre pertingere vel etiam aliis predicante." But the opposition to the papacy and its aims, to which the Roman Church had so persistently adhered, and to which the latter among the forbidden books, on a level with those condemned as heretical. The Conc. Tolosanum (1229) forbade the laity (c. 14) to even possess the O. or N. T. (see Hегегмау, Gesch. des Bibelwerks, Ulm. 1786). When the Inquisition became established and prosperous, the enforcing of the rules relating to forbidden books was intrusted to it, and in the Conc. Biburiense (1246) we find (c. 36) a number of theological works mentioned which both the laity and clergy are forbidden the reading of (theo). And in 1247, the Church established its position secure by such means, the more did influences quite to the contrary exert themselves to secure its overthrow, particularly the precursors of the Reformation, whose doctrines and writings struck at the most vital parts of the Romish organization. A Synod of London (1408) forbade the reading of Wycliffe’s works when not previously approved, while the works of Huss were condemned as thoroughly heretical. The discovery of the art of printing gave a new impulse to the publication of dangerous books, and Alexander VI complained in his Decretum de libris non sine censorshipe sensibus imputatis (Raynal, Annali, a. 1511, no. 56) that heretical dogmas were extensively promulgated, especially in the provinces of Mayence, Cologne, Triebst, and Magdeburg. He recommended the bishops and vicars to carefully watch the appearance of any heretical works, and Parliament in 1524, enacted that the printers should be examined by the authorities. As to the printers, he says: “Debent—ipsi merito compesci opportunis remedii, ut ab eorum impressione desinitant, quae fidei catholicae contraria fore nocentur vel adversa, aut in mentibus fideliissimum possum verisimili sermoni sceaudum generare.” Pope Leo X, in the tenth session of the Lateran Council (May 4, 1114), stated in the decree Inter sollicitudines that no book should be published without the authorization of either the bishop, his legate, or the Inquisition, under penalty of excommunication. Any book issued in contravention of this regulation was to be sequestered and burned.

2. At and after the Reformation and the Council of
INDEX

Trent.—The Reformation gave rise to innumerable writings highly dangerous to the Roman Church, and, in spite of all orders to the contrary, they were widely circulated and eagerly read. In 1546 the University of Louvain, by order of Charles V, published a list (Index) of such books as were considered dangerous to rea 

But translations of the New Testament, made by authors of the first class of this index, are allowed to no one, since little advantage, but much danger, generally arises from reading books which the ordinary company of persons are allowed to be read, or are joined to the Vulgate edition, the works of the Jews, and those of the ancient churchmen and persons as the versions, after the suspected places have been expounded by the theological faculty of some Catholic university, or by the bishops. The dicta 
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(III). Translations of ecclesiastical writers, which have been hit the prejudices or delusions of any kind, and of any books, subsequent to the first edition of the New Testament, are not intended to be allowed to be printed. In this connection it is not intended to be referred to the bishop, or some other prelate, who has also been an archbishop of the old college of the city or diocese in which the impression is executed, who shall gratuitously, and without delay, affix their approbation to the work, to their own prejudice, without any such prelate, nevertheless, to the purges and censures contained

(1) All books condemned by the supreme pontiffs of General Councils before the year 1585, and not included in the present index, are not to be considered as condemned.

(II). The books of heretical, whether of those which were or are, or are the heads or leaders of heretics, as Luther, Zwingli, Calvin, means by themselves, or with the consent of any other, or with the consent of any other, are altogether forbidden, whatever may be their names, titles, or subjects. And the books of other heretics, which are not treated upon any subject of as total truths, are utterly condemned; but those which do not treat upon religion are not to be printed, nor are they to be printed.
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The Congregation of the Index was originally established by pope Pius V. It holds its sitting at Rome, and has the general and exclusive power of examining books against which concern faith, morals, ecclesiastical discipline, or civil society; on which it passes judgment, for suppressing them absolutely, or directing them to be corrected, or allowing them to be read with precaution, and by certain persons. Persons specially deputed by it may give permission to read or use books, and those the Romanists in their world to read prohibited books; and the penalty denounced against those who read or keep any books suspected of heresy or false doctrine is the greater excommunication; and those who read or keep works interdicted by any decree, or who use the said books, are legally committed, and to be severely punished at the will of the bishop. It is remarkable, however, that the Index is hardly in force at the present day, even in the most Romish-inclined countries. In Austria even, the faithful daughter of Rome, Maria Theresa forbade the publication of all books by which the Romish Church and the House of Austria are esteemed, the bishops, or printers of such works. If any person import foreign books into any city, they shall be obliged to announce them to the deputies; or if this kind of merchandise be exposed to sale in any public place, the public officers of the place shall signify to the said deputies that books have been brought in. They shall have the right to examine, to read, or sell any book which has or any other person has brought into the city, until he has given permission to sell the same in the city. Booksellers, or booksellers, or such persons as aredeemers of books, shall be frequently visited by persons deputed by the bishop, and the booksellers shall have the right to be assured that nothing that is prohibited may be sold, printed, or published, or that no books of the deceased, nor in any way transferred to them, until they have presented a catalogue of their books, and obtained the permission of the bishop to publish or sell it. The booksellers or others shall be bound to observe the same rules, if they deem it necessary for the good of the kingdom, or province, or diocese. And let the secretaries of these fathers, according to the command of the holy father, transmit to the bishop, or the notary of the general inquisitor the names of the books that have been corrected, as well as of the persons to whom the fathers have granted the power of examination. Finally, it is enjoined on all the faithful, that no one person shall read or keep any book, unless permitted by these rules, or prohibited by this index. But if any one read or keep any books composed by heretics, or the writings of any person suspected of heresy, he shall instantly incur the sentence of excommunication; and those who read or keep works interdicted on another account, or those who read any book, or the morial sin, shall be severally punished at the will of the bishops” (Labbel SS. Consilia, 618).

This Index of Pius IV was established at Rome by Aldus Manutius (1564), and afterwards revised and enlarged by Gregory XIII, Sixtus V, Clement VIII (1595).

2. INDEX EXPRSERATORIUM.—Pope Sixtus V introduced a series of works which, after expurgating certain obvious passages, could be allowed to be read. This list received the name of Index librorum expurgando-rum or expurgatoriurn. It was first published by order of the duke Alba, under the style Index expurgatorum librorum, qui huc secuto prodererunt (Antwerp, 1571, and republished in 1588). It was corrected by the fathers, on the model of that of Rome, were, however published in other countries, especially in Spain (most of them under Philip II in Madrid, in 1577 and 1584) and in Italy. John Maria Brachiselli and Brachiselli (properly Wenzel of Bresciglia) prepared, with the aid of the pope, a Latin version of the Index (Milan, 1648), which is highly praised for its completeness. The Romish Index was republished in 1818, but has since received, and is constantly receiving, numerous additions.

In'dia (Heb. Hokdhu, הוקד, for "הוקד", i.e. "Hindu", of Sanscrit origin; see Gesenius, Thesaur. Heb. p. 366; Sept. "Hokidh", Vulg. "Indius"), occurs in the Bible only in Esther i. 1; viii, 9, where the Persian king is described as reigning "from India unto Ethiopia, over seven and seven other provinces" (see Herodotus, History, iii. 111, 119). The name is, however, applied by the Greeks to all countries of Asia which were discovered by the Persians (see Herodotus, i. 110), and is used in the Bible to designate the whole of foreign lands. It is found against, however, in the Apocrypha (compare Esther xiii. 1, where India is mentioned among the countries which the Romans took from Antiochus and gave to Eumenes (1 Macc. viii. 8). It is also with some reason conceived that in the list of foreign lands present at the Pentecost (Acts ii. 9) we should read "India, Indiu, and not "Iuvemia, Judea; but the still more probable reading is "Iwemia, Indeum, if indeed the common reading ought to be changed at all (see Kuenin, Comment. on Luke, ii. 8, 9, etc., and loc. cit. The Hebrew form "India" is the abbreviation of "India", which is identical with the Indological name of the river Indus, "Hindu", or "Sindhu", and again with the ancient name of the country as it appears in the Veddita, "Hapta Hendu." The native form "Sindus" is noticed by Pliny (vi, 25). The name, however, is also applied in the inscriptions of Persepolis and Nakhsh-i-Rustam, but not in those of Behistun (Rawlinson, Herod. ii. 485). In 1 Macc. viii. 8, it is clear that India proper cannot be understood, inasmuch as this never belonged
either to Antiochus or Eumenes. At the same time, none of the explanations offered by commentators are satisfactory: the Eneiti of Paphlagonia have been suggested, but these people had disappeared long before (Strabo, xiii, 534): the India of Xenophon (Cyr. op. i. 5, 3; ii. 22), which may have been above the Carian straits, is but a shadow of the Cilician India, and is more likely; but the emeniation "Mysia and Ionia" for Indica and India offers the best solution of the difficulty. See IONIA. A more authentic notice of the country occurs in 1 Macro. vi, 37, where Indians are noticed as the drivers of the war-elephants introduced into the kingdom of the Bythinian king (see also 1 Eadras iii, 2; Esther xxvi, 1). See ELEPHANT.

But, though the name of India occurs so seldom, the people and productions of that country must have been tolerably well known to the Jews. There is undoubted evidence that an active trade was carried on between India and Western Asia; the Tyrians enabled their depôts on the shores of the Persian Gulf, and procured "horns of ivory and ebony," "bristered work and rich apparel" (Ezek. xxvii, 15, 24), by a route which crossed the Arabian desert by land, and then followed the coasts of the Indian Ocean by sea. The trade opened by Solomon with Cinerre through the Red Sea coast consisted of Indian articles, and some of the names even of the articles, algumimim, "sandal wood," kophim, "apes," tukkikim, "peacocks," are of Indian origin (Humboldt, Koosmos, ii, 135); to which we may add the Hebrew name of the "topaz," pitédah, derived from the Sanscrit pita. There is a strong probability that productions of yet greater utility were furnished by India through Syria to the shores of Europe, and that the Greeks derived both the term καυσιτερός (compare the Sanscrit kastita), and the article it represents, "tin," from the coasts of India. The connection thus established with India, which in the days of the Mohammedan invasions, under the ethnological title of Cush (Gen. x, 6), and hence the Syrians, Chaldeans, and Arabic versions frequently render that term by India or Indians, as in 2 Chron. xxvi, 16; Isa. xi, 11; xviii, 1; Jer. xii, 23; Zeph. iii, 10. For exterminating the which some have sought to establish between India and Paradise, see EDEN.

The above intimations, and, indeed, all ancient history, refer not to the whole of Hindostan, but chiefly to the northern parts of it, or the countries between the Indus and the Ganges; although it is not necessary to assert that the rest of that peninsula, particularly its western coast, was at that time altogether unknown. It was from this quarter that the Persians and Greeks (to whom we are indebted for the earliest accounts of India) invaded the country: and this was consequently the region which first became generally known. The countries bordering on the Ganges continued to be involved in obscurity, the great kingdom of the Prasians excepted, which, situated nearly above the modern Bengal, was dimly discernible. The nearer we approach the Indus, the more clear becomes our knowledge of the ancient geography of the country; and it follows that the districts of which at the present day we know the least, were anciently best known. Besides, the western and northern boundaries were not the same as at present. To the west, India was not then bounded by the river Indus, but by a chain of mountains which, under the name of Koh (whence the Grecian appellation of the Indian Cauca- sus), extended from Bactria to Makran, or Gedrosia, inclosing the kingdoms of Candahar and Cabul, the modern kingdom of Eastern Persia, or Afghanistan. These districts anciently formed part of India, as well as, further to the south, the less perfectly known countries of the Arabi and Haurus (the Arabitae and Oriete of Arrian, vi, 21), of which the modern Kohistan. The geographical boundary continued at all times the same, and was removed to the Indus only in consequence of the victories of Nadir Shah. Towards the north, ancient India overpassed not less its present limit. It comprehended the whole of the mountainous region above Cashmir, Badakshan, Belor Land, the western boundary mountains of Little Bucharia, or Little Tibet, and even the desert of Cohi, so far as it was known. (See Herren's Historical Research, i, c. i, § 3, on Persian India; and Renell's Geography of Herodotus. For other conjectures respecting the location of the Scriptural India, see Winer's Realenzyklopädie, v, 209; in the Dictionary of the history of ancient India, see AnthoN's Class. Dict. s. v.—Smith; Kitto.)

INDIA, MODERN. The name is sometimes used of the two peninsulas west and east of the Ganges combined, to which even occasionally the Indian Archipelago is added; but, more commonly, it is applied either to the peninsula west of the Ganges (East India), or to the aggregate possessions of the British crown, including the royalty of India, or the Indian Empire. The present form of government of the Indian Empire is established by the Act 21 and 22 Victoria, cap. 106, called an Act for the better Government of India, sanctioned Aug. 2, 1858. Under the terms of this act, all the territories heretofore under the government of the East India Company are vested in the crown, and all its powers are exercised in her name; all territorial and other revenues, and all tributes and other payments, are likewise received in her name, and disposed of for the purposes of the government of India alone, subject to the provisions of this act. One of the queen's principal secretaries of state, called the Secretary of State for India, is invested with all the powers hitherto exercised by the company or by the Board of Control. The executive authority in India is vested in a governor general or viceroy, appointed by the crown, and acting under the orders of the Secretary of State for India. The governor general has power to make laws and regulations for all persons, whether British or native, or foreigners or others, within the Indian territories under the dominion of the queen, and for all servants of the government of India within the dominions of the East India Company. The Secretary of State for India is aided in the administration by a council of fifteen members, of whom seven are elected by the Court of Directors from their own body, and eight are nominated by the crown. The duties of the council of state are, under the direction of the secretary of state, to conduct the business transacted in the united kingdom in relation to the government of and the correspondence with India.

The total area and population of British India were, according to official returns of the year 1876, as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Area in Sq. Miles</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ajmeer</td>
<td>316,032</td>
<td>2,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benar</td>
<td>2,231,666</td>
<td>17,560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benaras</td>
<td>565,334</td>
<td>8,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coorg</td>
<td>168,312</td>
<td>2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government of Madras</td>
<td>31,672,615</td>
<td>138,566</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bombay</td>
<td>13,835,073</td>
<td>123,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rajasthan</td>
<td>1,621,470</td>
<td>156,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bengal</td>
<td>2,201,436</td>
<td>206,595</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punjabin</td>
<td>1,713,469</td>
<td>194,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief Commissioner of Central Provinces</td>
<td>8,201,519</td>
<td>84,045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British Burmah</td>
<td>2,747,148</td>
<td>84,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assam</td>
<td>4,132,019</td>
<td>55,580</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total | 190,204,097 | 308,794 |

There has never been a regular census of the whole of India under British administration, but enumerations, more or less trustworthy, were made in the north-west.
em and in the central provinces in the years 1865 and 1866. The census of the north-west provinces, taken Jan. 10, 1865, showed that this division of India had increased in prosperity within the decennial period 1856-1866, as reckoned by the number of houses and extension of cultivation. There were found to be 4,71 persons per square mile in 1866, a number of what is called family dwelling. The census further showed that there were 42 millions of Mussulmans in the north-west provinces, or about one seventh of the total population, the other six sevenths being Hindus of the four chief castes; namely, Brahmins, 70 subdivisions; Kshatriyas, 173 subdivisions; Suddras, 360 subdivisions. The Suddras were found to form the great bulk of the Hindus, being 18,594,309 in number; the Vaishyas numbered 1,091,250; the Kshatriyas, 2,827,768; and the Brahmins, 3,451,892. The census of the central provinces, taken in 1866, showed that their population consisted of 6,864,770 Hindus, 1,953,668 Gonds and aboriginal tribes, 237,962 Mussulmans, 602 Europeans and Eurasians, and 90 Parsees. The number of Mussulmans was much lower than had been expected. All the enumerations showed a high proportion of children to adults. Thus, while the percentage of children under 14 years of age was 29 in England, and 23 in India, it was only 13 in India as high as 55. Among the reasons to account for such a result are the custom of polygamy, and, in particular, the desire of the Hindus to have more male issue, which induces them to marry as many wives as they can. There was 29 in England, and 30 in India, of married women. The religious statistics of the four largest cities were, according to the enumeration of 1881: Calcutta, total population, exclusive of Howrah, 684,638; of whom 62 per cent, were Hindu, 322 Mohammedans, 4,4 Christians. About 29,000 were Europeans, and 29,000 Eurasians. In Madras the population was 2,38,000, with a proportion of 773,196, of whom less than 13,000 were British born. Lucknow had a population of 284,779. There is also a considerable admixture of Parsees and Indo-Europeans, or, as they are now usually styled, Eurasians, i.e. of mixed blood. Leaving out of account the native states, the following is given as the relative proportion of creeds and races in India: Hindus, 110,000,000; Mussulmans, 25,000,000; aborigines or non-Aryans, 12,000,000; Bullahists, 3,000,000; Asiatic Christians, 1,100,000. The English population amounted, according to the census of 1861, to 1,155,980.

Christianity became known in India at an early period. There is an old tradition that one of the twelve apostles, St. Thomas, preached the Gospel to the people of India, but the tradition is not supported by any proofs. Cosmas Indicopleustes, who visited the country in the 6th century, found a large number of Christian congregations, with a bishop who was ordained in Persia. In consequence of this connection with Persia, the Christians of India, who, after the reputed founder of the Indian Church, were called Christians of St. Thomas, were drawn into the Nestorian movement, and subsequently received their bishop from the head of the Nestorian Church. Their territory extended from the southern point of the peninsula of Malabar as far as a few miles south of Calicut, and from the deities of the Ghats as far as the sea. An Armenian or Syrian merchant, Thomas Canna, rearranged in the 9th century the ecclesiastical and political administration of these Churches, through his efforts they obtained from the kings of Malabar important privileges; in particular, an exempt jurisdiction in all except criminal cases. Their rank was equal to that of the nobility of Malabar, and they were in great demand for offices for the Hindu princes. This finally led them to attempt the establishment of a kingdom of their own, which was, however, of but short duration. After that their position was less favorable, and the Portuguese, who in 1498 landed, under Vasco de Gama, in the port of Calicut, were consequently regarded by them as their liberators. The first Portuguese missionaries were Franciscan monks, who were introduced in 1500 by Cabral. Dominican monks landed in 1503 with the two Albuquequeques, but they confined themselves to a few convents, while the Franciscans were for about forty years the only Christian missionaries. It was, in particular, P. Antonio de Porto who in 1555 established on the island of Sebastia a convent of the first Roman Catholic bishop for India was established at Goa; the first bishop, Albuquerque, was a Franciscan monk. But, although the convents of the Franciscans were so numerous that they constituted two provinces of the order, they soon ceased to make notable efforts for the propagation of the faith. The missionary field was wholly to the new order of the Jesuits, who made their first appearance in India in 1542. Their number increased very rapidly, and soon they had in all the Portuguese colonies of India houses and colleges, which were divided into the two provinces of Goa and Cochin. Their success at first was very slow, but when the Portuguese viceroy Constantine de Braganza banished some of the most prominent Brahmins, the Jesuits in 1550 succeeded in baptizing nearly 18,000 persons in that city. In 1579 several Jesuits were called to the court of the great mogul, Akbar, who for a time showered gifts and favors upon them. Subsequently, however, he conceived the plan of founding a new religion himself, and the Jesuit mission, which at first promised grand results, was confined to the establishment of a few congregations in the empire of the Moguls. The Jesuits were not successful in their endeavors to unite the Christians of St. Thomas with the Roman Catholic Church. This union was accomplished in 1595, at the Synod of Drexner, by the archbishop of Goa, Alexius Menezes. The bishopric of Goa had in 1557 been made an archbishopric, with two suffragans, that of Cochim and Malacca. In 1606, Meliapur was added. The Christians of St. Thomas received, in 1601, an episcopal see at Angamala, which in 1601 was raised to the archbishopric of Cranganor. The right of patronage over the ecclesiastical benefices was left to the king of Portugal, as he had to defray most of the expenses for the support of the churches and missionaries. A new impulse was given to the missions when, in 1606, the Jesuit P. Robert de Nobili, at Madura, conceived the novel plan of introducing Christianity by accommodating his mode of life entirely to the Indian customs. He called himself a Roman sannyasi, i.e. one who renounced everything, lived after the manner of the Brahmins, clothed his preaching of the Gospel in Indian figures of speech, and even retained among the new converts the difference of caste, allowing the converts to wear certain badges indicative of their caste. He encountered a. strong opposition, even among the members of his order, and a violent controversy began, which, after thirteen years, was decided by pope Gregory XV in favor of P. de Nobili, and the converts were permitted to wear the badges. After this the Roman Catholic Church made numerous converts. According to statements of the Indian Christians, P. de Nobili is said to have baptized about 100,000 persons belonging to all castes. The separation was carried through even with regard to churches and missionaries; the missionaryries of the Brahmins being called Sannyasi, those of the Pashi, Paululama. The successors of Nobili, who were supported by the Pope through the Church, prolonged the conquest and the missions to the other parts of the empire, so that the number of Christians increased. The Jesuits also lived and worked in the missions and developed the system, but became consequently involved in new controversies, especially with the Capuchins (controversy of accommodation), which, in 1704, by cardinal Tournon, who had been commissioned to examine the subject, and again by pope Benedict XIV in 1744, by the bull "Cum solemnissimis", was decided against the Jesuits. These decisions not only put an end to the conversions, but the majority of the Indians who had been gained by the accommodation theories of the Jesuits again returned to their native religion. The suppression of the order of the Jesuits still more injured the Roman Catholic mis-
sions, which, moreover, suffered severely from the wars of Tippu Sahib. Long before this time the Jesuits had lost their missions among the Christians of St. Thomas, who in 1638 left the communion of Rome, and those in the vicinity of Cochin, as the Dutch from 1660 to 1663 had conquered nearly all the Portuguese possessions on the coast. In 1698, the first group of the Jesuits at St. Thomas were, however, a second time prevailed upon to unite with Rome by Italian Carmelites; and in 1698, through the mediation of the emperor Leopold I, one bishop and twelve missionaries of this order received permission to settle on the coast of Malabar. But this protection afforded the Jesuits, however, a proper haven of refuge for various kinds of commerce between the Portuguese government, bishop, and missionaries and the Italians, as Portugal declined to forego its right of patronage, although it was neither able nor willing to exercise it. In 1888, Gregory XVI, by the bull "Multa praecedit," abolished the former papal constitutions for the Church of India, and assigned to the several vicars apostolic their dioceses. The sees of Cranganor, Cochin, and Mellappor (St. Thomas) were suppressed.

The bishopric of Meliapour was transferred to the vicariate apostolic of Madras; the territory of the two other bishopsric to the vicariate of Malabar, which had been erected 1636 for the Portuguese Carmelites and the see of which is now at Verapoly. To it were also assigned the United Christians of St. Thomas, a population of about 200,000, with 330 priests and 160 ministers. The Portuguese of Goa now tried to make a similar submission of Goa, Joao da Torre, who had been consecrated in 1843, ordained, immediately after his arrival in Goa in 1844, no less than 800 priests, chiefly men without any education, and sent them into the territories of the vicar apostolic. They succeeded in obtaining control of a majority of the churches and jurisdiction of about 240,000 souls. A letter from pope Gregory XVI to the archbishop remained without effect.

In 1848 Portugal consented to the transfer of the archbishopric from Goa to Portugal, where he became coadjutor of the archbishop of Braga. But the bishop of Macao continued to perform episcopal functions in the dioceses of the vicar apostolic, denounced the latter, deposed the letters of the pope, and at Goa within seven days ordained 586 priests. When Pius IX threatened the bishop of Macao with ecclesiastical censures, the Portuguese chambers complained to the pope of Rome so severely that the papal nuncio withdrew the point of leaving the country. New negotiations between Rome and Portugal led, however, in 1859, to another compromise, and the opposition of the Portuguese priests in British India to the vicars apostolic appears to have died out. From the vicariate apostolic for Agra and Tibet, which was established in 1808, the vicariate of Patna was separated in 1845. Both vicariates are administered by missionaries of the Capuchin order. The French vicariate of Pondicherry was established in 1770; from it three new vicariates were formed in 1846, namely, Mysore, Coimbatore, and Madura; the two former under priests of the Paris Seminary of Foreign Missions, and the latter under the Jesuits, who in 1856 reoccupied this former field of their order. The vicariate of Vizagapatam was established in 1845 for the priests of the Congregation of St. Francis de Sales.

Protestant missions began at the commencement of the 18th century. When the Lutheran missionary Ze- genbaly was sent to the Danish coast of Tranquebar, amidst the greatest difficulties which the foreign languages and the officers of the colony placed in his way, he founded schools, translated the Bible and the Catechism into the local language, and a congregation which rapidly increased, and laid the foundation of the Evangelical Church of India. A large portion of the councils either belonged to the lowest castes or were in pariah. In the course of the 18th century, the missionary work was carried on by the Missionary Society of Hawaii; at first with great zeal, which, however, gradually slackened under the influence of Rationalism. The last great missionary who was sent out from Halle was the apostolical Fr. Schwarz (q. v.), the results of whose work can still be traced. Gradually the Halle Society leaned on the English Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, which at last took entire charge of these missions. With regard to the differences of castes, the missionaries had at first great difficulty to obtain the continuance in the Christian churches; but this policy was subsequently changed, and the differences permitted to remain on the ground that they were merely a social character. In 1841 the Lutheran Missionary Society of Dresden began to gather up again the scattered missionaries in the different stations, and in 1845 the Landed Church of Tranquebar, but in the prosecution of the work became involved in many difficulties with the other missionary societies which had taken charge of the Halle missions. This society is the only one among the missionary societies now laboring in India which undertakes to vindicate the social, though not the religious standing of the caste.

The recent mission in India begins with the arrival of the Baptist missionary, W. Carey, at Calcutta (Nov. 1793). He encountered from the start the formidable and entirely unexpected opposition of the East India Company, which hoped for larger commercial profits if the country were opened to the Hindus and Mohammedans, and therefore not only discouraged the establishment of Christian missions, but supported and defended the religious institutions of the native religions. The few chaplains who were sent out were compelled to attend the services of the missionaries, but were like the European residents in general, drunkards, servants of the mammon, and worldlings; when, therefore, the Rev. Henry Martyn, one of the most zealous missionaries of that time, arrived in 1806 in Calcutta, and endeavored to kindle a missionary spirit, he provoked the hostility of the population of about 240,000 souls. A letter from pope Gregory XVI to the archbishop remained without effect. In 1848 Portugal consented to the transfer of the archbishopric from Goa to Portugal, where he became coadjutor of the archbishop of Braga. But the bishop of Macao continued to perform episcopal functions in the dioceses of the vicar apostolic; denounced the latter, deposed the letters of the pope, and at Goa within seven days ordained 586 priests. When Pius IX threatened the bishop of Macao with ecclesiastical censures, the Portuguese chambers complained to the pope of Rome so severely that the papal nuncio withdrew the point of leaving the country. New negotiations between Rome and Portugal led, however, in 1859, to another compromise, and the opposition of the Portuguese priests in British India to the vicars apostolic appears to have died out. From the vicariate apostolic for Agra and Tibet, which was established in 1808, the vicariate of Patna was separated in 1845. Both vicariates are administered by missionaries of the Capuchin order. The French vicariate of Pondicherry was established in 1770; from it three new vicariates were formed in 1846, namely, Mysore, Coimbatore, and Madura; the two former under priests of the Paris Seminary of Foreign Missions, and the latter under the Jesuits, who in 1856 reoccupied this former field of their order. The vicariate of Vizagapatam was established in 1845 for the priests of the Congregation of St. Francis de Sales.

Protestant missions began at the commencement of the 18th century. When the Lutheran missionary Ze- genbaly was sent to the Danish coast of Tranquebar, amidst the greatest difficulties which the foreign languages and the officers of the colony placed in his way, he founded schools, translated the Bible and the Catechism into the local language, and a congregation which rapidly increased, and laid the foundation of the Evangelical Church of India. A large portion of the councils either belonged to the lowest castes or were pariah. In the course of the 18th century, the missionary work was carried on by the Missionary Society of Hawaii; at first with great zeal, which, however, gradually slackened under the influence of Rationalism. The last great missionary who was sent out from Halle was the apostolical Fr. Schwarz (q. v.), the results of whose work can still be traced. Gradually the Halle Society leaned on the English Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, which at last took entire charge of these missions. With regard to the differences of castes, the missionaries had at first great difficulty to obtain the continuance in the Christian churches; but this policy was subsequently changed, and the differences permitted to remain on the ground that they were merely a social character. In 1841 the Lutheran Missionary Society of Dresden began to gather up again the scattered missionaries in the different stations, and in 1845 the Landed Church of Tranquebar, but in the prosecution of the work became involved in many difficulties with the other missionary societies which had taken charge of the Halle missions. This society is the only one among the missionary societies now laboring in India which undertakes to vindicate the social, though not the religious standing of the caste.

The recent mission in India begins with the arrival of the Baptist missionary, W. Carey, at Calcutta (Nov. 1793). He encountered from the start the formidable and entirely unexpected opposition of the East India Company, which hoped for larger commercial profits if the country were opened to the Hindus and Mohammedans, and therefore not only discouraged the establishment of Christian missions, but supported and defended the religious institutions of the native religions. The few chaplains who were sent out were compelled to attend the services of the missionaries, but were like the European residents in general, drunkards, servants of the mammon, and worldlings; when, therefore, the Rev. Henry Martyn, one of the most zealous missionaries of that time, arrived in 1806 in Calcutta, and endeavored to kindle a missionary spirit, he provoked the hostility of the population of about 240,000 souls. A letter from pope Gregory XVI to the archbishop remained without effect. In 1848 Portugal consented to the transfer of the archbishopric from Goa to Portugal, where he became coadjutor of the archbishop of Braga. But the bishop of Macao continued to perform episcopal functions in the dioceses of the vicar apostolic, denounced the latter, deposed the letters of the pope, and at Goa within seven days ordained 586 priests. When Pius IX threatened the bishop of Macao with ecclesiastical censures, the Portuguese chambers complained to the pope of Rome so severely that the papal nuncio withdrew the point of leaving the country. New negotiations between Rome and Portugal led, however, in 1859, to another compromise, and the opposition of the Portuguese priests in British India to the vicars apostolic appears to have died out. From the vicariate apostolic for Agra and Tibet, which was established in 1808, the vicariate of Patna was separated in 1845. Both vicariates are administered by missionaries of the Capuchin order. The French vicariate of Pondicherry was established in 1770; from it three new vicariates were formed in 1846, namely, Mysore, Coimbatore, and Madura; the two former under priests of the Paris Seminary of Foreign Missions, and the latter under the Jesuits, who in 1856 reoccupied this former field of their order. The vicariate of Vizagapatam was established in 1845 for the priests of the Congregation of St. Francis de Sales.
who succeeded in overcoming those hindrances which had prevented the free propagation of Christianity throughout India. After having travelled through a large portion of the country, and acquired a minute knowledge of the people, he returned in 1807 to England, and by a number of works endeavored to gain public opinion to the need of establishing mission schools in the administration of India. His writings produced a great effect, and when, in 1813, the charter of the East India Company was renewed, the English Parliament passed resolutions which granted to all British subjects the right to establish schools and missions in India, and compelled the company to subscribe a sum of money for the instruction of the natives. This was followed by a number of other reforms, as the prohibition of burning of widows (1829), and of a further payment of temple and pilgrimage taxes (1833 and 1840), and the admission of native Christians to the lower offices of administration. Full liberty for missionary operations was finally given in 1833, when a resolution of the British Parliament allowed all foreigners to settle in British India, and thus opened the field to all non-British missionary societies of the world. The first bishop of the English Church in India was established at Calcutta in 1814. The first bishop, Dr. Middleton, a rigid High-Churchman, was more noted for his quarrels with the ministers of other denominations than for missionary zeal. His successor, Heber (q.v.), on the contrary, though likewise a High-Churchman, was devoted to the cause, and sternly opposed the toleration of caste differences among the converts. His work was continued in the same way by his successor, Wilson (died 1868). In 1855 other bishoprics were established at Bombay and Madras, and the bishop of Calcutta received the title of Metropolitan for India itself and seminaries beyond its borders. In 1857 the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland sent Dr. Norman M'Leod and Dr. Watson to inquire into the working of the missions there. The following facts are gleaned from later reports. The missionaries of the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel are distributed among 84 principal stations, assisted by 70 unordained European agents, and 111 ordained and 3040 unordained native agents. 24,578 communicants, and 14,994 catechumens are connected with the churches, while there is a total of 74,192 baptisms in the year 1839. 718 were catechumens, and 5490 pupils. St. Thomas's College, in Ceylon, has recently been endowed by the society to the amount of £25,000. The London Missionary Society has its most successful mission in Travancore, where 269 stations are filled. There are 45,176 adherents, of whom 5,192 are communicants, and 885 of whom are unordained native workers. The native contributions for 1888 amounted to £1029. In South India there are 208 stations and outstations supplied by 24 foreign and 14 native ordained pastors, assisted by 4 foreign and 104 native unordained workers. The adherents number 7612, of whom 110 are communicants; 110 day-schools are maintained, with 12,350 pupils. The native contributions for 1888 amounted to £1220. In North India 24 ordained and 43 unordained workers supply 26 stations and out-stations. The number of communicants is 533; adherents 5,727; day-schools 75, with 21,276 pupils, £1294 were contributed by the natives in 1888. Brasses were furnished for a mission college; Almora a college; Calcutta, Bangalore, Nagarkoil have higher institutions of learning. There is a medical mission at Neyer. The Church Missionary Society has in Madras large stations, and 266 day-schools are maintained by native workers. It has also a mission to the Mohammedan population of that city. In 1830 Tinnevelly was entered by the society, and now there are more than 1000 villages in which there are Christians. Successful work is done in Travancore, Cochin, and among the Telugus. There are 88,000 Christians in all of South India. North India is also field of the society. Divinity colleges are supported at Calcutta and Allahabad. A medical mission was started in the valley of the Kashmir in 1865, which is very successful. A divinity school was started at Poona, in Western India, in 1888. Ceylon, as the result of the society's work, has 6508 adherents; Trinity College, at Kandy, and important schools at Cotta and Jaffna. In Madras there is now a new establishment with a school where the natives are now more liberal than formerly in regard to India, and is entering upon all kinds of aggressive work. Among the latest is a medical mission. Its work is now in a critical condition, owing to the great number professing conversion. Many of the churches and schools are self-sustaining and are without the missionary spirit. This district is in juxtaposition with the South Travancore missions of the London Society, and with the Tinnevelly missions of the Propagation Society. Add the converts reported by these, and the 6000 of the American Board, and we have 10,000 Tamil Christians within 150 miles of Cape Comorin. The Wesleyan Missionary Society devotes but a twelfth of its income to the Indian missions, which are, of course, among its smallest. It has stations at Madras and six other points in the Tamil country, seven or eight stations in the two native districts, 465 Church members in all, 5 native ministers, besides several candidates, and 3500 pupils in the schools. The following are extracts from the late (1888) reports of some of the American societies. The American Board has the Marathi Mission, established in 1813, the first of its kind in India. It had 28 stations in Madura, and 17 in the native districts, in 1816. The Marathi Mission has 7 stations, 102 outstations, 12 preachers, 2 medical catechists, and with Bible readers and teachers, 255 native helpers. The native contributions amounted to $4779. The Theological Seminary, suspended in 1866, was reopened in 1868. There is a mission at high-school and college at Admednagar, which had 311 pupils in 1887. The Madura Mission has 12 stations, 234 out-stations, 3233 church members, 11,881 adherents, 10 missionaries, 20 native pastors, 399 native workers of all classes, 138 common schools, with 3215 pupils, a college theological institute, with 334 pupils; in all the mission 5680 pupils. A new feature is the employment of native evangelists by the native churches themselves for the outlying districts. The native contributions amounted to $6245. The Ceylon Mission has 7 stations, with 25 out-stations, 294 members, 28,034 native adherents, 1860 native contributions, $5752. This mission has had a wonderful educational work; the report claims that one in thirteen of the population are in school. Nearly all of the schools are managed by the missionaries. 329 have been educated at Jaffna College. The Presbyterian Church sustains the Lodi and Purruckhabad Mission with 17 stations, 28 American and 11 native missionaries, 30 American and 120 native teachers, 456 communicants, and 6194 scholars in the schools. Out-stations are increasing in numbers. Tours into different districts have been made as in former years. Various medals have been attended, among which was Hariwar. The number of people present at this place, according to government officials, was almost 30,000. For days some twenty preachers, native and foreign, preached to many thousands. Frequently many remained after the service to discuss some of the points set forth in the discourse. Giving was always in cash, and usual. "The more revolting rites of Hindustan are evidently becoming obsolete." At this festival the brethren were "particularly struck with the marked increase in the knowledge of Christianity manifested by the pilgrims." To add to the publicity of the event, four cards were sent to all the principal stations, and to each of the meetings at most of the stations, and in the Lodi Mission the native Christians have contributed for religious and charitable objects, during the year, 670 rupees. Nearly 11,000 pages of publications of various kinds have been issued. A "medical mission" is connected with these missions, at which 1313 patients have been treated. The (Dutch) Reformed Church has the Arm Mis-
In 1868 the statistics of the Roman Catholic Church in British India, Portuguese, and French India were as follows:

| Diocese                  | Priests 1 | Celibate 1 | Other 1 | Students 2 | Chil- |.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Vic. Apostol. of Agra</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>14,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>700</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Vic. Apostol. of Beng-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>11,000</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Vic. Apostol. of Eas-</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6,710</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>250</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Vic. Apostol. of Ben-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21,280</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>1,580</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Vic. Apostol. of Bom-</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45,000</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>7,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Vic. Apostol. of Com-</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>500</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Vic. Apostol. of Hyd-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6,645</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Vic. Apostol. of Mad-</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38,425</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>2,110</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Vic. Apostol. of Mad-</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>144,226</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,166</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Vic. Apostol. of Mye-</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>1,290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Vic. Apostol. of Pat-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Vic. Apostol. of Pon-</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>112,246</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1,900</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Vic. Apostol. of Qu-</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>56,000</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>2,920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Vic. Apostol. of Vei-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10,678</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>725</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Vic. Apostol. of Mal-</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8,500</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The statistics of Protestantism in India (inclusive of Bornala, Siam, and Ceylon), compiled from the latest reports, give the following results:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American Societies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Presbyterian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Presbyterian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reform. Church</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Evangel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L. Lutheran Societies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist Miss. Union</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Am. Free Baptists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Will Baptists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian Baptists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist Episco-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pal Board.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbytery in Canada</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Societies.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church Miss. Soc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soc. of Property of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the Diocese.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London Miss. Soc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wesleyan Miss. Soc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baptist Miss. Soc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Baptists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church of Scotland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irish Presbyterian.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free Ch. of Scotland.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congregational Soc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Indep. Church).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit. Presb. England</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit. Presb. Scotland</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strict Baptists.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian Engli.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welsh Calvin. Metha.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friends Mission.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bapt. Evangelical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missionary Soc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leipzig Evangelical.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luth. Miss. Soc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gossamer's Miss. Soc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hermannsburg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dan's Miss. Soc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swedish Evangelic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Societies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 10,242 899 11,140 1957 13,782 229 660 318,089

Indian Caste.

The social distinctions indicated by this term are much more numerous, fixed, and exclusive in India than anywhere else in the world. The term caste had similar ranks, but they were not so strictly hereditary, nor did they form such impassable barriers in ordinary intercourse. See Egypt. The Hindu-
dua, indeed, regard these as absolute, original, and permanent demarkations of race rather than of mere position or occupation.

1. Origin. — From a very early period the Hindu writers have propounded a great variety of speculations regarding the origin of the castes and the classes or castes into which their community is divided. The most commonly received of these explanations is that contained in the ancient story, of which Mr. Muir thinks no trace is found in the Rig Veda (excepting one in Purusha Sūkta), but which is found in the Sātwi Parva of the Mahābhārata, and is conveyed by the Purāṇas to the Brahmans, the Kṣatriyas, and Sūdras, the son of Iśu, and Mārīcīsvar, and Viṣṇu, the wind god. Purāṇa asks, “Whence was the Brahmān, and whence were the three castes produced, and whence is the superiority of the first?” and Yājva answers, “The Brahmān was created from the mouth of Brahmā, the Kṣatriya from his arms, Vaisya from his thighs, and to serve these three castes the fourth caste was fashioned, and so the Sūdra sprang from his feet.” The sacred books of the Hindus, however, contain no uniform or consistent account of the origin of castes, but offer a “mythical, mythical, and rationalistic” explanations of it, or fanciful conjecture concerning it. In the Harāvīṣa (sec. 211, v. 11808 sq.), Jānamiṣya says, “I have heard the description of the Brāhma Yug, the first of the ages; I desire now to be accurately informed about the Kṣatriya Age,” and he proceeds to describe it: “Viṣṇu, the all-merciful, the great one, created the Brahmān, exalted above the power of sense, and absorbed in devotion, becomes the patriarch Daśākuti, and creates numerous human beings. The beautiful Brahmāns were formed from an unchangeable element (akṣatra), the Kṣatriyas from a changeable substance (kalatra), the Vaisyas from changeable elements (kakṣaṇa), and the Sūdras from a modification of smoke.” Another account makes the Brahmāns to have been fashioned with white, red, yellow, and blue colours. Thence creatures attained in the world the state of fourfold castes, being of one type, but with different duties. Still another account (Sātwi Parva of the Mahābhārata, v. 1858 sq.), after giving a statement of the creation of men, etc., propounds the following: “Desire, anger, fear, curiosity, grief, anxiety, hunger, fatigue, prevail in all; all have bodily secrets, with plégues, bile, and blood; and the bodies of all decay—by what, then, is caste distinguished? There are four castes or the sons of Brahmā; the whole world is formed of Brahmā; for, having been formerly created by him, it became separated into castes by means of works.” In the Bhāgavat Purāṇa we read that there was formerly only one Veda, one God, one caste. Sometimes the Veda is divided into eight parts, and the gods into eight classes. The poet Kaṇḍāma, who speaks of caste, says: “From different Vedas; from different sets of prayers; from the gods; from nonentity; from the imperishable, the permissible, and other principles. They are sometimes made to be coeval with the creation, and as having different attributes involving different moral qualities, while in other places, as in the Epic poems, the creation of mankind is described without the least allusion to the separate production of the progenitors of the four castes. Sometimes all men are the offspring of Manu. Thus it is clear that the separate origin of the four castes could not have been an object of belief among the older Hindus, while the variety and inconsistency of these accounts help us not at all in determining its origin.

Many writers have claimed for caste a trans-Himalayan origin, while others have supposed that it originated with the successive waves of emigration within the Indian peninsula. Professor Gorai, in his lecture, states this view: “When the Vedic people, driven by some political shock, advanced from their abodes in the Punjab further and further south, and drove the aborigines into the hills, and took possession of the country lying between the Ganges, the Jumna, and the Brahmaputra, circumstances required and favored such an organization of society as was therein developed.” On the other hand, Dr. Haug says: “From all we know, the real origin of caste appears to go back to a time anterior to the composition of the Vedic hymns, though its development is carried on in a regular system with insurmountable barriers can be referred only to the latest period of the Vedic age.”

2. Extent.—But, whatever may have been its origin, it is now a complex and highly artificial system, multi-form in shape, and often so blended with the ordinary usages of society and the minute division of labor to which the older civilizations tend, that it is very difficult to make a complete or even an analysis of it. A close inspection of the census returns to the British government in the north-west provinces of India in 1866 shows that it is very much more variable than was formerly supposed. Sometimes the minister divisions into classes seems to follow no other than the lines of the occupations of the people, and they are still returned as belonging to the caste of tailors, or shopmen, etc., without other discrimination. This “blue book” thus enrolled more than three hundred distinct castes within that political division. There is, however, an additional division which may be termed of “legal classification,” as (1) Eriśhakram, (2) Kṣatriyajita, (3) Vaśīhakas, and (4) Sūdra; below which is a yet more debased class, (5) known as Pārvakas, or outcasts, to be found in all portions of the country. The four greater castes above named answer to priestly, warrior, agricul- tural, and servile, and are distinguished from the lesser classes by the fact that the former return hereditary priests, robe-dancers, sweepers, elephant-drivers, turban-winders, ear-piercers and cleaners, charmers, makers of crowns for idols, and even hereditary beggars and common blackguard.

3. Rules.—These castes are all hereditary, the son always following the occupation of the father, however overburdened some departments of occupation may become by the accidents of birth. No classes except the highest two are assumed to intermarry, and all es- tewd contact with a lower class. They do not eat to- gether, nor cook for nor serve food to each other. This dislike of contact extends to their vessels, and other utensils. The usages, however, seem often arbitrary, as smoking from the bowl of another’s pipe may not be an offence if one can make a stem of his fist, but the stem or snake of the pipe must not be touched, or it is ren- dered worthless to its owner. It is well known that the caste requirement that brass or copper utensils should be moved from place to place, but an earthen vessel once used for cooked food or water must not be trans- ported to another locality. Loads may be carried on the head by some castes, on the back by some, and not by others. It is well known that one caste never wears silver, but wash their own clothes, yet the loin-cloth must always be washed by the wearer of it. If a Hindu were touch- ed by a man of an inferior caste while eating, he would not only throw away all the food he had cooked, but would even spit out what might chance to be in his mouth at the instant.

The accumulation of motive for the preservation of caste purity is astounding. The slightest variation from custom is at once visited with punishment or fines, while the graver offences become the ground of expulsion literally from all human society, and of disabilities in business and in marriage. It is well known that the caste requirement that brass or copper utensils should be moved from place to place, but an earthen vessel once used for cooked food or water must not be transported to another locality. Loadsa may be carried on the head by some castes, on the back by some, and not by others. It is well known that one caste never wears silver, but wash their own clothes, yet the loin-cloth must always be washed by the wearer of it. If a Hindu were touched by a man of an inferior caste while eating, he would not only throw away all the food he had cooked, but would even spit out what might chance to be in his mouth at the instant.

The accumulation of motive for the preservation of caste purity is astounding. The slightest variation from custom is at once visited with punishment or fines, while the graver offences become the ground of expulsion literally from all human society, and of disabilities in business and in marriage. It is well known that the caste requirement that brass or copper utensils should be moved from place to place, but an earthen vessel once used for cooked food or water must not be transported to another locality. Loadsa may be carried on the head by some castes, on the back by some, and not by others. It is well known that one caste never wears silver, but wash their own clothes, yet the loin-cloth must always be washed by the wearer of it. If a Hindu were touched by a man of an inferior caste while eating, he would not only throw away all the food he had cooked, but would even spit out what might chance to be in his mouth at the instant.

4. Effects.—The caste policy of India checks genius, yet as from the first the individual knows what his life- business is to be, he pursues it, and attains a skill in handicraft unequalled. The Indian system tends like- wise to give permanence to institutions, but it unfor- tuneately is a hindrance. It eviles the minds of the mountainous, circumstances required and favored such an organization of society as was therein developed.” On
progress of Christianity. The railroads and other European conveniences have by some been looked upon as likely to make great innovations on caste-usage. There is already a large and well-organized portion of the population of these countries who wholly ignore castes. See Hindu, Modern.

There is much less of caste observance among what is considered to be an older population than the Hindu, such as the people inhabiting the Himalaya Mountains, and the "wild tribes" of Central India.

See also Strachey, vol. i, 378 sq. (1865).—Colebrooke's Miscellaneous Essays; Wilson's Travels, Vishnu Purana; Müller, Chips, ii, 295 sq. (J. T. G.)

Indians, American. Under this title may be included all the semi-civilized and wild tribes of North and South America, since the most thorough investigation shows that they were indeed "human beings." The only source of intelligence concerning the Indian tribes of America is the trader, who, in dealing with these people, is forced to adopt methods of communication which are not always those that are best suited to the Indian mind. The trader must be able to understand the Indian language, and to convey ideas to him in such a manner that he can understand them. This is done by means of signs and gestures, and by imitating the sounds of the Indian language.

1. Sources of Knowledge. Notwithstanding the proverbial taciturnity of the American Indians, some information has been elicited by oral communication. Many of the tribes, also, have a species of records for their traditions. In some instances these seem to be little more than mnemonic signs, made on their skins, tents, clothing, mats, and rocks; but in others, as in Mexico, we find stories which were kept in the form of iatro-epigraphic writing, wherein signs stand for ideas, as the Arabic numerals do with us. Besides these there must have existed in some localities a phonetic alphabet prior to the coming of the white man. The only known, however, is found with the Maya, resident in the peninsula of Yucatan. It has "a well rounded alphabet of twenty-seven elementary sounds, the letters of which are totally different from those of any other nation, and evidently original with themselves."

2. Origin. Much has been written on the origin of the Indian tribe, and their probable connection with the people of the Old World. Hattaway says, "If by no ray of light whatever could be thrown upon the questions which concern the primitive populations of America; if no analogy to the case had existed in the spread of the Malayan-Polynesian tribe across the islands of the Pacific Ocean and the Eastern Archipelago, and the Pacific Ocean; if the speech of the Americans had absolutely no affinities with other human dialects; if their traditions, meagre as these are, hinted nothing of a distant home and of a perilous migration; if insoluble enigmas were presented by the physical structure of the Americans, or if their mental powers and physical capacities as such were such that they could not have been derived from a different source, it is safe to say that we should infer from them a place in the great brotherhood of men; if, lastly, no resemblance were found, I will not say in primary articles of belief, but in the memory of specific incidents, and in those minor forms of human thought and culture which will hardly bear to be explained on the hypothesis of 'natural evolution,' we might then, perhaps, have cause to hesitate in our decision" (Christ and other Musters, ii, 120 sq.). There is literally nothing, according to our ablest writers, either in the bodily structure or psychology of the American tribes which is not equally found in other primitive races. The only difference between the two is that the American, being a more intelligent and conscious creature, is more capable of conceiving and expressing his ideas. The Indian has not the faculty of expressing his ideas in words, but he has the power of expressing them in deeds and gestures. The Indian is a highly organized and thoughtfully constructed organism, and his ideas are as much a part of his nature as the organs of his body. The American, on the other hand, is a creature of less intelligence, and his ideas are less distinct and definite. The American is a creature of less culture, and his ideas are less developed and refined. The American is a creature of less civilization, and his ideas are less advanced and more primitive. The American is a creature of less life, and his ideas are less active and more passive. The American is a creature of less mind, and his ideas are less logical and more irrational. The American is a creature of less body, and his ideas are less tangible and more intangible. The American is a creature of less soul, and his ideas are less spiritual and more material. The American is a creature of less heart, and his ideas are less tender and more harsh. The American is a creature of less brain, and his ideas are less active and more passive. The American is a creature of less body, and his ideas are less tangible and more intangible. The American is a creature of less soul, and his ideas are less spiritual and more material. The American is a creature of less heart, and his ideas are less tender and more harsh. The American is a creature of less brain, and his ideas are less active and more passive.

3. Legends. The Indian myths of the creation, the deluge, the epochs of nature, and the last day, are numerous and clear, although it seems more difficult to ascertain here what does and what does not antedate the European invasion, before the creation, and after. The Muscoquees, "a great body of water was alone visible. Two pigeons flew to and fro over its waves, and at last spied a blade of grass rising above the surface. Dry land gradually followed, and the islands and continents took their present shape." Many tribes trace their descent from a raven, "a mighty bird, whose eyes were fire, whose glances were lightning, and the clapping of whose wings was thunder. On his descent to the ocean the earth instantly rose, and remained on the surface of the water. This omnipotent bird was called forth all the water animals." The early Algonquin legends do not speak of any family who escaped the deluge, nor did the Dakota, who firmly believed the world had been destroyed by water. Generally, however, the legends made some to have escaped by ascending some mountain, on a raft or canoe, in a cave, or by climbing a tree. The pyramids of Cholula, the mounds of the Mississippi Valley, the vast and elaborate edifices in the artificial hills of Yucatan, would seem to have direct reference to the hill on which the ancestors of these people escaped in past deluges, or from the realm of rains, called the Hill of Heaven, the last destruction of the world to have been by water, though some few represent it to have been by fire.

4. Religious Beliefs. It is generally believed that all approximations to monotheism observed among the tribes of the New World are little more than verbal. Their "Great Spirit," as the phrase stands among Europeans, is at best the highest member of a group of spirits. He may be a personification of the mightiest of all natural energies, but not a personality distinct from nature, and controlling all things by his sovereign will. He is devoid of almost everything which constitutes the god of the God of revelation. In spite of whatever grandeur, goodness, or ubiquity he may be endowed with, he exercises no control over the lives of individuals or the government of the world. "There is no attempt," says Mr. Schooler, "by the hunter-priesthood of the Indians, to connect with the physical universe the almost poetic way in which they look at it suggests that much of their religious thought received comprehension from their hunter-life. For the most part, their conceptions of deity seem to have been connected with the phenomena of the meteorological or atmospheric world, and with their observations concerning light and fire. The highest good is generally symbolized as the storm-god or the sun-god, these being sometimes blend-
INDIANS 559 INDIANS

"father," "sustainer," "revivifier." Muller maintains that there were numerous subordinate hostile deities, who created discord, sickness, death, and every possible form of evil, and that in many cases these were reputed to be under the leadership of the sun, which was as the

The Manito or Manto is alleged to have no personal meaning, but to be equivalent to "spirit," or "a spirit," perhaps somewhat akin to our thought of a guardian spirit. Schoolcraft thinks that, so far as a meaning distinct from an invisible existence attaches to it at all, the tendency is to a bad meaning, and that a bad meaning is distinctly conveyed in the inflection osh or ish (Red Races, p. 214). In considering this belief in manitos it is necessary to remember that the Indian conceives every department of the animal, vegetable, and, in particular, the animate and inanimate, holding the same relation to matter that the soul does to the body, and in accordance with which, not only every man, but every animal, has a soul, and is endowed with a reasoning faculty. Dreams are a means of direct communication with the spiritual world, and are generally regarded as the various manifestations of their personal manitos. No labor or enterprise is undertaken against their indications, whole armies being sometimes turned back by dreams of the officiating priest. Under the guidance of a particular spirit, names are commonly supposed to be bestowed. These personal spirits are invisible to the naked eye, but are, however, of varied ability, and there is a constant fear lest the manito of a neighbor may prove more powerful than one's own.

The mythological personages who are the heroes of Indian tales, and who are in some measure associated with the highest good, as set forth above, may be represented by Michaho or Manibozho of the Algonquins, and Quetzalcoatl, the god of the air, the highest deity of the Toltecs. The same deity appears with more or less modification among all the tribes, under various names. One of the most interesting is also the original of the religious conceptions of the Quichewah, the-in the fancy of these people that there was a white man, of superior strength from the father of the sou.

6. The Soul and a Future Life.—The immortality of the human soul is universally believed by the North-American Indians.

Among all the tribes soul is equivalent to breath, or the wind. The same person may have more than one soul; some say four, and others more than this number. Generally, however, there is some distinction made in these souls. One may remain with the body, being attached to its earthly functions, and is absorbed in the elements, while another soul may pass away to the "Happy Hunting-grounds;" or, in other cases, one may watch the body, wander about the world, one hour in one village, and another go to the spirit land. According to an author quoted by Mr. Brinton, certain Oregon tribes located a spirit "whenever they could detect a pulsation," the supreme one being in the heart, and which alone would go to the skies at death.

Among all the tribes, from the Arctic region to the tropics, the Indians held that the human body was destined to be where the highest good, i.e. where light comes from, or, in other words, in the sun-realm. Hence the soul is

variously said to go at death towards the east, or towards the west, the place of the coming or departure of the light, or among some northern tribes, to whom the sun lay in a southern direction, the soul is said to go towards the west, which is the reverse of the sun's course. The cult of the sun-god that this permanent soul finds its ultimate home. "Spirituality is clogged with earthly accidents even in the future world. The soul hungers, and food must be deposited at the grave to supply its need. It suffers from cold, and the body must be wrapped about with clothes. It is in darkness, and a light must be kindled at the head of the grave. It wanders through plains and across streams, subject to the vicissitudes of life, in quest of a place of enjoyment. Among some northern tribes a dog was slain on the grave, and there are indications of a like practice having obtained in Mexico and Peru." In other words, the place and where the government was despotic, not only animals, but men, women, and children were often sacrificed at the tomb of the "caccia." There are traces of this on the Lower Mississippi. Among the Natchez Indians, when a chief died, "one or several of his wives or his highest officers were buried, or were buried with him." There is the belief among many of them that the soul needs light, particularly for four nights or days after death, as it is either confined in the body, or "wandering over a gloomy marsh," or in some other peril which prevents its ascending to the skies. The souls of the extreme south, of the Pampas and the Patagonians, suppose the stars to be the souls of the departed.

According to some, there is but little trace, if any, of a clear conception of a system of rewards and punishments, as there certainly do not seem to have been very clear distinctions between vice and virtue, as in any way related to a future world. The difference between the soul's comfort and disadvantage in a future life, in so far as it is made a matter of degree at all, was made to depend, as in the Mexican mythology, on the mode of death. Women dying in among them were associated in the category of worth and merited happiness with warriors dying in battle. In Guatemala a violent death in any shape was sufficient to banish, in after-life, from the felicitous regions. The Brazilian natives divided the dead into classes, making those drowned, or killed by violence, or without sin, to ascend to the heaven, and others to descend into the lower regions; but there seems to be no reason founded in morals connected with this. It is but just to say that others take a different view of this part of the subject from that here set forth. The abbe Em. Domenech, who spent seven years among these tribes, gives traditions of a doctrine of future life, but with a restriction that the future punishments for the good or bad deeds of this life (p. 288). Other tribes, however, seem to know nothing of punishments. The Master of Life, or Merciful Spirit, will be alike merciful to all, irrespective of the acts of this life, or of any degree of moral turpitude. They see nowhere clear conceptions of virtue and vice even in this world. Sin, they say, is only represented at worst as a metaphorical going astray, as of one who loses his path in the woods, though this may suggest much more than this class of persons admit. That there is a moral sentiment is admitted, and written in their hearts, though not as connected with their future state. Their prayers are almost wholly for, temporal, and not for moral blessings; but there may be found an assumption of moral qualities or ethical character in connection with their gods, as in the case of Quetzalcoatl alluded to, who is said to be the "spirit of the water," the sun, who is to be the incarnation of the god of the dead, the confessor of the dead, the reformer of the household, instilled patriotism, etc. The Mexicans had another place for the souls of those dying by lightning-stroke, dropsies, leprosies, etc., who could not go to the home of the sun, but who must go to the realm of the god of the rains and waters, called Tlalocan. There are traditions of the separate resurrection of the bird, also of the doctrine of the resurrection of the dead. The vast tumuli, though they were not all con-
The priesthood of the country has been considered by those long familiar with the subject to have done more than any other agency to keep these tribes from becoming degraded. They are remarkable men, and are variously styled by the Algonquins and Dakotas "those knowing divine things," "dreamers of the gods;" in Mexico, "masters or guardians of the divine things;" in Cherokee their title means "possessed of the divine fire;" in Iroquois, "keepers of the faith;" and in Quebec, "the images of the gods." As medicine-men, they tried to frighten the demons that possessed the patient; sucked and blew upon the diseased organ, sprinkled it with water, rubbed the parts with their hands, and made an image representative of the spirit of sickness, and knocked it to pieces. They were much skilled in tricks of ledge-mend, setting fire to articles of clothing and instantly extinguishing the flames by magic. They summoned spirits to answer questions about the future, and possessed clairvoyant powers; and they were reputed to be even able to raise the dead. They consecrated amulets, interpreted dreams, cast horoscopes, rehearsed legends, performed sacrifices, and, in short, constituted the chief centre of the intellectual force of the people. They are thus a kind of priests, doctors, and charlatans, who perform penance, and submit to mutilation, fasting, and flagellation. They did not utter the words of incantation with a solemn countenance, but in a way that expressed the monotonous, monotonous rhythm of their magic. The priest is particularly important in the ceremony which is necessary to secure rain. The medicine lodge is used for nearly all ceremonies. See NORTH AMERICA, RELIGIONS OF.

8. Present Location and Numbers.—The large proportion of the Indians of the United States are now gathered together in the Territory, with a few scattered in the States. The census of 1880 gives the following numbers: 17,000 Chippewa; 15,000 Chippewas; 11,000 Sauk and Foxes; 10,000 Creeks; 10,000 Ojibway; 9,000 Shawnees; 5,000 Choctaws; 1,000 Absarokas; 2,000 Pawnees; 1,000 Cheyennes; 1,000 Osages; 1,000 Comanches; 1,000 Poncas; and 1,000 Omaha. The total number of Indians is estimated at 390,000.

According to the census of 1880 there were within the Indian territory, Cherokees, 19,720; Muscogees or Creek, 15,000; Seminoles, 2,685; Choctaws, 11,000; Chickasaws, 30,000; Cheyennes, 4,000; Arapahos, 2,000; Pawnees, 1,000; Navajos, 9,000; Pueblo Indians in New Mexico. There were 4050 Chippewas and 1500 Oneidas in Wisconsin, and 5000 Chippewas in Michigan. Much of the land formerly assigned to the Indians has lately been purchased by the government and opened to settlers, and some of it has been occupied, so that there is a demand for the removal or consolidation of the natives. See MIGRATION, REMOVAL, RECONSTRUCTION.

9. Literature.—Brinton, Myths of New World (N. Y. 1868); Waiz, Anthropologie der Natur-Volker (Leipzig, 1862-63); Cattin, N. Am. Indians (London, 1864); Miller, Geschichtsbuch der indischen Ue-religionen (Berlin, 1864); Squier, The Serpent Symbol of America (N. Y., 1851); Hawking, Sketch of the Creek Country (Georgia Hist. Soc. 1848); Schoolcraft, Red Races of America (N. Y. 1847); Notes on the Iroquois (Albany, 1848); Hist. and Stat. Information prepared for the Indian Bureau of the United States by the United States Census Office, 1882; Seven Years’ Residence in the great Deserts of North America (London, 1860, 2 vols. 8vo); Brainard, A Journal among the Indians (Philadelphia); Prescott’s Conquest of Mexico; Conway, Traditional Hist. of the Gibney Nation (London, 1860); Mc Coy, Hist. of the Boyot. Indian Missions; Mrs. Eastman, Legends of the Sioux, Chippewas, and Menomines; Mrs. Capron, Catholic Missions among the Indian Tribes from 1529 to 1824 (N. Y. 1855); Trans. Am. Ethn. Soc. (1848); Relations de la Nouvelle France (Quebec, 1858); Mr. Dupontonne’s Report to Amer. Philos. Soc. (1819, 8vo). (J. T. G.)
Indictio Festorum Mobilium. See Indictio Paschasialis.

Indiction (Latin indicio, a declaring) is a term which designates "a chronological system, including a circle of fifteen years: (1) the Cæsareaem, used long in France and Germany, beginning on Sept. 24; (2) the Constantinopolitan, used in the East from the time of Antiochus, and beginning Sept. 1; and (3) the Papal, reckoned from Jan. 1, 313. The Council of Antioch, 341, first gives a documentary date, the 14th indiction. The computation prevailed in Syria in the fifth century, and is mentioned by Ambrose as existing at Rome. It is, however, the only one that in the Western Church, with the exception of Africa, the inductions, until the 16th century, were reckoned from Sept. 1, 312, and that they commenced in Egypt in the time of Constantine."—Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, p. 537; see also Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ii, 141. See Cyc.

Indictio Paschasialis. It was an old custom in the Christian Church of the early ages to announce on Epiphany (q. v.) the days on which Easter would fall, and this announcement was called the Indictio paschalis; but as on the appointment of the days on which Easter should be observed depended the appointment of the movable feasts, this announcement was called the "Paschalis multifidum". Besides this kind we find in the Alexandrian Church, but it soon became general throughout the Christian Church, even by ecclesiastical enactments. Thus the fourth Synod at Orleans (Concil. Aurelianum, iv, c. 1) ordered its observance and even the fifth Synod at Carthage (A.D. 403, Concil. Carthaginum, v, can. 7) ordered a written announcement, which was called Epistola paschalis et horastatica. See Bingham, Antiqu. Eccles. i, 85 sq.; Augusti, Handbuch der Christl. Archäol. i, 544; Riddle, Christian Antiquities, p. 867. (J. H. W.)

Indifference, Liberty of, a name sometimes given, by metaphysical and theological writers, to the power in the human mind of choosing between opposing motives, or of resisting or yielding to a given motive. The upholders of fatalism consider this "liberty of indifference" as a chimera. If we were indifferent, say they, to the motives which determine our actions, we should either not act at all, or we should act without motive, at hazard, and our actions would be effects without cause. But this is intentionally confounding indifference and insensibility. We are necessarily sensible to a motive when that motive induces us to act, but the question as to whether there is a necessary connection of a motive and an action; that is, whether, when such a motive induces us to will anything, we can or cannot will the contrary in spite of that motive, or whether we cannot prefer another motive to that by which we determine to act. As soon as it is supposed that we act from a motive, it cannot be supposed that this motive does not determine us to act, for the two suppositions would contradict each other; but it may be asked whether, before any supposition, our will was connected with the motive in such a manner as to render a contrary volition impossible. The advocates of moral liberty maintain that there is no physical or moral volition in the case of the contrary volition, but only a moral connection, which does not prevent our resisting; in other words, that motives are the moral, not the physical causes of our actions. Because we are said to be determined by a motive, it does not follow that we cannot resist a motive and thus suppose that an active faculty like volition could become passive under the influence of a motive, or that this motive, which after all is but an idea, a thought, could act upon us as we act upon a body we put in motion. This metaphysical question is intimately connected with the doctrine of man's stain, with the idea of a free agent, with the nature of an active faculty like volition, but it is qualified by the fact that a man's will is not free and must act as evil, and the existence of such a faculty requires that lib-
kind of infidelity in England and America. It is stated, or implied, in much of our current popular literature, that a man’s creed does not depend upon himself. This dogma pervades the writings of Mr. Emerson. Napoleon, one of his ‘representative men,’ of whom he tells ‘infidelity’ (p. xxvii) must not in his life be set down as cruel, but only as one who knew no impediment to his will.’ He depicts him as an ‘exorbitant egoist, who narrowed, impoverished, and absorbed the power and existence of those who served him; and concludes by saying, ‘it was not Bonaparte’s fault.’ Thus we come to think of Napoleon, like Jesus, as a man who sought the holy grail of true belief, as if the emotional part of our nature was independent of the intellectual. ‘Belief,’ says he, ‘is one thing, and faith another.’ And he complains of those who, on religious grounds, are alienated from him because he has adopted; ‘infidelity’ (p. 12). The difference between them and him turning merely ‘on questions of learning, history, criticism, and abstract thought’ (Phases of Faith, Preface). The philosophy is as bad here as the theology. The view of common sense and Scripture, a living faith as is the doctrine believed. But Mr. Newman, in common with Mr. Parker and others, can lay down his offensive weapons when he wills, and take up a position on the low ground of indifference as to religious belief. Then, creeds become matters of mere moonshine, and responsibility is regarded as a fiction invented by priests. This is part of the bad theology of Mr. Bailey’s ‘Festus.’ The hero of the poem is made to say, ‘Yet merit or demerit none I see In nature, human or material, In passions or affections good or bad. We only know that God’s best purposes Are oftentimes brought about by dreadest sins. Is the thunderer, or is he a dew divine? Does virtue lie in sunshine, sin in storm? Is not each natural, each needful, best?’

The theory of this infidelity appears to be that man has no capacity for faith, that he is no more responsible for his opinions than he is for his color or his height, and that an infidel or an atheist is to be pitied but not blamed. This, we are persuaded, is a piece of thinly sophistry which no man should utter, and which would not be listened to for a moment in connection with the other subject than that of religion. It would be condemned in the senate and at the bar, it would be drowned in the tumult of the exchange and the market-place. Common sense, and a regard to worldly interests, would rise up and hoot down the traitor. Unfortunately, however, in the province of religion, the natural indissociation of the mind to things unseen and spiritual exists itself with the pleadings of the sophist, and receives his doctrine of irresponsibility with something like flattering unction. Nothing more than this is requisite to undermine the foundation of all religious belief and morals, to let open the floodgates of immorality, and to make the name of infidelity a badge of merit, in the培有 of little things there the yielding sand. In opposition to such latitudinarianism, we maintain that man is responsible for the dispositions which he cherishes, for the opinions which he holds and avows, and for his habitual conduct. This is the great want of the history of Scripture; there is no farther. More, which affirms that every one of us must give an account of himself unto God. And this meets with a response from the amid of elements of man’s moral nature, which sets its seal that the thing is true’ (Pearson, Prize Essay on Infidelity, ch. v). (Comp. Baumgarten, Gesch. der Religions-Parthien, p. 102 sq.) See Responsibility.

Indifferent things. (Comp. Harries, System of Christian Ethics, transl. by Morison and Findlay, Edinburgh, 1808, 8vo.) See ADAPHORA.

Indigetès (sc. Ditr), an epitaph given by the Romans to the particular gods of each country, who, having been natives of those countries, were deified by their countrymen after death. Thus Romulus was one of the gods Indigetes of the Romans, and was worshipped under the name Quirinus. Æneas, though not a native of Italy, yet, as founder of the Roman name, was ranked among the gods Indigetes.—Broughton, Biblioth. Hist. Soc. i, 300.

Indignation, a strong disapprouvment of mind, excited by flagitious in the conduct of another. It does not, as Mr. Cogan observes, always suppose that excess of depravity which alone is capable of committing deeds of horror. Indignation always refers to culpability of conduct, and cannot, like the passion of horror, be extended to distress either of body or mind. It is produced by acts of treachery, abuse of confidence, base ingratitude, etc., which we cannot contemplate without being provoked to anger, and feeling a generous resentment.—Cogan, On the Passions: Buck, Theo. Dict. Æmulation, Anon.

Indra, one of the Hindu deities of the Vedic period of the Hindu religion, who also enjoyed a great legendary popularity in the Epic and Purânic periods. See Hindúism. He is, so to speak, the Hindu Jupiter. He is quite frequently styled ‘Lord of heaven’ (devapati =disputant). The name itself is of doubtful origin, meaning either (1) ‘blue’ (as epithet of the firmament), or (2) ‘the illuminator,’ or (3) ‘the giver of rain’ (compare Wutke, Gesch. des Heidentums ii, 242). Max Müller (Science of Language, 2d series, p. 449) says the name admits of but one etymology; i.e. it must be derived from the same root, whatever that may be, which in Sanscrit yielded indra, drop, sap. It meant originally the giver of rain, the Jupiter pluvius, a deity in India more often present to the mind of the worshipper than any other, (comp. Benfey, Orient and Occident, i. 49). ‘In that class of Rig-Veda hymns where there is occasion to look for the oldest portions of Vedic poetry, the character of Indra is that of a mighty ruler of the bright firmament, and his principal feat is that of conquering the demon Vrîtra, a symbolical personification of the cloud which obstructs the clearness of the sky, and which, by his resistless blows, holds the firmament together. In his battles with Vritra he is therefore described as ‘opening the receptacles of the waters,’ as ‘cleaving the cloud’ with his ‘far-whirling thunderbolt,’ as ‘casting the waters down to the earth,’ and ‘restoring the sun to the sky.’ He is, in consequence, the‘upholder of heaven, earth, and firmament,’ and the god ‘who has engendered the sun and the dawn.’ And since the atmospheric phenomena personified in this conception are ever and ever recurring, he is ‘undecaying’ and ‘ever youthful. All the wonderful deeds of Indra, however, are performed by him merely for the benefit of the good, which, in the language of the Veda, means the people who worship him in their songs, and invoke him with the offerings of the juice of the soma plant. See Hindúism. He is, therefore, the ‘lord of the virtuous,’ and the ‘disconsoler of those who neglect religious rites. Many other epithets, which we have not space to mention, are bestowed on him. It is on account of the paramount influence which the deeds of Indra exercise on the material happiness of man that this deity occupies a foremost rank in the Vedic worship, and that a greater number of invocations are addressed to him than to any other of the Hindu deities.—Cf. Chips from a German Workshop, i, 30-32, et al.). But to understand the gradual expansion of his mythical character, and his ultimate degradation to an inferior
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position in the Hindu pantheon of a later period, it is necessary to bear in mind that, however much the Ve-
dic poets call Indra the protector of the pious and virtu-
ous, he is in their songs essentially a warlike god, and
gradually endowed by imagination not only with the qualities of his mythological
but also with the attributes of a"called king. The legends which represent him in this light seem, it
is true, to belong to a later class of the Rig-Veda
hymns, but they show that the original conception of
Indra excluded from his nature those ethical considera-
tions which in time changed the pantheon of elementary
forces in the Rig-Veda into that of a different stamp; whether the
idea of an incarnation (q. v.) of the deity, which, at the
Epic and Puranic periods, played so important a part
in the history of Vishnu, did not exercise its influence as early as the composition of some of the Vedic hymns
in honor of Indra, may at least be matter of doubt. He
is, for instance, frequently invoked as the destroyer of
cities—of seven, of ninety-nine, even of a hundred cities
—and he is not only repeatedly called the slayer of the hostile tribes which surrounded the Aryan Hindus,
but some of the chief sin by him are enumerated by name.
The curving horns, of course, turn into serpents; their
‘chiefs’ into demons, and their cities into celestial
abodes; but as it is improbable that all these names
should be nothing but personifications of clouds destroyed
by the thunderbolt of Indra, it is, to say the least,
questionable whether events in the early history of India,
which have been associated with the deeds of Indra
himself, in like manner as, at the Epic period, mort-
al heroes were looked upon as incarnations of Vishnu,
and mortal deeds transformed into exploits of this god.

The purely kingly character of Indra assumes its
typical shape in the Asura-Brähmana, where his inst-
allation as lord of the inferior gods is described by
much more detail; and from that time he continues
to be the supreme lord of the minor gods, and the type
of a mortal king. During the Epic and Puranic pe-
riods, where ethical conceptions of the divine powers
prevail over ideas based on elementary impressions, Indra
continues to enjoy the majesty he had acquired at the
Vedic time, and his existence is chiefly upheld by the
poets, who, in their turn, however, work it out in the
most fanciful detail. Of the eight guardians of the
world, he is, then, the one who presides over the east,
and he is the god who, according to the Vedas, wields
the thunderbolt; but poetry is more exalted by the
beauty of his paradise, Swarga, the happy abode of the
inferior gods, and of those pious men who attain it after
death in consequence of having, during life, properly
discharged their religious duties; by the charms of his
beauty; the music of a thousand instruments, which
descend to earth to disturb the equanimity of austerity
penitents; by the musical performances of his choris-
ters, the Gandharvas; by the splendor of his capital,
Amravatī; by the fabulous beauty of his garden, Nan-
dana; etc. A remarkable trait in this legendary life of
Indra is the series of his conflicts with Krishna (q. v.), an
incarnation of Vishnu, which end, however, in his becom-
ing reconciled with the more important god. As
the god who is emphatically called the god of the hundred
sacrifices (Sakra), Indra is jealous of every mortal
who may have the presumption of aiming at the perform-
ance of those sacrifices, for he is the god of the king,
and he cannot countenance the repudiation of such an intention would raise the sacrificer to
a rank equal to that to which he occupies. He is,
therefore, ever at hand to disturb sacrificial acts which
may expose him to the danger of having his power
shattered. According to the Puranas, Indra is the
reigning god of Indra, who is frequently called also
Sakra, or the mighty, does not last longer than the
first Manvantara, or mundane epoch. After each suc-
cessive destruction of the world, a new Indra was cre-
ted, together with other gods, saints, and mortal be-
ing. In the second Manvantara, Indra is the prince of
Vipachit; of the third, Sudutsi; of the fourth, Sirī; of
the fifth, Vībhū; of the sixth, Manava; and the
Indra of the present age is Purandara” (Chambers, s.
v.). In works of art, Indra is generally represented as
riding on an elephant. In paintings, his eyes are vein-
See also Hardwick, Christ and other Masters, i, 178.

Induction (Lat. inducere, from duco, lead) is a term in
ecclesiastical law for the act by which a clergyman
in the Church of England, having been presented to a benefice by its patron, is brought in to the possession of the freehold of the church and glebe. This is usually done by a mandate, under the seal of the bishop, ad-
dressed to the archdeacon, who either in person induces
the minister, or commissions some clergyman in his place to perform the ceremony; that office, or his deputy, induces the incumbent, by laying his
hand on the key of the church as it lies in the lock,
and using this form: “I induce you into the real and
actual possession of the rectory or vicarage of M.,
with all its profits and appurtenances.” The church door
is then opened; the different enter, as it were, tolls a bell, in token of having entered on his spiritual
Duties. In Scotland the Presbytery induce the minis-
ter.

Indulgence (Lat. indulgentia, in English, is the title
applied to a proclamation of Charles II (A.D.
1663), and especially to one of James II, April 4, 1687,
announcing religious tolerance to all classes of his sub-
jects, suspending all penal laws against nonconformists,
and abolishing religious tests as qualifications for civil
office. The king’s object was simply to favor Roman
Catholics, and therefore neither the English Church nor
the great body of the dissenters received the illegal
stretches of prerogative with favor, and refused to believe
that a “dispensing power” exercised by the king inde-
dependently of Parliament could be of any lasting advan-
tage. Howe and Baxter maintained this opinion. The
same instrument was extended to Scotland, and divided
the Covenanters into two parties. At first the king
asked toleration for Papists only, but the Scottish Par-
liament, usually very obscure, would not listen. He
finally declared, as if Popery were already in the ascend-
ant, that he would never use “force or invincible nes-
satility against any man on account of his Protestant faith,”
and all this he did by his sovereign authority, prerog-
itive royal, and absolute power.”—Macleay, Hist.
of England, i, 213; iii, 44 sq.; Skeats, Hist. of Free
of England since the Restoration, ii, 296, et al.

Indulgences (Lat. indulgentiae), the name of a pe-
cular institution in the Roman Church. The doctrine
and practice of indulgence constitutes the very centre
of the hier-
archical theory of Romanism, and was, for that
very reason, the first object of attack on the part of Lu-
ther in the beginning of the Reformation.

I. Origin of the System. — The early Church knew
nothing of indulgences. The system seems to have
originated in that of penance (q. v.), which, in the hands
of the episcopacy, began to assume a corrupt form in
the 8th century. The immediate object of penance was
the partial expiation of sins; an office introduced by
Purification with God, but
to the constitution of the Church. When an excom-
municated person sought remission, the bishop
assigned him a penitential discipline (q. v.) of abstinence,
mortification, and good works, after which he was taken
back into fellowship by certain regular modes of pro-
ceedure. These procedures were either a period of
pro-

riot of probation, or to mitigate the severity of the pen-
ance, and in this power lies the germ of the doctrine
of
INDULGENCES

504

INDULGENCES

Indulgence (see Canons of Council of Antioch, c. v). In course of time penitential discipline came to be applied, not merely to excommunicated persons, but to all delinquents within the pale of the Church; and penance came at last, in the hands of the schoolmen, to be a sacrament, with its systematic theory nicely fitting into the theologian's system of which, in some degree, it was a very keystone. Nothing could so surely augment the power of the priesthood as the right of fixing penalties for sin, and making terms of forgiveness. "Just as, in early times, the penances of the excommunicated were frequently mitigated, so, in the course of the Middle Ages, the delinquents were given a chance of reforming, and their delinquencies were subjected. Permission was given to exchange a more severe for a gentler kind of penance. Sometimes, in place of doing penance himself, the party was allowed to employ a substitute. And sometimes, in fine, instead of the actual penance prescribed, some service conducive to the interest of the Church and the glory of God was accepted. This last was the real basis of indulgence. Even here, however, the process was gradual. At first only personal acts performed for the Church were admitted, and then the gifts became more and more common, until at last the matter assumed the shape of a mere money speculation. This when the abuse grew up in practice. Then came Scholasticism, and furnished it with a theoretical substratum; and not until the institution had thus received an ecclesiastical and scientific foundation, and the practice of distributing indulgences had overstressed all limits. The first powerful impulse to the introduction of indulgences, properly so called, was given by the Crusades at the great Synod of Clermont in 1096. Urban II there promised to all who took part in the Crusade, which he proposed as a highly meritorious ecclesiastical work, plenary indulgence (indulgentias plenariae); and from that date for a period of two hundred years, this grace of the Church continued until the most powerful means for renewing and enlivening these expeditions, although it was evident to unprejudiced contemporaries that the adventurers, when they crossed the ocean, did not undergo a change of character with the change of climate. The same favor was extended to the military expeditions set on foot against the heathen in Europe, and at last, by Boniface VIII, in 1296, to the year of the Roman Jubilee. Subsequently, papal indulgences were granted on all kinds of occasions, and princes and monarchs, and the heads of the churches; in short, many and many places likewise received from successive popes special privileges in the matter of indulgence" (Ullmann, Reformers before the Reformation, i, 236).

II. Scholastic Doctrine of Indulgence. The practice of indulgence had been going on for some time when the Scholastic theologians took it up, and formed a speculative theory to justify it. Three great men contributed to this task: Alexander de Hales (q. v.), Albertus Magnus (q. v.), and Thomas Aquinas (q. v.).

Alexander de Hales († A.D. 1245) laid a firm foundation for the theory in the doctrine, first fairly propounded by him, of the Treasuries of the Church (thesauri ecclesiae). It runs as follows: "The sufferings and death of Christ not only made a sufficient satisfaction for the sins of men, but also acquired a superabundance of merit. This superabundant merit of Christ is conjointly the property of the faithful; it is the same in kind, though smaller in degree, for they likewise performed more than the divine law required of them. The sum of these supererogatory merits and good works forms a vast treasure, which is disjoined from the persons who won or performed them, exists objectively, and, having been accumulated by the Church, and intended by it for use, belongs to the Church, and is necessarily placed under the administration of its representatives, especially the pope, who is supreme. It is therefore competent for the pope, according to the measure of his insight at the time, to draw from this treasure, and bestow upon those who have no merit of their own such supplies of it as they require. Indulgences and remissions are made from the supererogatory merits of Christ's members, but most of all from the superabundance of Christ's own, the two constituting the Church's spiritual treasure. The administration of this treasure does not pertain to all, but to those only who occupy Christ's place, viz. the bishops. The pope is the true keystone" (Alex. de Hales, Summa theol. 1. c. par. 5). He does not, however, suppose that in such cases indulgence is granted in the way of judicial absolution or barter, but in that of intercession ("per medium suffragii et interpretationis").

Albert the Great († 1280), adopting the opinions of his predecessor, designates indulgence the remission of some imposed punishment or penance, proceeding from the power of the keys, and the treasure of the superfluous merits of the perfect. With respect to the efficacy of indulgence, Albert proposes to steer a middle course between the extremes. Some hold that indulgence has no efficacy at all, and is merely a pious fraud, by which men are enticed to the performance of good works, such as pilgrimage and almsgiving. These, however, reduce the action of the Church to child's play, and fall into heresy. Others, carrying the contrary opinion to the other extreme, hold that indulgence at once and unconditionally accomplishes all that is expressed in it, and thus make the divine mercy diminish the fear of judgment. The true medium is that indulgence has that precise amount of efficacy which the Church assigns to it (Alb. Magnus, Sentend. lib. iv, d. xxiv, art. ii). As regards effectual indulgence, Albert never speaks of it, while Thomas Aquinas deduces the efficacy of indulgence directly from Christ. The history of the adulterers shows, he says, that it is in Christ's power to remit the penalty of sin without satisfaction, and so could Paul, and so also can the pope, whose power in the Church is no less than that of Paul. Besides, the Church general is infallible, and, as it sanctions and prides indulgence, indulgence must be valid. This, Thomas is persuaded, all admit, because there would be impurity in representing any act of the Church as nugatory. The reason of its efficacy, however, is in the sum of those merits that it greatly exceeds any that are within the limits of which there are many who, as respects works of penitence, have done more than they were under obligation to do; for instance, many who have patiently endured undeserved sufferings sufficient to expiate a great amount of penalties. In fact, so vast is the sum of those merits that it greatly exceeds the measure of the guilt of all the living, especially when augmented by the merit of Christ, which, although operative in the sacraments, is not in its operation confined to these, but, being infinite, extends far beyond them. The measure of the efficacy of indulgence—this St. Thomas reckons to be the truth—is determined by the measure of its cause. The procuring cause of the remission of punishment in indulgence is, however, solely the plenitude of the Church's merits, not the piety, labors, or gifts of the party by whom it is obtained; and therefore the power of the Church must be limited to that extent within which it is sufficient. The pope need not correspond with any of these, but only with the merits of the Church. In respect to the party who ought to dispense indulgence, St. Thomas asserts that no mere priest or pastor, but only the bishop, is competent for the duty. On the other hand, deacons and other parties consecrated by the pope, may grant indulgence if, either in an ordinary or extraordinary way, they have been intrusted with jurisdiction for the purpose. For indulgence does not, like sacramental acts, pertain to the power of the keys inherent in the priestly office, but to that power of the keys which belongs to jurisdiction (Aquinas, Suppl. 18d parte Summa Theologica, qu. xxxv-xxvii).
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III. Opposition to Indulgences within the Church of Rome.—Such a doctrine could not fail to offend truly pious souls even within the Church. Long before the Reformation the whole system was attacked by eminent doctors. One of its most powerful opponents was John of Wesel (q.v.), in the middle of the 15th century. A feast which was indulged by pope Clement VI in 1450, and cardinal Cusanus visited Erfurt as a preacher of indulgence. This brought the subject practically before Wesel’s mind, and he wrote a treatise against indulgences (Adversus indulgentias; see Walch, Monum. Med. Eevi, ii, fasc. i, 111-158). For a few years Ullmann, Bishop of Hildesheim, before the Reformation, i, 298 sq. The flagrant abuses connected with the sale of indulgences began to cause a reaction against the system ever in the popular mind. In the 15th century, in particular, the disposal of them had become almost a common traffic; and a public sale of them was generally preceded by some specious pretext; for instance, the reduction of the Greeks under the yoke of the Romish Church, a war with heretics, or a crusade against the Neapolitans, etc. Too often the pretences for selling indulgences were in reality bloody, idolatrous, or superstitious. It was one of the charges brought against them at the trial of Constance, in 1415, that he empowered his legates to abrogate penalties from all sorts of crimes upon payment of sums proportioned to their guilt. When such indulgences were to be published, the disposal of them was correspondingly fostered; for the papal court could not always wait to have the treasures collected by the people from every country of Europe. And there were rich merchants at Genoa, Milan, Venice, and Augsburg who purchased the indulgences for a particular province, and paid to the papal chancery handsome sums for them. Thus both on the one side indulgences and the chancery benefited. The chancery came at once into possession of large sums of money, and the farmers did not fail of a good bargain. They were careful to employ skilful hawks of the indulgences, persons whose boldness and impudence bore due proportion to the eloquence which with them they imposed upon the simple people. Yet, that this species of traffic might have a religious aspect, the pope appointed the archbishops of the several provinces to be his commissioners, who in his name announced that indulgences were to be sold, and generally selected the persons to hawk them, and for this service shared the profits with the merchants who hired them. That the papal hawks enjoyed great privileges, and, however odious to the civil authorities, they were not to be molested. Complaints, indeed, were made against these contributions, levied by the popes upon all Christian Europe. Kings and princes, clergy and laity, bishops, monasteries, and confessors, all felt themselves aggrieved by them; the kings, that their countries were impoverished, under the pretext of crusades that were never undertaken, and of wars against heretics and Turks; and the bishops, that their letters of indulgence were rendered inefficient, and the people released from ecclesiastical discipline. But at Rome all were deaf to these complaints; and it was not till the revolution produced by Luther that unhappy Europe obtained the desired relief (Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. cent. iii, sec. i, chap. 1). Leo X, in order to carry on the expensive structure of St. Peter’s Church at Rome, published ten indulgences, with a promise of remission due to all such as should contribute towards erecting that magnificent fabric. The right of promulgating these indulgences in Germany, together with a share in the profits arising from the sale of them, was granted to Albert, elector of Ments and archbishop of Magdeburg, who selected as his chief agent for retaining them in Saxony John Tetzel, a Dominican friar, of licentious morals, but of an active and enterprising spirit, and remarkable for his noisy and popular eloquence. Assisted by the monks of his order, he executed the commission with great zeal and success, but with no less indeftnacy, boasting that he had saved more souls from hell by his indulgences than St. Peter had converted by his preaching. He assured the purchasers of them that their crimes, however enormous, would be forgiven; that the efficacy of indulgences was so great that the most heinous sins, even if one should violate (which was impossible) the mother of God, would be remitted and expiated by the perfections both from punishment and guilt; and that this was a veritable gift of God, in order to reconcile men to himself. In the usual form of absolution, written by his own hand, he said: "May our Lord Jesus Christ have mercy upon thee, and absolve thee by the merits of his most holy passion, sin, and death, and by his death before the mercy of the Holy Father, Peter and Paul, and of the most holy pope, granted and committed to me in these parts, do absolve thee, first, from all ecclesiastical censures, in whatever manner they have been incurred; then from all thy sins, transgressions, and excesses, how enormous soever they may be; even from such as are reserved for the cognizance of the holy see, and as far as the keys of the holy Church extend. I remit to thee all punishment which thou deservest in Purgatory on their account; and I restore thee to the holy sacraments of the Church, to the unity of the faithful, and to that innocence and purity which thou lost through thine own transgression. And know, that gates of punishment shall be shut, and the gates of the Paradise of delights shall be opened; and if thou shalt not die at present, this grace shall remain in full force when thou art at the point of death. In the name of the Father, the Son, and the Holy Ghost. The sentence of absolution and remission of sins is pronounced by me on their account in Christ’s stead. So be it; amen." The sale of indulgences was the breaking of the dam in which the indulgence-hunters collected all their benefits, and the necessity of purchasing them, was so extravagant that they appear almost incredible. If any man, said they, purchase letters of indulgence, his soul may rest secure with respect to its salvation. The whole system of indulgences was supported by the papal censure, and by the threat of excommunication to those who refused to buy indulgences, or to sell them, or to use them. If these should pursue any other course, which led to the Lutheran Reformation, and it was against these that Luther first directed his attacks. See Luther; Reformation.

III. Present Doctrine and Practice of Indulgence.—The following extracts show what has been, since the Council of Trent, and is now, the Roman doctrine of indulgence. The Council declared that "as the power of granting indulgences was given by Christ to the Church, and she has exercised it in the most ancient times, this holy synod teaches and commands that the use of them, as being greatly salutary to the Christian people, and approved by the authority of councils, shall be retained; and she anathematizes those who say they are useless, or deny to the Church the power of granting them; but in this grant the synod wishes that moderation, agreeably to the ancient and approved practice of the Church, be exercised, lest by too liberal indulgence the remission of sin be weakened" (Conc. Trident. Sess. xxv, De Indulgentiis). "If a bill of Indulgentias, whose object he states to be "that no one in future may allege ignorance of the doctrine of the Roman Church respecting indulgences and their efficacy," declares "that the Roman pontiff, view of Christ on earth, can, for reasonable causes, by the powers of the keys, grant to the faithful, whether in this life or in Purgatory, indulgences, out of the superabundance of the merits of Christ, and of the saints (expressly called a treasure); and that those who have truly obtained these indulgences are released from so much of the temporal punishment due for their act-
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ual sins to the divine justice as is equivalent to the indulgence granted and obtained" (Bulla Leon. X., auct. Luther.). Clemens VI, in the bull Unigenitus, explains this matter more fully: "As a single drop of Christ's blood would have sufficed for the redemption of the whole human race, so the rest was not lost, but "was a treasure which the wise man hid in the field, where it would be useful for the benefit of his sons; which treasure he would not suffer to be hid in a napkin, or buried in the ground, but committed it to be dispensed by St. Peter and his successors, his own vicars upon earth, for proper and reasonable causes, for the total or partial remission of the temporal punishment due to sin; and of all the whole salvation of his treasure, the merits of the blessed mother of God, and of all the elect, who are known to come in aid." The reasonable causes, on account of which indulgences are given, are, where "the cause be pious, that is, not a work which is merely temporal, or vain, or in no respect appertaining to the divine glory, but any work whatsoever which tends to the honor of God or the service of the Church, an indulgence will be valid." We see, occasionally, the very greatest indulgences given for the very slightest causes; as when a penitent indulgence is granted to a poor wretch, by a simple act of faith, whilst the pope gives the solemn blessing to the people on Easter day; for "indulgences do not depend, for their efficacy, on the consideration of the work enjoined, but on the infinite treasure of the merits of Christ and the saints, which is a consideration surpassing and transcending all the man's duties, which are granted and remitted for the same cause." In some cases the work enjoined must not only be pious and useful, but bear a certain proportion with the indulgence; that is, the work enjoined must tend to an end more pleasing in the sight of God than the satisfaction remitted, "although it is not necessary that it be in immediate connection, or satisfaction for, or difficult, and laborious (though these things ought to be regarded too), but that it be a means, apt and useful, towards obtaining the end for which the indulgence is granted." So "the large resort of people," before the gates of St. Peter, when the pope gives his solemn blessing, "is a means, apt and useful, to set forth the jubilee, and to gladden the people, and to give them the idea of the indulgence" (can. xi). The third and fourth Lateran Councils granted the same indulgence to those who set themselves to destroy heretics, or who shall take up arms against them (see Laubé, x., 1528). Boniface VIII granted not only a full and larger, but the most full pardon of all sins to all that visit Rome the first year in every century. Clement V decreed that they who should, at the Jubilee, visit such and such churches, should obtain a "most full remission of all their sins;" and he not only granted a "plenary absolution of all sins to all who died on the road to Rome," but also commanded the angels of Paradise to carry the soul direct to heaven. "Sin- cere repentance, we are told, "is always enjoined or implied in the grant of an indulgence, and is indispensably necessary for every grace" (Milner, End of Con- troversy, p. 804.). But as the dead are removed from the possibility of living, so are they removed from the necessity of repentance; "as the pope, says Bellarmine, is the satisfaction of Christ and the saints to the dead, by means of works enjoined on the living, they are applied, not in the way of judicial absolution, but in the way of pay- ment (per modum solutionis). For as when a person gives alms to a poor man, or makes a pittance on account of the dead, the effect is, not that he obtains absolution for themselves from their liability to punishment, but he presents to God that particular satisfaction for them, in order that God, on receiving it, may liberate the dead from the debt of punishment which they had to pay. In like manner, the pope does not absolve the deceased, but offers to God, out of the measure of satisfaction, as much as is necessary to free them" (ib.). Their object is "to afford succor to such as have departed real penitents in the love of God, yet before they had duly satisfied, by fruits worthy of penance, for sins of commission and omission, and are now purifying in the fire of Purgatory, that an entrance may be opened for them into that coun- try set apart for them, where they are defiled, and where they may be useful for the benefit of his sons; which treasure he would not suffer to be hid in a napkin, or buried in the ground, but committed it to be dispensed by St. Peter and his successors, his own vicars upon earth, for proper and reasonable causes, for the total or partial remission of the temporal punishment due to sin; and of all the whole salvation of his treasure, the merits of the blessed mother of God, and of all the elect, who are known to come in aid." The reasonable causes, on account of which indulgences are given, are, where "the cause be pious, that is, not a work which is merely temporal, or vain, or in no respect appertaining to the divine glory, but any work whatsoever which tends to the honor of God or the service of the Church, an indulgence will be valid." We see, occasionally, the very greatest indulgences given for the very slightest causes; as when a penitent indulgence is granted to a poor wretch, by a simple act of faith, whilst the pope gives the solemn blessing to the people on Easter day; for "indulgences do not depend, for their efficacy, on the consideration of the work enjoined, but on the infinite treasure of the merits of Christ and the saints, which is a consideration surpassing and transcending all the man's duties, which are granted and remitted for the same cause." In some cases the work enjoined must not only be pious and useful, but bear a certain proportion with the indulgence; that is, the work enjoined must tend to an end more pleasing in the sight of God than the satisfaction remitted, "although it is not necessary that it be in immediate connection, or satisfaction for, or difficult, and laborious (though these things ought to be regarded too), but that it be a means, apt and useful, towards obtaining the end for which the indulgence is granted." So "the large resort of people," before the gates of St. Peter, when the pope gives his solemn blessing, "is a means, apt and useful, to set forth the jubilee, and to gladden the people, and to give them the idea of the indulgence" (can. xi). The third and fourth Lateran Councils granted the same indulgence to those who set themselves to destroy heretics, or who shall take up arms against them (see Laubé, x., 1528). Boniface VIII granted not only a full and larger, but the most full pardon of all sins to all that visit Rome the first year in every century. Clement V decreed that they who should, at the Jubilee, visit such and such churches, should obtain a "most full remission of all their sins;" and he not only granted a "plenary absolution of all sins to all who died on the road to Rome," but also commanded the angels of Paradise to carry the soul direct to heaven. "Sin- cere repentance, we are told, "is always enjoined or implied in the grant of an indulgence, and is indispensably necessary for every grace" (Milner, End of Con- troversy, p. 804.). But as the dead are removed from the possibility of living, so are they removed from the necessity of repentance; "as the pope, says Bellarmine, is the satisfaction of Christ and the saints to the dead, by means of works enjoined on the living, they are applied, not in the way of judicial absolution, but in the way of pay-ment (per modum solutionis). For as when a person gives alms to a poor man, or makes a pittance on account of the dead, the effect is, not that he obtains absolution for themselves from their liability to punishment, but he presents to God that particular satisfaction for them, in order that God, on receiving it, may liberate the dead from the debt of punishment which they had to pay. In like manner, the pope does not absolve the deceased, but offers to God, out of the measure of satisfaction, as much
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tion of any soul from Purgatory, through a mass offered at that altar. Instead of these words, however, the same thing is more plainly expressed in some churches. In the church Santa Maria della Pace, so celebrated for the magnificent fresco of the Sibyls by Raphael, there is over one of the altars the following inscription: "Ogni messa in quest’altare è considerata come perdonato il delitto di purgatorio"—Every mass celebrated at this altar is considered as a soul released from Purgatory. In some churches this privilege extends throughout the year, but in others it is limited to those masses which are offered on particular days. In the church of Sta. Croce di Gerusalemme this privilege is connected in an especial manner with the fourth Sunday in Lent. And this is notified by a public notice posted in the church close to the altar, setting forth that a mass celebrated there on that day releases a soul from Purgatory" (Seymour, 

Eveings at Rome).

Indulgences are now granted in the Roman Church on a very ample scale, especially to all contributors to the erection of churches, and to the funds of the Propaganda and other missionary societies, etc. In fact, almost any act of piety (so-called) entitles one to an indulgence: as, for instance, the worship of relics; the visiting of churches or special altars; participation in divine services or in processions of such altars; the visiting of churches, and, especially, taking part in pilgrimages. Indulgences which apply either to the whole Church are called general (indulg. generalis), while those that are confined to particular localities, as a bishopric, etc., are called particular (indulg. particularis). The most general of these indulgences was that granted by the pope in the year 1366 to the Cathedral of Jubilee (q. v.). The general indulgence is always made out by the pope himself, while the particular indulgences, either plenary or novem plena, are often among the privileges of divers localities, either for special occasions or for various lengths of time, or occasionally, as in the case of the jubilees, for an indefinite period. The indulgence is granted by the bishop and two canons of the diocese receiving it. "Indulgences are divided into plenary and non-plenary, or partial, temporary, indefinite, local, perpetual, real, and personal. 1. A plenary indulgence is that by which is obtained a remission of all the temporal punishment due to sin, either in this life or in the next. 2. A non-plenary or partial indulgence is that which remits only a part of the temporal punishment due to sin: such are indulgences for a given number of days, weeks, or years. This sort of indulgence remits so many days, weeks, or years of penance, which ought to be observed agreeably to the ancient canons of the Church, for the sins which we have committed. 3. Temporary indulgences are those which are granted for a specified time, as for seven or more years. 4. Indefinite indulgences are those which are granted without any limitation of time. 5. Perpetual indulgences are those granted forever, and which do not require to be renewed after a given number of years. 6. A general indulgence is one granted by the pope to all the faithful throughout the world. 7. A local indulgence is attached to certain churches, chapels, or other places: it is gained by actually visiting such church or other building or place, and by observing scrupulously all the conditions required by the bull granting such indulgence. 8. A real indulgence is attached to certain movable things, as rosaries, medals, etc., and is granted to those who actually invest these articles with devotion; which binding devotions and their observance in what respects are in the nature of satisfaction, which were originally an integral part of the sacrament of penitence, are entirely disconnected, with it, and viewed as a mere matter of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, but it has this further radical defect pervading all its constituent parts, that moral and religious things, which can only be taken as spiritual magnitudes, are considered as material ones, quality being treated wholly as quantity, and, consequently, a standard of external computation and a sort of religious arithmetic applied, which involves contradiction. Even in order to establish the superabundance of the merit of Christ, it was affirmed that there is a single drop of his blood would have sufficed for a universal atonement, yet the Saviour had shed so much, as if it were not the divine sacrifice of love on the part of the Son of God and man, and his atoning death in general, but his several outward sufferings of his whole humanity in what respects is of weight and importance consisted. In like manner, on the part of the saints, it was not their peculiar and more exalted moral and religious character, but their several works, and especially the volume rather than the worth of these, which was taken into account; and the whole was handled as something totally disconnected with their persons, as an objective fund, a sum of ready money in the Church's hands. According to the same category, the imputation of the merits of Christ and the saints was described as a purely external transference of a portion of that sum to one who needed it. For, although a penitent frame of mind was required of the sinner, still
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It was not for the sake, nor according to the measure of that, that the merit of Christ and the saints was transferred to him, but solely for the sake of some service performed by him for the Church, and this performance, again, is quite an external and isolated work. At the same time, as respects the merits of the saints, the theory of indulgences is based on the supposition that a man who is still human, although a saint, may not only possess a sufficiency of merit to answer his own need before God, but may likewise do more than the divine law demands of him, and thus acquire a surplus of merit for the benefit of others. Even this is a monstrous supposition, but still more monstrous is the position that another, who invokes the religious domain and the glory of God. In point of fact, the doctrine and practice of indulgences gives the Church a position as an absolutely unerring and omniscient judicial power. It identifies the tribunal of the Church with that of God, and the tribunal of the pope with that of the Church, whereby indirectly identifying the pope's of God's, so that the pope is raised to a position, in virtue of which, as the visible head of the mystical body of Christ, and as the dispenser of all penalties and graces, he decides the high and mighty. This is the salvation of the living and the dead, according to his mere pleasure. Granting, however, that the whole doctrine were well founded, the position assigned to the pope would be one elevated far above the reach of fancy, and could be designated only as that of a terrestrial god. What an infinite amount of power would be the means to a corruption, a playing with the powers, and with what conscientiousness sharpened to the utmost ought the popes, if they were bold enough to believe that such plenitude of power had actually been lodged in the hands of any child of the dust, to have dispensed the long blessings committed to their trust? How carefully ought they to have guarded them from perversion and debasement! And yet what do we see? Abuse upon abuse, and profanation upon profanation, in an ascending scale, for more than two centuries, until at last moral indignation bursts like a tempest upon their impious hurlings! (Ullmann, Reformers before the Reformation, i, 246). "Either the pope has the power of bringing souls out of Purgatory, or he has not. If he has not, the question is decided. If he has, what cruelty, then, for him to leave there whole millions of souls whom he might by a word bring out of it! Without greater power would there be a congregation, a pittance, and with what conscientiousness sharpened to the utmost ought the popes, if they were bold enough to believe that such plenitude of power had actually been lodged in the hands of any child of the dust, to have dispensed the long blessings committed to their trust? How carefully ought they to have guarded them from perversion and debasement! And yet what do we see? Abuse upon abuse, and profanation upon profanation, in an ascending scale, for more than two centuries, until at last moral indignation bursts like a tempest upon their impious hurlings! (Ullmann, Reformers before the Reformation, i, 246)."

V. For further literature and discussion of the subject, see Bp. Philip's Letters to Mr. Butler, p. 151-158; Hales, Analysis of Chronology, vol. ii, pt. ii, p. 1019-22; Mendham, Spiritual Vandalism of Rome (London, 1886, 12mo); Mendham, Vindication and Paradox of the Church of Rome exemplified (London, 1889, 12mo); Ferraria, Bibliotheca Promin., s. v.; Elliott, Delegation of Romanism, book ii, ch. xii.; Herzog, Real-Encyclopedia, ii. 67; Neander, History of Doctrines, ii, 594; Neander, Church History, i, 52, ch. x, 186; Neander, Church History, ii, 61, ch. ii, 186; F. C. Burkitt, Ch. History, ii, 75, ch. ii, 54, § 1, ch. i and ii; D'Aubigné, History of the Reformation, bk. iii; Amort, De Origine, etc., indulgentiarum (Aug. 1735, fol.); Hirsch, Lehrb. v. Ablass (Tübingen, 1844); Gieseler, Church Hist. ii, § 55, 81; Hook, Church Dictionary, s. v.; Gaudenz, Text-Book of Roman Church; Bungener, Hist. of the Council of Trent, p. 518-530; Ullmann, Reformers before the Reformation, i, 235 sq.; Berger, Diction. de Théologie, iii, 398.

Indul (Latin indulitus, participle of indulgere, I indulge) signifies in ecclesiastical law a peculiar form of dispensation granted by the pope from the requirements of the ordinary law. Thus the power of bestowing benefits is granted to cardinals or princes by an indul from the pope.
these subjects instruction in cooking, washing, and ironing has been tried as yet only to a limited extent, and has been only partially successful. In ragged schools, on the other hand, no department of the school-work seems to thrive better, partly because it enters so largely into the scheme of instruction, partly because the children are so fluent on the subject. In England the ragged schools are recognised by the Legislature as 'industrial schools,' and may be defined as schools in which the pupils are fed and clothed (wholly or partially), as well as taught the elements of an ordinary education, and the practice of some trade. By a statute of 1828 children under bond must not beg or be vagrant or begging, convicted of petty offences, may be sent by a magistrate to an industrial school that has been certified by the home secretary. Parents also, on paying for board and lodging a small sum, may place their children in industrial schools if they can show that they are unable to control them. The treasury may contribute to the maintenance of these schools on the representation of the home secretary. If a child abscond from the school before he is 15, the justices may send him back, or place him in a reformatory school (q. v.). In 1861 there were in England 39, and in Scotland 342, in both of which the number of pupils attending was respectively 1754 in the former, and 1606 in the latter" (Chambers, s. v.). In Germany, these schools prove even a greater boon to the poorer classes than elsewhere, especially to orphans. By law every child is obliged to attend school instruction (sachliche Bildung), and the number of pupils and the requirement of some trade enables children of 14 to begin work to advantage, and earn at least their own livelihood if they may not even aid in the support of their parents or other near relatives. It is to be hoped that in the United States the generous spirit of the people will stimulate especially further this work, and make industrial schools numerous in all our large cities at least. (J. H. W.)

Indwelling Scheme, a name used by some English theologians to denote a theory derived from Col. ii, ix: "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," which, according to some, asserts the doctrine of Christ's consisting of two beings: one the self-existent Creator, and the other a creature, made into one person by an ineffable union and indwelling, which renders the same attributes and honors equally applicable to both. See Christology.

Indwelling Sin. See SIN.

Ineffable Deus. See IMMACULATE CONCEPTION.

Ineffability. See INDEFECTIBILITY.

Ineffability is the quality of being incapable either of being deceived, or of leading others astray. Romantics, while acknowledging that God alone is naturally ineffable, maintain that he has been pleased to transmit this quality, to some undefined extent, to the Church and to the Pope, so that they are ineffable in their decisions on all points of doctrine.

I. INEFFABILITY OF THE CHURCH.—The following is a condensed view of the ineffability of the Church of Rome, as collected from her own authors. Denis affirms, "That the Church, in matters of faith and manners, can by no means err; is an article of belief. Moreover, ineffability in the Church may be considered in two points of view: the one active and authoritative, which is called ineffability in teaching and defining; the other passive or submissive (obedientialis), which is called ineffability in learning and believing. Ineffability, considered in the first sense, refers to the Church with respect to the head or chief pontiff, and the prelates of the Church; although this ineffability would not regard the laity or inferior pastors; for, as a man is said to see, although his vision does not apply to all his members, but to his eyes only, so the Church, in like manner, is said to be ineffable, although this ineffability refers only to the prelates. But if the Church is not said—
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Luke x, 16). They also quote 2 Tim. i, 14; ii, 2; and Acts xx, 28, to show that the apostles claimed this privilege for themselves, as well as the power of transmitting it to those they appointed over the churches.

The same privilege has also been ascribed to the pope as successor of St. Peter, and God's only vicegerent on earth, by Bucer, Zwingli, Beza, Baronius, etc., maintaining that whatever dogmatic judgment or decision on a doctrinal point the pope addressed to the whole church, is necessarily correct. But as it has repeatedly occurred that the Church, as represented in councils, has disagreed with the pope on points of doctrine, it is clear that both are equally responsible, the people are bound to believe equally two opposite doctrines. The French Church settled the difficulty by proclaiming general councils superior to the pope (or "more infallible"); the assembly of the clergy, in 1682, asserted that "in controversies of faith the office of the pope is the chief, and that his decrees pertain to all churches; nevertheless, that his judgment is not irreformable unless it is confirmed by the consent of the Church." Bossuet sustained this principle with great talent and eloquence in his Defensio Declarat. Cleri Galli, ii, pt. i, 12 sq. He proves by the decrees of councils, both ancient and modern, and by the declarations of popes themselves, and especially of Adrian VI, that the infallibility of the pope was a new doctrine, altogether unknown in the early ages of the Church. He disproves the infallibility of the pope not merely by authority, but by a long and strong chain of positive evidence; by adding a number of instances, as well as direct assertions of his infallibility from generation to generation; by showing, from a large induction of facts, that during a series of centuries he was regarded and treated as fallible, and never as otherwise than fallible; and that, when another opinion began to gain ground, it arose mainly from the exercise of that authority which belongs to a supreme power" (Hare, Contest with Rome, p. 218).

Bossuet's views were held by Fleury, Dupin, cardinal Bausset, etc. They were attacked by De Maistre in his work Du Pape. A work of great weight on this subject is the recently discovered Refutation of all Heresies of Hippolytus, which gives us a clear idea of the manner in which the Roman bishops were considered in his times. "In Germany, where truth is held the most precious of all possessions, even by members of the Church, the doctrine of infallibility of the bishops produced by the doctrine of the infallibility of the pope is so strongly felt by many, that one of the greatest philosophers of the last generation, Baader, who was a zealous champion of the Christian truth, and himself an earnest Roman Catholic, used perpetually to repeat the pregnant words of St. Martin: Le Pape n'est la faiblesse du Catholicisme; et le Catholicisme est la force du Pape" (Hare, Contest with Rome, p. 218).

As regards the infallibility of the Church, Dr. Newman himself, in his Lectures on Romanism, p. 61, said: "In the creed of pope plus a word is said expressly about the Church's infallibility: it forms no article of faith there. Her interpretation indeed of Scripture is recognized as authoritative; but so also is "the unanimous consent of the fathers, whether as primitive or concordant; they believe the existing Church to be infallible; and, if ancient belief is at variance with it, of course it is not to be followed, but if it is, antiquity must be mistaken—that is all.""

"That general councils are infallible is generally believed by Romanists. Some, however, maintain that the confirmation of the pope is necessary to constitute infallibility. But the decrees of councils are infallible, whether confirmed by the pope or not. We quote the sentiments of some who contend that the decrees of a general council, with the confirmation of the pope, are infallible. Ferraris says, "The definitions of a general council legitimately assembled, issued in the absence of the pope, are not infallible without his confirmation" (Ferraris, Biblioth. Prompt, in Concilium, art. i, sect. 66). Cardinal Cusanus, as quoted by the former writer, declares that "the pope gives authority to the council" (Cusanus, lib. iii, cap. xv, De Concord Cathol.)." Jens teaches that "general councils, without the approbation of the pope, are fallible, and often err; that the confirmation of the pope to any particular decrees of a council imparts to them the character of infallibility. It is then necessary that both the pope, by his consent, and general councils approved by the pope cannot err in defining matters of faith and morals: hence they are to be considered as manifest heretics who presume to call in question what is decreed by such councils." He also believes that the decisions of particular councils are fallible by the pope's infallibility, and that this is founded on the infallibility of the pope. But Benedict XIV., to whom Jens refers, thinks that the decisions of such councils are binding only in their own provinces or dioceses. Many Romanist writers, however, maintain strongly that the decisions of general councils are infallible without the pope's confirmation. It would be an endless task to quote the authorities on both sides. They are, for the most part, however, agreed that what they call general councils are infallible: some believe them infallible because they are general councils, while others, believing the same, consider the confirmation of the pope necessary to the authoritative character of the assembly.

"The discordant sentiments of Romanists respecting those characteristics which are necessary to constitute infallibility, form a strong argument against the inerrancy of this doctrine. The Church has never openly professed that it has been strongly held by the Church of Rome: (1) Some have asserted that the diffusive, and not the representative body of the Church possessed infallibility. Occam, Petrus de Alaco, Cusanus, Antoninus of Florence, Pas- norvian, Nicholas de Ciamings, Franciscus Miranda, and others, were of this opinion, and either say that councils are no farther infallible than as they adhere to Scripture and universal tradition. (3) Others, that councils are of themselves infallible, whether the pope confirm them or not. This was the common opinion before the Council of Lateran, under Leo X, as appears from the Councils of Basel and Constance. (4) Many make the confirmation of the pope necessary to the infallibility of a general council. There is an irreconcilable difference between the two opinions; for those who suppose councils to be infallible without the confirmation of the pope believe the latter to be fallible; while those who are of opinion that the confirmation of his holiness is absolutely necessary to the infallibility of the council believe him to be infallible, and superior to a council."


II. INFALLIBILITY OF THE PAPe.—For many centuries the popes have demanded, and, so far as they can, in them, enforced an absolute submission to all their doctrinal decisions. They forbade appeal from their tribunal to the General Council, and even disallowed the plea of the Jansenists, Hervesian, and other schools whose views were censured, that the popes censoring them had erred, not in what they stated to be the approved doctrine, but in understanding the right sense of the censured books. Thus the popes for many centuries have acted as though they were infallible; and yet it was distinctly taught within the Church that the infallibility of the pope was no property of infallible councils, and even many catechisms and manuals of doctrine explicitly stated, with the consent of many bishops, that the infallibility of the pope was not a doctrine of the Church. One of the chief objects for which the Vatican Council was called in 1869 was to make an end of this uncertainty and enrole the doctrine of papal infallibility among the formal Church doctrines. Anson as
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It became generally known that it was intended to bring this subject before the council, a number of works appeared, discussing the proposed innovation in every aspect. By far the most important of these is the one published in Germany under the title Der Papst und das Concil (Mentz, 1869; Engl. transl. The Pope and the Council), which gives an exhaustive history of the views of the popes on the question of infallibility of the work, who on the title-page calls himself Janus, was subsequently found to be professor Huber, of the University of Munich. The book is a storehouse of immense learning, for the author quotes thousands of individual cases to show that no one can for a moment believe in the infallibility of the pope, the irresponsibility of his personal worthiness or unworthiness, is valid and indelible. Putting aside baptism, the whole security of the sacraments rests on this principle of faith, and re-ordination has always been opposed in the Church as a crime and a profanation of the sacrament. Only in the 5th century, in Rome, during the pontificate of the Goths and Lombards inflected on Central Italy, there was a collapse of all learning and theology, which disturbed and distorted the dogmatic tradition. Since the 8th century, the ordinations of certain popes began to be annulled, and the bishops and priests ordained by them were compelled to be reordained. This occurred first in 769, when Constantine II, who had possessed the papal chair by force of arms, and kept it for thirteen months, was blinded, and deposed at a synod, and all his ordinations pronounced invalid.

But the most crucial case took place at the end of the 9th century, after the death of pope Formosus, when the repeated rejections of his ordinations threw the whole Italian Church into the greatest confusion, and produced a general uncertainty as to whether there were any valid sacraments in Italy. Auxilius, who was a contemporary, claims that through the monotonous repetition of orders ('ordinatio, exordinatio, et superordinatio'), matters had come to such a pass in Rome that for twenty years the Christian religion had been interrupted and extinguished in Italy. Popes and synods decided in glaring contradiction to one another, now for, now against the validity of the ordinations, and it was self-evident that in Rome all sure knowledge on the doctrine of ordination was lost. At the end of his second work, Auxilius, speaking in the name of those numerous priests and bishops whose ecclesiastical status was called in question by the decisions of Stephen VII and Sergius III, demands that the Holy General Council, as the only authority capable of solving the complication introduced by the popes (Mabillon, Analecta [Paris, 1728], p. 39).

But the council never met, and the dogmatic uncertainty and confusion in Rome continued. The end of the 11th century the great contest against simony, which was then thought equivalent to heresy, broke out, and the ordinations of a simoniacal bishop were pronounced invalid. Leo IX reordained a number of persons on this ground, as Peter Damiani relates (Petri Damiani Opera p. 419). Gregory VII, at his fifth Roman synod, made the invalidity of all simoniacal ordinations a rule, and the principle, confirmed by Urban II, that a simoniacal bishop can give nothing in ordination, because he has nothing, passed into the Decretum of Gratian (Causa, i, qu. 7, c. 24).

In these cases it is obvious that doctrine and practice were most intimately connected. It was only from their holding a false, and, in its consequences, most injurious notion of the power and nature of this sacrament, that the popes acted as they did, and if they had been generally considered infallible, a hopeless confusion must have been introduced, not only into Italy, but the whole Church.

In contrast to pope Pelagius, who had declared, with the whole Eastern and Western Church, the indispensable necessity of the invocation of the Trinity in baptism, Nicolas I assured the Bulgarians that baptism in the name of Christ alone was quite sufficient, and thus exposed the Christians there to the danger of an invalid baptism. The same pope declared confirmation administered by priests, according to the Greek usage from remote antiquity, invalid, and ordered those so confirmed to be confirmed anew by a bishop, thereby denying...
to the whole Eastern Church the possession of a sacrament, and laying the foundation of the bitter estrangement which led to a permanent division (Concil. Coll. [ed. Labbe], vi, 548).

"Stephen II (III) allowed marriage with a slave girl to be dissolved, and a new one contracted, whereas all previous papal pronouncements on such marriages had been indissoluble (ib. vi, 1650). He also declared baptism, in cases of necessity, valid when administered with wine (ib. vi, 1662).

"Celestine III tried to loosen the marriage tie by declaring it dissolved if either party became heretical. Innocent III, in this decision, was condemned by Adrian VI, who called Celestine a heretic for giving it. This decision was afterwards expunged from the MS. collections of papal decrees, but the Spanish theologian Alphonseus de Castro had seen it there (Ade. Hcr. [ed. Paris], 1665; comp. Melch. Canus, p. 246).

"The Cappeneast doctrine, that Christ's body is sensibly (sensualis) touched by the hands and broken by the teeth in the Eucharist— an error rejected by the whole Church, and contradicting the impassibility of his body—was affirmed by Nicholas II at the Synod of Rome. Berenger was condemned to acknowledge it. Lanfranc reproaches Berenger with afterwards wishing to make cardinal Humbert, instead of the pope, responsible for this doctrine (Lanfranc, De Euch. c. 3 [ed. Migne], p. 412).

"Innocent III, in order to exhibit the papal power in the one of the effects of its divine omnipotence, invented the new doctrine that the spiritual bond which unites a bishop to his diocese is firmer and more indissoluble than the carnal bond, as he called it, between man and wife, and that God alone can dissolve it, viz. translate a bishop from one see to another. But as the pope is the representative of the true God on earth, he, and he alone, can dissolve this holy and indissoluble bond, not by human, but divine authority, and it is God, not man, who looses it. (Decretal 'De Transl. Episc.', c. 2, 3, 4, 5. This was to introduce a new article of faith. The Church had not known for centuries that resignations, depositions, and translations of bishops belonged by divine right to the pope.) The obvious and direct corollary, that the pope can also dissolve the less firm and holy bond of marriage, Innocent, as we have seen, overlooked, for he solemnly condemned Celestine III's decision to the Pope, and thus he was himself in a contradiction. Many canonists have accepted this as the legitimate consequence of his teaching.

"Innocent betrayed his utter ignorance of theology when he declared that the Fifth Book of Moses, being called Deuteronomy, or the Second Book of the Law, must bind the Christian Church, which is the second Church (Decretal 'Qui filii sit legitimi', c. 13). This great pope seems never to have read Deuteronomy, or he could hardly have fallen into the blunder of supposing, e.g., that the Old Testament prohibitions of particular kinds of food, the burnt-offerings, the harsh penal code and bloody laws of war, the prohibitions of woolen and linen garments, etc., were to be again made obligatory on Christians. As the Jews were allowed in Deuteronomy to put away a wife who displeased them and take another, Innocent ran the risk of falling himself into a greater error about marriage than Celestine III.

"Notable contradictions as to temporal privileges occur in the history of the alternate approbations and persecutions of the Franciscan order by the pope.

"One of the most comprehensive, dogmatic documents ever issued by a pope is the decree of Eugenius IV to the Armenians, dated November 22, 1439; three months after the Council of Florence was brought to an end by the departure of the Greeks. It is a confession of faith of the Roman Church, intended to serve as a rule of doctrine and practice for the Armenians on those points they had previously differed about. The dogmas of the Unity of the Divine Nature, the Trinity, the Incarnation, and the Seven Sacraments, are expounded, and the pope, moreover, asserts that the decree thus solemnly issued has received the sanction of the council, that is, of the Italian bishops whom he had detained in Florence.

"If this decree of the pope were really a rule of faith, the Eastern Church would have only four sacraments instead of seven, and this would have been the case between the first and the eighth century, and for less eight centuries have been deprived of three sacraments, and of one, the want of which would make all the rest, with one exception, invalid. Eugenius IV determines in this decree the form and matter, the substance of the sacraments, or of those things on the presence or absence of which the Catholic Church has decided, according to the universal doctrine of the Church. He gives a form of confirmation which never existed in one half of the Church, and first came into use in the other after the 10th century. So, again, with penance. What is given as the essential form of the sacrament was unknown in the Western Church for eleven hundred years, and never known in the Greek. And when the touching of the sacred vessels, and the words accompanying the rite, are given as the form and matter of ordination, it follows that the Latin Church for a thousand years has not known the consecration of the Greek Church, which never adopted this usage, possesses to this hour neither priests nor bishops, and consequently no sacraments except baptism, and perhaps marriage. (Comp. Denzinger, Enchirid. Symbol. et Defini., Viene, 1864, p. 200 sq. But Denzinger, in order to explain the sacraments of the Roman Church, defines his decree, has omitted the first part, on the Trinity and Incarnation, which is given in Raynaldus's Annuar, 1439. (The same conspicuously unexplained explanation was adopted in the Dublin Review for January, 1866.—Tr.))

"It is noteworthy that this decree— with which papal caprice of the bishops and universality, and for which the decrees of the Church stand or fall—is cited, refuted, and appealed to by all dogmatic writers, but that the adorants of papal infallibility have never meddled with it. Neither Bellarmine, nor Charles, nor Aguirre, nor Omi, nor the other theologians of the Roman court, troubled themselves with it."

"Into dogmatic theology the doctrine of papal infallibility was introduced by Thomas Aquinas. On the basis of fabrications invented by a Dominican monk, including a canon of the Council of Chalcedon, giving all the bishops and universities, and for the decrees, the decrements of the Church stand or fall—the Church, Thomas built up his papal system, with its two leading principles, that the pope is the infallible teacher of the world, and the absolute ruler of the Church. The popes were so well pleased with the teachings of Thomas that John XXII, who openly affirmed that Thomas had written without a spirit of inspiration of the Holy Ghost, and Innocent VI said that whoever assailed his teaching incurred suspicion of heresy. The powerful mendicant orders of Dominicans and Franciscans found the papal system, with its theory of infallibility, indispensable for the success of their own claims against the bishops and universities, and they became the violent champions of the new doctrine. The boldest champions of papal absolutism admitted, however, that the popes could err, and that their decisions were no certain criterion. But they also held that in such cases a heretical pope ipse facto ceased to be pope, without or before any judicial sentence, so that councils, which are the Church's judicature, only attested the vacancy of the papal throne as an accomplished fact.

"The contest between the Council of Basel and pope Eugenius IV evoked the work of cardinal Torquemada, who vigorously attacked those who hold to the teachings of Bellarmine, to be the most conclusive apology of the papal system, rests entirely on fabrications later than the pseudo-Isidore, and chiefly on the spurious passages of St. Cyril. Torquemada also holds that a pope can lapse into heresy and propound false doctrine, but then he is ipse factum deposed by God himself before any sentence of the Church has been passed, so that the Church or
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council cannot judge him, but can only announce the judgment of God, and thus one cannot properly say that a pope can become heretical, since he ceases to be pope at the moment of passing from orthodoxy to heterodoxy. The doctrine entered on a fresh phase of development from the time of Leo X. Its foremost defender at that time was Thomas Cajetan, and yet the doctrine was so far from becoming dominant at Rome that the successor of Leo X, Adrian VI, who, as professor of Louvain, had maintained in his principal work that several popes had been heretical, and that it was certainly possible for a pope to establish a heresy by his decree, at that time was Thomas Cajetan, and his work denrying infallibility to be reprinted in Rome.

Another patron of the infallibility theory, who labored hard to naturalize it in Belgium, the Louvain theologian, Ruard Tapper, returned in 1592 from Trent cruelly disillusionized, and thought the deep-seated corruption of the Church a matter not to be disputed, but to be deposed. The third of the theological fathers of infallibility in the 16th century was Tapper's contemporary, the Spaniard Melchior Canus, whose work on theological principles and evidences was, up to Bel- larminian times, more important for the infallibilists. Like Tapper, he became in later years disgusted with the effect of the papal system on the popes and the Curia, and in a report to the king of Spain expressed the opinion that the whole administration of the Church at Rome was "converted into a great trading place for goods and of great gains." For the pope can natural, and divine." Out of Italy the hypothesis of infallibility had but few adherents, even in the 16th century, till the Jesuits began to exercise a powerful influence.

The bishops and prominent scholars of France, Spain, Germany, and other countries were almost unanimous in advocating the superiority of ecclesiastical councils over the pope. The turning of the tide was chiefly due to the influence of the Jesuits, who were naturally inclined to favor the extreme absolutism in the Church. Their representative, cardinal Bellarmine further developed the ideas of Cajetan, in which he generally concurs; but he rejects decisively Cajetan's hypothesis of a heretical pope being deposed in quo facto by the judgment of God. A heretical pope is legitimate so long as the Church has not deposed him. If Cajetan said the Church was entitled to depose such a pope, Bellarmine says that whatever doctrine it pleases the pope to prescribe the Church must receive; there can be no question raised about proving it; she must blindly renounce all judgment of her own, and firmly believe that all the pope teaches is absolutely true, all he commands absolutely good, and all he forbids absolutely evil. For the pope can as little err in moral as in dogmatic questions. Nay, he goes so far as to maintain that if the pope were to err by prescribing sins and forbidding virtues, the Church would be bound to consider sins good and virtues evil, unless she chose to sin against conscience; so that if the pope absolve the subjects of a prince from their oath of allegiance, which, according to Bellarmine, he has a full right to do, the Church must believe that what he has done is good, and every Christian must hold it a sin to remain any longer loyal and obedient to his sovereign. In this connection Bellarmine and other writers of his order, the infallibility hypothesis now made immense strides. One great stumbling-block had, however, to be removed. Every theologian, on closer inspection, found papal decisions which contradicted other doctrines, laid down by popes or generally received from the pope, and his desire was to give to the pope an infallible authority, but he knew his doubts, and it seemed impossible to declare all these products of an infallible authority. It became necessary, therefore, to provide some distinctive marks by which a really infallible decision of a pope might be recognized, or to fix certain conditions, in the absence of which the pronouncement is not to be regarded as infallible. And thus, since the 16th century, there grew up the famous distinction of papal decisions promulgated ex cathedra, and therefore dogmatically, and without any possibility of error. By means of this ingenious distinction, some of the most inconvenient decisions of popes, which it was desirable to escape from the privilege of infallibility generally asserted in other cases, could be excluded. Thus最好。 This about the latter limited the dogmatic letter which was condemned as heretical by the sixth ecumenical council, and the decision addressed by Nicolas I to the Bulgarian Church that baptism administered simply in the name of Jesus is valid, were declared to be judgments given by the popes as private persons. In other words, they were not pronounced by the theologians advocating infallibility, but only two were commonly received, viz. Bellarmine's, that the papal decree must be addressed to the whole Church; and Cellesi's, that he must anathematize all who dissent from his teaching. According to this doctrine, which is taught by the most prominent dogmatic writer of the order in the present century, Perrone (Prolect. Theol. viii, 497, Louvain, 1848), and received by pretty nearly the whole order, the pope is liable to err when he addresses an instruction to the French or German Church only, while his pronouncements are, however, very questionable whenever he omits to denounce an anathema on all dissentients. Since the time of Bellarmine, the infallibility hypothesis has been one of the chief distinctions of the Jesuits and the most radical portion of the Ultramontane party on the one hand, and of all other parties on the other. A number of synods, bishops, and prominent theologians, and in some instances the whole Catholic Church of several countries, put themselves on record against the doctrine, for which, on the other hand, the Jesuits and other Ultramontane writers incessantly strove to gain friends among the bishops, clergy, and laity, and, in particular, among the sovereigns.

When pope Pius IX intimated his intention to invoke a council for the definition of the doctrine, a number of bishops, especially in France and Germany, declared themselves to be decidedly opposed to the doctrine, and at least one of them, the French bishop Marcellus (bishop of Suria in partibus infidelium, and dean of the theological faculty of Paris), published an elaborate work (On The General Council and the public Peace) to refute it, and to prove that it would subvert the very basis of the church. The opposition against papal infallibility is as follows: According to the holy Scriptures the Church is a limited monarchy, which stands under the common rule of the pope and the bishops. The history of the councils is at least as much in favor of the divine right of the bishops as of the supremacy of the holy chair. The freedom of discussion, vote by majority, a juridical examination of the apostolic decrees, and in certain cases a right to condemn the doctrines and the person of the pope—these are rights which prove beyond all doubt the participation of the bishops in the sovereign powers of the holy father. But the time being far enough to give the episcopal body a supremacy over the pope, and the latter therefore exercises, in general, all the privileges of supremacy. He summons the council, presides over it, dissolves it, and sanctions its decrees. In a word, he always remains the master of the Church. If, however, the changes desired by a certain school are made, the Church will cease to be a limited, and become an absolute monarchy. This would be a complete revolution; but what is truly divine is unchangeable, and, consequently, if the constitution of the Church is changed, it is to be done by the divine authority. Infallibilitas Dei, has himself said of doctrine, Crescit in codem sensui, in eodem sententia; but the new dogma would lead to a development of doctrine in alio sensui, in aliquo sententia. It would therefore amount to a denial of the divinity of the Church. "If it were received," exclaims the bishop, "what a triumph would it be to the enemies of the Church! They would call the saev-
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ATIONS of centuries, and history itself, as witnesses against Catholicism: she would be crushed by the weight of opposing testimony; the holy Scriptures, the fathers, and the councils would rise in judgment against her. With the moderns, who ascribe to us in our infancy, from the desert atheism would rise more powerful and threatening than ever" (ii, 378).

When the council met (Dec. 8, 1869) it was soon found that there were, with regard to this question, three parties among the bishops: one, which regarded the presentation of the doctrine of infallibility as the best and most urgent work the council should attend to; the second, which petitioned the pope against this doctrine, which they believed would be at least a great stumbling-block for all non-Catholics, and even for a great many members of the Catholic Church; the third, which was in favor of a compromise, would have some regard for the arguments aduced by the second class, and therefore, instead of promoting in unmistakable and bold clearness the doctrine of papal infallibility, would attain the same end in a less offensive way, by inculcating the duty of an absolute submission to the decision of the pope in matters of faith. The majority of the bishops signed a petition for the promulgation of infallibility, which had been drawn up by the German bishop of Paduborn, and received 410 signatures. The counter addresses (or, rather, counter addresses) against the infallibility of the bishops, among which there were 29 Americans, 46 Frenchmen, 37 Germans and Austrians, 19 Orientals, 2 Portuguese, 14 Hungarians, 3 Englishmen, and 15 Italians. The address of the middle party, which desired to effect a compromise, was drawn up by the archbishop of Baltimore. The address against the promulgation of the doctrine of infallibility, drawn up by the cardinal archbishop Rauscher, of Vienna, is couched in the most submissively expressions, assures the holy father of the devotion of all the bishops to the apostolical see, and concludes: "It would not be right to ignore the many difficulties, arising from express actions or actions of the Church fathers from the documents of history, and even from the Catholic doctrine, remain, which must be thoroughly explained before it would be admissible to lay this doctrine before the Christian people as one revealed by God. But our minds revolt against the contrary decision of this question, and confidently implore thy kindness not to lay upon us the duty of such a transaction. As we, moreover, exercise the episcopal functions among great Catholic nations, we know their condition from daily intercourse; hence we are satisfied that the asked-for doctrine of infallibility will offer weapons of our religion, in order to excite aversion to the Catholic religion, even of men of good character, and we are certain that this decision would, at least in Europe, an opportunity or a pretext to the governments of our countries to make encroachments upon the rights which have remained to the Church. We have concluded to lay this before thy holiness, with the sincerity which we owe to the father of the faithful, and we ask thee that the doctrinal opinion, the sanction of which is demanded by the address, be not submitted to the council for consideration. Among the signers are, besides the cardinal archbishop of Vienna, metropolitan, the archbishops of Germany and Austria; in particular, the cardinal archbishop of Prague, the archbishops of Cologne, Munich, Bamberg, and others. The bishops who signed this remonstrance against the promulgation of papal infallibility have been confined for some years in the inopportune. Only a few plainly expressed themselves against the dogma itself. But what the bishops failed to do, the Catholic scholars, especially those of Germany, did so emphatically that their protests against the ultra papal theories, and against the whole spirit prevailing in Rome, made a profound sensation throughout the Christian world.

One of the most learned Church historians of the Roman Catholic Church, professor Döllinger, of the University of Munich, in a letter addressed to the Augsburger Zeitung, and since published as a pamphlet in an enlarged form (Erwägungen für die Bischofe des Concils, Ratibon, 1869), subjected the address of the bishops to the most crushing criticism. Dr. Döllinger says of this petition of the champions of papal infallibility that henceforth "one hundred and eighty millions of human beings are to be forced, on pain of excommunication, refusal of the sacraments, and everlasting damnation, to the belief that the Church, which we are told has not believed, not taught." The proclamation of this dogma, he says, would be an "alteration in the faith and doctrine of the Church such as has never been heard of since Christianity was first founded." The whole foundation of the Church would thereby be destroyed. Dr. Döllinger shews conclusively that until the 16th century the doctrine of papal infallibility was entirely unknown, and that, when it was taken up by cardinal Bellarmine, it could only be supported by the testimony of Isidorian decreets, which are forged, and those of Cyril of Alexandria, a ficer.

The views of Döllinger and Gratry received the emphatic assent of the large majority of the Catholic scholars of Germany and France. The governments of France, Austria, Portugal, Spain, Bavaria, and other Catholic countries instructed their ministers in Rome to enter as protest against the new doctrine. The first to compel all members of the Roman Catholic Church to believe in the right of the pope to choose kings and lease their subjects from the oath of allegiance. Even some of the members of the council, in particular the cardinal archbishop Rauscher of Vienna, and bishop Heleod of Rome, who was regarded as the most learned bishop of the council, published pamphlets against the dogmatization of infallibility while it was discussed by the council. But all this opposition failed to make the least impression upon the majority of the bishops. From the opening of the council until the close, the members themselves so uncompromising that they refused to give to the minority even one single representative in the important commission on dogmatical questions, which, on the other hand, embraced the name of every bishop who, by writings, influence, or otherwise, had gained a prominent position as a defender of infallibility: in particular, archbishop Manning, of Westminster; archbishop Dechamps, of Malines; archbishop Spalding, of Baltimore; bishop Martin, of Paduborn; bishop Pie, of Poitiers; the Armenian patriarch Hassun, of Constantinople. The discussion of the question commenced on the 16th of December. The 18th of December, the council, after four days of discussion, decided to commit to the commission the rest of the question. The resolutions of the council made it lawful for ten prelates to petition for the closing of a discussion; the proposal being then put to the vote of all the fathers, and the majority deciding. When fifty-five speeches had been made, the matter was referred to a committee. On the 3rd of January, the bishops sent a petition for closing the general discussion, which was accordingly done, to the great dissatisfaction of the opponents of infallibility, a number of whom addressed to the pope a protest against the closing of the general discussion, as it had deprived the council of the opportunity to hear all the arguments for and against the new doctrine. The discussion of the schema as regards the whole and the several parts having been completed, a vote was taken according to the regulations in a general
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congregation on the 13th of July, on the whole schema by name, with placet, or placet iusta modum, or non-placet. The result was as follows: 451 placet, 62 placet iusta modum, and 88 non-placet. Some of the placet iusta modum, while 3164 answered placet, 2 replied non-placet, and 106 were absent, some be- cause sick, the far greater number not wishing to vote favorably. As soon as the result was made known of- ficially to Pius IX, he announced the fact of all with the exception of two having given a favorable vote, "Wherefore," he continued "by virtue of our apostolic authority, with the approval of the sacred council, we define, confirm, and approve the decree and canons just read." The following is a faithful translation of chapter iv of the schema, which treats of papal infallibility: "by acknowledging the authority of the Church (St. Pius IX, 13th July, 1870)."

The expectation that some of the bishops who opposed infallibility at the council would persist in their opposition, and decline to promulgate the new doctrine in their dioceses, was not fulfilled. The bishops not only submitted themselves, but forced also their dioceses to submit. In Germany, number of the most promi- nent theological scholars were removed from their chairs, and suspended from their priestly functions, for refusing to comply with the demands of Rome. Thus the creed of the Roman Catholic Church received a new doctrine which, in the opinion of many theologians who up to that time had regarded throughout the Church as her oldest scholars, radically changes the character of the Church.

According to the opinion of Dr. Dollinger, more has been written on this subject during the last one hun- dred and thirty years than on any other point of Catholic dogma. It has been as if it were the most important work on the subject, that of Janus (The Pope and the Council), as well as the works of Maret, Dollinger, Maistre, and several works of former centuries, have already been noticed. Other important works treating on the subject are Ballerini, De Vico ut Rousseus (F. S. S. Buonarotti, Deschamps (archbishop of Malines), L Infallibilitas papae (Malines, 1869); Gratry, Lettres sur L infallibilita du Pope (Paris, 1870); Weininger, De L infallibilita del Pope (Cincinnati, 1869); Herderthauer, Anti-Janua (Wurzburg, 1870); Frohshammer, Zur Wir- digung der Unbeachtbarkeit der Papst und d. Kirche (Mi- nchen, 1869); Bickel, Gründe für die Unbeachtbarkeit des Kirchenoberhaupts (München, 1870); Rauscher (cardi- nal), Archiv für systematische und historische katholische In- fallibilität. ecclesiae subiecto (Naples, 1870, against the dogmatization of infallibility); Kleutgen (Jesuit), De Romani Pontificis Suprema potestate docendi (Naples, 1870); Schmitz, Ist der Papst persönlich unverfahrenheit (München, 1867). The fullest account of the proceedings of the council, and of all the actions that而后 is given in Quirinus, Römische Briefe vom Concil (München, 1870). (A. S. J.)
Infant Baptism. See Baptism; Paedobaptism.

Infant Communion. Notwithstanding the apostle's direction, "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup" (1 Cor. xi, 28); so that it is inconsistent to a man to partake of holy communion if he is incapable of self-examination as a requisite in those who approach the Lord's table, we find infants admitted to holy communion as early as in the 3d century. The first instances of it occurred in the North-African Church. Cyprian, in his Tractatus de loposis (p. 193, ed. Germaine), says, "children who enter into the world partook of the body and blood of the Lord (cibum et polum dominicum);" he further gives the example of a girl (puella) whom a deacon had obliged to partake of the cup, but who could not retain what she had taken because she had previously, by her nurse's fault, partaken of bread dipped in wine, and had thus an offering to idols. This practice of infant communion was undoubtedly connected with infant baptism, and, as a reason for it, Augustine lays down the principle that, unless we partake of the Supper of the Lord, to which no one can be regularly admitted who is not baptized, we can have no life in God (John vi, 53); and this, he maintains, applies as well to children as to men (Epist. 25, ad Bonif.; Ep. 106, contra duas epistolatas Pelygo, i, 22; Sermo viii, de vernis apostol. sec. meriti, i, 20). The same reasons are given by his contemporary, Innocent I, (de pavo), who, in his letter of communion to the Council of Milevi: Aug. ep. 83, "Parvulos aternae vitae premia etiam sine baptismatis gratia donari posse perficiat est; nisi enim manuuvocavit armentum Christi et hibernit sanguinem ejus, non habebat vitam in se ipsius." From a similar point of view, Gelasius I, pope (496-518), writes in a letter to Augustine and Synesius that "No one should venture to exclude any child from this sacrament, without which no one can attain to eternal life." But as early as the 9th century, Fulgentius, the Augustinian of that century, advocated the rite of baptism, only suggesting that by it "children were incorporeal into Christ, and that he should be born in the human and that he should not even be nursed except in case of absolute necessity." We find the same in Alcuin's De Afflicto, where it is expressly directed that, whenever a bishop is present, baptism should be immediately followed by confirmation, and that the child should be sent to the Latin school with a letter of introduction. In the synodical decree of the Council of Orleans, in the same century, we find that priests are always to have the Eucharist ready, so that if a child should be taken ill it should not be in danger of dying without the eucharist. In the 9th century this question of infant communion gave rise to controversies. Thus Paschatus Ratibus maintained that children dying before communion were not therefore in danger, since by baptism they had already entered into communion with Christ. Still, in the 12th century, we find Radulphus Ardens saying (Hom. in die Paschae de Exsacr. necas.) that it is prescribed (statutum) that children should receive communion, at least with the cup, soon after being baptized, so that "they might not be in danger of dying without that necessary sacrament."

Hugo of St. Victor also recommends infant communion, where it can take place without danger, but remarks that this custom had already fallen into disuse in his time. He says that the custom among the Germans is that the newly-baptized child a little ordinary wine, instead of the blood of Christ, which practice he condemns. Soon after this, Odo, bishop of Paris, forbade giving children unconsecrated wafers, and thus the custom was lost in the Gallican Church. In Germany traces are to be found of it at a still later period; the thing ended in a mere senseless superstition. The Council of Trent condemns the principle of the necessity of infant communion, saying that the practice arose in the circumstances of the early ages, and that the fathers had sufficient grounds for introducing it in their days, without its being made a necessity of salvation; wherefore the usage of it must be abandoned when it has been dropped (Sess. xxii).

In the Greek Church we find passages of some theologians, which in their exposition of the doctrine of baptism would seem to imply that they rejected this necessity of infant communion based on John vi, 58; for they designate the former sacrament as a purification through the efficacy of the blood of Christ, or the sacrifice of the Latin rites of God, etc. Yet infant communion was one of the early practices in that church, as is evident from the fact that in the Apostolic Constitutions (viii, 12) mothers are recommended to bring their children with them to communion, and children are counted among those who partake of the Leutera Suma. The non-Oriental church, in the Canons of the Eastern Church, p. 118, 119.) This custom is also defended by Pseudo-Dionysius (Hier. Eccl. vii, 11) against the, profane, who considered it ridiculous. The Greek Church still upholds infant communion. According to Metaphanos Kritopulos (Conf. Eccl. Gr. c. 9), children (jyngik) after they are baptized, should commune whenever their parents do.

The Roman Church and all Protestant churches now agree in rejecting infant communion. Nevertheless, there have been a few advocates of the practice even among them; amongst the most prominent of them is Ficetor (Essay on the Eucharist, London, 1804), who argues for the practice (1) on the ground of primitive usage; (2) from Scripture. The latter argument is that "Christians succeeding to the Jews as God's people, and being grafted upon that stock, their infants have a right to partake of the blessings of which they are capable, till forfeited by some improprieties; and, consequently, have a right to partake of this ordinance, as the Jewish children had to eat of the passover and other sacrifices; besides this, he pleads the texts which speak of the Lord's supper as received by all Christians. The non-Oriental church is, that which is taken from the incapacity of infants to examine themselves, and discern the Lord's body; but he answers that this precept is only given to persons capable of understanding and complying with it, as those which require faith in order to baptism are interpreted by that rite. The objection made by the Jewish children eating the sacrifice, it is to be considered that this was not required as circumcision was; the males were not necessarily brought to the Temple till they were twelve years old (Luke ii, 42); and the Gentiles were not circumcised. The phrase 'Eucharist' became the common food to all that were clean in the family, and were not looked upon as acts of devotion to such a degree as our Eucharist is; though, indeed, they were a token of their acknowledging the divinity of that God to whom they had been offered (1 Cor. x, 18); and even the Passover was a commemoration of a temporal deliverance; nor is there any reason to believe that its reference to the Messiah was generally understood by the Jews. On the whole, it is certain there would be more danger of a contempt arising from the Lord's Supper from the admission of infants, and of confusion and trouble to other communicants than would be required in Scripture, it is much the best to omit it. When children are grown up to a capacity of behaving decently, they may soon be instructed in the nature and design of the ordinance; and if they appear to understand it, and give proof of love to Christ, it would be allowable for the priest to give them the food of the very young; which, by the way, might be a good security against many of the snares to which youth are exposed."

See Augusti, Handbuch d. christl. Archäol., ii, 629 sq.; Böhmer, Die christlich-kirchliche Alterthums- wissenschaft, ii, 865 sq.; Hippocrates, Cod. 1, 548 sq.; Zorn, Historia Eucharistiae Infantis (Berlin, 1786, 8vo); Knapp, Theology, § 144; Dodridge, Lectures on Divinity, lect. cviii; Neander, Church History, i, 311,
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315. ii. 319. iii. 496: Smith, _Account of the Gr. Church_, p. 161; Bingham, _Orig. Eccles._, bk. xv, ch. iii., § 7; Cole- 
man, _Ancient Christianity_, ch. xxx., § 8; Neander, _Hist. of 
Deism_, p. 342; Gieseler, _Dogmengeschichte_, p. 542.

Infanticide is the term for the act or practice of 
murdering infants, which was very general among 
the ancient nations. The Greeks and Romans, 
with all their high notions of 
civilization, were guilty of favoring this horrible prac-
tice by legislative enactments, and Plato and Aristotle 
are found among its supporters. Thus, at Sparta, the 
law required that a child, immediately after birth, was 
to be exposed to the various elements for seven 
weeks, and if it was not born well, or its limbs crippled, “it 
was thrown down a deep cavern at the foot of the moun-
tain Taygetus; and it was said that this law had a 
wholesome effect, for it made women with child very 
careful as to their eating, drinking, and exercise, and 
thereby they proved excellent nurses. In the older Gre-
cian republics a similar disregard of the life of sickly 
infants was shown.” Among the Romans it seems to 
have been the duty of the father to decide the fate of 
his new-born babe. Among the Norse a somewhat sim-
ilar custom was observed. Most of the laws of the early 
Christian Church, in the matter of the infanticide of 
the weaker sex, the father not unfrequently “dispro-
ved of its living, and it was exposed to die by wild 
beasts or the weather.” Among the barbaric tribes, 
child-murder prevails most extensively. Thus it is 
general throughout the whole of the South-Sea Islands, 
and is found among the Chinese (f. v.). In Vanu Levu, 
we are informed by a recent authority, “the extent of 
infanticide reaches nearer two thirds 
than one half of all the children born.” Among the 
people of India, especially the Hindus, as well as the 
Brahmans, this evil prevailed to a very great extent, 
due to the doubts, in a great measure, to the national 
prejudice of remarriage of a widow (compare Max Muller, 
_Chips from a German Workshop_, ii. 312). But, since 
the rule of the English, laws have been enacted likely 
to modify the practice, if not to check it altogether. 

“The Rajput, it is said, destroy all the female children 
but the first-born—a peculiar custom. Due to the being 
a point of honor with a Rajput to nearly ruin himself in 
the marriage feast and portion of his daughter, so that 
he could not afford to have more than one. The Mo-
hammedans were inclined to the same practice, but ef-
forced by their laws. The practice of aborting or 
shortening the life of a child before birth for 
the native women nothing of destroying by 
compression the infant in the womb, to avoid the trouble 
of rearing it alive. In China infanticide is supposed 
to be common, the chief cause being said to be the right 
of periodically repudiating their wives which is possessed 
by Chinnamen. Some statistics recently published in 
in the _Experence of Nancy_, indicate the fearful extent 
to which life is lost through this practice prevailing in 
so vast a population as that of China.” Newcomb (Cy-
clof, _Missions_, p. 487) says, “It is computed from au-
thentic data that not less than 9000 children are exposed 
in the streets of Peking every year, and as many more 
in the provinces, and that it is a part of the duty of the 
police to carry away in carts, every morning, those that 
have been exposed at night, some of whom are yet alive; 
but they are all carried to a pit without the walls, and 
buried purposely.” In Japan, poverty of the parent is 
deemed an excuse for the practice, committing an 
infant’s life, and in Greenland the infant is buried 
with the mother, if she dies in or shortly after child-
birth. The South American women commit the same 
sorrows as the poor parents of Japan. In Africa the 
Bantu practice the brutal custom of slaughtering an 
infant’s life, and a report upon them has been made by 
a previous analogous among the ancient Greeks and Romans; and 
so frequent has been the practice of feeding lions with in-
fants’ flesh, that “it has greatly increased the desire of 
the lion for human flesh.” In Madagascar the fate of 
the infant depends upon the calculation of lucky and 
unlucky days. Among the North American Indians 
infanticide has also prevailed, and does still prevail very 
extensively. The lower castes of the Natchez Indians 
on the lower Mississippi, Brinton (Myths of the New 
World [N. Y. 1868, 8vo.], p. 239) says, deliberately mur-
der their own children on the funeral pyre of a son or 
chief to gain admission to a higher caste. But as a 
principal reason of the great extent of infanticide, es-
ymptically because of the social or political high regard 
attached to a child, is the _origin of civilization_. 
Birkbeck (Origin of Civilization, and Primitive Condition of 
Man [London, 1870, 8vo.], p. 93) assigns the scarcity of 
game, and the fact that female children are only con-
sumers, and not providers. “Under these circumstances, 
female children become a source of weal or woe, as 
the necessities for procuring food may require. The 
primitive tribe did not hunt; they weakened 
their mothers when young, and when growing up were 
a temptation to surrounding tribes.” But while these 
reasons, which seem quite plausible at the outset, may 
have helped to aggravate and spread the horrid crime of 
ininfanticide, it is no doubt true, after all, that the 
practice of child-murder is due to a false comprehension 
of the duties and relations of man towards his Maker. 

Perverted religious teachings have done much to foster 
this great crime among these ignorant human beings, 
whom Christianity is slowly but surely convincing of 
the error of the practice. The benevolent efforts of 
Christianity, which was so marked on the legislation of 
the Graeco-Roman empire in the treatment of woman, and, as 
a natural consequence, in the treatment likewise of her 
offspring, is already apparent also among these uncivil-
ized tribes. One of the maxims of modern civilization, 
or, rather, of Christianity, is a firm opposition to the 
practices of the first Christian emperor, namely, Constan-
tine’s declaration that “the killing of a child by its fa-
ther, which the Pompeian law left unpunished, is one of 
the greatest crimes” (Schaaf, _Ch. Hist._, iii. 114). In-
stead of encouraging the destruction of life, modern civil-
ization is a stepping stone to the destruction of life. 
In the meantime, the interpretation of the laws of the 
criminal law deals with the cognate offences which make up 
ininfanticide in the following manner, whether the child 
is legitimate or illegitimate. As regards the procuring 
of abortion, every woman who takes poison or other 
noxious things, or uses instruments or other means 
procure her miscarriage, is guilty of felony, and liable 
to penal servitude for life, or not less than three years; 
and so is any person who administers poison, or uses 
instruments upon the woman with such intent. Who-
evver supplies drugs, poison, or instruments for the same 
purpose is guilty of a misdemeanor, and liable to penal 
servitude for three years. The concealment of birth is 
also a criminal offence. Whoever, after a child is born, 
by any secret disposition of the body, endeavors to con-
ceal its birth, is guilty of a misdemeanor, and liable to 
imprisonment for two years. This is the offence which, 
by the law of the state of New York, is made the subject of 
the prosecution in such cases, as the attempt 
to establish the larger crime of murder to the satisfac-
tion of a jury is frequently foiled by the secret sympa-
thy shown towards the mother, who is presumed to 
have been the perpetrator of an abortion (Vandalia Cod-
el) (Chambers). But one of the greatest difficulties 
we are beginning to encounter in our own day, in sev-
eral Christian lands, among which our own is perhaps 
the most prominent, is the practice of abortion, only an-
other form of infanticide, so general among the so-called 
higher classes of society. It is really alarming to the 
Christian man to see how extensively the great sin has
INFANT SALVATION

Infant Jesus, Daughters of the Congregation of the, is an order in the Roman Church which has its seat at Rome. It owes its origin to Anna Moroni, a native of Lucca, who, having come to Rome entirely destitute, succeeded by her industry and economy in securing a competency. In more advanced years, her charitable feelings prompted her to establish an institution where poor girls should be instructed in such female work as would enable them to earn a livelihood. A priest, Cosmas Berlanti, and other members of the clergy, approved of her plan, and afforded her much assistance. By their joint efforts it was finally established as a regular institution, and Clement X acknowledged the existence of the society, gave it by-laws, and endowed it with sundry particular privileges, under the appellation of "Daughters of the Infant Jesus." The number of the "Daughters" allotted to each convent was fixed at 35, in commemoration of the number of years Jesus lived upon earth. The novitiate lasts three years; the sisters make vows of poverty, chastity, and obedience. Such as may wish to leave the convent are allowed to do so before taking the vows, but, in that case, they are to leave to the convent all they brought to it at their admission. Prayers and fasts are strictly enjoined. The regular habit of the order consists of a wide, dark brown dress, and a white hood. There also existed in former times an organization whose members bore the name of "Sisters of the Good Jesus;" these, in the earlier part of the 15th century, were transformed from a lay association into a regular order, and the members were sustained by suitable avocations. — Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, vi, 615.

Infant Membership. See Membership in the Christian Church.

Infant Regeneration. See Regeneration.

Infant Salvation. On this question most Christians will agree with the following statements: "The great consideration which leads to a solution of the case of persons dying in infancy is this: In Rom. v. 19, it is said, "Therefore, as by the offense of one, judgment came upon all men to condemnation, even so, by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men unto justification of life." In these words, the sin of Adam and the merits of Christ are co-extensive; the words applied to both are precisely the same, "judgment came upon all men," "the free gift came upon all men." If the whole human race be meant in the former clause, the whole human race is meant in the latter also; and it follows that as all are injured by the offence of Adam, so all are benefited by the obedience of Christ. Whatever, therefore, that benefit may be, all children are benefited by the obedience of Christ, and a large portion of the human race upon whom the 'free gift,' the effects of 'the righteousness of one,' did not 'come,' which is contrary to the apostle's words." (Watson, Institutes, ii, 57.);

"Theologians have pursued two different methods in treating the infant subject. (a) Some are content with saying that God will pardon and save infants on account of the merits of Christ, which extend to all, although they may not have believed in Christ during their lifetime; and that their being born with natural depravity will not harm them, because they themselves are not to blame for it. These writers refer to Rom. v. 15-17 for an analogous proceeding. This is the most simple and safest view. (b) Others, misunderstanding the passage Mark xvi. 16, suppose that faith in Christ is an indispensable requisite for salvation in all men, and have therefore attributed to some schoolmen the doctrine of a 'faith of infants,' which they have variously explained and described as fides praesumpta, implicita, per baptismum sine verbo (some say sine cognitione) infusa; tella affectio in infantibus qualis Deo placet. The schoolmen describe it as dispositio ad justitiam. But one of them, Lombard, in conveying an opinion of his own, said: 'Nothing is said in the N.T. about such a faith. Faith always presupposes knowledge and power to exercise the understanding. Now, since children have neither of these requisites, faith cannot be ascribed to them; nor, indeed, disbelief, unless the word is used very improperly. The word faith is not divided into faith only, or the guilty destitution of faith. Those who have adopted this view have thus been compelled (as appears from the preceding remarks) to vary the idea which is uniformly attached to the word fides where adults are referred to, as soon as they speak of infants, and call something in them by this name which is nowhere else so denominated. The passage Matt. xvi. 6, does not bear upon this point, since the disciples of Christ are there meant. See Baptism. From the words of Christ, however, Matt. xix. 14, 'Of such is the kingdom of God; it is clear that he can no more be as belonging to his kingdom. And this is enough' (Knapp, Theology, p. 423).

Calvin, who laid particular stress on infant baptism in harmony with the other leading reformers, held that "it is no small injustice to the covenant of God if we do not rely upon it as sufficient of itself, since the covenant depends not on baptism or anything adventitious. It is alleged there is danger lest a child who is sick, and dies without baptism, should be deprived of the grace of regeneration. This I can by no means admit. 'God pronounces that he adopts our infants as his children before they are born, when he promises that he will be a God to us, and to our seed after us. This promise includes their salvation. Nor will any dare to offer such an insult to God as to deny the sufficiency of his promise to insure its own accomplishment. The reception of an opinion, that all who happen to die without baptism and not rely upon it as sufficient of itself, since the covenant depends not on baptism or anything adventitious. It is alleged there is danger lest a child who is sick, and dies without baptism, should be deprived of the grace of regeneration. This I can by no means admit. 'God pronounces that he adopts our infants as his children before they are born, when he promises that he will be a God to us, and to our seed after us. This promise includes their salvation. Nor will any dare to offer such an insult to God as to deny the sufficiency of his promise to insure its own accomplishment. The reception of an opinion, that all who happen to die without baptism and not rely upon it as sufficient of itself, since the covenant depends not on baptism or anything adventitious. It is alleged there is danger lest a child who is sick, and dies without baptism, should be deprived of the grace of regeneration. This I can by no means admit. 'God pronounces that he adopts our infants as his children before they are born, when he promises that he will be a God to us, and to our seed after us. This promise includes their salvation. Nor will any dare to offer such an insult to God as to deny the sufficiency of his promise to insure its own accomplishment. The reception of an opinion, that all who happen to die without baptism and not rely upon it as sufficient of itself, since the covenant depends not on baptism or anything adventitious. It is alleged there is danger lest a child who is sick, and dies without baptism, should be deprived of the grace of regeneration. This I can by no means admit. 'God pronounces that he adopts our infants as his children before they are born, when he promises that he will be a God to us, and to our seed after us. This promise includes their salvation. Nor will any dare to offer such an insult to God as to deny the sufficiency of his promise to insure its own accomplishment. The reception of an opinion, that all who happen to die without baptism and not rely upon it as sufficient of itself, since the covenant depends not on baptism or anything adventitious. It is alleged there is danger lest a child who is sick, and dies without baptism, should be deprived of the grace of regeneration. This I can by no means admit. 'God pronounces that he adopts our infants as his children before they are born, when he promises that he will be a God to us, and to our seed after us. This promise includes their salvation. Nor will any dare to offer such an insult to God as to deny the sufficiency of his promise to insure its own accomplishmen..."
may justly forthsend the following: “We still hold on to the old faith of the Church, that the sacraments are
sanctifying ordinances, and feel as confident as ever that God will remain true to his promise, and save the children of the covenant, though they should die without its seal.” Indeed, it seems almost impossible for the “Reformed Church” to take any other ground, since one of her founders and greatest theological teachers, Chrysostom, held not only in the case of infants, but also in the case of all God’s reasoning creatures, that “not all those who are not baptized are excluded from the grace of Christ; for not the want, but the context of baptism, excludes most.” Neonate, “the covenant of God, made with the faithful and their children.” (Compare articles in the Rev. Ch. Messenger, March 4, 1868; March 11, 1868).

One of the greatest arguments against the salvation of children not baptized, which has been advanced, is, that the rite of baptism is essential to covenantship, provided the parents had not by peculiar circumstances been prevented from attending to this duty. But this point does not seem to be well taken, for among the Israelites circumcision did not admit their children into covenant with God, as they were in that covenant by birth. Circumcision was merely the sign or seal of the covenant, under which they could be considered as being of the people of God. So Christian children are included in the covenant with Christ; but the rite of baptism is their natural sign and seal of that covenant, and without it they cannot be considered as belonging to the visible followers of Christ. See, besides the authorities already referred to, ed., Vol. I, p. 377; Mercersb. Rev. 1860, p. 387 sq.; Mth. Quart. Rev. 1855, p. 582; 1864, p. 517 sq., 552 sq.; 1865, p. 817; 1870, p. 290; Fairchild, Are Infants elected (Tract of the Presb. Ch. No. 229); McConoughy, Are Infants saved (Presb. Ch. Tract No. 120); Children in Heaven (Philad. 1860, Presb. Board of Publ.), p. 352; Christian Examiner, iv, 491; v, 229, 310; Russell, On Infant Salvation (London, 1822, 12mo); Harris, Hope for Salvation of all dying in Infancy (London 1822, 8vo); Doddridge, Lectures on Divinity, Lect. 168.

Inferior Clergy.

Inferential Theology.

Many pious minds of the Christian Church have earnestly opposed the opinion of the more liberally inclined orthodox theologians, that the Christian theology is in some respects “inferential.” Liddon adroitly puts this question in his Baptist Lectures of 1866 (ed. Lord’s Distinct, p. 441, 442): “No one would deny that in all ages of the Church the field of theology has been the scene of hasty, unwarrantable, and misleading inferences. False conclusions have been drawn from true premises, and very doubtful or false premises have been occasionally assumed, if not asserted to be true. . . . But if this should be admitted it would not follow that theology is in no sense ‘inferential.’ Within certain limits, and under due guidance, ‘inference’ is the movement, it is the life of theology. The primal records of revelation itself, as we find them in Scripture, are continually inferential, and it is at least a business of the wise to observe and marshal these revealed inferences, to draw them out, and to make the most of them. The illuminated reason of the collective Church has for ages been engaged in studying the original materials of the Christian revelation. It has put together of these various materials, and made this foundation of theology. What is theology but a continuous series of observed and systematized inferences respecting God in his nature and his dealings with mankind, drawn from premises which rest upon God’s authority? . . . If we reject conclusions drawn professedly from the substance of revelation, but really enlarging instead of explaining it, it does not follow that we should reject inferences which are simply explanatory, or which exhibit the bearing of one revealed truth upon another. This, indeed, is the most fruitful and legitimate province of inference in theological inquiry. Such ‘inference’ brings out the meaning of the details of revelation. It raises this feature to prominence, it throws that into the shade. It places language to which a too servile literalism might have attributed the highest force in the lower rank of metaphor and symbol; it elicits pregnant and momentous truths from incidents which, in the absence of sufficient guidance or reflection, may have been thought to possess only a secondary degree of signification. Inferior Clergy, the several classes of assistants to the priesthood in the ancient churches. They were distinguished by the title ἄγιοι και τῆς οὐσίας, because they were appointed to their respective offices without the imposition of hands. Not being ordained at the altar, nor in ecclesiastical form, they were, of course, incapable of the exercise of any of the sacramental functions; indeed, so distinctly drawn was the line between them and the superior orders, called ἱερέως, ἁγία, that they were strictly forbidden to touch the sacred vessels, or so much as to enter the ‘diakonium’—sanctuary. The inferior clergy of the Church of England includes all those in holy orders not distinguished by their position and title as dignitaries of the Church. The offices of churchwarden, verger, sexton, and pew- opener in the Church of England correspond in general to the offices of the inferior clergy of ancient times” (Eaude, Encyclopedia, s. v.). See Bingham, Orig. Eccles. book i, ch. 1. See Clergy.

Infuseda is a term in law for the placing in possession of a fee or freehold estate. It was used in ecclesiastical law to designate the granting of tithes to laymen, and the temporary possession by ecclesiastical associations of lay property. Pope Urban VIII, in the year 1629, declared himself against all infusion, and made it null and void if thereafter contracted. See Aschbach, Kirchen-Lexikon, iii, 450.

Infidel (ἄμαρτος, 2 Cor. vi, 15; 1 Tim. v, 18), an unbeliever, as elsewhere rendered.

Infidelity etymologically means simply want of belief. By common usage it has come to mean (1), in a restricted sense, a rejection of the Christian faith; and (2), in a wider sense, the rejection of religion generally. Thus Atheists, who disbelieve in God, and Deists, who believe in God, but reject Christianity, are alike called infidels.

1. Various Forms of Infidelity.—Pearson, in his excellent prize essay on Infidelity, its Aspects, Causes, and Effects (London, 1859, 8vo), classifies the various phases of infidelity as follows: 1. Atheism, or the denial of the divine existence; 2. Pantheism, or the denial of the divine personality; 3. Naturalism, or the denial of the divine government; 4. Spiritualism, or the denial of the divine redemption. To these may be added, what belong more properly to practical than to theoretical infidelity, 5. Indifferenthness, or the denial of man’s responsibility; and, 6. Formalism, or the denial of the power of godliness. Each of these will be found noticed in this Cyclopedia under their proper heads. Riddle (Bampton Lecture for 1862) gives the following survey of the various phases of infidelity. (1.) Rationalism.—Infidelity, scarcely fashioned, and perhaps hardly conscious of its own true character, but yet really existing and putting forth some degree of energy, appears in the form of a rash infidelity against rationalism, found in this form to spring rather to the substance of the Gospel than to its proofs and evidences, infidelity is susceptible of such diversified modifications, and assumes so many disguises, that it may sometimes escape detection, and is often in a disposition to repel, with logical correctness, the charges which may be justly brought against it by those who perceive its real tendency and nature. The faintest, but still dangerous phase of this rationalistic spirit consists in the habit of making an arbitrary choice and selection of dogmas to be believed by those who professedly, and with more or less sincerity, accept the Christian revelation as a whole. From this unhealthy state
phases of unbelief which have appeared and disappeared at intervals from the earliest ages of Christianity, but which, thanks be to God, have never yet succeeded in making the Gospel obsolete, and in robbing mankind of the knowledge of salvation. It is, however, fraught with danger, and its power of mischief arises, in no small degree, from its capability of disguise. It can put on the semblance of Christian truth; it can comply with any form of words, even the soundest form, in creeds and confessions drawn up with the greatest fidelity and decorum. (Bucer, Christ and other Masters, i. 5 sq.) See SPIRITUALISM.

(3.) Naturalism.—"The mind that revolts at mystery, or religious truth which we cannot know independently of a direct and outward revelation, is also shocked and repelled by miracle. Accordingly we find that the sedate, orderly, Byzanitine, and almost puritanical manners of the Protestant churches are no longer the efficient antagonists of the Church of Rome. Nor are the free-thinkers of the present day to be confounded with those of the old Voltairean school in France, or with the English Deists of the last century. Their system is no longer exclusively negative, but, on the contrary, intensely positive, and, in its moral aspect, intensely Christian. It embraces a series of essentially Christian conceptions—equality, fraternity, the suppression of war, the education of the poor, the abolition of slavery, the diffusion of liberty. It results in a kind of Christianity that represents itself without its dogmatic system and its supernatural narratives. From both of these it uneffectually recoils, while deriving all its strength and nourishment from Christian ethics. Hardly conscious of its own character, as Mr. Riddle tells us, modern Rationalists go forth under such leaders as Leckey, and declare that 'the idolatry of dogmas will pass away,' and that 'Christianity, being rescued from sectarianism and intolerance which have defaced it, will shine by its own moral splendor, and, sublimated above all the sphere of controversy, upon points of dogmatic position as an ideal, and not a system; as a person, and not a creed.' We see this great result, which Mr. Leckey succeeds in picturing, in a somewhat modified form, in the efforts of the free-thinkers of our land, especially since the last meeting of the 'Free Religious Association,' more particular in the work of the Sunday-school Societies in the city of Boston, inaugurated first by the followers of Theodore Parker. See RATIONALISM.

(2.) Spiritualism.—"But while Rationalism appears to have lost much of its former reputation, there is another school, arriving at the same end which finds acceptance in the minds of many people this day. These men are not Rationalists; they are so-called Spiritualists. They do not deny the great truths which lie on the very surface of the sacred record; nor do they disavow the fact of a divine revelation, and so leave man entire to the dictates of his reason, and the conclusions of his understanding, with the additional aid to be derived from his fellow-creatures, all uninspired like himself. But their theory is this. There is, say they, a revelation made from God to man, but it is only subjective, inward, to the already existing spiritual life, or religious consciousness of humanity; the inspiration by which this life or consciousness is awakened is common to every man who will wait and seek for it; and as to religious truth, it is simply that which individuals, or the mass of humanity, so far as their powers of being heightened by the divine affluence, are able to appreciate, to appropriate. According to this view, we are not to suppose that the Gospel announces positive spiritual facts, such, for example, as that which is usually understood by the atonement; but it propounds ideas which may be differently received by different men, and which will produce a different effect, according to the spiritual mould into which they may be cast. Now, in this Spiritualism, let it be observed, there is nothing original or new. This system is, in substance, only one of those that are the most striking and apparent in Christian history. It is nothing more than a sort of plagiary.
Infini

I. Causes of Infini-
it. — The chief source of infi-
tility is undoubtedly a moral one. It is evident, "re-
named Edie, is infidelity. "Is it generally, generally, speaking, or in any one of two sources; either in a deficiency of evidence, or in a state of mind and heart on which the clearest and strongest evidence has no power. The causes of in-
fiility, we are persuaded, are more ethical than intellect-
ual. The former are real; the latter imaginary. The perusal of some of the productions of our modern infidel writers." "Nothing can be more contemptible," says professor Garbett (Mod. Philos. Infidia, p. 5), "than the argumentative resources of modern infidelity. It
does not reason, it only postulates; it dreams and it dog-
maticizes. Nor can it claim invention." This testimony is
true. Indeed, we venture to assert, that the general
strain of argument brought to bear against Christianity by its modern assailants would not be tolerated for a
moment within the province of purely literary criticism.
The evidence which attends the truth of Christianity, vast, cer-
sal evidence is cumulative; but, however strong it may be,
it is never irresistible. An indolent mind can ward it off.
The existence of God [see God] does not admit of
demonstration, but moral certainty. See Evi-
dence. So the personality of God, though much more rational than pantheism and does not enough for one of an oppos-
ite conception. Christianity is based upon evidence. The
reason why evidence is necessary is to be found in our
moral constitution as rational, discriminating, account-
able agents; and in the fact that, from the existence of
evil, we are otherwise liable to a deception in refer-
cence to our highest interests. It could never be
a man's duty to believe in a revelation claiming to
itself the authority of heaven, unless that revelation bore,
legibly on its front, heaven's signature, or was in some
way attended with heaven's evidencing power. The
evidence that attends the truth of Christianity, vast, cer-
sal, and of great cumulative power though it be, is not,
however, irresistible. No man is warranted to expect it to be so. Faith is a moral act, and, while resting on
a strong groundwork of proof, it must have some dif-
culties over which to triumph. Origen, speaking of the
difficulties in the Bible revelation, and of those in the
revelation of nature, says: "In both we see a self-con-
cerning, self-revealing God, who makes himself known
only to those who earnestly seek him; in both are found
stimulants to faith, and occasions for unbeliev." "There
is light enough," says Pascal, "for those who sincerely
wish to see, and does not enough for those of an oppo-
site description." Mr. Newman tells us it "supersedes
the authoritative force of outward miracles entirely" to say
that "a really overpowering miraculous proof would
have destroyed the moral character of faith." This,
however, is not argument, but a feeble, dogmatic asser-
tion. The Christian miracles are of "a convincing and
stupendous character," and yet not so overpowering as
the axion that a whole is greater than its part; and we
lack sagacity to perceive where lies the contradiction
between these statements. Evidence is obligatory on
man, not because it is overpowering or irresistible, but
because it preponderates.

Besides the moral ground, there are certain external
causes constantly operating, e. g. Speculative Philo-
sophy (q. v.); corruptions of Christianity [see Chris-
tianity; Romanism]; religious intolerance [see Tol-
eration]; and, more especially, the connection of
Church and State. In our own country, on the other
hand, the fact that religion is a matter of private opinion
has brought upon us the charge, from the other side of
the Atlantic, that in our corporate capacity we, by our
peculiar position on this point, permit the inference that
we "distinctly affirm that no religion is true, but that
all theological systems are human speculations upon a
subject or less amount of truth, but no one of which is
so probable as that we will act in a matter so important
and legislate upon the theory of its truth." It is held by
skeptics that it is not possible to prove any other theoretical justification of toleration, or for religious opinion or for what is supposed by the system which

treats religion as a matter of private opinion is called,
than one which is founded on the principle that religion
is matter of opinion; in other words, that the best of all
religions is doubtful. The mere non-acceptance of the
Koran or of the Roman Catholic Creed, after notice of
their contents, appears to them tantamount to a denial of
the truth of the claims of Mohammed and the pope
respectively. They argue thus from the position that
a nation cannot remain on neutral grounds in a matter in
which it is theoretically, and practically too, impossible
for the majority to be neutral. Acting in this way the
Government, which led the founders of our Constitution to
think otherwise, are fundamentally wrong (The Nation,
1866, p. 354). See Church.

For further information, see the different articles re-
tioned above, and also the articles EVIDENCES OF
CHRISTIANITY; MILNER, John; "Moral" morality; critical
also Garbett, Modern Philosophical Infidelity; Rogers,
Reason and Faith; Rogers, Eclipse of Faith; Riddle,
Natural History of Infidelity (Hampton Lect. for 1852,
8vo); Thomson, Aids to Faith (London, 1861, 8vo); Mor-
gan, Christianity and Modern Infidelity (London, 1864,
21st edition); London Review, No. 5, art. 1; Ch. of Eng-
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Infinite. See Attributes; God.

Infinity, without end or limit, the negation of finite: an-

un-end."

I. The Infinite. — Besides the definite consciousness
of which logic formulates the laws, there is also an
infinite consciousness which cannot be formulated.
Besides complete thoughts, and besides the thoughts
which, though incomplete, admit of completion, there
are thoughts which is impossible to complete, and
yet which are real, in the sense that they are normal
affections of the intellect. Positive knowledge, how-
ever extensive it may become, does not and can never
fill the whole region of possible thought. At the utter-
most reach of discovery there arises, and must arise, the
question: What lies beyond it? Regarding science as a
gradually increasing sphere, we may say that
every addition to its surface does but bring it into wider
contact with surrounding nescience. There is always
something which forms alike the raw material of defi-
nite thought, and remains after the definiteness which
thinking gave to it has been destroyed (H. Spencer,
First Principles, p. 21 sq., 88, 90 sq.). This vague ele-
ment in thought, which is ineradicable, Spencer consid-
ers to be the groundwork of the feeling of awe of, and
of natural religion. It is the infinite in this sense, the at-
tent to conceive which involves a contradiction in
terms; which can only be believed to exist, but can never become an object to consciousness. "If all thought is limitation; if whatever we conceive is, by the very act of conception, regarded as finite, the infinite, from a human point of view, is merely a name for the absence of those conditions under which thought is possible," said Aristotle (in the *Nicomachean Ethics*, p. 48; comp. p. 90, 68, 80, 118; see esp. notes on p. 48 and 51, 4th ed.).

II. The *Infinite* as an Interminable Series.—Aristotle mentions five ways (*Phys. A.unc. 203, b. 15) in which the notion of the *∞* is attained: (a) From the unlimited duration of time; (b) from the possibility of perpetually increasing magnitude; (c) from the continuity of growth and decay in nature; (d) from the fact that limitation is always relative, and never absolute; and (e), "the strongest proof of all," from the inability to conceive a limit to number, magnitude, and space. Any given moment of time is both preceded and succeeded by another, and that by another without end. Any magnitude admits of multiplication or division, and the multiples or parts are again capable of multiplication or division, respectively, without limit. Any effect in nature is the result of a cause which, again, is the effect of another, until these operate in an infinite series; and, conversely, every effect is itself the cause of some other effect, and this, in its turn, is the cause of another effect, and so on in an interminable progress. Time, space, and causation thus exhibit infinity in the form of a straight line or series of terms without beginning or end. The properties of this series of the infinite are: (1) that it is purely negative, i.e. the mere process of passing beyond limitations; (2) that it postulates the perpetual recurrence of limitations as its condition; and (3) that, as an endless series, it is incapable of being thought out, it is always possible and never absolute, i.e. it cannot be said to exist, but always to be in the act of coming into existence.

It follows from this that, if infinity is an idea realizable by the mind, it must be conceived in some other way than as a linear series; it must be capable of an expression which is at once definite, and yet preserves the true character of infinity. Mathematical science does this by the summation of an infinite series in a finite expression, and manipulates both the infinite and the infinitesimal as terms having a definite meaning in calculation. The possibility of conceiving the infinite as a whole but not in terms of a finite series of acts, the condition that any object which we can see, handle, imagine, conceive, without any difficulty, e.g. a grape, or a stone, is really the sum of an infinite number of parts into which it may be divided, an infinite, therefore, which is not merely coming into existence, but actually exists here and now. Regarding, too, the aspect of a term in the line of causation, any object in nature sums up an infinite series in itself. For, as an effect, it is the result of all previous causes, and, as a cause, the germ of all succeeding effects.

These summations of the infinite, whether achieved by the formulae of mathematics or presented as complete, in every portion of space, in every period of time, and in every object in nature, are anticipations of a higher form of infinity which is revealed by the mind of man.

III. The Spiritual Infinite (infinium rationis, infinitum notio, *Μέν τίνος* differs from the former, not so much in excluding as including the limit or boundary of which it is the negation, i.e. as not limited from without and perpetually passing beyond the limit, but as limiting itself. As the natural or mathematical infinite is represented by the line, so the rational or spiritual infinite finds its appropriate symbol in the circle, i.e. the line which is without beginning or end, and at the same time is limited at every point by itself. It is thus at once absolutely unlimited, and yet absolutely definite. The transition from I to III may be illustrated by the mathematical definition of a straight line as the chord of an infinite circle. Such is the infinite as exhibited (a) the thought and (b) the volition of man.

(a) Consciousness, and thought as a mode of consciousness, involve the opposition of the subject which thinks and the object about which it thinks. As a condition of thinking at all, the mind must set its thought over something. As a condition of an object being thought of at all, it must be presented as distinct from the mind which thinks of it. Here, then, is a limitation or barrier which constitutes what is called "the finiteness" of the human understanding. The thinker is limited and conditioned by his thought. He is conditioned by the thinker. But, as it is possible to present any object to thought, it is competent for the thinker to present himself as the object about which he thinks, i.e. to be at once the subject which thinks and the object which is thought about. This capability of self-consciousness of which, so far as can be ascertained, the lower animals are destitute, constitutes at once the pride and the degradation of man, is a source at once of his best and his worst actions. Here we have the analogue of the line returning, as the circumference of a circle, into itself. In mathematics, the circle is a closed figure; and whenever an object is thought of as real as before, only it is a limitation of himself by himself: he is conditioned, as before, but self-conditioned, i.e. infinite. See Personality.

(b) The same infinity appears in free will. As free, a man does an action which originates absolutely with himself, and in himself alone, as a free and individual character, and thus determines the quality of the next action. This new action is also originated absolutely by the free agent, but the agent himself is modified, conditioned, limited, by the previous action. The agent has thus his freedom limited and defined, and increasingly so with every fresh action, limited by that of which he is himself the absolute originator. He is finite (limited, conditioned) and at the same time infinite (unlimited, unconditioned), because he is self-conditioned. See Liberty.

It is in this sense, rather than in that of infinite magnitudes, that infinity is an attribute of God. See Theism.

IV. Relation to the Finite.—It follows from what has been said above (a) that, although the essence of infinity is the transcendence of every limitation, yet that the finite is not the first, or initial, but merely the result of that process by which infinity is postulated as a condition of infinity, and that in the higher forms of infinity the limit is included, or, rather, imposed from within. Even in the sense of the indefinite residue of thought, definite thinking is presupposed as the condition of our becoming conscious of the vague element beyond. The serial infinity, again, while the mere process of transcending every given term, postulates the perpetual recurrence of terms to transcend: *άτομον, μέν* Aristotelis, μν οὖν ιστίν οὐ κατά τοσίν λαμβάνοντο, αιτὶ τὸ λαβών ιστίν έξω (Phys. Aunc. 207, a. 7)="The quantitative infinite is that which always has something outside it, i.e. a term 'not yet reached.'" The spiritual infinite, lastly, as the self-determination of thought and volition, is, *ex ei termini, a process of generating at every step the finite and limited.* (b) On the other hand, it would be a reversal of the true order to conceive the infinite to be, as its etymology suggests, the mere negation of the finite, and, as such, a secondary and derived idea. On such a supposition it becomes impossible to explain how we become conscious of limitation at all. How, it may be asked, do we know that thought is finite if we know not the infinity of the immanent infinite? How is the consciousness of limitation possible except as the negation of what is unlimited? The infinite is thus, as the condition of the finite, prior and positive; the finite, as the limit excluded, included, self-imposed by the infinite, posterior and negative.

The relation of God, as the Infinite, to the world and the soul, as finite, is considered elsewhere. But, unless
(a) be borne in mind, the logical result is cleem, and if
(b) be neglected, pantheism.

V. Infinity as symbolized in the Imagination.—We find
the attempt to picture the infinite to the imagination among non-European nations in the form of a state of
vacancy immediately preceding creation. The constitu-
tent parts of the image are generically all alike. The
image of mere air or mere water would be no realizable
image at all, because involving no distinction. But
in the contrast of the two we get that minimum of defi-
niteness which renders the image possible. A beauti-
fully pure representation of the imagined infinite is found
in the illustrated books of the aborigines of Guat-
amala (Max Müller’s Chips, i, 333). It is as follows.

"There was a time when all that exists in heaven and
earth was made. All was then in suspense; all was
calm and silent. All was immovable, all peaceful, and
the vast space the heavens was empty. There was
no man, no animal, no shore, no trees; heaven alone
existed. The face of the earth was not to be seen;
there was only the still expanse of the sea and the
heaven above. Divine beings were on the waters like
a growing light. Their voice was heard as they meditated
and counseled; and when the dawn arose man
appeared." Here we have as the constituents of the image
"empty heaven," or space, and—which is intro-
duced as if not at all contradictory to the statement
that "heaven alone existed"—the "still expanse of the
sea." [Compare this with the account in holy Scrip-
ture, and, indeed, with all the Mosaic, in Ex. iii, 3, and
the Phœnician, the globe of the sky. (2) The infinite
is not pictured as preceding the emergence of finite
things, but as underlying the process of nature, as it is
ordinarily known.

The Egyptian symbol of the serpent with his tail in
his mouth approaches the mathematical representation
of infinity. See Blunt, Theol. Dict. i, 144 sq. See
Journal of Speculative Philosophy, July, 1870.

Infirmerer is the name of the person who "had
the care of the sick-house, in which Lent and fasts were
not observed, had charge of the burial of the dead, pro-
vided physicians and attendance, and flesh-meat."—
Walcott, Sacred Archæology, p. 329.

Infalaparians. See SUBLAPARIANS.

Infila (otherwise called mura, στρεγγος, cornon
σιβογ, θαυμα, and τιγάς, τίγας) is a cap worn, since
the 16th century, by the bishops of the Roman Catholic
and Greek churches, as one of the insignia of their epis-
copal office. See MITRE.

Ingather, Feast of. See FESTIVALS; Tab-
Karenacles, Feast of.

Ingelheim is the name of a place at which a church
(Concilium Ingalheimense) was held June 27,
948, under the presidency of the Roman legate Marieus,
and in the presence of the German emperor Otto I and
Louis Outremer. The principal business of the
Council was the punishment of Hugo, count of Paris,
whom it excommunicated. It also decided that no lay-
man should have a church of his own, without the consent of the
bishop; that the whole
of Easter week be kept as a festival, and the three days
following Whitsunday; that St. Mark's day be kept
with fasting on account of the great litanies, as was done
on the rogation days preceding the feast of the Ascen-
sion; and that all differences as to title be settled in
an ecclesiastical synod, instead of granting this
power to the civil courts.—Landon, Manual of Councils,
p. 267.

Ingen is the name of a disdised Japanese, who is said
to have arrived about 1658 in Japan, whither his zeal
for the religion of Siakd had led him. He was at first
respected by the Japanese only as a saint, but at a season
of an excessive drought they came to him and be-
ought his prayers (kiti) to avert the judgment of
heaven; and the rain descending in mighty torrents
shortly after the offering up of Ingen's prayer, the
people thought him no longer earthly, and deified him—
Kampepper, Hist. Japan, Append.; Broughton, Bibliotheca
Hist, Sac. i, 383.

Ingham, Benjamin, was born at Ossett, Yorkshire, June 11, 1712. He received a liberal education, first at
Batley school, and afterwards at Queen's College, Ox-
ford, where, in 1733, he joined himself with Charles
and John Wesley, the founders of Methodism. In 1735 he
received episcopal ordination, and in the same year embar-
arked with Mr. Wesley for Georgia. He remained in
Georgia about two years, visited Carolina and Pennsyl-
vania, and then returned to England, where, soon after
his arrival, he accompanied Wesley to Hermit, the seat of the
Methodist society in America, and strong bonds of
fellowship with this excellent people that he could not sacrifi-
ced his attachment to them when the Methodists revolted
from the disorders of the Fetter-Lane society. He
went into Yorkshire, and with incredible itinerant lab-
ors, assisted the Moravians, with whom he labored,
what may be called a Moravian form of Methodism.
Preaching stations were established throughout the
county and in neighboring shires. At Birstal he took
Nelson publicly by the hand, and gave him liberty to speak
in all his chapels. The Wesleys, Whitefield, Ma-
dan, and Ingham, had been preached for his societies, and
they seem to have been generally recognized by the
Methodist leaders as a legitimate branch of the great
revival, notwithstanding Wesley's people in Yorkshire experienced many vexations from the eccentricities of
individual preachers, who retained some of the London Moravian follies. Within a few years the number of
"Inghamite" societies reached eighty-four. In 1741,
Mr. Ingham married Lady Margaret Hastings, sister to
the earl of Huntingdon, on which he removed his resi-
dence from Ossett to Abberford, where he continued to
reside till his death. After forming this connection, he was
so far absorbed in his exercising his gifts, and in the
Gospel that he greatly extended the sphere of his oper-
ations, and, in process of time, may be said to have evan-
gelized all the surrounding country. Ingham was ad-
mitted to Wesley's Conference in Leeds, but the precise
relation of this society to the Wesleyan body was every-
where defined. He had his own Conferences also, and at one of them was elected a general overzeer, or bishop. Lady
Huntingdon, who could not approve all the disciplinary
features of his societies, attempted to promote a union
of them with Wesley, and she sent Whitefield to New-
castle-upon-Tyne to meet the Wesleys for consultation
on the subject. Charles assented, but John declined the
overture, very wisely, as events demonstrated. In 1759,
Ingham read "Sandeman's Letters on Theron and As-
paso," and "Glass's Testimony of the King of Martyrs." These
works produced such an impression on his mind that he deputed two of his adherents to assist him,
in the assistance of his friends. The countess of Hunting-
don wrote them letters. Whitefield used his influence to
save them. Romaine hastened into Yorkshire, but could
not restrain them. Ingham attempted to excommunicate
the disturbers, but it was an endless task. The
whole order was wrecked and sunk. Thirty societies
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first preference was to the perpetual curacy of Bridhurst, in Kent, next the living of Orston, in Nottinghamshire, and afterwards the vicarages of Worthington and Boxted, in Essex. He died in 1804. Mr. Ingram wrote on the "Great Events of the Seventeenth Century, or Period when the Mystery of God was hid in the Veil," the "Three Odes" to the "Ancients of the Ten Tribes of Israel being in America," originally published by Manasseh ben-Israel: — "A Complete and Uniform Explanation of the Prophecy of the Serem Viali of Wrath," see Hook, Eccles. Enquiry; Hoole, "Annals of England," xxx. 871. (J. N. F.)

Ingulphus, the celebrated abbot of Croyland, long considered as the founder of the church of "Hirside Monasterii Cruylandensis," is supposed to have been born about A.D. 1030. According to the account of his life in his history, he was educated at the University of Oxford. He was a great favorite of Editha, the wife of Edward the Confessor, and visited duke William of Normandy at his own court in 1057. About 1060 he went on a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. On his return he entered the monastery of Fontenelle, in Normandy, and there remained till 1076, when he was invited to England by the Conqueror, and made abbot of Croyland. In 1103 Dec. 17, 1103. The "Historia Monasterii Cruylandensis," was published by Saville, in the "collection script.," at London in 1596, and in a more complete edition by Galbe ("Rer. Angl. Script.,") at Oxford, in 1684. An English translation of it was furnished by Ryley in Bohn's Antiquarian Library. "Some writers, even of the last century questioned the entire genuineness of the book, though scepticism did not then proceed further than the hypothesis of interpolations by a later writer; but in 1826, the late Sir Francis Palgrave, in an article in the Quarterly Review, endeavored to prove that the whole so-called history was little better than a novel, and was probably the composition of a monk in the 15th or 16th century. His conclusions have been accepted by almost universally adopted." See Chambers's Encyclopedia, v. 579; Wetzer and Welsch, Kirchen-Lexikon, v. 623 sqq.

Inheritance (frequently προσφατός, checlo, a "portion" or providential bestowment; but properly and usually some form of the verbs προέχεισθαι, προέχεσθαι, to possess; προέχεισθαι, to pass on; κληρονομεῖν, to get by lot). God is the creative and personal God who gave it to man to be held, cultivated, and enjoyed. (Gen. i, 38 sqq.; Isa. xxv. 16; Eccl. v. 9; not to any favored portion of our race, but to the race itself—to man as represented by our great progenitor, to whom the use of the divine gift was first graciously vouchsafed. The impression which the original gift of a gift earth was calculated to make on men, the Great Donor was pleased, in the case of mankind, to render, for his own wise purposes, more decided and emphatic by an express donation to the patriarch Abraham (Gen. xiii, 14 sqq.). Many years, however, elapsed before the promise was fulfilled. Meanwhile the notices which we have regarding the state of property in the patriarchal ages are few and not very definite. The products of the earth, however, were, at an early period accumulated and held as property. Violence invaded the possession: opposing violence recovered the goods. War soon sprang out of the passions of the human heart. The necessity of civil government was felt. Consequent laws were accordingly developed themselves. The head of the family was supreme. His will was law. The physical superiority which he possessed gave him this dominion. The same influence would secure its transmission in the male rather than the female line. Hence, to the rise of the right of patrimony. In the early condition of society which is called patriarchal, landed property had its origin, indeed, but could not be held of first importance by those who led a wandering life, shifting continually, as convenience suggested. So long as another, Carth, had control, then the chief property (Gen. xxxv. 55). But land, if held, was held on a freehold tenure; nor could any other tenure..."
have come into existence till more complex and artificial relations arose, resulting, in all probability, from the increase of population and the relative insufficiency of food. When Joseph went down into Egypt, he appears to have found the freehold tenure prevailing, which, however, he anticipates, as at surplus, to assume the rate, into a conditional tenancy. Other intimations are found in Genesis which confirm the general statements which have just been made. Daughters do not appear to have had any inheritance. If there are any exceptions to this rule, they only serve to prove it by the support they give to the main tenet. The daughter is recorded (xiii, 15) to have given his daughters an inheritance conjointly with their brothers. How highly the privileges conferred by primogeniture were valued may be learned from the history of Jacob and Esau. In the patriarchal sage-phrase these rights were very great. See BRITISHROY. The eldest son, as being by nature the first fitted for command, assumed influence and control, under his father, over the family and its dependents; and when the father was removed by death, he readily, and as if by an act of Providence, took his father's place, from Gen. xlvii, 10, where it is said, 'A prophet/' succeeding to the headship of the family, the clan, or the tribe. At first the eldest son most probably took exclusive possession of his father's property and power; and when, subsequently, a division became customary, he would still retain the largest share—a double portion, if of his brothers; a single portion, if of his father's sons, of Abraham other sons partook with the eldest, and that, too, though they were sons of concubines, is clear from the story of Hagar's expulsion: "Cast out (said Sarah) this bondwoman and her son; for the son of this bondwoman shall not be heir with my son, even with Isaac." (Gen. xxi, 10). This notion still lingered in Abraham's mind:" On the transfer of property from hand to hand are interesting, and bear a remarkable similarity to what takes place in Eastern countries even at this day (Gen. xxi, 32 sq.; xxiii, 9 sq.). The purchase of the Cave of Machpelah as a holding-place for the dead, detailed in the last passage, serves to show the stability of property at that early period, and the facility with which an inheritance was transmitted even to sons' sons (comp. Gen. xxiv, 39). That it was customary, during the father's lifetime, to make a disposition of property, is evident from Gen. xxiv, 35, where it is said to the patriarch he had given all he had to Isaac. This statement is further confirmed by ch. xxx, 5, 6, where it is added that Abra- ham gave to the sons of his concubines' "gifts, sending them away from Isaac his son, while he yet lived, eastward unto the east country." Sometimes, however, so far from being disposed of, the property was commingled with a gift, that they shared, with what we should term the legitimate children, in the father's property and rights. See CONCUBINE. Thus Dan and Naphtali were sons of Bilhah, Rachel's maid, whom she gave to her husband, falling to bear children herself. So Gad and Asher were, under similar circumstances, sons of Zilpah, Leah's maid (Gen. xxx, 2-14). In the event of the eldest son's dying in the father's lifetime, the next son took his place; and if the eldest son left a widow, the next son married his wife (Gen. xxvii, 7 sq.), the daughter-in-law of which union was recalled to the first-born and deceased son. Should the second like- wise die, the third son took his place (Gen. xxxi, 11). While the rights of the first-born were generally established and recognised, yet were they sometimes set aside in favor of a younger child. The blessing of the father or the theocratic blessing was mainly internal to the devolution of power and property—in its effects not unlike wills and testaments with us; and instances are not wanting in which this (so to term it) testamentary bequest set aside consuetudinary laws, and gave precedence to a younger son (Gen. xlviii, 15 sq.). Special claims were made in favor of the younger sons, and were rewarded by special gifts, as in the case of Jacob's donation to Joseph (Gen. xlviii, 22). In a similar manner, bad conduct on the part of the eldest son (as well as of others) subjected him, if not to the loss of his rights of property, yet to the evil influence of his father's dying maladministration (Gen. xlix, 3); while the good and favored, though younger son, was led by the paternal blessing to act probably also to reprove the rich inheritance of individual and social happiness (Gen. xlix, 8-22). See HEIR; ADOPTION. The original promise made to Abraham of the land of Palestine was solemnly repeated to Isaac (Gen. xxvi, 9), the reason assigned being because "Abraham obeyed, and kept my every commandment and statute, and my laws," while it is expressly declared that the earlier inhabitants of the country were dispossessed and destined to extermination for the greatness of their iniquity. The possession of the promised land was embraced by Isaac in his dying benediction to Ja- cob (Gen. xlviii, 3, 4), to whom God vouchsafed (Gen. xlviii, 15; see also xxxvi, 10, 11) to give a renewed assurance of the destined inheritance. That this dona- tion, however, was held to be dependent for the time and manner of its fulfilment on the divine will, appears from Gen. xxxvi, 17, where it is said, 'The land of Canaan, bought for a hundred pieces of money "a parcel of a field, at the hand of the children of Ham." Delayed though the execution of the promise was, confidence never deserted the family of Abraham, so that Joseph, dying in the land of Egypt, assured his brother Benjamin that "the brothers will find you," (Gen. xlvii, 29-34). The sons of Jacob had no part in possession of Canaan, enjoining on them, in this con- viction, that, when conducted to their possession, they should carry his bones with them out of Egypt (Gen. i, 25). A promise thus given, thus repeated, and thus believed, easily, and indeed unavoidably, became the fundamental principle of that settlement which Moses made when at length he effected the divine will in the redemption of the children of Israel. The observations, and practices too, which we have noticed as prevailing among the patriarchs, would, no doubt, have great influence on the laws which the Jewish legis- lator originated or sanctioned. The land of Canaan was divided among the twelve tribes descended through Isaac and Jacob from Abraham. The division was made by lot for an inheritance among the families of the sons of Israel, according to the tribes, and to the number and size of each tribe. Each tribe, however, had no inheritance; but forty-eight cities with their suburbs were assigned to the Levites, each tribe giving according to the number of cities that fell to its share (Numb. xxxviii, 90; xxxiv, 1; xxxvi, 1). The inheritance thus acquired was never to leave the tribe to which it fell; every man kept what was given to his tribe to its own inheritance. An heiress, in consequence, was not allowed to marry out of her own tribe, lest property should pass by her marriage into another tribe (Numb. xxxvi, 6-9). This restriction led to the marriage of heiresses with their near relations: thus the daughters of Zelophehad "were married unto their father's broth- ers' sons," and "their inheritance remained in the tribe of the family of their father" (ver. 11, 12; comp. Joseph. Ant. iv, 7, 5). In general cases the inheritance went to sons, the first-born receiving a double portion, "for he is the beginning of his father's strength." If, however, there were no other sons, it was given to his father's brothers: if his father had no brothers, it came into possession of the nearest kinsman (Numb. xxxvii, 8). The land was Jehovah's, and could not, there- fore, be permanently alienated. See HUSBANDRY. Ev- ery fifteenth year, whatever land had been sold returned to its former owner, the payment of a reassessment usually rose or fell in proportion to the number of years there were to elapse prior to the ensuing fifteenth or jubi-
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baptized, but withheld from the unbaptized. The baptized were thus called initiati, oi μεταιγισθέντες, μεταιγισθέντες, or οἱ μεταιγισθέντες; and it is very common to find the fathers using the expression "the initiated will understand," and the language of mixed congregations, especially when they were speaking of anything that belonged to the doctrine of the holy Eucharist. This expression is said by Cassabon to occur fifty times in the sermons of St. Chrysostom alone.—Blunt, Theol. Dict. i, 948. Several other names were given to these persons, such as μαρτυροι, λεγομενοι, etc. The word has sometimes been employed with reference to the supposed duty of reserve in communicating divine knowledge, as though the holy Scriptures justified the withholding instruction in Christianity from persons in an early stage of their Christian course.—Bingham, Orig. Eccles. b. i, ch. iv, § 2. See DISCIPLINA ARCANA.

INJURY, a violation of the rights of another. "Some," says Grove, "distinguish between iniuria and injuria. Iniuria is opposed to justice in general, whether negative or positive; an injury, to negative justice alone. See JUSTICE. An injury is wilfully doing to another what ought not to be done. This is injustice too, but not the whole idea of it; for it is injustice also to refuse or neglect what is ought to be done. An injury must be wilfully committed; whereas it is enough to make a thing unjust that it happens through a culpable negligence. 1. We may injure a person in his soul by misleading his judgment, by corrupting the imagination, by inflicting guilt, and wounding the soul with grief. Persecutors who succeed in their compellable measures, though they cannot alter the real sentiments by external violence, yet sometimes injure the soul by making the man a hypocrite. 2. We may injure another in his body by homicide, murder, preventing life, disseminating death by wounds of any kind, by imprisonment, or any unjust restraint upon its liberty; by robbing it of its chastity, or prejudicing its health. 3. We may injure another in his name and character by our own false and rash judgments of him; by false witness; by charging a man to his face with a crime which either we ourselves have forged, or others who have been forgery by some other person; by detraction or backbiting; by reproach, or exposing another for some natural imbecility either in body or mind; or for some calamity into which he is fallen, or some miscarriage of any kind which has been guilty; by some specious or indirect accusations that are not true. Now if we consider the value of character, the resentment which the injurious person has of such treatment when it comes to his own turn to suffer it, the consequence of a man's losing his good name, and, finally, the difficulty of making a reparation, we must at once see the injustice of injuring another's good character. There are these two considerations which should sometimes restrain us from speaking the whole truth of our neighbor, when it is to his disadvantage. (1.) That he may possibly live to see his folly, and repent and grow better. (2.) Admitting that we speak the truth, yet it is a thousand to one but when it is bandied about for some time it will contract a deal of falsehood. 4. We may injure a person in his relations and dependencces. In his servants, by corrupting them; in his children, by drawing them into evil courses; in his wife, by sowing strife, attempting to alienate her affection. 5. We may be guilty of injuring another in his worldly goods or possessions: (1.) By doing him a mischief without any advantage to ourselves, through envy and malice. (2.) By taking what is another's, which is theft." See Grove, Mor. Phil. ch. vii, 9; Crellius, Sermons, vol. ii, ser. 93; Tillotson, Sermons, ser. 42.

INK (ιγκ, ἁγκ), so called from its blackness, Jet. xxxvi, 18; ἀγκ, μακροκ, black. 2 Cor. iii, 3; 3 John 12; 3 John 18). The most simple, and hence probably the most ancient mode of preparing ink was a mixture of water with charcoal powdered, or with soot, to which
The Hebrews made use of different colors for writing, as did also the ancient Egyptians, and some of the books of the former are stated by Josephus to have been written in gold. The mode of writing mentioned in Numb. v. 28, where it is said that "the priest shall write the multitude, blot them out with the bitter water," was with a kind of ink prepared for the purpose, without any calc of iron or other material that could make a permanent dye; these maledictions were then washed off the parchment into the water, which the woman was obliged to drink: so that she drank the very words of the excommunication. The ink still used in the East is almost all of this kind; a wet sponge will completely obliterate the finest of their writings. The ancients used several kinds of tinctures as ink; among them that extracted from the cuttle-fish, called in Hebrew רָפָן, tekeleth. Their ink was not so fluid as ours. Demosthenes reproaches Aeschines with laboring in the grinding of ink, as painters do in the grinding of their colors. The substance found in an inkstand at Herculaneum looks like a thick oil or paint, with which the manuscripts had been written in a sort of relievo, visible in the letters when a leaf is held to the light in a horizontal direction. Such vitriolic ink as has been used on the old parchment manuscripts would have corroded the delicate leaves of the papyrus, as it has done the skins of the manuscripts of Virgil and Terence in the library of the Vatican; the letters are sunk into the parchment, and some have eaten quite through it, in consequence of the corrosive acid of the vitriolic ink with which they were written. See Writing.

**Ink-horn** (יְפָאָל, ke' Seth, a round vessel), an inkstand worn in the girdle (Ezek. ix. 2, 3, 11). This implement is one of considerable antiquity; it is common throughout the Levant, and is often seen in the houses of the Greeks. To one end of a long brass tube for holding pens is attached the little case containing the moistened sepia used for ink, which is closed with a lid and snap, and the whole stuck with much importance in the girdle. This is, without doubt, substantially the instrument borne by the individual who Ezekiel mentions as "one man: clothed in linen, with a writer's inkhorn by his side." We find the Egyptian scribes had likewise a cylindrical box for ink, which was probably carried in a similar manner. Besides these, the modern Egyptians have a regular inkstand for more extensive writing. The ancient Egyptians made writing-tablets, which are square pallets of wood, permitting the occupants to enjoy every breath of air that passes across the heated plain. The terrace is tolerably clean, but the court is "a deep in chained straw and filth" (Longf., Chaldee, i. 13). The great khans established by the Persian kings and great men, at intervals of about six miles on the roads from Bagdad to the sacred places, are provided with stables for the horses of the pilgrims. "Within these stables, on both sides, are other cells for travellers" (Lavard, Nin. and Bab, p. 478, note). The "khal" or "manger," mentioned in Luke ii, 7, was probably in a stable of this kind. Such khans are sometimes situated near running streams, or have a supply of water of some kind, but the traveller must carry all his provisions with him (Ouseley, Trans. in Persia, i. 261, note). At Damascus...
In the Mishna (Yebamoth, xvi, 7) a tale is told of a company of Levites who were travelling to Zoar, the city of Palms, when one of them fell ill on the road and was left by his companions at an inn, until the next day. The hostess (רָפֵא מִשָּׁלָה, "a woman who keeps an inn") in Judg. xi, 1, of the mother of Jephthah; of Delilah (Judg. xvi, 17) and for an inn, under the charge of the hostess (יַעֲמָל קַרְטָרִים, רָפֵא מִשָּׁלָה). On their return to inquire for their friend, the hostess told them he was dead and buried, but they refused to believe her till she produced his staff, wallet, and roll of the law. In Jos. ii, 1, נֶפֶצֶק, אִשָּׁה, the term applied to Rahab, is rendered in the Targum of Jonathan יַעֲמָל קַרְטָרִים, רָפֵא מִשָּׁלָה, "a woman who keeps an inn." So in Judg. xi, 1, of the mother of Jephthah; of Delilah (Judg. xvi, 17) and for an inn, under the charge of the hostess (יַעֲמָל קַרְטָרִים, נֶפֶצֶק). In Kings iii, 16, יָמַשׂ, "words, in the opinion of Kimchi on Jos. ii, i, appear to have been synonymous. See KHAN.

INNER (i.e. DOMESTIC, or "Home") Missions is the name given, in the Protestant churches of Germany, to any association of evangelical Christians for the purpose of religious instruction, and temporary establishments of the community by disseminating the Gospel truth, and affording help in temporal concerns.

I. Origin and Organization.—Christianity commands that faith should manifest itself in deeds of love; hence, as early as the apostolic times, we see deacons and deaconesses appointed to attend to the poor and the sick, distribute alms, etc. This continued in later days by Origen, St. Anthony, etc. When, in the 4th century, Christianity became the religion of the state, the clergy assumed this office, which, from the abundance of means in the Church, had become very important. In subsequent times it was reserved for Francis of Assisi, Elizabeth of Thuringia, Francis of Sales, and a number of religious orders, hospitals, sisters of charity, etc., devoting themselves to the care of the poor, the aged, and the sick. Hospitals, houses of refuge, orphanages, were established for the promotion of these ends. The Protestant Church, in consequence of its subjection to the state, could exert itself but little in that direction, being oftentimes even prevented by law from the care of the poor. Still efforts were made by private individuals, as August Hermann Francke, whose orphan asylum at Halle became a model which was imitated in other places; Biblical, missionary, and tract societies were established in Germany, and a number of houses of refuge and infant schools established. In modern times a fresh impulse was given to this evangelical movement by England. The attempts of Howard, Wilberforce, and Buxton were continued on an enlarged scale by Lord Ashley, the duke of Argyle, Elizabeth Fry, etc. City missions, Magdalen and night asylums, Sabbath and ragged schools, were established. Chalmers, first in the Presbyterian and then in the Free Church of Scotland, restored the deacon and care of the poor on an ecclesiastical basis. Similar efforts were made in France, among the Romanists, by the Sisters of St. Mary and St. Joseph, and St. Regis.

II. Sphere.—The German inner missions endeavor to promote infant, secular, and Sunday school associations, institutions of refuge, intercourse with the families, etc. They at the same time partake in the social questions of the day, and labor to systematize the aid given to the poor, to promote personal intercourse between the giver and the receiver, the purification of morals; and for these purposes they have established female benevolent institutions, domesticatories, nurseries, and what not. The influx of communicative ideas they seek to counterbalance by establishing schools for apprentices and adults, societies for the education of servants, both male and female, and for the propagation of good books. They oppose unchristian and uneclesiastical tendencies by promoting the study of the Scriptures, especially among family worship, awakening religious feelings in the families, organizing book and tract societies, sending out colporteurs and street preachers, and opposing prostitution, drunkenness, and all other immorality. They discoun-
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tenance revolution as subversive of political organization, and as the enemy of religion and of morality: in this department they act through political speeches and the press, in raising the standard of popular literature, and especially by their influence over the rising generation. They also lend to the prisons, trying to promote Christian love in the hearts of the officers intrusted with their charge, and to further a profession, as their candidate, in their institutions. Aside from the protective associations for culprits who have finished their time of imprisonment, they endeavor also to establish asylums for them.

II. Intent.—In Germany the inner missions embrace some eleven to twelve million Protestants, not regularly classified, of any Church, any denomination, and the workmen’s associations, which are often a prey to atheism and communism, travellers and strangers, etc. In this manner they become a friendly ally of the government, of which all they require is the protection of their associations and freedom of worship. With regard to the Church, they labor for the evangelization of the masses according to a truly Christian spirit, but without entering into any of the disputes of the different confessions, and without seeking to gain proselytes. Their agents are women as well as men; for instance, Elizabeth Fren, Sarah Martin, Anselm Steekting, etc. To show the necessity of such an association was shown by statistical statements of the wants of the population, which were especially collected by Wichern. From this starting-point the institution in question developed its labors. Aside from the organization of societies, which were soon propagated throughout the country, it directed its attention to the establishing of houses of refuge, to which that established by Wichern at Horn, near Hamburg, served as model, and of which, in 1888, there were some 140 in existence in Germany. For the care of the poor it was difficult to do much, as the inner missions could not engage in the management of the local or diocesan organizations for that purpose, yet in some places, as at Erlangen and at Ansbach, the voluntary system of relief has produced good results. The inner missions also labor to promote the observance of the Sabbath, and to distribute Bibles. Their most important results, so far, in Germany, are the establishing of Bible depts., of associations to meet the wants of the ignorant, the improvement of the prison systems, which has been adopted in a number of countries, etc.

The interest of Germany in the cause of inner missions has of late greatly increased. The Congress for Inner Missions, which in 1888 was organized in connection with the Church Diet (Kirchentag), has ever since held annual or biennial general meetings in connection with the sittings of the Church Diet. At these meetings reports are made on the condition of religious life in Germany, and the proper remedies for the existing evils are discussed. The establishment of houses of refuge and of Christian lodging-houses, the care of the poor and of discharged prisoners, the solution of the social question, the extension of Young Men’s Christian Associations, and of Bible and other religious societies, are the chief objects, which engage the attention of every congress. In addition to the General Congress for Inner Missions, a number of provincial associations for the same purpose have been organized. Thus a South-eastern Conference for Inner Missions was established in 1885; a central association for the inner missions, which was organized to invoke the good will of the state government for the suppression of vice and immorality, especially of prostitution. Germany has a number of papers advocating the cause of inner missions, the most important of which is the Fliegende Blätter für innere Mission, is published by Wichern (established in 1860). See also Merz, Arnulf u. Christenthum (1841); Wirchen, Denkschrift (1840); Braune, Vier Vorlesungen (1850); Buss (Roman Catholic), Die Volksmissionen (1851); Pierer, Universal Lexicon, viii., 919. For a fuller account of the subject, especially with regard to America, England, and other countries, see Missions, Home.

INNOCENT (prop. "p", d320g).—The Hebrews considered innocence as consisting chiefly in an exemption from external faults committed contrary to the law; hence they were innocent with hands (Gen. 30, 29; 31, 22; Psa. xxxvi, 4). "I will wash my hands in innocency" (Psa. xxvi, 6); "Then have I cleansed my heart in vain, and washed my hands in innocency" (Psa. lxxiii, 13). Josephus admits of no other sins than those actions which are put in execution (A Hist. xii, 7, 1). Sins in thought, in his account, are not punished by God. This is a very different standard of morality from that of the Gospel (Matt. v, 28; John iii, 15), or even of the O. T. (Psa. li, 6). To be innocent is used sometimes for being exempt from punishment. "I will not treat you as one innocent" (Jer. xvi, 28); literally, I will not make you innocent; but chastise thee, but like a kind father. Jeremiah (xxiii, 12), speaking to the Edomites, says, "They who have not (so much) deserved to drink of the cup of my wrath, have tasted of it." Nahum (iv, 5) declares that God is ready to exercise vengeance; he will make no one innocent; he will spare no one; (Exod. xxxii, 19, 20). "Thus shalt thou shalt know that I am innocent." no sin shall be unpunished. "With the pure thou wilt show thyself pure" (Psa. xviii, 26); thou treatest the just as just, the good as good: thou never dost confound the guilty with the innocent.

INNOCENT I, St., a native of Albano, near Rome, became pope April 27, 402, as successor of Anastasius I, St. Chrysostom had just been driven from Constantinople and exiled. The influence of the empress Eudoxia. Innocent I at once actively took his part, and sought to have the affair referred to a council of the joint bishops of the Eastern and Western churches. Failing in this, he next attempted an arrangement with the emperor, but his envoys were ill treated, and accomplished nothing. St. Chrysostom died in the mean time, but Innocent resolved to cease all intercourse with Constantinople until justice was done to his memory. The Western Church was itself in a state of great disturbance; in Africa the Donatists (q. v.) were giving much trouble, and Innocent, more especially, was accused and condemned by the Council of Carthage (405); in Rome Vigilius opposed the abuses introduced into the Church, such as the cellibacy of the priests, the worship of images, and monastic life. At the same time Alaric was marching with the Goths against Rome: the Christians fled to their churches, and Innocent permitted the heathen to offer up sacrifices to their gods; but prayers and sacrifices proved in vain, and the pope was obliged to pay to Alaric the ransom of the city, which was nevertheless taken by the barbarians Aug. 24, 410, and burned, but plundered, and pillaged, and torn down year by year by Astolf, Alaric’s brother-in-law. After the Goths had left the neighborhood of Rome, Innocent I, who had sought refuge with the emperor at Ravenna, returned to the city, and by his efforts to restore its prosperity gained a great many heathens to the Church. He commanded that the Mondays after Easter and the four days as well as Fridays, enjoined celibacy on the priests, and took repressive measures against the Macedonians. His course against the Pelagians seems to have been variable. Schaff says that he commended the Africans, who had condemned Pelagianism in two synods (Carthage and Milev, now Milevis), for having added themselves to the Church of St. Peter to obtain an approval for their acts, but that he refrained from giving judgment. He died March 12, 417, was canonized, and ranks among the highest saints of the Roman Catholic Church. He is commemorated on July 28. His decre-
tals are to be found in the collection of Dionysius Exiguus, and the most complete collection of his letters in Schönermann's Pontificum Romae, epistola genuina. Labbe, Conc. ii, 1246-1306, gives thirty-nine of his letters. General mention is made of Ecclésiastique, v, xvi, of Germanus, 1241-1235, who was consecrated to him the Decretum occidentale et orientale ecclesiæ adversus Pelagianos datum, published during the reign of his successor, Sismon. i. See Brusy, Hist. des Papes (1755, 5 vols. 4to), i, 169; Labbe and Cossart, Sacrosancta Concilia (1671, 15 vols. fol.), ii, 1241-1235; Bar- ronius, Annales, vi, 401-639; Fleury, Hist. Ecclesiastique, v, ch. xxii; Vossius, Histor. Pelag. ; H. de Noris (Norisius), Histoire du Pelagianisme; Alletz, Hist. des Papes, iii, 36; Anastasius, Vite Roman Pontif., i, 276; Caenicius, Vite et res gesta Pontificum Romanorum, i, 68; Herbill, Real-Encyklop., vi, 693; Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. v, pt. ii, ch. ii; Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Générale, xxv, 886; Neander, History of the Christian Religion and Church, ii, 170, 299, 585, 587; Schaff, Church History, iii, 737 sq.

Innocênt II, Pope (Gregorio Papareschi), was born at Rome as one of the family of the Guidoni. He became successively abbot of the Benedictine convent of St. Nicholas at Rome, cardinal-deacon in 1118, and was within three years pope by the choice of all the cardinals (1130), as successor of Honorius II. The other party elected Peter Leonis, under the name of Anacletus II. Innocent fled to France, where Bernard de Clairvaux caused him to be acknowledged as pope by Louis VI of France, and was consecrated by the bishops of Toulouse. He was afterwards recognized also by Henry II of England, by Lotharius, king of Germany, and even by the synod of Pisa in 1134. In 1136 he returned to Rome with the emperor, and, after the death of Anacletus in 1138, was universally acknowledged as pope. He drove Arnold of Brescia out of Italy, and put King Roger under the ban, but, having taken the field against the latter, he was made prisoner at Galleccio in 1139. He was afterwards released by abandoning Sicily, Apulia, and Capua to Roger. He had also some severe conflicts with the king of France, and the Romans, having revolted against his government, re-established the senatus, and declared themselves independent. In the midst of these troubles Innocent died, Sept. 29, 1143. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop., s. v.; Fabricius, Bibl. Lat. med. et inf. et. ii, 38; Lannes, Pontificat du Pope Innocent II (Paris, 1741, 8vo); Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. xii, pt. ii, ch. ii; Neander, History of the Christian Religion and Church, iv, 75, 144, 225.

Innocênt III (a) (Lothario Conti), by far the greatest pope of his name, was the noble family of Rome at Anagni in 1161. After a course of much distinction at Paris, Bologna, and Rome, he had greatly distinguished himself in the studies of philosophy, theology, and the canon law, and also by several written compositions, especially by his treatise De Misitana Conditionis Huma-

Innocênt II, Pope (Gregorio Papareschi), was born at Rome as one of the family of the Guidoni. He became successively abbot of the Benedictine convent of St. Nicholas at Rome, cardinal-deacon in 1118, and was within three years pope by the choice of all the cardinals (1130), as successor of Honorius II. The other party elected Peter Leonis, under the name of Anacletus II. Innocent fled to France, where Bernard de Clairvaux caused him to be acknowledged as pope by Louis VI of France, and was consecrated by the bishops of Toulouse. He was afterwards recognized also by Henry II of England, by Lotharius, king of Germany, and even by the synod of Pisa in 1134. In 1136 he returned to Rome with the emperor, and, after the death of Anacletus in 1138, was universally acknowledged as pope. He drove Arnold of Brescia out of Italy, and put King Roger under the ban, but, having taken the field against the latter, he was made prisoner at Galleccio in 1139. He was afterwards released by abandoning Sicily, Apulia, and Capua to Roger. He had also some severe conflicts with the king of France, and the Romans, having revolted against his government, re-established the senatus, and declared themselves independent. In the midst of these troubles Innocent died, Sept. 29, 1143. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop., s. v.; Fabricius, Bibl. Lat. med. et inf. et. iv, 38; Lannes, Pontificat du Pope Innocent II (Paris, 1741, 8vo); Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. xii, pt. ii, ch. ii; Neander, History of the Christian Religion and Church, iv, 75, 144, 225.

Innocênt III (a) (Lothario Conti), by far the greatest pope of his name, was the noble family of Rome at Anagni in 1161. After a course of much distinction at Paris, Bologna, and Rome, he had greatly distinguished himself in the studies of philosophy, theology, and the canon law, and also by several written compositions, especially by his treatise De Miseria Conditionis Huma-

The gloomy asetic views which he took in this work of the world and of human nature show a mind finely fitted with contempt for all the accidents of action, and not likely to be restrained in forwarding what he considered to be his paramount duty by any of the common feelings of leniency, conciliation, or concession, which to a man in his situation must have appeared sinful weaknesses. His ambition and haughtiness were apparently not personal. His interest seems to have been totally merged in what he considered the sacred right of his see, 'universal supremacy,' and the sincerity of his conviction is shown by the steady, uncompromising tenor of his conduct, and by a like uniformity of sentiments and tone throughout his writings, and especially his numerous letters." The external circumstances of his time also furthered Innocent's views, and enabled him to make his pontificate the most marked in the annals of Rome; the culminating point of the temporal as well as the spiritual supremacy of the Roman see. "The emperor Henry VI, king of Italy, and also of Sicily, had lately died, and rival candidates were disputing for the crown. The rest of Germany, with the exception of Sicily, Henry's widow, was left regent of Sicily and Apulia in the name of her infant son Frederick II. Innocent, asserting his claim of suzerainty over the kingdom of Sicily, confirmed the regency to Constance, but at the same time claimed from her a surrender of all disputed points concerning the jurisdiction over those fine territorics. Constance dying shortly after, Innocent himself assumed the regency during Frederick's minority. At Rome, availing himself of the vacancy of the imperial throne, he bestowed the investiture on the prelates of the kingdom of Sicily, who made an oath of allegiance to himself, thus putting them into possession of the kingdom, though often eluded claim of the imperial authority over that city. In like manner, being favored by the people, ever jealous of the dominion of foreigners, he drove away the imperial feudalatories, such as Conrad, duke of Spoleto and count of Ascoli, and even the count of Ancona and the count of Marsculta, and took possession of those provinces in the name of the Roman see. He likewise claimed the exarchate of Ravenna; but the archbishop of that city asserted his own prior rights, and Innocent, says the anonymous biographer, 'prudently deferred the enforcement of his claim for the present, but at the convenient moment he entered Tuscany, with the exception of Pisa, threw off their allegiance to the empire, and formed a league with Innocent for mutual support. It was on this occasion that Innocent wrote that famous letter in which he asserts that, "as God created two luminaries, one superior for the day, and the other inferior for the night, which last owes its splendor entirely to the first, so has he disposed that the regal dignity should be but a reflection of the splendor of the papal authority, and entirely subordinate to it." It was in the affairs of Germany, however, that Innocent's position most clearly manifested the greatness of the papal power over the destinies of the world. Setting himself up as supreme arbitrator between the two claimants who were contending for the imperial crown, he decided (in 1201) in favor of Otho, because he descended from "a race (welf) devoted to the Church," with the condition that the disputed concession of the countess Mathilda be wholly resign to the decisions of the holy see; and, as a natural consequence, he proceeded at the same time to excommunicate Otho's rival, Philip. In spite of a determined resistance of Philip and his friends, which for a time seemed almost to check his advance, he at last forced through by the assassination of Philip, Innocent's triumph in Germany was complete, and his vassal emperor Otho was made temporal lord of the West. But a further triumph crowned the efforts of Innocent in Germany only a short time after. Otho, incensed by the displeasure of the pope by his estrangement from the papal see, was excommunicated and deposed in 1210, and Innocent's own ward, Frederick of Sicily, was brought forward as a candidate for the vacant throne, and finally crowned emperor at Aix-la-Chapelle, with the approval of the fourth Lateran Council (A.D. 1215). For the seventh time Innocent was pope in Germany. Twice he had decided an imperial election. Against one of the emperors whom he supported he had made his sentence of excommunication and deposition valid; the other had put forward, intending him to be a mere puppet and instrument of his will, "his nephew." This is to say, Innocent proved himself a great statesman, it must be conceded also that he was very much unlike many of his predecessors, very strict and uncompromising in his notions of discipline and morality. Irregularity and vexation were repressed everywhere as soon as discovered. Thus he excommunicated tyrants, because he had repudiated his wife Ingerburg of Denmark, and had married Agnés de Meranie. "The interdict was laid on France: the dead lay unburiad; the
living were deprived of the services of religion. Against an antagonist armed with such weapons, even Philip Augustus, brave and firm though he was, was not a match. The idea of the papal power had too firmly taken hold of men's minds; the French would gladly have remained true to their king; they dared not dispute with a rival. Beside the jealousy of Nicholas I's intervention with Lothair, Innocent's power was exercised on behalf of morality. Philip was obliged to take back his divorced wife, not yielding, as one of his predecessors, Robert I of France (996–1031), had done, to feel the superintendence; not subduing, like his predecessor, Henry IV, by internal dissensions, but vanquished in open fight with an opponent stronger than himself."

As we have already said, the external circumstances of that day seem to have favored Innocent, and enabled him to "assert without concealment the idea of papal theocracy;" that the pope was "the viceregent of God upon earth;" that to him "was intrusted by St. Peter the government not only of the whole Church, but of the whole world." "Next to God, he was to be so honored by princes that their claim to rule was lost if they failed to serve him; princes might have power on earth, but the princes of the blood, the saviors of the world, were immortals."

The same fate that had befallen Philip Augustus threatened keener the more the princes of the church, the clergy, the make of heaven in reward. He sent two legates to attend the crusade, and their letters or reports to him are contained in the collection of his "Epistles" (especially Epistolae 108 of B. xii, in which the legate Arnaldus relates the taking of Bezier, and the massacre of 30,000 individuals of the age, and of 50,000 of the clergy."

But however, who did not live to see the end of the consecration he had kindled, can hardly be held responsible for the fearful excesses into which it ran. In 1215 he convened a general council at the Lateran, in which he inculcated the necessity of a new crusade, which he regarded not merely as lawful, but even as obligatory, undertaking in behalf of religion and piety. He also launched fresh anathemas against heretics, determined several points of doctrine and discipline, especially concerning auricular confession, and sanctioned the establishment of the two great mendicant monastic orders, the Dominicans and Franciscans, the former to extirpate heresy, and the latter to preach sound doctrines, and to assist the parochial clergy in the execution of their duties. For if ever watchfulness was required by the clergy, it was at this time. "It was in this very time," says a contemporary writer, "that the darkest period of the Church's history began and did not disappear. It was during this very reign of Innocent III that the gray dawn of twilight gave the first promise of modern independence, modern superintendence, modern discipline, and modern revolutionizing the whole structure of society, both feudal and ecclesiastical. To control or subjugate the new spirit was therefore the great problem presented to the Church of the 13th century" (Prof. C. K. Adams, in the New-Englander, July, 1876, p. 576). But if, by establishing these mendicant orders, Innocent III had provided himself with willing minions to spread over Europe, and to purify the Church from "modern intolerance" and "modern independence," he had certainly, at the same time, created for himself an opposition which afterwards became a still greater danger to the Church itself, by its opposition which these mendicant orders created among the laity against the parochial clergy (compare Reichel, p. 576 sq.). It remains for us only to add one of the greatest achievements of Innocent's day, undertaken by him, no doubt, that nothing could be more evident than this. It might be well to consider, as it is a matter of public interest throughout the whole known world, viz. the establishment of the Latin kingdom at Jerusalem, and the Latin conquest of Constantinople, which Foulkes (Chris- tendom's Division, ii, 226), while yet a communicant of the Roman Catholic Church, does not hesitate to pronounce "one of the foulest acts ever perpetrated under the garb of religion in Christian times; a sorry
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connection, unquestionably, for one of his high position and commanding abilities.” At the very commencement of his pontificate, Innocent began writing epistles (209 of B. xi) to the patriarch of Constantinople, and other letters to the emperor Alexius, with the view of inducing him to acknowledge the supremacy of the see of Rome; and although he failed in this, he had, soon after, by an unexpected turn of events, the satisfaction of consecrating a prelate of the Western Church as patriarch of Constantinople; but this by no means resulted, as Innocent most probably desired, in a reunion of the Eastern and Western Church; it was overfollowed by an increase of Church revenues. The Crusaders, whom Innocent had sent forth, as he thought, for the reconquest of the Holy Land, after taking Zara from the king of Hungary, for which they were severely censured by the pope, proceeded to attack Constantinople, and overthrew the Greek empire. All this was at the expense of Innocent’s sanction; but when Baldwin wrote to him, acquainting him with the full success of the expedition, Innocent, in his answer to the marquis of Montferrat, forgave the Crusaders in consideration of the triumph which they had acquired over the holy Church over the Eastern empire. Innocent also sent legates to Calo Johannes, prince of the Bulgarians, who acknowledged his allegiance to the Roman see (Innocenti III Epistole). One year after the Lateran Council, “one of the latest acts, and by far the most momentous in the pontificate of Innocent III” was united with a formal act of submission on July 16, 1216, in the very prime of life, broken down by overwork, for “the work of the whole world was upon him, as may be seen from his letters, not one of which exhibits the impress of any other mind than his own.” In Innocent III the Roman Church lost one of the most extraordinary Christendom, and in one of the most illustrious, as he was certainly one of the most ambitious she has ever honored with the pontifical dignity. His pontificate may be fairly considered to have been the period of the highest power of the Roman see. At his death, “England and France, Germany and Italy,enegro and Hungary, all the papal states, and the whole Church over the whole world,” was united with a formal act of submission on July 16, 1216, in the very prime of life, broken down by overwork, for “the work of the whole world was upon him, as may be seen from his letters, not one of which exhibits the impress of any other mind than his own.” In Innocent III the Roman Church lost one of the most extraordinary Christendom, and in one of the most illustrious, as he was certainly one of the most ambitious she has ever honored with the pontifical dignity. His pontificate may be fairly considered to have been the period of the highest power of the Roman see. At his death, “England and France, Germany and Italy,enegro and Hungary, all the papal states, and the whole Church over the whole world,”

Innocent III (b). Under this category we also find an anti-pope in the Roman Church. He was a descendant of the Frangipani family, and is distinguished from the eminent pope of that name by the surname Lanfranc. After the death of Hadrian he contested the succession of Alexander III, who succeeded in securing his person and Innocent was imprisoned in the monastery Cava. Thus ended a schism which had lasted twenty years, under four successive rivals for the papal throne. (J. H. W.)

Innocent IV (Simbolo del Fiescbo, of Geneo) was elected the successor of Celestine IV in the year 1248. In the preceding bitter quarrels between Gregory IX and the emperor Frederick II, cardinal Sinibaldo had shown himself rather friendly towards the emperor; and the imperial curators, on receiving the news of his exaltation, were rejoicing at it; but the experienced Frederic checked them by remarking, “I have now lost a friendly cardinal, to find another hostile pope: no pope can make a schism.” He was also later excommunicated from excommunication, Frederick made advances to the new pope, and offered conditions advantageous to the Roman see; but Innocent remained inflexible, and, suddenly leaving Rome, went to Lyons, and there summoned a council in 1245, to which he invited the emperor. That he was received with a cordial answer to the charges brought by the pope against Frederick; and, after much wrangling, Innocent excommunicated and deposed the emperor, on the ground of perjury, sacrilege, heresy, and defiance of the Church, commanded the German princes to elect a new emperor, and reserved the disposal of the kingdom of Sicily to himself. In Italy the only consequence was that the war which already raged between the Guelfs and Ghibellines continued fiercer than before; in Germany a contemptible rival to Frederick was set up in the person of Heinrich von Schanzenburg, who was deposed by Conrad, Frederick’s son. Frederick’s sudden death in Apulia, A.D. 1250, led Innocent to return to Italy, and to offer the crown of Sicily to several princes, one of whom, Richard of Cornwall, observed that the pope’s offer “was much like making him a present of the moon.” The council of Lyons, 1245, confirmed Innocent in the decisions of the previous council and died at Lyons, July 16, 1246. He was so successful in defending his cause, was excommunicated; but he gave little heed to this act of Innocent’s, and even went into Italy in 1252, and took possession of Apulia and Sicily. Two years after he died, and his brother Manfred, who became regent, in a like manner baffled a council assembled by Innocent at the court of Rome. Innocent himself died soon after, at the end of 1254, at Rome, leaving Italy and Germany in the greatest confusion in consequence of his outrageous tyranny, and his unbending hostility to the whole house of Swabia. He was succeeded by Alexander IV. He wrote Apparatus superselectus (fol. often reprinted):— De Potestate Ecclesiasticâ et Jurisdictione Imperii:—Officium in octaria festi Nativitatis B. Mariae: Interpreta tiones in Vetus Testamentum. Nineteen letters of his are given by Labbe, Comel. xi, 568–592; forty-eight by Labbe, Concilia. II; several by Concilia Francorum scriptores, v, 141, 861. See Labbe and Cassart, Sacrosancta Concilia, xi, 597–716; Brus, Hist. des Popes, iii, 199; Fleury, Hist. Ecclesiastique; Muratori, Runum Italicorum scriptores, iii, 589–592; Ph. de Mor nay, Hist. de la Papauté, p. 576–404; Ciacium, Vie et res des Papes, vii, 221. See also Yates, Inoenza de Vila del gran Pontifice Innocenzo Quarto (Naples, 1601, 4to); Reichel, See of Rome in the Middle Ages (London, 1870, 8vo), p. 242 sq.; Milman, Lat. Christ. (see Index); Bower, History of the Popes, vi, 188 sq.; Wetter u. Weite, Kirchen Lex., v, 631 sq.; English Cyclopaedia, s. v.; Chambers, Cyclopaedia, s. v.; Hurter, Geschichte der Inf. III u. seiner Zeitgenossen (Hamburg, 1834–42, 4 vols.; 3d ed, 1845 sq.).

Innocent V (Peter of Tarantasia, also called Peter of Champagni or of Champagnac) was born at Moustier, in Savoy, in 1225. He was elected pope January 20, 1276, as successor of Gregory X. He was a Latin legate to the council of Lyon in 1245, and preached the Crusade; he had entered quite young, and where he had acquired a great reputation. He succeeded Thomas Aquinas as professor of theology in the University of Paris; was made archbishop of Lyons in 1272, and afterwards bishop of Ostia and grand penitentiary. As soon as he became pope he applied himself to the amelioration of the conditions in Italy, which was then divided into two contending factions, under the leadership of the Guelfs and the Ghibellines (q. v.), and in this he measurably succeeded. He was also on the eve of inducing the Greek emperor, Michael Palaeologus, to confirm the act of union between the Greek and Latin churches, drawn up in the Council of Lyons, when he died June 22, 1276, having occupied the papal throne only five months. He wrote com-
mentaries Super ius librorum Sententiarum (Toulouse, 1659, 8 vols. fol.) — Super Pententatem; super Lucam; super Epistolam Pauli (Cologne, 1478; Antw. 1617, fol.); and various treatises: De Unitate Formae; De Materia Culti; De Eternitate Formae; De Instructe et Voluntate Dei; his works which are given by Quetif, Scriptores Ordinis Predicatorum (Paris, 1719, 2 vols. fol.). See Labbe, Concilia, xi, 1007; Cis- cianus, Vita et gesta Pontificum Romanorum, ii, 203; Fleury, Hist. Ecclesiastique, i, xviii, chap. xxxvi; Du- chesne, Hist. des Episcop., ii, 208; Muratori, Iterum Italicorum Scriptoribus, i, 397; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, xxvii, 908; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. cent., iii, pt. ii, ch. ii.

Innocent VI (Eliane d'Albert or Aubert), a Frenchman, succeeded Clement VI in 1352. He resided at Avignon, like his immediate predecessors; but, unlike them, he put a check to the disorders and scandals of that court, which have been so strongly depicted by Petrarck, Villani, and other contemporary writers. He reformed the abuses of the reservations of benefices, and enforced the rules of council of bishops in their sees. His immediate predecessors having lost their influence in the States of the Church, Innocent VI determined on reconquering these territories, and successfully reoccupied, with the assistance of the warlike cardinal Egidius Albormoz, the various provinces of the papal state which had been lost by petty tyrants, and then sent back to Rome the former demagogue Cola di Rienzo, who, being still dear to the people, repressed the insolence of the lawless barons, but who, being himself intoxicated with his power, committed acts of wanton cruelty, upon which the people rose and murdered him in 1354. In 1358 the emperor Charles IV was crowned at Rome by a legate deputed by pope-Innocent for the purpose. Innocent died at Avignon, at an advanced age, in 1362. It was during his pontificate that the mendicant orders were persecuted in England, and declared to be an unchristian order by Richard, archbishop of Armagh, and of Ireland, in a book which he published in defence of the curates or parish priests, entitled Defensorum Curatorum. Of course Innocent rallied to the defense of the mendicants. He repudiated the archbishop, and confirmed anew all the privileges which had been granted to his predecessors to that order. A letter of his is preserved in Labbe, Concilia, xi, 1890; four by Ughelli, Italia Sacra; and two hundred and fifty by Martene, Theanevarnaus novus An- ecletorum, ii, 845-1072. See Duchene, Hist. des Popes, ii, 381; Fleury, Hist. Ecclesiastique, i, xxx, chap. xxxvi; Simon, Histoire de l'Empire, iii, 397-398; Herzog, Real-Encykl. vi, 670; Engl. Cyclop.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale, xxvii, 910; Neander, Hist. of the Christian Religion and Church, 70, 247; Bower, History of the Popes, vii, 91 sq. (J. H. W.).

Innocent VIII (cardinal Giovanni Battista Cibo), a Genoese of Greek descent, was during his youth in the service of Alfonso of Aragon, king of Naples, but subsequently entered the Church, Paul II giving him the bishopric of Savone. His conduct was disgracefully irregular: seven illegitimate children he had by three different women, and was, besides, married when he took or- ders. At the death of Sixtus IV serious troubles broke out in Rome. The election was warmly contested, and among the chief agitators was chancellor Borgia, who forwarded an unavailing candidacy for Alexander VI; but the cardinals in favor of Cibo proved at last successful. Innocent had bought the tiara by means of benefices, legations, palaces, and large sums of money, and was elected Aug. 24, 1484. His first undertaking was to reconcile the Italian princes, and to reconcile to the papal see all those whom a rebellious pope had alien- ated. Frightened at the advance of Bajazet with his Turks, Innocent wrote to the Christian princes for help in men or money to resist the invasion. Immense sums were at once forwarded to Rome from various countries; but the pope, pretending that he could not act without the assistance of the German emperor, had been divided by the quarrels between Mathias, king of Hungary, and emperor Frederick, Albert of Brandenburg and Otho of Bavaria, etc.,) used the funds thus obtained to war against Ferdinand I, king of Naples, who refused to pay him the usual tribute. The pope favored the revolted Neapolitans barons against Ferdinand I of Naples, in consequence of which the troops of Ferdinand rav- aged the territory of Rome; but through the mediation of Lorenzo de Medici and of the duke Sforza of Milan, peace was re-established between the two parties. The Turks were still threatening war. Jem, in order to thum the enmity of his brother Bajazet, had fled to Rhodes, where he was seized by the grand master of the order of St. John, D'Aubusson, and delivered up to the pope in exchange for the cardinal's hat. The pope received Jem with great honor, but took care to secure his person, as he would be an important hostage. In this he was not mistaken, for Bajazet feared for the life of his brother, and, to secure his throne, he sent an ambas- sador to Rome to offer Innocent a large sum if he would keep Jem in prison. The pope accepted the dis- onorable bargain, although the sultan of Egypt, who was in constant rivalry with his brother, determined Jem to go to the Mediterranean to march against Bajazet, offered, on condition of his re- lease, to restore Jerusalem to the Christians, and was even ready to pledge himself to surrender to the pope all the territory that should be taken from the Turks. Under Innocent's successor, the deposed Alexander VI, Jem was punished by order of the pope (comp. Restel), See of Rome in the Middle Ages, 538, Bajazet, of
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course, showed himself very generous towards his ac-
complice, Innocent VIII. On May 29, 1492, he sent
him the iron of the spear with which, he asserted,
Christ was pierced on the cross, and which was among
the booty taken by Mohamed II after the downfall
of Constantinople. The relic (dressed with a
great ceremony) was, unfortunately, the third of the
kind in Europe, for the emperor of Germany claimed
to have the holy lance at Nuremberg, and the king of
France in the Holy Chapel at Paris. Innocent VIII

died July 25, 1492. Among the principal acts of his
administration was the condemnation of the order of
the Conception, founded at Toledo by Beatrice of
Sylva; the canonization of Leopold of Austria in
1485; the condemnation of the propositions of Miran-
dola in 1487; the union under the crown of Spain of
the three military orders of Calatrava, St. James, and Alcu-
tara, in 1489; and the confirmation of the brother-
hood of Mercy, instituted at Rome for the benefit of
condemned criminals. Two letters of Innocent are pub-
lished by Ughelli, Italia Sacra, i, 710; v, 948. Roman
Catholic writers endeavor to free Innocent VIII from
the charge of being immoral in connexion with his
only two illegitimate children, and that they were born
before he was made pope; but "the success of Innocent
VIII in increasing the population of Rome was a favor-
ite topic with the wits of the day" (Innocuo priscos
aquam est debere Quiritis. Prognosis exhaustam restitu-
tuit Epigrammazarii Epigrammata, he was grace-
ning with "the epitaph which declared that flith,
gluttony, avarice, and sloth buried him in his tomb"
(Marullus, Epigram, lib. iv.). But the conduct of In-
nocent VIII can hardly compare with the career of his
successor, Alexander VI, "the most depraved of all the
popes," uniting in himself all the vices of Innocent VIII
and the unscrupulous family ambition of Sixtus IV."
Indeed, all the latter half of the 16th century scarcely
saw a supreme pontiff without the visible evidences of
human frailty around him, the unblushing acknowledg-
ment of which is the fairest commentary on clerical
morality (Lea, Hist. of Sovereign Priests, p. 358, 850).
See Labbe, Concilia, xiii, 1465; Fleury, Hist. Ecclesiastique,
lib. xxiii, ch. xv; Duchesne, Historia Francaorum Scriptores, ii, 350; Sismondi, Hist. des Fran-
cais: Ciconiens, Viva et vetus Pontificum Romanor-
mum, iii, 90; Fieschi, Annali Fieschieri, Vittorio I, 1851
(Milan, 1829, 8vo); Coislin. Memoires, lib. vii, ch. 1;
Hertzog, Real-Encyklop., vi, 672; Engl. Cyclop.; Hoefer,
Nouv. Biog. Generale, xxv, 912; Ranke, Hist. of the Pu-
pacy in the 16th and 17th Centuries, i, 43, 296; Mosheim,
Ch. Hist. p. 436; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, vii, 818;
Sismondi, Hist. de la Liturgie; 3, 423 sq.; Aschbach,
Kirchen-Lexicon, iii, 460 sq.

INNOCENT IX (Giovanni Antonio Facchinetti), born
in Bologna in 1519, had distinguished himself as papal
legate at Trent, afterwards as the papal nuncio at Ven-
ice, and as presidnet of the Inquisition. He was elected
pope after the death of Gregory XIV, in Oct. 1591. He
bore a good reputation for learning and piety, but he
was too old and feeble for the papal chair, and constantly
confined to his bed by illness, and was even obliged
to give his audiences there. Notwithstanding these
difficulties, however, he took an active part in the
affairs of France and Spain. He entered Dec. 30, 1591,
the papal conclave, which had elected Silvio Passeri
as his predecessor Gregory had done. A letter of his is
still extant (in Cayet, Chronologie novemnaire), in which
he urges Alexander Farnese to hasten the equipment of
his troops, to invade France, and to relieve Rouen, all
which that general forthwith executed with much success
and skill. He died Jan. 16, 1592, in the 12th year of his
reign of only two months, and was succeeded by Cle-
ment VIII.

See Labbe, Concilia, xv, 1480; Duchesne,
Historia Francorum Scriptores, ii, 457; Fleury, Hist. Ecclesi.
Eclesi. i, xxxvi, chap. clxxix; Sismondi, Hist. des Fran-
cais, xxi, 80; Bolla, Christiani Ordinis Regni In-
nocent IX (Rome, 1592, 4to); Herzog, Real-Encyklop.,
vi, 672; Engl. Cyclop.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Generale,
xxv, 914; Ranke, History of the Popes of the 16th and
17th Cent. ii, 281, 392; Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. cent. xvi.
sec. iii, pt. i, ch. i.

INNOCENT X (cardinal Giovanni Battista Panfili),

born at Rome in 1572, was elected in Sept. 1664, after
the death of Urban VIII. He was then seventy-three
years of age. He was under the cloud of a lawsuit
in-law, Donna Olimpia Maidalchini Panfili, who appears
to have been an unprincipled woman, very fond of mon-
y, and anxious to aggressivate her relatives. Innocent,
however, displayed in several instances much firmness,
judgment, and prudence, and a wish to protect the humble
and poor. He absolved the excommunication of different
churches, diminished the taxes, which had been very heavy under
his predecessor, Urban VIII, and at the same time em-
bellished Rome. The people of Fermo, on the Adriatic,
revolted against their governor, being excited by the
riotous nobility and landholders, who were interested
him for having by an edict of annona kept the price of
corn low; the governor and other official persons were
murdered. Innocent sent a commissioner with troops,
and the guilty, without distinction of rank, were pun-
ished, some being executed, and others sent to the
galley. The city of Narni, in which Castello and Roncenario
was still in possession of the Farnese dukes of Parma,
notwithstanding the efforts of Urban VIII to wrest it
from them. Disputes about jurisdiction were continu-
ously taking place between the officers of the duke and
those of the pope. Innocent having consecrated a new
bishop of Foligno, a charge of simony was not accepted
by the latter forbade his entering his territories, and as
the bishop elect persisted, he was murdered on the
road. The pope immediately sent troops to attack Castro,
which being taken, he ordered the town to be razed to
the foundations, and a pillar erected on the site, with
the inscription, "Qui fecit Castro," His energy in the
resolution against the Barbarini, who had opposed his
election, and was a steadfast enemy of cardinal Mazarin,
the supporter of the Barberini. The French prelate,
half, however, exulted and obliged him to yield by
threatening to take Avignon. Innocent also took
an active part in the quarrel between the Jesuits and
the Jansenists. As early as 1650, Hubert, bishop of
Valeres, had denounced to the pope five propositions
attributed to Jansenius (q.v.), which, in the preceding
year, had been referred to the theological faculty.
Innocent exclaimed, "There is a special congress to
consider them," April 20, 1651. De Saint Amour and some
other theologians sent by the Jansenists were heard May
19, 1658, but P. Annat, a Jesuit, informs us that the
affair had already been judged and decided in advance.
Finally a bull was issued, Usum occasionis, May 30, 1655,
condemning the five propositions. It was received in
France, and published by order of Louis XIV. Innocent
died soon after, Jan. 6, 1654. His anxiety to further
the interests of Rome throughout the world is manifest
by the pecuniary assistance which he afforded the
Venezians and Poilis in their war against the Turks, by
his opposition to the peace of Westphalia, in fearing that
it endangered the Romish states, and even the pontifical
chair, and especially by the assistance which he gave to
the Irish to combat the English, and, if possible, to re-
gain the English territory for his Church. In Germany,
also, he secured, by his undaunted efforts, the conversion
of several princes and noblemen of influence. He built
two beautiful churches in Rome, and left a well-filled
treasury, which proved very useful to his successor,
Alexander VII.

See Brus, Hist. des Papes, 283; Du-
chene, Historiarg Francorum Scriptores, ii, 582; Caio-
ulis, Historiarg Francorum Scriptores, iii, 510; Bon-
soni, Hist. des Francais, xvi, 78; Relation des dé-
libérations du clergé de France sur la Constitution et sur
le Juyfe de N. S. P. le pope Innocent X (Paris, 1565, fol.);
De Lalanne, Defense de la Constitution du pope Innocent
X, etc. (1655, 4to); Vie de Madame Olympic Malebranche,
qui a gouverné l'Église pendant le pontificat d'Innocent X
(Amst. 1666, 18mo); Memoires du Cardinal de Bels, i, iii.

Innocent XI (cardinal Benedetto Odescalchi), born at Como in 1611, succeeded Clement X in 1676. It is said by some that he was a soldier in his younger days, though this has been denied by others (Count Torre Neti, in his Histoire de l'Italie, Bruxelles, 1746, Benedetto Odescalchi). He was a man of great firmness and courage, austere in his morals, and inflexible in his resolutions, and withal one of the most distinguished popes of the 17th century. He inaugurated many reforms, reduced very materially the pomp and luxury of the papal court, and suppressed various abuses. His administration was entirely free from the weakness of nepotism which had so greatly sullied the fame of many of the pontiffs who had preceded him. His own nephew he obliged to live at Rome, under his pontificate, in a private character; and in this respect, certainly, he has had the character of a saint. His austerity was so great that it made him many enemies, and oftentimes estranged even some who would gladly have offered him their friendship. His greatest enemies, no doubt, were the Jesitical order, which he was determined to crush out. The principal event of his pontificate was his decision to desist from the question whether the French King was of the right line. He was determined to put an end to this discussion by publising firmly the doctrines of the Gallican Church concerning the temporal power of the popes, their infallibility, and the independence of the king. The result of their deliberations was the famous four propositions promulgated March 16, 1682. See GALICAN CHURCH.

Innocent XI also condemned the propositions of the bishops who had voted them, and April 11, 1682, issued a brief annulling the proceedings of the French council. In 1686 he also condemned the doctrines of Molinos (q. v.), who was obliged to make a public recantation, September 3, 1687, besides suffering for the remainder of his life close confinement in the prisons of the Inquisition. At the close of 1676 Innocent took a threatening attitude towards the Jesuits, forbidding them, among other things, to receive any novices into their order. They retorted by calling the pope a Jesuitist, offered prayers for his conversion, and entered into an alliance with the French king. Innocent XI, however, died only a few years after, August 21, 1689. It was during his pontificate that James II of England became a Romanist, and endeavored, by a succession of bold attempts, not only to give Romanism toleration, but to make it the religion of his country. (Compare Fox, James II, p. 382; Hallam, Constit. Hist. ii, 212; Mackintosh, Hist. of Revolution, ch. v; Stoughton, Eccles. Hist. of England [Land. 1870, 2 vols., 8vo], vol. ii, chap. viii.) Stoughton claims that these efforts accorded, however, only "with the dazing policy of the Jesuits, who were masters at a court, but no less able to play off with the more cautious measures of the papacy." No doubt this is true in a measure. Innocent XI was evidently unwilling to become master of the English ecclesiastical establishment if to be secured by the aid of an order which he abhorred, and which he was determined upon extirpating, and this our supposition is strengthened by the demand which James II made upon Rome for a red hat for a Jesuit named Petre. See JAMES II. Two letters of this pope are published by Ughelli, Italia Sacer, iv, 513: x, 55. He wrote also breve ad Franciscum Camillum in episcopos eminentissimos, eiusdem anni, de suae communionis usus datum (Paris, 1679, 4to). See Palatius, Vit. Innocentius XI, in the 5th vol. of the Greg. Pontiff, Rom. vita d'Innocentio XI (Venet. 1690). Brusy, Hist. des Papes, v, 360: Siemieni, Hist. des Fransapi, xxv, 311; J. A. Costa (R. Simon), Hist. de l'Origine des Brevions (Paris 1677). He published in French, Nouveau Traité de la Régalie (1685, 12mo); Bayle, Nouvelle de la République des Lettres (1686); Heideggler, Historia Paparum (Amst. 1698, 4to) pl. ii; De La Luzerne, Sur la Déclaration de l'assemblée du clergé de France en 1682 (Paris 1821, 8vo); F. Bonoumassi, Il Vito et Bolus gesta Innocentii XI (Rome, 1776, 8vo); Herzog, Real-Encyclop. vi, 765; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale.
INNOCENTS XII

xxv, 399: Banke, Hist. of the Papacy, i, 278, 279: Mosheim, Ch. Hist. cent. xvii, sec. ii, pt 1, ch. i; Asbach, Kirchen-Lex. iii, 464 sq.; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, viii, 468 sq.; English Cyclopaedia, s. v.; Chambers, Cyclopaedia, s. v.

Innocent XII (cardinal Antonio Fagiolatti) was born at Naples March 13, 1615, and succeeded Alexander VIII in July, 1691. He had a serious dispute with the emperor Leopold I, who, attempting to revive in Italy the rights of the empire over the former imperial fefs, which had, during the wars and vicissitudes of ages, become emancipated, published an edict at Rome in June, 1697, enjoining all the possessors of such territories to apply to the emperor for his investiture within a fixed time, or they would be considered as usurpers and rebels. This measure, if enforced, would have affected the greater part of the landed property of Italy, and also the sovereignty of its governments, and of the Roman see among the rest. The pope protested against the edict, and advised the other Italian powers to resist such obloque pretensions, and, with the support of France, succeeded in persuading Leopold to desist from them. He also succeeded in putting an end to the difficulties existing between the papacy and France on the question of investiture [see Innocent XI], and obtained from the French clergy an address which amounted almost to a recantation of the four articles of the Gallican Church. The question of Quietism then reappeared.

Bossuet accused Fénélon of favoring that tendency in his Examen de l'abbé Maury, and the pope, while not explicitly condemning the pope, in accordance with the report of the Congregation of the Index (q. v.), and Fénélon (q. v.), is as well known, submitted (see vol. iii, p. 529-530).

Innocent built the harbor of Ponto d'Anzo on the ruins of the ancient Antium; he constructed the aqueduct of Civita Vecchia; the palace of the Monte Citorio at Rome, for the courts of justice; and the fine line of buildings at Ripagrande, on the north bank of the Tiber, below the town, where vessels which ascend the river load and unload; he also built the arsenal, and, in particular, the Arsenal of San Martino, and other useful works. Innocent was of regular habits, attentive to business, a lover of justice, and averse to nepotism. He died Sept. 27, 1700, and was succeeded by Clement XI.


Innocent, a Russian prelate, born in 1800 at Sievsk. At school he distinguished himself by his superior ability over his fellow students, especially displaying great oratorical talent. When twenty-four years old, in accordance with the Russian custom of the better class of society destined for the service of the Church, he entered the monastic order. Two years after, he was called as an officer to the theological academy of St. Petersburg, and in 1828 made rector of the high school at Kief. After filling various positions of great eminence in his Church, he was made a member of the "Holy Synod" in 1858. He died at Odessa May 6, 1857. His works are, The last days of Christ's terrestrial life (1828); The Life of the Apostle Paul (ed.); Discourses and Sermons (1843, 8 vols.); Of Sin and its Consequences (1844); etc.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen. xxv, 927.

Innocent, Gизыт, a Russian prelate, was born in Prussian Poland, of Lutheran parents, at the commencement of the 17th century. He joined the Greek Church while yet young, and became a monk. Distinguished for great ability and learning, he was selected for a professor's chair. He died at that place Feb. 24, 1684. He published On the Peace between God and Man (Kief, 1669), which, by a ukase of the Synod of 1766, was put in the Index: Instructions on the Sacrament of Penitence (Kief, 1671); and left in MS. a work on The true Faith (written in Polish), which aims to refute a work on the supremacy of St. Peter, and to exalt the Pecession of the Holy Spirit. He also published a synopsis of Russian history, which has been extensively circulated—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxv, 926.

Innocentii Portus (gate of innocence) is one of the names given to the rite of baptism, aiming more directly at a description of its end or efficacy. See Baptism.

Innocentium Festum. See Innocents Day.

Innocents, MASSACRE OF, by HERBOD (Mall, ii, 16). It has been thought strange that Josephus should not mention this atrocity (see Volkborst, Feram esse Infanticidii Bethlehem, hist. Gottingen, 1788) but it was one only, and that a local one, of his many acts of tyranny and cruelty. See HEROD THE GREAT.

Innocents' Day (Fatum Innocentium, ιννητή, των δυναμών των ευπρεπών), set apart by the Greek, Roman, and English churches to commemorate the slaughter of the children by Herod shortly after our Saviour's birth, is celebrated in the Western Church on Dec. 28, and in the Eastern Church Dec. 29. Ancient ecclesiastical writers speak of these children as Christian martyrs. Cyprian says, "The nativity of Christ began (a martyrdom to fruition) "with the martyrdom of those infants that from two years old and under were slain for his name" (Epist. 56, ad Tiber. p. 123). Augustine says, "These infants died for Christ, not knowing it; their parents bewailed them as dying martyrs; they could not have imagined, but, nevertheless, they were Christ: Christ granted them the honor to die for his name" (De Symbol, iii, 4, p. 303; De Lib. Arbit., iii, 23). So Prudentius (Cath. Hymn. de Epigr.),

Salve, flores martyrum,
Quos lucis Ipsi In limine
Christi insecutor sustulit,
Cen turbo saepeaves roseas
In prima Christi victimam
Grex immaculorum tener
Accessit in luctu
Et in Palma et corona laudis.

"Hail, ye flower of martyrs, whom the enemy of Christ cut off in your very entrance upon the light, as the tempest does roses in the bud! First victims for Christ, tender flock of sacrifices, ye play innocently with your crowns and garlands before the very altar." It was a popular superstition in the old Church that Innocents'
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Day (or Childermass, as it was also called) is very unlucky to begin any work upon; and what day soever that falls on, whether on a Monday, Tuesday, or any other, nothing must be begun on that day throughout the year. Though Childermass Day was reckoned unfortunate, nevertheless reverence is held on it. The Societatis Evangelii makes an effort to change an older day that season called the King of the Cockneys, who presided on the day of his appointment. But in the modern Church this feast is observed as a special holiday by the young, and many curious customs connected with it prevail still. Thus it is that many of the children are on this day privileged to wear the clothes of the elders, and in some sort to exercise authority over the household in their stead. So, also, in communities of nuns, the youngest sister becomes for this day superior of the house, and exercises a sort of sporting authority even over the real superior. In Church, the priest celebrating mass on this day wears a blue gown. See Bingharn, Orig. Eclec. bk. xx. cap. vii. § 12; Augusti, Denkwürdigkeiten a. der christl. Archäol. (Lips. 1817), i, 304 sqq.

Innovatio Beneficii is the technical term for any change that may be made in a benefice; it may be regarded either to the position itself, or only to the revenues accruing therefrom.

In partibus infidelium (i. q. in heathen countries), Episcopus, episcopi titularis, episcopus suffraganeus. All these expressions, sometimes used promiscuously, have important and closely connected significations. As bishops, on account of the great variety and number of duties devolving on them, are unable to perform them all in person, they are allowed the use of assistants, such as archdeacons, coadjutors, etc. For such functions, however, as can only be performed by a bishop of this kind, such as ordination and confirmation, bishops suffragan in a diocese are usually obliged to call in the aid of a neighboring bishop. In after times, the bishops driven out of their dioceses were especially intrusted with these functions, being considered as still belonging de jure to their dioceses. The Roman Church was thus led never to give up, in principle, any place where it had once obtained a footing, even when it did lose it in fact; and thus, when its bishops were driven out of a place, their connection with their cathedra did not therefore cease. In the 9th century a number of bishops were driven out of Spain by the Moors, and sought refuge at Oviedo (it is said that some were even driven out of their dioceses) before going to the Punicunset, and finally the bishops suffragans were put in charge of these places, which the bishops had left in the usual manner ("servati consuetudinis de episcopatu titulari in partibus infidelium"). That consecration differs from that of the other bishops only in making the recipient simply an adjunct of the regular bishop, without separate consecration. When they confer orders without the consent of their bishops, or otherwise overstep their duties, they are punished by being suspended for one year. The episcopi in partibus, as simple titular bishops, are revocable papal delegates. So also when they are missionary bishops. Suffragan bishops are in a more secure position, "cum assurgante crede seigniorum providatur," as says the bull De salute. See A. H. Andreucci, De episcopis titularibus seu in partibus ineditum (Rom. 1732); Thomassin, Vetus ac nova ecclesiae disciplina de beneficiis, pt. i, cap. xxvii, xxviii; F. A. Dür, De suffraganis seu vicariis in partibus infidelium episcopis. Germ. (Mogunt. 1762); J. H. Heister, Suffraganetum Coloniensium extraordinarium sive de sacra Coloni. ecclesiœ pro episcopis, etc. (Mogunzt. 1848).—Herzog, Real-Encyclop. iv, 103.

Inquisition (Inquisitio hereticae, Sacramentum accumulatio) is the name given to a tribunal of the Roman Catholic Church, whose function is to seek out and punish heretics (Albigenses). It is a perversion of the old Church discipline, originally in the hands of the rural bishops, on whom devolved the duty of checking false doctrines, and who, for the purpose of stamping out rising heresies, made frequent visits to the churches of their dioceses. Upon such heretics, when discovered, they inflicted several punishments, the severest of which, however, was only excommunication. Another punishment frequently resorted to was banishment; but capital punishment on account of one's faith was not inflicted by Christians until the 4th century. The first instance of legally enforcing the death-penalty against Christians occurred under the emperor Theodosius the Great (382), who opposed and aimed at uprooting all heresy, especially that of Manicheism (Schaaf, Ch. Hist, ii. 141 sqq.). Under this emperor, and under Justinian, judges (inquisitores) were first appointed to examine heretics with a view to effecting their excommunication, and such punishments, if found guilty; and, in order to enable the ecclesiastical officers to execute their functions, the civil authorities surrendered for this purpose to the bishops the right of exercising the requisite jurisdiction in their diocese. And it was in the early days that such bishops should thenceforth be appointed without the special authorization of the pope, and that no monks could be raised to that office without the consent of their superiors (cap. v. Clement. De elect. Other restrictions were also enacted at Ravenna in 1111, 1114, etc., but the practice was not abolished. Thus, at the Synod of Cologne in 1229, we find the bishop of Liege represent-
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Synod of Verona, in 1184, certain directions were given to the bishops "concerning heretics," who at this time formed a very formidable enemy of the Romish Church, more especially in the south of France. The sects had become so numerous that some of them, such as the Cathari (q. v.), the Albigenses (q. v.), and the Waldensians (q. v.), formed a kind of secondary hierarchy, and this led Innocent III (q. v.) in 1198 to dispatch the Cistercians Raineri and Guido, and in 1206 Peter of Castelnau and Raoul, as papal legates to France, to assist the bishops and the civil authorities in punishing all heretics with the utmost rigor. But, effect to this end, the synod of Verona in 1215 determined to make a permanent institution of the Inquisition, "the most formidable of all the formidable engines devised by popery to subdue the souls and bodies, the reason and the consciences of men, to its sovereign will."

Accordingly, the fourth Lateran Council (1215) made the persecution of heretics the chief business of synodal courts, in the form that every archbishop or bishop should visit, either personally, or through the archdeacon, or some other suitable person, the parish in which, according to rumor (in qua firma fuerit), there were heretics or to which the two or three inhabitants of irreproachable character, or, if necessary, all the inhabitants, to point out those who were known as heretics, or those who held secret meetings, or departed from the faithful in their walk and conduct. The refusal to take oath justified the suspicion of heresy, heresy proved by examination to the bishop was, according to the comp. Biehn, Beiträge z. d. Gesch. des Inquisitionsprozesses [Lpz. 1827], p. 60 sq.). In name, the bishops still conducted the matter, but the legates had supervision over them, and, in fact, conducted the persecution of heretics. In 1229 the Council of Toulouse confirmed this decision of the Synod of Verona, and I published forty-five decrees to complete the institution of episcopal inquisition (see Mansi, xxiii, 192; Planck, Gesch. d. Kirchl. Gewissenschafterfussung, iv, 2d half, 468 sq.). It was decided that each bishop should appoint in each district one plain and two or three laymen in good standing, who should devote themselves exclusively to ferreting out heretics, and then deliver them up to the archbishops, bishops, or other authorities for punishment. Every one guilty of concealing a heretic forfeited thereby his land possessions or offices; the house in which a heretic was discovered was to be burned, and he who was less severe, no heretic or unbeliever was to be allowed the aid of a physician; penitents were to leave their home, to wear a peculiar dress, and could hold no office except by a special dispensation from the pope. But, notwithstanding these rigid and definite regulations, the severity of the laws and the sinlessness of the officials, and the many who were found in the execution of the laws by the bishops, the see of Rome did not even approach the desired end. To accomplish this more certainly, the affairs of the Inquisition were taken from the bishops, and made a papal tribunal, and the bishops themselves were subjected to it. Accordingly, Gregory IX appointed, in 1229, in Germany, Aragonia, and Austria, in 1239 in Lambray and South France (see Beiers, anno 1239, in Mansi, xxiii, 269 sq.; Raymond, Annal. a. 1238, n. 59 sq.), the Dominicans (q. v.) permanent papal inquisitors (later also the Franciscans). "The mission, the wider powers and the conditions of these monks made profession, but of which, as it appeared in the sequel, they soon began to tire, afforded them leisure to attend incessantly to this new calling. The meanness of their dress, the poverty of their monasteries, and, above all, the public mendicancy and humility, disarmed the horrid terror of these monks, who were quite skilled in the art of making the people believe in the existence of so many ghosts, that they would not rest until they had satisfied their curiosity. Nevertheless, the degeneracy of the times, the looseness of the ecclesiastical laws, and the decay of the arts of seduction, made the monks, instead of the people, the victims of the Inquisition. They were the victims, not of the Church, but of the wealth and power of the Church, for they were employed by the Church to prey upon the people, and to rob them of their possessions, to the discontent of the people, and to support their own exactions. The Inquisition was established to carry out the policy of the Church, not to the advantage of the people, but to the advantage of the Church, and to the advantage of the Roman Catholic Church. The Inquisition was established to carry out the policy of the Church, not to the advantage of the people, but to the advantage of the Church, and to the advantage of the Roman Catholic Church.

In conclusion, it may be said that the Inquisition was established to carry out the policy of the Church, not to the advantage of the people, but to the advantage of the Church, and to the advantage of the Roman Catholic Church. The Inquisition was established to carry out the policy of the Church, not to the advantage of the people, but to the advantage of the Church, and to the advantage of the Roman Catholic Church. The Inquisition was established to carry out the policy of the Church, not to the advantage of the people, but to the advantage of the Church, and to the advantage of the Roman Catholic Church. The Inquisition was established to carry out the policy of the Church, not to the advantage of the people, but to the advantage of the Church, and to the advantage of the Roman Catholic Church. The Inquisition was established to carry out the policy of the Church, not to the advantage of the people, but to the advantage of the Church, and to the advantage of the Roman Catholic Church.
house and Narbonne the inquisitors were banished in 1235, and four of them killed in the former city in 1242, and the pope was finally obliged to suppress the tribunal at the former place altogether. When last restored, the inquisitorial tribunal resumed its former cruellty, and the pope ordered the process to be carried on with even greater severity. The bishops proceeded to condemn and execute a large number of persons. The Reformation at last completely overthrew the power of the Inquisition in Germany, and the attempt to re-establish it, made mostly by the Jesuits, with an endeavor to check the progress of evangelical truth, as described above, Bohmen in particular supplied the power of the hierarchy with the latter, and limited thereby the power of the Inquisition, so that it now proceeded against secret or suspected heretics only on the accusation of sorcery and connection with the devil (compare the Breve of Nicholas V, in Raynald, a. 1461). In the 16th century, the time of the Reformation, the clergy, supported by the Guises, were able to rekindle violent persecutions against the Huguenots (q. v.), and endeavored to restore the Inquisition to its former power, but it had now lost its territory. Paul IV, it is true, published a bull (April 25, 1557) to re-establish it (Raynald, a. 1562). The Pope, Henry IV, con- 

The Inquisition in Germany.—But from France the Inquisition soon cast its net over neighboring and distant countries, even beyond the oceans, by the aid of the Jesuits and the Dominicans. Almost immediately after its firm establishment in France, the Inquisition spread to Germany. The first inquisitor was Conrad of Marburg, who organized the "holy office" with terrible severity during the years 1231-1233. The sentences of death which this new tribunal pronounced were not few in number, and in many cases obtained the approval of the emperor, Ferdinand II. But there was a higher power than that of the reigning prince, which had been lost sight of; and though the people's voice was in those dark days not quite so powerful as in our own, it certainly sufficed to thwart the inquisitors' designs. Such was the case with the accusa- 

A. Moreover, the papal bull of 1248 (Dec. 5) which re- 

But such a mode of procedure the Church of Rome found to be ineffectual for suppressing free in- 

They even influenced the pope to publish the bull (Summis desiderantes acheiis) in 1492 (Dec. 3), which reaffirmed the dogmas of the Council of Trent; they were the authors of the Inquisition's division of the world into two parts, the kingdoms of Christ and the kingdoms of the world; and they were the promoters of the Inquisition's power over the entire world, including the Americas. The Inquisition's role in the Americas was significant, as it was responsible for the suppression of indigenous cultures and the enforcement of Catholicism through violence and torture. The Inquisition wasabolished in 1834 by Pope Pius VII, who declared it to be a relic of the Middle Ages, no longer necessary in the modern world.
while the inquisitors were to extirpate heresy and punish heretics, the vicar of Christ reserved for himself the graces of reconciliation and absolution. In the arrogance which Rome has ever manifested, the power which belonged to the judge was withdrawn, and the pope, in the severest form of absolute monarchy, gave the highest guarantees to the inquisitors that the governments of the world asserted to belong to the papal see. Of course the new cardinal inquisitors made full use of their powers, and soon became the terror not only of Rome and Italy, but of all the countries over which they could possibly exert any influence. The Inquisition was spread, though not so severely as the Inquisitors, "Books were destroyed, and many more disfigured; printers were forbidden to carry on their business without licenses from the Holy Office." See Index. The terror-stricken people, however, soon gained their foothold again, and oppositions against the encroachments of Rome were everywhere manifest. The greatest resistance to it was offered in Venice. The republic refused to submit to an inquisitorial tribunal responsible solely to the pope, and, after long negotiations, permitted only the establishment of an inquisitorial tribunal on conditions that, with the papal office, a certain number of magistrates and lawyers should always be associated, and that the definitive sentence should not, at least in the case of laics, be pronounced before it was submitted to the senate (Basdragi Epistolae: Scriptum Antiquarum, i. 921, 926 sq.; Thunni, Hist. ad an. 1548). In Naples like in Rome, the government took advantage of the pope's advantage, and set up that tribunal in Naples, after the same form in which it had long been established in Spain.

The people rose in arms, and although Rome would have been only too glad to see this formidable tribunal established in Naples, yet, rather than forego the introduction of an inquisitorial tribunal altogether, she took the part of the people against the government, and encouraged them in their opposition by telling them that they had reason for their fears, because the Spanish Inquisition (see below) was extremely severe. Here it may be well to quote M. Crie (Ref. in Italy, p. 235 sq.) on the truth of this assertion, which many have repeated, as well as Roman Catholic writers have not failed to repeat and urge in favor of the tendency to mercy at Rome. Says M. Crie: "Both the statement of the fact and the reasons by which it is usually accounted for required a word. One of these reasons is the policy with which the Italians, including the popes, have always consulted their pecuniary interests, to which they postponed every other consideration. (Compare the opposition of the papacy to the Inquisition as a state institution in Portugal, below.) The second reason is that the popes, being temporal princes in the States of the Church, had no occasion to employ the Inquisition to undermine the rights of the secular authorities in them, as in other countries. This is unquestionably true; and it accounts for the fact that the court of the Inquisition, long after its operations had been suspended in Italy, remained in Rome, nor was it only supported by inquisition. In Spain, but at the time of which I write, and during the remainder of the 16th century, it was in full and constant operation, and the popes found that it enabled them to accomplish what would have baffled the attempt to exterminate heresies. The chief difference between the Italian and Spanish Inquisitions at this period consisted in their respective lines of policy as to the mode of punishment. The latter sought to inspire terror by the solemn spectacle of a public act of justice, in which the scaffold was crowded with criminals. . . The former were as free (e.g., V. M. de' Lollido) as ever at once over Europe; the executions of Rome made less noise in the city, because they were

less splendid as well as more frequent, and the rumor of them died away before it could reach the ear of foreigners. But all that Rome could accomplish in Naples, in spite of her cunning, was the establishment of an independent Inquisition, such as Venice had permitted. In Sicily, on the contrary, the government had suffered for the inquisition, and, though abolished for a time, the office was restored in 1782, and remained in force until Napoleon, as king of Italy, did away with it throughout the realm in 1806. The fall of Napoleon, of course, at once enabled the papal see to re-establish the Inquisition, but, being a foreigner, though he should abolish the Inquisition, he did not extend its power, and it did not spread far, and meet with great opposition. In Sardinia, where Gregory XVI restored it in 1833, it was not discontinued until the Revolution of 1848 again did away with it. "In Tuscany it was arranged that three commissioners, elected by the congregation of Rome, along with the local inquisitor, should inquire in all causes of religion, and intimate their sentence to the duke, who was bound to carry it into execution. In addition, it (the Holy Office) was continually soliciting the local authorities to send such as were accused, especially if they were heretics or stran-
gers, to be tried by the Inquisition at Rome." Everywhere within the territory persecution was let loose. Especially during the political reactions of 1849 the inquisitorial tribunal was perhaps nowhere so active and so severe in its dealings as in Tuscany (compare Ranke, History of the Popes, i. 357). In fact, it was a means of subordinating the country to the will of the Inquisition, and by the Inquisition, to the will of the pope. The country got rid of this great curse, from which all Italy suffered; and "popish historians" certainly "do more homage to truth than credit to their cause when they say that the erection of the Inquisition was the salvation of the Catholic Church. . . ." The Inquisition, in fact, does not verify itself in our own days, though the tribunal of the Inquisition still exists at Rome, under the direction of a congregation, and though the last ecumenical council, which the landless pope, Pius IX, has just declared adjourned sine die, has but lately passed two canons (canon viii and canons xii, xiii, De Ecclesiae Christi) in favor of its action. Its action, by the circumstances of the day, is mainly confined to the examination of books, and to the trial of ecclesiastical offences and questions of Church law, as in the late case of the Jewish boy Mortara; and mere reasonable existence in recent times was an Oriental imitator, who, by means of forged credentials, succeeded in obtaining his ordination as a bishop. The Inquisition was introduced into Poland by pope John XXII in 1237, but it did not subsist there very long; and all attempts of Rome to introduce it into England and Sweden was frustrated.

Spanish Inquisition.—"The life of every devout Spaniard," says Milman (Latin Christianity, v, 239), "was a perpetual crusade. By temperament and by position he was in constant adventurous warfare against the enemies of the Cross: hatred of the Jew, of the Mohammedan, was the banner under which he served; it was the oath of his chivalry: that hatred, in all its intensity, was soon and easily extended to the heretic. No wonder, then, that pope Gregory IX, after the Inquisition had assumed general form in France and Germany, introduced it into Spain, and that it proved to be a plant which took root on a most propitious soil, a feudal institution, which took root at once, and in times attained a magnitude which it never reached in any other country. It was first introduced into Aragon, where, in 1242, the Council of Tarragona gave the instructions which were to be the "oath of office" everywhere as elsewhere by the Dominicans. "Acustomed, in the contempt of the Jesuits, to penetrate into the secrets of conscience, they (the Dominicans) converted to the destruction of the bodies of men all those arts which a false zeal had taught them to employ for the saving of their souls. Inflamed with a passion that was a part of their vocation, the pope Gregory IX and Vidal-lodoli blazed at once over Europe; the executions of Rome made less noise in the city, because they were
maxims formed on the grossest deceit and artifice, according to which they sought in every way to ensnare their victims, and by means of false statements, delusive promises, and a tortuous course of examination, to betray them into confessions which proved fatal to their lives and fortunes. To this mental torture was soon after added the physical one, which consisted in kindling a fire under a bed, or a concealment of the names of witnesses" (M'Crie, Ref. in Spain, p. 85 sq.). The arm of persecution was directed with special severity, in the 13th and 14th centuries, against the Albigensians (q. v.), who, from the proximity and political relations of Aragon and Provence, had become a powerful tendency to act on the minds of the populace, the persecutions appear to have been chiefly confined to this unfortunate sect, and there is no evidence that the 'holy office,' notwithstanding papal briefs to that effect, was fully organized in Castle before the reign of Isabella. This was, perhaps, imputable to the paucity of heretics in that kingdom. It cannot, at any rate, be charged to any lukewarmness in its sovereigns, since they, from the time of St. Ferdinand, who heaped the fagots on the blazing pile with his own hands, down to that of John the Second, Isabella's father, who hunted the Saracens, like a leopard among the mountains, had ever evinced a lively zeal for the orthodox faith. Upon the whole, the progress of the Inquisition during the 14th century was steady, and its vigor and energy constantly on the increase. Its jurisdiction the inquisitors succeeded in enlarging, and the numbers of victims which were put to death (q. v.) were celebrated in a number of places, and its victims were not a few. "By the middle of the 15th century the Albigensian heresy had become nearly extirpated by the Inquisition of Aragon, so that this infernal engine might have been suffered to sleep undisturbed from want of sufficient fuel and to keep in motion, when new and ample materials were discovered in the unfortunate race of Israel." The 'new Christians,' or 'converts,' as those who had renounced the faith of their fathers were denominated, were occasionally preferred to high ecclesiastical dignities, which they illustrated by their integrity and learning. They were inrolled with municipal offices in the various cities of Castile; and as their wealth furnished an obvious resource for repairing, by way of marriage, the decayed fortunes of the nobility, there was scarcely a family of rank in the land whose fortunes did not partake more or less of this peculium or other mixture with the 

one kingdom, governed by Ferdinand and Isabella, towards the close of the 15th century, the Inquisition became general. It was at this time that the inquisitorial tribunal underwent what its friends have honored with the name of a reform; in consequence of which it became a more terrible engine of persecution than before. Under this new form it is usual to speak of the Inquisition, though it may with equal propriety bear the name of the Spanish, as it originated in Spain, and has been confined to that country, including Portugal, and the dominions subject to the two monarchies. The principles of ancient and modern inquisition were radically the same, but they assumed a more malignant form under the latter than under the former. Under the ancient Inquisition the bishops always had a certain degree of control over its proceedings; the law of secrecy was not so rigidly enforced in practice; greater liberty was allowed to the accused on their defence; and in some countries, as in Aragon, in consequence of the civil rights acquired by the people, the inquisitors were restrained from sequestrating the property of those whom they convicted of heresy. But the leading difference between the two institutions consisted in the organization of a secret and independent Inquisition, which, extending over the whole kingdom, was governed by one code of laws, and yielded implicit obedience to one head. The inquisitor general possessed an authority scarcely inferior to that of the king or the pope; by joining with either of them, he proved an overmatch to both; and when his power was concentrated in his own hands, his power was irresistible. The ancient Inquisition was a powerful engine for harassing and rooting out a small body of dissidents; the modern Inquisition stretched its iron arms over a whole nation, upon which it lay like a monstrous incubus, paralyzing its exertions, crushing its energies, and extinguishing every spark of life. It was a sort of national "sense of weakness and terror" (M'Crie, Ref. in Spain, p. 86, 108). Most prominent among those who were active in bringing about this new order of things were the archbishop of Seville, Pedro Gonzalez de Mendoza, the Franciscan (afterwards cardinal) Xyfrezens, and the Dominican prior Torquemada. But to the credit of Isabella be it said, that it was only her zeal for the cause of her Church that led her, when misguided, to commit the unfortunate error; "an error so grave that, like a vein in some noble piece of statuary, it gives a sinister expression to the whole face, and precludes all perfect beauty" (Prescott). Indeed, it was only after repeated importunities of the clergy, particularly of those whom she believed to be sincere as herself in the zeal for the Romish religion, and only these when seconded by the arguments of Ferdinand, who, to his shame be it said, favored the project because he believed it likely to result in filling his coffers by means of confiscations, that she consented to solicit from the pope a bull for the establishment of the "holy office" in Castile. "Sixtus IV, who at that time filled the pontifical chair, easily discerning the sources of wealth and influence which this measure opened to the court of Rome, readily complied with the petition of the sovereigns, and expedited a bull bearing date Nov. 1, 1478, authorizing them to appoint two or three ecclesiastics inquisitors for the detection and suppression of heresy throughout their dominions" (Prescott, i, 246-49). The appointment of the inquisitors was made Sept. 17, 1480, the clergy in confidence with the queen professing to have failed in their attempts to illuminate the benighted Israelites by means of friendly exhortation and a candid exposition of the true principles of Christianity," which Isabella had coun-
first of Castle, and afterwards of Aragon. "This man, who concealed more pride under his monastic weeds than might have furnished forth a convent of his order, was one of that class with whom zeal passes for religion, and who testify their zeal by a fiery persecution of those who do not believe as they do. It was their own punishment for their abstinence from sensual indulgence by giving scope to those devilish vices of the heart, pride, bigotry, and intolerance, which are no less opposed to virtue, and are far more extensively mischievous to society" (Prescot, i, 247). Torquemada at once set about his work, apprehended, examined, and executed the inquisitors in different cities of the united kingdom. Over the whole was placed the Council of the Supreme, consisting of the inquisitor general as president, and three counsellors, two of whom were doctors of law. His next employment was the formation of a body of laws for the government of his new tribunal. This appeared in 1494; additions to it followed from time to time; and as a diversity of practice had crept into the subordinate courts, the inquisitor general Valdes in 1561 made a revial of the whole code, which was published in eighty-one articles, and continued, with the exception of a few slight alterations, to be the law to this day. They are substantially as follows: the accused was invited three times edictaliter to appear. If he did not come before the tribunal, he was excommunicated under the form of inquisition, and condemned to pay a fine, under reservation of more severe penalties if he did not come before the tribunal and submit such. Seldom did any one escape, for familiaris, the holy Hermandad, and the Congregation of the Crucified tracked mercilessly all who were denounced to the Inquisition. If the accused appeared before the court he was at once seized, and from that moment all his relations and friends were forbidden to protect him or his outlaw; and he was not even permitted to give proofs of his innocence. The prisoner and his house were now thoroughly searched, especially for papers or books, a list taken of all his possessions, and, in general, his goods sequestered; a once, to provide beforehand for the expenses of his trial. His hair was cut short in recognition more certain in case he should escape, and he was placed in a dark cell. If he confessed his real or imputed sin, he did indeed escape with his life, as his confession was considered a proof of repentance, but he and all his family were dishonored, and became incapable of holding any office. If he seized his innocence, and there was not sufficient proof against him to condemn him, he was liberated, but carefully watched by the familiaris as an object of suspicion, and generally was soon arrested a second time. Now commenced against him the real, slow trial of the Inquisition, and after the first Inquisitio- nis of the grand inquisitor of Aragon, Nicolas Eymericu- cus. When the prisoner refused to acknowledge his fault at the first interrogatory, he was remanded to prison; after many months he was again brought forth, and asked to swear before a crucifix that he would tell the truth. If now he did not confess, he was immediately considered guilty, otherwise he was tried with loading questions until thoroughly bewildered. The defender was not allowed to take his client's part, but only to in- vite him to declare the truth. Witnesses were not named, and their testimony, the truth of which they were required to submit to examination, was not only in- connected fragments, and years after it had been given. Any sort of testimony was admitted. Two witnesses who would only testify of a hearsay were considered equivalent to an eye-witness. The accuser was exam- ined as a witness. Friends and men of the same order were also admitted to testify, but only against the pris- oner, never in his favor. If the accused still persisted in asserting his innocence, he was now tortured by the whip, the water, and fire, under the direction of the in- quisitors and the bishop of the diocese. If the prisoner then confessed what he was tortured to and if he declared his motives, and afterwards a third time, to make him name his accomplices; and when the in- quisitors had obtained from him all they wanted, they left him to his sufferings, without allowing a physician to assist him. After this confession the prisoner was considered penitent, yet recantation was still demanded of him de levi; if heresy or Judaism was his crime, de re- hemen de levi. He was then brought before the Tribunal in forma, which latter included a free assent to all fur- ther punishments the Inquisition might yet see fit to inflict on the penitent. After that he was generally condemned to imprisonment for life, or sent to the gal- leys, his possessions sequestered, and his family dishon- ored. If he persisted, he was at last condemned to the tortures of the Inquisition; he was punished only by having to wear for a certain time the sanbenito (q.v.), a frock without sleeves, with a red cross of St. Andrew before and behind, over a black under- frock (comp. Encojupr, Britam, xii, 390). The penitent (sancenitedo) who laid it aside before the appointed time was considered as unrepenting; but when he com- plished his penance, the sanbenito was hung up in the church with a card bearing his name, and a state- ment of his offence. A relapse was punished by death. When the three degrees of torture failed to elicit a con- fession, the torturer was ordered to put his prisoner in such a fit to speaking that he might, if he could, really speak the truth. If he did not, he was burnt only by having to wear for a certain time the sanbenito (q.v.), a frock without sleeves, with a red cross of St. Andrew before and behind, over a black under- frock (comp. Encojupr, Britam, xii, 390). The penitent (sancenitedo) who laid it aside before the appointed time was considered as unrepenting; but when he com- plished his penance, the sanbenito was hung up in the church with a card bearing his name, and a state- ment of his offence. A relapse was punished by death. When the three degrees of torture failed to elicit a con- fession, the torturer was ordered to put his prisoner in such a fit to speaking that he might, if he could, really speak the truth. If he did not, he was burnt only by having to wear for a certain time the sanbenito (q.v.), a frock without sleeves, with a red cross of St. Andrew before and behind, over a black under- frock (comp. Encojupr, Britam, xii, 390). The penitent (sancenitedo) who laid it aside before the appointed time was considered as unrepenting; but when he com- plished his penance, the sanbenito was hung up in the church with a card bearing his name, and a state- ment of his offence. A relapse was punished by death. When the three degrees of torture failed to elicit a con- fession, the torturer was ordered to put his prisoner in such a fit to speaking that he might, if he could, really speak the truth. If he did not, he was burnt only by having to wear for a certain time the sanbenito (q.v.), a frock without sleeves, with a red cross of St. Andrew before and behind, over a black under- frock (comp. Encojupr, Britam, xii, 390). The penitent (sancenitedo) who laid it aside before the appointed time was considered as unrepenting; but when he com- plished his penance, the sanbenito was hung up in the church with a card bearing his name, and a state-
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tenure of office (1483-1498) nearly 9000 were condemned to
the flames, 6500 were burnt in effigy, and more
than 90,000 were subjected to various penalties, besides a still
larger number who were reconciled; "a term which
must not be misunderstood by the reader to signify
anything like a partial or amiable, but rather the
imposition of a capital sentence for inferior penalties,
as fines, civil incapacity, very generally total confiscation of
property, and not unfrequently imprisonment for life" (Presc-
cott, Ford, and Isaiah, i, 238; comp also p. 267). His suc-
cessor, Diego Deza, in eight years (1499-1506), accord-
ing to the same sources, the total number of the aboul9000 to a
similar death.

Under the third general inquisitor, Francis Xim-
enes de Cisneros (1507-17), 2536 persons were killed,
1358 were burnt in effigy, and 2426 were punished in
other ways (Llorente, iv, 292). Not much better are the
records of the proceedings of the other successive
inquisitors general. McCrie (Reform. in Spain, p. 109)
very rightly asserts that cardinal Ximenes, more than
any other inquisitor general, contributed towards riv-
eting the chains of political and spiritual despotism of
Spain. "Possessed of talents that enabled him to
foresee the dire effects which the Inquisition would in-
evitably produce and the regulations and tribunals or
affairs at a time when these effects had decidedly ap-
peared. It was in his power to abolish that execrable
tribunal altogether as an insufferable nuisance, or at
least to impose such checks upon its procedure as would
have rendered it a cause of national shame. Yet he not
only allowed himself to be placed at the head of what
employed all his influence and address in defeating every
attempt to reform its worst and most glaring abuses. . . .
Ximenes had obtained the title of a great man from
foreigners as well as natives of Spain. But in spite of the
monarchical domination and of his written endorsement of
the policy of Philip II, he was convinced that the Inquisi-
tion was contrary to the principles of his mind. It is
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true that the power of the Inquisition was not
as great as its influence and extent. It was not
only a power against those who openly or secret-
ly adhered to the evangelical principles of the faith,
but it was also a terror against all who regarded the
institutes of the Church as false, and a means of
denunciation, and convened its chief tribunals at Se-
ville and Valladolid. But it also directed its power
against such members of its own Church as did not ac-
tcept the doctrines of the Council of Trent concerning
justification. As, however, they succeeded in entirely
prevailing in the Church of Spain, the inquisitors of
the 17th century, executions became rarer, and in the
latter half of the 17th century the Inquisition abated its
rigor, and was active principally in suppressing books
and persecuting those who possessed or circulated for-
bidden books. Autos da fe were hardly ever heard of,
and, as a result, the tribunal was less feared; and
finally, even Charles III forbade first the execution of
capital punishment without royal warrant, and afterwards
also set further limits to the power of the Inquisition,
preventing it from rendering any final decision without
the assent of the king, and also from making any new
laws in the course of the executions. The Council of
1770 directed the Inquisition to promote the translation
into a convenl for condemning a book against the king's
will. In 1770 his minister Aranda circumscribed its
power still further by forbidding the imprisonment of
any royal subject, unless his guilt was well substanti-
ated; and in 1778 he followed the precedents of the
powers of every suit against a graudee, minister, or any
other officer in the employ of the king, should always
be presented to the sovereign for inspection before judg-
ment could be pronounced: and although it afterwards
regained ground for a while, public opinion proved too
arresting to it. Even the pope began to restrain the
powers, and it was finally abolished in Madrid, Dec. 4, 1808,
by an edict of Joseph Napoleon. Llorente calculates
that from the time of its introduction into Spain (1481)
to that date (1808), the Inquisition had condemned in
Spain alone 341,921 persons. Of these, 51,912 persons
were burnt alive, 17,650 in effigy, and 291,456 others
were punished severely. When Ferdinand V regained
the throne of Spain in 1814, one of his first acts was the
re-establishment of the Inquisition, but also one of the first
acts of the Revolution of 1820 was the destruction of
the palace of the Inquisition by the people of Madrid. Yet,
after the restoration, the apostolical party continued to demand
its re-establishment; an inquisitorial junta was or-
ganized in 1825, and the old tribunal finally restored in
1829. The law of July 15, 1854, again suspended the
Inquisition, after restoring it in 1853. The Constitution
of 1855 expressly declares that no one shall be made to suffer
for his faith. Yet in 1857 the Inquisition showed itself still very vigorous in persecu-
ing all persons suspected of Protestantism, and all books
containing their doctrines. Such as were found with
heretical books in their possession, or had read them,
were severely punished. The great political changes
which the last few years have wrought on all the civi-
zized world have not been without marked effects on
Spain, and have removed not only in a measure, but, we
hope, altogether, the deplorable effects of the Romish
spirit of insolence and intolerance. The Romish Inquisi-
tion, praised, preached, and imperatively enjoined as one
of the highest of Christian virtues by the antichristian
see of Rome. Indeed the Inquisition, not only in Rome,
but in every land, the papacy considered its master-
piece, "the firstrate and most solid support of the power,
both spiritual and temporal. Hence it put all things
under the feet of its tribunal in the countries subject to
its authority. There the most extravagant maxims
were held to be incontestable, and the most unfounded
pretensions established beyond dispute. Thus the in-
falibillity of the popes, their supremacy over the Church,
their dominion over the possessions of all the
churches in the world, the power to dispose of them as
they pleased, their pretended authority over the temporal concerns of sovereigns, the right which they claim of deposing them, of absolving their subjects from the oath of allegiance, and giving away their dominions, are maxims which none dared to doubt in the countries of the Inquisition, much less to contest them, lest they should expose themselves to all the horrors of that detestable tribunal. No wonder that the popes, in return, so warmly supported all its pretensions, and earnestly and incessantly labored to procure for it so extensive an authority. In that it desired, because formulabile ad the very princes by whom it was adopted" (Shoberl, Persecutions of Popery, i. 113 sq.). These assertions, written (in 1844) long before the occurrence of the late so auspicious events, deserve especial consideration, as among the first changes which the downfall of the temporal power of the papacy must Portugal bring is religious freedom all over the world. (Comp. also Guettée: The Papacy [N. Y. 1867, 12mo], Introd. p. 4 sq.)

Portugal.—From Spain the Inquisition was introduced into the different countries over which it held its sway. Thus it was not really introduced into Portugal until its union with Spain was formed in 1578, and only after much opposition. It is true, under king Joan III of Portugal, an effort was made to establish the tribunal against the New-Christians of that country, imitating the Spaniards in this respect, and Henrique, the bishop of Ceuta, a former Franciscan monk and fanatic, even took the law in his own hands and executed five New-Christians, for which he hastened the establishment of the Inquisition. Many reasons swayed in favor to tolerate the Jews in Portugal, and they, of course, were in that country the first against whom the tribunal was intended to direct the bloody work. In 1581 Clement VII was even persuaded to issue a breve (Dec. 17) to introduce the Inquisition, but already, in the year following (Oct. 17, 1582), he revoked this order (comp. Herculean, Origem da Inquisição em Portugal, i, 276 sq. et al.). But when the Inquisition, under Spanish influence, was at last introduced, as in Spain, as a tribunal of the crown, and it is for this reason Roman Catholic writers argue that the see of Rome cannot be held responsible for the horrible deeds that it enacted in these two countries and in their dependencies. It is true, some of the popes protested against the establishment of the Inquisition in Portugal, but only must be remembered that the opposition was directed against it (as in Italy, above) not so much on account of its cruel measures, but because it chose to be independent of Rome. Indeed the popes, feeling their power insufficient to enforce, excelled, found themselves compelled, from motives of patience, to tolerate what they could not suppress; i.e. unable to establish the Inquisition under their own immediate control, with the benefits accruing therefrom all flowing into their own treasury, they yielded to a state tribunal, that gave them at least a part in the proceedings, as well as a part of the spoils. The highest tribunal of the Portuguese Inquisition was, of course, at Lisbon, the capital of the country, and the appointment of the grand inquisitor at the pleasure of the king, nominally also subject to the approval of the pope. When, finally, Portugal became again independent under the duke of Braganza, John IV (1640), an effort was made by the Royalists to abolish the Inquisition, and to deprive it of the right of sequestration. But John IV found too strong an opposition in the priesthood, especially in the ever-plotting Jesuits, and he was prevented from executing his intentions successfully. When he was imprisoned under T. Ferreira Braganza, his life was insecure, and his body was only a long time after officially absolved from this, one of the grossest sins a son of Rome could possibly have permitted, the attempt to cleanse his Church from the sin of unrighteousness. In the Inquisition was in its activity and privileges by Pedro II (1706), and a still more decided step was taken by Pombal under his son and successor, Joseph I. The Jesuits were expelled from the country, and the inquisitorial tribunal was commanded by law to communicate to the arrested the accusations presented against him or them, the names of the accusers and witnesses, the right of an attorney to hold communication with the accused, and it was furthermore decreed that the sentence should be executed without the assent of the civil courts. At the same time, the auto da fé was also forbidden. After the fall of Pombal and the death of Joseph I the clergy regained their power for a season, but the spirit of enlightenment had not yet permeated the country, and the interference of the priests, and under king John VI (1818-26), when "the great engine for the coördination of the human mind, if worked with the unscrupulous, impassive resolution of Machiavellianism," could no longer be made to accomplish its purpose, it breathed its last, and the very records of its proceedings were condemned to the flames.

Netherlands.—From Spain the Inquisition was also introduced into the Netherlands as early as the 13th century, and from this time forward exerted in this country, next to Spain, her authority most unscrupulously. Especially the finances of the Inquisition were most important during the Reformation. After a severe edict by Charles V at Worms against the heretics (May 8, 1521), he appointed as inquisitors to the Netherlands his councillor, Franz von der Hulst, and the Carmelite Nicolas of Egmont. They at once set out to do their task, and to inflict the usual penalties on the heretics. But they quickly found special helpmeetings in the regent of the Netherlands, Margaret of Austria, in connection with the bishop of Arras, Granvella. The printing, sale, and possession of heretical books were strictly forbidden, and the magistrates were required, under a penalty of being placed out of office, to be active in discovering heretics, and send a quarterly report of their labors to the regent; the informers to receive a considerable reward for any proof (Rauner's Briefe, i, 164 sq.). Nevertheless, the Reformation spread, and the Inquisition was not even able to prevent the rise of fanatical sects, as the Anabaptists (q.v.), etc. But Charles, determined to uproot the Reformation, issued a new mandate for the organization of the Inquisition after the Spanish form (April 20, 1550) (see Sleidtami Commentarii, ed. chr. car. Am Ende: Frey. ad M. 1785, iii, 203 ; Gerdessi Hist. Reformat. iii, App. 192). Especially acute was its tribunal during the persecutions. Maria, the widowed queen of Hungary, who in secret inclined to the Reformation, was now regent. Deputations of the citizens made her aware of the dangers which threatened her on that account; she went immediately to Germany to Charles, was received favorably in the imperial court, and was even given the mandate in so far that in a new form of it (issued September 25, 1550) the words "Inquisition" and "inquisitors" were omitted. But it was still opposed, and could only be published in Antwerp on the condition of the municipal rights being preserved (Gerdessi, at sup. iii, 216 sq.). That the Inquisition was very active up to this time in the Netherlands is certain; but the accounts that, under Charles V, 50,000, or even 100,000 persons lost their lives by it in that country (Sculleti Amales, p. 87; Grotti Amales et Historie de robe Belgica, Amst. 1658, p. 12), seems to be exaggerated. When the Netherlands were placed under the government of Philip II a more severe policy was initiated, determined, if possible, not to modify the existing heresies, but to extinguish them altogether. The Inquisition was at once set in full motion, and a zeal was manifested by its tribunal worthy of a better cause. As a result the contempt under it for the most sacred of all the inviolable rights of man, the right of the individual to determine his own conscience, has already confined to too narrow limits, and it at last burst forth in all its madness. In 1566, the Antwerp synod was restrained, Antwerp, and Herzogtenbuche united in demanding the abolition of the Inquisition. Their example was imitated, and in February, 1556, a league of the nobility,
called the Compromise, was formed, which energetically but humbly made the same request (Schröder, Kirchen-
gesch. iii, 390 sq.). After some delay this was accomplished in 1567. Shortly after, however, the terrible Alba was dispatched to the Netherlands with unlimited power. Margaret was forced to resign the regency, and she retired to the convent of the Gracia Mag. She and those who had become suspected, or whose riches attracted him. Upon the 16th of February, 1568, by a sentence of the holy office, all the inhabitants of the Netherlands were condemned to death as heretics. "From this universal doom only a few persons especially named were excepted. It is said that the number of those who were later, confirmed this decree of the Inquisition, and or-
dered it to be carried into instant execution. . . . Three millions of people, men, women, and children, were sen-
tenced to the scaffold in three lines" (Motley, Rise of the Dutch Republic, ii, 155). But even with these measures they failed in uprooting the Reformation as a dan-
gerous heresy, and in 1578, when the provinces had al-
most become a waste, and depopulated by the emigra-
tion of hundreds of thousands and the execution of thousands of its most valuable citizens, Philip saw him-
self under the necessity of recalling the duke. The les-
sion that he had taught Spain was insufficient to incline her to moderation. Philip now, as much as ever, was determined to uproot heresy by force, and these further attempts resulted finally in the inde-
pendence of the northern provinces of the Netherlands, by formidable union which they formed at Utrecht in 1579, which the peace of Westphalia, by the peace of Westphalia, and overturned the Mohammedan empire which had been established for ages in the Peninsula, began to con-
sider themselves as the favorites of Heaven, destined to propagate and defend the true faith, and "thus the glory of the world, which the Jews did not know, in the extinction of heresy." In the New World the Inquisi-
tion established its power, especially in Mexico. It was also terribly severe in Carthagena and Lima. By the Portuguese it was taken to East India, and had its chief seat at Goa. Under John Vilh of Portugal it was, after it had undergone several modifications, wholly abolished both in Brazil and East India.
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Inquisitor. See Inquisition.

Y. N. R. J. are the initials for Jesus Nazarenum Rex Judeorum (Jesus of Nazareth, King of the Jews), fre-
quently met with as inscriptions. See CROSS OF CHRIST.

Insabbattâti. See WALEDSIANS.

Insacrâtî, the name usually given in the ancient canons to the inferior clergy. The term was commonly called the isqopias, a holy or sacred; the oth-
ers insacratî, un consecrated. Different ceremonies were observed at their ordination: the higher orders were se-
parated at the altar by the solemn imposition of hands; the others had no imposition of hands. The superior orders ministers as priests, celebrating the sacraments and preaching in the church; the inferior performed some lower or ordinary duties, and generally attended upon the others in their sacred services. See IN-
FERIOR CLERGY.

Inscriptions carved on stone have in all ages been regarded by cultivated, and sometimes even by rude na-
tions, as the most enduring monuments of memorable events. Thus the early patriarch Job would have his dying profession of faith "graven with iron in the rock forever" (Job xix, 24). Moses inscribed the law upon stones, and set them up permanently in Mt. Ebal (Deut. xxvii, 2-8; Josh. viii, 30). See PRIESTS.
The oldest inscriptions now known to us are the Chi-
inese, which precede to B.C. 2278. Those of India date only back to B.C. 815, the age of Sandarco-
tus; but it has been thought that the hieroglyphical inscri-
ptions of Central America and of Mexico may prove to be of much older date than those of China even. The Egyptian inscriptions are generally acknowledged to be as old as B.C. 2000; next in order come the Assyrian and Babylonian, reaching nearly as high an antiquity, and then follow the Persian, and Median, and Phemi-
cian, all of about B.C. 700, while the Greek date only to B.C. 500 and 690, and the Etruscan and Roman to no re-
 mote date than the Indian, i. e. B.C. 400-300.
The most remarkable of all the known inscriptions are the trilingual inscription of Rosetta, that of Shalmanezer on the obelisk of Nimrud, and the cylinder of Semach-
erib; the trilingual inscription of Darius I on the rock at Behistum; the Greek inscription of the Roman triumph of Pamiethicus at Ipsambool, and the bronze helmet dedicated by Hiero I to the Olympic Jupiter; the inscrip-
tion on the coffin of the Cyprian king Asmmazzer; the Etruscan inscription called the Euboea Tables; that of Marathon, the conquest of Asia Minor, and the will of Augustus at Ancyra; the inscription of the Ethiopian monarch Silico; the old monument of Yu, and the inscription of Se-gan-fu, recording the arrival of Christianity in China (A.D. 651); the inscriptions of Chandara-gupta and Asoka in India.

1. Egyptian Hieroglyphics. — These are at once the most ancient, the most copious, and the most instruc-
tive of all relics of this description extant. The Egyptian
iums used three modes of writing: (1) the Enchorial
or Demotic, the common language of the country; (2)
the Hieratic, peculiar to the priests; and (3) the Hie-
roglyphic. Hieroglyphics, again, are of three kinds:
(1) Phonetic, when the hieroglyphic stands for a letter;
(2) Emblematic or Symbolic, when it is an emblem or
symbol of the thing represented; (iii.) Figuretate, when
it is a representation of the object itself. The annexed
engraving will give some idea of the four different kinds
of Egyptian characters; by this it will be seen that in
some cases the derivation of the demotic character is to
be traced, through its various gradations, from the orig-
inall pure hieroglyphic, while in others the resemblance
is utterly lost. We illustrate this subject by a few
examples, pointing out the various meanings attached
to the Egyptian characters under different circum-
stances. The names of the gods were in general ex-
pressed by symbols and not by letters: "in the same
manner, the Jews never wrote at full length the ineffa-
ble name of Jehovah, but always expressed it by a short
mark, which they pronounced Adoni." These repre-
sentations were of two kinds: figuretate, in which the
name of the deity is implied by the form in which he
was represented in his statue, and symbolic, in which a
part of the statue, or some object having a reference to
the deity, was employed, as for instance:

![Hieroglyphic Symbols](image)

Many words were also expressed by symbols, of which
the following are examples:


Dr. Young and Mr. Tattam have satisfactorily shown
that all that has come down to us of the language and
literature of ancient Egypt is contained in the Coptic,
Sahidic, or Upper Country, and the Baemurcan-Coptic
dialects, and in the enchorial, hieratic, and hieroglyph-
ic inscriptions and MSS.; and it is a point that cannot
be too much insisted upon, that a previous knowledge of
the Coptic is absolutely necessary to a correct under-
standing of the hieroglyphics. See Hieroglyphics.

These inscriptions are found abundantly on the vari-
umous monuments still remaining in Egypt, especially
in the tombs and palaces of the several kings. They
are found either alone, as documentary records, e. g. on
the obelisks and columns; or oftener in connection with pic-
torial representations of public or private scenes, very
rarely, as in the famous Rosetta Stone, with interlinear
translations in the corresponding Egyptian or a foreign
language. See Egypt.

II. Assyrian Cuneiform.—These characters, like the
Egyptian hieroglyphics, are usually inscribed upon slabs
concerning scenes of war, sieges, festivals, dedications of
martial hunting, or other scenes. See Cuneiform. The most
noted places where they occur are at Behistun, Khorso-
bad, Koyunjik, and Nimrud. See each in its order.
All the great halls of the various palaces are surrounded
in the interior with sculptured slabs set into the walls,
and covered with representations of the great historical
events of the reign of the respective kings, such as
battles, sieges, diversions, the festivals, the building of
towns, and of mounds for palaces and temples,
processions of captives, caravans bearing tribute from
subjected nations, or presents from vassal kings, or
taxes from the various districts of the empire, etc.

Several hundreds of these have been removed, taken
down the Euphrates, and shipped home to England,
and set up in the British Museum, and that of the Louvre
at Paris. These slabs vary in size from three to seven
feet in breadth, and from five to eleven feet in height;
and a part even reach thirteen and fifteen feet. Some
of them have been brought to our own country, and pre-
mitted to Amherst and other colleges. Many have be-
come, as it were, leaves in the Assyrian history. Each
chamber, in fact, is a volume; for not only do we have
the sculptures, but also inscriptions in a cuneiform or
wedge-form letter, which furnishes a commentary on the
event a hint given by the artist. Greatly as we have
already been made in deciphering this language, as we
have stated elsewhere, and we have most wonderful
and interesting additions to our knowledge of ancient
Nineveh (q. v.).

III. Phoenician Records.—These are very fragmentary
and imperfect. They are in characters closely
resembling the old Hebrew. Most of them have been
diligently collected and expounded by Gesenius in his
Monumenta Phocincia (Lpz. 1837). See Phoenicia.
A very interesting inscription relating to the history of
one of the early Moabite kings has lately been dis-
covered. See Moab.

IV. Sinoic Inscriptions.—Wady Mokatteh, the cliffs
of which bear these inscriptions, is a valley entering
wady Shiek, and bordering on the upper regions of the
Sini Mountains. It extends for about three hours' 
march; and in most places its rocks present abrupt cliffs
one or thirty feet high. From these cliffs large
masses have separated and lie at the bottom in the
valley. The cliffs and rocks are thickly covered with in-
scriptions, which are continued, at intervals of a few
hundred paces only, for at least the distance of two
hours. Bunsen says that to copy all of them would occu-
p'y a skilful draughtsman six or eight days.

The inscriptions are very rudely executed, some-
times with large letters, at others with small, and sel-
dom with straight lines. The characters appear to be
written from right to left; and, although not cut deep,
an inscription on a large stone must have been required,
as the rock is of considerable hardness. Some of them are
on rocks at a height of twelve or fifteen feet, and must
have required a ladder to ascend to them. The charac-
ters were not known. The superior of the Franciscans,
who visited the place in 1722, observes: "Although we
had among us men who understood the Arabic, Greek,
Hebrew, Syriac, Coptic, Latin, Armenian, Turkish, Eng-
lish, Illyrian, German, and Bohemian languages, there
was not one of us who had the slightest knowledge of
the characters engraved in these hard rocks with great
labor in a country where there is nothing much to eat
or to drink. Hence it is probable that these characters
contained some profound secrets, which, long
before the birth of Jesus Christ, were sculptured in
these rocks by the Chaldeans or other some others."

This account excited profound attention in Europe; and
it was thought by many that copies must have been
formed by the Israelites during their stay in this
region, and probably contained irrefragable evidence
for the truth of the Mosaic history. Hence copies of
them have been anxiously sought and secured; but, with
the exception of a few in Greek, the character and language
were perfectly unknown, although Be'er-David, says
"greater progress than has yet been attained must be made in the paleography and ancient
languages of the East. The most general opinion is that they were the work of pilgrims who visited Sinai about the 6th century." This seems to us very doubtful. The Greek inscriptions and the crosses, on which this conclusion chiefly rests, may indeed have been of that or a later age; but it does not follow that those in the unknown characters necessarily were so too.—Kitto, *Pict. Bible*, note on Job xix, 24. Rev. Charles Forster contends that they are records of the Israelites on their way from Egypt to Palestine (*Sinai Photographed*, London, 1862, &c.). Better opportunities than had formerly been at the command of casual travellers were enjoyed by captain Palmer, a member of the expedition now employed in making a complete and exhaustive survey of the physical features and condition of the Sinaic region. His collection of transcripts from wady Mokattab and other localities exceeds 1500 in number, and he was much aided in the study of their meaning by finding several undoubted bilingual inscriptions where the Greek and Sinaic characters occur together, and express the same meaning. The result of four months' steady devotion to this object has given a complete alphabet of the latter, so that captain Palmer can read and interpret any of the inscriptions with ease. Both the alphabet and language must have been employed by a late Semitic people—"in all probability a commercial community who inhabited, or at least colonized, the Peninsula for the first few centuries of the Christian era." That many of the writers were Christians is proved by the numerous Christian signs used by them; but it is equally clear, from internal evidence, that a large proportion of them were pagans. It is interesting to note that captain Palmer's researches were pursued without the knowledge of professor Beers's studies, though they mainly corroborate each other, and he bears testimony to the professor's acuteness and penetration. A writer in the *Princeton Review* (Oct. 1870), after giving the history of the discovery and decipherment of these inscriptions, thus concludes: "It seems to be ascertained that the writers were natives of Arabia Petraea, inclusive of the Sinaic peninsula; and, whether they were subjects of the kingdom centring in Petra or not, they made use of the language and the mode of writing current there. They were neither Jews nor Christians, but worshippers of heathen deities, and particularly of the heavenly bodies. They were mostly pilgrims on their way to certain celebrated sanctuaries, which were for centuries resorted to at special seasons by the pagans resident in this region. The inscriptions in the old native character belong to the period immediately preceding and following the Christian era; and they come down to the time when the Gospel and the Christian Church penetrated these localities, supplanted heathenism, and suppressed its sanctuaries. They then yield to legends in Greek and Latin, and even more recent tongues, the work of Christians, who, in imitation of their heathen predecessors, have left the record of their pilgrimage to hallowed spots gravend on the same imperishable works." Hence we find crosses and other marks of Christianity mingled in the pagan names and symbols. Similar inscriptions have been found scattered, but not so profusely, nor in such confusion, in various other portions of the Sinaic peninsula, and even in the outskirts of Palestine. (See the literature in the *Princeton Review*, ut sup.) See SINA.

**INSCRIPTIONS, CHRISTIAN.** There are but few Christian inscriptions that remain extant from an early date, but these few yet suffice to convey to us a pretty accurate idea of the history of the early Christian Church, and of the customs and belief of the first followers of the Lord Jesus Christ. "They express," says Maitland, in his justly celebrated and now quite rare work on *The Church in the Catacombs* (Lond. 1846, 8vo, p. 13), "the feelings of a body of Christians whose leaders alone are known to us in history. The fathers of the Church live in their voluminous works; the lower orders are only represented by these simple records, from which, with scarcely an exception, sorrow and complaint are banished; the boast of suffering, or an appeal to the revengeful passions, is nowhere to be found. One expresses faith, another hope, a third charity. The genius of primitive Christianity, 'to believe, to love, and to suffer,' has never been better illustrated. These 'serious in stones' are addressed to the heart, and not to the head, to the feelings rather than to the taste; and possess additional value from being the work of the

---

**Engraved Rocks in Wady Mokattab.**
purest and most influential portion of the 'catholic and apostolic Church' then in existence." In the early years of the Christian Church the inscriptions were, with few exceptions, confined to the memory of deceased persons and to sacred objects.

1. The custom of tomb-stone inscriptions was borrowed by the early Christians from the Romans and Greeks; they simplified them, however, very much, and indicated the Christian knowledge, life, and rank of the deceased partly by significant symbols, partly by written signs, words, and expressions. These symbols, as they are found in Italy, France, and along the coasts of the Rhine, pertain partly to the designation of the Redeemer by means of pictorial representations, partly to the life after death, hope for the same through Christ and the cross. The name of Christ, their Lord and Master, is, as would be expected of his followers, everywhere the most prominent, and is "repeated in an endless variety of forms, and the actions of his life are figured in every degree of rudeness of execution." But remarkable it certainly is, that in the inscriptions contained in the Lapidarian Gallery, selected and arranged under papal superintendence, containing one of the largest, if not the largest collection of Christian inscriptions, there are no prayers for the dead (unless the forms "May you live," "May God refresh you," "be so constituted"); no addresses to the Virgin Mary, nor to the apostles or earlier saints; and, with the exception of "eternal sleep," "eternal home," etc., no expressions contrary to the plain sense of Scripture. Neither is the second person of the Trinity viewed in the Jewish light of a temporal Messiah, nor is he degraded to the Socinian estimate of a mere example, but he is ever represented as invested with all the honors of a Redeemer. On this subject there is no reserve, no heathenish suppression of the distinguishing feature of the Christian religion as professed by the evangelical sects. On stones innumerable appears the good Shepherd, bearing on his shoulders the recovered sheep, by which many an illiterate believer expressed his sense of personal salvation. One, according to his epitaph, "sleep in Christ;" another is buried with a prayer that "she may live in the Lord Jesus." But most of all, the cross in its simplest form is employed to testify the faith of the deceased; and whatever ignorance may have prevailed regarding the letter of Writ, or the more mysterious doctrines contained in it, there seems to have been no want of apprehension of that sacrifice "whereby alone we obtain remission of our sins, and are made partakers of the kingdom of heaven" (Maitland, Church in the Catacombs, p. 14, 15). One of the principal symbols used in referring to Christ is a monogram of the initial letters of the Greek name Χριστός. Most generally it is found to be composed of X and ρ, the latter placed in the heart of the former. Strange to say, we preserve in our own language a vestige of this figure in writing Xmas and Xian, which can only be explained by supposing the first letter to stand for the Greek X, the face of a monogram of Christ's name is copied from Maitland, p. 166, and was originally taken from the Lapidarian Gallery. The α and ω reversed in this epitaph refer to the well-known passages in the Apocalypse: their continued use proves the general reception of that book as a part of the inspired canon. The α and ω [see article on Apokalypse] are mentioned by Prudentius as well as by Tertullian, who regarded them as mysteriously containing the signification that in Christ rest the beginning and end of all spiritual life (De monogram, c.c.). From the ignorance of the sculptor, the entire symbol was sometimes inverted, as in the opposite figure (also from Maitland, p. 167). A change was afterwards made by the decussation (as it is technically termed) of the X, by which the figure of a cross was produced. Having once arrived at this happy coincidence, the monogram remained stationary. Its simple outline, thus chiselled on a grave-stone (from the Lapidarian Gallery), or accompanied by the misplaced letters, or even converted into "Pas," as if for Pasitos, D·M·N· ELEI ΠASA

SORIAO.

Read: "To our great God—Elias to Soricius, In Christ," was in course of time ornamented with jewels; and the monogramma gemmata took its place as a work of art among Christian bas-reliefs of the 4th century. The best specimen in the Lapidarian Gallery Maitland refers to the Emperor Constantine, and that, as is generally believed, it was first seen by him in the so greatly celebrated miraculous vision, which resulted in his conversion to the Christian religion. An epitaph, such as the subjunctive, discovered by Bonio, may be well assigned to that time, when the motto "In hoc vincies" might have become common.

IN HOC VINCIES

SINFONIA ET FILIS

V·AN·XLVIII M·V·D III

"In this thou shalt conquer—In Christ. Sinfonia, also for her sons. She lived forty-eight years, five months, and four days."

The next is contained in Oderici:

IN VICTRIX

which probably signifies,

"Victrix (a woman's name), victorious in Christ."

But the epitaphs of Alexander and Marius, martyrs under Adrian and Antonine, also exhibit the monogram: "and though," says Maitland, "they do not appear to have been executed at the time, they contain strong marks of belonging to a period of violent persecution." Gaetano Marni, however, asserts that the earliest monogram belongs to the year 381, i.e., six years after the Council of Nice.

A cut from a stamp of Boldetti. The P (r) of the monogram also serves as a p in the words spro Der. It is to be read, "My hope is in God Christ."

The only resemblance to the monogram used by the
heathen was the ceramium, or symbol of lightning. The Egyptian cross appears to be an abbreviation of the Nilometer.

CELIX ET CEREALIS PATRI BENEM.
QVIXIT ANNIS LXXXV M VIII D V DORMIT IN PACEM.

Transliterate: "The mark of Christ. Cellix and Cerealis to their deserving father," etc.

For the assertion that the monogram was a symbol of martyrdom, and signified "for Christ," there seems to be not the least authority. In many inscriptions we read, however, in X: as in

IN X ASELYS D.

"Aelius sleeps (or is buried) in Christ." Prudentius informs us that the name of Christ, "written in jewelled gold, marked the purest laureum, and sparkled from the helmets" of the army of Constantine; but this is, in all probability, only a poetical fiction (Liber i, contra Symmachum). Only in the later inscriptions, as far down as the Middle Ages, as in a Cologne inscription (Centr. 100), are found the words initium et finis. The monogram with the two letters is there sometimes surrounded by a circle or a wreath. The symbols, however, were used more frequently than any other, and of these the fish (ἰχθύς), which is often found in different forms upon the same stone, was no doubt suggested by the initials which contains of the formula Ιησοῦς Χριστός Θεοῦ Υἱός Σωτήρ (Jesus Christ, Son of God, the Saviour), a sentence which had been adopted from the Sibylline verses. Moreover, the phonetic sign of this word, the actual fish, was an emblem whose meaning was entirely concealed from the uninitiated—an important point with those who were surrounded by foes ready to ridicule and blaspheme whatever of Christianity they could detect. Nor did the appropriateness of the symbol stop here. "The first," observed Tertullian, "seems a fit emblem of him whose spiritual children are, like the offspring of fishes, born in the water of baptism." Sometimes the word ἰχθύς was expressed at length, as in the two following (Ladidian Gallery):

IKYOC
BONO ET INOCENTI FILIO
PASTORI QV X A N III
NNIS X
IXYOC

The first contains the mistake of χ for χ. At other times the fish itself was figured, as recommended by Clement of Alexandria (Pedagog. iii, 106), who, besides the fish, proposed as Christian emblems for signets fishermen, anchors, ships, doves, and myras.

This specimen Maltland also copied from the Ladidian Gallery.

In a metrical Grecian inscription at Antrim, Christ himself, at the supper, is called ἰχθύς. Usually, however, it is the fisherman, who is Christ himself; he who also called the apostles to become the fishermen of men (Matt. iv, 19; Mark i, 17). Clement observes that it refers to the apostle Peter, and the boys who were drawn out of the water (of baptism). To these the anchor is added, which, as early as the letter to the Hebrews (vi, 19), is made the symbol of hope resting in the centre of holiness (comp. Mai Inscrip. Chr. p. 472, 4; 415, 3; 428, 7; 430, 10; 449, 4; 460, 6). Less frequently we find the IV. Q q

sailing ship, e. g., upon an inscription of Firmia Victoria, in the porch of Maria in Trastevere, in Rome, and (Mai, Inscrip. Chr. p. 430, 6) upon the tomb-stone of a certain virgin named Serenilla. The same is also found in the Vatican. Clement calls it ναεις ὁπανοςματίας, "the ship hastening heavenwards." The lyre, as far as we know, does not occur on tomb-stones. The lyre is perhaps an ideal picture of the harmony which reigns in the Christian soul, or is used instead of Orpheus, by whom also Christ was represented. The dove, also specified by Clement, and the olive-branch, are more numerous, as the symbols of love and peace. The word peace is added to this fac-simile from the Ladidian Gallery.

The olive-branch which it bears is borrowed from the history of Noah: it was sometimes carried in the claws of the bird, as in the copy below given, which is taken from the Vatican library.

INVARIE BIRGINI
BENEMERENTI IN
FACE BOTIS DEPOSITA

"To Jannaria, a virgin, well-deserving. Buried in peace, with vows." The substitution of botis and birgini for votis and virginis: the b and v are sometimes so absurdly reversed.

BIB BEOVENE MERENTI
"To Bibbenus, the well-deserving." DECEMBER 8 EVIVO FECIT SIBI BISOMYM.

"In Christ. December, while living, made himself a Bisomym." Clemen, among other things, forbids Christians to carry pitchers and swords upon their rings. The pitcher, with or without handle, does occur, however, frequently in Rome, Trier, and elsewhere, on Christian graves, usually between two doves. Whether this symbol refers to the doves drinking from a bowl, or whether it points to the water of life which is to refresh the thirsty soul, is not known. Instead of the sword, the axe occurs a few times on Christian tomb-stones: thus in Rome, at the church Nereo ed Achille, in the Palazzo Guicelmi, several times at Aringhi, etc. They are most probably a concealed representation of the cross, whose form they somewhat resemble. The Christians could use this symbol more readily, because it was also used by the heathens as dedicatio sub aescis. In addition to these, we find the seven-armed candelstick, which occurs in the cloister of St. Paola at Rome and elsewhere upon Jewish tomb-stones, but also upon Christian basilisks of Rome; not so frequently on graves, e. g. Mai, Inscrip. Chr. p. 406, 4. The lamb occurs seldom, e. g. Mai, Inscrip. Chr. p. 401, 3; the same, between two doves, p.
The balance occurs twice at Aringhi; and upon private sarcophagi, representations of the good shepherd, Old and New Testament histories, etc. Besides these, there are a few occasional allusions to the name of the deceased, when the anchor is cast.

A voyage, when the anchor is cast.

used by Peter. "So shall an entrance be ministered unto you abundantly," generally referred to the prosperous entrance of a vessel into port. "The ignorance displayed by the sculptor is scarcely to be accounted for, excepting by the circumstance that the traffic on the Tiber was confined to barges supplied with sails and steered by steersmen, and towed by horses. The peacock is said to have been used as an emblem of immortality. This idea was borrowed from the pagans, who employed it to signify the apotheosis of an emperor: for this purpose it was let fly from the funeral pile on which his body was consumed. The triumph was also adopted by the Christians with the same intention; so, also, the crowned horse, as a sign of victory." The supposed emblems of martyrdom, such as a figure praying, a crown, or a palm branch, which generally belong to this class, are borrowed from paganism, with additional significance in Christian cases, especially on account of the mention of it in the book of Revelation. "On the strength of some expressions there used, antiquarians of later times have taken it for granted that the early Church employed both the crown and palm, or either separately, as emblems of martyrdom." This idea of nature has been abandoned from want of proof; and such a fragment as the following, found in the cemetery of St. Priscilla (Lapidarian Gallery), is now only supposed to belong to the epitaph of an ordinary Christian:

NA VIBAS
DOMINO
ESV

The crown and palm conjoined are also met with in the present example, from the Vatican library, they encircle the monogram, as represented below:

- FL. JOVINA - QVAE - VIX
ANNS - TRIBVS - D - XXX
NEOPITA - IN PACE - XI - K

"Flavia Jovina—who lived three years and thirty days—neophyte—alive in peace. (She died) the eleventh Kalendar..."

The extreme youth of the neophyte, while it proves the custom of infant baptism, makes the martyrdom of Jovina improbable. "The notice of death is various in the heathen inscriptions. Occasionally occurs D.M. (de membra); instead of that, also B.M., i.e. bone memoria. The beginning formula usually is hic quiesci, or requiescit in pace; in the Greek, ὁ δὲ κεῖται ἡμών οἱ ταῦτα ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου πάσχοντα, dormit in pace, φεβεράς ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ γεγενημένος, in sīpiās longe, etc. etc. etc. In the name of the deceased in the nominative or dative, with and without in pace, is sīpiās."

Quite remarkable, however, is the distinguishing feature of Christian inscriptions of the early centuries, and especially in such mon creating from pagan inscriptions, viz. in its use of names. "While the heathen name consisted of several essential parts, all of which were necessary to distinguish its owner, the Christians in general confined themselves to that which they had received in baptism." But as some of the converts came from Roman families, it was quite natural for them to retain their Gentile and other names, yea, genuine heathen names, and thus even the names of heathen gods occur, e.g. Azizos, the name of a Syriac godess, we find in Trier (Centralium, ili, 58) given as the name of a Syriac Christian. Also Artemis, Marii, Marcellus, Epaphras, Victor, Herodes, Vespasianus, names united with Sabatia, Sabatius, Nundina, and Dominica, taken in a great measure from the names of the days of the week. But the desire to simplify names, and to give them an ethical significance, is none the less noticeable even among the Roman converts; for while it is true that their part in life was to be spent in their world then world for a person to have six, eight, or ten names, in Christian inscriptions (the name given at the time of baptism being always preferred) but one or two names generally occur. The name was, as a rule, taken in view of facts universally believed to be desirable, whether with regard to life: Vitalis, Vitalius, Vitalisissimus, Viventius, Zoes, etc.; in view of fortune: Felicio, Fortunio, Fortunula, Felicianissima, Faustina, Prosper, Successus, Eutyches, etc.; of joy: Gaudentius, Gaudiosus, Hilario, Hilarianus, Jucunda, Eadone; of victory: Victor, Vincentius, Nicer, Pancratius; of strength: Virissimus, Fortissima, Alcinus, Dynamice, of faith: Theophistus, Fidelis; of hope: Spes, Helpis, Eplidia; of love: Phileus, Philumena, Agape, Agapetus, Caritosa; of spiritual blessing: Dorotheus, Theodorus, Theodos, Theodulus, Timothea, Theophilus, and various others. The kingdom of nature has been passed over in the account. In months: Januarius, Februarius, Aprilis, Decembrin; animals, plants, employment of rural life, etc. Of Old Testament names few are found, e.g. Susanna, Daniel, and Daniel; of New Testament names, Maria, Petrus, Paulus, and under the designation of national names, e.g. e.g. Agrippa, Bithia, and others, are appended to our purpose. After the name of the deceased there is frequently appended a short statement of his Christian position, views, or habits which distinguished him in civil life. He is called a neophyte (once in alius), a believer (fidelis), i.e. one who is really accepted: martyrs, discor, exorcistas, subdiscor, etc.; child, virgin, man, wife; anima dulcis, miss innocence anima or exemplum, dulcis apsiissimis insens et visageta et verbis dulcisissima cunctis, filius innocentissimam, dulcisissimus, bonus, sapiens, omnibus honorificissimam et nomen, deo fideli et dicitur marito, nutritie familias, cunctis humiles, placita pura corde, anmatrix paupere, ab acatis ab omni maligna re, etc. The most common form is bene merens. Then follows the age, with a qui vixit or in seculo, ζωαν, ζωας, either with an accurate account of the years, months, and days, or merely about the time, with the additional statement plus minus, spavdot Vesper. Then that day of burial, with a depositis or deposito, not seldom the fastis for the year; sometimes, also, the announcement of the person who erected the stone (titulam posuit or posuerunt), and of his suffering (doles, contra votum, etc.). Of course this arrangement is not always followed. Sometimes we find following the name a motto, such as ζωαν, vivas in Christo, in deo vivas, vivas in domino, spex paix tibi, accepts
INSECT

INSPIRATION

Insect.

The language is largely corrupted, the Latin degenerating into the Roman, but for this reason is very important. In grammar we find Latin words written in Greek letters, or mixed inscriptions in both languages. When written in poetry, the hexameter or distich measure is commonly used, and yet they are rhythmical rather than metrical. In such rhythmical inscriptions we find extension of thought not for form sake. The manuscripts from which the inscriptions were made consists of small, plain marble slabs, either laid upon the grave or put into the coffin. Sometimes, to designate the death of martyrs, there occur vessels of blood and the instruments of death; also glasses, etc.

4. The definition which Dr. Knapp gives of inspiration is one which most will readily adopt. He says: "It may be best described, in the terms of the Scriptures themselves, as an extraordinary divine agency upon teachers while giving instruction, whether oral or written, by which they were taught what and how they should write or speak." The nature, permanence, and completeness of this inspiration are matters upon which orthodox believers have differed. (See below.)

II. The Fact of the Inspiration of the Bible.—(On this point we condense the arguments of Dr. Leonard Woods in Kitto's Cyclopaedia, n. v., confining ourselves chiefly to the question of the inspiration of the written word.) To prove that the Scriptures are divinely inspired, it might with propriety refer to the excellence of the doctrines, precepts, and promises, and other instructions which they contain; to the simplicity and majesty of their style; to the agreement of the different parts, and the scope of the whole; especially to the full discovery they make of man's fallen and ruined state, and the way of salvation through a Redeemer; together with their power to enlighten and sanctify the heart, and the accompanying witness of the Spirit in believers. But the more direct and conclusive evidence that the Scriptures are divinely inspired, is the agreement of the writers themselves. As the writers did, by working miracles and in other ways, sufficiently authenticate their divine commission, and establish their authority and infallibility as teachers of divine truth, their testimony, in regard to their own inspiration, is entitled to our full confidence. Our best and most conclusive testimony to the Godhead is the writings of the writers themselves. As the writers did, by working miracles and in other ways, sufficiently authenticate their divine commission, and establish their authority and infallibility as teachers of divine truth, their testimony, in regard to their own inspiration, is entitled to our full confidence. Our best and most conclusive testimony to the Godhead is the writings of the writers themselves.
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attributive of the subject. But this rendering is liable to
insipid objections. For θύτατοσσος and ὄφελμός
are connected by the conjunction καὶ, and must both be
predicates, if either of them is; and unless one of them
is a predicate there is no complete sentence. Hender-
sen remarks that the mode of construction referred to
is "a variant with a common rule of the τὸ αὐτὸ καὶ τὸ
αὐτὸ" which shows that those two relatives are closely
joined, as θύτατοσσος and ὄφελμός here are, if there be
an eclipse of the substantive verb ἱερί, this verb must
be supplied after the former of the two, and re-
garded as repeated after the latter. Now there exists
parallelism of the kinds of wh in the case, and as there is
nothing in the context which would lead to any
exception to the rule, we are bound to yield to its force."

He adds that "the evidence in favor of the common
rendering, derived from the fathers, and almost all the
versions, is most decided." It cannot for a moment be
admitted that the apostle meant to signify that divine
inspiration belongs to a part of Scripture, but not to the
whole; or that he meant, as Semler supposes, to furnish
a criterion by which to judge whether any work is ins-
pired or not, namely, its utility. "That author
proceeds feebly to apply this criterion to the books of
the Old Testament, and to call them inspired as not
possessing the requisite marks of legitimacy. Many of
the German divines adopt Semler's hypothesis." But it
is very manifest that such a sense is not by any means
suggested by the passage itself, and that it is utterly
preposterous. The language of the case is very much
like it, not Christ nor any one of his apostles ever intimates
a distinction between some parts of Scripture which are
inspired and other parts which are not inspired. The
document which is plainly asserted in the text under
consideration, and which is fully sustained by the cur-
cent language of the New Testament, is that: all the
writings denominated the Scriptures are divinely inspired.
What particular books have a right to be included un-
der this sacred designation in the general opinion of the
Church is a question considered under the article Case
of Scripture.

III. The nature of Inspiration.—The interior process
of the Spirit's action upon the minds of the speakers or
writers was of course inscrutable (John iii, 8) even to
themselves. That they were conscious, however, of such
an influence is manifest from the authority with which
they put forth their words; yet, when they sat down to
write, the divine and the human elements in their men-
tal action were perfectly harmonious and insiparable
(Luke i, 3).

As to the outward method, "God operated on the
minds of inspired men in a variety of ways, sometimes
by audible words, sometimes by direct inward sugges-
tions, sometimes by outward visible signs, sometimes
by the Urin and Thummm, and sometimes by dreams and
visions. This variety in the mode of divine influence
detracted nothing from its certainty. God made
known his will equally in different ways; and, whatever
the mode of his operation, he made it manifest to his
servants that the things revealed were from him." All
this, however, relates rather to revelation than simple
inspiration, a distinction that is ably made by Prof. Lee
in his work on the subject.

But inspiration was concemed not only in making
known to the prophets and apostles, but also in giving them direction in writing the sacred books. In this
also, there was a diversity in the mode of divine
influence. Sometimes the Spirit of God moved and
guided his servants to write things which they could
not know by natural means, such as new doctrine or
precepts, or predictions of future events. Sometimes he
moved and guided them to write the history of events
which were wholly or partly known to them by
tradition, or by the testimony of their contemporaries,
or by their own observation or experience. In all these
cases the divine Spirit effectually preserved them from
all error, and influenced them to write just so much and
in such a manner as God saw to be best. Sometimes
he moved and guided them to write a summary record
of larger histories, containing what his infinite wisdom
saw to be adapted to the end in view, that is, the bene-
fit of his people in all ages. Sometimes he influenced
them to make a record of important maxims in common
use, to be handed down from one generation to another
in connection or experience, or from special divine teaching. Sometimes he influenced them to write parables or al-
gories, particularly suited to make a salutary impression
of divine things on the minds of men; and sometimes
to record supernatural visions. In these and all other
kinds of works of which the case is most important
and special divine guidance, as no man could of himself
attain to infallibility, and no wisdom, except that of God,
was sufficient to determine what things ought to be
written for permanent use in the Church, and what
manner of writing would be best fitted to promote the
great ends of revelation."

"Some writers speak of different modes and different
kinds, and even different degrees of inspiration. If
their meaning is that God influenced the minds of ins-
pired men in different ways; that he adopted a variety
of modes in revealing divine things to their minds; that
he could be guided by the guidance given to them in the
Scriptures, and in the different forms of composition; that
he moved and guided them to write history, prophecy,
domains, commands, promises, reproofs, and exhorta-
tions, and that he adapted his mode of operation to each
individual man, and of these operations there is no
Fool. The Scriptures exhibit these different kinds of writ-

ings and modes of divine instruction. Still every part
of what was written was divinely inspired, and equally
so. It is all the word of God, and clothed with divine
authority, as much as if it had all been made known
and written in one way." There is a true and

IV. Theories of Inspiration.—These may be concisely
stated thus: (1) The orthodox, or generally accepted
view, which contents itself with considering Scripture
to be inspired in such a sense as to make it infallibly
certain when apprehended in its legitimate sense, and
of absolute authority in all matters of faith and con-
science. This theory has lately been, with great pro-
priety, designated as the dynamical, purporting that the
power or influence is from God, while the action is
human. (2) The mystical, or extremely strict view,
thought to have been held by Philip, Joseph, and
some of the primitive Christian fathers (but condemned
by the early councils as aspiring to heathenish μαν-
τείς), which regarded the sacred writers as wholly pos-
sessed by the Spirit, and uttering its dicta in a spe-
cies of frenzy. This, in opposition to the former, has
justly been characterized as the mechanical view, de-
noting the passivity of the inspired subject. (3) The
lauttinsbarion view, entertained by Rationalists of all
orders, which deems inspiration but a high style of po-
etic or religious fervor, and not inconsistent with errors
in fact and sentiment.

This last theory, to be confounded, however, with that of those who limit inspiration to such matters in
holy Scripture as directly pertain to the proper material
of revelation, i. e. to strictly religious truth, whether of
doctrine or practice. Among English divines, those
who have most zealously maintained the point are
Author of Scripture, lect. viii. and ix.), Bp. Williams
(Boyle Lect. sermon iv, p. 133), Burnet (Artic cle vi, p. 157,
1, 90), Bp. Watson (Tracts, iv, 446), Bp. Law (Theory of
Religion), Tomline (Theol. Lect. 21), Dr. J. Barrow (Dia-
sertations, 1819, 4th disp.), Dean Conybeare (Theological
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Lectures, p. 186), Bp. Hind (Inspiration of Scripture, p. 151), Bp. D. Wilson (lecture xii on Evidences, i, 509), Parry (Insquiry into the Nature of the Inspiration of the Apostles, p. 26, 27), and Bp. Blomfield (Lectures on Acts, v, 186). It is, however, pretended to prove that the value of the religious element in the revelation would not be lessened if errors were acknowledged in the scientific and miscellaneous matter which accompanies it. Among those who have held this form of the theory are Baxter (Method. Theol. Chr. pt. ii, ch. xii, 3, 4), Leidenfrost in his True and Divine Inspiration, or Dodridge (On Inspiration.), Warburton (Doct. of Grace, bk. i, ch. vii), Bp. Horsley (seem on Eccles. xiii, 7, Works, iii, 179), Bp. Randolph (Rem. on Michaelis' Introd. pt. 15, 16), Paley (Evid. of Christianity, pt. iii, ch. ii), Whately (Lev. 13, in Summ. of the Scripture, i, and 11; Sermons on Firsts, p. 59; Psalms of Christianity, c. 233), Hampden (Bampton Lect. on p. 301), Thirlwall (Schleiermacher's Luke, Introd. pt. 15), Bp. Heber (Bampton Lect. viii, 577), Thomas Scott (Essay on Inspiration, p. 3), Dr. Fye Smith (Script. and Geol. p. 276, 277, 3d ed.), and Dean Alford (Proleg. to Gospels, in loc.).

(For other writers who have held the same views, see Dr. Davidson's Facts, Statements, &c., in defence of his vol. ii of Horne's Introd. 1857.) The inadmissibility, however, of either of these limitations to inspiration is evident from two considerations: 1st, That the sacred writers them- selves, indeed, in the truthfulness of the Scriptures. We therefore are compelled by the necessity of the case, no less than the positive declarations of the Bible itself, to maintain that all Scripture is divinely inspired, and not some of its parts or statements alone. At the same time, we may, without inconsistency—nay, we must, in the light of just criticism—admit that the phraseology in which these statements are couched is oftentimes neither elegant nor exact. This does not impair their essential truth, as the testimony of an illiterate witness may be scrupulously truthful, although confused in order and unscientific in style. (For other facts are substantially given, the want of logical, rhetorical, and grammatical precision is comparatively unimportant, and forms no ground of impeachment. The mental habits of the sacred writers must be taken into account in order to arrive at their meaning, and this is the case of any reader is in search of, and of which language, whether clear or obscure, is legitimately but the vehicle. The errors imputed to the Scriptures by certain scientific men have accordingly all been explained, sooner or later, as being merely apparent, and due to the popular style of the sacred writers. Even the most difficult instances of these, such as the omissions and general enumerations in the genealogies [see Genealogy of Christ], are susceptible of the same explanation, since these were evidently copied faithfully from public registers, which, however, it is very clear may seem to us, were of unquestioned accuracy, that the truthfulness of the principle of a quotation of Scripture to correct an unimportant mistranslation in the Authorized Version. Just so when our Lord and the apostle Paul freely cite passages according to the inexact rendering of the Septuagint, and sometimes even make them the point of an argument; it is no disparagement either to their intelligence or inspiration, but rather an evidence of their appreciation of the literary aptitudes of those whom they addressed. See Accommodation. On the other hand, within the bounds of the orthodox view of inspiration, as above stated, there are two epithets currently employed which seem to border too closely upon the extravagant, and are equally unnecessary and incorrect. (i) "Plenary Inspiration" is a phrase nowhere warranted by the Scriptures as predicated of themselves. Christ alone was plenarily inspired (John iii, 34) of all human beings. The term plenary authority would be far more scriptural and definite. 2. "Verbal Inspiration" is an expression still more objectionable as applied to the Scriptures. For,

(I) Words, as such, are incapable of inspiration. They are either oral, consisting of certain sounds, or written, consisting of certain marks on paper; both material signs or symbols, which are properly predicated. Thought, ideas, sentiments only can be inspired; and this is really what the theorists mean. It is better to say so plainly.

(II) The assumption by these theorists that we think only in words is plenarily contradicted by every man's consciousness. As children, we have conceptions long before we have words. The dog that lies dreaming of the chase has rapid trains of thought, but not a syllable of a word. We are constantly exercising perceptions of shades of color, and shapes of matter, for which there is no name. He must have a feeble power of consciousness, or power over words, who is not often possessed of a thought for which he has no word. We hold the conception fast, waiting for its correlative term to come. Who does not often think of a friend's face without being able to recall his name? Words, it is true, enable us to express our ideas, and generally that expression renders the conception itself more distinct. But surely God is shut up to no such necessity in communicating his mind to men. His Spirit even gives us thoughts beyond the compass of language (ἀληθεία, Rom. vii, 28; ἀφρόσυ, 2 Cor. xii, 4).

(III) The suggestion of the ἐπιφάνεια verbi to the minds of the sacred writers is incompatible with their free action, as evinced in the varieties and even blunders of style. These are clearly the human element, partaking of the imperfection and diversity inseparable from man's productions. To say that God makes use of them is only evading the point. He does not directly say that these affections and thoughts are the conception of God in them. The insincerity of statement by Gaisen and other verbalists on this head is palpable, and shows the untenableness of their position in the face of infided objections and rationalistic criticism. Equally insufficient is the claim of self-control and self-composure in the case of the objection that if the actual Greek and Hebrew words are inspired, no translations can in any correlative sense be called "the word of God."

(IV) Nothing is gained by asserting the verbal theory that is not equally secured in point of divine sanction and infallible truth by simply claiming for the Holy Scriptures that their statements and sentiments substantially and in their essential import represent the mind and will of God; that they contain divine thoughts clothed in merely human language. Such is the obvious fact, recognised by every devout and judicious interpreter. Such a view, indeed, gives far more dignity to the sacred volume than the mechanical theory of a mere amanuensis. It is the power of God in earth vessels (2 Cor. iv, 7).

(V) The theory of verbal inspiration is comparatively recent in the history of the mind of man. [1] There is no such theory stated in the Scriptures. Scriptural authority would preclude all citation of names, great or small, among the theologians. The passages adduced in its favor have no pertinence. [2] The fathers had no definite theory of inspiration at all. Sometimes, in describing the character of Scripture, they used striking figures and strong expressions, from which we might infer a belief in verbal inspiration. But, on the other hand, their ordinary mode
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of commenting on Scripture, of quoting it, and of def-
fining it, is inconsistent with such a belief.
(a) John, the presbyter, who is believed to have been
one of our Lord's disciples, speaking of Mark's Gospel,
says that Mark "wrote it with great accuracy, as Pe-
ter's interpretation moved him as when he spoke out
words as he remembered them. He was very careful
to omit nothing of what he had heard, and
to say nothing false in what he related" (Eusebius,
Hist. Eccles., i. 39).
(b) Justin Martyr, after using the figure of the "lyre,"
writes, "If much relied upon by the advocates of ver-
bal inspiration, goes on to limit his remark to "those
things in Scripture which are necessary for us to know"
(c) Ireneus, in a fragment on "the style of St. Paul,
alludes to the fact that his sentences were sometimes
"manystatical," and accounts for it by the "rapidity
of his utterances (velocitas sermonum), and the impulsive-
ness of spirit which distinguished him."
(d) Clemens Alexandrinus states that "Peter having
preached the Gospel at Rome... many present ex-
horted Mark to write the things which had been spoken,
since so much relied upon by the advocates of verbal
inspiration, he delivered to them on which he had com-
commissioned the Gospel, he delivered it to them who had asked of him" (Eusebius, Hist. Eccles., vi. 14).
(e) Origen, speaking of the Epistle to the Hebrews,
remarks that the "thoughts are Paul's, but the language
became somewhat committed to Peter's" (Hist. Eccles.,
ii. 12, 28).
3. The period between the fathers and the school-
men is of so little value in the history of theology that it
is hardly worth while to refer to it. One or two
writers of some note in this period adopted verbal
inspiration, but there was no received theory of the kind.
Agobard, archbishop of Lyons, in answer to Fredericg
(who is cited by Prof. Harris), asks, "What absurdity
follows if the notion be adopted that the Holy Spirit not
only inspired the prophets and apostles with the sense
of their teachings, but also fashioned on their lips the
very words themselves, bodily and outwardly (corporae
verba extrinseca in ora illorum)?" (Agobard, Contro
Fredericium, c. 12).
4. By the schoolmen, and subsequently by the doc-
tors of the Church in general, a distinction was made
in inspiration between revelatio and assistantia.
5. Of the great reformers, Luther, Melancthon, Cal-
vlin, and Zwinglius, not one maintained any such doc-
trine as that of verbal inspiration, while they all speak in
the same spirit as the verbal advocates of the truth, cre-
dibility, and infallibility of the sacred writings.
6. It was in the 17th century that the notion of verbal
inspiration, which had before been only floated about
from one individual mind to another, took the shape of
a definite theory, and received a proper ecclesiastical
sanction. The subject was treated at length by Calvinist
(as the better opponent of Grotius and Calixtus), who
set forth the verbal theory very fully; and later writers,
both Lutheran and Reformed, carried it so far as to ex-
tend inspiration to the vowel-points and the punctua-
tion. The Formula Conclusa Helvetici declares that the
Old Testament "is [the word is very explicit in the
consonants of the vowels, and the vowel-points, or at
least their force."
V. Literature.—Early treatises on the subject, of a
general character, are those of Quintestut, Carpzov, Weg-
ner, Lange, Le Clerc, Louth, Lamotte, Clarke, Dodridge,
etc., which rather belong to the province of "Introduc-
tion" (q. v.) than to the explicit doctrine of verbal
inspiration. The best of all, probably, is the essay on Inspiration (London, 1707, 1708); Jaquetot, Le
Verité et l'Insipration des lettres du V. et N. T. (Rotterdam,
1718); Calamy, Inspiration of O. and N. Test. (London,
1710); Martens, Christiana doctrina de divina Sacra-
rum Litterarum inspir. et divinae (Jena, 1724); Klemm,
Theopneust, Sacrorum Litterarum, adseres (Thib., 1743); Stocchi,
De duplici Apostol. theopneustia, tum generali tum spe-
ciali (Guelph, 1754); Bullstedt, De vera S. S. inspira-
tione indole (Coburg, 1757 sq.); Teller, De inspir. di-
vina Vatuum Sacrorum (Helmst., 1762); also Diss. de In-
spir. Script. Sac. justicie formando (Helmst., 1764); Tull-
ius, De Inspir., Die heilige Schrift gehorchen, welche
Bibel (Helmst., 1765); Mok, De”
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tore [apologetic] (London, 1856); Bannerman, Truth and Authority of Scripture [aims at orthodoxy, but fails to meet the controversy fully] (Edinb., 1864); Hannah, Divine and Human Elements in Holy Scripture (Bampton Lect. for 1855; presents many points clearly); Rowe, Nature and Extent of Inspiration [limited in plan] (London, 1864); Warrington, Inspiration, Its Limits and E f f e c t s [chiefly apologetic] (London, 1867); Curtis, Hu man Element in Inspiration [Rationalistic] (N. Y. 1867). See also Horne, Introduction, i; Witsius, Muziel. Sac. i, p. 262 sq.; Tweedst, Dogmatik i, sec. 23-26; Hill, L ec t u r e s (London, 1829), ch. i; Thubuck, in the Theo. of Sac. Lit. July, 1854, p. 381 sq.; [takes a low position for orthodoxy] (from the Deutsche Zeitschr. 1860); Steudel, in the Tübing. Zeitschr. 1840 [takes more advanced ground] (transl. in the Brit. and For. Rev. Oct., 1862); Rudebell, in the Zeitschr. l. Luth. Theol. 1860 [mostly historical] (transl. in part in the Brit. and For. Rev. April, 1863); Westcott, Introd. to the Gos pels, p. 5, 883; Donaldson, Hist. Christ. Lit. and Doctr. (see Theol. Ind. vol. iii); Werner, Gesch. d. apol. u. polem. Litter. d. christ. Theol. v, 346 sqq.; Denziger, Die Lehre v. d. Inspiration mit Beziehung auf mannigf. geistliche Schriften und confessionelle Begriffe (in the Rel. Erklärt, ii, 156-242); Fr. de Rougemont, Christ et ses témoins (Paris, 1865, 2 vols.) [opposes Gauzen and the false spiritism of the Strasburg school of Scherer and others]; Lange, Philosoph. Dogm. p. 540 sqq.; Feye Smith, First Lines of Christian Thought in Dogmatic Theol. p. 237 [Declaration of Doctrine], p. 239 [Scripture]; Fick, Dogm. Lit. 1856, p. 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245; Martensen, Christian Dogmat. p. 48, 538, 388 sqq.; 402 sqf; Farrar, Critical History of Free Thought (see Index); Donaldson, Christian Orthodoxy, ch. iii and Appendix v: Baur, Dogmengesch. (see Index to each vol. i); Thol. ii, 129, 130; Delitzsch, Bibl. PsychoL p. 433; Liddell, Bampton Lect. 1866, p. 43, 519; August, Dogmengesch. i, ii (see Index); Münzenberg, Dogmengesch. ii, 219; Kahl, The History, p. 116; Bickersteth, Christ. Stud. p. 409; Aids to Faith, p. 287 sq.; Neander, Ch. Dogm. ii, 435, 442, 407; Hurst, Rationalism, p. 200 sqq., 550 sqq.; Carmichael, TheoL. and Metaph. of Scripture, i, 1 sqq.; Maurice, Theol. Essays, p. 314; Engl. Rev. xlii, 247; Lond. Quart. Rev. 1856, p. 559; 1860, p. 527; 1865, p. 260; North. Brit. Rev. xxxv, 74; Stud. u. Krit. 1896, p. 458; Bib. Sacra, 1855, p. 505, 519; Oct. 1867, p. 67, 136; 1868, p. 192 sqq., 316, 381; 1869, p. 588; 1870, p. 38; Christian Examiner, 1865, p. 506; 1866, p. 192, 193, 206, 208; 1868, p. 287; Christian Examiner, 1865, p. 255; Meth. Quart. Rev. 1850, p. 500; 1855, p. 895; 1867 and 1868, Dr. Haven on Inspiration; 1870, p. 111; New Englander, 1861, p. 809; 1862, p. 635; 1867, p. 55; Westm. Rev. 1864, p. 527, 525; Fresh. Rev. 1864, p. 141; 1860, p. 192; 1865, p. 328, 519; Oct. 1866; Princet. Rep. 1857, p. 501; Bapt. Quart. Rev. Jan. 1868. **Inspired**, the name of a sect which existed for some 150 years in Germany, and remnants of which are still to be found in the United States. They owe their origin partly to the French Prophets [see CAMBRAIS], partly to the German Separatists (q. v.). Their name is derived from the fact that, aside from the inspiration of the Scriptures, they also believe in an immediate divine inspiration, affecting the person in such a manner that he becomes the instrument by which the Holy Spirit manifests himself, and he is therefore to be obeyed by the faithful. After the unfortunate conclusion of the religious war in the Cevennes, a large number of these French Prophets, for the most part honest, but in whom bodily sufferings had exalted the mind until they believed themselves directly inspired by God, went to England and Scotland. Most of them opposed, at that time were Elie Marion, Durande Fage, Jean Cavialier, and Jean Allnut. These prophets preached against France, and especially against the papacy, which they consider as the Anti-Christ. They soon became objects of suspicion on account of their attempts at raising the dead, and were expelled from the established Episcopal Church. Obliged, there fore, to form a separate sect, Allnut and Marion, with their adherents, connected themselves for a while with the French Reformed churches of the Netherlands, but they failed also here to acquire any influence. On the other hand, they obtained great consideration among the Pietists and Separatists of Northern and Western Germany, in France, Switzerland, and even in the Netherlands and Hall (1718) and Berlin (1714). From Hall the principles of the Inspired were disseminated into the neighboring regions and countries, and communities, composed chiefly of Separatist emigrants from France and Suabia, soon formed in many places. The chiefs were E. L. Grü ber, at Himbar, near Hanau (born 1656, + 1728); A. Gross, in Frankfort; the saddler, J. F. Rock, at Him bach; and the hermit, E. C. Hochmann, at Schwarzena u, near Berleburg (born 1670, + 1721). In 1716 they took the name of Truly Inspired (see J. J. Winkel, Cus tomar, Bielef, 1850). Their organization was based on the so-called twenty-four rules of true sanctification and of holy conduct, taken mainly from an address of Johann A. Gruber in 1716. Up to 1719 they counted nine of their members endowed with the gift of inspiration. In order to make proselytes, they travelled through all the north of Germany and southwest France, in many, especially the Palatinate and Alsace, and even visited Saxony and Bohemia. They established communities at Schwarzenau, Hornringhausen, near Berle burg, Himbach and Bergheim, Nonnemar, Dindelheim, Bridingen, Birkenst in Wetteraw, Anweiler in the Palatinate, and in other places. In 1749 Memminger in Württemberg, Scharffaum, Zürrich, Borne, Diesbach, Amosdingen in Switzerland. In the mean time the number of inspired members did not increase, and the eight died out one by one, until, in 1719, Rock alone remained, and he continued to be the head of the sect until his death in 1749. From that time the sect gradually lost its influence. A number of former members, under the leadership of Gruber, Gleim, Macklin, and other Separatists, emigrated to America, and settled at Germantown, Pa. In 1730, when the Herrn hut movement began, Rock had some difficulties with his former friend Zinzendorf, which proved fatal to the interest of the Inspired. He also had a long controversy with the Mystic Separatist Johann Kaiser, who had founded a Philadelphia community at Stuttgart in 1710, and founded an Inspired one in 1717. In 1745-50 the two communities were dissolved, and converted to the enthusiasts, who even at that time succeeded in making proselytes. They were joined by the court preacher Kämpf, of Buhl, in Alsace, who remained attached to the cause until his death in 1758, and the celebrated theologians Ottinger and Tenstroem, themselves were for a time favorable to the movement. After 1816 the sect received a new impulse, and reorganized themselves under the leadership of Michael Krausert, a tailor of Strasburg, and later under Christian Metz (born at Neuwied in 1792), but, being subjected to severe oppression by the civil authority, they emig rated, numbering about 100, in 1841, to this country, and settled at Ebeneser, near Buffalo, in the state of New York. They established a community which still exists at that place. They support themselves by agriculture and the manufacturing of cloth, practising communism to a certain extent; their possessions amount to more than 2000. They have also established colonies in Canada and (since 1854) in Iowa. The Inspired occupy a place midway between the Separatists and the Herm phutters. In their doctrines they are evangelical, but they reject the sacraments, and disclaim any relation to the English Congregationalists. They claim to be the soldiers of Christ, and, as such, obliged to lead a life of renunciation and abnegation; in their practice they follow the principles of the Mystic Schwenkfeld, J. Böhm, Weigel, etc. Inspiration, they believe, is always preceded by some material sign or physical sensation, such as a burning in the chest, cessation of breathing, convulsive motions of the arms, etc., after which, in
sort of somnambulistic state, the inspired person receives and manifests the divine inspiration: this manifestation consists sometimes only in convulsive motions, or in broken sentences, which latter are generally invitations to repentance and amendment, or denunciations of some advancement of the temple. Occasionally a person is moved or prophesies and two elders, and they hold occasional conferences together. They have no regular ministry, but all members, of both sexes, are required to contribute to the common edification by praying aloud in the assemblies; besides this, if an Inspired teacher is present, and feels inspired, he preaches; if not, he reads some passages of Scripture, or the recorded utterances of some Inspired members. They have also a particular collection of hymns. Their principal festivals are love-feasts, at which preaching is generally part of the order of exercises of the day. These festivals are announced long beforehand, but none take part in them except those who are personally invited to do so by the Inspired leaders. The week before a love-feast is always a season of especial fasting, penitence, and prayer, and the day preceding it is still more strictly observed. Prayer, singing, prophesying, and feet-washing always precede the love-feast, at which the persons invited partake of cake and wine. See M. Mögel, Gesch. d. wahren Inspirationsgemeinden von 1888-1884 (in the Zeitsschrift für Hist. Theologie, 1884); Schröckl, Kirchengesch. s. d. Reformation, viii, 401 sq; Schlegel, Kirchengesch. d. 19. Jh., ii, div. ii, 1047; H. Baumgarten, Geschichte d. Relig. Partbheim, p. 1048 sq.

 INSTALLäre. See Installation.

 INSTALLATION. (Low Lat. in and stollum, a seat) is a seat in some churches for the ceremonial act or process by which an ordained minister is formally put into possession of his office, and by which he is fully empowered not alone to exercise his functions, but to enjoy his honors and emoluments. The ceremonial form, as well as the name, differs according to the office which is conferred, as enthronization for a bishop, induction for a minister, etc. Installation in the English Church, however, properly regards only the office of a canon or prebendary. The word is also used generally for a formal introduction to any office. "Though technically distinguished in modern times from the act of ordination, it is virtually included in the 'ordination' services whenever the minister is inducted into the pastoral office for the first time. But when, having been previously ordained for a former and perhaps pastoral connection, the person is to perform official induction is termed simply 'installation.'" See Chambers, Cyclop. s. v.; Walcott, Sacred Archearol, p. 329 (for the use of the term as used in the English Church); Congreg. Quarterly, 1868, p. 340.

 INSTINCT, that power which acts on and impels any creature to a particular manner of conduct, not by a view of the beneficial consequences, but merely from a strong impulse, supposed to be necessary in its effects, and to be given in order to supply the place of reason.

 INSTITUTIO is one of the names by which the addresses on the Catechism or the catechetical instruction was designated in the Christian Church after the time of Justin. See Catechetism.

 Institution, an established custom or law; a precept, maxim, or principle. Institutions may be considered as positive, moral, and human. 1. Those are called positive institutions or precepts which are not founded upon any reasons known to those to whom they are given, or discoverable by them, but which are observed merely through their command. 2. Moral are those, the reasons of which we see, and the duties of which arise out of the nature of the case itself, prior to external command. 3. Human are generally applied to those inventions of men, or means of honoring God, which are not appointed by the people, and which are numerous in the Church of Rome, and too many of them in Protestant churches. See Butler's Analogy, p. 214; Doddridge's Lect. lect. 158; Robinson's Claude, i, 217; ii, 238; Burroughs, Disc. on Positive Institutions; Bp. Hoadley's Plain Account, p. 3.

 INSTITUTION, in Church law, means the final and authoritative appointment to a church benefice—more especially to a benefice—by the pope with whom such right of appointment ultimately rests. Thus, in the Roman Catholic Church—even after the election of a bishop by the chapter, or his nomination by the crown, when that right belongs to the crown—it is only the pope who confers institution. In English usage, institution is a ceremony performed by the bishop or the pope, who, or whose deputy, reads the words of the institution, while the clerk kneels. The institution vests the benefice in the clerk, for the purpose of spiritual duty, who thereupon becomes entitled to the profits thereof. But the title is not complete till induction (q.v.).

 Institution of a Christian Man, also called The Bishop's Book, is the name of a book containing an exposition of the Apostles' Creed, the Seven Sacraments, the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, the Ave Maria, Justification, and Purgatory, which was drawn up by a committee of prelates and divines of the English Church in 1557, "for a direction for the bishops and clergy," and to be "an authoritative explanation of the doctrine of faith and manners," and a sort of standard for the desk and the pulpit, or, as it itself expresses it, for the clergy "to govern themselves in the instruction of their flock to this rule." Some say that Stephen Pyeot, bishop of Winchester, wrote the book himself, and that a committee of prelates and divines gave it their sanction. It was called forth at the time of the early reformatory ecclesiastical movements in England during the reign of Henry VIII. At the time of the publication of the "Bishop's Book," the "Institution of a Christian Man" (printed in Formularies of Faith put forth by authority during the Reign of Henry VIII, Oxf. 1825), the English Church had become alienated from the Church of Rome; at least King Henry had made claim to his sovereignty over the Church in his dominions, which an act of Parliament in 1533 had secured him, and, with few dissentient voices, the clergy of the land had seconded the opinion of Parliament. In 1556 a convocation, called "the Southern Convocation," published a manifesto, entitled "Articles to stablish the Christen quietness, and univere in question to prepare the people for ordination," which are generally regarded as the starting-point of the English Reformation. "But, upon the whole, these articles breathed rather the animus of the Middle Ages. Thus they took, on the doctrine of justification, a course midway between the Romanists and the Lutherans. They had also paid reverence to some of the Romanist superstitions, as the use of images, invocation of saints, and still held to the doctrine of purgatory, which was at this time beginning to encounter a determined opposition from the more radical reformers. To represent more truly the real desires and opinions of the English Church, the Bishop's Book was launched. It discussed at length the Roman superstitions which the Southern Convocation had sanctioned, and declared against a further adherence to them by the English people. They also held that the fabric of the papal monarchy was altogether human; that its growth was traceable partly to the favor and encrease of the Roman emperors, and partly to ambitious artifices of the popes themselves; that just as men originally made and sanctioned it, so might they, if occasion should arise, withdraw from it their confidence, and thus recover the ground on which all Christians must have stood anterior to the Middle Ages." See Hardwick, Reformation, p. 202; Collier, Eccles. Hist. of England, anno 1537.

 Instruction. See Education.

 Instrument (στρ., kolos, ἵλιον, general names for any implement, vessel, etc.). See MUSIC: ARMOR.

 Instrumental Music. See MUSIC.
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INTERCESSION

Instrumentum pacis. At the pas homed (q.v.) in sacred mass, the celebrant of the mass gives to the deacon the kiss of peace, which the latter gives to the subdeacon, and then it is transmitted successively to the other ministers of the rite. Since at a recent time it is customary to use for this purpose an image of the crucified Christ, which is handed to the different clerks for the purpose of bestowing upon it the kiss in token of brotherly love (such are also used at the coronation of Roman Catholic princes), and the image is therefore called the "instrument of peace." See Theol. Univ. Lex. ii, 410.

Insculption. See EXORCIST.

Insulâni (islanders) is an old name by which those monks who belonged to the famous monastery in the island of Lewis were known.

Insult, or such a treatment of another, in word or deed, as to express contempt, is not definitely taken cognizance of in the Mosaic law; only the reviling of a person is forbidden (Exod. xxii, 28), yet without any special penalty attached. The severity, however, with which disrespect towards sacred persons was punished appears from 2 Kings ii, 22 sq. There also occurs mention (Ps. xxiii, 8; xxxviii, 21; Lam. ii, 15; Matt. xxviii, 39) of gesser-melaniaca, a mockery of the head, 209-217). Insult by abusive words. (Matt. v, 22; diac.; see Raca) or stroke (smiting on the cheek, Job xvi, 10; Matt. v, 39; John xviii, 22; xix, 3; pulling the ears, spitting upon, Matt. xxviii, 30, etc.) was, in later law, punished by fine (Mishna, Baba Kamma, viii, 6; comp. Matt. v, 22), as also in Roman law. For a marked public affront which Herod Agrippa I received at Alexandria, see Philo, ii, 522. See COURTESY.

Intention, a deliberate notion of the will by which it is supposed to accomplish a certain act: first, taking in merely the act; secondly, taking in also the consequences of the act. An action may be done with a good intention, and may produce bad results; or it may be done with a good intention, and produce good results. It may also be done with an evil intention, and yet good results may follow; or with an evil intention, producing evil results. As a question of morals, therefore, the intention with which anything is done really determines the quality of the action as regards the person who does it. It is not possible that it should always determine the course of social policy in the matter of rewards or punishments; but it may mostly determine the verdict of conscience respecting the good or evil character of the man who is in doubtless a divine judgment of them. No intention can be good, however, which purposes the doing of an evil action, although with the object of securing good results; nor any which does a good action with the object of producing evil results." See Ethics; Moral Sense.

In the Roman Catholic Church the intention of the priest is held to be essential to the valid celebration of the sacraments. This the Council of Trent decreed in its 11th canon (Sess. vii.): "If any one shall say that in ministers, while they effect and confer the sacraments, there is not present the intention at least of doing what the Church does, let him be anathema." The same principle, in the main, was advocated and set forth by popes Martin V and Eugenius IV in the early part of the last century. So abused has this principle generally become in the Roman Catholic Church, that by its consequences it is believed to be greatly detrimental to the cause of the Christian religion. In the antagonism of the insincerity of the actor reduces the act to a mockery and a sinful trifling with sacred things, the Church of Rome, by this decision, "exposes the laity to doubt, hesitation, and insecurity whenever they receive a sacrament at the hand of a priest, in whose piety and sincerity they have not full confidence. If a wicked priest, for instance, should baptize a child without an inward intention to baptize him, it would follow that the baptism was null and void for want of the intention." The Church of England, to repudiate this perverse doctrine, in its 26th Article of Religion, declares, therefore, that the unworthiness of ministers does not hinder the effect of sacraments. "Forasmuch as God doth not the same in their own name, but in Christ's, and do minister by his commission, [and therefore] we may use their ministry both in hearing the word of God and in receiving the sacraments. Neither is the effect of Christ's ordinance taken away by their wickedness, nor the grace of God's gifts diminished from such by faith, and rightly, do receive the sacraments ministered unto them, which be effectual because of Christ's institution and promise, although they be ministered by evil men." See Stounton, Eccles. Dict. p. 598; Blunt, Theol. Dict. i, 351; and, for a moderate Roman account of Intention, Liebermann, Iust. Theol. (a 1863), i, 386 sqq.

Intercalary Fruits is a term in the Roman Catholic Church for the revenues of an ecclesiastical benefice accruing during a vacancy. In the xxivth Sess. of the Council of Trent (c. 18, De Reform.; c 1 and 3, X. De probend. et dignit). it was decreed that whatever the deceased ecclesiastic had really earned was a part of the property of the ecclesiastic, but also that the remainder should go either to his successor in office or to the fabrica reclusis, or to him who is to appoint the successor, and to provide in the interim. It is frequently the case that these funds are transferred to societies of widows and orphans, orphans, orphans, orphans, orphans, orphans, orphans, orphans, orphans, orphans, for some benevolent object of the Roman Church. See Wetzer und Welte, Kirchen-Lex. v, 678; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. iii, 498; Theol. Univ. Lex. ii, 410.

Intercalary Month. See Calendar.

Intercision (intercisi, inræcut) is the act of interposition in behalf of another, to plead for him (Isa. lii, 12; lix, 16; 1 Tim. ii, 1). See ADVOCATE.

INTERCESSION OF CHRIST. This refers, in a general sense, to any aid which he, as perpetual High-priest, extends to those who approach God confiding in him (Heb. iv, 16; vi, 25–27). He is also represented as offering up the prayers and praises of his people, which become acceptable to God through him (Heb. xiii, 16; 1 Peter ii, 5; Rev. viii, 3). Of the intercession of Christ we may observe that it is righteous, for it is founded upon justice and truth (Heb. vii, 26; 1 John iii, 5), compassionate (Heb. ii, 17; v, 8), perpetual (Heb. vii, 25), and efficacious (1 John ii, 1). See MEDiator.

Intercession, in the sense of supplication, was not appropriate to the office of the Hebrew high-priest; he was the presenter of sacrifices on account of the people, and made expiation for the sins of the people by sprinkling the blood of victims before Jehovah: this gave, as it were, a voice to the blood. Hence, if we attach a special idea to the term "intercession," as applied to the work of our glorious High-priest, may we not say that it is equivalent to propitiation or atonement? In the holiest of all, the "blood of Jesus speaketh" (Heb. xii, 24). The dignity and merit, power and authority of the Messiah, in his exalted state, imply a continued presentation of his obedience and sacrifice as ever valid and efficacious for the pardon and acceptance, the perfect holiness and eternal happiness, of all who are truly repentant, believing, and obedient. Hence his intercession, or his acting as high-priest in the heavenly world, was represented by the Hebrew high-priest's entering into the most holy place, on the annual day of atonement, with the fragrant incense burning, and with the sacrificial blood which he was to sprinkle upon the mercy-seat, or the ark of the covenant, and before the awful symbols of Jehovah's presence. See HIGH-PRIEST.

"The need of an intercessor arose from the loss of the right of communion with God, of which Adam was deprived when he lost his title as the high-priest of all creation, and, as such, privileged to hold free intercourse with God; and this privilege, lost by Adam, was restored in Christ. Until the fulness of
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time came a temporary provision was made for man's acceptance with God in the sacrifices of the patriarchal age, and the ceremonies of the Mosaic ritual; but all these were shadows of the priestly function of the Son of God, which commenced from the time when he offered up himself as a sacrifice on the cross. The intercession of Christ is the exercise of a prerogative which is carried on continually in heaven (Rom. viii., 34). He was fitted to become our high-priest by the union of his divine and human natures (Heb. vii., 25; I.aa.iii., 12). His manhood enables him to plead on our behalf as the representative of human nature, and so to sympathize with those needs and those sorrows which require his intercessions, that he offers them up as one most deeply interested in our welfare (Heb. iv., 15). His priesthood, moreover, requires an offering, and it is still his human nature which furnishes both the victim and the priest. His Godhead renders that sacrifice an invaluable offering, and his intercession all-effectual (Heb. ix., 14)."

INTERCESSION OF THE HOLY GHOST. Man intercedes with man, sometimes to procure an advantage to himself, sometimes as a mediator to benefit another; he may be said to intercede for another when he puts himself as a representative of human nature, and so prompts him to say what otherwise he would be unable to say, or to say in a more persuasive manner what he might intend to say. The intercession of the Holy Spirit (Rom. viii., 26) is easily illustrated by this adaptation of the term. See PARACLÉS: Invocation.

INTERCESSION OF SAINTS. In addition to the intercession of Christ, and, indeed, that of Christ likewise, Roman Catholics believe in the efficacy of the intercession of the Virgin and the saints, who, however, as they do not directly intercede for men with God, but with the Saviour, the sinless One, who alone has the ear of the King of the universe. See INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

Intercessórs or Interventórs was the name of officers peculiar to the African Church, who acted as temporary incumbents of a vacant bishopric, and for the time being performed the episcopal functions. It was their duty to take measures for the immediate appointment of a bishop. To prevent abuses, which had become prevalent in either choosing the intercessors or by protracting the election of a new prelate, a Council of Carthage in 401 forbade the tenure to continue longer than one year, and also any succession to the temporary occupant. See Farrar, Theol. Dict. s. v.; Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, s. v.; Riddle, Christ. Antig. p. 228.

Interdict (interdictum, sc. celebrationis divini officii, a prohibition of religious offices) is an ecclesiastical censure or penalty in the Roman Catholic Church, consisting in the withdrawal of the administration of certain sacraments, of the celebration of public worship, and of the solemn burial service. There are three kinds of interdicts: local, which affect a particular place, and thus comprehend all, without distinction, who reside therein; personal, which only affect a person or persons, and which reach this person or persons, and these alone, no matter where found; and mixed, which affect both a place and its inhabitants, so that the latter would be bound by the interdict even outside of its purely local limits. But, as the interdict is oftentimes inflicted on the clergy alone, it is always strictly interpreted, so that one imposed on a parish, etc., does not take effect also on the clergy, and vice versa (compare Ferraris, art. ii., v.). The interdict, like the ban (q. v.), may be inflicted by local or general chapter, and by ecclesiastical judges (ab homine). The reasons for consenting this ecclesiastical penalty are various; most generally they are the abolition of Church immunities, disrespect towards ecclesiastical authority or commands, and the effects are generally the prohibition of administering the sacraments, of holding public worship, and the denial of Christian burial; yet various modifications have been frequent. Thus Alexander III permitted in 1173 the administration of the sacrament of baptism to children, and that of penitence to the dying (c. 11, X. De sponsalis, vi., 1; comp. c. 11, X. De nemiti. et remiss. v. 38; c. 24, De sententiis excom. vi.; v. 11). Innocent III allowed the same (c. 28, c. 34, X. De sent. excom. v. 39, a. 1208), as also penitence, with some restrictions (c. 11, X. De nemiti. v. 38, a. 1214; comp. c. 24, De sent. excom., in vi), the silent burial of the clergy (c. 11, X. cit. v. 38), and to convert the observance of the canonical hours, without singing, and the reading of a low mass, which in the following year extended also to the bishops (c. 25, X. De privilegiis v. 83, a. 1215). But to this was appended the condition that the parties under excommunication or interdict should not be present, that the doors of the churches should remain locked, and no bells allowed to ring. Boniface VIII went further, and allowed the celebration of public worship with open doors, ringing of bells, and in the presence of the excommunicated parties on the occasions of the Nativity, Easter, Pentecost, and the Assumption of the Virgin. Yet such of the interdicted and excommunicated did not come to the altar were to be treated as excommunicated aeterniter. Eugenius IV and Boniface VIII extended this to the whole octave of the Corpus Christi (Const. Iustifabili, a. 1429, and Const. Excelsissimum, a. 1433, in Bullar. Magni, i., 808, 328); and Leo X to the octave of the festival of the Holy Conception. There were, moreover, other special regulations made for the benefit of the Roman Curia, and other orders of monks (Ferraris, art. vi., no. 15). In the xxvth Session of the Council of Trent (cap. 12, De regul. et ordin.) it was decided that the regulars generally were to observe the interdict, as had already been commanded by Clement VIII (c. 1, Clem. De sent. excom. v. 10, Concil. Veneam, 1311).

The right of pronouncing the interdict is vested in the pope, the provincial synod, the bishop, with the assent of the chapter, and even without it (c. 2, X. De his quos intendat a maioris parte cupiendi, iii., 11, Celestini III, ann. 1190; Clem. i., De sent. excom. cit. Concil. Trident.; see Gonzalez Telesz, c. 5, X. De consuet. no. 4). The interdict can be withdrawn by any confessor when it is particular and personal, not reserved, but applying to minor points (c. 29, X. De sent. exc. v. 39, Innocent III, anno 1193) otherwise the interdicts are to be withdrawn by those who pronounced them, their successors,legates, or superiors (see Ferraris, art. viii). The fundamental principles of the interdicts are yet in vigour in the Roman Church (see Riegger, Dis. de potestatis et pasius eccl. Vienne, 1772, § 70; and Schmidt, Theaumrus juris eccl. vii, 172), and particular interdicts are still in frequent use, as, for instance, the interdictio ingressus in eccleniacum, the defense for laymen to enter the Church (c. 48, X. De sent. excom. v. 39, Innocent III, ann. 1215; c. 20, exod. in vi; v. 11, Boniface VIII, etc.). The Council of Trent (Sess. vi, cap. 1, in fin. de ref.) pronounced this punishment against the bishops and archbishops who neglected the command to reside in their diocese. To it belongs also the cassatio a diviné, touching the use of the ecclesiastical penalties (c. 55, X. De appellatio, ii., 28, Innocent III, ann. 1218; c. 13, § 1, X. De officio judicis ordi. i., 81, Innocent III, ann. 1215; c. 2, exod. in vi, and i., 16, Gregor. X., ann. 1274; c. 8, exod. Boniface VIII), as a public murmuring of the Church (c. 18, X. De sent. excom. in vi., l., Boniface VIII).

History.—The time when the interdict was first introduced into the Church is not generally known; but it is usually traced to the early discipline of public penance, "by which penitents were for a time debarred from the privilege of presence at the celebration of the Eucharist." Instances of it are met with in very early times (see c. 8, Can. v. q. vi. [Cecch. Agath., anno 605]).
Protestants were nevertheless afraid of some hidden plan, and only an apparent reconciliation was effected: it really settled no question at all, satisfied neither party, and finally, as Luther had predicted before the convocation, led only afterwards to much misunderstanding and mutual recrimination.

‘Let them go on,’ said Luther, ‘so long as they believe in each other and keep the same Creed. But the differences between Roman Catholics and Protestants might be made up by such conferences, we shall not envy the success of their labors; they will be the first who could ever convert the devil and reconcile him to Christ. . . . the sceptre of the Lord is not without bended bow, but in the vail and straight bow, the rule of faith and practice.’” Charles V, determined to secure the ratification of the points of agreement entered into at Ratisbon by a national council, forbade the Protestants to argue, in the meantime, on the controverted points, or to dispose in any way of the property of the churches. They protested, however, and went on, regardless of the interim.

II. THE AUGSBURG INTERIM. After the duke of Alva, through the treachery of Maurice of Saxony, had broken the power of the Protestants at the battle of Pavia, July 23, 1525, the electors of the empire, at Augsburg, July 16, 1526, under the presidency of the archbishop of Mainz, met in general council. The emperor, the bishop of Rome, the pope, and the council, all held the same religious opinions and the same views concerning them. The emperor thought that while the church was in divided state, it languished, and which constantly vanished in the distance.” For that purpose he called the three divines, viz. Julius Pflug, bishop of Naumburg; Michael Helding, titular bishop of Sidon; and the Protestant John Agricola, preacher to the elector of Brandenburg, to agree upon a series of articles concerning from it should either in dispute between the Catholics and Protestants. The controverted points were, the state of Adam before and after his fall; the redemption of mankind by Jesus Christ; the justification of sinners; charity and good works, the confession we ought to have in God, that our sins are regarded, d. the church and the true marks, its power, its authority, and ministers; the pope and bishops, the sacraments; the mass; the commemoration of saints; their intercession, and prayers for the dead. The result of their discussions was the agreement drawn up in the following articles. These the emperor had submitted to the pope for his approbation, and sent copies of them also to the electors of Saxony and of Brandenburg, and to other evangelical princes. But both the pope and the German theologians refused to adhere to them. The emperor next had them revised by two Dominican monks, and made several alterations, and then promulgated as an imperial constitution, called the “Interim,” wherein he declared that “it was his will that all his Catholic dominions should, for the future, inviolably observe the customs, statutes, and ordinances of the universal Church; and that those who had separated themselves from it either reunite themselves to it, or at least conform to this constitution; and that all should quietly expect the decisions of the general council.” It was published in the diet of Augsburg, May 15, 1548. To the Protestant clergy it granted, for the time being, the right of residence and status of the Reformed city communion of both kinds. It was truly a standard of faith put forth by the emperor independent of Rome, as the pope refused to sanction it; and in the face of the bitter complaints that came to him that the power and property of the Church should be diminished. Afterwards the emperor showed the pope that he too, like Henry VIII, could regulate the consciences of his subjects, and prescribe their religious faith. The elector of Ments, quite contrary to the wishes of the other members of the Diet, and of the people there represented, announced the acceptance of the interim by the states, and it was consequently declared law, and printed in Latin and in Geo-
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Both Protestants and Catholics began, however, violently to attack it; the Romanists complained of the concessions made to the Protestants, while the Protestant princes (John Frederick of Saxony, the landgrave of Hesse, the margrave John von Kustrin, the elector Wolfgang von Zweiibrücken) declined introducing it in their states; the only princes who submitted to it were the elector of Brandenburg, the count of Württemberg, and the cities of Augsburg, Halle, etc. (the latter by compulsion).

III. THE LEIPZIG INTERIM.—The Lutheran theologians openly declared they would not receive the Augsburg interim, alleging that it re-established popery; some caused an edict of banishment against it to be drawn up and subscribed to it. Calvin and several others wrote against it. On the other side, the emperor was so severe against those who refused to accept it, that he disfranchised the cities of Magdeburg and Constance for their opposition.

Most important, however, for the Protestant cause, and impossible for Charles to pass unheeded, was the opposition against the Augsburg interim by Maurice of Saxony, who denied the right of the elector of Mentz to give himself the approval to an act that demanded the concurrence of the states directly and not indirectly. Yo fortify himself more strongly in his position, Mauritz dissolved the diet and summoned a new one, and called a council of state and of prominent theologians at Leipzig and other cities. In the conference at Leipzig it was decided, Sept. 22, 1548, that the Augsburg interim could not be accepted. Yet, for fear of incurring the displeasure of the emperor, a compromise was effected. In a series of resolutions which were adopted, they admitted a great part of the Roman Catholic ceremonies, and tacitly acknowledged also the power of the popes and bishops, but yet well guarded (1) the creed of the Reformers. These resolutions of the conference were published as the Leipzig Interim, Oct. 22, 1548. Subsequently it was divided into a lesser and greater interim. The first was based on resolutions passed at the conference of Celle, and was published by an edict of the elector, and this ultimately became the basis of the greater Leipzig Interim. It was prepared by Melancthon, Bugenhagen, Major, and times other of Anhalt. It restored some Roman Catholic practices; directed that mass should be celebrated in ringing of bells, lighted tapers, and a decorated altar, accompanied by singing, and be performed in Latin by priests in canonicals; that the Horae comitials, and psalms should be sung according to the custom of each place; the old festival days of Mary, etc., were re-established, and meat forbidden on Fridays and fast-days, etc. These decisions, which were promulgated in March, 1549, met with much opposition in Saxony, yet they were strictly enforced, and such ministers as refused to submit to the interim were deposed, as, for instance, Placius of Wittenberg. The latter then put himself at the head of the opposing party, called by the partisans of the interim Adiaphorists. See ADIAPHORIST CONTROVERSY. Another treacherous action of Maurice, which secured his services anew to the Reformers, undid all the work already accomplished by Charles V: "and while Henry II was winning, at the expense of the empire, the delusive title of conqueror, Charles found himself reduced to the hard necessity of restoring all that his crooked policy had for so many years been devoted to exterminating." In 1553 the interim was finally confirmed by all the states of Germany, and the Diet of Augsburg, was finally confirmed the right of the states and cities of the Augsburg Confession (q. v.) "to enjoy the practices of their religion in peace." Compare MANUEL, Neue Geschichte, vol. iii; Robertson, Charles V (Harper's edit.), bk. ix, especially p. 377 sq.; and see BLOCHER, Ueber d. Interim (Leiz. 1727, 2vo); Hirsch, Ueb. d. Interim (Lpz. 1783); Baumgarten, Gesch. d. Rel. Partien, p. 1163 sq.; Schröck, Kirchengegesch. s. d. Ref. 1, 632, 674 sq., 685, 686 sq.; Zeit. der Geschr. f. hist. theol. 1866, p. 3 sq. ; Brit. and For. Encyc. Rev. 1868, p. 631; LEA, Hist. of Socordal Celiacy, p. 482 sqq.; HARDWICK, Reformation (see Ind.).; Pieter, Univ. Lex. s. v. (J. H. W.)

INTERMEDIATE STATE, a phrase employed to denote the state or situation of disembodied souls during the interval between death and the resurrection. There have been several theories upon the subject. See HATER.

The condition of the soul after death cannot but be a subject of intense concern to every thoughtful mind. Pagan philosophers have groped in the dark for some clue to guide their aspirations after immortality, but have at best attained only surmises and conjectures. Of all the theories that have ever been advanced, which separates time from eternity, none have ever returned to bring tidings of what befall them the moment after they launched from the shores of mortality. Revelation alone has cast a ray across the mighty void, and its light has gradually grown clearer and more penetrating, until in the New Testament we are no longer left in any measure to doubt whether, "if a man die, he shall live again." We rest assured that not only shall the soul survive the shock of dissolution, but the body also shall eventually join it in an endless reunion.

Still the question recurs. What will be the intermediate state and what shall be the external circumstances of the spirit during the period between death and the resurrection? Respecting this little is definitely said in the Scriptures, and it is therefore left for speculation to fill up the lack of information on this interesting theme, guided by such hints thrown out by the sacred writers, and such considerations as the ascertained nature and destiny of man afford.

1. The popular sentiment or belief of Christians—expressed rather in the form of hope than as a theory—appears to be that the righteous enter heaven immediately after death, and the wicked immediately after the second coming of the Lord, in line with the parable of Dives and Lazarus, are thought especially to support this view; and hence believers have fearlessly cast themselves into the arms of death, expecting to awake the next moment in the full realities of everlasting glory.

Now we would not for all the world deprive dying saints of a particle of the consolation which the Gospel is designed to yield, nor is it any part of our present purpose to weaken anticipations of the future rest in the kingdom of God. On the other hand, we are equally insensible of the known truth that a long—probably immense—interval of time will elapse between the decease of Christians of the present age—and certainly of past centuries —and the revival of their bodies at the general judgment, is sufficient to prove that they do not instantly pass from the Church militant to the New Jerusalem above. Let us calmly and logically consider what may be ascertained as to the experience and surroundings of the soul during this intermediate period. See IMMORALITY.

The topic calls for a volume rather than an essay, and, as we must be brief, we make but two other preliminary remarks. The first is that we have not space here to discuss the above and kindred passages of the New Testament; but we direct the reader to professed commentaries for their exposition, and the solution of the points in dispute. We are arguing ourselves here with simply observing that they are figurative in their phraseology, and that, whatever they may mean, they cannot be intended to contradict the fact of a real space between death and the resurrection. Our other prelatory remark is, that as this is legitimate and debatable ground, no essential breach of creed or orthodoxy being involved in it, we ought not to incur any odium theologicae of unsoundness in the faith should our discussion lead to new and surprising conclusions. This last remark is especially pertinent in view of the fact that even orthodox Christians in all ages have en-
tertained very different views on this subject, as will appear from the following enumeration of opinions.

II. The theory of a state of sleep, insensibility, or unconsciousness. It was taught as early as A.D. 248 by the Arabian Thetosophists, whom Origen combatted. It was thought to be held by pope John XXII, and was discussed at the University of Padua, in the time of pope Benedict XII. It was revived by the Swiss Anabaptists under the name of Psychopompists, and was opposed by Calvin. And in later times it has been started anew, in a form more or less distinct, by John Heyn, Wetzstein, Sulzer, Reinhard, and Whately, and by a new sect in Italy. It was the subject of a state of insensibility produced such texts as Psa. xxi, 15; 1 Thess. iv, 14. In opposition are cited 2 Cor. v, 8; Phil. i, 28; Matt. xvii, 3; Luke xvi, 23; xxiii, 43; Rev. vi, 9.

III. The theory of a Purgatory. That Christ preached to the souls detained in Hades, as the patriarchs or others, was held in the 2d and 3d centuries by Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and Clem. Alexandrinus. It was supposed to be warranted by 1 Pet. iii, 19; Acts ii, 27; Rom. x, 7; Eph. iv, 9; Matt. xxii, 31. The idea of a purgatorial fire is more or less obscurely hinted in the writings of Origen and Cyprian. But the complete scheme owes its paternity to Gregory the Great, who propounded it as an article of faith, along with intercessory masses for the dead; finding a supposed warrant in 2 Macc. xii, 46. In opposition to the notion of a Purgatory, it may be said that it is said that it is absurd to think that the human soul exists in the purgatory state of reason and common sense; that it is contradictory to express assertions of Scripture (Heb. xii, 23; Rev. xiv, 13, xxiii, 11); that it is subversive of the cardinal doctrines of the Gospel, the atonement and justification by faith in Christ; that it robs the Christian of evangelical peace and consolation; and that it was unknown to the primitive Church. Even Augustine, when he prayed for the increase of his deceased mother's happiness, denied the existence of any middle place. (So also Clem, Rom. Ep. 2 ad Cor.) The article, "he descended into hell," was not admitted into the Apostles' Creed, nor those of other nations. It appeared first in the Creed of Ariminum, A.D. 585, and in that of Aquileia, A.D. 381 (Rufinus, De Symbolo.). See Wilson, Illustrations from Apost. Fathers, p. 106. Comp. PURGATORY.

IV. The scheme of a middle or intermediate place, or purgatory, is a different idea from that of an intermediate state, meaning by the latter only an inferior degree of happiness apart from the yet unraised body. It is affirmed that judgment is not pronounced till the last day; but this is denied, a particular judgment passing on each individual, and his place being assigned him upon his death (Acts i, 35; Luke xvi, 23; xxiii, 43; 2 Cor. xii, 2, 4). It is said that no one is perfectly holy when he dies, but only such can enter heaven. In reply, it is contended, as in the Westminster Catechism, that there is a distinction made between being perfectly holy and perfectly blessed, the first taking place at death, the latter only at the resurrection (Heb. xii, 23). It is alleged that the Scriptures favor the notion (John iii, 18; xx, 17; Acts ii, 34; Heb. xi, 39); to which it is replied that these texts are dubious, and neutralized by others positive and unequivocal (Job xiv, 19; Acts ii, 21; xxiii, 39; Rev. xiv, 25; vii, 14). We proceed to render this theory more definite by proposing our own view of the subject.

1. In the first place, we lay it down as an axiom that a disembodied or pure spirit is necessarily freed from all the relations of space of which we are terminally cognizant, as by the senses, as by the physical organs are absent. Such a spirit may, for ought we know—and perhaps this position is the more probable—be open to intercourse with other pure spirits; doubtless it is at least accessible to the divine Spirit, from whose influence nothing material or immaterial can be veiled; but we are unable to conceive of any intercourse or connection between it and the present relations of things. There is absolutely no medium of communication, as far as we are aware. Death severs the link between the soul and the body, and therefore between the soul and all bodies. What new capacities may by that act be developed within the soul, what new relations created with other immaterial beings,—are questions, of which we have no means of knowing; and, indeed, we have no reason to suppose any such; but if we would not utterly confound mind and matter, or unconsciously clothe the departed spirits with some ethereal form of body, we are bound to conclude, from the total diversity and even contrariety of their appearances and attributes, that they are really dead to everything pertaining to time and sense.

This cuts us, root and branch, all those impressions—some have even gone so far as to claim them as scientific experience—of intercommunication between living persons and the spirits of their deceased friends. The common sense of enlightened Christianity has long since stamped all such stories with the just suspicion of superstitious imagination. Severe reasoning compels us to set them down as hallucination or imposture. Those who have indulged themselves in these fancies have always evidenced a strong desire for an Ascendancy of the Soul.

A disembodied spirit, therefore, prior to the restoration of its physical organism, is incapable of any of the material joys which imagination is wont to associate with the full idea of the heavenly state. We must carefully exclude from its experience during that interval every relation to the physical world and present externalities. That these, and more than these, will be restored on the consummation of its bliss in the new heavens and the new earth of its final abode, we are abundantly assured by the symbols and teachings of the New Testament; but the soul must wait for these enjoyments until its bodily counterpart has of course been raised, spiritualized, perfected, and immortalized.

We may go further than this, and declare that none of the now known and verbally defined relations in point of location are predictable of the departed soul; in other words, it is not in any particular assignable place while in that state. The instant it quits the body it passes to no local habitation. Its position cannot be determined as to space, for it has no metes or boundaries, no point of contact with visible objects. It can neither be said to be somewhere nor nowhere, nor yet everywhere. It is in the second place, the soul is apprehended as a spirit, a spirit omnipresent, without property being spoken of as being more any where than elsewhere. This, we admit, is an abstraction; but we are speaking of a mere abstraction; for what can be more abstract—more really inconceivable according to our earthly notions—than a soul without a body?

But let it not be imagined that the soul has thus lost any of its essence or inherent powers. It remains in all these absolute and intact, a veritable entity, as truly such as any spiritual being, or as when united to the body, or indeed as the body itself; but it is shut within itself, and circumscribed by the limits of its own being. All the powers of a disembodied soul are as vast as any, or as any else, or than any where else. This, we admit, is an abstraction; but we are speaking of a mere abstraction; for what can be more abstract—more really inconceivable according to our earthly notions—than a soul without a body?
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swear of the flight of hours, seasons, or ages. To it "a
thousand years are as one day"—both alike unapprecia-
table. The only change it could experience would be the
succession of its own ideas, and these—if comparable
for such a purpose with our present associations of
thought, which are like chords played upon by every
person—would amount to a complete change of condi-
tion—furnish no fixed standard or definite mark to our
own consciousness. How seldom do we think of
the lapse of time during our dreams, which afford the
nearest parallel to the state we are considering; and
how wide of a true estimate are we when we chance to
consider the conformation of the view that none, or
nearly none, of our present sensations appear in our
solenomy. Some notable instances are on record of the
ergogic miscalculation of time by dreaming persons,
showing that in sleep they have no accurate means of
determining it, but that they protract or abbreviate it
to suit the humor of the dream. Much more would
this be true with the disembodied soul, which has even
less opportunity or occasion to review its course of
thoughts for such a purpose, or, indeed, to take any note
of its rapidity or tidiousness of succession. We con-
clude, therefore, that the intermediate state will pass to
all intents and purposes to show that none will be aware
of the length of the interval.

This is in accordance with a remarkable passage of
Scripture—about the only one where the subject is
directly and literally touched upon—and this but inciden-
tially, in answer apparently to a query that had been
advanced in regard to the future of the saved and the
unrepentant persons; for the Scriptures are very charger
of information on such abstruse points. Paul tells us ex-
presly (1 Thess. iv. 15, 17), "We [or those] which are
alive and remain unto the [final] coming of the Lord
shall not precede ([prevent]) them which are asleep.
We [or those] who are alive and remain in our bodies,
called together with them in the clouds." He is speak-
ing, it is true, of the resurrection of the body, and it is
with reference to this that he says one class of saints
shall not anticipate another in that reward; but his lan-
guage implies that none shall have any advantage in
point of time over the rest, and this would not be true
if some must pass long centuries of waiting, while oth-
ers are translated suddenly from earth to heaven.
No; it will all be equalized: Noah, who died thousands of
years ago, shall not seem to himself to pass any longer
period of expectation than the one he was called to
spiritual life by the last saint that is interred just as
Gabriel's trump shall reawaken his undecayed corpse,
or than those who then shall be living on the globe.
This theory meets and harmonizes all their cases, and
vindicates the divine impartiality.

Something of this may likewise be derived from the
simultaneousness of the general judgment.
We surely are not to suppose that any will re-
main cycles of ages in the other world, whether happy
or miserable, without having their destiny as yet fixed,
and their final doom awarded. To each individual's
consciousness, doubtless, will be definitely assigned,
at the instant he is ushered into the presence of his Maker,
the awards of his irrecoverable fate, and this knowledge
will form the basis of his joy or despair. The only ob-
ject after this of a general gathering would be to make
known to the universe a sentence that has perhaps been
anticipated by the parties chiefly interested. The Scrip-
tural representations of the "last grand assize" are evi-
dently scenic in their character, that is, pictures of what
to those concerned shall seem to transpire substantial-
ly, but not necessarily literally thus. See JUDGMENT,
Good News, "What a universal assemblage would be
more possible and signif-
ificant: to each human being the hour of death is
practically, although not actually, the day of judgment,
for the two events are separated only by an inapprecia-
table interval; and as the same is true of all his fellows,
and as their several days of doom are also separated by
an inappreciable interval, they are all red—ed to ev-
ery man's own apprehension—to the same plane of time,
and consequently may judge—yet with reference to
individuals—be depicted as judged together. The hour
of Christ's three predicted comings—in vengeance on
the Jews—in the article of death—in the final scene—
thus, although really distinct events, become identical
by more than any conceivable difference of time and
place, and is justified in alluding to them all in the same
breath.

3. In the third and last place, however, as above inti-
mated, the intermediate state will not be a period of un-
consciousness. This might be hastily inferred from the
insulation of the spirit from all sources of external
knowledge and sense perception. But let us not
olay up in the whole inner world of thought and feeling: memory
is busy with the past, and hope is active with anticipa-
tions of the future; the direct comforts of the Holy
Spirit also are by no means denied during this expec-
tant period, and none can tell how greatly these and all
the foregoing emotions may be intensified by the rapt
state of the disembodied soul. Examples like those of
Paul "caught up into the third heavens," of Tennent in
a prolonged fit of catalepsy, and of others in similar
extraordinary states of spiritual elevation, might be
subtracted. A substraction of bodily functions is calcu-
lated to enhance the perception of celestial verities; but these, it must be borne in mind, were real
real experiences in the flesh—although Paul seems doubt-
ful whether he was not actually "out of the body," and
at least intimates that such mental exaltation would be
not repressed or released by any such condition. The
actions of his mind are not described as occurring under the joint relations of soul and body, and therefore
no sure indications of what might take place in a disem-
bodied state. Accordingly, we fall back upon the
position most agreeable to our native aspirations, and
most conformable, as we think, to the teachings of
revelation, that the soul, immediately after passing out
of the body, enters upon a condition of conscious hap-
iness or misery, according to its previous fitness and hab-
its. In a word, we see no reason why, when set free
from connection with the body, the spirit should do oth-
erwise than in the case of the soul before its union with
telletuctions which had already become customary with
it. Until its reunion with the body, however—a space,
as we have seen, of practically no account to itself, at
least in point of duration—it can receive no new expe-
rience, and be subject to no external influences, unless
they be purely spiritual. See HEAVEN.

See Hagenbach, Hist. of Doctrines; Bp. Law, Theory
of Religion; Rees, Cyclopaedia, art. Sleep of Soul; Tay-
lor, Physical Theory of another Life; Tucker, Light of
Nature; Brougham, Natural Theology; Stuart, Essays;
Abp. Whately, On Future States; Les Horizons Célestes;
Barrow, Pearson, Bull, On Apocalypse; Creed; Bp. White,
Lectures on the Catechism; Archibald Campbell, View
of the Middle State; Watts, World to Come; Watson,
Theolog. Institutes; Hall, Purgatory Examined; M'Cul-
lough, On the Intermediate State; Meth. Quart. Review,
1852, p. 240; Bayley, The Intermediate State of the Elec-
trated (London, 1864); Shimellme, The Unseen World (N. York,
1868); Freewill Baptist Quarterly, April, 1861; Presb.
Quart. Rev. October, 1861; Christian Rev. Annual, 1862,
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INTERNAL DIGNITARIES was the name by which, in
the English Church, under the "old foundation," the
dean, precentor, chancellor, and treasurer of cathedrals
were known. See Walcot, Soc. Archaeol. p. 381.

INTERNUM or INTERNUNCIUL, an envoy of the
pope, sent only to small states and republics, while the
real nuncio is the representative of the papal see at
the courts of emperors and kings.
Interpretation, Biblical, or the science of sacred Hermesmatics, as it is more technically called. In a narrower sense it is frequently termed exegesis, especially in relation to particular passages. For practical rules of interpretation, see Hermesmatics.

1. Definition and Use of the Word. In very ancient and widespread belief that the knowledge of divine things in general, and of the divine will in particular, is by no means a common property of the whole human race, but only a prerogative of a few specially-gifted and privileged individuals. It has been considered as this higher degree of knowledge than its sources lie in light and instruction proceeding directly from God, and that it can be imparted to others by communicating to them a key to the signs of the divine will. Since, however, persons who in this manner have been individually taught, are initiated into divine secrets, and consequently appear as the confidants of Deity, they also enjoy, although instructed only through the medium of others, a more intimate communion with God, a more distinct perception of his thoughts, and consequently a mediate consciousness of Deity itself. It therefore follows that persons thus either immediately or medially initiated, are supposed to be capable, by means of their divine illumination and their knowledge of the signs of the divine will, to impart to mankind the arduously desired knowledge of divine things and of the will of Deity. They are considered to be interpreters or explainers of the signs of the divine will, and, consequently, to be mediators between God and man. Divine illumination, and a communicable knowledge of the signs and expressions of the divine will, are thus supposed to be combined in one and the same person. See Revelation.

2. The above general idea is the basis of the Hebrew נביא, prophet. The prophet is a divinely-inspired seer, and, as such, he is an interpreter and preacher of the divine will. He may either be directly called by God, or have been prepared for his office in the schools of the prophets (comp. Knobel, Der Prophetenmus der Hebräer vollständig dargestellt, Bresl., 1867, i, 102 sq.; ii, 45 sq.). See Seer.

However, the being filled with the Holy Ghost was the most prominent feature in the Hebrew idea of a prophet. This is even implied in the usual appellation מִשְׁנֵי, which means a person in the state of divine inspiration (not a predictor of future events). Prophetism ceased altogether as soon as Jehovah, according to the popular opinion, ceased to communicate his Spirit to his people. See Prophet.

3. The Hebrew notion of נביא appears among the Greeks to have been split into its two constituent parts of μάνης, from μανεῖν, to rave (Plato, Phaedrus, § 48, ed. Steph. p. 344, a, b.), and of Ἡγεμόν, from ἦγε-μον, to command. However, the idea of μάνης and of Ἡγεμόν could be combined in the same person. Compare Boissin, Ateodota Graece, i, 90; Apollo, Ἡγεμόν, μάνης γάρ νῦν και χαρισμάτων ἐγείρετο (compare Scholia in Aristophanes, Nubes, 396), and Arrian, Epictetus, ii, 7, Ἄν αἱ μανής τῶν Ἡγεμόνων τα σημεία; Plato, De Legibus, ix, p. 871, c, ὁ Ἡγεμόν καὶ μάνης; Eupides, Philemon, v. 1018, ὁ μάνης Ἡγεμό- να, and Iphigenia in Aulis, i, 530. Plutarch (Vita Apollonii, cap. x) places Ἡγεμόν and μανής together; so also does Dionysius Halicarnassensis, ii, 78. The first two of these examples prove that Ἡγεμόν were, according to the Greeks, persons who possessed the gift of reveling the will of the Deity, defining certain appearances and of interpreting signs. Jul. Pollux (viii, 124) says, Ἡγεμόν ἄρα ἰδιωτοὶ οἱ τὰ πειρὰ τῶν δο- σμέων καὶ τὰ τῶν ἄλλων ἰδιών διακόσμηται. Hor- pocrates says, and Suidas repeats after him, Ἡγεμόνι, ὁ Ἡγεμόνις τῶν ἰδιών. Comp. Becker, Ateodota Graec., p. 310, and Plutarch, De Antiqu. Cith. 355, Ἡγεμόνιος οἱ Ἡγεμόνια ἐν διάθεσις ἐν θείων ὁμοπληρωματίας. See Interpreter, in his Symbolik and Mythologie der alten Völker, i, 15, as persons whose high vocation it was to...
on the interpreters of dreams and omens are called also interpreters of dreams (Quintil. Inst. iii. 6).

From what we have stated, it follows that ἐγγύτης and interpretatio were originally terms confined to the unfooling of supernatural subjects, although in Latin, at an early period, these terms were also applied to profane matters.

The Christians also early felt the want of an interpretation of their sacred writings, which they deemed to be of divine origin; consequently they wanted interpreters and instruction by the aid of which the true sense of the sacred Scriptures might be discovered. The right understanding of the nature and will of God seemed of the greatest importance; well and truly to understand the meaning that God, the artist of his own work, had put upon the heathen, to depend upon a right understanding of certain external signs; however, there was a progress from the unintelligible signs of nature to more intelligible written signs, which was certainly an important progress.

The Christians retained about the interpretation of their sacred writings the same expressions which had been current in reference to the interpretation of sacred subjects among the heathen. Hence arose the fact that the Greek Christians employed with predilection the words ἐγγύτης or ἐγγύτης for the interpretation of the holy Scriptures. But the circumstance that St. Paul employs the term ἐγγύτης γιαλωσιων for the interpretation of the γιαλωσις καλειν (1 Cor. xii. 10; xiv. 26), greatly contributed to the use likewise of words belonging to the root ἐγγυτεω. According to the bishop of Hierapolis, wrote, as early as about A.D. 100, a work under the title of λογοι ευαγγελικοι ἐγγύησις, which means an interpretation of the discourses of Jesus. Papias explained the religious contents of these discourses, which he had collected from oral and written traditions. He distinguished between the meaning of ἐγγύησια and ἐγγυτεω, as appears from his observation (preserved by Eusebius in the place quoted above), in which he says concerning the λογος of Matthew, written in Hebrew, ἐγγυτεω δ οι ανω πνευματος ἐγγυτεω, "But every one interpreted them according to his ability." In the Greek Church, the ἐγγύης and ἐγγυτεω τοι τω λογοι were the usual terms for teachers of Christianity. (See Eusebius, Historia Ecclesiastica, vii. 30, and Heinichen on this passage, note 21; Photius, Biblioth. cod. p. 105; Cave, Hist. Liter. i. 145.) Originates his commentaries on the holy Scriptures and interpreters. In reference to the meaning of the word of the Bible, entitled σχολαι ἐγγυτεω. However, we find the word ἐγγυτεω employed as a synonym of ἐγγύης, especially among the inhabitants of Antioch. For instance, Gregorius Nyssenius says concerning Ephraem Syrus, Γραμματεοι θυμάμενοι ρήματα λόγον ὁμογενεών (see Gregory of Nyssa, Vita Ephraimatis Syri, in Opera, Paris, ii, 1328). Theodore of Mopsuestia, Theodoret, and others, wrote commentaries on the sacred Scriptures under the title of ἐγγύης (comp. A. H. Nie- neyer, De Isidoris Pelasgiis Vita, Scripta, et Doctrina, Halae, 1825, p. 67). Among the Latin Christians the word interpres had a wider range than the corresponding Greek term, and the Latins had no precise term for the exposition of the Bible which exactly corresponded with the Greek. The interpretation was applied only in the sense of occupation or act of an expositor of the Bible, but not in the sense of contents elicited from Biblical passages. The words tractare, tractatur, and tractatus were in preference employed with respect to Biblical exposition, and the sense which it elicited. Together with these words there occur commentarii and tractatus. St. Augustine's tractatus are well known; and this father frequently mentions the divinarum scripturarum tractatc. For instance, Retractationes, I. 26, "Divinarum tractatorum eloquium est," Subplicitus Severus, Dial. IV. 2 a. 6. "Originem..." 7. "qui tractator sacrorum priscitius habeatur." Vincentius Lirinensis observes in his Commentarium on 1 Cor. xii. 28: "In the third place, teachers who are now called tractatores; whom the same apostle sometimes styles prophets, because by them the mysteries of the prophets are opened to the people" (comp. Dufresne, Glosarium medii et inferior Latinitat, s. v. Tractator; Tractatus; and Baluze, ad Servett. Lupum, p. 479). However, the occupation of interpres, in the nobler sense of this word, was not unknown to St. Jerome, as may be seen from his Prophesia in libros Samuelis (Opera, ed. Vallarsi, i. 458): "For whatever, by frequently transacting, divulgating and explaining certain signs and events, as is the duty of an expositor, if you are grateful, or a paraphrast if you are ungrateful." In modern classification, Herennius 4 forms a branch of the same general study with Exegesis (q. v.), and, indeed, is often confounded with that science; but the distinction between the two branches is very marked, and is, perhaps, sufficiently indicated by the etymology of the names themselves. To hermeneutics propinquity below in expounding in the history of the discovery of its true meaning; the province of exegesis is the exposition of the meaning so discovered, and the practical office of making it intelligible to others in its various bearings, scientific, literal, doctrinal, and moral. Hence, although the laws of interpretation have many things in common with those of explication, it may be laid down that to the especial province of hermeneutics belongs all that regards the text and interpretation of the Holy Scripture; the signification of words, the force and significance of idioms, the modification of the sense by the context, and the other details of philological and grammatical inquiry; the critical examination of the writer or the persons whom he addressed; of the circumstances in which he wrote, and the object to which his work was directed; the comparison of parallel passages; and other similar considerations. All these inquiries, although seemingly purely literary, are modified by the views entertained as to the text of Holy Scripture, and especially on the question of its inspiration, and the nature and degree of such inspiration" (Chambers, Cyclopaedia). II. History, Methods, and Literature.—1. From ancient times the Christian Church has been divided into religious denominations, and have taken the same supranatural view with reference to the Bible, as before the Church, the Jews did with respect to the Old Testament. The Church and denominations have supposed that in the authors of Biblical books there did not exist a literary activity of the same kind as induces men to write down what they have thought, but have always required from their followers the belief that the Biblical authors wrote in a state of inspiration, that is to say, under a peculiar and direct influence of the divine Spirit. Sometimes the Biblical authors were described to be merely external and mechanical instruments of God's revelation. But, however wide or however narrow the boundaries were within which the operation of God upon the writers was confined by ecclesiastical supposition, the origin of the Biblical books was always supposed to be essentially different from the human compositions; and this difference demanded the application of peculiar rules in order to understand the Bible. There were required peculiar acts and kinds of information in order to discover the sense and contents of books which, on account of their extraordinary origin, were inaccessible by the ordinary way of logical rules, and whose written words were only outward signs, behind which a higher and divine meaning was concealed. Consequently, the Church and denominations required ἐγγυτεω, or interpreters, of the signs by means of which God had revealed his will. Thus necessarily arose again in the Christian Church the art of opening
or interpreting the supernatural, which art had an existence in earlier religions, but with this essential difference, that the signs, by the opening of which supernatural truth was obtained, were now more simple, and of a more intelligible kind than in earlier religions. They were now written signs, which belonged to the sphere of speech and language, through which alone all modes of representation are now possible, and can be readily communicated to others. But the holy Scriptures, in which divine revelation was preserved, differ, by conveying divine thoughts, from common language and writing, which convey only human thoughts. Hence it followed that the deeper, the wiser, the more original, the more subtle, the more profound, what is reserved for the higher sphere of human thoughts, so that the usual requisites for the right understanding of written documents appeared to be insufficient. According to this opinion, a lower and a higher sense of the Bible were distinguished. The lower sense was that which could be elicited according to the rules of grammar; the higher sense was considered to consist of deeper thoughts concealed under the grammatical meaning of the words. These deeper thoughts they endeavored to obtain in various ways, but not by grammatical research. The Jews, in the days of Jesus, employed for this purpose allegorical—typical—allego-legendary interpretation. The Jews of Palestine endeavored by means of this mode of interpretation especially to elicit the secrets of futurity, which were said to be fully contained in the Old Testament. (See Walthers, Antiquitates Hebraeorum, Göttingen, 1743, l, 341 sq.; Dzik, Hebraisches Wörterbuch der neusten Schriftdichter, Leipsic, 1809, p. 88, sq., 164 sq.; Hirschfeld, Der Geist der Talmudischen Auslegung der Bibel, Berlin, 1840; compare Juvenal, Sat. xiv, 108; Justin Martyr, Apol. i, p. 52, 61; Bretschneider, Historisch-dogmatische Auslegung d. Neuen Testamentes, Leipzig, 1837, 85 sq.).

The Alexandrine Jews, on the contrary, endeavored to raise themselves from the simple sense of the words το υπηκοον, to a higher, more general, and spiritual sense, το συμβολικον (see Dühne, Geschichtliche Durstellung der Jüdisch-Alexandrinischen Religions-Philologie, Halle, 1824, i, p. 50 sq.; ii, 17, 195 sq., 209, 226, 241). Similar principles were adopted by the authors of the New Testament (see De Wette, Über die Symbolisch-Typische Lehrtart in Briefe an die Hebräer, in Theologische Zeitschrift, by Schleiermacher and De Wette, pt. iii; Tholuck, Briefe zum Commentar über den Brief an die Galater, 1837).

These two modes of interpretation, the allegorical-typical and the allegorical-mystical, are found in the Christian writers as early as the first and second centuries; the latter as νοεμα; the former as a demonstration that all things are in some sense a fore-shadowing of what was to come was somehow contained in the sacred Scriptures (see Justin Martyr, Apol. i, p. 52, 61, and Tertullian, Adversus Marcionem, iv, 2, "The preaching of the disciples might appear to be questionable, if it was not supported by other authority"). To these allegorical modes of interpretation was added a third mode, which necessarily sprung up after the rise of the Catholico-apostolical Church, namely, the dogmatical or theologico-ecclesiastical. The followers of the Catholico-apostolical Church agreed that all apostles and all apostolical writings had an equal authority, because they were all under an equal guidance of the Holy Ghost. Hence it followed that they could not set forth either contradictory or different doctrines. A twofold expediency was adopted in order to effect harmony of interpretation. The one was of the apparent and relative kind, because it referred to subjects which appear incomprehensible only to the confined human understanding, but which are in perfect harmony in the divine thoughts. Justin (Dialogus cum Tryphonc, c. 65) says: "Being quite certain that no Scripture contradicts the other, I will rather confess that I do not understand what is said therein." S. Chrysostom restricted this as follows (Homil. iii. c. 4, in Ep. 2 ad Thessalonicensias): "In the divine writings everything is intelligible and plain, whatever is necessary is open" (compare Homil. iii. De Lucaro, and Athanasii Oratio contra gentes, in Opera, i, 13).

The second expediency adopted by the Church was to consider certain articles of faith to be leading doctrine, and to regulate and define accordingly the sense of the Holy Scriptures over it appears double and uncertain.

This led to the theologico-ecclesiastical or dogmatical mode of interpretation, which, when the Christians were divided into several sects, proved to be indispensable to the Church, but which adopted various forms in the various Churches. Not only the heretics of ancient times, but also the followers of the Roman Catholic, the Greek Catholic, the Syrian, the Anglican, the Protestant Church, etc., have endeavored to interpret the Bible in harmony with their dogmas.

Besides the three modes of interpretation which have been mentioned above, theological writers have employed of typical, prophetical, emphatical, philosophical, traditional, moral, or practical interpretation. But all these are only one-sided developments of some single feature contained in the above three, arbitrarily chosen; and, therefore, they cannot be considered to be separate modes of interpretation, but are only a mixture of those three. The interpretation in which all these modes are brought into harmony has lately been called the panharmonical, which word is not very happily chosen (F. H. Germar, Die Panharmonische Interpretation im Heiligen Schrift, Lpz., 1821; and by the same author, Beitrag zur Allgemeinen Hermeneutik, Altona, 1829). The interpretation which, in spite of all ecclesiastical opposition, ought to be adopted as being the only true one, strictly adheres to the demands of general hermeneutics, to which the other theories particularly do not conform to the requisites of particular cases. This has, in modern times, been styled the historico-grammatical mode of interpretation. This appellation has been chosen because the epigraph grammatical seems to be too narrow and too much restricted to the mere verbal sense. It might be more correctly styled simply the historical interpretation, since the word "historical" comprehends everything that is requisite to be known about the language, the turn of mind, the individuality, etc., of an author in order to rightly understand his book. This method, the origin of which has been traced to Semler (Vorlesungen z. d. theolog. Hermeneutik, 1763) and those three, is essentially the following: the grammatical, the allegorical, and the dogmatical. The grammatical mode of interpretation simply investigates the sense contained in the words of the Bible. The allegorical, according to Quintilian’s sentence, "Allud verbi, aliud sensu estendit," maintains that the words of the Bible have, besides their simple sense, another which is concealed as behind a picture, and endeavors to find out this supposed figurative sense, which, it is said, was not intended by the authors (see Olschewski, Ein Wort über leeren Schriftenma, Köningsberg, 1824). The dogmatical mode of interpretation endeavors to explain the Bible in harmony with the dogmas of the Church, following the principle of analogia fidei. Compare Concilii Tridentini, Session iv, decretr. ii: "Let no one venture to interpret the holy Scriptures in a sense contrary to that which the Church has held, and does hold, and which has the power of deciding what is the true sense and the right interpretation of the holy Scriptures." So also Rambach, Institutiones Hermeneuticae Sacrae (Jene, 1728): "The authority which this analogy of faith exercises upon interpretation consists in this, that it is the foundation and general principle according to the rule of which all scrip-
tural interpretations are to be tried as by a touchstone.” Art. xx of the Anglican Church: “It is not lawful for the Church to ordain anything that is contrary to God's word, and is superfluous to the sacraments and institutional parts of Scripture so as to be repugnant to another.” Scotch Confession, art. xviii: “We dare not admit any interpretation which contradicts any leading article of faith, or any plain text of Scripture, or the rule of charity, etc.

2. The allegorical, as well as the dogmatical mode of interpretation, presupposes the grammatical, which consequently forms the basis of the other two, so that neither the one nor the other can exist entirely without it. Hence the grammatical mode of interpretation must have a historical precedence before the others. But history is native to the Church, and was emdavored to curtail the province of grammatical interpretation, to renounce it as much as possible, and to rise above it. If we follow, with the examining eye of a historical inquirer, the course in which these three modes of interpretation, in their mutual dependence upon each other, have generally been applied, it becomes evident that in opposition to the grammatical mode, the allegorical was first set up. Subsequently, the allegorical was almost entirely supplanted by the dogmatical; but it started up with renewed vigor when the dogmatical came to be adopted for uniformity in the interpretation of the human intellect, as well as all religious sentiment, within the too narrow bounds of dogmatical despotism. The dogmatical mode of interpretation could only spring up after the Church, renouncing the original multiplicity of opinions, had agreed upon certain leading doctrines; after which time it grew, together with the Church, like a mighty tree, towering high above every surrounding object, and casting its shade over everything. The longing desire for light and warmth, of those who were spellbound under its shade, induced them to cultivate again the allegorical and the grammatical interpretation: but they were unable to bring the fruits of these modes to full maturity. Every new intellectual revolution, and every spiritual development of nations, gave a new impulse to grammatical interpretation. This impulse lastedit until interpretation was again taken captive by the longing of ecclesiastical power, whose old formalities had regained strength, or which had been renovated under new forms. Grammatical interpretation, consequently, goes hand in hand with the principle of spiritual progress, and the dogmatical with the conservative principle. Finally, the allegorical interpretation is as ancient as the ecclesiastical system of interpretation, as the conservative principle, when, by its vigorous stability, the latter opposes a too unnatural pressure. This is confirmed by the history of all times and countries, so that we may confine ourselves to the following few illustrative observations.

The various tendencies of the first Christian period were combined in the second century, so that the principle of one general (Catholic) Church was gradually adopted by most parties. But now it became rather difficult to select, from the variety of doctrines prevalent in various sects, those by the application of which to Biblical interpretation a perfect harmony and systematical agreement might be obtained. Nevertheless, the Church, by the force of science powerfully demanded a systematic arrangement of Biblical doctrines, even before a general agreement upon dogmatical principles had been effected. The want of science were especially felt among the Alexandrine theologians; and in Alexandria, where the allegorical interpretation had from ancient time existed, it offered the desired expedient which met the exigency of the Church. Hence it may naturally be explained why the Alexandrine theologians of the second and third century, particularly Clemens Alexandrinus and Origen, interpreted allegorically, and why the allegorical interpretation was perfected, and in vogue, even before the dogmatical came into existence. Origen, especially in his fourth book, De Principiis, treat.s on scriptural interpretation, using the following arguments: The holy Scriptures, inspired by God, form a harmonious whole, perfect in itself, without any defects and contradictions, and containing nothing that is insignificant and superfluous to the grammatical parts of Scripture so as to be repugnant to another.

Since, however, allegorical interpretation cannot be reduced to settled rules, but always depends upon the greater or less influence of imagination; and since the system of Dogma, on the other hand, the Alexandrine theologians produced by means of allegorical interpretation, was in many respects objected to; and since, in opposition to these Alexandrine theologians, there was gradually established, and more and more firmly defined, a system of Christian doctrines which formed a firm basis for uniformity in interpretation, in the mind of the majority, there gradually sprang up a dogmatical mode of interpretation founded upon the interpretation of ecclesiastical teachers, which had been recognised as orthodox in the Catholic Church. This dogmatical interpretation has been in perfect existence since the beginning of the fourth century, and has more and more supplanted the allegorical, which henceforward was left to the wit and ingenuity of a few individuals. Thus St. Jerome, about A.D. 400, could say (Comment in Malach. 1, 16): “The rule of Scripture is, where there is a manifest prediction of future events, not to enfeebles that which is written by the uncertainty of allegory.” During the whole of the fourth century, the ecclesiastically-dogmatical mode of interpretation was developed with constant reference to the grammatical. Even Hilary, in his book De Trinitate, I, properly asserts: “He is the best reader of the Holy Writs who obtains sense from the words than imposes it upon them, and who carries more away than he has brought, nor forces that upon the words which he had resolved to understand before he began to read.”

After the commencement of the fifth century grammatical interpretation fell entirely into decay; which ruin was effected partly by the full development of the ecclesiastical system of doctrines defined in all their parts, and by a fear of deviating from this system, partly also by the continually increasing ignorance of the languages in which the Bible was written. The primary condition of ecclesiastical or dogmatical interpretation was then most clearly expressed by Vincentius Lirinnessis (Consolatus. i): “Since the holy Scriptures, on account of their depth, are not understood by all in the same manner, but their sentences are understood differently by different persons, so that they might seem to approach variously, and not be agreed upon; we must take care that within the pale of the Catholic Church we hold fast what has been believed everywhere, always, and by all” (Compare Consolatus. ii, ed. Frenernessis, 1668, p. 821 sq.). Henceforward interpretation was confined to the mere expression of Christian doctrine, which was first given by men whose ecclesiastical orthodoxy was unquestionable. “It is better not to be imbued with the pretended novelty, but to be filled from the fountain of the ancient” (Cassiodor, Institutions Diacon, Pref. Compare Alciati Epitola ad Gisla, in Opera, ed. Frenernessis, i. 464; Comment in Jn, ed. Jn. Claudius Turon, Prolegomena in Comment, in Libros Re- gnum; Haymo, Historia Ecclesiastica, i, 3, etc.). Doubtful cases were decided according to the precedents of ecclesiastical definitions. “In passages which may be
either doubtful or obscure, we might know that we should follow that which is found to be neither contrary to evangelical precepts, nor opposed to the decrees of holy men” (Benedicti Capitulare, iii, 58, in Pertz, Monu-

During the whole period of the Middle Ages the al-
legorical interpretation again prevailed. The Middle Ages were distinguished by intolerance than by
clarity, and the allegorical interpretation gave satis-
faction to sentiment and occupation to free mental spec-
culation. The typical system of miracle-plays (q.v.)
and the Biblia Pauperum exactly illustrate the spirit
of allegorical interpretation in the Middle Ages. But
many of the most distinguished of the scholiasts (A.D. 840, in Gallaln Bibli, xiii, p. 446), Johannes Scottus, Erigena, Dutohnra, Nico-
laus Lyranus, Roger Bacon, and others, acknowledged
the necessity of grammatical interpretation, and were
only wanting in the requisite means, and in knowledge,
for putting it successfully into practice.

When, in the fifteenth century, classical studies had
revived, they exercised also a favorable influence upon
Biblical interpretation, and restored grammatical
interpretation to honor. It was especially by grammatical
interpretation that the dogmologing Catholic Church
won the Reformation; for as soon as the newly-born Protestant Church had been dogmatically
established, it began to consider grammatical interpre-
tation a dangerous adversary of its own dogmas, and
opposed it as much as did the Roman Catholics them-
selves. From the middle of the 16th to the middle of
the 17th century both Protestant and Roman
Catholics was subjected to the artificial law of a new dogmatis-
ical interpretation, while the Roman Catholic Church
changed the principle of interpretation formerly ad-
vanced by Vincentius into an ecclesiastical dogma. In
consequence of this new opinion, the religious senti-
ment, which had frequently been worked up among
Roman Catholics and Protestants, took refuge in alle-
gorical interpretation, which then reappeared under the
forms of typical and mystical theology.

After the beginning of the 18th century grammatical
interpretation was reintroduced by the Arminians, and, in spite of constant
attacks, towards the conclusion of that century, it de-
cidedly prevailed among the German Protestants. It
exercised a very beneficial influence, although it cannot be
denied that manifold errors occurred in its applica-
tion. During the last half century both Protestants
and Roman Catholics have again curtailed the rights and in-
vaded the province of grammatical interpretation by
promoting (according to the general reaction of our
times) the opposing claims of dogmatical and mystical
interpretation. Comp. J. Rosenmüller, Historie Inter-
Lipsia, 1793-1814, 5 vols.; Van Mildert, An Inquiry into the General Principles of Scripture Interpretation, In Eight Sermons, etc. (Oxford, 1815); Meyer, Geschicte der Schriftverhältnisse der Weltgeschichte (Göttingen, 1802-5, 5 vols.); Simon, Historie
Critique des principes du Commentaire de la Nova. Test. (Rotterdam, 1833); E. F. K. Rosenmüller, Handbuch für die
Literatur der Bibelkundl. Kritik und Ezechias (Göt-
1737-1800, 4 vols.).

3. In accordance with the various notions concerning
Biblical interpretation which we have stated, there have been
produced Biblical hermeneutics of very different kinds;
for instance, in the earlier period we might mention
that of the Donatist Ticonius, who wrote about the fourth century his Regula ad investigandam et inventien-
andum Scripturam Sacram septem Augustimus, De Doctrina Christiane, lib. 1, 2; Isidora Hispalense,
Sentent. 419 sq.,; Santia Fagnini (who died in 1541),
Isagoga ad mysticus Sacrae Scripturae sensus, libri octo-
decim (Colom. 1540); Sexti Semensis (who died 1599),
Bibliae Sacrae Simulata (Venetia, 1566). Of this work,
which has frequently been reprinted, there belongs to
our present subject only Liber tertius, Artem expositi
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Sancta Scripta Catholicæ Expositurae apotropæa Bap-
tism et Extremæ orationem. At a later period the Ro-
man Catholics added to these the works of Goldhages
(Mains, 1765), Bellarmine, Martianay, Calmet, and, more
recently, Seemüller's Hermeneutica Sacra (1799); Mayr's
Institutio Interpretis Sacri (1789); Jahn's Enchiridion Her-
menen, (Vienna, 1812); Arigler's Hermeneutica Generalis
(Vienna, 1792), and Hermeutica trium principum (1811); Ranold, Her. Bibl. Princ. Ratiothetica (Fifn Kirchen, 1898); Schnittler, Grundlinien der Her-
meutik (Ratisbon, 1844); Claire's Hermeneutica Sacra
(1840).

Of the part of the Lutherans were added Flaccius,
Clavis Sacrae Scripturae (Basil, 1537, and often re-
printed in two volumes); by Johann Gerhard, Tractatus de Legitima Scripta, Sacra Interpretatione (Jena, 1610); by
Solomon Glasius, Philologia Sacra libri quinque (Jena, 1629, and often reprinted); by Jacob Rambach, Institutiones hermeneutica Sacrae (Jena, 1729).

On the part of the Calvinists there were furnished by
Turretin, De Scriptura Sacra Interpretatione Tractatus
Bipartitus (Dortrecht, 1729, and often reprinted).

In the English Church were produced by Herbert Marsh
Lectures on the Criticism and Interpretation of the Bible
(Cambridge, 1740). Among the French, Tournay, Les
Instructiones Sacrae (Paris, 1744, and often reprinted).

Since the middle of the last century it has been usual to
treat on the Old—Testament hermeneutics on and on
those of the New Testament in separate works: for in-
stance, Meyer, Versuch einer Hermeneutik des Alten
Testaments (Luebeck, 1759); Paraeus, Interpretatio
Verbi Sacri (Trjacti, 1822); Ernesti, Institutio Interpretis
Noi Testamenti (Lipsii, 1761, ed. 5th., cur-
ante Ammon, 1809; translated into English by Terrot,
Edinburgh, 1833); Muros, Super Hermeneutica Noi
Testamenti acroasae academicae (ed. Eichstädt, Lipsii,
1797-1800, in two volumes, but not completed); Keil,
Lehrbuch der Hermeneutik des Neuen Testamentes, nach
Grundsätzen der grammatisch-historischen Interpretation
(Leipzig, 1810; the same work in Latin, Lipsii, 1811);
Conybeer, The Baptiston Lectures for the year 1824, be-
ing an attempt to trace the History and to ascertain the
limits of the secondary and spiritual Interpretation of
Scripture (Oxford, 1824); Schleiermacher, Hermeneutik
The most com-
plete is Klaussen, Hermeneutik des Neuen Testamentes (from the Danish, Leipzig, 1841); Wilke, Die Her-
meutik des Neuen Testamentes (Leipzig, 1848); S. Davidson's Sacred Hermeneutics
developed and applied; including a History of Biblical
Interpretation from the earliest of the Fathers to the
Reformation (Edinburgh, 1845).

For listed works on the subject, see Walch, Bib-
liotheca Theologica, iv, 206 sq. Danz, Universal Wörter-
buch, p. 884 sq.; Append. p. 46; Darling, Cyclopedia
Bibliographia, ii, 51 sq.; Malcolm, Theological Index, p.
218.

Interregnum. The interregnum from the time of
the execution of Charles I to the accession of Charles
II to the throne of England is one of the most im-
portant periods in the ecclesiastical history of that
country. It was during this period that the Episcopal Church,
"which had been reared by the wealth and power of the
state, and cemented with the tears and blood of
dissenters," was subjected to the greatest Internal Presbyte-
rianism, and for a time even Congregationalism, gained
the ascendency. But, to the justice of the latter, it
must be said that the Congregationalists, or, rather, the
Independents, never actually sought to establish their
religion as the religion of the state. While the Congre-
gationalists were the only sect who succeeded in enforcing uniformity to their creed. Stoughton says (in his Eccles. Hist. of England since the Restoration, i, 49), "It was with Presbyterianism thus
tuated, rather than with Independency, or any other
ecclesiastical systems, that Episcopacy came first into
competition and conflict after the king's (Charles I) return. Some writers deny the possibility of an inter-
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regnum in the English government as it then existed, because, say they, "there can be legally no interregnum in a hereditary monarchy like that of England," and hold that the reign of Charles II is "always computed in legal language as commencing at the execution of Charles I." See Legal history.

See also CHURCH OF ENGLAND, CHURCH OF ENGLAND, PROTESTANT CHURCH, PROTESTANTISM.

Interrigationes Mariae, an apocryphal work. See PSEUDOGRAF.

Interstitia Temporum. The Council of Sar

dica established the principle "Potest poter possi so

nare (cuius ab omnibus, quae beati

tempe, probati, ut dem creasti, quae modestia, quae graviti

tate et verecundia, et si dignus fuerit probatus, divino

sacerdotio illustriatur, quia conveniens non est, nec ratio

vel disciplina patitur, ut temere et leviter ordinetur

episcopus aut presbyter aut diaconus . . . sed hi, quo

rum per longam tempe examinata sit et velut mutrici fiet,

sunt comprobata." Consequently every member of the clergy was obliged to spend a preparatory interval (inter

stitium) before he could be promoted from a lower to a higher order (ordo) (Dist., c. 2). This principle was also observed concerning the consecration for the lower orders of the priesthood, the ordination of laics,

ical functions were attached to them, but, as their ear

ner character changed, the discipline also became more lax as regards the time of consecration (see Dist., c. 2, 9).

After the consecration to these lower offices had come, a consecration of a more solemnity for the transi-

tion to higher orders, the observation of the periods of

habitations was also neglected. The Council of Trent at

tempted to restore the old customs concerning the lower degrees of the priesthood (c. 17, Ses. 23, De Reforma), and stated expressly that "per temporum interstitia, nisi aliquid expedita est magia, deferatur, conferentur, ut . . . in unumque munere iuxta scripturae episcopi se exsecrante" (c. 11, etc.); yet this had but little or no effect, and it is even usual in some Roman Catholic countries to confer at the tonsure and all the lower orders. The Council of Trent decided also that between the lower consecration and the higher, and between each of these, there should be an interval of one year, "nisi necessitas altae ecclesiae utilitas aliquid

poscat" (c. 11, 13, 14, etc.), but that "duo sacri ordi-

nes non eodem die, etiam regularibus, conferentur, privilegia ac indultis quibusvis concessis non obstans librorum quibusvis" (c. 13, etc.); compare also c. 13, 15, X. De temp. ord. i, 11; c. 2, X. De eo qui furtiv. v. 30). These intervals of years are computed, not according to the calen-
dar, but according to the Church year. With regard to the right of dispensation conceded to the bishops by

the Council of Trent (c. 11, cit.), the Congregatio Con-
cellum decided that the simultaneous administration of the ordinum minores and the subdeaconship is a punishable offence (No. 1, c. 11, cit. in the edition of Schulte and Richter). See Thomassen, (et nov. eccl. discipl. i, 2, c. 35, 36; Van Esen, Jus eccl. universi. i, c. 2; ii, 9, ca. 9; Phillips, Kirchenrecht, i, 648 sqq.; Herzog, Real-

Encyklopädie, lxxvii, 707.

Intervals. See INTERSTITIA.

Interventures. See INTERCESSORS.

Inthronisation is the ceremony of installing a bishop on the episcopal seat immediately after his con-

secration. It is said that in the early times of the Church it was customary for the bishop, after taking possession of his seat, to address the congregation, and this address was called Introductio. In the early times of the provinces under his control he addressed instead letters containing his confession of faith, intended to establish communications with them: these were called

Introductory letters (Bingham, Orig. Eccles. i, c. xi, § 3). The province in which the province money is the tithe money paid by some prelates for the purpose of securing their ordin-

ation.—Bergier, Dict. de Théol. iii, 438.

Intrination is a name for one of the three modes in

which the sacrament is administered to the laity of the Eastern Church (comp. Neale, Intro. East. Church, p. 525), viz., by breaking the consecrated bread into the consecrated wine, and giving to each communicant the two elements together in a spoon, to prevent the possi-
bility of a common error by another element. Historical writers assert that the practice of intinction was introduced by Chrysostom himself (which Neale approves), but the traditional evidence adduced does not well support this assertion; and the fact, which seems to be pretty well established, that the two elements were of old administered together, by persons, is as it is now as done at present, makes it doubtful whether their ad-
mixture for communion was ever the ordinary practice. Bona (Rerum Luris, ii, xviii, 3), however, says that it was forbidden by Julius I (A.D. 337-352), whose decree, as given by Gratian (Juristic. ii, c. 7), speaks of it as a practice not warranted by the Gospel, in which Christ is represented as giving first his body and then his blood to the apostles; and, if this decree is authentic, it goes to prove that the practice was known during Chrysos-
tom's time. The third Council of Braga (A.D. 675) de-
creed against it in their first canons, and the custom itself was used by Julius I: "Illo, quod pro complemento communiunis institutum tradunt eucharistiam populi, nec hoc probatum ex evangelio testimoniun recipit, ubi apostolus corpus suum et sanguinem commendavit; se eorumnum panis et sursoria celebens commissit meos.

Historically this custom was justified by those who held that the Eucharistic elements were prebuisse legimus excepto illo tantum discipulo, quem proditori impederent." Micrologus (c. xix) asserts that the practice contradicted the primitive canon of the Ro-
nan liturgy, but this certainly cannot go to prove the time of its introduction into the Eastern Church. In the 11th century it was forbidden by the bull "Salus et munus" of Urban II (A.D. 1088-1099), except in cases of necessity; and his successor, Pascal II, forbade it altogether, and ordered in cases where difficulty of swallowing the solid element occurred, to administer the fluid element alone. Bona, however, quotes from Ivo of Chartres about this time a canon of a Council of Tours, in which priests are ordered to keep the reserved oblation "intaec in sanguine Christi, ut veracier Presbyter positiv diece infirmo, Corpus, et Sanguis Domini nostri Jesu Christi proficat tibi in remissionem peccatorum et vitam aeternam." The Convocation in Canterbury (A.D. 1175) expressed itself opposed to the practice of intinction in the following plain language: "Inhibemus ne quasi pro comple-
mento communiones instituimus alium Eucharisticastrad.

But from the word complementum the practice for-
bidden seems to have been as much the consumption of the superabundance of the elements by the laity (as one of the modern rubrics of the Church of England) as that of intinction. There can be no doubt, however, that the Western Church always stood committed against the practice, though some think that traces of it can be found, e. g. in the ancient Irish Visitation Office, written about the 9th century, and which was published by Sir William Bentham (comp. Hart, Eccles. Records, Intro. xiv). See CONOMIANT.

Intolerance is a word chiefly used in reference to those persons, churches, or societies who do not allow men to think for themselves, but impose on them articles, creeds, ceremonies, etc., of their own devising. See TOLERATION.

Nothing is more abhorrent from the genius of the Christian religion than an intolerant spirit or an intol-
erant church. "It has inspired its votaries with a sav-
gard ferocity; has plunged the fatal dagger into inno-
cent blood; has legislated towns and provinces; over-
thrown states and empires, and brought down the right-
eous vengeance of heaven upon a guilty world. The pre
tence of superior knowledge, sanctity, and authority for its support is the disgrace of reason, the grief of wis-

dom, and the shame of humanity. To foster such a spirit is injustice; to inscribe it is an act of sacrilege; but to torture it by an attempt to force its feelings is
horrible intolerance: it is the most abandoned violation of all the maxims of religion and morality. Jesus Christ formed a kingdom purely spiritual: the apostles exercised only a spiritual authority under the direction of Jesus Christ, particular churches were united only by faith and love, and were affiliated to civil and ecclesiastical jurisdiction; and in religious concerns they were governed by the reasoning, advice, and exhortations of their own officers: their censures were only honest reproofs; and their excommunications were only declarations that such offenders, being incorrigible, were no longer acceptable members of the distinct communities.

Let it ever be remembered, therefore, that no man or men have any authority whatever from Christ over the consciences of others, or to persecute the persons of any whose religious principles agree not with their own. See Lowell's Sermons; Robinson's Claude, ii. 227, 229; Saurin's Sermons, vol. iii, Preface; Locke, Government and Toleration; Memoir of Roger Williams. See Judgement, Private.

Intorsetta, Prosper, a Roman Catholic Sicilian who went to China as a Jesuit missionary, was born at Piazza in 1625. He had first studied law, but, believing in the Church, he joined the Society of Jesus, and served in her Chinese mission. After the establishment of the Church in China, he encountered many obstacles, but, notwithstanding, succeeded in making many converts. To the memory of the Chinese, he courageously pressed his work forward, and became one of the greatest of the Jesuit missionaries to that country. He died Oct. 3, 1696. His works evince a careful and continued study of the language of the country in which he aimed to establish his peculiar religious creed; and it might be well for Protestant missionaries sent to Asiatic and other heathen fields of missionary work to imitate the great zeal and energy exhibited by so many of the members of the Jesuit Church, and which has secured them often times greater prominence than the Protestant laborers. He wrote Tathio (or "the great study of Confucius and of his disciple Tse-see"), edited, with a Latin translation, by Father Ignace de Costa (1632);--T'cheng-young (or "Invariability in the intermediate course"); one of the four books of Confucianism, presented by a life of Confucius: Confucii Vita (Goa, 1699, small fol.);--Lamuy ("the book of Confucius's philosophical discussions") (without place or date, 1 vol. small fol.);--Testimonia de Cultu Sinarum (Venice, 1708, 8vo);--Compendio della Storia della Missione Cinese, cominciando dall'anno 1581, sino al 1669 (Rome, 1671 or 1672, 8vo). There also remains still in MS. a complete paraphrase of the four books of Confucius. See Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Gén., xxv, 501.

Intriguity is a term used to designate a disposition of mind unaffected with fear at the approach of danger. Resolution either banishes fear or surmounts it, and is firm on all occasions. Courage is impatient to attack, undertakes boldly, and is not lessened by difficulty. Valor acts with vigor, gives no way to resistance, but pursues an enterprise in spite of difficulties. Aggression is not recognized as it runs nimbly into danger, and prefers honor to life itself. Intriguality encounters the greatest perils with the utmost coolness, and dares even present death. This is especially the case with the martyrs of Christianity. No persecution, however great, did they fear to encounter for the sake of their religious belief, and death was welcomed as the crowning victory over error and superstition.

Introduction, Biblical, is now the technical designation for works which aim to furnish a general view of such subjects and questions as are preliminary to a proper exposition of the sacred books, the correspondences of the sacred books with the findings of history, and the analogies, in a strict sense. The word "introduction" being of rather vague signification, there was also formerly no definite idea attached to the expression "Biblical Introduction." In works on this subject (as in Horne's Introduction) might be found contents belonging to geography, antiquities, interpretation, natural history, and other branches of knowledge. Even the usual contents of Biblical introductions were so unconnected with each other as to seem to belong to different fields. One field was from Biblical history and archaeology by being less intimately connected with what is usually called history. It comprised treatises on the origin of the Bible, on the original languages, on the translations, and on the history of the sacred text, and was divided into general and special introductions, and this vagueness by furnishing a firm definition of Biblical introduction was made by Dr. Credner (in his Einleitung, noticed below). He defined Biblical introduction to be the history of the Bible, and divided it into the following parts: 1. The history of the separate Biblical books; 2. the history of the collection of these books, or of the canon; 3, the history of the spread of these books, or of the translations of it; 4. the history of the preservation of the text; 5. the history of the interpretation of it. The same historical idea has been advocated by Hävernick (in his Einleitung), and more particularly by Benjamin H. and Meyer (1844). This view, however, has not generally been acquiesced in by Biblical scholars, being regarded as too limited and special a treatment, inasmuch as the end in view is to furnish a solution of such questions as arise upon the Bible as books, yet excluding such parts of Biblical science as pertain to philology, archaeology, and exegesis, the first two of which rather relate to ancient writings, and the last to passages in detail. By common consent, treatises on Biblical introduction have now usually come to embrace the field covered by the articles on the several books as given in this Cyclopaedia, and the topics legitimately included in this department of Biblical science may briefly be summed up under the following heads, which may, however, sometimes require to be differently arranged, or even combined: 1. Authorship; 2. date; 3. place; 4. inspiration; Biblical criticism; 5. the history of the collection of several books, with the literature and commentaries appended. In this way the old division of general and special introduction is preserved only so far that some treatises are on all the books of the Old or New Testament in order, while others take up a single book only. The introduction is very appropriately the prolegomena to every commentary; and the wider topics formerly discussed are relegated to their appropriate and separate spheres, e.g. in addition to Archaeology (including Geography, Chronology, History, and Antiquities proper), Lexicology (including radical and comparative philology, and synonyms), and Grammar (including all the peculiarities of Hebraistic and Hellenistic phraseology, poetical modes of expression, rhetorical traits, etc.)--the following more especially: the Canon, Criticism, Inspiration, and Interpretation (q. v. severally). With these preliminary distinctions it is necessary to give a sketch of the historical development of this department of Biblical Science, with some criticisms upon the several works in which it has been evolved. In these remarks we especially include formal treatises upon the subject at large, besides those found in commentaries; see also Bleek's Intro. to the O. T., 1, i. 5 sqq.

The Greek word εἰσαγωγή, in the sense of an introduction to a science, occurs only in later Greek, and was first used, to denote an introduction to the right understanding of standing of the Bible, by Adrian, a Greek who probably lived in the 5th century after Christ. It was styled "Introductio," or "Eisagoge," in a small book, the object of which is to assist readers who are unacquainted with Biblical phrasingology in rightly understanding peculiar words
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and expressions. It was first edited by David Höschel, under the title of Adriani Isogoge in Sacrum Scripturum Graecum cum Scholiis (Augustae Vindobonae, 1602, 4to), and was reprinted in the Crisici Sacri (London ed. vol. viii: Frankfurt edit. vol. vi). But it is evident that excellent editions on isolated portions of Biblical introduction, but they were few or not written so that the whole system of Biblical introduction. The following Biblical introductions are among the best of those which were published about that period: Rivetus were published by T. A. and J. T. (1627); Michaelis Waltheri Officium Biblicum novi et adi-

perta, etc. (Lipsia, first published in 1636); Alabranii Caloivii Crisici Sacri Eubicns, etc. (Vitzmberge, 1648); Hottinger, Theaivv. Philologici, etc. Crisici Script. Sac. ( Tiguri, 1649); Heidigger, Exsediitio Bibliothecum hier-

pomii Asini (Tiguri, 1681); Leusden, a Dutchman, published a work separated Philosophicad de Graeco Generalis (Utrecht, 1670); Pfeiffer (Ultraj, 1704); Van Thii (1729-22); Du Pin (1701); Calmet (1720); Moldenhauzer (1744); Börner (1758); Goldbarg (1768-85); Wagner (1785). Most of these works have frequently been reprinted.

The Dominican friar Sixtus of Sienna, Bibliothecae Sancta ex principiis Catholicae Ecclesiae autoritibus collecta, et in octo libros digesta (Venetii, 1566; frequently reprinted), is of greater importance, although it is manifestly written under the influence of the Inquisition, which had just been restored, and is perceptibly attenuated by the decrees of the Council of Trent; but Sixtus furnished also a list of books to be used by a true Catholic Christian for the right understanding of Holy Writ, as well as the principles which should guide a Roman Catholic in criticism and interpretation. The decrees of the Council of Trent prevented the Roman Catho-

lics from making any further investigation, while the Protestants zealously carried out their researches in various directions. The Ilyrian, Matthias Flacius, in his Crisici Sacri Suevo, seu de Sermone Sacrarum Literarum (Basle, 1616, in folio), furnished an excellent work on Biblical Hermeneutics; but it was published at a time when the Church was still belonging to his celebrated Biblica Sacra Polyglotta (Lond.

1657, six vols. fol.). These Prolegomena contain much that will always be accounted valuable and necessary for the true introduction of the sacred text. They have been published separately, with notes, by archdeacon Wrangham, (1528, 2 vols. 8vo). Thus we have seen that an excellent work on isolated portions of Biblical introduction, but they were few or not written so that the whole system of Biblical introduction. The following Biblical introductions are among the best of those which were published about that period: Rivetus were published by T. A. and J. T. (1627); Michaelis Waltheri Officium Biblicum novi et adi-

domesticated, together with several polemical treatises occasioned by this work, at Rotterdam, in 1685, 4to:—Histoire Critique du Texte du Nouveau Testament (Rotterdam, 1688):—Histoire Critique du principec Commentations sur le Nouveau Testament (Rotterdam, 1691). By these excellent critical works Simon established a claim upon the gratitude of all real friends of truth; but he was thanked by none of the prevailing parties in the Christian Church. The Protestants saw in Simon only an enemy of their Church, not the thorough investiga-

tor and friend of truth. To the Roman Catholics, on the other hand, Simon's works appeared to be destruc-
tive, because they demonstrated their ecclesiastical de-
crees to be arbitrary and unhistorical. The Histoire Critique du Vieux Testament was suppressed by the Ro-
m风格s of the New Testament, etc. (Amsterdam, 1703-173), which was then followed by Wetstein's Novum Testamentum Graecum cum Lectionibus Vari-

untius (Xenia, 1707, folio), which was soon followed by Wetstein's Novum Testamentum Graecum editionis re-
perta, cum Lectionibus Variantibus (Amstelodami, 1751,

92, folio), and by which even Bengel was convinced, in spite of his having written for years on corn, the title De

parutus Critices Novis Testamentis, n. 684 sqq); (the Bib-

lical works by H. Michaelis, especially his Biblia Hebra-

ica.
his work entitled Historisch-kritische Einleitung in sämtliche kanonische und apokryphische Schriften des Alten und Neuen Testaments (Erlang, 1812-19, 6 vols.).

Augusti's Grundriss einer historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die Bibel A. and N. T. Berlin (pt. 1, O. T., 1817, and O. T., 1821, 2 vols.); he was also influenced by the anathemas of the ecclesiastical party, who have pronounced him a heretic. By their ecclesiastical persecutors, Richard Simon was falsely described to be a disciple of the pantheistical Spinoza, and Michaelis as a follower of both Simon and Spinoza. However, the maturing endeavors of Michaelis gradually prevailed. His Einleitung in die Göttlichen Schriften des Neuen Bundes (Göttingen, 1750, 8vo) was greatly improved in later editions, and the fourth (1788, 2 vols. 4to) was translated and essentially augmented by Herbert Marsh, afterwards bishop in the State of Allen. The third title Introductio in the New Testament, etc. (Cambridge, 1791-1801, 4 vols. 8vo). Michaelis commenced also an introduction to the Old Testament, under the title Einleitung in die Göttlichen Schriften des Alten Bundes (Hamburg, 1757). Ed. Harwood's New Introduction to the Study and Use of the New Testament, London, 1767-71, translated into German by Schulz, Halle, 1770-73, 3 vols. contains so many heterogeneous materials that it scarcely belongs to the science of introduction.

The study of New-Testament introduction was in Germany especially promoted also by J. S. Semler, who died at Halle in 1791. He was mortally influenced by the view that the critical works of Richard Simon were translated into German, and the works of Wetstein re-edited and circulated. The original works of Semler on Biblical introduction are his Apparatus ad librum Novi Testamenti, Hamburg, 1781, and in his Abhandlung von der Freier Untersuchung des Canoni (Halle, 1771-5, 4 vols.). Semler's school produced J. J. Griesbach, who died at Jena in 1812. Griesbach's labors in correcting the text of the New Testament are of great value. K. A. Hahn in published a work called Handbuch der Einleitung in die Propheten des Neuen Bundes (Erlangen, 1794-1802, 2 vols.), in which he followed the university lectures of Griesbach. A second edition of this work appeared in 1801, 3 vols. This introduction contains excellent materials, but is wanting in decisive historical criticism.

G. Eichhorn, who died at Göttingen in 1827, was formed in the school of Michaelis at Göttingen, and was inspired by Herder's poetical views of the East in general, and of the literature of the ancient Hebrews in particular. Eichhorn commenced his introduction when the times were inclined to give up the Bible altogether as a production of priestcraft inapplicable to the present period. He endeavored to bring the contents of the Bible into harmony with modern modes of thinking, to explain, and to recommend them. He sought, by means of hypotheses, to furnish a clue to their origin, without submitting them to strict historical criticism. Eichhorn's Einleitung in das Alte Testament was first published at Leipzig in 1780-83, in three volumes. The fifth edition was published at Göttingen, 1820-24, in five volumes. His Einleitung in das Neue Testament was first published at Leipzig (1804-27, 5 vols.). The earlier volumes were published. The critical treatment of the materials, the style, aim, and many separate portions of both works, are masterly and excellent; but, with regard to linguistic and historical research, they are feeble, and overwhelmed with hypotheses.

Leonhart Bertholdt was a very diligent but uncritical compiler. He made a considerable step back at Vienna (1836) in his Einleitung in die göttlichen Bücher des alten Bundes (Vienna, 1759, 2 vols., and 1802, 3 vols.), and in his Introductio in Libros Sacros Veteris Testamenti in epitomes

The Isagoge Historico-critica in Libros Novi Federis Sacros (Jena, 1800) of H. A. Schott is more distinguished by diligence than by penetration.

The Lehrbuch der Historisch-kritischen Einleitung in die Bibel A. and N. T. Berlin (pt. 1, O. T., 1817, and O. T., 1821, 2 vols.); he was also influenced by the anathemas of the ecclesiastical party, who have pronounced him a heretic. By their ecclesiastical persecutors, Richard Simon was falsely described to be a disciple of the pantheistical Spinoza, and Michaelis as a follower of both Simon and Spinoza. However, the maturing endeavors of Michaelis gradually prevailed. His Einleitung in die Göttlichen Schriften des Neuen Bundes (Göttingen, 1750, 8vo) was greatly improved in later editions, and the fourth (1788, 2 vols. 4to) was translated and essentially augmented by Herbert Marsh, afterwards bishop in the State of Allen. The third title Introductio in the New Testament, etc. (Cambridge, 1791-1801, 4 vols. 8vo). Michaelis commenced also an introduction to the Old Testament, under the title Einleitung in die Göttlichen Schriften des Alten Bundes (Hamburg, 1757). Ed. Harwood's New Introduction to the Study and Use of the New Testament, London, 1767-71, translated into German by Schulz, Halle, 1770-73, 3 vols. contains so many heterogeneous materials that it scarcely belongs to the science of introduction.

The study of New-Testament introduction was in Germany especially promoted also by J. S. Semler, who died at Halle in 1791. He was mortally influenced by the view that the critical works of Richard Simon were translated into German, and the works of Wetstein re-edited and circulated. The original works of Semler on Biblical introduction are his Apparatus ad librum Novi Testamenti, Hamburg, 1781, and in his Abhandlung von der Freier Untersuchung des Canoni (Halle, 1771-5, 4 vols.). Semler's school produced J. J. Griesbach, who died at Jena in 1812. Griesbach's labors in correcting the text of the New Testament are of great value. K. A. Hahn in published a work called Handbuch der Einleitung in die Propheten des Neuen Bundes (Erlangen, 1794-1802, 2 vols.), in which he followed the university lectures of Griesbach. A second edition of this work appeared in 1801, 3 vols. This introduction contains excellent materials, but is wanting in decisive historical criticism.

G. Eichhorn, who died at Göttingen in 1827, was formed in the school of Michaelis at Göttingen, and was inspired by Herder's poetical views of the East in general, and of the literature of the ancient Hebrews in particular. Eichhorn commenced his introduction when the times were inclined to give up the Bible altogether as a production of priestcraft inapplicable to the present period. He endeavored to bring the contents of the Bible into harmony with modern modes of thinking, to explain, and to recommend them. He sought, by means of hypotheses, to furnish a clue to their origin, without submitting them to strict historical criticism. Eichhorn's Einleitung in das Alte Testament was first published at Leipzig in 1780-83, in three volumes. The fifth edition was published at Göttingen, 1820-24, in five volumes. His Einleitung in das Neue Testament was first published at Leipzig (1804-27, 5 vols.). The earlier volumes were published. The critical treatment of the materials, the style, aim, and many separate portions of both works, are masterly and excellent; but, with regard to linguistic and historical research, they are feeble, and overwhelmed with hypotheses.
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redacta (Vienne, 1806). This work has been republished by F. Ackermann, in what are asserted to be the third and fourth editions, under the title of Introductio in Libros Sacros Veteris Testamenti, usum academici accommodata (Vienne, 1825, 2 vols.; 5th ed. 1830), called the new editions, are full of alterations and mutilations, which remove every free expression of Jahn, who belonged to the liberal period of the emperor Joseph. J. L. Hug's Einleitung in das Neue Testament (Stuttgart and Tübingen, 1806, 2 vols.; 4th ed. 1847) surpasses Jahn's work in size and scope, and obtained much favor among Protestants by its learned explanations, although these frequently swerve from the point in question. Hug's work has been translated into English by the Rev. D. G. Wait, L.L.D.; but this translation is much surpassed by that of Froshick, published in the United States, and enriched by the additions of M. F. Stuart. The critical and apologetical style prevails in the work of J. G. Herbart, Historisch-kritische Einleitung in die Schriften des Alten Testamentes (completed and edited after the death of the author by Wele, Carlus, 1840); and in L'Introduction Historique et Critique des Libres de l'Ancien Testament, by J. B. Glaire (Paris, 1839, 4 vols.). The work of the excellent Feilmeuer, who died in 1831, Einleitung in die Bücher des Neuen Bundes (2nd ed. Tübingen, 1880), forsakes the position of a true Roman Catholic, inasmuch as it is distinguished by a noble ingenuity and talent for observation, and remains a useful guide to the still later work of Scholz, Einl. in d. heil. Schriften d. A. und N. T. (vol. i general introd. Cologne, 1845). Among the best Roman Catholic contributions to this branch of Biblical literature are the works of Rausch, Lehrb. der Einleitung in das A. T. (Freiburg, 5th ed. 1898); and Langer, Grundriss der Einleitung in das N. T. (Freiburg, 1868).

In Great Britain, besides the above works of Horne and Hamilton, we may especially name the following as introductory in their character. Colliar's Sacred Interpreter (1746, 2 vols. 8vo) was one of the earliest publications on this subject. A. C. Perceval's Book of the Bible (2 vols. 1802), and Lanman's, Grundriss der Einleitung in das N. T. (Freiburg, 1868). The author of this criticism is an admirable introduction to the New Testament. "It is a storehouse of literary information, collected with equal industry and fidelity." From this work, the English translation of Michael's Introduction (1761), and from Dr. Owen's Observations on the Gospel (1764), Dr. Percivall has most successfully compiled, and the useful manual, called A Key to the New Testament, which has gone through many editions, and is much in request among the candidates for ordination in the Established Church. The Key to the Old Testament (1760), by D. J. goes, afterwards bishop of Bristol, was written in imitation of Percivall's compilation; but it is much more elaborate performance than the Key to the New Testament. It is a compilation from a great variety of works, references to which are given at the foot of each page. Bishop Marsh speaks of it as "a very useful publication for students of divinity, who wish to have an idea of what must otherwise be considered from many writers." It is now, however, almost entirely behind the times. Dr. Harwood's Introduction to the Study and Knowledge of the New Testament (1757, 1771, 2 vols. 8vo), although noteworthy in this connection, is not properly an introduction to the New Testament in the usual sense of the term. It does not describe the books of the New Testament, but is a collection of dissertations relative partly to the character of the sacred writers, Jewish history and customs, and to such parts of heathen antiquities as have reference to the New Testament. The first volume of bishop Tomline's Elements of Christian Theology contains an introduction both to the Old and to the New Testament, and has been published in a separate form. It is suited to its purpose as a manual for students in divinity; but the standard present attainment cannot be very high if, as Marsh states, "it may be read with advantage by the most experienced divines."


Introdo (I will go in), the word taken from the 5th verse of the 12th Psalm of the New Vulgate. This word is applied to the Roman Catholic priest, at the foot of the altar, after having made the sign of the cross, begins the mass, and to which the服务器 replies with the rest of the verse. The whole psalm is then recited alternately by the priest and the server. In masses for the dead, and during Passion-week, the word is not pronounced.

Introto (a:) (Officium Sarum, inoac, Eastern: Ingreso, Ambrosian) is the name (from the Latin introitus, to enter) of a paschal hymn, but now properly the former, sung in some churches as the priest goes up to the altar to celebrate the Eucharist. "Introito autem vocamus antiphonam illam quam chorus cantat et sacerdos ut ascendet ad altare legit cum versu et gloria" (Martene, De aut.), iv, 4). According to the English. of Thessalonica, the introit typifies the union of men and angels. According to Freeman (Prince of Divine Service), ii, 310, the true introit consists of the "Hymn of the only-begotten Son" in the East, and the Gloria in Excelsis in the further East and the whole Western Church. Neale too remarks (Intro. to the East, Ch. 4, 363) that the "introits of the liturgies of St. Mark and St. James, and the Armenian consist of the hymn 'Only-begotten Son.'" But, besides the introit proper, there are general in the Western Church a psalm or hymn, with antiphon, varying according to the season, and in the liturgy of Chrysostom we find a number of these. Walcott (Sac. Archol. p. 531) says the introit is of two kinds: (1) regular, that sung daily; (2) the irregular, which is chanted on festivals. The latter he
describes as having been of old a grand and solemn character. "In a great church there was a procession round the nave to the sound of bells, and with incense, passing out by the small gate of the sanctuary and re-entering by the great doors. The deacon then went up with the Gospel elevated in both his hands, and set it on the midst of the altar, so as to be seen by the people. Then followed the introt, composed of several anthems, supported by the organ and stringed music, the Trumpet, the Flute, and the Harp. The procession and deacon intoned it, the choir and people took it up, and a candlestick with three lights, as a symbol of the Holy Trinity, was lighted." The introit is believed to have originated with pope Celestine (A.D. 422-432), c. 430 (comp. Bonn, iii, 46). Before that time the mass had probably already succeeded the Epistles of Paul and the Gospels. "Its structure is that of an antiphon, followed generally by a whole psalm or a portion of a psalm (compare, however, Neale, Essays on Liturgy, p. 138 sq.), and the Gloria Patri, and then by a repetition of the whole or part of the commencing antiphon. In the Old Gregorian introit the antiphon was repeated three times, a custom found also in the Sarum rite; this triple recitation being connected mystically with the three laws, viz., the Natural, the Mosaic, and the Evangelic." In the English Church the introit was introduced by Edward VI, in his Prayer-book, before every collect, epistle, and Gospel. The gradual containing proper psalms for the particular Sunday or holiday to which they were applied; but they were afterwards struck out, and the choice of the psalm was left to the clergyman. The introits of each Sunday and holiday are given by Wheatley in his Common Prayer, p. 205. See Blunt, Thol. Cyclopedia, i, 355 sq.; Eadie. Eccles. Dict. s.n.; Austin, Isl. bibl. d. Christl. Archd., ii, 778; Siegel, Archd., iii, 378. See also Mass. (b.) This word also designates the verses sung at the entering of the congregation into the church, a custom also introduced, called Singing or the Ambrosian Ritual. See Palmer, Origins Lit. ii, 195.

Introsion (Lat. instruo, I thrust upon), the unlawful appropriation or usurpation of a church benefice, i.e., if done without the co-operation of the person who, according to the canon, is entitled to the benefice. In the Church of Scotland, the General Assembly, in 1736, passed an act against intrusors of ministers into vacant congregations; and the reason assigned is the principle of the Church of Scotland, "that no minister shall be intruded into any church contrary to the will of the congregation...so as none be intruded into such parishes, as they (the General Assembly) regard the glory of God and the interest of the body of Christ in the Hetherington, Hist. of the Ch. of Scotland, ii, 218, 363.

Intuition. See Illumination; Instinct; Spirituality.

Intuition of God. See God.

Invention of the Cross is the name of a festival in the Latin and Greek churches, celebrated May 3, in memory of the invention of the cross said to have been miraculously discovered at Jerusalem by Helena, the mother of the emperor Constantine the Great, in 326. The legend of it runs as follows: Helena, being assured in a dream to search for the cross of Christ at Jerusalem, took a journey thither with that intent; and having employed laborers to dig at Golgotha, after opening the ground very deep (for vast heaps of rubbish had purposely been thrown there by the Jews or heathens), she found three crosses, which she presently concluded were the crosses of our Saviour and the two thieves who were crucified with him. But, being at a loss to know which was the cross of Christ, she ordered them to be applied to a dead person. Two of them, the story says, had no effect; but the third raised the karass to life, which was an evident sign to Helena that that was the cross she looked for. As soon as this was known, every one was for getting a piece of the cross, insomuch that in Paulinus's time (who, being a scholar of St. Ambrose, and bishop of Nola, flourished about the year 420) there was much more of the relic of the cross than there was of the original wood. Whereupon that father says it was miraculously increased: it very kindly afforded wood to men's importunate desires without any loss of its substance." Dr. Schaff comments on it thus: "The legend is at best faintly implied in Eusebius, in a letter of Constantine to the bishop of Ma'la, which contains a reference to an event which Gieseler overlooked — though in iii, 25, where it should be expected, it is entirely unnoticed, as Gieseler correctly observes), and does not appear till several centuries later, first in Cyril of Jerusalem (whose Epist. ad Constantium of 351, however, is considered by Gieseler and others as an interpolation by the writer of a later production), then, with good agreement as to the main fact, in Ambrose, Chrysostom, Paulinus of Nola, Socrates, Sozomen, Theodoret, and other fathers. With all these witnesses the fact is still hardly credible, and has against it particularly the following considerations: (1) The place of the crucifixion was desecrated under the emperor Hadrian by heathen temples and statues, besides being filled up and defaced beyond recognition. (2) There is no clear testimony of a contemporary. (3) The pilgrim from Bordeaux, who visited Jerusalem in 388, and in a still extant Vitaminiarius (Vetera Rom. v) states, that most of the holy things of the holy city, knows nothing of the holy cross or its invention (comp. Gieseler, i, 279, note 37; Edinb. ed. ii, 36). This miracle contributed very much to the increase of the superstition of use of crosses and crucifixes. The ruined Church of Jerusalem was a place of pilgrimage from the 4th century, and the relics of the whole cross filled the whole world, and yet, according to the account of the devout but credulous Paulinus of Nola (Epist. 31, a, 11) (whom we mentioned above), the original remained in Jerusalem undiminished—a continual miracle!" (Schaff, Ch. Hist. ii, 459; compare particularly the minute investigation of this legend by Isaac Taylor, Th. Invention of the Cross and the Miracles therewith connected, in Ancient Christianity, ii, 277-315; Wheatley, Common Prayer, p. 61 sq.; Walcott, Sacred Archaeol, p. 851). See Crosses. (J. H. W.)

Investiture (Lat. investire, to put on a vest or coat), is defined by many writers as "the conferring or the giving possession of a fief or a property by a suzerain lord to his vassal," and was usually accompanied by a certain ceremonial, such as the delivery of a branch, a banner, or an instrument of office, more or less designed to signify the power or authority invested. It is supposed to convey to the vassal a certain sense of sacredness, as the abbot of Vendôme [Vindocinnicum], Tractatus de ordinatione Episcoporum et Investitura Laicorum, in Melch. Goldast Apologia pro Henrico IV — ad Gregorii VII, P. criminationes (Hamb. 1611, p. 262).

The contest about ecclesiastical investitures was so interwoven with the whole course of mediæval history that a brief account of its origin and nature is indispensable to a right understanding of many of the most important events of that period.

1. By the liberality of the northern nations, the Church of Rome had greatly attained considerable wealth, both personal and real. The Carolingian and Saxo-Saxon emperors, the kings of England and Leon, had vied with their predecessors in bestowing on their lavish benefactions, and the clergy were, in consequence, without strangers to wealth. Many churches possessed seven or eight canons; and these endowed with more than one or two priests, was capable of cultivation and movement, and as civilization and population increased they became a source of gain and profit. Nay, this accumulation of lands in the hands of the clergy progressed so rapidly that it naturally excited the jealousy of the sov.
enigma. These provocations were still further sharp-ened by another great source of clerical enrichment, viz. the payment of tithes, which seems to have received a legal sanction in the 9th century, but which in the 12th century had become universal. Still other revenues were derived from the sale of pardons and offerings of the laymen. "They made oblations to the Church, and then set out on military expeditions: bequests were made by others in the terrors of dissolution." Indeed, it became at last a pious custom to assign a portion of the property of a deceased person to the clergy for their distribution among the poor, to atone for their sins, by the prayers of these emperors. Therefore the Romans learned to rank their churches among the poor," and as it was believed that the deceased would regard them with special favor, they absorbed the lion's share of the alms, until the other poor were forgotten altogether."

Thus what began as a pious custom the Church gradually so distorted until it all flowed into her coffers, and was finally made a compulsory tribute. But, as if all these sources of income were not yet sufficient to meet the wants of an indolent clergy, dependent wholly for their support upon a superstitious and ignorant class, in the 12th century in our day, the penances were added, and, by being made compulsory, were imposed upon repentant offenders; and acts of lawlessness, which it ought to have taken more than an ordinary lifetime to discharge, were allowed to be committed for money payments. "One day's fasting might be repaid by a Further's purchase of a church or a bishop's shilling, or with freeing a slave that was worth that money (one of the few good things that the Church of the Middle Ages is guilty of). Many, in a glow of zeal, vowed to go on a crusade, but, when the first aridor had cooled down, were glad to purchase exemption. Many, to atone for their sins, set out on pious pilgrimages to well-known shrines; and, as the clergy had not failed to inculcate that no atonement could be so acceptable to Heaven as liberal presents, large offerings were presented to such churches by the remorse of repentance. At Rome, in the year of jubilee, two priests stood with their hands receiving the uncounted gold, and silver from the altar."

No wonder, then, that the Church and her officers the bishops, as well as all the clergy, with possessions so vast, and resources so unbounded and fertile, became the objects of suspicion to temporal princes, as well as to many in the nobles and the clergy. The disfavor in which the practice had long been held by the Church was first expressed by Clemens II (see Stenzel, Gesch. Deutschl. u. d. frühchristl. Kaiser, pt. i., 117; ii, 130), but its most energetic opponent it really first found in the person of Gregory VII, who, having in the year 1074 enacted most stringent measures for the repression of simony, proceeded, in the beginning of the year 1075, to condemn, under excommunication, the practice of investiture, as almost necessarily connected with simony, or leading to it. "The prohibition was couched in the most pointed and comprehensive terms. It absolutely deposed every bishop, abbot, or inferior ecclesiastical who should receive investiture from any lay person. It interdicted him—whosoever should be guilty of this act of ambition and rebellion (which was the sin of idolatry), until he should have abandoned the benefice so obtained; and all communion with him was deposed, except Peter, and from admission into the Church. And if any emperor, duke, marquis, count, or secular potentate or person should presume to grant such investiture of bishopric or inferior dignity, he was condemned to the same sentence. This statute made a revolution in the whole feudal system throughout Europe as regarded the relation of the Church now dominant to the state. In the empire (then under Henry IV) it annulled the precarious power of the sovereign over almost half his subjects. All the great prelates and abbots, who were at the same time the princes, the nobles, the counselors, the leaders in all the wars and expeditions because to a great degree independent of the crown; the emperor had no concern, unless indirectly, in their promotion, no power over their degradation. Their lands and estates were as inviolable as their persons. Where there was a man, there was no fealty; there could be no treason. Everybody had his own independence, his own liberty, and could not be bound by any servitude other than his own conscience, on the other hand, thus disdained from the crown was held, if not directly, yet at the pleasure of the pope. For as with him was the sole judgment (the laity being excluded) as to the validity of the election, with him was the decision by what offenses the dignity might be forfeited; all the temporal and spiritual rights were inalienable, and were withdrawn from the national property, and became that of the Church and of God, the
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pope might be, in fact, the liege lord, temporal and spiritual, of half the world” (Milman, Lat. Christendom, iii, 416-417). These proceedings of the pope the kings could not, of course, possibly permit without a practical abdication of all their powers, and hence arose the conflicts of investiture which resulted so triumphantly for the popes, not only in raising to the thrones of the princes of the earth, but drawing into their own hands all civil government, and which enabled some of the incumbrants of the papal see, e.g. Innocent III, to aspire to be the supreme dispensers of the Christian world, with all its belongings (see Reiche1, p. 569). Some of the sponsporship of Philip of France and William of England, paid no attention whatever to the pope’s mandate, and the latter, satisfied that they would not actively oppose him, was quite willing to let them alone; but far otherwise was his conduct towards the emperor Henry IV, whom he sought by every possible exertion to compel to submit to these decisions. For this the licentious and ambitious character of Henry had given him good cause. But for a time he failed to make any impression on the emperor, who paid no regard to the threats of Gregory VII, but continued to nominate not only to German bishoprics, but to the royal thrones, and thus widened still further the breach between the emperor and the pope. See the article GREGORY VII, vol. iii, especially p. 1008, col. 1. After Hildebrand’s (Gregory VII’s) death, the rivalry for the papal throne assuaged for a time the controversy on investiture; each papal party, anxious to secure the greater credit and influence most prominent position, wilfully made all possible concessions. But when Urban II, elected and supported by the Hildebrandian party, ascended the papal throne, the controversy was renewed by his declaration: “Nullum jus laicis in clericis esse vulnus est, ego contemnerim, ut erit, si papam postea sacerdotes” (p. 1095). By canon 17 of this council clergymen were forbidden to accept any ecclesiastical office from a layman; the 16th canon applies this especially to kings and other civil authorities; canon 17 forbade bishops and priests binding themselves by feudal oaths to either kings or other laymen; and canon 18 threatened every one who, after two warnings, continued in these forbidden relations, with deprivation of all office and power. Yet Urban found more difficulty than he had expected in bringing the princes to second him in his views, and he did not succeed in enforcing these decisions, where Roger, 2nd count of Sicily, stoutly defended the rights of the civil authorities. Urban, however, evaded the difficulty by naming Roger, to whom he was under many obligations, his legate in Sicily. The death of this pope, in 1099, by no means extinguished the opposition, but, instead, the contest became more earnest, and continued during the most of the 12th century. In the beginning of the 12th century it assumed a new form under PASCAL II, whose name, of all popes, is most prominently connected with the question of investitures both in England and Germany. PASCAL II had ascended the papal throne with the intention of following in the footsteps of his predecessors, but he lacked the strength of character necessary for determined action. “In England, William the Conqueror had maintained his supremacy over the Church with an iron arm. Thus no one was allowed to acknowledge the pope, when chosen, except by the king’s permission; no one might receive letters from Rome unless they had been previously shown to him for approval. The archbishop was not permitted to frame any canon, although with the assistance of the bishop of the realm, unless it had been previously sanctioned by the sovereign. Nor was any bishop, even the pope himself, permitted to create a bishop, or to bestow any ecclesiastical dignity on any charge, without having first obtained the king’s consent. The same policy was pursued by his son William Rufus, without any difficulties being raised on the part of the popes. They had too many reasons for conciliating the friendship of the Normans in Italy to venture to oppose their wishes in England.” Nor was it otherwise now when archbishop ANSELM came forward, determined to execute the papal decisions concerning the investitures, and King Henry I felt his prerogatives invaded, and Anselm alone had to bear the whole brunt of Henry’s indignation. See ANSELM. In 1107, an agreement which had been entered into between the king and the archbishop was finally proclaimed, with the formal act of the pope, as was necessary for his purpose. “By it Henry, whilst surrendering an unnecessary ceremony, retained a substantial power; and Anselm’s scruples were set at rest by a letter from PASCAL, in which he freed those who had received lay investitures from the penalties of his predecessor . . . Still more fortunate than the English kings were the kings of Castile, who, by directly yielding when Urban’s decree was first published, obtained from him an absolute privilege of nomination to all bishoprics in their dominions—a privilege which they have since retained by virtue of a particular indulgence renewed by the pope for the life of each prince” (Reiche1, p. 368; see Hallam, Middle Ages, ii, pt. i, ch. vii, 190). But it was in Germany that the struggle about investitures was waged most fiercely, and that it also continued longest. Taking advantage of the political troubles in Germany, the emperors used every exertion to detach the Church entirely from the control of the state. “Not only had PASCAL II begun his course by denouncing lay investiture as strongly as his predecessor Urban II, but he had also followed the tactics of Urban.” He not only put Henry IV a second time at variance with his imperial predecessors, but the most desperate measures were resorted to in the assault of the Church. He extended from Henry the affection of those to whose love and consideration he was entitled by the most sacred of laws. Two of the sons of Henry IV were invited to rebel against their own natural father (1101, 1104), which brought the emperor into the grave of broken heart (1106). PASCAL now thought, of course, that he had secured for himself the obedience of Germany, and with pride he announced that henceforth the Church would begin to enjoy anew her liberty indeed, for death had removed, and was fast removing, those who opposed her success (MANUEL, i, p. 1329; Muratori, Scriptores rerum Italicae, iii, i, 363); he even caused the laws on investiture to be reasserted by the councils of Troyes, Benevento (1108), and Lateran (1100). But for once PASCAL II had made his reckoning without his host. His power, which had been so great and so strong, began to fade before he discovered its vanities; for Henry V was no sooner in undisputed possession of the throne than he maintained as stoutly as his father had done his own right to invest bishops.” Strengthened in his opposition by the example of England, and of France also, he now interpreted the actions of the councils as the works of power, and after a vain endeavor to bring the pope to acknowledge his right in a conference at Chalons, he returned to Rome to arms. At the head of a vast army he marched to Italy, and so terrified the pope that he obtained a very favorable compact without the least difficulty (Feb. 9, 1111). But the bishops refused to comply with it, and Henry hesitated not to force a favorable conclusion by imprisoning the pope and his cardinals. By a second treaty, which was now compacted (April 8, 1111), PASCAL II actually agreed to surrender all the possessions of the church in France without one of the}
surrender any of the liberties and rights of the Church, that it was for the assembly to examine the agreement, and pronounce thereupon; but that for himself he would adhere to his oath, and undertake nothing personally against Henry," i.e. poor wretched Paschal had sworn to a compact which he felt he could not break himself, but for which, if he were less determined to abrogate, he ought to have next to his kinsmen and to the might of his hands, that they might execute the wishes of his heart, which he dared not openly espouse as a pope. The action of the pope, however, in accordance with his own wishes, was repudiated in a Lateran council in 1222 (Rom. iii. 29 sq.). The struggle was reserved for Calixtus II, but not before one preliminary contract had been concluded and as soon violated, nor before the utterance of a sentence of excommunication and dethronement on Henry V, at the great synod of Rome (Labbe, xiii. 71). It was agreed that every investiture should be retained, and each diocese restored to its former incumbent, but that those belonging to the Church should be governed according to the canons, and the secular ones by the civil laws (Mansi, t. xxii. p. 244; Stenzel, p. 680). Upon a second consideration, however, they relented, and the question of the oath soon created new pretexts for the struggle between them, and, in a synod of Rheims (1119), Calixtus put the emperor under the ban, and deposed him (Mansi, l. c., p. 250). In the mean time, archbishop Adalbert, of Mentz, created troubles in Germany. Calixtus strengthened his position in Rome, and even succeeded in taking the anti-pope, Gregory VIII, whom the emperor had opposed to him; prisoner; yet the public sentiment of Germany was strong enough to compel the papal party finally to adopt the course which Ivo of Chartres and the monk Hugo of Fleury had commanded. It was then a matter of course between the two systems of the Gregorian party on the one hand, and the secularizing tendencies of their opponents on the other. It combated the Gregorian position that it was a degradation for the priesthood to own itself subject to any lay authority, and held fast to the principle that to God must be rendered that which is God's, and to Cesar that which is Cesar's. It therefore maintained that the king ought not to invest the candidate bishop with staff and ring, these being the symbols of spiritual jurisdiction, and, as such, belonging to the archbishop; but it allowed homage to be done to the emperor, and the use of some other symbol for bestowing the temporalities. The celebrated concordat of Worms, Sept. 1122 (Mansi, L c. p. 273 sq.), finally settled the question to the satisfaction of all parties, and the Lateran Council of 1123 gave its full approval (comp. Mansi, l. c. p. 277). The emperor, however, gave up the empty ceremony of the ring and pastoral staff, to grant to the clergy the right of free elections, and to restore all the possessions of the Church of Rome which had been seized either by himself or by his father; while the pope, on his part, consented that the elections should be held in the presence of the emperor or his official, but with a right of appeal to the provincial synod; that investiture might be given by the emperor, but only by the touch of the auctoritas; and that the bishops and other church dignitaries should faithfully discharge all the feudal duties which belonged to their principality (see Montagu, p. 455 sq.; Stenzel, p. 704). Lothair III, Henry's successor, rendered these conditions still more advantageous to the Roman see by substituting a more general profession for the feudal oath (see J. D. Olschlegler, Eklus- terung d. giitenen Bulle, Frankfort, 1766; Urkundenbuch, p. 19). This measure, to some extent, at least, allayed the ill will which the hierarchical party bore to the Concordat of Worms. The pope had in reality secured but little; the struggle by which the first period of the election of bishops, and the use of influence obtained by it in the place of the influence exercised over them by the emperor was sure in due time to be of great advantage to the papacy. It certainly had considerable effect in restraining one of the two parties, and simultaneous with the Middle Ages, if not in eradicating altogether the real evil of simony and corrupt promotion of unworthy candidates for ecclesiastical offices; and although, even as late as the 12th century, we find instances of the emperor's interference in the election of German bishops, and even of his direct appointments to such offices (see Sugenheim, Staatskunde d. Krie- rus im Mittelalter, Berlin, 1899, pt. i. p. 158), these instances are, after all, only few in number, and disappear altogether after the times of Otto IV and Frederick II. Civil interference in ecclesiastical appointments ceased also in France, England, and Spain; but in Naples, Hungary, Denmark, and Sweden, the struggle continued, and the struggle was reserved for Calixtus II, but not before one preliminary contract had been concluded and as soon violated, nor before the utterance of a sentence of excommunication and dethronement on Henry V, at the great synod of Rome (Labbe, xiii. 71). It was agreed that every investiture should be retained, and each diocese restored to its former incumbent, but that those belonging to the Church should be governed according to the canons, and the secular ones by the civil laws (Mansi, t. xxii. p. 244; Stenzel, p. 680). Upon a second consideration, however, they relented, and the question of the oath soon created new pretexts for the struggle between them, and, in a synod of Rheims (1119), Calixtus put the emperor under the ban, and deposed him (Mansi, l. c., p. 250). In the mean time, archbishop Adalbert, of Mentz, created troubles in Germany. Calixtus strengthened his position in Rome, and even succeeded in taking the anti-pope, Gregory VIII, whom the emperor had opposed to him; prisoner; yet the public sentiment of Germany was strong enough to compel the papal party finally to adopt the course which Ivo of Chartres and the monk Hugo of Fleury had commanded. It was then a matter of course between the two systems of the Gregorian party on the one hand, and the secularizing tendencies of their opponents on the other. It combated the Gregorian position that it was a degradation for the priesthood to own itself subject to any lay authority, and held fast to the principle that to God must be rendered that which is God's, and to Cesar that which is Cesar's. It therefore maintained that the king ought not to invest the candidate bishop with staff and ring, these being the symbols of spiritual jurisdiction, and, as such, belonging to the archbishop; but it allowed homage to be done to the emperor, and the use of some other symbol for bestowing the temporalities. The celebrated concordat of Worms, Sept. 1122 (Mansi, L c. p. 273 sq.), finally settled the question to the satisfaction of all parties, and the Lateran Council of 1123 gave its full approval (comp. Mansi, l. c. p. 277). The emperor, however, gave up the empty ceremony of the ring and pastoral staff, to grant to the clergy the right of free elections, and to restore all the possessions of the Church of Rome which had been seized either by himself or by his father; while the pope, on his part, consented that the elections should be held in the presence of the emperor or his official, but with a right of appeal to the provincial synod; that investiture might be given by the emperor, but only by the touch of the auctoritas; and that the bishops and other church dignitaries should faithfully discharge all the feudal duties which belonged to their principality (see Montagu, p. 455 sq.; Stenzel, p. 704). Lothair III, Henry's successor,
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It's Church, where the order of daily prayer is chiefly taken from the corresponding offices of the Sarum Brev- iary (of which the rubric runs thus [after the Gloria and Alleluia]: "Sedegatur invocatorius hoc modo. Ecco venit rex. Occursamus obivam Salvator nostri. Ps. Venite; post i, ill et v, versa, psalms repetatur totius invocatorius. iv et v, versa, psalms repetatur solam hoc pars. Occursamus. Et deinde reinicitur totius invocatorius"); the opening sentences of matins and evensong are generally considered to be of a similar character (compare Procter, Common Prayer, p. 182; Freeman, Principles of Divine Service, i, 132 sq.). Blunt (The Church, i, 336) observes, and it is the true invoca- tory of the English Church "is in the fixed versicle 'Praise ye the Lord,' with its response, 'The Lord's name be praised.' The singing of Alleluia after the Gloria Patri, at the commencement of matins, was or- dered in the Prayer-book of 1549. The response was inserted in 1661. The 36th Psalm, with this versicle and response, is to be considered as an unwary invitation in the medizing English rite, except on Easter day, for which special provision is made." See also Neale, Liturgical Essays, p. 7 sq.; et al.; Comment on the Psalms, i, 45 sq.; Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, p. 262.

INVOCATION OF ANGELS, or the act of addressing prayers especially to the superhuman, prevails in the Roman and the Greek churches as well as in all the different Eastern churches. They hold that angels are sharers of the divine nature, though in a somewhat subordinate measure. In the same manner they also permit the invocation of saints (q.v.) even, and designate this worship under the technical term of αὐθελία, in distinction from the worship of God himself, which they term λατρεία. See Hagenbach, History of Doctrines, i, 141, 142, 538 sq. Compare Angels; Venera- tion.

INVOCATION OF THE HOLY GHOST. In the prayer of the mediaval canon, retained also in the Scottish of- fice on the consecration of the elements for the Lord's Supper, the Holy Ghost is thus invoked: "Vouchsafe so to bless and sanctify with thy word and Holy Spirit thy gifts and creatures of bread and wine that they may be unto us the body and blood of thy most dearly beloved Son.

INVOCATION OF SAINTS. As a form of idolatry pre- vailing in the Roman, the Greek, and the different Eastern churches. They ignore the doctrine to the Protestant tenaciously clung, that the rendering of divine worship to one Infinite Being must of necessity exclude the idea of rendering divine worship, no matter how modified and excused, to any other being, depend- ent on and governed by the Supreme Being. They also deny that the invocation of the created, instead of the Creator, does in any wise trench upon the honor due only to God, and that it is, as we assert, irreconcilable with Scripture, "which holds him forth as the sole ob- ject of worship, and the only fountain of mercy." They cannot, of course, dispense these truths from Scripture, neither can they furnish any authority from the holy book for a practice unknown to the early Church, and expressly condemned by the Council of Laodicea (A.D. 481) and by the early fathers. The few passages which they frequently cite they themselves claim only to im- ply an intercommunion of the two worlds as the Matt. xii. 8; Luke xiv, 17; Exod. xxxiii, 13), and they are there- fore obliged to have recourse to tradition. To this end they cite some of the Church fathers, such as Origen (Opp. ii, 273), Cyprian (Ep. 60, Dodwell's edition), Basilius, Theodoret, Chrysostom, first, Gregory of Nyssa (ii, 1017), Ambrose (ii, 300), Chrysostom (iv, 419), and especially the liturgics of the different ancient churches of Roman, Greek, Syrian, and even Egyptian rite. But, while these testimonies are gener- ally credited, it must be remembered that they are only uncial; and that they apply not only to the infusion of the Church system of Alexandrian Neoplatonism and Oriental Magianism, which left its traces even in the most orthodox form of Christian wor- ship, and creed also, up to the 4th and 5th centuries, a period in the history of the Christian Church when her- esies were, to use a common phrase, almost the order of the day. Nay, even the Roman Catholic Church ad- mits the existence of the practice of invoking the saints not only in this age, but especially in the mediaval pe- riod. The worship of saints and of the Virgin Mary then took the place of the worship of Christ, the only legal intercessor between God and man, and thus virtu- ally ignored the mediatorialship of Christ. It is true some of them grant, however, and it is the true invoca- ry of the English Church "is in the fixed versicle 'Praise ye the Lord,' with its response, 'The Lord's name be praised.' The singing of Alleluia after the Gloria Patri, at the commencement of matins, was ordered in the Prayer-book of 1549. The response was inserted in 1661. The 36th Psalm, with this versicle and response, is to be considered as an unwary invitation in the medizing English rite, except on Easter day, for which special provision is made." See also Neale, Liturgical Essays, p. 7 sq.; et al.; Comment on the Psalms, i, 45 sq.; Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, p. 262.

As a regular doctrine, the invocation of saints is taught in a canon Touching the Invocation, Veneration, and on Rites and Sacraments, issued by the Council of Trent in its 25th session. It reads as follows: "The holy synod enjoins on all bishops, and others sustain- ing the office and charge of teaching, that, accord- ing to the usage of the Catholic and Apostolic Church, received from the primitive time of St. Chrysostom (c. 269), Cyprian (c. 258), St. Justin (c. 162), St. Irenaeus (c. 163), St. John the Baptist (c. 167), St. Paul (c. 174), and the decrees of the sacred councils, they es- pecially instruct the faithful diligently touching the in- cession and invocation of saints, the honor paid to rel- ics, and the lawful use of images: teaching them that the saints, who reign together with Christ, offer up their own prayers to God for men; that it is good and useful
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suppliantly to invoke them, and to resort to their prayers, aid, and help in obtaining benefits from God, through his Son, Jesus Christ our Lord, who alone is our Redeemer and Saviour; but that they think impiously who deny that the saints, who enjoy eternal happiness in heaven, are to be invoked; or who assert either that they do not pray for men, or that the invocation of the saints is nothing but the same as the prayers of the Holy Church, or that it is repugnant to the Word of God, and is opposed to the honor of the one mediator between God and men, Jesus Christ; or that it is foolish to supplicate, orally or inwardly, those who reign in heaven. Also, that the holy bodies of holy martyrs, and of others now living in heaven, the Church and the temple of the Holy Ghost, which are by him to be raised unto eternal life, and to be glorified, are to be venerated by the faithful; through which bodies many benefits are bestowed by God on men, so that they who affirm that veneration and honor are not due to the relics of saints; or that these, and other sacred monuments, are uselessly honored by the faithful; and that the places dedicated to the memories of the saints are vainly visited for the purpose of obtaining their aid, are wholly to be condemned, as the Church has always condemned those who do now and then also condemn them. Moreover, that the images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother of God, and of the other saints, are to be had and retained particularly in temples, and that due honor and veneration are to be awarded them; not that any divinity or virtue is believed to be in them, on account of which they are to be venerated; but that anything is to be asked of them; or that confidence is to be reposed in images, as was of old done by the Gentiles, who placed their hope in idols; but because the honor which is shown unto them is referred to the prototypes which they represent; in such wise that by the images which are consecrated by the Church we adore and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ and venerate the saints, whose similitude they bear. And this, by the decrees of councils, and especially of the second synod of Nicaea, has been ordained against the opposers of images. And the bishops shall carefully teach this, that, by means of the history of the mysteries of our redemption, depicted by paintings or other representations, the people are instructed, and strengthened in remembering and continually reflecting on the articles of faith; as also that great profit is derived from all sacred images, not only because the people are thereby admonished of the benefits and graces which have been bestowed upon them by Christ, but also because the miracles of God through the means of the saints, and their salutary example, are set before the eyes of the faithful; that so for these things they may give God thanks; may order their own life and manners in imitation of the saints; and may be excused to adore and love God, and to cultivate piety. But if any one shall teach or think contrary to these decrees, let him be anathema.

Most ridiculous is the defence which Foulkes (Christ- tenden's Dissertations, p. 86) advances in behalf of this species of idolatry, while yet in communion with the Romish Church; and his friends of the High-Church party of England and our own country may do well to read it before they carry much farther the laughable affections which they term "devotions." While defending this abuse, he has written in the breviary of the Church, sometimes designated by Romanists as "revisions," on the invocation of saints and of Mary, he says, "They were but the expressions of what had been the devotional feelings of the whole Church.... His Holy Spirit communing with their spirits, and no other agent or instrument had taught them that the saints reigning with Christ, and his blessed Mother especially, could and would intercede for them did they ask their prayers; and so one asked, and had his petitions granted, and asked again. Then he breathed the secret (1) of his success to his brother or friend, till he in turn was encouraged to ask. Then another, and another, as the secret was passed about from house to hamlet, and from hamlet to town, and from one country to another, till at length it had spread over Christendom." If this was the way in which the invocation of saints was practised, to authorize its admission in the litany by Pius V in the 16th century, and its affirmation as a doctrine by the Council of Trent, would it not produce the Church fathers of the early age, and the practices of some Christian churches of an age when the Church of Christ was so greatly corrupted and overrun by innovation? The Protetants also believe in saints. They believe in inimitating the noble character exemplified in the life and works of the Church, which is the church of Christ, and the temple of the Holy Ghost, and which are by him to be raised unto eternal life, and to be glorified, are to be venerated by the faithful; through which bodies many benefits are bestowed by God on men, so that they who affirm that veneration and honor are not due to the relics of saints; or that these, and other sacred monuments, are uselessly honored by the faithful; and that the places dedicated to the memories of the saints are vainly visited for the purpose of obtaining their aid, are wholly to be condemned, as the Church has always condemned those who do now and then also condemn them. Moreover, that the images of Christ, of the Virgin Mother of God, and of the other saints, are to be had and retained particularly in temples, and that due honor and veneration are to be awarded them; not that any divinity or virtue is believed to be in them, on account of which they are to be venerated; but that anything is to be asked of them; or that confidence is to be reposed in images, as was of old done by the Gentiles, who placed their hope in idols; but because the honor which is shown unto them is referred to the prototypes which they represent; in such wise that by the images which are consecrated by the Church we adore and prostrate ourselves, we adore Christ and venerate the saints, whose similitude they bear. And this, by the decrees of councils, and especially of the second synod of Nicaea, has been ordained against the opposers of images. And the bishops shall carefully teach this, that, by means of the history of the mysteries of our redemption, depicted by paintings or other representations, the people are instructed, and strengthened in remembering and continually reflecting on the articles of faith; as also that great profit is derived from all sacred images, not only because the people are thereby admonished of the benefits and graces which have been bestowed upon them by Christ, but also because the miracles of God through the means of the saints, and their salutary example, are set before the eyes of the faithful; that so for these things they may give God thanks; may order their own life and manners in imitation of the saints; and may be excused to adore and love God, and to cultivate piety. But if any one shall teach or think contrary to these decrees, let him be anathema.

Most ridiculous is the defence which Foulkes (Christ- tenden's Dissertations, p. 86) advances in behalf of this species of idolatry, while yet in communion with the Romish Church; and his friends of the High-Church party of England and our own country may do well to read it before they carry much farther the laughable affections which they term "devotions." While defending this abuse, he has written in the breviary of the Church, sometimes designated by Romanists as "revisions," on the invocation of saints and of Mary, he says, "They were but the expressions of what had been the devotional feelings of the whole Church.... His Holy Spirit communing with their spirits, and no other agent or instrument had taught them that the saints reigning with Christ, and his blessed Mother especially, could and would intercede for them did they ask their prayers; and so one asked, and had his petitions granted, and asked again. Then he breathed the secret (1) of his success to his brother or friend, till he in

Involutions. About the 8th century, says Procter (On the Book of Common Prayer, p. 249), the invocations of saints (q. v.) were introduced into the churches of the Western world, and thence spread to various other services. See LITANY. (Comp. Renan- dot, Liturg. Orient. i, 356; Bingham, Antig. xvi., i, § 2; Mabillon, Anecd. iii, 609 sq.)

Involvavit, a name sometimes given to the first Sunday in Lent on account of the Introit (q. v.), which opens, "Innolvavit me et exaudiam eum," etc. (Ps. xci. 15).—Riddle, Christian Antiquities, p. 668.

Iona (formerly Ionas), one of the most famous of the Hebrides, is about three miles long, and a mile and a half in breadth from a mile to a mile and a half. In 1681 it had a population of 264. Its remarkable fertility was regarded as miraculous in the Dark Ages, and no doubt led to its early occupation. Dumi, the highest point on the island, is 830 feet above the sea-level. Its history begins in the year 563, when St. Ninian, leaving the shores of Ireland, landed upon Iona with twelve disciples. Having obtained a grant of the island, as well from his kinsman Conall, the son of Comgall, king of the Scots, as from Brudi, the son of Mel- chon, king of the Picts, he built upon it a monastery, which was long regarded as the mother-church of the Picts, and was venerated not only among the Scots of Brittain and Ireland, but among the Angles of the north of England, who owed their conversion to the self-denying missionaries of Iona. From the 6th to the 17th century, the island was most generally called I, Ii, Jo, Jo, Jo, Li, Li, Hu, Hu, Hu, Hii, Hu, H, or Yi—that is, simply, "the Island," or (on Columba's account) Iucolitih, I-Columb-Kille, or Hii-Colum-Kille—that is, "the Island of Columba of the Church." From the end of the 6th to the end of the 8th century Iona was scarcely second to any monastery in the British Isles; but the fierce and heathen Norsemen burned it in 795, and again in 802. Its "family" (as the monks were called) of sixty-eight persons were martyred in 806. A second martyrdom, in 825, is the subject of a contemporary Latin poem by Walfridus Strabo, abbot of the German monastery of Reichenau, long regarded as the mother-church of Ireland. On the evening of 896 the island was again wasted by the Norsemen, who slew the abbot and fifteen of his monks. Towards the end of the next century the monastery was repaired by St. Margaret, the queen of king Malcolm Canmore. It was visited in 1097 by king Magnus the Barefooted, of Norway, being at that time a part of that kingdom, and so fell under the ecclesiastical jurisdiction of the bishop of Man and the archbishop of Dromtheim. In 1208 the bishops of the north of Ireland disputed the authority of the Manx bishop, pulled down a monastery which he had begun to build in the island, and placed
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The Ionian Order. See ARCHITECTURE.

Ionic Philosophy. See PHILOSOPHY (GREEK).

Iota. See JOT.

Iperen. JOSUA VAN, a noted Dutch theologian, was born at Middelburg, Feb. 23, 1726. He was descended from an old and respectable Flemish family. His studies, in which he evinced very superior mental endowments, were pursued first at Groningen, and afterwards at Leyden, where he was permitted to enjoy the instructions and friendship of the celebrated professors A. Schultens and T. Hemsterhuyx. In 1749 he was called to the pastoral charge of Lillo. Here he labored with zeal and fidelity for sixteen years. In 1762 he was made professor of divinity at Leiden, and in 1772 he went to Veere, where he remained ten years. Several of the most noted literary, scientific, and poetic societies successively elected him to membership. Zealand also appointed him a member of the commission to which was intrusted the work of preparing a new poetic version of the Book of Psalms. He took an important part in the performance of this duty. The work was approved in 1778, and still continues in use in the Reformed Church of Holland. It possesses a high degree of poetic merit. His income, both at Lillo and Veere, was small, which, with a numerous family to support, was the source of many trials and perplexities. Accepting an appointment as preacher in Batavia, in the Dutch East India possessions, he went thither in 1778, accompanied by his wife and five children. He was cordially received, and an agreeable field of labor was opened to him. He labored here with redoubled zeal and success, but the climate was adverse to his health, and in 1780, after the short space of two years, he rested from his labors on earth. A philological essay, dedicated to the Holland Society of Sciences, and published in 1755, was regarded as highly creditable to him in a linguistic point of view, and as evidencing a philosophic spirit. His History of Church Psalmody, published in 1777, is said to exhibit extensive historical knowledge, combined with good taste. He seems to have excelled in various departments of knowledge. See B. Glasius, Goedgedacht H. Iperen, A. Bouman, Gedachtenis der Geldersche Hoogeschool, ii. (J. P. W.)

Iphedel'ah (Heb. Fikpháy, יִפְדֶלָה, set free by Jehovah; Sept. Ἱφαδέλπη, one of the "seventy" of Shashah, and a chief of the tribe of Benjamin resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii. 25). B.C. post 1612 and ante 588.

Ir (Heb. id. יָרָא, a city; Sept. ὑπ. v. r. Year, Yulg. Hir), the father of Shuphim (Shupham) and Huphim (Hupham), of the tribe of Benjamin (1 Chron. vii. 12); probably identical with one of the sons of Benjamin (Gen. xvi. 21), and therefore not (as often supposed) the poet of the 42nd Psalm, v. 7, but one of the 15 officers. See IRAB. Also comp. IR-I-NASH, IR-IMESHES, etc.

Ira (Heb. Ira, יִרָא, citizen, otherwise watchful; Sept. ἦρα, ἵρα, ὑπάτη, the father of David's favorite officers.

1. Son of Ikkeia, a Tekoite, and one of David's thirty famous warriors (2 Sam. xxiii. 26; 1 Chron. xi. 26). He was afterwards placed in command of the seventh regiment of foot troops (1 Chron. xxi. 26, B.C. 1006).

2. Jethro, another of David's thirty chief heroes (2 Sam. xxiii. 38; 1 Chron. xi. 40). B.C. 1046.

3. A Jairite and priest (172, A. V. "chief ruler").

but its towns were distributed politically under other provinces. Ptolemy ranks them in Asia Proper, while Strabo (xiv. 681), Flinn (H. N. Y., 81), and Mela (17) speak of Ionia as a distinct territory. In the account which Josephus gives (Ant. xvi, 2, 3) of the appeal of the Jews in Ionia to Agrippa for exemption from certain oppressions to which they were exposed, the ancient country is referred to as the ancient Greek nation being still called, the cathedral, and the monks his chapter. No building now remains on the island which can claim to have sheltered St. Columba or his disciples. The most ancient ruins are the Laithriean, or Foundations, in a little church of Port-a-Church, the Cobhuis, Cudich or Calves' Cell, in a hollow between Dunil and Dunbhurg; the rash or hill-fort of Dunbhurg; and the Ghearn-an-Tempull, or Glen of the Church, in the middle of the island, believed to be the site of the monastery which the Irish bishops destroyed in 1208. St. Oran's Chapel, now the oldest church in the island, may probably be of the latter part of the 11th century. St. Mary's Nunnery is perhaps a century later. The Cathedral, or St. Mary's Church, seems to have been built chiefly in the early part of the 12th century. It has a choir, with a sacristy on the north side, and chapels on north and south transepts; a central tower about seventy-five feet high, and a nave. An inscription on one of the columns of the choir appears to denote that it was the work of an Irish ecclesiastic who died in 1202. On the north of the cathedral are the chapter-house and other remains of the conventual or monastic buildings. In the "Rooling Orran"—so called, it is supposed, from St. Oran, a kinsman of St. Columba, the first who found a grave in it—were buried Ecfrid, king of Northumbria, in 846; Godred, king of the Isles, in 1188; and Haco Ospar, king of the Isles, in 1228. No monuments of these remains now remain. The oldest of the many tomb-stones on the island are two with Irish inscriptions, one of them, it is believed, being the monument of a bishop of Connor who died at Iona in 1174.—Chambers, Cyclop. v. 619; Duke of Argyll, in Good Words, Sept. 1, 1889, p. 614 sq.; Princeton Rep. 1897, p. 1-22. See also COLMEN.
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e. royal chaplain (2 Sam. xx, 26). B.C. cir. 1022. As he was not of the sacerdotal family, the Rabbins hold that he was only one of David's cabinet. See Jair.

Trad (Heb. Ira'd, 'y"r, perf. runner; Seq. R"d, apparently by erroneously reading 'y"r; Joseph. Tapeb'q, Ant. i, 8, 4; Vulg. Ira'd), one of the antediluvian patriarchs, of the Cunite line, son of Enoch and father of Mehujael (Gen. iv, 18). B.C. considerably post 4045.

'iram (Heb. 'iram', 'r, v. o. watchful; Sept. H"r, but Taqwe in Gen. xxvi, 49; Vulg. Hiram), the last-named of the Edomite phylarchs in Mount Seir, apparently contemporary with the Horite kings (Gen. xxvi, 45; 1 Chron. i, 54). B.C. perhaps cir. 1618. See Pema'amac.

Ireland, the more western of the two principal islands of which the kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland is composed, is between lat. 51° 25' and 55° 28' N., and long. 6° 20' and 10° 20' W. Area, 32,515 sq. miles. At the time when the island became known to the Greeks and the Romans, the inhabitants were Celta. Of Celtic origin is the original name of Erin, which means "West Side," and was changed by the Greeks into Ierne, and by the Romans, who made no endeavors to subjugate the island, into Hibernia. During the whole period of the rule of the Romans over Brittany the history of Ireland is shrouded in mystery. As according to later chronicles, Ireland is said to have had in the 3d century five states, Momonia, Conacua, Lagenia, Ultunia, and Modia (Meath). As the people were akin to the Celta of Scotland, Ireland was, until the 4th century, often called Great Scotland (Scotia maior). Christianity appears to have been brought to Ireland at an early time, perhaps as early as the 2d century. A reference to Ireland is, in particular, found in the words of Tertullian, who says that parts of the British islands which had never been visited by the Romans were Christian. In the 4th century a number of churches and schools are mentioned, and even before the 4th century missionaries went out from Ireland. Celestius, the friend and colaborer of Pelagius, was, according to Jerome, an Irishman, and the son of Christian parents. That the Irish had received their Christianity not from Rome, but from the East, is shown by their aversion against the institutions of the Church of Rome. The first Roman missionary, who about 340 was sent to Ireland by pope Celestius, was not well received, and had soon to return to Scotland. Two years later (402), the Scotch monk St. Patrick (q. v.) arrived in Ireland. He had spent his youth in Ireland as a slave, and had subsequently lived for some time in Gaul. With great zeal he preached Christianity throughout Ireland, converted several, and was, in particular, active for the establishment of convents, so that Ireland was called the island of the Saints. He settled finally as bishop of Armagh, which see thus received metropolitan power over all Ireland. According to some writers (Wilsch, Kirchl. Statistik, ii, 48), Ireland was, however, without its own archbishop, being, until the 12th century, subject to the archbishop of Canterbury; according to others, as early as 406 four metropolitan sees at Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam. Certain it is that the permanent division of Ireland into the four ecclesiastical provinces of Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam took place about 1150 (according to Moroni in 1152, at the Council of Melfont; section of Easter to the practice of the Roman Church, instead of following, as heretofore, the rite of the Eastern churches. The Irish made a long resistance, until, in 717, the monks in Iona (q. v.) were on this account either expelled or coerced into submission. Most of the Irish churches then submitted; yet, as late as the 12th century, some monks were found who adhered to the Eastern practice of celebrating Easter. In the 9th century the Irish Church considerably distanced the Other in the proportion of the Conversions of the Northmen, who destroyed many churches, and burned manuscripts and convents. These invasions were followed by a period of anarchy, during which the moral condition of the Irish clergy greatly degenerated. The complaints of Rome at this time referred chiefly to the peculiar cistological practices depopulated the Irish - the marriage of the clergy, the administration of baptism without chrismas, and the use of their own liturgy. The legates of the popes finally succeeded in obtaining the entire submission of the Irish Church to the Church of Rome about the middle of the 12th century, which until then is believed to have been preserved. The Irish clergy were condemned, sacrifice of the mass, and indulgences, and to have celebrated the Lord's Supper in both kinds. In 1155 a bull of pope Hadrian IV allowed king Henry II of England to subject Ireland, the king, in turn, promising the pope to pay the papal privilege. In 1172, a synod at Cashel regulated the ecclesiastical affairs in accordance with the wishes of Rome. During the time of the following kings of the house of Plantagenet the clergy were in a deplorable condition: the bishops carried the sword, and lived with their clergy in open and sequestered. The most extraordinary example of this is apparent from what they had been in former times, traversed the country as troublesome beggars, molesting the priests as well as the laity. When Henry VIII undertook to make himself the head of the Church in his dominions he met in Ireland with a violent opposition. The separation of the English church was more popular as it was intended that henceforth only such priests as understood the English language would be appointed. The Englishman, George Brown, who was appointed bishop of Dublin, met, therefore, in spite of his position, a passionate labor in behalf of the Reformation, with but little success. The English liturgy was introduced in 1551, under Edward VI, but the order to hold divine service in the English language seems not to have been executed. The gerrms of Protestantism were wholly destroyed under the government of Mary. The people, it seems, were not prepared for the Reformation, and the clergy were not as corrupt as in many other countries. Moreover, there were among the ministers who had been sent to Ireland as Protestant missionaries many adventurers, who, by disputable conduct, strengthened the aversion of the people to Protestantism. Under the government of Elizabeth the government was issued in 1560 to introduce the general use of the English liturgy and of the English language at divine service. Some years later, however, concessions appear to have been made in favor of the old Irish language. In 1602 the first translation of the New Testament into the Irish language by William Daniel appeared, but the translation of the whole Bible was not finished until 1655. The persistent endeavors of the English government to extirpate the native language established a close union between the Irish nationality and the language of Rome. The excitement against England greatly increased when Elizabeth sought to confiscate the whole property of the Roman Catholic Church in behalf of the Protestant clergy. A number of revolts consequently occurred, which found a vigorous support on the part of the pope and the Spanish court. A Protestant policy was not only condemned by the English lord lieutenant, Sir John Perrot, for thoroughly Anglicizing Ireland, but was rejected as being too expensive, and thus England was compelled to maintain at a heavy expense a large military force in Ireland. In 1555 the chieftain Hugh O'Neill, whom Elizabeth had made earl of Tyrone, placed himself at the head of a host of 30,000 men, which was mainly supported by Irish soldiers who had returned from military service in foreign countries. The earl of Essex, with an army of 22,000 men, was unable to withstand the attack of the Irish army. June 11, 1556, the battle was fought at the head of the town of Kinsale, where the English were completely defeated. The king of Spain, who had advanced against Ireland, was defeated by the small forces of the earl of Essex at the battle of Kinsale. The king of Spain, who had advanced against Ireland, was defeated by the small forces of the earl of Essex at the battle of Kinsale. The king of Spain, who had advanced against Ireland, was defeated by the small forces of the earl of Essex at the battle of Kinsale.
to quell the insurrection; but his successor, Lord Mountjoy, was more successful, and pacified the whole island. In 1601 the Irish again rose, aided by Spanish troops under Aguila and Ocampo; but the combined forces of Ocampo and O’Niel were, on Dec. 24, 1601, totally defeated. Meanwhile English troops had landed in Ireland in January, 1602, and O’Niel made peace with the English. At the death of Elizabeth the whole of Ireland was under English rule. As a large number of Irish had perished in this conflict, 500,000 acres of land were confiscated in favor of English colonists. In view of the onerous speculations of the Chief Justice, Plunkett, and of the native Irish, the government of Elizabeth proceeded with equal severity against both: the public exercise of the Catholic religion was totally forbidden, and every inhabitant, under penalty of twelve pence, was commanded to be present at divine service celebrated in the Anglican churches. Decreets in this provoked a general dissatisfaction, which was carefully fomented by the Jesuits of the University of Douay, in the Netherlands (now belonging to France). On the accession of James I to the English throne the papal policy was very much opposed, and in 1604 a large number of French Protestant ministers from many places, and re-established the service of the Catholic Church. These attempts were forcibly suppressed, and new insurrections consequently were caused, all of which proved of short duration. In order to break the power of the Catholic chieftais, the government of James I, supported by example of Queen Elizabeth, was especially intent upon wresting from them their landed property. Whoever was unable to prove, by means of a bill of sequestration, his title to his property, lost it. Thus, in the northern part of Ireland alone, about 800,000 acres were confiscated by the crown, which sold them to English speculators and to Scottish colonists. Among those who founded the town of Londonderry. From this time dates the predominance of Protestantism in Ulster, the northern province of Ireland. At the same time, however, many most beneficent measures were taken for improving the social condition of the people. The English law supplanted the previous lawslessness; all inhabitants were declared to be free citizens, and the country was divided into parishes. In 1615 an Irish National Parliament was called to sanction these measures. In consequence of the interference of the government, there were among the 126 members of the lower house only 101 Catholics, while the upper house, consisting of 50 members, consisted almost entirely of Protestants. The Catholics were, moreover, excluded from the public offices, because most of them refused (hence their name "Recusants") to take the oath of supremacy, which was required of all who held the king of England. At the beginning of the reign of Charles I the Anglican Church was nevertheless in a deplorable condition. Many churches were destroyed, the bishoprics impoverished, the clergy ignorant, indolent, and impoverished. A convocation called in 1604 adopted the 39 articles of the Church of England, and retained the 104 articles of the Irish Church which had been adopted by the Parliament of 1615. The constitution of the Church of Ireland was defined in 100 canons, which were of a somewhat more liberal character than the 141 canons of the Church of England. The Roman Catholic Church, however, was allowed all her service in private houses, and many priests who had fled returned. At the same time the Irish nationality continued to be persecuted, and a number of new confiscations were added to the old ones. On Oct. 23, 1644, a body of insurgents broke out under the leadership of Roger More, O’Neale, and lord Maguire, the descendants of former chieftais. Within a few days from 40,000 to 50,000 Protestant Englishmen were murdered (according to other accounts the number of killed amounted to only 6000), and an equally large number is said to have perished in the attempt to flee. The English ordered the confiscation of two and a half million acres of land, but, in consequence of its conflict with the king, was unable to achieve anything. The king’s lieutenant, the marquis of Ormond, concluded peace with the Catholic Irish, who received the promise of religious toleration, and, in return, furnished to the king an army against the Parliament. When, after the execution of the king, the Catholic chiefs fled to France, the Protestant Irish for the prince of Wales as king Charles II, the English Parliament sent an army of 10,000 men under Cromwell to Ireland, which conquered the whole island. The Catholics were punished with the utmost severity: all their landed property, about 5,000,000 acres, confiscated; about 10,000 priests were banished, and 40,000 others compelled to flee to Spain and France. The celebration of Catholic service was forbidden, and all Catholic priests ordered to quit Ireland within twenty days. The restoration of royalty caused no important changes in the condition of the people. Religious persecution ceased by order of Charles II, but the Protestants remained in possession of the confiscated property. The accession of the Catholic James II filled the Irish Catholics with the greatest hopes, and when, after his expulsion, he landed, at the beginning of 1698, with a priest army of 50,000 men, he was received by the Catholics with enthusiasm. His army in a short time numbered more than 38,000 men, and he succeeded in capturing all the fortified places except Enniskillen and Londonderry. Large numbers of Protestants had to leave the country because their lives and property were threatened. Soon, in order to secure the succession of William III over the Catholic party on the Boyne River, near Drogheda (July 1, 1690), and near Aughrim (July 13, 1691), completed the subjugation of Ireland. The peace concluded with the British general Ginkel at the surrender of Limerick promised to the Irish the free exercise of their religion and property under King William III. While James II had deprived 2400 Protestant landowners of their estates, now more than 12,000 Irishmen who had fought for James voluntarily went into exile. A resolution of the English Parliament ordered all the Protestants to sell their land, which were distributed among the Protestants, who began to organize themselves into Orange societies. A number of rigorous and cruel penal laws were passed in order to exterminate the national spirit and the Roman Catholic Church. Bishops and other high dignitaries were exiled; the priests were confined to their own counties; all institutions in the Catholic religion and its public exercise were forbidden; the Catholic Irishmen were not allowed to own horses of higher value than £5, or to marry Protestants, and were excluded from public offices. The irritation produced by these laws was still increased when James II, as king of England, was asked to take the crown of Ireland. The duty on the exports from Ireland, dealt a heavy blow to the commerce and prosperity of the island, and when, in 1727, it deprived the Catholic Irish of the franchise. These harsh measures soon led to the establishment of several secret societies, as the "Defenders," the "Whiteboys" (about 1730), so called from the white shirts which they threw over their other clothes when at night they attacked unpopular landlords and their officers; and the "Hearts of Oak" (about 1768). During the American War of Independence, the Irish, under the pretext that the French might avail themselves of the withdrawal of most of the British troops from the island, formed a volunteer army, which, in the course of two years, increased to 50,000 men. Monster petitions, numerously signed by Irish Protestants also, demanded the abolition of the penal laws, the restoration of the privileges enjoyed by the Irish before the English Parliament, and the relief of Irish commerce. Fear of a general insurrection induced the Parliament to mitigate the penal laws, and to allow the Catholics to establish schools, to own landed property, and to exercise their religious worship. The onerous tithes which the Catholics had to pay to the Established Church of England and the Parliament was another secret society, the "Right Boys," who, by means of oaths and threatened vengeance, endeavored to in-
timidate the Catholics from paying tithes. A still more dangerous movement was called forth by the outbreak of the French Revolution. The league of "United Irishmen," which, in November, 1791, was formed at Dublin by former members of the volunteer army, endeavored, in union with the French convent, to make Ireland an independent republic. When the Catholics, at a meeting of Dublin merchants, demanded with Protestants, the British Parliament abolished several penal laws, and gave to the Catholics the right of becoming attorneys-at-law and of marrying Protestants. In 1738 the law was abolished which fined the Catholics for neglecting to attend the Protestant Church on Sundays. In 1794 he were permitted to hold lower public offices, and received the right to vote. The United Irishmen, nevertheless, assumed a threatening attitude, and a French corps of 25,000 men, under General Hoche, landed in Ireland. The latter had, however, to leave again in December, 1796, and a new insurrection, which broke out in May, 1798, was unsuccessful.

In 1800 the Irish Parliament, bribed by the English Parliament, consented to the legislative union of Ireland with Great Britain, and in the next year the first united Parliament of Great Britain and Ireland assembled in Westminster. It was in principle the union of the Anglican churches in the two countries, which now received the name of the United Church of England and Ireland. Several further concessions were, however, about this time made to the Catholics. In 1796 a Catholic theological seminary had been established in the British ministry; but it was not until 1838 that the Catholic priests were educated upon British territory they would be less hostile to British rule. The rules against convents were also moderated, and at the close of the 19th century the Dominican order alone had in Ireland about forty-three convents. In 1865 the Catholic Association was formed to secure the complete political emancipation of the Catholics. It soon became the centre of all political movements in Ireland, and, as the Orange lodges began likewise to be revived, frequent disturbances between Catholics and Protestants took place. In 1825 both associations were dissolved by the British government; but the Catholic association was once reorganized by O'Connell, and gained considerable influence upon the elections. The unceasing agitation of O'Connell, aided by the moral support of the Liberal party in England, finally succeeded in inducing the British ministry to lay before Parliament a bill of emancipation, which passed after violent debates, and was signed by George IV on April 18, 1829. The oath which the members of Parliament had to take was so changed that Catholics also could take it. At the same time they obtained access to all public offices, with the only exception of that of lord chancellor. This victory encouraged the Catholics to demand further concessions; in particular, the abolition of the tithes paid to the Protestant clergy, and the repeal of the legislative union between Great Britain and Ireland. In 1828 the British government authorized the Irish Coercion Bill, which authorized the lord lieutenant of Ireland to forbid mass meetings and to proclaim martial law. When the liberal ministry of Melbourne rescinded the Coercion Bill and began to pursue a conciliatory policy towards Ireland, O'Connell dissolved the Repeal Association, Earl Mulgrave, since 1855 lord lieutenant of Ireland, filled the most important offices with Catholics, and in 1856 suppressed all the Orange lodges.

In 1858 the British Parliament adopted the Tithe Bill. When, in August, 1841, the government fell again into the hands of the Tory, O'Connell renewed the repeal agitation so violently that in 1845 he was arrested and sentenced to one year's imprisonment, a sentence which was, however, annulled by the Court of Pears. The repeal agitation ended suddenly by the death of O'Connell in 1857, because no competent successor in the leadership of the party could be found. It was followed by the ascendency of the more radical Young Ireland party, which did not, like O'Connell, court an alliance with the Catholic Church, but preferred to it an outspoken sympathy with the radical Republicans of France, and is on that account not so much interwoven with the ecclesiastical history of Ireland as the movements of O'Connell.

The ultramontane doctrines taught in the seminary of Maynooth called forth an agitation in Protestant England for a repeal of the annual subsidy which that seminary received from the British government. New offence was given to the bishops and the ultramontane party by the constitution of the Catholic denominational "Queen's Colleges." The bishops at the time they were denounced the colleges as "godless," and warned all Catholic parents against them; they could, however, not prevent that ever from the beginning the majority of the students in these colleges were children of Catholic parents. The disregard of the episcopal orders showed a decline of priestly influence upon a considerable portion of the Catholic Irishmen. This decline of priestly influence became still more apparent when, during the civil war in the United States, the Fenian organization was formed for the express purpose of making Ireland an independent republic. As it was made against English rule in Ireland, the new organization, like all its predecessors, had to direct its attacks promingly against the Established Church of Ireland, and thus appeared to have to some extent an anti-Protestant character; but, being a secret society, it was excluded from the communications of political parties. As the Church was so completely in the power of the Irish bishops. The general sympathy with which it nevertheless met among the Catholic Irishmen both of Ireland and the United States is therefore a clear proof that the Catholics of Ireland no longer obey the orders of the bishops. The Established Church of Ireland, regarding itself as the legitimate successor of the medieval Catholic Church, and taking possession of all her dioceses, parishes, and Church property, retained for a long time the same diocesan and parochial divisions as the Roman Catholic Church. As late as 1883, the Church, notwithstanding its small membership, had 4 archbishops and 18 bishops: namely, Armagh, with 5 bishops; Dublin, with 4 bishops; Tuam, with 4 bishops; and Cashel, with 5 bishops. The income of these 22 archbishops and bishops was estimated at £180,000 to £185,000. In 1883 the first decisive step was taken towards reducing the odious prerogatives of the Established Church. The number of archbishops was reduced to two, Armagh and Dublin, and the number of bishops to ten, five for each archbishop. As the income was very unequally distributed, all the benefits yielding more than £200 had a tax of from ten to fifteen per cent. imposed upon them, the proceeds of which were employed for church building, raising the income of poor clergy, and other ecclesiastical purposes. In 1868, the English House of Commons, on motion of Mr. Gladstone, resolved to abolish the Church of Ireland. The proposition was rejected by the House of Lords. Public opinion expressed itself, however, so strongly against the continuance of the privileges of the Irish Church, that the report of the royal commissioners on the revenues and condition of the Church of Ireland (dated July 27, 1869, recommending reductions as to the benefits of the Irish Church. This report, a volume of more than 600 pages, is replete with interesting information, and is one of the best sources of information concerning the condition of the Church at this time. It states that the total revenue of the Church of Ireland, in 1868, amounted to £13,197, and in 1861 benefited a church population of over forty persons, and extending to 5000 and upwards. Four bishops were suggested for abolition, namely, Meath, Killaloe, Cashel, and Kilmurry. The commissioners were in favor of leaving one archbishop only, that of Armagh. All bishops were to receive £3000 a year in-
ome, and an additional £500 when attending Parliament. The primates was to get £6000, and the archbishop of Dublin, if continued, £5000. The abolition of all cathedrals and deaneries except eight was recommended. With a view to rearrangement of benefices, it was proposed that ecclesiastical commissioners should have extended jurisdiction. A bill was introduced to vest all benefices not having a Protestant population of forty were to be suppressed. The estates of all capular bodies and of the bishoprics abolished were to be vested in ecclesiastical commissioners, and the surplus of all property vested in them to be applicable at their discretion to augmentation of benefices. The ecclesiastical commission was to be modified by the introduction of three unpaid laymen and two paid commissioners, one appointed by the crown, the other by the primates. The management of all lands was to be taken out of the hands of ecclesiastical persons and placed in those of the ecclesiastical commissioners.

Mr. Gladstone having become, towards the close of the year 1868, prime minister, introduced in March, 1869, a new bill for the disestablishment and disendowment of the Irish Church. It passed a second reading in the House of Commons, after a long and exciting debate, by a vote of 368 to 230, showing a majority in favor of the passage of 118; and in the House of Lords by a majority of 38 in a house of 300 members. The amendments adopted by the House of Lords were nearly all rejected by the Commons, and on July 26 it received the royal assent. The bill, which contains sixty clauses, is entitled "A Bill to put an end to the establishment of the Church of Ireland, and to make provision in respect to the temporalities thereof, and in respect to the royal College of Maynooth." The disestablishment was to be total, but was not to take place until Jan. 1, 1870, when the ecclesiastical courts were to be abolished, the ecclesiastical laws to cease to have any authority, the bishops to be no longer peers of Parliament, and all ecclesiastical corporations in the country to be dissolved. The disendowment was technically and legally to be total and immediate. Provision was made for preserving up the ecclesiastical commission, and the constitution of a new commission, composed of ten members, in which the whole property of the Irish Church was to be vested from the day the measure received the royal assent. A distinction was made between public endowments (valued at £15,500,000), including everything in the nature of a state grant or revenue, which were to be resumed by the state, and private endowments (valued at £500,000), which were defined as money contributed from private sources since 1690, which were to be restored to the disestablished Church. Provision was made for compensation to vested interests, including those connected with Maynooth College and the Presbyterians who were in receipt of the regium donum. Among these interests, the largest in the aggregate were those of incumbents, to each of whom was secured during his life, provided he continued to discharge the duties of his benefice, the amount to which he was entitled, deducting the amount he might have paid for curates, or the interest might under certain circumstances, be commuted, upon his application for a life annuity. Other personal interests provided for were those of curates, permanent and temporary, and lay compensations, including claims of parish clerks and sextons. The amount of the Maynooth grant and the regium donum was to be valued at fourteen years' purchase, and a capital sum equal to it handed over to the respective representatives of the Presbyterians and of the Roman Catholics. The aggregate of these amounts would amount to about £3,000,000, leaving about £7,500,000, placing an annual income of about £30,000,000 at the disposal of Parliament. This was to be appropriated "mainly to the relief of unavoidable calamity and suffering, but in such a way as not to interfere with the obligation imposed upon property by the poor laws." A constitution for the disestablished church was adopted by a General Convention, held in Dublin in 1870. The Church will be governed by a General Synod, consisting of a House of Bishops and a House of Clerical and Lay Delegates. The House of Bishops has the right of veto, and their veto prevails also at the next synod; but seven bishops must agree upon a veto to make it valid. The bishops will be elected by the Diocesan Convention, but the House of Bishops will in all cases be the court of selection when the Diocesan Synod does not elect by a majority of two thirds of each order a clergyman to fill the vacant see. The primates (archbishop of Armagh) shall be elected by the Bench of Bishops out of their own number. The property of the Church is to be vested in a "Representative Church Body," which is to be permanent. It is to be composed of three classes: the ex-officio, or archbishops and bishops; the elected members, who are to consist of one clerical and two lay representatives for each diocese; and the co-opted members, who are to consist of persons elected in number to each diocese, and to be elected by the ex-officio and representative members. The elected members are to retire in the proportion of one third by rotation. The Convention also adopted a resolution against the introduction of the ritualistic practices which have crept into the Established Church of England.

The following table shows the population connected with the Anglican Church, according to the official census of 1881, in each of the counties, together with the number of Roman Catholics, and the population of other religious denominations in each:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Roman Catholics</th>
<th>Anglican Total</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Protestant Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Roman Catholic Church in Ireland is governed by four archbishop, whose sees are in Armagh, Dublin, Cashel, and Tuam, and two other bishops; they are all nominated by the pope, generally out of a list of three names submitted to him by the parish priests and chapter of the vacant diocese, and reported on by the archbishops and bishops of the province. In case of expected incapacity from age or infirmity, the bishop names a coadjutor, who is usually confirmed by the pope, with the right of succession. In many of the dioceses
a chapter and cathedral corps have been revived, the dean being appointed by the cardinal protector at Rome. The diocesan dignitaries are the vicars-general, of whom there are one, two, or three, according to the extent of the diocese, who have special disciplinary and other powers; vicars-forane, whose functions are more restricted; the archdeacon, and the parish priests or incumbents. All of these, as well as the bishop, are appointed by the bishop. The whole of the clergy are supported solely by the voluntary contributions of their flocks. The episcopal emoluments arise from the mensal parish or two, the incumbency of which is retained by the bishop, from marriage licenses, and from the considerations of 2d to 7d per annum, varying to £10 or £15 paid by each incumbent in the diocese. The 2425 civil parishes in Ireland are amalgamated into 1073 ecclesiastical parishes or unions, being 445 livingless than in the Anglican Church. The incomes of the parish priests arise from fees on marriages, baptisms, and deaths, and Easter and Christmas dues, and from incidental voluntary contributions either in money or labor. The number of priests in Ireland in 1833 was 2291 (of whom 1222 were educated at Maynooth College); in 1869 it was 3053. The curates of the parish priests form more than half the whole clerical society dispersed through the cities and towns are 70 or 80 communities of priests of various religious orders or rules, hence called Regulars, who minister in their own churches, and, though without parochial jurisdiction, greatly aid the secular clergy. All the places of public worship are built by subscriptions, legacies, and donations. There are numerous monasteries and convents; the latter are supported partly by sums, usually from £300 to £500, paid by those who take the vows in them, and partly by the fees for the education of the daughters of respectable Roman Catholics. Various communities of monks and nuns also devote themselves to the gratuitous education of the children of the poor. Candidates for the priesthood, formerly under the necessity of obtaining their education in continental colleges, are now educated at home. The principal clerical college is that of Maynooth, which was founded in 1795 as Royal College of St. Patrick at Maynooth. The Irish Parliament made it to an annual grant of £14,000; the English Parliament sanctioned the grant, but reduced it to £8927, out of which the professors and 450 students were supported. The Irish lord Dunboyne founded 20 scholarships in 1845, the government, under the administration of Sir Robert Peel, raised the annual grant to £26,000; more recently this sum was again raised to £38,000. In 1869, when the Anglican Church was disestablished, a capital sum equal to the amount of the Maynooth grant, valued at fourteen years' purchase, was handed over to the representatives of the Roman Catholic Church. The Roman Catholic University at Dublin was established at a synodical meeting of the Catholic bishops held on May 18, 1854. At a conference held in 1863 the bishops resolved to enlarge the university, and to erect a new building at the cost of £100,000. There are besides the Catholic colleges of St. Patrick, Carlow; St. Jarlath, Tuam; St. John's, Waterford; St. Peter's, Wexford; St. Colman's, Fermoy; St. Patrick's, Armagh; St. Patrick's, Thurles; St. Kyran's, Kilkenny; St. Mel, Longford; All Hallows (devoted exclusively to prepare priests for foreign missions), and Clonfert, Dublin, all supported by voluntary contributions.

There are also for the education of Irish priests two colleges in Rome, the Irish College and the College of St. Isidore, and one in Paris. The number of religious communities of men has decreased during the last hundred years. The Dominicans, at the time of Benedict XIV, had 29 houses, in 1890 only 18 houses, with about 50 monks; the Augustines had formerly 28, now 11 convents; the Carmelites have 19 houses, formerly 167; the Jesuits 5 colleges, 1 home, and 79 members; the Lazarists, Passionists, and Redemptorists 2 houses each; the brothers of the Christian Schools have a large number of institutions. The following is a statistical summary of the Roman Catholic Church in Ireland in 1889:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>House of Parliament</th>
<th>Houses of Clergy, Or Commissions of Priests</th>
<th>Total Priests</th>
<th>Houses of Priests, Or Commissions of Convents</th>
<th>Houses of Women, Or Commissions of Convents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Armagh Province</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>5810</td>
<td>834</td>
<td>93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dublin Province</td>
<td>1168</td>
<td>1918</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashel and Emly</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cork</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>186</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Killarney</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Limerick</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterford's Island</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roscommon</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuam</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cloyne</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town Prov.</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>2808</td>
<td>4216</td>
<td>656</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first Presbytery in Ireland was formed at Carrickfergus in 1642, and gave rise to the Synod of Ulster. The Presbytery Synod of Minster was formed about 1660. The Presbytery of Antrim separated from the Synod of Ulster in 1717, and the Remonstrant Synod in 1829. A number of seceders formed themselves into the succession Synod of Ireland about 1780. In 1840, the General and Succession Synods, having united, assumed the name of the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland, comprising, in 1888, 600 congregations, arranged under 87 presbyteries. The ministers were supported by voluntary contributions, the rents of seats and pews, and the interest of the regium domum, or royal gift. This was first granted in 1672 by Charles II, and in 1869 26 (first class) ministers received from the state £92 2s. 6d. each, and 551 (second class) £50 4s. 6d. each per annum. As the ministers in the first class died, their successors only received the latter amount. The regium domum, as annual grant, was abolished by the Irish Church Bill, but a capital sum equal to the amount of the domum, valued at fourteen years' purchase, was handed over to the representatives of the Presbyterian body. The total sum for regium domum voted by Parliament for the year ending March 31, 1869, was £40,547. The minutes of the General Assembly for 1869 state that in the year ending March 31 there were 628 ministers (besides 51 licentiates and ordained ministers without charge), 560 congregations, and 262 manes. The seat rents produced £58,011; the stipends paid to ministers, £37,583; raised for building or repairing churches, manes, and schools, £17,820; Sabbath collections, £13,575; mission collections, £12,124; other charitable collections, £6,835. The Congregational Debt was £53,167. The Presbyterians have the General Assembly's College at Belfast, and Magee College at Londonderry. The latter was opened Oct. 10, 1865. In the year 1840, Mrs. Magee, widow of the late Rev. William Magee, Presbyterian minister of Largan, left £20,000 in trust for the erection and endowment of a Presbyterian college. This sum was allowed to accumulate for some
IRELAND

years, until eventually the trustees were authorized, by a decree of the lord chancellor, to select a convenient site at or near the city of Londonderry. The citizens of Derry subscribed upwards of £5000 towards the erection of the building, which cost about £10,900. The Irish Society have granted an annual endowment of £250 of the revenue of Derry, on the ground that, contrary to its usages and code of discipline, it required from its members in 1827 and 1828 submission to certain doctrinal tests and overtures of human invention. There are 4 presbyteries and 27 congregations in this synod.

The Reformed Presbyterian Synod of Ireland, consisting of 4 presbyteries and 25 congregations, is unconnected with the General Assembly. It did not participate in the regnum donum.

United Presbytery or Synod of Munster.—This body was formed in 1869 by the junction of the Southern Presbytery of Munster with the Presbytery of Munster, and is one of the three non-subscribing Presbyterian bodies of Ireland, the other two being the Presbytery of Antrim (now consisting of 11 congregations) and the Reformed Synod of Ulster. A few years ago these three bodies united to form the "General Non-subscribing Presbytery of the General Association of the Church of Ireland," for the promotion of their common principles, the right of private judgment, and non-subscription to creeds and confessions of faith. The General Association meets triennially for these objects, while the three bodies of which it is composed retain their respective names and independent existence, being governed by their own rules and regulations.

The Irish Conference of the Wesleyan Methodist Connection of Great Britain numbered in 1869 19,659 members, 827 members on trial, and 174 ministers. The president of the British Conference is also president of the Irish Conference. The Primitive Methodist Society (also called Church Methodists) numbered in 1869 57,633 members in Ireland. They regard themselves as belonging to the Anglican Church. According to the census of 1861, the total Methodist population of Ireland amounted to 165,797. There were also attached to the Wesleyan Conference, 4,529 Independents, 4,827 Baptists, 3,695 Friends, 18,798 belonging to other sects, and 458 Jews.

The commissioners of public instruction and the census commissioners return the numbers in the principal religious denominations, and their percentage of the general population have been as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Profession</th>
<th>1861</th>
<th>1871</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Par.</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Par.</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irish Church</td>
<td>605,567</td>
<td>618</td>
<td>605,876</td>
<td>624</td>
<td>677</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>685</td>
<td>83</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>2,455,963</td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>2,461,088</td>
<td>7,6</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>593,193</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>598,812</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodist (other denominations)</td>
<td>45,269</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>47,464</td>
<td>0,8</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jews</td>
<td>452</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>453</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3,796,461</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>3,816,731</td>
<td>100,0</td>
<td>484,554</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>532</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The census commissioners of 1861, in their report on religion and education (p. 5), remark that "the Wesleyan Methodists, by a peculiarity of their constitution, although frequenting places of worship distinct from those of the Established Church, very generally declined to be reckoned as dissenters, and were therefore included (by the commissioners of public instruction of 1864) among the members of the Established Church." Between the years 1864 and 1873 the Roman Catholic population showed a decline of 1,390,770 persons—the difference between 4,436,069 in 1864 and 4,625,255 in 1861—or nearly a third of what was their entire number in 1861; and, distributing this loss over the original dioceses (as given in the list of Anglican dioceses), as in the case of the Established Church, we find that it has to be divided among thirty out of the thirty-two, the only exceptions being the dioceses of Dublin and Connor, in both of which the number of Roman Catholics is something in excess of what it was in 1854. The total Roman Catholic population of Ireland in 1854, as it has been estimated, is 3,300,500, in 1861, 4,653,255, and in 1873, 4,635,255; or, rather less than a fifth of their number in 1854. This reduction distributes itself over ten of the thirty-two (original Anglican) dioceses—those, namely, of Achonry, Armagh, Clogher, Connor, Derry, Down, Dromore, Kilfenora, Kilmore, and Raphoe, the total Presbyterian population of which amounted in 1834 to 657,784, and in 1861 to 505,196, showing a reduction of 132,588, or 20.8 per cent. of the original numbers.

In twenty-two dioceses the Presbyterians have very considerably increased, their gross population having been only 5274 in 1854, and 18,095 in 1861, showing an increase in twenty-two dioceses of the members of the Established Church to the general population which had risen since 1854 in twenty-one out of the thirty-two dioceses, had remained stationary in two, and fallen in nine.

In 1861 the grants of public money for the education of the children of the Established Church were to the charge of the lord lieutenant, to be expended on the instruction of the children of every religious denomination, under the superintendence of commissioners appointed by the crown, and named "The Commissioners of National Education." The principles on which the commissioners act are, that the schools shall be open alike to Christians of every denomination; that no pupil shall be required to attend at any religious exercises, or to receive any religious instruction which his parents or guardians do not approve, and that sufficient opportunity shall be afforded to the pupils of each religious persuasion to amount separately, at appointed times, such religious instruction as their parents or guardians think proper. In 1845 the commissioners were incorporated under the name of "The Commissioners of National Education in Ireland," with power to hold lands to the yearly value of £40,000, and to purchase and hold land for the purpose of erecting schools to amount to that amount, to erect and maintain schools where and as many as they shall think proper, to grant leases for three lives or thirty-one years, to sue and to be sued by their corporate name in all courts, and to have a common seal, a power being vested in the lord lieutenant to fill up vacancies, to appoint additional members, provided the total number does not exceed twenty, and to remove members at his pleasure.

The following return gives the number of schools and pupils at different periods, and the amount of parliamentary grants annually voted for their maintenance:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Pupils</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1860</td>
<td>1575</td>
<td>263,480</td>
<td>256,000</td>
<td>353,480</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1861</td>
<td>241,500</td>
<td>380,200</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>515,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1862</td>
<td>150,700</td>
<td>250,800</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>550,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1863</td>
<td>362,500</td>
<td>320,600</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>682,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1864</td>
<td>451,800</td>
<td>380,800</td>
<td>300,000</td>
<td>752,600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The religious denomination of the children who, on Dec. 31, 1888, were on the rolls of the national schools, was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Pupils</th>
<th>Grant</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Irish Church</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman Catholic</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Presbyterian</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other denominations</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

witness to this connection in the following words: "Those opinions, Florinus, that I may speak in mild terms, are not part of sound doctrine; these opinions are not consonant with the Church, and involve their votaries in the utmost impiety; those opinions have never ventured to broach; these opinions the present age has not promulgated, and the sects, who were conversant with the apostles, did not hand down to thee. For, while I was yet a boy, I saw thee in Lower Asia with Polycarp, distinguishing thyself in the royal court, and endeavoring to gain his approbation. You have a more vivid recollection of what occurred at that time when more of life remains, such as the experiences of childhood, keeping pace with the growth of the soul, become incorporated with it, so that I can even describe the place where the beloved Polycarp used to sit and discourse—his going out and coming in—his general mode of life and personal appearance, together with the discourses which he delivered to the people; also how he would speak of his familiar intercourse with John, and with the rest of those who had seen the Lord; and how he would call their words to remembrance... What I heard from him, and what I wrote in a paper, the grace of God, I constantly bring it fresh to my mind." It is not known at what time Irenaeus removed to Gaul, but it is supposed by some that he accompanied Photinus (whom he afterwards succeeded as bishop) on his mission to Gaul to establish churches at Lyons and Vienna. So far as it is certain, that he died about 184, under the papacy of Irenaeus, Lyons under Marcus Aurelius, according to Eusebius (388, p. 171; compare p. 157), and was sent by his people to Eleutherus, bishop of Rome (A.D. 176-192), as a mediator in the Montanistic disputes. While yet on this mission Photinus suffered martyrdom, and Irenaeus was elected as his successor (about A.D. 177). He at once returned and zealously devoted himself, by tongue and pen, for the upbuilding of the Christian Church, so greatly suffering at this time in further Gaul from the persecutions of the heathen government. He is supposed by some to have suffered martyrdom in the persecutions under Septimius Severus, A.D. 202; but the silence of Tertullian and Eusebius, and most of the early Church fathers, makes this point very doubtful.

Irenaeus was the leading representative of the Asiatic Johanian school in the second half of the 2nd century, and was one of the most active of the Catholic apologists against the Gnostic heresy, and the mediator between the Western and Eastern churches. He united a learned Greek education and philosophical penetration with practical wisdom and moderation, and a just sense of the simple essentials in Christianity. We plainly trace in him the influence of the spirit of John, "The voice of one crying in the wilderness," and the teachings of the church at Smyrna, in France, during the latter half of the 2nd century.

II. Writings of Irenaeus. — His writings, which are very extended, covering, in their translation into English, so far as now known, between six and seven hundred pages of the "Ante-Nicene Library" of the Marston, Clark, of Edinburgh, are perhaps the most valuable relic of early Christian literature. We have there a perfect picture of the teaching of the church at Smyrna, as it was preserved in his time, and as it was handed down to him, by the teaching of the bishop Polycarp, and as it was handed down to him, by the teaching of the bishop Polycarp, and as it was handed down to him, by the teaching of the bishop Polycarp. "Through this link he still was connected with the Johannine age. The spirit of his preceptor passed over to him, and misled a former friend of his own, Florinus, who had rejoined to Valentinianism, whom he earnestly endeavored to bring back to the Church, he bore
valled in the primitive Church respecting many most important points. Especially valuable, and the most important of all the writings of Irenæus, is his work Ἐλκυρία καὶ ανατηρητική τῆς ἡγουμένων γνώσεως; generally published under the Latin title De Refutatione et Exercitio Fidei ("A Refutation and Exercitation of Knowledge falsely so called"), and more commonly even under the shorter title of Adversus Haereses ("Against Heresies"). This work, which was mainly directed against the Gnostic error of that day, was composed during the pontificate of Eleutherus, and "is at once a logical and theological masterpiece of the ante-Nicene age, and the richest mine of information respecting the Gnostics, particularly the Valentinian heresy, and the Church doctrine of that age" (Schaaff). The work is divided into five books. The first of these contains a minute description of the tenets of the various heretical sects, with occasional brief remarks in illustration of their absurdity, and in confirmation of the truth to which they were opposed. In his second book, Irenæus proceeded to a more complete demolition of those heresies which he has already explained, and argues at length against them, on grounds principally of reason. The three remaining books set forth more directly the true doctrines of revelation, as being in utter antagonism with the views held by the Gnostic teachers. "In the course of this argument many passages of Scripture are quoted and commented on; many interesting points are made, bearing on the rule of faith, and much important light is shed on the doctrines held, as well as the practices observed by the Church of the 2d century." As an introduction to the study which he describes, and with which he manifestly had taken great pains to make himself familiar, and as an exposé and refutation of them, for which the greatest learning of the writer, acknowledged by nearly all his critics, fortunately coupled with a firm grasp of the doctrines of the Holy Scriptures, especially fitted him, this work is truly invaluable. And though it must be admitted that on some points Irenæus has put forth very strange opinions, it cannot be denied that, upon the whole, Adversus Haereses "contains a vast amount of sound and valuable exposition of Scripture in opposition to the fanciful systems of interpretation which prevailed in his day." The Adversus Haereses was written in Greek, but it is unfortunately no longer extant in the original. The English translator of it for Clark's (Edinburgh) edition says that "it has come down to us only in an ancient Latin version, with the exception of the greater part of the first book, which has been preserved in the original Greek, through means of copious quotations made by Tertullian, Clemens, and Epiphanius. The text, both of the Latin and of the Greek, as far as extant, is often most uncertain, and this has made it a difficult task for translation into English. In all only three MSS. of it are known to exist at present; but there is reason to believe that Erasmus, who printed the first edition of it (1520), had others at hand in his preparation of the work for the press. The Latin version, spoken of above as the only complete version of it, was, according to Dodwell (Illustrt. Iren., 9, 10), prepared in the 4th century; but it is known that Tertullian, in his day, used the same version, and it is highly probable, therefore, that that which is the only Greek text at the beginning of the 3d century. It is certainly to be depled that the other codices which Erasmus must have used have not come down to us, or that they are, at least, not known to us, for they might, perhaps, enable us to determine more accurately the meaning in many passages now quite obscure to us in their barbaric Latin. From 1526, when Erasmus printed his first edition, to 1571, several editions were produced. But all these depended on the ancient barbarous Latin versions, and were moreover defective towards the end by five entire chapters. These first three were not supplied in print by Tertullian, of Paris, in an edition of 1575, which was reprinted in six successive editions Gallusius, a minister of Geneva, also had in 1570 supplied the Latin with the first portions of the Greek text from Epiphanius. In 1702, Grabe, a Prussian, resident in England, published an edition at Oxford, which contained considerable additions to the Greek text, besides some fragments. But his edition was soon followed by that of the Benedictine Massuet (Paris, 1712; Venice, 1724, 2 vol. fol.), since (1857) added to the Migne edition of the fathers, of which, very unfortunately, all the stereotype plates have lately been destroyed by fire. Another edition, containing the additions which have been noted to the text from the Greek, is that of the Berlin, phaumenes of Hippolytus, and thirty-two fragments of a Syriac version of the Greek text of Irenæus, culled from the Nitrian collection of Syriac MSS. in the British Museum, all of which in several instances rectify the readings of the barbarous Latin version, was prepared by Wigan Harvey, at Cambridge, in 1857, under the title S. Irenæus Episcopi Lugdunensis libri quinque adversus Haereses, and may be considered the best now extant. It is also enriched with an introduction of great length, which supplies much valuable information on the sources and phenomena of Gnosticism, and the life and writings of Irenæus. Further more contains numerous extracts which display great research and erudition, and are especially deserving of notice on account of the hypothesis which the writer seeks to establish, that Irenæus understood Syriac, and that the version of the Scriptures used by him in writing his works, as well as the hebrew, were translated from the LXX. This translation was made by H. W. J. Thiersch (in the Studien u. Kritiken, 1843) to translate the Latin version of the first four chapters of the third book back into the original, in order to lead to a better understanding of Irenæus's meaning. Objections to the genuineness of this work of Irenæus were of course made, and the more learned and concerning the theologians, as it is one of the "historic links associating the Christianity of the present day with that of our Lord's apostles and disciples," and a work on which "we depend for satisfactory evidence respecting the canons of the New Testament" (see below, under "Doctrines of Irenæus") would have spared themselves, was quite "inadequate." Besides Adversus Haereses, Irenæus also wrote, according to Eusebius, "several letters against those who at Rome corrupted the doctrine of the Church: one to Blasius, concerning schism; another to Florinus (already alluded to), concerning the monarchy, or to prove that Eusebius and Blasius were correct in number eight," but these are all lost to us with the exception of a few fragments. Eusebius also mentions "a discourse of Irenæus against the Gentiles, entitled Εἰς ιορρηγίας (Concerning Knowledge); another incribed to a brother named Marcianus, being a demonstration of the apostolical preaching; and a little book of sundry disputations;" but these, also, are mainly lost to us. Pfaff, in 1715, discovered at Turin four more Greek fragments, which he attributed to Irenæus as their author. The genuineness of these has been called in question by some Roman divines; "though," says Dr. Schaaff, "without sufficient reason." These fragments treat (1) of true knowledge (Γνωσις αληθινη;) "which consists, not in the true solution of subtle questions, but in divine wisdom and the imitation of Christ;" (2) on the Eucharist; (3) on the duty of toleration in religious points of division; (4) of the Easter difficulties; (4) on the object of the incarnation, "which is stated to be the purging away of sin, and the final annihilation of all evil." An edition containing the Prologomena to the earlier editions, and also the disputations of Maffeii and Pfaff on the fragments of the first three, was published by H. Schlesinger under the title S. Irenæus Episcopi Lugdun. qua super sunt omnium (Lipsa, 1855, 2 vols.).
III. Doctrines.—We have already said that the writings of Irenæus are invaluable to us as an index of the views which the primitive Church of Christ held on many very important points that have become matters of controversy between the different branches of the Christian Church up to our own day. In this, of course, we shall be following the Father of the Church in his extensive work against Heretics, or the Gnostics; and though some of his views, especially on the millennium, may not have our approval, we must none the less commend the whole work for the fervent piety which constantly impregnates us in the perusal of it.

1. God the Father.—The doctrine of the unity of God as the eternal, almighty, omnipotent, just, and holy creator and upholder of all things, which the Christian Church inherited from Judaism, was one which the early Christian writers were especially called upon to vindicate against the absurd, atheistical, paganism of the pagans, and particularly against the dualism of the Gnostics. Accordingly we find most of the creeds of the first centuries, especially the Apostles' and the Nicene, begin with the confession of faith in God, the Father almighty, maker of heaven and earth, of the visible and the invisible, and the sole source of salvation from sin and death, and because of this fundamental doctrine laid down in the very first chapters of the Bible, Irenæus opens his refutation of the Gnostic heresies, saying, in the language of Justin Martyr, that he would not have believed the Lord himself if he had announced any other God than the Creator, because he is, after Polycarp, "the most perfect and the most exalted idea of God, and bases his knowledge wholly on revelation and Christian experience." So also on the doctrine of creation, Irenæus, and with him Tertullian, "most firmly rejected the hylozoic and demiurge views of paganism and Gnosticism, and taught, according to the book of Genesis (comp. Ps. xcvi, 9; cvi, 5; John i, 3), that God made the world, including matter, not, of course, of any material, but out of nothing, or, to express it positively, out of his free, almighty will by his word. This free will of God, a will of love, is the supreme, absolutest law of the universe, and all-conditioning cause and final reason of all existence, precluding every idea of physical force or of eminence. Every creature, since it proceeds from the good and holy God, is itself, in its essence, good (comp. Gen. i, 31)." Evil, therefore, is not an original and substandard deviation from the true, but the result of spiritual enmity, and hence can be destroyed by the power of redemption. Without a correct doctrine of creation there can be no true doctrine of redemption, as all the Gnostic systems show."

2. Person of Christ.—On the relation which Christ sustained to the Father also, the views of Irenæus are important, because he is, after Polycarp, "the most faithful representative of the Johannean school." He certainly "keeps more within the limits of the simple Biblical statements," and in the simpler way of the Western fathers, among whom he may be counted, notwithstanding his early Greek training. "He ventures no such bold speculations as the Alexandrians, but is more sound, and much nearer the Nicene standard. He likewise uses the terms λόγος and Son of God interchangingly, and concedes the distinction, made also by the Valentinians, between the inward and the uttered word, in reference to man, but contemplates the application of it to God, who is above all antitheses, absolutely simple and unchangeable, and in whom before and after, thinking and speaking, coincide. He repudiates also every speculative or a priori attempt to explain the derivation of the Son from the Father; this he holds to be an incomprehensible mystery, and connects the actual distinction between Father and Son by saying that the former is God revealing himself, the latter, God revealed; the one is the ground of revelation, the other is the actual, appearing revelation itself. Hence he calls the Father the invisible of the Son, and the Son the visible of the Father. He discriminates most rigidly the conceptions of generation and of creation. The Son, though begotten of the Father, is still, like him, distinguished from the created world, as increase, without beginning, and eternal—all plainly showing that Irenæus is much nearer the Nicene dogma of the substantial identity of the Son with the Father than Justin and the Alexandrians. If, as he does in several passages, he still subordinates the Father to the Son, and designates the latter as the principal one, he is consistent, and that for want of an accurate distinction between the eternal Logos and the actual Christ. The λόγος Ἰσονῖκος and the λόγος ἕναρκος, expressions like 'My Father is greater than I,' which apply only to the Christ of history, he refers also, like Justin and Irenæus, to the Logos himself. On the other hand, he has been charged with leaning in the opposite direction towards the Sabellian and Patrapiasian views, but unjustly, as Duncker, in his monograph Die Christologie des heiligen Irenaus (p. 50 sq.), has unanswerably shown. Apart from his frequent want of precision, he steers in general, with sure Biblical and churchly tact, equally clear of both extremes, and asserts alike the essential unity and the eternal personal distinction of the Father and the Son. The incarnation of the Logos he ably discusses, viewing it both as a restoration and redemption from sin and death, and the concomitant revelation of God and of the creation of man. In the latter view, as finisher, Christ is the perfect Son of man, in whom the likeness of man to God, the similitudo Dei, regarded as moral duty, in distinction from the image Dei, as an essential property, becomes for the first time a fully real. Standing like a bridge between the two worlds, he is grounded in the original plan of God for the education of mankind, and independent of the fall; it would have taken place even without the fall, though in some other form. Yet Irenæus does not expressly say this; speculation on abstract possibilities was foreign to his realist cast of mind. (Dr. Schaff, i, § 77, 78.)"

We now pass to a consideration of Irenæus's views on the doctrine of Christ's humanity. Here, again, his first task is to refute Gnostic Docetists. "Christ," he contends against them, "must be a man, like us, if he would redeem us from corruption and make us perfect. As in and death came into the world by a man, he could be blotted out legitimately and to our advantage only by a man; though, of course, not by one who should be a mere descendant of Adam, and thus himself stand in need of redemption, but by a second Adam, supernatural in being begotten, and hence not only beyond, but different from the man he is human. A new birth unto life must take the place of the old birth unto death. As the completer, also, Christ must enter into fellowship with us, to be our teacher and pattern. He made himself equal with man, that man, by his likeness to the Son, might become precious in the Father's sight." (Dr. Schaff, still further) conceived the humanity of Christ not as mere corporeality, though he often contends for this alone against the Gnostics, but as true humanity, embracing body, soul, and spirit. He places Christ in the same relation to the regenerate race which Adam bears to the natural, and regards him as the absolute universal man, the prototype and summing up of the whole race. Connected with this is his beautiful thought, found also in Hippolytus in the tenth book of the Philo-phonemen, that Christ made the circuit of all the stages of human life, to redeem and sanctify all. To this idea he so singularly extended the life of Jesus to fifty years, and endeavored to prove his view from the gospels against the Valentinians. The full communion of Christ with men involved his participation in all their evils and sufferings, yea, with the touch of death, even the death of the cross. Also on the doctrine of the mutual relation of the divine and the human in Christ, which was neither specially discussed nor brought to a final, definite settlement until the Christological controversies of the 5th century, Irenæus, in a number of passages, throws out hints which deserve consideration from their importance. "He teaches unequivocally a true and indissoluble union
of divinity and humanity in Christ, and repels the Gnostic idea of a mere external and transient connection of the divine Logos with the human Jesus. The foundation for that union he perceives in the creation of the world by the Logos, and in man's original likeness to God and destination for perfection with him. In the act of union, that is, in the supernatural generation and birth, the divine is the active principle, and the seat of personality; the human, passive or receptive; as, in general, man is absolutely dependent on God, and is the vessel to receive the revelations of his wisdom and love. The medium and bond of the union is the Holy Ghost (see below), who took the place of the masculine agent in the generation, and overshadowed the virgin womb of Mary with the power of the Highest. In this connection he calls Mary the counterpart of Eve, the 'mother of all living' in a higher sense, who, by her believing obedience, became the cause of salvation both to herself and to the whole human race, as Eve, by her disobedience, induced the apostasy and death of mankind—a fruitful parallel, which was afterwards frequently pushed too far, and turned, no doubt, to subserve the contrary to its original sense, to favor the idolatrous worship of the blessed Virgin. Ireneus seems, at least according to Dorrer (Christology, i, 446), to conceive the incarnation as progressive, the two factors reaching absolute communion (but neither absorbing the other) in the ascension; though before this, as everywhere, Christ was a perfect man, presenting, the model of every age" (Schaff, i, § 79).

8. The Holy Ghost.—On the doctrine of the Holy Ghost, Ireneus, more nearly than the Greek Church fathers, especially the Alexandrians, represents the dogma of the perfect, substantial identity of the Holy Spirit with the Father and the Son; *the Holy Spirit being personified* (but for this reason not so definite) designation of the Son and Spirit as the 'hands' of the Father, by which he made all things, implies a certain subordination (see Ireneus' views given below under "Trinity"). He differs from Origen, *Christ is the Wisdom of the book of Proverbs not to the Logos, but to the Spirit, and hence he must have regarded him as eternal*. Yet he was far from conceiving the Spirit as a mere power or attribute; he considered him an independent personality, like the Logos. 'With God,' says he (Christ, ii, 16), 'the Holy Ghost has been personified'; *the Son is personally* the Wisdom, the Son and the Spirit, through whom and in whom he freely made all things, to whom he said, "Let us make man in our image, after our likeness."* But he speaks more of the operations than of the nature of the Holy Ghost. The Spirit predicted in the prophets the coming of the Son, and has been personified; communicates the knowledge of the Father and the Son; gives believers the consciousness of sonship; is fellowship with Christ, the pledge of imperishable life, and the ladder on which we ascend to God" (Schaff, § 80).

4. The Trinity.—On the doctrine of the Trinity, the language of Ireneus is perhaps plainer and more incontrovertible than that of any other of the early Church fathers, and yet both Arians and Socinians have sometimes presumed to claim him as a supporter of their peculiarities. From that point of view, we have here the bug both Christ and the Holy Spirit parts of the supreme divinity. Nay, Christ is often expressly declared to be God. Thus, in a passage in which Ireneus is commenting on the prophecy respecting the birth of Emmanuel he says: "Carefully, then, has the Holy Ghost pointed out the name; for thus did his birth, his virgin birth, and his essence, that he is God, for the name Emmanuel indicates this" (iii, 21, 4); and again, in allusion to the Father: "With him were always present the Word and Wisdom, the Son and the Spirit, by whom and in whom, freely and spontaneously, he made all things; to whom, also, "Let us make man in our image and likeness." Indeed, Dr. Schaff (Ch. Hist, i, 296) seems hardly justified in his statement that "of a supermundane trinity of essence Ireneus betrays but faint indications." He continually quotes from Genesis, with the object of showing that both Christ and the Holy Spirit existed with the Father anterior to all creation ("ante omnes constitutionem"). With a writer in the Irenika, and For. Rom., 1 (rev.), p. 5, he seems to believe that the word "hands" is used by Ireneus to indicate that they are both co-workers of the Father rather than his subordinate workman (compare Ebrar, Kirchen- und Dogmengesch., i, 110 and 111, note 8). "In all things and through all things there is one God, the Father, and one Word, and one Son, and one salvation to all that believe in him." Another very beautiful passage "reveals the doctrine of the Trinity as being, in fact, wrapped up in the official title by which the Saviour is designated." Says he: "In the name of Christ (iii, 18) it is implied he alone to whom he is appointed, and the union itself with which he is appointed. And it is the Father who appoints, but the Son who is appointed by the Spirit, who is the union, as the word declares by Isaiah, 'The Spirit of the Lord is upon me, because he hath anointed me,' thus pointing out the anointer, the Father; the appointed one, the Son, and the Unierse which is the Spirit'—certainly "a rich and pregnant thought, which will bear much consideration. It is very striking and satisfactory to find the doctrine of the three divine persons thus developed out of the very name which the Saviour bears. Nor does there seem any reason to doubt, in the reasoning of the three persons is not think of an appointed one without necessarily thinking also of one who appoints, and of the union with which he is appointed, we are thus led to conceive, by a simple remembrance of our Lord's official designation of the Father, the anointer, the Son, the anointed, and the Spirit, the living God who came upon him, infinite fullness, from the Father on the Son—the three-one God, being by means of a single word thus brought forth as the God of our salvation" (Ebrar, and For. Evang. Rev., 1869, p. 18). With all these direct testimonies standing as in the vine in the vineyard, referring to the acts of the part of some Rationalistic theologians to assert that Ireneus was not strictly Trinitarian in his views on this subject. But more than this: it was this self-same Ireneus who opposed the Philonic doctrine of the λόγος, which other Church fathers, especially of the Alexandrian school, the Word and the Son, and to accept, as Theophilies of Antiochus, and even Tertullian (comp. Ebrar, Kirchen- u. Dogmengesch., i, 116).

5. Redemption.—Of all the Church fathers, Ireneus was the first who gave a careful analysis of the work of redemption, "and his view," says Dr. Schaff (Ch. Hist, i, 297), "is the only coherent one in all the ancient fathers for the first three centuries. Christ, he teaches, as the second Adam, repeated in himself the entire life of man, from birth to death and hades, from childhood to manhood, and, as it were, summed up that which the life and brought it under one head (this is the sense of his frequent expression, 'Ἀνακαταστάσεως, διαφοράματος, recapitulatio'), with the double purpose of restoring humanity from its fall and carrying it to perfection. Redemption comprises the taking away of sin by the perfect obedience of Christ, the destruction of death by his victory over the devil, and the communication of eternal life to man. To accomplish this work, the Redeemer must unite in himself the divine and human natures; for only as God could he do what man could not, and only as man could he do, in a legitimate way, what man should. By the voluntary obedience of Adam, the prince of the pious, he gained a viceroy, and the divine right to rule over all. By his voluntary obedience of Christ that power was wrested from him by lawful means (by suavela, persuasion, announcement of truth, not overreaching or deception). This took place first in the temptation, in which Christ renewed or recapitulated, as it were, the妥府, and after our imitations and the sinner, and thereby liberated man from his thralldom. But then the whole life of Christ was a co-
tinted victorious conflict with Satan, and a constant obedience to God. This obedience was completed in the suffering and death on the tree of the cross, and thus blotted out the disobedience which the first Adam had committed on the tree of knowledge. It is, however, only in the resurrection, this is the consummation of a new divine principle of life, and the perfecting of the idea of humanity first effected by Christ. See Redemption; Origin.

6. The Sacraments.—On this subject, perhaps more than upon any other on which Ireneus has written, we meet with the most complete process of logical development. The order of its development enables us definitely to determine what he actually believed. But even "Romanists tacitly admit that he says nothing of confirmation, ordination, marriage, or extreme unction favorable to the sacramental character which they assign to these rites. And this is a very strong negative testimony against the correctness of their opinions. If such an early writer as Ireneus, in the course of a lengthened theological work, which naturally led him to the ordinances as well as doctrines of the Church, had not a word to say in regard to the above so-called sacraments, the inferiors pray before them, and they were not recognized as such in his days. . . . Masaeus makes a very lame attempt to prove from the writings of Ireneus that the sacrament of penance was practised in the Church of his day. There can be no doubt that the passages to which he refers (i., 6; 3; 15; 5) prove that penance was recognized in the schools in the last part of the Church of the 2d century. This was called exomologesia, and seems to have been indispensable for the removal of the censures of the Church. But there is nothing to indicate its sacramental character, and not a shadow of support can be derived from it for the popish practice of particular confession." (Bp. For. Exeg. Rev., Jan., 1869, p. 18). See Confession.

Of Infant Baptism the first clear trace is found in the writings of our author, who thus writes of the sacrament of baptism (ii., 22, 4): "Christ came to save all who are regenerated by him, infants and little children, and boys, and women; and the scribe applies it to all ages, Christ having passed through all the stages of life for this purpose. Neander says of this passage (Hist. Christian Dogm., i. 230): "If by the phrase ""baptism in Deum"" (in the Latin tranl.) baptism is intended, it contains a proof of infant baptism. But when the words ""purus"" are distinguished; the latter possess a developed consciousness, hence to them Christ is a pattern of piety, while to the infants he merely gives an objective sanctification; we must therefore understand the latter to mean quite little children." But the statement of the disciples' confession that he believed the doctrine of baptismal regeneration, which is strengthened by another passage (iii., 17, 1): "And again, giving to the disciples the power of regeneration unto God, he said to them, 'Go and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.'" (Compare an article on this subject in the American Presbyterian Review, April, 1867, p. 239 sq.; Schaff, Church History, i, 402.)

On the Lord's Supper, also, the indefinite statements of Ireneus have given rise to much dispute. Romanists stoutly affirm that he declares in favor of their doctrine of eucharistic transubstantiation; and the whole party hardly that this arises from a variable reading of one passage, of which Neander says (p. 238), "According to one reading it is said, Verbum quod auter Deo, which must mean the Logos which is presented to God; therefore, the sacrifice would refer to the presentation of Christ himself. Yet we can hardly make up our minds to accept this as the opinion of Ireneus, who always says that Christians must consecrate all to God in Christ's name; for example, Ecclesia offer per Jesum Christum. We cannot doubt that the other reading is the correct one, namely, que auter Deo. Also declines to give the Romans a hearing on this point, and argues further, that Ireneus "in another place (iv., 18 and passio) calls the bread and wine, after consecration, "antitypes," implying the continued distinction of their substance from the body and blood of Christ. This expression in itself, indeed, might be understood as merely contrasting here the Supper, as the substance, with the Body and Blood of Christ. The Old Testament calls the Samaritan showing the type of the saving water of the flood (1 Pet., iii, 20, 21). But the connection, and the usus loquendi of the earlier Greek fathers, require us to take the term antitype in the sense of type, or, more precisely, as the antitype of archetype. The bread and wine are thus represented as the body and blood of Christ, as the archetype, and correspond to them as a copy to the original. In exactly the same sense it is said in Heb. i., 24 (comp. viii, 5), that the earthly sanctuary is the antitype, that is, the copy of the heavenly." (i., 387.) We think Ireneus speaks more definitely of this ordi- nance in one of the Fragments (xxxviii, Massaeus), from which it clearly follows that he by no means believed in the opus operatum of the Romanists. (Comp. Bp. and For. Exeg. Rev., Jan., 1869, p. 19, 20.)

7. The Church.—By the peculiar attitude in which he places himself in the church, he may be supposed to have heresies, he became unconsciously one of the most elabor- ate writers on the early Church that now remains to us, and the utterances of no other of the early Church fathers have so frequently been misinterpreted to prop up the claims of Romanism as those of Ireneus. It is certain that he went beyond questions of the liturgy in the dispute with the Church prelatists, however hesitatingly, misconstrued the statements of Ireneus in defence of the Church of Christ against Valentinus, Basilides, Marcion, and other schismatics, who in his time threatened the very life of the early Christian Church, as statements favoring the doctrine of apostolic succession (q.v.). In his constant pressure in defence of his Church, and as an opponent of the heretics, presents a "historical" chain of bishops. Says he (iii., 3, 1), "We are in a position to reckon up those who were by the apostles instituted bishops in the churches, and the successors of these bishops to our own times." But, in naming the bishops in their historical order, he "never dreams of ascribing to them any sort of spiritual influence or authority which was propagated from one to another. To show that he could link historically Eleutherius, who was then head of the Church at Rome, with himself who was supposed to have founded that Church, was the sole and simple object contemplated by our author in reference to the succes- sion." In his arguments with the Valentinians, Marcionites, and others, he endeavors to prove, by constant appeals to the Scriptures, that their doctrines were not harmonious with the inspired doctrine of baptismal regeneration; but, he says, "ubi ecclesia," putting the Church first, in the genuine catholic spirit (iii., 24)—"ibi et Spiritus Dei; et ubi Spiritus Dei, ille ecclesia et omnis gratia," or, as Dr. Schaff says, Protestantism would put it conversely: "Where the spirit of the Church is, there is the spirit of God and all grace." (Comp. Bp. and For. Exeg. Rev., Jan., 1869, pp. 20, 21.)

8. The Millennium.—The peculiar millennial views of Ireneus, which stamp him, by his close adherence to Papais, as a Chilist, we hardly care to touch; they are certainly not a part in our author's thought, and cannot be passed not only without comment, but even unnoticed. They are brought out specially near the end of his great work (v., 32-36), declaring a future reign of the saints on earth; arguing that such promises of Scripture as those in Gen. xiii, 14; Matt. xxvi, 27-29, etc., can have no other interpretation. (Comp. Bp. and For. Exeg. Rev., Jan., 1869, pp. 20, 21.)

9. The Easter Controversy.—The personal character of Ireneus, of which we have as yet said but little, is
perhaps best illustrated by his conduct in the Easter controversy (q.v.). Determined to work for a union of all Christians (iv, 38, 7), he displayed an irenic disposition in all disputes about unessential outward things, and more especially in his mediation between Victor, the Bishop of Rome, and the Arian bishops. He gathered around him a band of likeminded people which, by the end of the 2nd century, became a church. The church was the first church, and consequently called by Eusebius "a disciple of the apostles," and by Jerome "the disciple of John the apostle," he bears us such direct testimony in behalf of the Gospels, or, as Eusebius terms them, the "Homologoumena," that it becomes to us of the very highest importance among the external proofs of their genuineness, more especially at the present moment, in face of the denials of this truth by Rationalists, and by those who, with other men, are known by our countrymen as the "Comte of the Gospels" by C. H. H. (Short Essays on Great Subjects). Now what does Ireneus say of the Gospels? "We have not received," he says, "the knowledge of the things which we teach out of any other source than those by whom the Gospel has been brought to us; which Gospel they first preached, and afterwards by the will of God committed to writing, that it might be for time to come the foundation and pillar of the faith." Here follows a declaration that the first Gospel was written by the Jews by Matthew, the second by Mark, a companion of Peter; the third by Luke, a companion of Paul; and the fourth by John, of whom he says, "Afterwards John, the disciple of the Lord, who also leaned upon his breast, he likewise published a Gospel while he dwelt in Ephesus, in Asia in the second century. Let us assume now, that between the time that John passed to the other world and the apostles there is only one intervening link—an honest, man and an intelligent man; in short, that he is a competent witness. At the time when he knew Polycarp, were the four Gospels extant and acknowledged authorities in the churches? We will here raise the question to the Gospel of John (q.v.), which is now so much a topic of controversy. Was or was not this gospel received as the production of him whose name it bears by Polycarp and his contemporaries at the time to which Ireneus, in his graphic reminiscences, refers? If it was then extant, we may assume that John, the apostle of Ephesus, in the very region where John had lived to so advanced an age, and where his followers and acquaintances survived—will be very difficult to disprove its genuineness. But if it was not thus received, when we ask, can it be supposed to have first seen the light? Who contrived a book which Polycarp had known nothing, and palpably it off on him and on the whole circle of Johannine express and churches in Asia? How is it that Ireneus knows nothing of the late discovery or promulgation of so valuable a book? Why does he not mention the momentous fact—Is it not possible that at his interviews with Polycarp there was found somewhere, or put forth by somebody, this priceless treasure? It is obvious that Ireneus would have had something to say of the extraordinary concord and final appearance of this Gospel history had he remembered it, or known of a time after John's death when this Gospel had not been a familiar and prized possession of the church. This testimony of Ireneus is a tough piece of evidence. Here we have specific declarations as to what he had himself seen and heard. Yet the attempt is made to disparage the value of this testimony on the ground that it was the expression of the author of a book, which stands in connection with his statements about the composition of the several gospels: 'Nor can there be more or fewer gospels than these. For as there are four regions of the world in which we live, and four branches of the human race, and the spirit of life, in like manner was it fit it should have the four branches of the human race, and the spirit of life, in like manner was it fit it should have been breathed on all mankind. Whence it is manifest that the Gospel, the former of all things, which is upon the cherubim and upholds all things, having appeared to men, has given us a Gospel of a fourfold character, but joined in one spirit.' (Here follows a brief characterisation of the four gospels as of the fourfold gospel, but of another.) That this is a fanciful (if one will, a puerile) observation there is no reason to deny; but how it can in the least invalidate the credibility of the author's testimony on a matter of fact within his cognizance, it is impossible to see. If these analogies had exerted any influence in determining Ireneus's acceptance of the four gospels of the canon, the case would be different. But Froude admits that such was not the fact. He accepts the Gospels on account of the historical proof of their genuineness, as he repeatedly affirms, and independent of the general widespread acceptance of them in the Church. It is even a hasty inference from such a passage that the author was intellectually weak. If this inference is to be drawn from such an observation, the abler of the fathers, as Augustine, must be equally condemned. Men who are not deficient in ability must be sometimes other foolish things. . . . On the whole, Ireneus is distinguished for the soundness and clearness of his understanding. (See Schaaff in the first part of our article.) He is rather averse to speculation, being of a prudential turn. There is hardly one of the early ecclesiastical writers who, in all the qualities that made up a trustworthy witness, is to be set before him. There is no reason to doubt that, in his statements concerning the origin and authority of the Gospels, he represents the Christians of his time. It is not the sentiment of an individual merely, but the state of things in general. . . . But why does Ireneus, in his reminiscences, say that Polycarp, a personal acquaintance of John the Apostle, an honored bishop in the neighborhood where John had labored and died, considered the fourth gospel to be the composition of Polycarp? (Dr. G. P. Fisher, of Yale College, in the Independent, Feb. 4, 1869, p. 249.)"
hypotheses; but, interpreted according to their natural meaning, they tell of a Church united by its head with the times of St. John, to which the books of the N. T. furnished the unaffected language of hope, and resignation, and triumph. And the testimony of Ireneus is the more, not the less, receptible, that he was a man of great influence. But the authenticity of the Gospels does Ireneus bear his testimony. He also furnishes conclusive evidence in support of other N.-T. books which have been questioned (see Brit. and For. Ec. Rev. 1869, p. 7 sq.).

11. Canon of Scripture.—Not a little surprising, but agreeable to the Christian of the present day to find that in the days of Ireneus, even when the canon of Scripture could not be expected to have been so accurately defined as it afterwards was, we find, with the exception of the spurious additions to Daniel, found in the Septuagint, and the books of Baruch, quoted under the name of Jeremiah, no writings of the O. T. acknowledged as forming part of the O.-T. canon, which Protestants do not include in it at the present day. So likewise of the N. T., the only book not now accepted, but to which Ireneus credited canonical authority, is the "Shepherd of Hermas." Altogether, "with the most important exceptions, the canon of both the O. and N. T., then accepted by the Church, was coincident and contemporaneous with our own." But more than this, by the language which Ireneus uses, we find the Church of his day harmonizing with and justifying the Sacred Writings. It is evident that the latter have claims that he and his contemporaries were in support of the inspired authority and infallible accuracy of the canonical writings. The utterance which Ireneus has made on this subject Romanists have sought to turn to account in their assertions of the authority of tradition as co-ordinate with that of Scripture. But though, as was natural in such an early writer, Ireneus often refers to the apostolic traditions preserved in the churches, he never ascribes to these an authority independent of Scripture.

12. Literature.—Beaven, Life of Ireneus (Lond. 1841); Schaaff, Ireneus, in Der Deutsche Kirchenfreund, vol. v (Münchens, 1850); Gervaise, La Vie de St. Irénée (Paris, 1828, 2 vol. 8vo); Sierien, art. "Ireneus," in Erich u. Gruber, Encyclop. vol. ii, sec. xxiii; Massuet, Disserta-
tiones in libros Ireni, prefixed to his edition of the Op-
era; Deleying, Ireneus, ecclesias veritatis confessor ac testis (Lipsa, 1721), against Massuet; Cellarius, Hist. gen. des Antiquités sacres et Ecclés., i, 456 sq.; Fabriicius, Biblia Græc. vii, 75 sq.; Böhringer, Kirchengeschichte, in Biographi-
æum, vol. i; Möhler, Patrologie, vol. ii; Ritter, Gesch. der Philosophä, i, 345 sq.; Duncker, Der hell. Irmin. Christol. i. Zusammenkampe m. d. teol. und antikrel. Grundlædern der Kirche und Welt, i, 376 sq.; Graul, Das a. u. b. Sciolle d. Irmin. Zeitschr. (1800), a very valuable little work of 168 pages, in which the"position of Ireneus is sketched with a bold and firm hand," Schröck, Kirchengeschichte, iii, 192 sq.; Saahoff, Church History, vol. i (see Index); Neander, Church History, vol. i (see Index); Shedd, History of Doctrines (see Index); Har-
rison, Are the Fathers? (see Index); Augusti, Dogmengeisch, vol. i and ii; Baumgarten-Crusius, Dog-
mengeisch. (see Index); Bullett, Théolog., 1869, Oct. 25, p. 319; Rev. de deses Mondes, 1868, February, art. viii; Christ. Remembrancer, July, 1868, p. 226; Herzog, Real-Encyclopädie, vi, 360 sq.

IRENEUS, St., a Tuscan martyr, flourished in the second half of the 8th century. But very little is known of the history of his life. He suffered martyrdom during the persecutions under the emperor Aurelius (275), and is commemorated in the Roman Church July 5.—Thibaud, Mémoires Ecclés., vol. iv; Hoef er, Nouv. Biog. Générales, xxxv, 498.

IRENEUS, St., another martyr, was bishop of Si-
mium (now Sirmiah, a Hungarian village), his native country, at the beginning of the 4th century. Many inducements were offered him by the then head of the country, Probus, who, no doubt, acted under instruc-
tions from the emperors Diocletian and Maximus, to re-

nounce Christianity, but, all provoking futile, he was at last beheaded, after having been subjected to various tor-
tures. Though but little is known of this Ireneus's per-
sonal history, it is evident, from the efforts of the gov-
ernor to secure his adhesion to the heathen practices, that he was a man of great influence. The date of his death is not accurately known. Some think it to be March 25, the day on which his death is commemorated by Romanists; others put it April 6. A.D. 304. See Hoef er, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxv, 498; Ceillier, Hist. des anci. sacr. iii, 27; Butler, Lives of the Saints, i, 661 sq.; Real-Encyclopädie, f. d. Kulti Kelt. Deutschl., v, 715 sq.

IRENEUS, bishop of Tyras, flourished in the first half of the 5th century. He was originally a count of the empire, and first took part in ecclesiastical affairs at the Council of Ephesus, A.D. 431, where he represented the emperor Theodosius as assistant to Candidius, to settle the controversy between Cyril and Nestorius, and their respective followers. Both he and Candidius favored Nestorius, and, failing to prevent his condemnation at the council, did their utmost, on their return to court, to counteract on the emperor's mind the influence and de-

nunciation of the Cyrillicans against Nestorius. For they were sure, as their representations were, that on their very face the impress of truth." But the Cyrillican party predominating, and John, the secretary of Cyril, appearing himself at court to counteract the efforts of Ireneus and Candidius, the feeble sovereign was soon turned in favor of the Cyrillican party. Ireneus himself was banished from the court about A.D. 435. He at once betook himself to his friends, the Oriental bish-

ops, and by them was raised to the bishopric of Tyre in 444. The emperor now issued an edict condemning the Nestorians, and, in addition, it was ordered that Ireneus should not be deposed from the bishopric; and deprived of his clerical character. In 448 the sentence was finally executed. After his retirement Ireneus wrote a history of the Nestorian struggle, under the title of Tragedia seu Commentarius de rebus in Synodo Ephesina ac in Ori-

crate geatia. The original, which was written in Greek, is lost, and only parts of it remain to us. This last-writ,

irenaeus, a pseudonym for the celebrated Church historian John of St. Bartholomew (see v. KARL LUDWIG GIESLER, q. v.).

IRENEUS, Christoph, one of the most zealous de-

fendants of the doctrine of the Flacians, was born at Schweidnitz, near the middle of the 16th century. First a deacon at Aschersleben, he was afterwards called to Eiseln as regular pastor, and finally appointed court preacher at Weimar. Accused of favoring the views of Flacian, a consistent though much persecuted follower of Luther, he was, with other prominent preachers guilty of the same failing, dismissed from his position in 1572. He now removed to Austria, where he published in 1581 a pamphlet against the first article of the Concordien-

Forf., under the title of Christoph Irenæus Examen d. ersten Artikel u. d. Wirbel-Grautes i. d. neuen Concordi-

ebach von der Erhebende. The date of his death is not known to us. See Aschbach, Kirchen-Lez. ii, 781. See Flacius.

IRENÉUS, Pálkóvázi, a learned Russian priest, was born May 28, 1762. He acquired a good knowledge of Hebrew, Latin, Frech and German, and was sent to Hungary to study philosophy, history, and mathematics. He was married, but his great merits caused him to be appointed bishop, although, according to the general rules of the Greek Church, marriage is a bar to a candidate for the episcopal office. He died Apr. 28, 1823 Old Style. See Chronologie d'histoire ecclésia-

Irenæus, 1797); —Christiana, orthodoza dogmatico-polemico Theologia
IRENAEUS

Compendium (Moscow, 1809, 2 vols. 8vo), and commentaries on Paul's Epistles to the Romans and to the Galatians (Kief, 1806, 2 vols. 8vo). See Gagarin, De la Théol. dans l'Église Russe (Paris, 1867), p. 55. (J. N. F.)

Irenæus, Kilentzvitovski, a very able Russian theologian and historian, was born at Vinnitsa in 1783. Of his early history but little is known to us. He enjoyed the reputation of a great savant, and held the bishopric of Tver, and, later, the archbishopric of Pskov, and died at St. Petersburg April 24, 1816. Of course he belonged to the monastic order of the Russian Greek Church, and all the people seemed devoted to this venerable Nestorian. The religious offices of Russia are accessible only to monastic orders (compare Eckhardt, Modern Russia). Archbishop Irenæus wrote Commentaries on the Twelve Minor Prophets:—St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans and to the Hebrews:—and also published some of his sermons, delivered before the royal household at St. Petersburg (1794). He likewise translated into Russian the writings of several of the Church fathers, and cardinal Bellarmine's Commentary on the Psalms (Moscow, 1807, 2 vols. 4to); and two other works on ascetism by Bellarmine. See Hestermann, Encyclop., xxx, 325.

Irené (Eipipry, Peace), empress of Constantinople, and one of the most extraordinary, though corrupt characters of the Byzantine empire, was born in Athens about A.D. 725. An orphan, 17 years of age, without any fortune except her beauty and talents, she excited the admiration of the emperor when reigning in his stead, Leo IV, and in A.D. 769 became his lawful wife. Her love for power, it is said, caused her to commit the crime of murder, for her husband, who died in 780, is generally believed to have been poisoned by her. During his reign she had acquired not only the love, but also the confidence of the emperor, and in his testament she declared he "empress guardian of the Roman world, and of their son Constantine VI," who was, at the decease of Leo IV, only ten years of age. Educated in the worship of images, she was herself an ardent opponent of the iconoclasts, who held sway during the reign of her husband, and who, even at one time, had caused her banishment from his court on account of her secret worship of images, and her conspiracies with image-worshippers against iconoclasts. "But, as soon as she reigned in her own name and that of her son, Irene most seriously undertook the War. (See the iconoclasts, xxx, 224.) The first step of her future persecution was a general edict for liberty of conscience. In the restoration of the monks, a thousand images were exposed to public veneration; a thousand legends were invented of their sufferings and miracles. As opportunities occurred by death or removal, they were replaced by images. The judicially formed saves from the highest to the lowest, the competitors for earthly or celestial favor anticipated and flattered the judgment of their sovereign; and the promotion of her secretary, Tarsius, gave Irene the patriarch of Constantinople, and the command of the Oriental Church." But the decrees of a general council could only be repeated effectually by a similar assembly, and to this end she convened a council of bishops at Constantinople, A.D. 786. By this time, however, the people and the army had learned to abhor the worship of images in place of the true God, and the council was opened; a synod was convoked by the emperor, and even driven from the capital. This by no means intimidated Irene in her marked course. She had determined on the reindroduction of image-worship and the extirpation of all iconoclasts, and well did her zeal for the restoration of this gross superstition deserve to be rewarded by the Church. (See the iconoclasts, which she still occupies in the Greek calendar). A second council was convened only a year after the first had been broken up, but this time at Nice. "No more than 18 days were allowed for the consummation of this important work; the iconoclasts appeared not as judges, but as criminals or heretics. The Synod was decorated with the legeresse of the pope Adrian and the Eastern patriarchs, the decrees were framed by the president Tarsarius, and ratified by the acclamations and subscriptions of 850 bishops. They unanimously pronounced that the worship of images is agreeable to Scripture and reason, to the fathers and councils of the Church; but they hesitate whether that worship be relative or direct; whether the godhead and the figure of Christ is to be venerated separately or in one person. Of this second Nicene Council the acts are still extant; a curious monument of superstition and ignorance, of falsehood and folly" (Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, v, 27 sqq.). Meanwhile, however, the young emperor was attaining the maturity of manhood; he was more and more the favorite of his own age, who shared his pleasures, and were ambitious of sharing his power. But Irene was by no means ready to concede to her son the power which she preferred to hold in her own hand, and, ever vigilant, she soon penetrated the designs of her son. As a consequence, there arose at court two factions. The young and the vigorous gathered around the heir presumptive, and in 789 he actually succeeded in assuming himself the government of affairs. As Constantine VI he became the lawful emperor of the Romans, and was dismissed to a Bishopric to retire and resume his duties. "But her haughty spirit condescended to the arts of dissimulation: she flattered the bishops and eunuchs, revived the filial tenderness of the prince, regained his confidence, and betrayed his credulity. The character of Constantine was not destitute of sense or spirit; he knew how to avoid those excesses which Leo IV committed, and the ambitious mother now exposed to the public censure the vices which she herself had nourished, and the actions which she herself had secretly advised." Meanwhile a powerful conspiracy was also conceived against Constantine, and only reached his ears when he knew it to be impossible for him to resist. In the end, he fled the capital. But his own guards even had been bought in the interests of Irene, and the emperor was seized by them on the Asiatic shore, and transported back to Constantinople to the porphyry apartment of the palace where he had first seen the light. "In the mind of Irene ambition had stifled every sentiment of humanity and nature; and it was decreed, in a bloody council which she had assembled, that Constantine must by some means be forever rendered incapable of assuming the government, and Irene while seated in his old and infirmities entered the room of the prince and stabbed their daggers with violence and precipitation into his eyes, depriving him not only of his eyesight, but rendering his life even critical. As if this crime were in itself not sufficiently great, the youth was even deprived of his throne. He was deposed from his father's place, and the state was placed in the hands of a four-year-old boy. A coup d'état stroke, and confined in a dungeon, where he was left to pine away. Thus the unnatural mother, guilty of a crime unparalleled in the history of crimes, secured for herself the reins of government. But still Irene was not free from anxieties. Though the punishment which her crime deserved did not immediately follow the likely deed, it yet came surely. Her two favorites, Stauracius and Eutius, whom she had raised, enriched, and intrusted with the first dignities of the empire, were constantly embroiled with each other, and their jealousies only increased when they went to the former, A.D. 800. In order to secure her possession of the throne, she sought a marriage with Charlemagne, but the Frank emperor had evidently no reliet for a woman who had committed so many crimes, and the scheme proved abortive. Two years later, her treasurer, Nicephorus, rebel'd against her, and the sudden death of the young Constantine, driven to the isle of Lesbos, where she was forced to spin for a livelihood. Here she died of grief, A.D. 808. See ICONOCLASM. (J. H. W.)

Irenological Theology is a term (from εἰρήνη, puro, peace) used to designate the art or science of conciliating any and all differences by the art of conciliation, from one-sided theories or misapprehensions. Making peace implies a previous warfare, hence irenological theology.
IRENICAL THEOLOGY

is closely allied to polemics (q. v.), which, in its true character, should be but a struggle for peace. For the σύνεσις της εὐσέβειας, or "bond of peace" (Eph. iv, 8), embraces all Christians, and the λατρείας ινά γαρηνπ, or "speaking the truth in love" (Eph. iv, 15), contains two commandments with a profounder meaning. Hence we find in the Christian Church, from her earliest days up to our own times, attempts to secure peace and unity by conciliating all differences and by reuniting those who had separated from each other. Such was particularly the case when schism occurred first between the Latin and the Greek churches, then between the Roman and the Protestant, and, again, between the Lutheran and the Reformed. Irenical attempts accompanied each of these separations, as is evinced by the large number of works known as Irenicum, Unio, Concordia, etc. But the labor of such men as Irenaeus (as Irenicum, Unio, Concordia, etc. It was against one of these peace-makers, David Pareus († 1615) that Leonard Hutter wrote his Irenicum eire Christianium (34. Oct, 1619), in which, however, he admits that the attainment of ultimate unity and peace is problematical. Among the most active in the cause of union we find, in the Reformed Church, Hugo Grotius († 1645), and, in the Lutheran, George Calixtus († 1656). The Jesuits, however, managed to interfere in all these attempts, to diffuse their short-sighted and well-chosen and impossibly bases of union. On the other hand, unintended propositions on both sides, dictated either by fear or worldly motives, threw discredit on the cause itself. It was now decreed as Babylonianism, Semism, nationalism, syncretism, etc. Still there continued a good deal of what is called Leopold Schmidt's Geist des Katholizismus oder Grundlage der christlichen Irenik (1848). On the contrary, such works as Dr. F. A. Staudenmaier's († 1866) Zum religiösen Frieden d. Zukunft (1864, 2 vols. 8vo) disprove Protestantism to such an extent, and are written in so literal a tone, that, if such were more abundant, they would kindle again the fiercest strife. Yet the scientific basis of religious and denominational peace has made much progress since Schleiermacher gave a scientific development to polemics and apologists. This is especially evident in J. Peter Laub's Griechische Dogmatik, in which the third part of which (Heidelberg, 1852) contains a clever sketch of practical dogmatics, of polemics and irenic theology. According to him, it is the province of irenic theology to bring out of the different religious opinions those which coincide with the Christian and from all others do, if not destroy, at least bring them into the life and consciousness of the Church, or to submit them to the Christian dogmas (§ 5). It has therefore to search out the hidden efforts of truth in all religious manifestations. All distortions of truth are the avowals of the existence of a false dogma in the history of church. Irenical theology is again divided into elementaria, i.e. an exposition of the struggles of truth and of the means of assisting it; and concrete, i.e. an exposition of the organic
liberation and development of truth in humanity until the completion of the Church. Sin, however, will always remain an obstacle to absolute peace till it is finally abolished in the reign of God. For this we must prepare ourselves by adhering to Meldeniu’s maxim: *In necessariis unitas, in non necessariis libertas, in utrique caritas.* See Dr. F. J. Lücke, *Ueber d. Alter dieses kirchlichen Friedensspruches* (Göttingen, 1850).—Herzog, *Real-Enzyklopädie*, vi, 60; Ersch u. Gruber’s *Enzyklopädie*, 29, 161.

Ir-ha-heres, in the A. Vers. “The CITY OF DESTRUCTION” (**ירָהֵרִיס**), *Ir-ha-heres*; v. r. *Ir-ha-che-rees*, **ירָהָּא-כְּרֵסֵי**; Sept. *’אֳחָיוֹס*, Vulg. *Civitas Solis*, the name or appellation of a city in Egypt, mentioned only in Isa. xix, 18. The reading **ירָהֵרִיס**, Heres, is that of most MSS, the Syr., Ar., and Théod.; the other reading, **ירָהָּא-כְּרֵסֵי**, Cherae, is supported by the Sept., but only in form, by Symm., who has χρήαν καίλου, and the Vulg. Gesenius (*Theaur.*, p. 591; a; 592) prefers the latter reading. There are various explanations; we shall first take those that treat it as a proper name, then those that suppose it to be an appellation used by the prophet to denote the future of the city.

1. “The city of the Sun,” a translation of the Egyptian sacred name of Heliopolis, generally called in the Bible On, the Hebrew form of its civil name As [see Ox], and once *Beth-shemesh*, “the house of the sun” (Judg. i, 35), is more literal, more literal translation than this supposed one of the sacred name. See Beth-shemesh. This explanation, however, is highly improbable, for we find elsewhere both the sacred and the civil names of Heliopolis, so that a third name, merely a variety of the Hebrew rendering of the sacred name, is very unlikely. The name Beth-shemesh is, moreover, a more literal translation in its first word of the Egyptian name than this supposed one. It may be remarked, however, as to the last part of the word, that one of the towns in Palestine called Beth-shemesh, a town of the Levites on the borders of Judah and Dan, was not far from a Mount Heres, *ירָהֵרָּא* (Judg. i, 35), so that the two names, as applied to the sun as an object of worship, might probably be interchangeable. See Heres.

2. “The city Heres,” a transcription in the last part of the word of the Egyptian sacred name of Heliopolis, *ירָהֵרִיס*, “the abode (liter. “house”) of the sun.” This explanation, however, would necessitate the omission of the article.

3. Jerome supposes *עזר* to be equivalent to *עזר*, “a potsherd,” and to be a name of the town called by the Greeks *Ostracina*, *Ostropaeus* (“earthen”). Akin with this is the view of others (see Alexander ad loc.), who suppose that reference is made to *Taiphones*, the brick-kilns of which are mentioned by Jeremiah (xlix, 9).

4. “A city preserved,” meaning that one of the five cities mentioned should be preserved. Gesenius, who proposes this construction, if the last half of the word be not part of the name of the place, compares the Arabic *charas*, “he guarded, kept, preserved;” etc. It may be remarked that the word Heres, or ancient Egyptian, probably signifies “a guardian.” This rendering of Gesenius is, however, merely conjectural, and has hardly been adopted by any other leading interpreter.

5. The ordinary rendering, “a city destroyed,” lit. “a city of destruction;” in the A. V. “the city of destruction,” meaning that one of the five cities mentioned should be destroyed, according to Isaiah’s idiom. Some maintain that the prophet refers to five great and noted cities of Egypt when he says, “In that day shall five cities in the midst of Egypt speak the language of Canaan,” but they cannot agree as to what these cities are. Others suppose that by five a round number is meant; while others think that some proportion number is referred to—five out of 20,000, or five out of 1000. Calvin interprets the passage as meaning five out of six—fire professing the true religion, and one rejecting it; and that one is hence called “City of destruction,” which is not proper to any of the deserts of Egypt. Egypt and Ethiopia were then either under a joint rule or under an Ethiopian sovereign. We can, therefore, understand the connection of the three subjects comprised in this and the adjoining chapters. Chap. xviii is a prophecy against the Ethiopians, xix is the Burden of Egypt, xxi is the prophecy delivered in the year of the capture of Ashdod by Tartan, the general of Sargon, predicts the leading captive of the Egyptians and Ethiopians, probably the garrison of that strong stronghold, as a warning to the Israelites who trusted in them for aid. Chap. xviii ends with an indication of the time to which it refers, speaking of the Ethiopians as we understand the passage—as sending “a present” “to the place of the name of the Lord of hosts, the Mount Zion” (ver. 7). If this be taken in a proper and not a tropical sense, it would refer to the conversion of Ethiopians by the preaching of the gospel, while the Temple was yet stood. The *such had been the case before the Gospel was preached is evident from the instance of the eunuch of queen Candace, whom Philip met on his return homeward from worshipping at Jerusalem, and converted to Christianity (Acts viii, 26-39). The Burden of Egypt seems to point to the invasion of the Persian and Greek hosts, described in the account of the capture of it, and 15, and the river, and canals, of the destruction of the water-plants, and of the misery of the fishers and workers in linen. The princes and counsellors are to lose their wisdom and the people to be filled with fear, all which calamities seem to have begun in the desolations of the land. It is not easy to say what follows as to the dread of the land of Judah which the Egyptians should feel, immediately preceding the mention of the subject of the article: “In that day shall five cities in the land of Egypt speak the language of Canaan, and swear to the Lord of hosts; one shall be called Ir-ha-heres. In that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt, and a pillar at the border thereof to the Lord. And it shall be for a sign and for a witness unto the Lord of hosts in the land of Egypt; for they shall cry unto the Lord because of the oppressor, and he shall save them, and the East shall look upon them and shall be ashamed, and a great one, and he shall deliver them” (xix, 18-20). The partial or entire conversion of Egypt is prophesied in the next two verses (21, 22). The time of the Greek dominion, following the Persian rule, may here be pointed to. There was then a great influx of Jewish settlers, and as we know of a Jewish town, Onias, and a great Jewish population at Alexandria, we may suppose that there were other large settlements. These would “speak the language of Canaan,” at first literally, afterwards in their retaining the religion and customs of their fathers. The altar which well corresponded to the temple built by Onias; the pillar, to the synagogue of Alexandria, the latter on the northern and western borders of Egypt. In this case Alexander would be the deliverer. We do not know, however, that at this period there was any recognition of the true God on the part of the Egyptians. If it was understood in a proper sense, we can, however, see no other time to which it applies, and must suppose that Ir-ha-heres was one of the cities partly or wholly inhabited by the Jews in Egypt: of these, Onias was the most important, and to it the rendering, “One shall be called a city of destruction;” if it was understood in a proper sense, we can, however, see no other time to which it applies, and must suppose that Ir-ha-heres was one of the cities partly or wholly inhabited by the Jews in Egypt: of these, Onias was the most important, and to it the rendering, “One shall be called a city of destruction;” if it was destroyed by Titus, while Alexandria, and perhaps the other cities, yet stand. If the prophecy is to be taken tropically, the best reading and rendering are matters of verbal criticism. See Isaiah.
IR-HAM-MELACH 657  IRON

IR-ham-Melach (ʾîr-hîm-mēlāḵ), city of the salt, so called probably from the salt rocks still found in that vicinity; Sept. ἱππα καὶ πῶς ὄλαυν, Vulg. cirtatis saltas, Auth. Vera, "City of Salt", a city in the Desert of Judah, mentioned between Nibshan and En-gedi (Josh. xvii, 62); probably situated near the south-western part of the Dead Sea. Compare the "Valley of Salt" (2 Sam. viii, 18; Ps. lx, 2).

Ir-hat-Temarin (ʾîr-hāt-tēmārīn), city of the palms, so called from a palm grove in its neighborhood; Sept. πῶς φοινικέων, or πῶς τῶν φοινικέων, Vulg. cirtatis palmatis, Auth. Vera, "city of palm-trees", a place not identical with Juscutio (Deut. xxxiv, 3; Judg. i, 16; ii, 13; 2 Chron. xxviii, 10), which now, however, is utterly destitute of palm-trees.

Yri (Heb. ʾîrī, יִירִי; čizem; Sept. Οἰκί, Vulg. Urut), the last-named of the five sons of Bela, son of Benjamin (1 Chron. vii, 7). B.C. between 1856 and 1666. See 18.

It also appears in the A. Vers. of the Apocalypse (1 Esdr. viii, 62) as the name (Οἰκίν οὗ τοῦ Οἴκου, Vulg. Jorua) of the father of the priest Marmoth; evidently the Uriah (q.v.) of Ezra viii, 33.

Irjah (Heb. ʾîrjāḥ, יִירִגָח, seen by Jehovah; Sept. Ἰουραία, Vulg. Jeria), son of Shelemiah, and a captain of the ward at the gate of Benjamin, who arrested the prophet Jeremiah on the pretense that he was desertsing to the Chaldeans (Jer. xxxvii, 13, 14). B.C. 616.

Irith Church. See IRELAND.

Irmena, a statue of unknown form and significance, which was erected at Eresbege, in Hessen and Westphalia, and worshipped by the ancient Saxons. In 772, Charlemagne, having conquered the country and brought the people under subjection, destroyed it, to intimidate the idolatrous worship. It is said that he found in the inside a great amount of gold and silver. In the cathedral of Hildesheim they show a column of green marble which is claimed to be the column of Irmena. See Grimm, Irmenstrasse u. Irmenstule (Vienen, 1815); Von der Hagen, Irmin, seine Säule u. seine Wege (Bresl. 1817).—Pieper, Univ. Lex. ix, 66. (J. N. F.)

IrnaHASH [many Irnahas] (Heb. Ir-nah-hash), "the sea"; accompanied with the word ʾěsawn, ʾěsawn, ʾěsawn, Vulg. urbe Naxis, Auth. Vers. marg. "city of Nahas", a place (re-founded) by Tehinnah, the son of Esthbon, of the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. iv, 12). Schwarz (Palast. p. 116) thinks it the present Dir-Nakhas, one mile east of Beth-Jibrin; prob. the same marked (perh. inaccurately) Dar-Hakkas on Zimmermann's map, a short distance north-east of Beth-Jibrin. Van de Velde likewise identifies it with "Dir-Nakhas, a village with ancient remains east of Beth-Jibrin" (Memoir, p. 322). See NAHAS.

Iron (ʾîrōn, barez; Chal. ʾîrōn, parzel; Gr. σιδήρος, Lat. ferrum). There is not much room to doubt the identity of the metal denoted by the above terms. They, like so many others, are the first-mentioned smith, "a father of every instrument of iron" (Gen. iv, 22). As this metal is rarely found in its native state, but generally in combination with oxygen, the knowledge of the art of forging it, which is attributed to Tubal-Cain, argues an acquisiteness of the difficulties that attend the smelting of this metal. Iron melts at a temperature of about 3000° Fahrenheit, and to produce this heat large furnaces supplied by a strong blast of air are necessary. But, however difficult it may be to imagine a knowledge of such appliances at so early a period, it is perfectly certain that the use of iron is of extreme antiquity, and that therefore some means of overcoming the obstacles in question must have been discovered. What the process may have been is left entirely to conjecture; a method is employed by the natives of India, extremely simple and of great antiquity, which, though rude, is very effective, and suggests the possibility of similar knowledge in an early stage of civilization (U. Dict. of Sci. and Arts, s. v. Steel). The smelting furnaces of Ethiopia, described by Diodorus (v, 13), remains of which still exist in that country, correspond roughly with the modern bloomeries (Napier, Metallurgy of the Bible p. 140). Malleable iron was in common use, but it is doubtful whether the ancients were acquainted with cast-iron. See METAL.

The mineral wealth of Canaan is indicated by describing it as "a land whose stones are iron" (Deut. vii, 9), a passage from which it would seem that in ancient times it was a plentiful production of that vicinity (compare Job xxvii, 22), and there it is still in Syria and in the region of Lebanon (Volney's Travels i, 238). There appear to have been furnaces for smelting at an early period in Egypt (Deut. iv, 20; comp. Hengstenberg, Mos. u. Aeg. b. 19). Winer, indeed (Reale, s. v. Eisen), understands that the basalt which predominates in the Haaran (Burchardt, ii, 627) was an iron ore of which Oga'sstead (Deut. iii, 11) was made, as it contains a large percentage of iron. But this is doubtful. Pliny (xxxvi, 11), who is quoted as an authority, says, indeed, that basalt is "ferrei coloris atque duritiae," but does not hint that it was extracted from it. The best work of Bob contains passages which indicate that iron was a metal well known. Of the manner of procuring it, we learn that "iron is taken from dust" (xxxvii, 2). Iron was prepared in abundance by David for the building of the Temple (1 Chron. xxii, 5), to the amount of one hundred thousand talents (1 Chron. xxix, 7), or, rather, "without weight" (1 Chron. xxii, 14). Working in iron was considered a calling (2 Chron. ii, 7). See SMITH. In Ecclus. xxxviii, 28, we have a picture of the interior of an iron-smith's (Isa. xlv, 12) workshop: the smith, parched with the smoke and heat of the furnace, sitting beside his anvil and contemplating during the unwearying labor, his ears deafened with the din of the heavy hammer, his eyes foasted on his model, and never sleeping till he has accomplished his task. The superior hardness and strength of iron above all other substances is alluded to in Dan. ii, 40; its exceeding utility, in Str. xxxix, 81. It was found among the Midianites (Num. xxxii, 22), and was part of the wealth distributed among the tribes at their location in the land (Josh. xxii, 8).

The market of Tyre was supplied with bright or polished iron by the merchants of Dan and Javan (Ezek. xxvii, 19). Pliny (xxxiv, 41) speaks of this "wrought iron," so De Wette "geschmiedetes Eisen." The Targum has "bars of iron," which would correspond with the strictura of Pliny (xxxiv, 41). But Kimchi (Lex. s. v.) expounds מסיבת, ḫizboth, as "pure and polished" (=Span. acero, steel), in which he is supported by R. Sol. Parchon, and by Ben-Zeb, who gives "glanzend" as the equivalent (comp. the Homeric ἀλοίματιος, ἀλοίμαι, II, v, 573). If the Javan alluded to were Greece, and not, as Bochart (Phileg. ii, 21) seems to think, some place in Arabia, there might be reference to the iron mines of Macedonia, spoken of in the decree of Ἐμιλιοῦ Paulus (Livy, xlv, 29); but Bochart urges, as a very strong argument in support of his theory, that, at the time of Ezekiel's prophecy, the Tyrians did not depend upon Greece for a supply of cassis and cinnamon, which are associated with iron in the merchandise of Dan and Javan, but that rather the contrary was the case. Pliny (xxxiv, 41) awards the palm to the iron of Serica, that of Parthia being next in excellence. The Chalybes of the Pontus were celebrated as workers in iron in very ancient times (Esch. Prim. Lyceum Antiqu. 733). They were identified by Strabo with the Chaldei of his day (xii, 549), and the mines which they worked were in the mountains skirting the sea-coast. The produce of their lands is supposed to have reached the Euphrates of superior quality. Iron mines are still in existence on the same coast, and the ore is found "in small nodular masses in a dark yellow clay which overlies a limestone rock" (Smith's Dict. of Clas. Geog. s. v. Chalybes).
From the earliest times we meet with manufacturers in iron of the utmost variety (some articles of which seem to be anticipations of what are commonly supposed to be modern inventions). Thus iron was used for chisels (Deut. xxvii, 5), or something of the kind; for axes (Deut. xii, 4); 2 Kings vi, 6, 5; Isa. x, 19; comp. Hos. vii, 10; Amos vi, 7; (2 Sam. xii, 31; 1 Chron. xxii, 3); for nails (1 Chron. xxii, 5), and the fastenings of the Temple; for weapons of war (1 Sam. xvii, 7; Job xx, 24), and for war chariots (Josh. xvii, 16, 18; Judg. i, 19; iv, 8-15). The latter were plated or studded with it, or perhaps armed with iron scythes at the rear of the chariot, terraria sidera, as ancient Romans. Its usage in defensive armor is implied in 2 Sam. xxiii, 7 (compare Rev. ix, 9), and as a safeguard in peace it appears in fetters (Psa. cv, 18), prison gates (Acts xii, 10), and bars of gates or doors (Psa. cvii, 16; Isa. xlv, 2), as well as for surgical purposes (2 Tim. iv, 2). Sheet-iron was used for cooking utensils (Exek. iv, 8; compare Lev. vii, 9), and bars of hampered iron are mentioned in Job xi, 18 (though here the Sept. pervertently renders σίδηρος χρύσος, "cast-iron"). We have also mention of iron instruments (Numb. xxxviii, 7; barbed arrows) and of "iron" (Job xiv, 21), on iron bedstead (Deut. iii, 11); iron weights (shekels) (1 Sam. xvii, 7); iron tools (1 Kings vi, 7: 2 Kings vii, 5); horns (for symbolical use, 1 Kings xxi, 11); trees bound with iron (Dan. iv, 15); gods of iron (Dan. v, 4), etc. It was used by Solomon, according to Josephus, to clamp the pillars in the temple in which he built the Temple of the mount (Ant. xii, 11, 3), and by Hezekiah's workmen to hew out the conduits of Gibon (Eccles. xlvii, 17). Images were fastened in their niches in later times by iron brackets or clamps (Wis. xiii, 15). Agricultural implements were early made of the same material. In the treaty made by Porsena was inserted the condition that no iron should be used except for agricultural purposes (Pliny, xxxiv, xxxix), provided it was not for the same purpose (Deut. xxii, 25); or that the sheaves were itched with and brass (Deut. xxiii, 25). Indeed, iron so frequently occurs in poetical figures that it is difficult to discriminate between its literal and metaphorical sense. In such passages, in which it is not iron itself, that it is compared with iron; "iron" (Deut. xxiv, 18; Eph. vi, 16) denotes hard service: "a rod of iron" (Psa. ii, 9), a stern government; "a pillar of iron" (Jer. i, 18), a strong support; and "threshing instruments of iron" (Amos i, 3), the means of cruel oppression; the hardnesse and heaviness (Eccles. xxii, 15) of iron are so clearly the prominent idea, that, though it may have been used for the instruments in question, such usage is not of necessity indicated. The "furnace of iron" (Deut. iv, 28; 1 Kings viii, 51) is a figure which vividly expresses hard bondage, as represented by the severe labor which attended the operation of smelting. Iron is alluded to in the following instances: Under the same figure, chasteisement is denoted (Ezek. xxii, 18, 20, 22); reducting the earth to total barrenness by turning it into iron (Deut. xxvii, 23); strength, by a bar of it (Job xi, 18); afflic- tion, by iron fetters (Psa. cvii, 10); prosperity, by giving silver for iron (Isa. lx, 17); political strength (Dan. ii, 38); authority, by an iron sword in the neck (Isa. xliv, 4); giving supernatural fortitude to a prophet, making him an iron pillar (Jer. i, 18); destructive power of empires, by iron teeth (Dan. vii, 7); deterioration of character, by becoming iron (Jer. vi, 28; Ezek. xxii, 18), which resembles the idea of the image of iron; a tirestone, by iron; a burden, by a mass of iron (Eccles. xxii, 15); the greatest obstacles, by walls of iron (2 Macc. xi, 9); the certainty with which a real enemy will ever show his hatred, by the rust returning upon iron (Eccles. xii, 10). Iron seems used, as by the Hebrew poets, metonymically for the sword (Isa. x, 31), and so the Sept. understand it, μίσχυς. The following is selected as a beautiful comparison made to iron (Prov. xxvii, 17), "iron (literally) unites iron; so a man unites the countenance of his friend," gives stability to his appearance by his presence. It was for a long time supposed that the Egyptians were ignorant of the use of iron, and that the solution of the problem of its origin remained unexplained. It has now been discovered in monuments; but in the sepulchres at Thebes butterflies are represented as sharpening their knives on a round bar of metal attached to their aprons, which, from its blue color, is presumed to be steel. The steel weapons on the tomb of Rameses III are of a character which have not been matched by the Egyptians, and are ascribed to the influence of the Phoenicians, (see Herod. ii, 34.) From Rome it has spread to the Popes, and to the Pope, when he is in the finest state, the greatest care is taken to present him with new ones. (see Rose, i, 347.) One iron mine only has been discovered in Egypt, which was worked by the ancients. It is at Hemamai, between the Nile and the Red Sea; the iron found by Mr. Burton was in the form of specular and red ore (see ibid. 246). That no articles of iron should have been found is readily accounted for by the fact that it is easily destroyed by exposure to the air and moisture. According to Pliny (xxxiv, 45), it was preserved by a coating of white lead, gypsum, and liquid pitch. Bitumen was probably employed for the same purpose. The iron of the Phoenicians was obtained entirely from Africa, and not the iron almost exclusively from Assyria Proper in the form of bricks or pigs (Layard, Nineveh, i, 415, Secs. 21, 22.) Specimens of Assyrian iron-work overlaid with bronze were discovered by Mr. Layard, and are now in the British Museum (Nin. and Bab. p. 191). Iron weapons of various kinds were found at Nineveh, and some parts of the Temple at Jerusalem. A pick of the same metal (Is. p. 194) was also found, as well as part of a saw (p. 195), and the head of an axe (p. 957), and remains of scale-armour and helmets inlaid with copper (Nin. and Bab. p. 191). The use of iron for defensive weapons, as bronze for defensive armor. The Assyrians had daggers and arrow-heads of copper mixed with iron, and hardened with an alloy of tin (Layard, Nineveh, i, 418). So in the days of Homer war-clubs were shot with iron (Homer, vii, 141); arrows were tipped with iron (Il. vii, 239; Od. x, 171) for the axles of chariots (Il. vi, 273), for fetters (Od. ii, 204), for axes and bills (Il. vii, 485; Od. xxii, 3, 81). Adria- tus (Il. vi, 48) and Ulysses (Od. xxi, 10) reckoned it among their treasures, the iron weapons being kept in a chest, as described by Homer. (Od. v, 499; xii, 292; xx, 80; x, 78; x, 61.) In Od. i, 184, Mentes tells Telemachus that he is travelling from Taphos to Thessalian to procure brass in exchange for iron, which Eustathius says was not obtained from the mines of the island, but was the produce of piratical excursions (Millin, Mineral. Hem. p. 115, 24 ed.). Pliny (xxxiv, 46) mentions iron as used in the construction historically for a statue of Hercules at Thebes (compare Dan. ii, 33; v, 4), and goblets of iron as among the offerings in the temple of Mars the Avenger, at Rome. Alyattes the Lydian dedicated to the oracle at Delphi a small goblet of iron, the workmanship of Glaucus of Chios, to whom the discovery of the art of smelting this metal is attributed (Herod. i, 25). The goblet is described by Pausanias (x, 16). From the fact that such offerings were made to the temples, and that Achilles gave as a prize of contest a rudely-shaped mass of the same metal (Homer, ii, 111), it has been argued that in early times there was so little iron as to be highly esteemed for its rarity. That this was not the case in the time of Lycurgus is evident, and Homer attaches to it no epithet which would denote its preciousness (Millin, p. 106). There is reason to suppose that the discovery of iron was an old, and of the iron ages a tirestone, a time when the little weight can be attached to the line of Heroid often quoted as decisive on this point (Op. et Dies, 150). The Dactyls Idae of Crete were supposed by the ancients to have the merit of being the first to discover the properties of iron (Pliny, vii, 57; Diod. Sic. v, 64), as the Cyclopes were said to have invented the iron-smith's forge (Pliny, vii, 57). According to the Arundelian marbles
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iron was known B.C. 1370, while Larcher (Chronologie d'Had. p. 570) assigns a still earlier date, B.C. 1367. See SSE.

Iron (Heb. Yiron, יִרְון, place of alarm; Sept. ἤρος, one of the "fenced" cities of Naphthali, mentioned between En-hazor and Migdal-el (Josh. xix, 38). De Sauley (Narrat, ii, 382) thinks it may be the Yaron marked in Zimmerman's map north-west of Safed, the Yaron observed by Dr. Robinson (see ed. of Researches, iii, 61, 62, notes). Van de Velde (ii, 168) considers that it is "now Yaron, a village of Belad Behsharar. On the north-east side of the place are the foundations and other remains of the ancient city" (Memoir, p. 392).

Irondale, Gilbert, D.D., a bishop in the Church of England during the period of the Restoration. Of his early history but little is known to us. He was the rector of a small church in an obscure little village in Dorsetshire when he was promoted to the see of Bristol immediately after the Restoration. Wood ( Athen. Oxon. iii, 940) says of him that he owed his promotion to a poor bishopric solely to his great wealth. He died in 1671. Bishop Irondale is the author of a work entitled A Sermon (Oxford, 1657, 4to). See Shouton, Eccles. History of England (Church of the Restoration), i, 494.

Irroqui. See Indians.

Ipe'el (Hebrew יパーיל, פֹּרָי, restored by God; Sept. Ἴπαριλλι), a city in the tribe of Benjamin, mentioned between Rekem and Taralah (Josh. xvii, 27). The associated names only afford a conjectural position somewhere in the district west of Jerusalem, possibly at e-Kursil (Lat. castelium), on a conical hill about half way between Kulaiyeh (Lat. colonia) and Saba (Robinson, Researches, ii, 326).

Irregularity is a technical term for the want of the necessary canonical qualifications for the acquisition and exercise of an ecclesiastical office. These requisite qualifications are set forth in canones or regulae enacted from time to time by the Church for that purpose. It was based first on the apostolic examples given in Tit. iii, 1 sq.; v, 22; Tit. i, 6 sq.; and, after the notion of the Levitical priesthood gained ground among the clergy, on the regulations of the O. Test., which were explained in a mythical sense. The qualifications themselves can all be pointed out in the sacred books, and the whole body of the Church would be in disrepute for crime, or in a state which would render him unfit for and incapable of ordination. Innocent III (in c. 14, X. De purgatione canonicarum [v, 38] an. 1297) "notis defectis et non defectus" as "impedientia ad sacros ordines promovendum;" and subsequent canonists have therefore divided the impediments into three categories in a like manner. In early times divers expressions were made use of to designate these impediments, but since Innocent III irregularitas has become the technical name of them in canon law (c. 38, X. De testibus [ti, 20] an. 1293). See INCAPACITY.

The Greek Church in general adhered more to the principles which had been established during the first six centuries (see Canones Apostolorum, Conc. Neocesar, an. 314; can. 9 [c. 11, dist. xxxiv]; Concil. Nicom. cod. an., Trullanum, an. 692, can. 21), whilst the Evangelical Church published later regulations, which were in accordance with its general spirit. The formularia of confession and ecclesiastical discipline still continue, however, to refer expressly to the above-named passages of Scripture.

1. Irregularity on Account of a Crime. The apostolic canons make this a special action sine officio. After the congregation should be unimpeached. Church discipline has gradually defined the offenses which compose irregularity. Originally it consisted of all offenses that necessitated public penance; after the 9th century, of such as were publicly known (delictum manifestum, scotorum), and all faults entailing disonor, in which the "infamias paras non patent dignitatum" of c. 87, De regulis juris, was practically adhered to (comp. c. 2, Cod. Just. "de dignitatisibus," xii, 1, Constantin.). There are, besides, other offenses named by the law which, even though secret (delicta occultae), constitute irregularity, namely, heresy, apostasy, schism, simony, anabaptism, subversion of the ordination, promotion without passing through the usual hierarchical ministry, imposition without consecration, performance of worship while under excommunication or interdict, disregard of the rule of celibacy, etc. (see Thomassin, Vetus et nova ecclesiae disciplinae, pt. ii, lib. i, cap. lxxv; Ferraris, Bibliotheca canonica, a. v. Irregularitas, art. i, No. 11; Ernch und Gruber, Evangel. Kirchen. Geschichte, a. v. Irregularitas.)

While the Greek Church generally adhered to these regulations, the Evangelical Church naturally deviates from them in many particulars, in consequence of the absence of an ecclesiastical hierarchy, the abolition of the rule of celibacy, etc. That a person who has undergone punishment for crime is incapable of being ordained is self-evident. If a party is in bad repute, the congregation has a right to oppose his appointment, in case the imputations are well founded. This is a law among all Christian denominations.

The Romish Church recognizes the consequences of irregularity as important by means of a dispensation which the bishops are empowered to give when the crime is not public, except in case of premeditated murder (Concilium Trident. Sess. xxiv, cap. 6, "De reform. verb."); Sess. xiv, cap. 7, "De reform."). In this case the dispensation can continue only to the temporal concerns of the party himself. So also for public offenses, except he delegates special powers to the bishop for that purpose. In the Greek Church, on the contrary, the strict regulations of old are maintained, whereby irregularity for heavy offenses cannot be removed (Thomassin, Vetus et nova ecclesiae disciplinae, cap. 4, "De reform.").

II. Irregularity caused by Want of Qualification. — Irregularity for offense constitutes also irregularity for want of sufficient qualification, as it entails the loss of good reputation (defectus famae); to this are, however, added other causes which are considered as defects. Among these are:

1. Defectus atatia (want of the canonical age). — The age appointed for ordination has undergone various changes. According to the present canon law, the primary consecration of the Romish Church can be imparted as early as the 3rd year; it is only at the 4th or 5th year that it is possible to impart the consecration in the case of a priest. Non. Justin. cxxxvii, cap. 1; Concil. Trullanum, can. xii. The Evangelical churches generally require full majority, or twenty-five years; in some countries ordination is given at twenty-one. Dispensations are also granted under certain circumstances. The Church of England requires candidates to deacons' orders to be twenty-three, presbyters twenty-four, and bishops thirty.

2. Defectus natalis (legitimorum). — Invalidity was no obstacle to ordination in the ancient Church (c. 8, dist. lvi, Hieronymus). It has been considered so since the 9th century; yet the rule was not very strictly enforced (Concil. Miledense, an. 845 [in cap. 17, can. i, qu. vii]; Regimo, De discipl. eccles. lib. i, cap. 416 sqq.). Especial action was taken concerning the children of ordained priests (Concil. Pictorivienae, an. 1078 [c. 1, X. "De filius presbyterorum ordinandis vel non," i, 17]; Clarmonton, an. 1095 [comp. c. 14, dist. lvi, Urban II], etc.; see especially dist. lvi, tit. x, i, 17; lib. vi, i, 11; Concil. Trullanum, xxxv, cap. 15, "De reform."). And justified their laws in the passage of the O. T. Deut. xxiii, 2 (comp. c. 10, § 6, X. "De renunciation."). I. 9, Innocent III, an. 1206. This
defect, however, can be remedied (a) by recognition (c. 6, X. "Qui illi sint legitimi," iv, 17, Alexander III) ; (b) by entrance into a convent or foundation of regular canons (c. 11, dist. Ivi, Urban II) ; c. 1, X. "De fillius presbyterorum," etc.). This regulation, abolished by Sixtus V, was restored by Gregory XVI in 1851, but with this condition, that such persons should be disqualified from prelatical honors. (c) By dispensation, which, for ordinandae minores, and for majors when the defect is not publicly known, can be granted by the bishop; otherwise, for ordinandi majors, and benefits connected with cure of souls, the person whom can be granted only by the pope (c. 1, "De fillius presbyterorum," in vi [i, 11]; c. 20, 25, X. "De electione" [i, 6]). The Greek Church does not recognise this defect (Thomasin, cap. Ixxxi, § 4), neither does the Evangelical Church, although many jurists consider the canonical principle on which it is based as common law (Wiese, Kirchenrecht, p. iii, sec. I, p. 190; Eichhorn, Deutsches Friherrechts, § 89; Kirchenrecht, i, p. 704).

3. Defectus corporis.—In imitation of the Mosaic law (Lev. xxii, 17-20 sq.), it was at an early time demanded that the candidates for orders should have no bodily defect which should render them disqualified from the discharge of their office, or a subject of dislike to the people (Constit. Apost. lib. vii, cap. 2, 3; Canones Apostolorum, cap. 76, 77). This became more and more strictly observed on this point, and declared all bodily defects sufficient ground for irregularity (cap. 2, dist. xxxiii; cap. 7, dist. xxxiii; cap. 13, dist. iv) ; but finally returned again to the former rules (tit. x, "De corpor. vitiatis ordinandis vel non,") i, 20). Thus ordination is refused to the deaf, dumb, and blind (Con. Apostol. 77, c. 6, X. "De clerico agrotante vel debilitato," iii, 6); also to those who have but one eye, especially if the one wanting is the left (Bosio contra haereses, in reading mass the Missal is placed on the left side (cap. 13, dist. iv), the lame (c. 10, dist. iv) ; c. 56, dist. i, "De consecr."); qupliceta (c. 1, 2, can. vii, qu. ii; c. 21, X. "De electione," i, 6); lepers (c. 3, 4, X. "De clerico agrot. iii, 6), those who had mutilated themselves (c. 21 sq. ; Apost. c. 7 sq. dist. iv), hermaphrodites (Ferraris, Bibliotheca canonica, s. v.). In some of these cases there can be dispensations granted, as, for instance, for the loss of the left eye, when the right has gained more strength so as to compensate for the defect (Ferraris, s. v. Irregularitas, art. "Constitutiones") .

4. Defectus animae (want of spiritual capacity).—Thus madness, imbecility, etc., are grounds of irregularity (c. 2-5, dist. xxxiii).

5. Defectus intellectus (the want of adequate educational preparation).—In accordance with various passages of the O. T. (Jcr. i, 9; Hos. iv, 6; Mal. ii, 7, etc.), even the early Church demanded of its officers to have enjoyed special educational advantages, which alone could qualify them to act as teachers of the people (comp. dist. xxvii-xxviii, etc.), and the civil laws also insisted on this point (Novella, vi, cap. 4, etc., Capitulares of Charlemagne; Reitberg, Kirchengesch. Deutschland, vol. ii, § 124). With regard to the different orders special regulations were gradually adopted. The Council of Trent prescribed : Priores, tonsura non initiata, qui saepe mendacium confirmationis non sequerent fiidei sancti ente docti non fuerint, quique legere et scribere necass. Minoris ordines iis qui salt Latinam linguam intelligant . . . conferantur. Subdicaes et daconis ordinat. . . . minores ordinibus jam probati, ac libidine D. D. 

6. Defectus fidei (want of a well-grounded faith).—In consequence of the prescription (Can. Tolet, i, anno 400, cap. 4, tit. iii, i; v, 22) that no person who is not firm in the faith should be ordained, the Church commanded that none should be ordained immediately after conversion (Can. Apostol. 79; Can. Nicom. 320, c. 2 [c. 1, dist. xlvii]; Gregorius, anno 599 [c. 2, cod. 1], and especially none who had been baptised in Catholic Church (cf. Constit. Apostol. 77, c. 1, dist. lvii), (i. c. 1, dist. lviii)); its original strictness against the children and relatives of heretics was subsequently relaxed, and even the decrees concerning new converts fell into disuse where such showed that they possessed a firm faith (c. 7, X. "In fine de rescriptis," [i, 9]); Gonzalez Teller, Controversias de celes, cap. 16, sect. 6 [c. 2, dist. xi]). Its original strictness against the children and relatives of heretics was subsequently relaxed, and even the decrees concerning new converts fell into disuse where such showed that they possessed a firm faith (c. 7, X. "In fine de rescriptis" [i, 9]); Gonzalez Teller, Controversias de celes, cap. 16, sect. 6 [c. 2, dist. xi]). Its original strictness against the children and relatives of heretics was subsequently relaxed, and even the decrees concerning new converts fell into disuse where such showed that they possessed a firm faith (c. 7, X. "In fine de rescriptis" [i, 9]); Gonzalez Teller, Controversias de celes, cap. 16, sect. 6 [c. 2, dist. xi]). Its original strictness against the children and relatives of heretics was subsequently relaxed, and even the decrees concerning new converts fell into disuse where such showed that they possessed a firm faith (c. 7, X. "In fine de rescriptis" [i, 9]); Gonzalez Teller, Controversias de celes, cap. 16, sect. 6 [c. 2, dist. xi]). Its original strictness against the children and relatives of heretics was subsequently relaxed, and even the decrees concerning new converts fell into disuse where such showed that they possessed a firm faith (c. 7, X. "In fine de rescriptis" [i, 9]); Gonzalez Teller, Controversias de celes, cap. 16, sect. 6 [c. 2, dist. xi]). Its original strictness against the children and relatives of heretics was subsequently relaxed, and even the decrees concerning new converts fell into disuse where such showed that they possessed a firm faith (c. 7, X. "In fine de rescriptis" [i, 9]); Gonzalez Teller, Controversias de celes, cap. 16, sect. 6 [c. 2, dist. xi]). Its original strictness against the children and relatives of heretics was subsequently relaxed, and even the decrees concerning new converts fell into disuse where such showed that they possessed a firm faith (c. 7, X. "In fine de rescriptis" [i, 9]); Gonzalez Teller, Controversias de celes, cap. 16, sect. 6 [c. 2, dist. xi]).}

7. Defectus perfecta lemmatia (want of meekness).—It applies to those who have departed from the principle Ecclesia non sitit semper seminum. Hence, to those who have shed blood in war (Conc. Tolet, i, anno 400, c. 4, dist. lii); Innocent I, anno 404 [c. 1, cod. 1]; c. 24. X. "De homicidio" [v, 12], Honorius III; also to those who have sat as accuser, witness, lawyer, judge, or jurymen in a criminal court, and taken part in a sentence of death (Concil. Tolet, iv, anno 635, c. 31; Conc. Tolet, xi, anno 663, c. 21); also to those who, in the Greek Church, have retained from the original principle, and its application by the Evangelical Church appears fully justified.

8. Defectus sacrorum (matrimonii) (want of adherence to the rule of monogamy).—The apostolic command about the bishops and deacons being the husbands of one wife (1 Tim. iii, 12; Tit. i, 6) was by the Church considered as forbidding not only actual bigamy (bige- mium vera seu simultaneum), but also second marriage (bij- giamia successiva) (dist. xxxvi; c. 1, 2, dist. xxxiii, tit. x, "De bigamia non ordinandi," i, 21, etc.). The idea of bigamy was subsequently extended to include marriage with a widow or a deceased virgin (bigeamia inter- pretativa) (c. 2, dist. xxxiv; c. 10, 6, X. "De denunciatione," i, 9; c. 38, X. "De testibus," ii, 20; c. 4, 5, 7, X. "De bigamia non ordinandi," i, 21; Norvella Justiniuni, vi, cap. 1, § 3; cap. v, cxxiii; cap. xii); also the continuation of the marriage relation after a woman had committed adultery (c. 11, 12, dist. xxxiv, tit. ii) was considered bigamous, because if the woman, who, by a vow of chastity, had been joined in spiritual marriage to the Church, like monks, or who had attained high ecclesiastical positions, to marry even a virgin (bigeamia simulhetudine) (c. 24, can. cxxxii, qu. 1 [Conc. Angr. an. 314]). In this case the irregularity was not proper defectus sacrorum, sed proper affectus intentionis cum opera subsequens, as Innocent III expressly
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Pelagianism, says the Rev. O. Adolphus (Compendium Theologiae, p. 144, 8d edit. Cambridge, England, 1865, of the Church of England, and himself a believer in predestination, carry their views of the absolute predestination of a limited number to the ultimate attainment of salvation, through the influence of the irresistible grace of God causing their final perseverance, to such an extreme in their logical deductions that there appeared persons who charged the Augustinian system with leading to the dangerous conclusions that human actions are immaterial, and human efforts for the conversion of the wicked unavailing, in the face of God's free gift of grace in accordance with his secret decrees, pre-determined from everlasting. For the Arminian argument on the other hand, see ARMINIANISM; ELECTION; PRE-DESTINATION; WILL.

Irrigation. Gardens in the East anciently were, and still are, when possible, planted near streams, which afford the means of easy irrigation. (See the curious account of ancient garden irrigation in Pliny, Hist. Nat. xix. 4.) This explains such passages as Gen. ii. 9 sq., and Isa. i. 30. But streams were few in Palestine, at least such as afforded water in summer, when alone water was wanted for irrigation: hence rain-water, or water from the streams which dried up in summer, was in winter stored up in reservoirs, spacious enough to contain all the water likely to be needed during the dry season. See POOL; WELL. In fact, many of our own large nurseries are watered in the same manner from reservoirs of rain-water. The water was distributed through the garden in numerous small rills, which trav-
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erased it in all directions, and which were supplied either
by a continued stream from the reservoir, or had water
poured into them by the gardeners, in the manner shown
in the Egyptian monuments (see Wilkinson, Anc. Eg.
abridg. i, 33 sq.). See GARDEN. These rills, being
turned and directed by the foot, gave rise to the phrase
"watering the garden" as indicative of garden irriga-
tion (Deut. xi. 10). Thus Dr. Thomson says (Land and
Book, ii, 279), "I have often watched the gardeners at
this fattiging and unhealthy work. When one place is
sufficiently saturated, he pushes aside the sandy soil be-
tween him and the furrow with his foot, and then
continues to do until all are watered."

The reference, however, may be to certain kinds of hydraulic machines
turned by the feet, such as the small water-wheels used
on the plain of Acre and elsewhere. At Hamath, Da-
mascus, and other places in Syria, there are large water-
wheels, turned by the stream, used to raise water into
aqueducts. But the most common method of raising
water along the Nile is the Shaduf, or well-scoop and
bucket, represented on the monuments, though not much
used in Palestine. (On the whole subject, see Kitto,
Nat. Hist. of Pal. p. ccxxii sq.). See WATER.

Ir-sh'ēmēsh (Heb. id. שְׂמֵי, in pause שְׂמֵים, city of the sun; Sept. πολύς, Vulg. Hier-
meæ, id est civitas solis), a town on the border of Dan,
mentioned in the next footnote with Shabbib (Josh. xix.
41); probably the same as the Beth-shēmēsh (q.v.) of
Josh. xv. 10.

Ir' (Hebrew Ir', עיר, city; Sept. Ἱπά, Vulg. Hir),
the first-named of the sons of Caleb, the son of
Jephunneh (1 Chron. iv. 15). B.C. 1618.

Irving, Mathew, a minister of the German Re-
formed Church, was born in Cumberland Co., Pa., De-
cember 22, 1817. In early life he was a school-teacher.
On account of his piety and gifts he was made an elder
in the Church. His call to the ministry then became
more apparent to himself and to others, and he began
the study of theology privately with his pastor, and in
1833 was licensed and ordained. He took charge of
feebly and scattered German Reformed congregations in
Bedford Co., Pa., where he did the work of a pioneer in
a truly apostolic spirit. A number of separate charges
were formed from time to time out of parts of his field.
His ministry was greatly blessed, and the wilderness
and solitary places all around became glad. He accom-
plished the work of a long life in a comparatively few
years, and died in peace April 31, 1867.

Irving, Edward, "the great London preacher,
and precursor of a fanaticism," was the same name that
five years ago was in everybody's mouth, and whose career,
so strange, grotesque, solemn, and finally so sad, was
the theme of the sneers of the thoughtless and of the
wonder of the thoughtful," was born Aug. 15, 1792,
at Annan, county of Dumfries, Scotland, where his father
was a tanner. He was piously brought up, having been
early destined by his ambitious parents for the ministry.
He was educated at the University of Edinburgh, and
shortly after graduation (1805) was appointed to super-
intend the mathematical school at Haddowen, whence
he removed in 1812 to Kirkcaldy to assume the duties
of a small but honorably supplied church. Here he also
began his theological studies, and, in accordance
with the usage of his alma mater, he entered as one of
her students of theology. After a stay of about seven
years, having completed the probation required by the
Church, he returned to Edinburgh, and, continuing an
opening immediately, and fired of the occupation of teaching, he
commenced study at Edinburgh, devoting most of his time to the
writings of Bacon, Hooker, and Jeremy Taylor. At
last there came an invitation to preach in the hearing
of the celebrated Dr. Chalmers, who was desirous of
procuring for himself an assistant in the great parish of
St. John's, Glasgow; and shortly after Irving was cho-
sen for this position, and so enabled to begin "in earn-
est the great life work of which he had been prepar-
ing, and which he had anticipated with most painful
longings. A parish of 10,000 souls, mostly the families
of poor artisans and laborers, composed the parish.
and Chalmers at once entered on its works, and
varied his duties with his forfry, and the preaching
in this parish with Dr. Chalmers only afforded
him an inferior place, he soon grew dissatisfied with
the position; and, his preaching having secured him quite
a favorable reputation, he was invited to the great Eng-
lish metropolis as minister of the Caledonian Church,
a Kirk of Scotland in Cross Street, Hanover Garden. Early
in July, 1822, he began his labors in this little out-
of-the-way church, composed of only fifty members, oc-
casionally enlarged by some stray Scotchmen visiting the
great city. In a very few weeks he began to attract
large congregations; in three months the applications for seats were nearly 1,500; at length it became
necessary to exclude the general public, and to admit only
those who were provided with tickets. Statesmen, or-
ators, the noble, the wealthy, the fashionable, occupied
the seats of the church, and their carriages throught
the adjoining street. His ability as a preacher was thus stated by a writer on "Henry Drum-
mond" in the London Quart. Review, October, 1860, p
275: "The preacher's great stature, his bushy black hair
hanging down in ringlets, his deep voice, his solemn
manner, the impressiveness of his action, his broad Scotch
dialect, his antiquated yet forcible style, his natural
tendency to rivet attention, and made you feel that you were in
the presence of a power. Nor did his manner belie the
impression which was thus created. He was bent upon
accomplishing the end of the Gospel ministry in saving
souls from death; and at the beginning of his course,
before the disturbing influences of his position had less
their full work upon him, he preached with great force
and effect."
The influence which Irving exerted among
all classes of society of London was really surprising.
Such an amount of applause as was awarded to his
pulpit discourses has never fallen to the lot of man since
his day, except perhaps in the case of Robert Southey.
In 1824, a volume containing some of his discourses
was sent forth, not as sermons, but under the title of Orna-
tions: For the Oracles of God, four Orations: For
Judgments to come, an Argument in nine Parts. The
books were highly lauded, and three and four edition
of the books were sold in less than half a year.
"Amiless, and without a wide or lasting
interest, curiously quaint in style and manner, while
the matter generally bears upon the topics of the pass-
ning hour, it contains many passages of extraordinary
beauty and depth, many an outpouring of lofty devo-
tion, and frequent bursts of the most passionate elo-
quence" (Encyclop. Brit. xii, 625). But, as the
production of the preacher of the little Hatton Garden
guild, everybody who wished to be up with the times
had to read it, and so it soon "became the talk of
the town, and was regarded by some as an impor-
tant and temper."
The book held many vulnerable
points, one of which, not the least perhaps, was the
thrust in his introduction against the evident lack of
success of the ordinary instructions of the pulpit, charg-
ing it all in the result of the Presby-
try of Annan, to "the ambiguous position of a li-
censed preacher and candidate—a layman in fact, though
often recognised as a clergyman by courtesy; and he
only waited an opportunity to escape from his present
occupation to that for which he had been formally des-
griguated, and for which, in the opinion of the
ministers of the church, he had incurred the displeasure of
the Church, and the risk of being expelled, being
generally prevalent in England at that time. But
if this arrayed a number of critics against him, an es-
trangement of the great body of contemporary evan-
gelical Christians only followed his course of action in
1824. In this year he was called upon, as one of the pulpit
celebrations of the 2000th anniversary of the birth of
the London Missionary Society. He had long dreamt of
a revival of apostolical missions, and to advance "these
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The public nature of the great preacher, however, continued unabated in the midst of all these difficulties; may, his late meditations and yearnings rather increased his reputation, and soon a new and more continuous crowd had to be provided for the throne of hearing that weekly came to listen to him. The money for the building of a new edifice was easily procured, and early in 1827 he was installed pastor of the newly-built church in Regent Square, Chalmers preaching on the occasion.

"The transfiguration of the little church was long thronged by a promiscuous crowd of London fashionable life, to the commodious National Scotch Church in Regent Square, with its well-ordered and well-defined congregation, marks the culmination and the beginning of the descent of Irving's popularity." Shortly after his removal to the new church, he again ventured before the public as an author by the publication of three volumes (1828) selected from his discourses preached since the commencement of his ministry at London. Up to this time many of the extravagances of Irving had more or less displeased his brother laborers in the ministry, but no one had ventured to attack him publicly until "an idle clergyman called Cole," of whom Mr. Irving's biographer, Mrs. Oliphant, can barely speak with civility, accused Irving of inculcating heterodox doctrines on the Incarnation in the first volume of his sermons, which treats chiefly of the Trinity; first of the divine character, and especially of the divinity of Jesus Christ.

"The perfect humanity of Christ was Irving's favorite theme. With the utmost intensity he clung to the idea of the brotherhood of his Master—an idea he held with perfect reverence. The first shock of the charge and challenge of the doubters was directed against this to his adorable Lord, utterly unmanned him. The last thought of his heart would have been to derogate from the dignity of his Master, his impassioned reverence for whom had probably stimulated the teaching which now bore the brand of heresy" (London Quart. Rev. Oct. 1862, p. 193). It would hardly be worth while to follow up the controversy incited by the impertinent, if not treacherous conduct of Mr. Cole in exaggerating "an error which should have been the groundwork of a brotherly exposition," were it not for the fact that for these very views on the incarnation Irving was, some years later, deposed as the minister of his church. As the report said, he was the last of all persons who could be led to believe that the views which he set forth on this subject had anything novel or unusual in them. All that he was possibly guilty of, says Dr. Curry, is that he took his larger views and comprehended the work of the Incarnation of the Word as redemptive, in that by it the Godhead came into vital union with humanity, fallen and under the law. This last thought carried to his realistic mode of thinking the notion of Christ's participation in the fallen character of humanity, which he designated by terms that implied a real sinfulness in Christ. His attempt to get rid of the odiousness of that idea by saying that this was overborne and at length
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wholly expelled by the indwelling Godhead helped the matter but little, and still left him open to grave censure for at least an unhappy method of statement. But under all this there is unquestionably a most precious Gose been so marvellous and so warm, first justly condemned for an unwarrantable misstatement of certain doctrines of Christianity, the orthodoxy of the age may be justly called to account for its partial exhibition of those doctrines. For centuries the Church has been actively occupied in the establishment and defense of the doctrine of Christ’s divinity, until that of his humanity has largely fallen out of its thinking. It is quite time to cease from this one-sidedness and to take in a whole Gospel. Fallen humanity demands a sympathizing no less than an almighty Saviour; and if indeed Jesus is to be that Saviour, he must be apprehended by our faith, as ‘man with man,’ and as really and fully ‘touched with a sense of our infirmities.’ The Church of Rome answers to the heart’s yearning for human sympathy in the Mediator by giving that office to Mary; while our misformed practical creeds remove Jesus beyond our sympathies, and give us no other aid. The Church always in the coming of a John, uprising from the Saviour’s bosom, to set forth in all fulness the blessedness of the grace of Jesus, the incarnate God, who hath borne our griefs and carried our sorrows.”

With this charge of heresy advanced against him, Irving set out on a visit to the Holy Land, and if Irving was his heart, and the Kinsman Kindred, and the country side which had still so great a hold upon his heart, and then universal Scotland, of that advent which he looked for with undoubting and fervent expectations; and brilliant was the success with which he saw his labors crowned wherever he went. For once he was a prophet who received honors in his own country. Wherever he preached, not only whole congregations from neighboring towns came to swell his already large numbers of hearers, but oftentimes even the ministers would adjourn their services and go with the multifarious warm fireside and read a “text” for his benefit. While preaching at Edinburgh on the Apoplectic, the special theme of study in these later years, the services began as six o’clock A.M. Of these Chalmers writes: “He is drawing prodigious crowds. We attempted this morning to force our way into St. Andrew’s Church, but it was to no avail. He changes to the West Church, with its three handsome galleries, for the accommodation of the public, and even then there was not room. As in Edinburgh, so was his success at Glasgow and other places that he visited, and we need not wonder that Chalmers himself exclaims “that there must have been a most marvellous power of attraction that could turn a whole population out of their beds as early as five in the morning.”

As if to augment the difficulties already in his way, in his candid and straightforward manner, he further estranged his friends of the Scottish Church by extending his sympathy to a minister of his native Church, a Mr. Campbell, of Row, who was just then under the oculum of teaching false notions on the Precursarian high-Calvinistic doctrine of the Atonement as set forth in the Westminster Confession. “But the final divergence from his mother Church further resulted, not from the communication of any doctrinal excitement from the banks of Guirloch, but from a very strange phenomenon which about this time took its rise along the quiet banks of this river. For some time Irving had been pondering on the heretic, An Oil Regain his An Oil Regain, (q. c.) who was inclined to believe this spiritual gift to have been not only possessed by the apostolic Church, but an actual heritage of the Church of all times; indeed, a necessary condition for the healthy state of any Church of Christ. These thoughts of his became convictions when seconded at this juncture by some remarkable instinct. In the locality of Row, celebrated for the piety of its inhabitants, there had lived and died a young woman, Isabella Campbell by name, of rare and saintly character. A memoir which her minister had written of her attracted the attention of people far and near, and many of them came as pilgrims to visit the spot where she had lived and prayed. These visits to the earthy dwelling-place, as well as the noble reputation, if not example of a departed sister, had a wonderful influence on the surviving sister Mary—gifted with the same spiritual temperament, with powers of mind of no ordinary character, and, moreover, with the personal fascinations of a Forerunner. She was afflicted with the same disease which had made a prey of her sister, and while lying, as all believed, at the point of death, she professed to have received “the gift of tongues,” and, “as she lay in her weakness,” the Holy Ghost, they say, had come upon her with mighty power, and “constrained her to speak at great length, and with superhuman strength, in an unknown tongue.” Similar cases occurred in other neighboring places, and the news of the wondrous phenomena soon reached the ears of Irving. To him, of course, these indicated “an approaching realization of his prophetic dreams.” Not for an instant did he even attempt to acknowledge them as the natural answer of his aspirations and prayer; and many of his own flock, prepared by his previous teachings, seconded his feelings in favor of these long-lost spiritual gifts. Manifestations of a similar character soon appeared in his own Church h. at first private, but he watched its growth as it bustled about the house and busied itself in the public service on the Sabbath. “The die” had truly been “cast, and from that time the Regent Square church became a Babel.” His oldest and most discreet friends one by one deserted him, finding that their counselors were a man who would have the world believe that he was a Braham. Coleridge, both his friends, could not in the least stay the current that was fast hurrying him to a most frightful abyss. A collision between the pastor and his flock was inevitable, though some of his people shared his views. Against the continuation of the “new prophets” he was firm and decided. The inevitable result was of course the ejection of the minister and his believers in the “gift of tongues” from Regent Square Church. But it must not be supposed that a man of Irving’s great abilities, though his course was now downward, was surrounded only by a few weak followers. Among those who faithfully followed their pastor were some of London’s most distinguished characters, and when on the following Sunday he met his adherents in the hall of the great infidel Owen, no less than 800 were there to partake of the Lord’s Supper. Indeed, the place they had temporarily secured was far too small, and they moved to another room, and they removed to a large gallery in Newman Street, generally designated as West’s Gallery, because it had formerly belonged to West the painter. The denounce- ment of the play had now fairly begun, and it rapidly hastened to its close. The “gifted one” at Newman and Street had things in their own hands, and everything proceeded by “vision,” and prophecy, and in the “Spirit;” to all which Irving gave the most reverent and obedient attention. The Presbytery of Aman, by which body Irving had been first licensed to preach, but not afterwards by a remarkable stroke of fate, condemned him as guilty of heresy, and excommunicated him from the Church of Scotland. But as if his cup of sorrows was not yet sufficiently bitten, to add to the condemnation which he had just received at the hand of his mother Church, which he so dearly loved, he was afterwards condemned by Ann Girrus (q. c.) for his own adherents of the authority which by reason of his superiority had universally been granted to him, and, in accordance with a “revelation,” was interdicted “from exercising any priestly function, or administering the sacraments, or even preaching, excepting to those less sacred assemblies to which he was admitted.” Astounded, he yet uttered no murmur, but sat in the lowest places of the Church which he himself had created, in silent and resigned humility.” Mr. Andrews, in
1. The promise of a son had been made to his parents when Abraham was visited by the Lord in the plains of Mamre, and appeared so unlikely to be fulfilled, seeing that both Abraham and Sarah were “well stricken in years,” that its utterance caused the latter to laugh incredulously (Gen. xviii, 1 sq.). B.C. 2064. Being reproved for her unbelief, she laughed, “she laughed.” The reason assigned for the special visitation thus promised was, in effect, that Abraham was pious, and would train his offspring in piety, so that he would become the founder of a great nation, and all the nations of the earth should be blessed in him. See ABRAHAM. Isaac was born in his ninety-third year. He was named the name of Isaac (Gen. xxii, 1-3). B.C. 2063. This event occurred at Gerar. Isaac was thus emphatically the child of promise. Born, as he was, out of time, when his father was a hundred years old and his mother ninety, the parents themselves laughed with a kind of strangled laugh, in commemoration of the extraordinary, supernatural nature of the birth, and of the laughing joy which it occasioned to those more immediately interested in it. This signification of Isaac’s name is thrice alluded to (Gen. xvii, 17; xviii, 12; xxxi, 6). Josephus (Ant. i, 12, 2) refers to the story of the birth of this great of strangers, with the name as a symbol. Isaac. It includes a reference to them all, besides according with and expressing the happy, cheerful disposition of the bearer, and suggesting the relation in which he stood, as the seed of Abraham, the channel of the promised blessing; and the type of him who is pre-eminently the Seed, whose birth is the subject of the awe and amazement of myriads of our race. The preternatural birth of Isaac was a sign from heaven at the outset, indicating what kind of seed God expected as the fruit of the covenant, and what powers would be required for its production—that it should move in new and exalted spheres of activity, and yet in some sense above nature—the special gift and offspring of God. When Isaac was eight days old he received circumcision, and was thus received into the covenant made with his father; while his mother’s sceptical laughter was turned into triumphal exultation and joy in God (Gen. xxxii, 1-2). (See De Wette, Krit. p. 138 sq.; Ewald, Gesch. i, 388; Hartmann, Ueber d. Pentateu, p. 269; Lengerke, Ken. p. 290; Niemeyer, Charact. ii, 160.) See NAME.

2. The first noticeable circumstance in the life of Isaac took place in connection with his weaning. His precise age at this time is not given, but we may suppose him to have been (according to Eastern custom) fully two years old. In honor of the occasion Abraham made a great feast, as an expression of joy, no doubt, of his joy that the child had reached this fresh stage in his career—was no longer a sucking, but capable of self-sustenance, and was therefore a certain measure of domestication. For the parents, and those who sympathized with them, it would naturally be a feast of laughter—the laughter of mirth and joy; but there was one in the family—in-him—whom it was no occasion of gladness, who saw himself supplanted in the more external honors of the house by this younger brother, and who mocked while others laughed—himself, indeed, laughed. (For it is the same word still, הָעָשָׂפ, Gen. xxii, 9), but with the envious and scornful air which betrayed the alien and hostile spirit that lurked in his bosom. He must have been a well-grown boy at the time; and Sarab, desiring in the manifestations then given the sure
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The next recorded event in the life of Isaac is his marriage to Rebecca (Gen. xxiv). He was twenty years old when she arrived at his camp. They lived together in a tent, and Isaac and Rebecca had four sons: Esau,Jacob, Shem and Laban. Isaac and his wife had a long and fruitful marriage, and their sons were the seed of Abraham and the beginning of the nation of Israel.

The story of Isaac's life is told in Genesis 18, where he is visited by the three angels, who promise him a son. Isaac and his wife Sarah are childless, and they have been blessed by the Lord. They are told that Sarah will bear a son, who will be the heir of the promise made to Abraham. Isaac and Sarah are so happy that they sacrifice their son Ishmael, who is born to Sarah. But God appears to them in a dream and tells them that they should not sacrifice Ishmael, but keep him safe. Isaac and Sarah are then blessed with a son, Isaac, who is the promised heir of the promise made to Abraham. Isaac is said to be 666 years old when he dies, and his death is mourned by his family and his friends.

The story of Isaac's life is told in the Old Testament, and it is a story of faith, love, and sacrifice. It is a story of God's faithfulness to his promises, and it is a story of the power of prayer. The story of Isaac is a story of the power of God to fulfill his promises, and it is a story of the power of prayer to bring about God's will. The story of Isaac is a story of the power of faith to overcome doubt and fear, and it is a story of the power of love to overcome hatred and division.

The story of Isaac's life is told in the New Testament, and it is a story of the power of God to fulfill his promises, and it is a story of the power of prayer to bring about God's will. The story of Isaac is a story of the power of faith to overcome doubt and fear, and it is a story of the power of love to overcome hatred and division. The story of Isaac is a story of the power of God to save his people, and it is a story of the power of prayer to bring about God's will.
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being (so Bruna, in Paula's Memorab. vi, 1 sq.) received any encouragement from a sacrifice which Abraham was forbidden to accomplish (see Waterland, Works, iv, 280). Some writers have found for this transaction a kind of parallel—-it amounts to no more—-in the classical legends of Iphigenia and Phrixus (so Rosenmuller, Motteville). Isaac was Abraham's son, Michael and Joseph a Gracia in Kyriam et Orismon concorsis, Frech. a. O. 1721; Zeichb. Iisac auf Hynradam et Orisonis vestigio, (Ger. 1776). Iisacque, Isaac ortus in fabula Orisonis vestigio, (Ger. 1776). The sacrifice of Isaac, which is the first century a rhetorical exhibition of his own unaccustomedness with the meaning of sacrifice (see Joseph. Ant. i, 18, 5). The general aim of certain writers has been, as they consider it, to relieve the Bible from the odium which the narrated circumstances are in their opinion fitted to occasion. That the passage is free from every possible objection it may be too much to assert: it is, however, equally clear that many of the objections to which either religion or morality can take a wrong position, or under the discrediting medium of a foregone and adverse conclusion. The only proper way is to consider it as it is represented in the sacred page. The command, then, was expressly designated to try Abraham. If he should obey it, was he the father of the faithful, was he worthy of his high and dignified position? If his own obedience was weak, he could not train others in faith, trust, and love: hence a trial was necessary. That he was not without holy dispositions was already known, and indeed recognised in the sacrifice. But it is not now to be inferred that he had been the other; but was he prepared to do and suffer all God's will? Religious perfection and his position alike demanded a perfect heart: hence the kind of trial. If he was willing to surrender even his only child, and act himself both as offerer and priest in the sacrifice of the required victim, if he could so far conquer his natural affections, as subdue the father in his heart, then there could be no doubt that his will was wholly reconciled to God's, and that he was worthy of every trust, confidence, and honor (comp. James ii, 21). The trial was made, the fact was sustained, but the victim was not slain. What is there in this story to identify a calm and reflective turn of mind, simple in his habits, having few wants, good rather than great, fitted to receive impressions and follow a guide, not to originate important influences, or perform deeds of renown? If his character did not take a bent from the events connected with his father's readiness to offer him on Mount Moriah, certainly its passiveness is in entire agreement with the whole tenor of his conduct, as set forth in that narrative. (See Kitto's Daily Bible Illustr. ad loc.) Isaac, having, in conjunction with his half-brother Ishmael, buried Abraham his father, "in a good old age, in the cave of Machpelah," took up a somewhat permanent residence "by the well Lahai-roi," where, being blessed of God, he lived in prosperity and at ease (Gen. xxxv, 7-11). B.C. 1885. One source of regret, however, he deeply felt. Rebekah was barren. In time, however, two sons, Jacob and Esau, were granted his prayers (Gen. xxxv, 21-26). B.C. 2003. As the boys grew, Isaac gave a preference to Esau, who seems to have possessed those robust qualities of character in which his father was defective, and therefore gratified him by such dainties as the pursuits of the chase enabled the youth to "have a liberal" share, while the daughters of the plain were an object of special regard to Rebekah—a division of feeling and a kind of partiality which became the source of much domestic unhappiness, as well as of jealousy and hatred between the two sons (Gen. xxxv, 27, 28). See Esaq.

5. The life of Isaac, moreover, was not passed wholly without trials coming in from without. A famine compels him to seek food in some foreign land (Gen. xxvi, 1 sq.). B.C. cir. 1895. At the occurrence of this famine Isaac was expressly admonished by God not to go down into Egypt, but to abide within the boundaries of the Promised Land; and occasion was taken to renew
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the promise to him and his seed, and to confirm in his
behalf the oath which had been made to his father.
The Lord pleaded his word to be with him and to bless him
in the land—which he certainly did, though Isaac
did not feel so secure of the promised guardianship and
support as to be able to avoid falling into the snare
which his father, Abraham, had been too old and weak
to detect. Isaac, forty years of age, was living at
Gerar, in the neighborhood of the Philistine capital,
during the prevalence of the famine, and no doubt observing the wick-
edness of the place, he had the weakness to call Rebekah
his sister, in fear that the people might kill him on
her account, if they knew her to be his wife. It does
not appear that any violence was offered to Rebekah;
and the Philistine king, on discovering, as he did, from
the familiar bearing of Isaac towards Rebekah, that she
must be his wife, simply rebuked him for having, by his
prevarication, given occasion to a misapprehension which
might have led to serious consequences (Gen.
xxvi, 10).

No passage of his life has produced more reproach to
Isaac's character than this. Abraham's conduct while in
Egypt (ch. xii) and in Gerar (ch. xx), where he
concealed the closer connection between himself and his
wife, was imitated by Isaac in Gerar. On the one hand,
this was disowned by avowed adversaries of Chris-
tianity as involving the guilt of "lying and endeavor-
ing to betray the wife's chastity," and even by Chris-
tians, undoubtedly zealous for truth and right, as the
conduct of "a very poor, paltry earthworm, displaying
cowardly pusillanimity of soul," in the cause of
[right to his own sake."] But, on the other hand,
with more reverence, more kindness, and quite as much
probability, Waterland, who is no indiscriminate apolo-
gist for the errors of good men, after a minute examina-
tion of the circumstances, concludes that the patriarch
died not, on account of the difficulty of the oath, as
so long as it could lawfully be evaded, and to await and see whether
divine Providence might not, some way or other, inter-
pose before the last extremity. The event answered.
God did interpose" (Scripture Vindicated, in Works, iv,
1816, 490).

There is no improbability, as has been asserted, that
the same sort of event should happen in rude times at
different intervals, and, therefore, no reason for main-
taining that these events have the same historical basis,
and are, in fact, the same event differently represented.
Neither is it an unfair assumption that Abraham
headed the title of the kings of the earth, as Pharaoh was
of the kings of Egypt, or that it may have been the proper
name of several kings in succession, as George
has been of several English kings.

In all respects except this incident, Isaac's connection
with the Philistine territory was every way creditable
to himself, and marked with tokens of the divine favor.
He cultivated a portion of ground, and in the same year
reaped a hundred fold—a remarkable increase, to en-
courage him to abide under God's protection in Canaan.
His flocks and herds multiplied exceedingly, so that he
rose to the possession of very great wealth; he even
became, on account of it, an object of sovay to the Philis-
tines, who could not rest till they drove him from their
territory. He reopened the wells which his father had
digged, and which the Philistines had meanwhile filled
up, and himself dug several new ones, but they disputed
with him from the right of possession, and obliged him to
withdraw from them one after another. Finally, at a
greater distance, he dug a well, which he was allowed
to keep un molested; and in token of his satisfaction at
the peace he enjoyed, he called it Rehoboth (room)
(Gen. xxi, 22). Thence he returned to Beersheba,
where, it is supposed, the Lord again appeared to him, and gave him
fresh assurance of the covenant-blessing; and Abime-
lech, partly ashamed of the unk ikind treatment Isaac had
received, and partly desirous of standing well with one
who was so evidently prospering in his course, sent
some of his leading men to enter formally into a cove-
nant of peace with him. Isaac showed his meek and
kindly disposition in giving courteous entertainment to
the messengers, and cordially agreed to their proposal.
It was probably a period considerably later still than
even the latest of these transactions to which the next
notice in the life of Isaac must be referred. This is
the marriage of Isaac to two of the daughters of Canaan
(Judith and Basemeth). When Isaac was about forty
years of age, his father Abraham died, and Isaac was in
the forty-seventh year of his life, coeval with Isaac's hundredth.

These alliances were far from giving satisfaction to the
aged patriarch; on the contrary, they were a grief of
mind to him and his wife Rebekah (Gen. xxvi, 36).

The last portion of Isaac's life is connected with the
blessing of his sons (Gen. xxvii, 1 sq.). B.C. 1927.
It has been plausibly suggested (Browne, Orbis Stoeck-
run, p. 310) that the forebodings of a speedy demise
(ver. 2) on the part of Isaac, whose health always ap-
ppears to have been delicate (Kitto's Daily Bible. [Part
ad loc.]), may have arisen from the fact that his beloved
Ishmael died at the age he had just now reached (Gen.
xxv, 17), although he himself survived this point for
many years (Gen. xxxvi, 28).

When old and dim of sight (which fails much sooner in Eastern
countries than with us), supposing that the time of his depar-
ture was near, he sent for his son Esau, and
sent him to "take some venison" for him, and to make his favorite "savoury meat," that he might eat and "bless" him before his death. Esau prepared to obey his father's will, and set forth to the field; but
through the deceptive stratagem of Rebekah the "sa-
vory meat" was perverted into a dish of venison disguised as a
to Esau, disguised so as to resemble his hairy brother, im-
posed on his father, and obtained the blessing. Yet, on
the discovery of the cheat, when Esau brought in to his
father the dish he had prepared, Isaac, remembering to
bless Jacob, said to Esau, "The elder should serve the
younger," and convinced that God intended the blessing
for Jacob, would not, perhaps rather could not, reverse
the solemn words he had uttered, but bestowed an infe-

This paternal blessing, if full, conveyed, as was usual, the
right of headship in the family, together with the chief
possessions. In the blessing which the aged patriarch
pronounced on Jacob, it deserves notice how entirely
the wishful-for-good is of an earthly and temporal na-
ture, while the imagery which is employed serves to show the extent to which the poetical element prevai-
lsl as a constituent part of the Hebrew orators' art
(Gen. xxvii, 27 sq.). Most natural, too, is the extreme
privation of the poor blind old man on discovering
the cheat which had been put upon him. All the parties
to this nefarious transaction were signally punished by
divine vengeance (comp. Genesis, chap. xxvi, 24-
7). The entire passage is of itself enough to
vindicate the historical character and entire credibility
of those sketches of the lives of the patriarchs which
Genesis presents.

Yet Isaac's tacit acquiescence in the conduct of his
sons has been brought into discussion. Fairbairn (Ty-
ology, i, 384) seems scarcely justified by facts in his
conclusion that the later days of Isaac did not fulfill
the promise of his earlier; that, instead of reaching to high
attainments in faith, he fell into general feebleness
and decay moral and bodily, and made account only of
the natural elements in judging of his son, which he
took to the literal sense as a garbled translation (to modern ears) of"... prey taken in hunt-
ing," by "venison" (Gen. xxv, 28), may have con-
tributed to, form, in the minds of English readers, a low
opinion of Isaac. Nor can that opinion be supported by
a reference to xxvii, 4; for Isaac's desire at such a
time for savory meat may have sprung either from a
natural element in judging of his son, or from that
kind of impulse preceding inspiration as prompted Eli-
sha (2 Kings iii, 15) to demand the soothing influence
of music before he spoke the word of the Lord.
For sadness and grief are enumerated in the Psalms among
the impediments to the exercise of the gift of prophecy
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(Smith's Select Discourses, vi, 245). The reader who has in mind the peculiarities of Isaac's character will scarcely infer from those passages any fresh accession of mental or moral feellessness. Such a longing in an old man was innocent enough, and indicated nothing of a spirit of self-indulgence. It was an extraordinary case, and, too, and Kalisch sets it in its true light: "The venison is the fruit of his soil, and what is offered to the Lord is the fruit of the blessing, and ratifying the proceedings; and hence Jacob killed and prepared two kids of the goats (verse 9), whereas, for an ordinary meal, one would have been more than sufficient; it imparted to the ceremony, in certain respects, the character of a covenant (comp. xxii. 27-30; Exod. xii, 22; xxiv, 5-11, etc.); the one party showed ready obedience and sincere affection, while the other accepted the gift, and granted in return the whole store of happiness he was able to bequeath. Thus the meal which Isaac required has a double meaning, both connected with the internal organism of the book" (Comm. on Gen. xxvii, 1-4).

7. The stealing, on the part of Jacob, of his father's blessing having angered Esau, who seems to have looked forward to Isaac's death as affording an opportunity for taking vengeance on his unjust brother, the aged patriarch is led to entrust Isaac's blessing to Jacob by misrepresenting him. Jacob into Mesopotamia, that, after his own example, his son might take a wife from among his kindred and people, "of the daughters of Laban, thy mother's brother" (Gen. xxvii, 41-46). B.C. 1927. See JACOB. This is the last important act recorded of Isaac. Jacob, this is the most illustrious and the most typical of the teachers of the nation. An act of the utmost importance is here to the benefit of Jacob and his family, and to the exclusion of the Edomites. The event, however, is left unrecorded. The blessing of Isaac to Jacob may be viewed as a prophecy of the future. To Jacob, the seed and the promise were given. Jacob was the father of the twelve tribes of Israel.

In the N. T. reference is made to the offering of Isaac (Heb. xi, 17, and James ii, 21) and to his blessing his sons (Heb. xi, 20). As the child of the promise, and as the progenitor of the children of the promise, he is contrasted with Ishmael (Rom. ix, 7, 10; Gal. iv, 29; Heb. xi, 18). In our Lord's remarkable argument with the Sadaeeum, his history is carried beyond the point at which it is left in the O.T., into and beyond the grave. Isaac, of whom it was said (Gen. xxvii, 29) that he was gathered unto his people, is compared to another of the same name and authority he is proclaimed as an acknowledged heir of future glory (Matt. viii, 11, etc.).

II. His Character. Isaac, the gentle and dutiful son, the faithful and constant husband (see Becker, De Isaaco, etc., Griseaw, 1750), became the father of a house in which order did not reign. If there were any very prominent points in his character, they were not brought out by the circumstances in which he was placed. He appears less as a man of action than as a man of suffering, from which he is generally delivered without any direct effort of his own. This is opposed to the object of Ishmael's mocking, of the intended sacrifice on Moriah, of the rapacity of the Philistines, and of Jacob's stratagem. But the thought of his sufferings is effaced by the ever-present tokens of God's favor; and he suffers with the calmness and dignity of a conscious heir of heavenly promises, without uttering any complaint, and generally without committing any action by which he would forfeit respect. Free from violent passions, he was a man of constant, deep, and tender affections. Thus he mourned for his mother till her place was filled by his wife. His sons were nurtured at home till a late period of their lives; and neither his grief for Esau's marriage, nor the anxiety in which he was involved in consequence of Jacob's deceit, estranged either of them from his affectionate care. His life of solitary blamelessness must have been sustained by strong habitual piety, such as showed itself at the time of Rebekah's barrenness (Gen. xxvi, 1), in his special intercession with God at Gerar and Beersheba (xxxvi, 2, 29), in the solemnity with which he bestows his blessing and refuses to change it. His life, judged by a worldly standard, might seem inactive, ignoble, and unfruitful; but the "guileless years, prayers, gracious acts, and daily thank-offerings of pastoral life" are not to be so esteemed, as to make no shadow of meaning. He, as a character, may not have exercised any commanding influence upon either his own or succeeding generations, but it was sufficiently marked and consistent to win respect and envy from his contemporaries. By his posterity his name is joined in equity honored with those of Abraham and Jacob, and so was esteemed as part of the formula which Egyptian magicians in the time of Origen (Contra Celsum, i, 22) employed as efficacious to bind the demons whom they adjured (comp. Gen. xxxi, 42, 50).

If Abraham's enterprises, unsettled life foreshadowed the early history of his descendants; if Jacob was a type of the careful, commercial, warlike character of their later days, Isaac may represent the middle period, in which they lived apart from nations, and enjoyed possession of the fertile land of promise. (See KALISCH, ad loc.)

III. The typical view of Isaac is barely referred to in the N.T., but it is drawn out with minute particularity by Philo and those interpreters of Scripture who were influenced by Alexandrian philosophy. Thus in Philo, Isaac (laughter = the most exquisite enjoyment = the source of joy, and in Philo's and the rest of the pious Israelites, at their home, the word is shadowed in the facts that his father had attained 100 years (the perfect number) when he was born, and that he is specially designated as given to his parents by God. His birth from the mistress of Abraham's household symbolizes happiness proceeding from a predominant wish. In Tertullian he is a pattern of monogamy, and a type of Christ bearing the cross. But Clement of Alexandria finds an allegorical meaning in the incidents which connect Abimelech with Isaac and Rebekah (Gen. xxvi, 8), as well as in the offering of Isaac. In this latter view he is followed by Origen, and by Augustine, and by Christian expositors generally. The most minute particulars of that transaction are invested with a spiritual meaning by such writers as Rabanus Maurus, in Gen. § 111. Abraham is made a type of the first person in the blessed Trinity, Isaac of the second; the two servants dismissed are the Jewish sects who did not attain to a perception of Christ's humiliation; the ass bearing the wood is the Jewish nation, to whom were committed the oracles of God which they failed to understand; the three days are the Patriarchal, Mosaic, and Christian dispensations; the ram is the Lord's Christ on the cross; the fire of Jehovah in him. Modern English writers hold firmly the typical significance of the transaction, without extending it into such detail (see Pearson, On the Creed, i, 243, 251, edit. 1843; Fairbairn's Typology, i, 392). A recent writer (A. Jukes, Types of Genesis), who has shown much ingenuity in attaching a spiritual meaning to the characters and incidents in the book of Genesis, regards Isaac as representing the spirit of sonship, in a series in which Adam represents human nature, Cain the carnal mind, Abel the spiritual, Noah regeneration, Abraham the spirit of faith, Jacob the spirit of service, Joseph suffering or glory. With these series may be compared the
view of Ewald (Gesch. i, 387-400), in which the whole patriarchal family is a prefigurative group, comprising twelve members with seven distinct modes of relation: 1. Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob are three fathers, respectively personifying active power, quiet enjoyment, success after struggles, distinguished from the rest as Ag aumento, the head of the Ulysses and the heroes of the Trojan Ilid, or as the Trojan Anchises, Eneas, and Ascanius, and mutually related as Romulus, Remus, and Numus; 2. Sarah, with Hagar, as mother and mistress of the household; 3. Isaac as child; 4. Isaac with Rebekah as the type of wedlock (comp. his Aetherium); p. 288); 5. Leah and Rachel thing with the same way; 6. Deborah as nurse (compare Anna and Caleb, Ann. iv, 654, and vii, 1); 7. Eliezer as steward, whose office is compared to that of the messenger of the Olympic deities.

IV. Traditions.—Jewish legends represent Isaac as an angel made before the world, and as residing in human form (Origen, in Johann. ii, § 25); as one of the three men in whom human sinfulness has no place, as one of the six over whom the angel of death has no power (Eisenmenger, Entd. Jud. i, 343, 964). He is said to have been instructed in divine knowledge by Shem (Judith x. 12). The ordinance of the evening prayer is ascribed to him (Gen. xxiv, 63), as that of morning prayer to Abraham (xix, 27), and that night prayer to Jacob (xxxvii, 11) (Eisenmenger, Ent. Jud. i, 483).

The Arabian traditions included in the Koran represent Isaac as a model of religion, a righteous person in spirit in Syriac, to do good works, and give alms and give alms (xxi, 68), endowed with the divine gifts of prophecy, children, and wealth (ch. xix). The promise of Isaac and the offering of Isaac are also mentioned (ch. xx, 38). Faith in a future resurrection is ascribed to Abraham: but it is connected, not, as in Heb. xi, 19, with the offering of Isaac, but with a notorious miracle (chap. ii). Stanley mentions a curious tradition of the reputed jealousy of Isaac's character that prevails among the inhabitants of Hebron respecting the grave of Rebekah (Jewish Church, i, 496 sq.). On the notices of Isaac in the Talmud, see Otho's Lex. Talm. p. 138; Hamburg, Hebr. Lex. s. v. Bittel u. Talmud, p. 62 s.; for the notices in the Koran, see Hottinger's Hist. Orient. p. 25, 52). See Bouchier, History of Isaac (London, 1864). For older treatises, see Darling, Cyclop. Bibliograph. col. 190.

Isaac, bishop of Langres, France, is supposed to have been present at the Council of kierry in 846, as described in the death of the St. Aulubalba, Waltze seized the bishopric of Langres in spite of all opposing causes; but Hincmar, archbishop of Rheims, declared against him, and Charles the Bald compelled him to flee. Hilduin, lay abbot of St. Denis, then proposed Isaac as bishop, and by his influence caused him to be appointed. Isaac was ordained bishop of Langres about 856. We afterwards find his name in the councils of Toul and Langres (859), of Tousy (860), of Pistes (862), of Verberie, and of Soissons (866)—an evidence that he had gained great consideration and influence. His mildness caused him to be surmounted, and the mantle of the Church of Dillingen fell upon him highly. A lasting monument of his efforts to effect a reform among the monastic orders is his work on Canons, published by Sirmond, Conciles, vol. iii; Labbe, Concil. etc.; Baluze, Constitutions, vol. ii. See Grätz Christ. vol. v, col. 888; Hist. lit. de la France, v, 928; Hoefer, Nouv. Dict. de l'Antiqu. xvi, 4. (J. N. P.)

Isaac the Syrian (c), with the surname of Doctor or Magnus, because of his ability of an ecclesiastical writer, who flourished in the first half of the 5th century, was, in all probability, a native of Syria. He was at first a monk in a convent not far from Gabala, in Phocis, and afterwards became a priest at Antioch. He died about 456. He wrote several theological pamphlets in Syriac (and perhaps also in Greek), directed chiefly against the Nestorians and Eutychians. A work on the Contempt of the World would be considered as his chief claim to reputation, but the authorship of this book is not at all well established. It is by some supposed to have been written by the other Isaac the Syrian (see next art.). There seem to be better grounds for considering him as the author of the treatise De Cogitatione Chrestos, and the two books of the Asceticon of Petrus. In the library of the Vatican contains some other MS. works of Isaac. He is honored as a saint both by the Maronites and Jacobites of Syria. See Gemmians, De Script. Eccles.; Cave, Hist. Litera- ria; Fabricius, Biblicum, Graece, xii, 314; Hoefer, Nov. Biog. Générale, xxvi, 8; Jocher, Geol. Letr. ii, 191.

Isaac the Syrian (d), generally with the surname of Ninivita, an ecclesiastical writer of the 5th century, became bishop of Nineveh, but afterwards resigned his office to enter a convent, of which he was subsequently chosen abbot. He died towards the close of the 6th century. He is generally, and, as it seems, justly considered as the author of the treatise De Contemptus Mundi, de Operacione corporali et sui Abjectione Liber, which may be found in the Orthodogogia (second edition, Basle, 1569), Bibliotheca Patrum (of Cologne, vol. vi), Bibliotheca Patrum (of Paris, vol. v), Bibliotheca nova- sina (of Lyona, vol. xi), and in Galland, Bibliotheca Pa- trum (vol. xii). All these collections contain a Greek text with a Latin translation, yet the former appears itself to be a translation from the Syriac. There are twenty-seven ascetic sermons of his in Greek (in MSS. in the British Museum and some manuscripts (MSS. in the Bolleian Library). See Cave, Hist. Liter.; Fabricius, Biblic. Graece, xi, 215; Hoefer, Nov. Biog. Général., 4; Jocher, Geol. Letr. ii, 191.

Isaac Aboa, a Spanish Jew of some distinction as a commentator and preacher, was born, according to Gratzi, Gesch. d. Juden, vii, 225), in 1409, and succeeded the celebrated Isaac of Campanotto as Gaon of Castile. He died in 1449. Aboa wrote, besides super commentaries to the commentaries of Rashi and Nachman, Zurim or Homilies, with free Use of the Hagadah, edited by Gemshon Soncini (Constantinople, 1588, 4to); Zolkiev, 1800, with notes; a number of other works that have frequently been attributed to the pen of this Isaac, which Dr. Zum assigns, as Gratzi believes very properly, to another Isaac Aboa, who flourished about 1300-1820. Among these, the most important, which First (Bibliotheca Judice, 4, 4 sq.) assigns to the present Isaac, is entitled Nissin-ji, a haggadic or ethical treatise on the Talmud and Midrashim, in seven sections (published at Venice, 1544, fol., and several times later: also with a Heb. commentary by Frankfurter, Amsterdam, 1701, 8vo; and by others with Spanish, Hebrew, German, and High-German translations at different times and places). (J. H. W.)

Isaac Albalad, a Jewish philosopher of some note, died during the latter half of the 13th century. He was a contemporary of the celebrated Falaquera, and, like him, well versed in Arabic philosophy. Albalad possessed greater natural endowments than Falaquera, but, wanting that independence of mind which made the latter so justly celebrated, he failed to take as prominent a position. He died about 1294. About 1292 he edited and improved Alghazali's Makanid Alphilosophia, under the title of al-Andalib. A part of it has been published by Schorr in Chalde, iv (1859) and vi (1861). See Gratzi, Gesch. d. Juden, vii, 226 sq. (J. H. W.)

Isaac Argyrus, a Greek monk who flourished in the latter half of the 14th century at St. Eune, in Thessalia, wrote about 1373, when he is said to have been at the age of sixty, Computa Gracorum de sollemnitate pascha-
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in celeberrimi, published in Greek and Latin by J. Christ-
mann (Heidelberg, 1611, 4to), and inserted by Dionys-
ianus Petavius in his De Doctrina temporum (iii, 359).
He is also supposed to be the author of a work still in
MS. form on astronomy. Of Isaac's personal history but
little is clearly known.—Jöcher, Gelehr. Lex. ii, 1894;
Machmuhl, Eccl. Hist. bk. iii, cent. xiv, pt ii, ch. ii. (J. H. W.)

Isaac ben-Abba-Mare, a Jewish exponent of the
Talmud, was born at Bourg des St. Gilles, France,
in 1135. His father was an officer under the govern-
ment of the count of Toulouse, and afforded Isaac ev-
en more opportunity for distinction by devoting
himself to the study of the Talmud under the celebri-
ted Rabbi Tam of Rameru. When only seventeen
years old he prepared a compendium of certain ritualistic
laws of the Jews, in which he evinced thorough famil-
arity with the Talmud. He also wrote a commentary on
one of the most difficult parts of the Talmud, and finally
collected all his investigations on the Jewish traditions
under the title of דקדוקי (probably in 1179). It
was incompletely published by Josef ben-Saruk (Ven.
1608; and since then, Warszawa, 1801), See Grätz,
(J. H. W.)

Isaac ben-Abraham, a distinguished Jewish
Rabbi of the Karaitic sect, was born at Trock, near Wil-
na (Lithuania) about 1588. He is especially celebrated
as the author of a work against Christianity, entitled
מנון מהלך, Chizzik Amanun (minimen fida), written
in 1593. It is divided into two parts: the first, contain-
ing fifty chapters, consists of an apology for Judaism,
and a general attack on the Christian faith; the second
contains a criticism of the examination of the hundred
phrases of the N. T., intended by the writer to refute the
proofs adduced by Christians from the Old Test. It is con-
sidered, next to the productions of Duran (q. v.), the
ablest work ever written by any Jew against the Christian
religion. It was first published by Wagensell, with a
Latin translation, in the Tela igura Sittanen (Allendorf, 1682, 4to),
from a MS. obtained from an African Jew, which, as
Grätz asserts, was imperfect. The Hebrew text was after-
wards reprinted by the Jews (Amsterdam, 1705, 12mo),
and by Gousset, with a Latin translation and a refuta-
tion (Amst. 1717, 8vo); into German by Leu (1717),
and by Alu (1718). The latter attack the works written
in answer to it, which deserve especial men-
tion, besides those named above, are J. Müller, Con-
flutio libri Chizzik Emuna (Hamb. 1644, 4to); Gebhard,
Centum loca Novi Testamenti vindicata adversus Chizzik
Emuna (Greifswald, 1699, 4to).; J. P. Storrs, Evangelische
Glaubenslehre gegen d. Werk Chizzik Emuna (Thub. 1703,
8vo); K. Kidder, Demonstrat. of the Messias (Lond. 1684–
1700, 3 pts. 8vo). Isaac ben-Abraham died about 1594.
See Ross, Dizionario storico degli Autori Ebrei; Bartolocci,
Magna Biblia, Rabbin., Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, ix, 400 sq.; Hase,
Novus Testamento xxvi, 10; Fürst, Biblioth. Jud. ii, 159. (J. H. W.)

Isaac ben-Abraham Alkhrish, a Jewish writer
of considerable note, was born about 1489, in Spain;
the name of the place is not known to us. He was lane
on both feet, but this minded condition by no means pre-
vented him from acquiring great learning; nay, he
even travelled in learning, and enjoyed the privi-
gees of a great scholar. When yet a boy, the persecu-
tions of the Jews by the Spaniards obliged him to leave his
native land (1492), and he removed to Naples. But he
also here he and his coreligionists were sorely tried by
persecution, and again he fled; this time from country
to country. As he was unable to understand the
languages he did not understand, and whose inhabitants spared neither the aged nor the
young,” until he finally found a home in the house of a
banished coreligionist in far-off Egypt. After a stay of
some ten years he removed to Palestine, and finally
settled in Turkey, where he was honored with the instruc-
tion of one of the princes of the realm. He died after
1677. His works are בְּנַחֲלוּת, or on Jewish Reign
during the Exile; containing (1) the correspondence of
Chasdei ben Joseph; (2) the reign of the Chassars;
(3) תְּרוּפָּה, or during the reign of Persians; also the
history of Bastaani, etc. (Constant. 15, 8vo; Basle, 1569,
8vo; and with a work of Farsaolo, Offenb. 1720, 12mo).
See Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, ix, 10 sq., 420 sq. (J. H. W.)

Isaac ben-Calousomo. See NATHAN.

Isaac ben-Elia ben-Samuvel, a Jewish com-
mentator who flourished in the beginning of the 18th
century, deserves our notice as the author of (1) A Com-
mentary on the Psalms, published at Dyrenfert, under
the title of הַקְּנֵי הַעֲשָׁר, the Psalms with a valuable catena (1728), consisting of excerpts from the
celebrated expositions of Rashi, D. Kimchi, etc., giving
also an abridgment of Alsheich’s commentary, entitled
מדרש הַעֲשָׁר, and a German explanation of the dif-
ficult words. (2) A Commentary on Proverbs, enti-
tled שְׂפָתָאנוֹת, Proverbs with a valuable catena
(Wandbeck, 1730–51), composed of excerpts from the
expositions of Rashi, Ibn D. Kimchi, Ibn Joseph, Ibn
Ahun, Solomon ben-Melech, giving also a German ex-
planation of the difficult expressions, and an abridg-
ment of Alsheich’s exposition called קָנֶה הַסּוֹפֵות; and (3) A Commen-
tary on the Subbatic Lessons from the Prophets,
entitled הַמְּצוֹאֵי הַסּוֹפֵות, the face of Isaac (Wandbeck, 1730),
which consists of excerpts from nine of the most distin-
guished commentators, viz. Rashi, Ibn Ezra, D. Kimchi,
Levi b.-Gershon, Ababanel, Alsheich, Samuel b.-Lania-
do, J. Arama, and one of the Alsheich’s brethren. Its
aim seems to be to give the Biblical student to see on one page the expositions of the best and most famous Jewish commentators on
every difficult passage, without being obliged to search for
them in inaccessible and costly volumes.—Kitto, Bibi-
nical Cyclopedia, ii, 410.

Isaac ben-Giskittila. See BEN-GISKITIILA.

Isaac ben-Jacob Alfasii or Alcalai, one of
the most distinguished Talmudical scholars of the Mid-
dle Ages, was born at Calsa-Hammad, near Fez, in Af-
rica, about 1018. It had been the custom among Jewish
Rabbi to follow in the interpretation of the Talmud the
decisions of the Gaonim, and thus direct inquiry and in-
dependence of thought had well-nigh become not only
obsolete, but even impossible. But when Alfasii had be-
come sufficiently familiar with the Talmudic writings to
make his voice heard among his Jewish brethren, he
evinced such an independence of thought, and a mind of
such penetration, that he was soon acknowledged not
only on Africa’s shore, but even on the other side of
the sea, by Spain’s Jewish savans, as one of the ablest
interpreters of their tradition. A work which he publish-
ed at this time, הַפּוֹתְרֵי הַלְּכָהָכָה or the Hakacha’s of the
whole Talmud, intended as a Talmudical compendium (published at Gnesen, 1597; Basle, 1598), has since
preserved its authority even to the present day, still
further increased his renown. During a time of perse-
cution (1588), being obliged to flee his native country,
he sought refuge in Cordova, and there he was received
with great honor. But his distinction as a Talmudist,
and the kind of success which he obtained, made him
have annoyed some of the more distinguished Rabbi
of Spain. A controversy, into which he was unwilling-
lly drawn, with Ibn-Gia and Ibn-Abalda, became espe-
cially severe. After the death of Ibn-Gia, he removed
to Lucena, where he was then appointed the successor of
his former opponent. But his controversy with Ibn-Alba-
da continued until the death of the latter (1594), when
Alfasi adopted a son of Ibn-Albaida, and made him one of his most faithful adherents. He died in 1108. A list of the different editions of his works may be found in Fürst, Bibliotheca Judæica, i, 34 sq. See Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, vi, 76 sq., 92 sq.; Munk, Notices auf Aboualeulid, p. 4 sq.; von der Lühe, Léonard Kadmonjel, text No. 210, and note X.


Isaac ben-Joseph, called also Isaac de Corbeil, was born in Corbeil, a city in France, towards the beginning of the 13th century, and died in 1280 according to Rosé (Jachia Ghebalia and Abraham Zakuth say, the one 1240, the other 1270). He is the author of the celebrated work entitled סַּפְרֵי הַמָּשֶׁהָ בְּגֵדָלָה (Sepher Midrash Gadol) of Moses of Coucy, and is known also by the name of Semak (from the initials of the three Hebrew words Sepher Mısdeth Katon). It contains a synopsis of the precepts of the Jewish religion. It is divided into seven parts, each containing regulations for one day of the week. Isaac wrote it in 1277, at the request of the French Jews, who desired to have a clear and convenient manual to guide them in matters pertaining to their religion. It is also known under the Latin title of Columnae capriciætatis, and still more frequently as De Universo Gentium in Vanus. Several other copies of it were made by French as well as German Rabbis. Jekutiel Salmon ben-Mose, of Posen, made a compendium of the work (Cracow, 1579, 4to). See Bar-tolocci, Magna Biblioth. Rabbin.; Wolf, Biblioth. Hebraica; Rosen, Disser. storico degli Autori Ebrei; Fürst, Biblioth. Judæica, i, 195; Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden; vili, 191; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenjum, iii, 88.

Isaac ben-Juda (Abrabanel). See ABRABANEL.

Isaac ben-Latif or Allatif, a Jewish philosopher of some note, was born about 1270, somewhere in the southern part of Spain. Of his early history scarcely anything is now known. But some of his works have been preserved, and from notices of distinguished contemporaries we learn that he was inclined to favor the Cabalists (q. v.). He is highly spoken of by the Rabbins of his day, but evidently, judging from his works, was rather two-sided on all cabalistic points, so that he may most appropriately be said to have stood "within one foot in philosophy, and with the other in the Cabala." He died some time in the first half of the 14th century. Of his works are printed בִּית הַגּוֹדַלְתֶּךָ (Bith ha-Gadol), a Commentary on Kohlet (Constantinople, 1504, 4vo); הַגּוֹדִילֵךְ (Hagodil), a Cosmology (Vien. 1625, edited by S. Stern); קֵּדוֹשׁ וּמְכֻרָה (Kadosh U-Mekara), a work on Dogmatics, Religious Philosophy, and the Physical Sciences, in 4 parts; מַעְלֵיה (Maalai), a History of Man; etc. See Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, viii, 220 sq.; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenjum, iii, 80; Sachs, Kerem Chezmed, viii, 88 sq.; Fürst, Bibliotheca Judæica, ii, 224.

Isaac ben-Mose. See PROFAT DURAN.

Isaac ben-Moses, also called Avot, who flourished in the latter half of the 13th century, deserves our notice as the author of (1) a Commentary on the Pentateuch, entitled בִּית הַגּוֹדִילֵךְ (Bith ha-Godil), or Consolations of God (Salem, 1578-9); and (2) a Commentary on Ecclesiastes entitled בַּקְטָאָב הָעֵרֵכָה (Bekta-Av Harok), or the Gatherer of the Congregation (ibid, 1597), which are both valuable contributions to the exegetical literature of the O.T. Scriptures. See Kitto, Bibl. Cyclop., ii, 410; Steinheimmer, Cudot. Lit. Heb., Iom. 139.

Isaac ben-Schechesch (Barfayt), one of the most distinguished Rabbis of the 14th century, was born about 1310, at or near Saragossa (Spain). He presided over the congregation at Saragossa for a number of years, and when, in 1391, the persecutions instituted against the Jews made it impossible for him to remain, he removed to Algiers, where he continued to hold a like position until his death, about 1444, and appointed Eliezer Ibn-Dakr'son as his successor. See Celebrated Jewish Da- ran (q. v.). He was especially celebrated for his thorough acquaintance with Jewish tradition. Not only from all parts of Spain, but from the different parts of Europe, he was constantly invited to express his opinion on the meaning of obscure Talmudical passages. These were, however, only a very small percentage of the source for the study of the interpretation of the Talmud, and convey at the same time a pretty accurate idea of the state of the Jews in his day, not only in Spain and Algiers, but in France and even other countries as well. His works are הַגּוֹדִילֵךְ, a collection of Hala- coth (edited by Samuel Levi in 2 parts, Constantinople, 1547, fol. and often); הָעֵרֵכָה, or Commentary on the Pentateuch, written from the Commentary he also, a work on the Talmud. The latter two, we think, still remain in MS. form. See Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, viii, 33 sq., 109 sq.; Jost, Gesch. d. Judenjum, iii, 87; Fürst, Biblioth. Judæica, ii, 145.

Isaac ben-Suleiman (Salamo) Israel, a Jewish philosopher and philologist, was born in Egypt about 845. He was a physician by profession, and as such attained to very high distinction, serving from 904 to his death at Cairo, as private physician to the reigning prince, and celebrated as the author of several medical works valuable even in our day. But as also philologist and philosopher he attained great notoriety, more particularly as the author of a philosophical commentary on the first chapters of Genesis, treating of the creation of which, however, only a part is now extant. It bore the title of Sefer Jesirah, whence the error that he wrote a commentary on the book Jesirah. He died about 940. See Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, v, 282 sq. (J. H. W.)

Isaac Blitz. See Jekuthiel ben-Isaac.

Isaac Campano. See KAMPANTO.

Isaac, Daniel, a prominent Methodist minister, commonly designated as the Wesleyan "Polemic Divine." He flourished in England, July 7, 1778. He was early devoted to books, and, on his conversion in his nineteenth year, at home determined to devote his life to the work of the Christian ministry. In 1800 he joined the Conference on probation, supplying at this time a vacancy on Grimsby Circuit, and was urged to give due distinction to his brethren in the ministry, and was appointed to some of the most prominent charges at the command of his denomination. May 20, 1832, while in Manchester preaching in behalf of the Sunday-school work, he was seized with paralysis from the effects of which he never recovered. At the session of the next Conference he was present, and believed himself sufficiently recovered to re-enter upon active work, and was appointed to York Circuit, an old and favorite circuit, to which he was now sent for the third time. But he began to fail fast, and died in the midst of his work, March 21, 1834. Speaking of the abilities of Daniel Isaac, the Rev. Samuel Dunn says: "He was an independent thinker, acute reasoner, formidable opponent, dexterous polemic, sound theologian, striking, instructive, extemporaneous preacher, perspicacious writer, generous benefactor, faithful friend, and valuable Christian." His life was original, subtle, analogical, penetrating, clear, strong. His manner was deliberate, grave, conversational, pointed, humorous, sarcastic, ironical. The sagacious Henry Moore remarked: Daniel Isaac, like Paul, reasoned with his hearers out of the Scriptures; and he kept in them, and not out of them, and never in and not of himself. If at any time he drew a smile from his hearers, he would maintain the utmost gravity He
ISAAC IBN-ALBALIA

displayed great power in grappling with the conscience, and in bringing to light the hidden things of darkness. Of the ludicrous he had a marvellous perception, and could present an object in such a light as to excite the indignation or the loathing of those who before admired it. He painted from life. Many hearers were disgruntled with their own likeness as they saw it in the clear mirror of his style. He was of medium height, but his forehead was very high and arched. He had an olive complexion, and his hair was black and inclined to curl. In debate he was remarkably cool, calm, collected, keen, argumentative, and short. There was no trebling hesitancy, quibbling, or artifice. He engaged in no sham fight; never brandished the sword at a distance, but came at once to sharp quarters, grappled with his antagonist, and pierced his vital points in "the arm of the heart," or music, or art. But the great strength of Daniel Isaac lay in his pen, and he wielded it with especial ability in matters of controversy. His works are, Universal Restoration (N. Y. 1839, 12mo), in which he meets the objections of the Universalists to the eternity of punishment—Sermons on the Person of our Lord Jesus Christ (Lond. 1815) ; Ecclesiastical Claims (Lond. 1816), the views of which his Conference disproved, but to which, in a reply, he steadfastly adhered. Dr. George Smith (History of Wesleyan Methodism, iii, 7) says of his work "It is a book, and published whilst it is in many important respects the work does great credit to the author's industry and research. It contains the most convincing proofs, from Scripture and history, of the groundless character and the extravagant claims put forth on behalf of the ministerial order by Papists and High churchmen, and clearly and ably refutes the misrepresentations, impieties, and absurdities to which the admission of these claims must inevitably lead. But in doing this, Mr. Isaac went so far as to impugn the scriptural position of the Christian ministry as held by Wesley and the Methodist people. Nor is this the only serious defect in the work; some passages are very indecent and irreverent, if not, indeed, profane (from this charge, however, it should be said, others seek to clear Mr. Isaac) ; while, as stated in the resolution of the Conference, its "general spirit and style" are decidedly improper. The case is greatly to be regretted." Mr. Isaac did well in publishing his work, as he showed the Episcopalian in his Ecclesiastical Claims, the Lord have mercy upon us." Isaac also wrote pamphlets against the use of instrumental music in the house of God, and on the Leeds organ discussions. He edited the Life of his father, Memoirs of the Rev. John Struve, and published sketches of Lives of Robert Birkbeck, Corbet, and other old Divines. In 1826 he began, at the instance of the Rev. Samuel Dunn, a work on the Atone-ment, which made its appearance a few years after. His works were edited after his death by the venerable John Bardshill, and published at London (N. Y., 1840, 8vo). See Everett, Polemic Divine, or Memoirs, etc., of Rev. D. Isaac (Lond. 1839); Stevens, Hist. of Methodism, iii, 482 sqq. (J. H. W.)

ISAAC Ibn-Albalia, a Jewish writer of great distinction, was born at Cordova about 1855. He manifested at an early age superior talents and great thirst for learning. Besides the study of the Talmud, and of philosophy, he was eager for the acquisition of a thorough knowledge of astronomy and the mathematical sciences, and when thirty years old began a commentary on the most difficult parts of the Talmud, under the title Kegat ha-Rochelah, but it was so extensive a work that he did not live long enough to complete it. He also attempted an astronomical work on the principle of the Jewish mode of calculating the calendar, under the title Idibur (about 1065). Becoming a favorite of the reigning prince of Spain, he was honored with the distinguished position of nasi and grand rabbi of the Jews of that domain. He died about 1094. See Gritz, Gesch. d. Juden, vii, 72. (J. H. W.)


ISAAC Israel ben-Josef, a very distinguished Jewish writer who flourished at Toledo in the first half of the 14th century (1800-1840), deserved our notice as the author of the book Leshon Rumi, or The Foundation of the World, a masterly production on Jewish chronology, including also the entire field of the science of astronomy, both theoretically and practically delineated (Berlin, 1777, 4to; and a better edition, ibid. 1848, 4to). This work, of which a part of the MS. has been preserved, was written about 1810 at the express wish of Israel's teacher, Asher ben-Jechiel. He also compiled tables of Jewish chronology under the title of Tereben Yisra’el (Zolkiew, 1805, 8vo, et al.), See Gritz, Gesch. d. Juden, vii, 290; Carmoly, Itineraires, p. 224; B. Goldberg, Isaac Israel (in the Herzl, y. 62, 1845), 453-455; Fürst, Biblioth. Judaeica, ii, 150. (J. H. W.)

ISAAC Levita, or JOHANN ISAAC LEVL, as he called himself after his change from Judaism, one of the most celebrated Jewish savans of the 16th century, was born at Wetzel in 1515. He was thoroughly prepared by his friends for the Rabbinoical office, and filled it for years with success; but, because of his consciousness of the truthfulness of the Christian interpretation of the Messianic predictions, he and his son both, after a careful and extended study of the prophecies, forsook the faith of their forefathers, and joined the Roman Catholic Church. Some Jewish writers have attributed this course to a desire for distinction in literary circles, which as a Jew was closed to him. But there is no reason to believe it other than the result of association with Christians, and the study of the writings of Christian commentators on the prophecies, especially of Isaiah (more particularly chapter iii), which is said first to have led him to a study of the Messianic predictions. After his conversion (1546) he was appointed professor of Hebrew and Chaldee at the city of Liwen, and in 1551 was called to a like position in the University of Cologne. He became a vigorous defender of the Hebrew text of the Bible, and replied to Lindanus, who had attacked it (in his De optimo Scripturis interpretandi genere, Cologne, 1548), in a work entitled Deenum Veritatis Hebraeus sacrarum scripturarum (Col. 1550). He published also the following works on Hebrew grammar, which rank among the best in that language:—(1) An Introduction to the Hebrew Grammar, and to the Art of Writing a pure Hebrew style, entitled Bein Eviyan (Col. 1553), in which he gave different specimens of Hebrew writing, dialogues, and epistles, both from the O. T. and other Hebrew writings, as well as the books of Obadiah and Jonah in Hebrew, with a Latin translation:—(2) A grammatical treatise entitled Meditationes Hebraicas in Artem Grammatic, per integram libros, Ruth et Esther inclusa; adjunctiones, in 9, 1. Förester Lexicon (Col. 1558), which consists of a useful analysis and excellent translation of the entire book of Ruth:—(3) Notes on Ceniardi Tabulam, etc. (Col. 1555), being annotations on Ceniardi's Tables of Hebrew Grammar:—(4) An excellent introduction to the end of Elias Levita's Chaldee Lexicon, entitled Syrius (Col. 1560). He likewise translated several scientific works written by Jews into Latin, and was an assistant to Paquinii on his great lexicographical work. See Bartolocci, Bibl. Rabb.; Jücher, Gelehr. I. r.; Addenda, ii, 2382 sqq.; Rives, Inseque ad Sacr. Script.; Hoefer, Nouv. Bibl. Gr. xxxvi, 10; Ettico, Bibl. Cycl. ii, 410.
ISAAC PULGAR

ISAAC "the Blind," a Jewish writer of the 18th century (from 1190-1210), is noted as the reputed author of the modern kabbalistic work, "Issagora." Some writers, as is well known, assert that the Cabala originated with him, but this is doubted by the best authorities, and he is considered only to have been the first to give a new impulse to the study of this peculiar philosophical system, to oppose the inroads of Maimonides's (q.v.) philosophical interpretation of the Scriptures. It is certain, at least, that he had much to do with one of the mystical books of the Cabala, the "Sefer ha-Cabala." His theories were further developed after his death by his two disciples Ezra and Azariel of Zerona. Gritz (Gesch. d. Juden, v. 74 sq., 444 sq.) seems inclined to favor the ascription of Joseph ben Moses ben Me'ir of Rothenburg to the Cabala system was the production of Isaac the Blind, and that neither the sacred Scriptures nor Jewish tradition bear any reference to prove its earlier existence. (J. H. W.)

ISAACUS. See ISAAC LEVITA.

Isabella of Castile, queen of Spain, one of the most celebrated characters of the 15th century, deserves our notice on account of the part she acted in the religious history of Spain, and those domestic subjects which, in her reign, were brought to a prosperous state. Isabella, born April 22, 1451, was the daughter of John II, king of Castile and Leon. In 1469 she married Ferdinand V, surnamed "the Catholic," king of Aragon. She was not the heir-apparent to the throne on the death of her father in 1481, as she had an elder sister named Juana, who died in her youth. The father of that band, a man of some sterling qualities, but of very little conscience, she succeeded in ascending the throne. Mr. Prescott and most modern historians seek to relieve her of the stigma that she was responsible for the cruelties that were inflicted on those of her subjects who chose to differ with the Church of Rome in their worship of their divine Maker. It seems certain that she was deceived by the Jesuits, and consented to these outrages only because, in her fervor for the Roman Catholic cause, she believed the very existence of the Church of Rome threatened; and, though she pity her weakness in the hour when resoluteness on her part was most needed to defend and protect her subjects, she saw that Spain once reformed, Romanism would have passed from the world in the 16th century, instead of still lingering in our midst at this late hour. But if we excuse the conduct of Isabella, still, Isabella of Castile and those domestic subjects which, in the writings of Rome seems also to have been the costume of Elijah, according to 2 Kings i, 8; and it was the dress of John the Baptist (Matt. iii, 4). Hair-sackcloth is in the Bible the symbol of repentance (compare Isa. xx, 11, 12, and 1 Kings xxii, 27). This costume of the prophet, worn in a sincere protest, a prophetic preaching by fact. Before he has opened his lips his external appearance proclaims meravenim, repent.

It is held traditionally that Isabella suffered martyrdom under the wicked Manasses, by being sewn into a garment of hair-sackcloth in the vicinity of Jerusalem (Gemara, Jebam, iv, 13; compare Synaked. c. 103 b, and the Targumim, in Amezched, Cat.Bibl. Vol. i, 452; Trypho, p. 349; Jerome, in Jes. iiri; Origen, in Psalm. xcviii, in Matt. xviii; Tertullian, Patient. xiv; Augustine, C. Det. xvii, 24; Chorin. Poosh, p. 155). The traditional spot of the martyrdom is a very old mulberry-tree which stands near the Pool of Siloam, on the slopes of Ophel, below the south-east wall of Jerusalem. A similar account of his death is contained in the Ascension of the Prophet Isaias, an apocryphal work, the Greek original of which was known to the early Church. (Epiph. Har. xii, 3; Jerome, in Jes. xlvir, 4, 6, 761, etc.), and of which only recently an Ethiopic version has been found and translated by Dr. Laurence, Oxford, 1819 (see Nitzach, in the Studia und Kritik, 1830, ii, 299; Engelhardt, Kirchengesch. lbr. viii, 204), the same fate of Isaias appears to be alluded to by Josephus (Ant. xvi, 3, 8).

II. Time of Isaias.—The heading of this book places the prophet under the reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah; and an examination of the prophetic writings seems to confirm this view. Chapter vi, in which is related the definite call of Isaias to his prophetic office, is thus headed: "In the year in which king Uzziah died I saw the Lord," etc. The collection of prophetic is, therefore, not chronologically arranged, and the utterances in the preceding chapters (i to vi) belong, for chronological and other reasons,

(A.D. 1230) says in his commentary on Isa. i, 1, "We know not his race, nor of what tribe he was." His father's name was Amoz (1, 1), whom the fathers of the Church confounded with the prophet Amos, because they were unacquainted with Hebrew, and in Greek the two names are spelled alike (so Clemen. Alex.; Jerome, Pref. in Am.; August. Cist. D. xvii, 37). See Amoz. The opinion of Josephus (Jew. Wars, Megilla, x, 2) that Isaias was the brother of king Amaziah rests also on a mere etymological combination (see Carpov, De regia Jesiata nataliostis, Rost. 1735). Isaias resided at Jerusalem, not far from the Temple (ch. vii). We learn from ch. viii and viii that he was married to a woman named Jashub, and that his son was called Shear-jashub and Maher-shalal-hash-baz. These significant names, which he gave to his sons, prove how much Isaias lived in his vocation. He did not consider his children as belonging merely to himself, but rendered them living admonitions to the people. In their names were contained the two chief points of his prophecetic utterances: one recalled to mind the severe and inevitable judgment wherewith the Lord was about to visit the world, and the other, the people; the other, which signifies "The remnant shall return, pointed out the mercy with which the remnant would return. Under the midst of apparent destruction, he would take care to preserve his people and his kingdom. Isaias calls his wife a prophetess. This indicates that his marriage-life was not only consistent with his vocation, but that it was intimately intertwined with it. This name cannot by any means be a mark of degradation, for a woman's prophetic gift, like Miriam, Deborah, and Huldah. The appellation here given denotes the suitableness as well as genuineness of their conjugal relation.

Even the dress of the prophet was subservient to his vocation. According to xx, 2, he wore a garment of hair-sackcloth, and to this garment both of Rome seems also to have been the costume of Elijah, according to 2 Kings i, 8; and it was the dress of John the Baptist (Matt. iii, 4). Hair-sackcloth is in the Bible the symbol of repentance (compare Isa. xx, 11, 12, and 1 Kings xxii, 27). This costume of the prophet, worn in a sincere protest, a prophetic preaching by fact. Before he has opened his lips his external appearance proclaims meravenim, repent.

It is held traditionally that Isaias suffered martyrdom under the wicked Manasses, by being sewn into a garment of hair-sackcloth in the vicinity of Jerusalem (Gemara, Jebam, iv, 13; compare Synaked. c. 103 b, and the Targumim, in Amezched, Cat.Bibl. Vol. i, 452; Trypho, p. 349; Jerome, in Jes. iiri; Origen, in Psalm. xcviii, in Matt. xviii; Tertullian, Patient. xiv; Augustine, C. Det. xvii, 24; Chorin. Poosh, p. 155). The traditional spot of the martyrdom is a very old mulberry-tree which stands near the Pool of Siloam, on the slopes of Ophel, below the south-east wall of Jerusalem. A similar account of his death is contained in the Ascension of the Prophet Isaias, an apocryphal work, the Greek original of which was known to the early Church. (Epiph. Har. xii, 3; Jerome, in Jes. xlvir, 4, 6, 761, etc.), and of which only recently an Ethiopic version has been found and translated by Dr. Laurence, Oxford, 1819 (see Nitzach, in the Studia und Kritik, 1830, ii, 299; Engelhardt, Kirchengesch. lbr. viii, 204), the same fate of Isaias appears to be alluded to by Josephus (Ant. xvi, 3, 8).

II. Time of Isaias.—The heading of this book places the prophet under the reigns of Uzziah, Jotham, Ahaz, and Hezekiah, kings of Judah; and an examination of the prophetic writings seems to confirm this view. Chapter vi, in which is related the definite call of Isaias to his prophetic office, is thus headed: "In the year in which king Uzziah died I saw the Lord," etc. The collection of prophetic is, therefore, not chronologically arranged, and the utterances in the preceding chapters (i to vi) belong, for chronological and other reasons,
to the last year of the reign of Uziah, although the utterances in chapters ii, iii, iv, and v have been erroneously assigned to the reign of Jotham. As, however, the position of affairs was not materially changed under the reign of Jotham, we may say that the first chapter was uttered during that reign. The continuation of prophetic authorship, or the writing down of the prophecies, depended upon the commencement of new historical developments, such as took place under the reign of Ahaz and Hezekiah. Several prophecies (certainly, vii-x, 4, 1, 2-31; xvii) belong to the reign of Ahaz (xiv. 28-32, apparently to the reign of his death); and most of the subsequent prophecies to the reign of Hezekiah. The prophetic ministry of Isaiah under Hezekiah is also described in a historical section contained in chapters xxxvi-xxxix. The data which are contained in this section come down to the fifteenth year of the reign of Manasseh; consequently we are in the possession of historical documents proving that the prophetic ministry of Isaiah was in operation during about forty-five years, commencing in the year B.C. 756, and extending to the year B.C. 711. Of this period, at least one year belongs to the reign of Uziah, as is shown by the prophecy to his grandson, the reign of Ahaz, and fourteen and upwards to the reign of Hezekiah. It has been maintained, however, by Stüddin, Jahn, Berthold, Gesenius, and others, that Isaiah lived to a much later period, and that his life extended to the reign of Manasseh, the successor of Hezekiah. For this opinion the following reasons are adduced: (1) According to 2 Chron. xxxii, 32, Isaiah wrote the life of king Hezekiah. It would hence appear that he survived that king; although it must be admitted that in 2 Chron. xxxii, 32, where the biography of Hezekiah is mentioned, the unimportant words "first and last" are omitted; while in xvii, 22, we read, "Now the rest of the acts of Uziah, first and last, did Isaiah, the son of Amoz, write." (2) We find (as above stated) a tradition current in the Talmud, in the fathers, and in Oriental literature, that Isaiah suffered martyrdom under the reign of Manasseh by being slain asunder, which is supposed to harmonize with 2 Kings xxii, 16, "Moreover, Manasseh shed innocent blood very much.

(3) The authenticity of the second portion of the prophecies of Isaiah being admitted (see below), the nature of this portion would seem to confirm the idea that its author had lived under Manasseh. The style of the second portion, it is asserted, is so different from that of the first that both could not well have been composed by the same author, except under the supposition that a time elapsed between the composition of the first and second portion. The contents of the latter—such as the complaints respecting gross idolatry, the sacrifice of children to idols, the wickedness of rulers, etc.—seem to be applicable neither to the time of the exile, into which the prophet might have transported himself in the spirit, nor to the period of the pious Hezekiah, but are quite applicable to the reign of Manasseh. This last argument, however, is too subjective in its character to be of much weight; the difference of style referred to may be more readily accounted for in the difference in the topics treated of, and it is a gratuitous supposition that the national sins rebuked in the later prophecies had ceased during the reign of Hezekiah. The other arguments may be admitted so far as to allow a survivorship on the part of the prophet beyond the ackness of Hezekiah, and sufficiently into the reign of Manasseh to have suffered martyrdom at the order of the latter, but it does not appear that he uttered any predictions during the fifteen added years of Hezekiah; at least none are found extant that seem to belong to that period (except ch. xl to end, which may be assigned to the year ensuing Hezekiah's recovery); his great age and the absence of any special occasion may well account for his silence, and he may naturally be supposed to have occupied the time in writing down his former predictions. Nor will this view, which seems to meet all the requirements in the case, require to be extended a life-time; for if Isaiah, like Jeremiah, was called to the prophetic office in his youth, perhaps at twenty years of age, he would have been but eighty years old at the accession of Manasseh (B.C. 696), an age no greater than that of Hosea, whose prophecies extend over the same period of sixty years (Hos. i, 1).

III. Historical Works of Isaiah.—Besides the collection of prophecies which has been preserved to us, Isaiah also wrote two historical works (comp. Isa. xxxix, 3, 22). It was part of the vocation of the prophets to write the history of the kingdom of God, to exhibit in this history the workings of the law of retribution, and to exhort to the true worship of the Lord (see Augusti)}

**Chronological View of Isaiah's Prophecies.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Prophet's Reign</th>
<th>Principal Themes</th>
<th>Probable Occasions</th>
<th>B.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Divine punishment and ultimate mercy on the nation.</td>
<td>The prophet's inauguration.</td>
<td>706</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reburial of the prevalent apostasy.</td>
<td>Accession of Ahaz.</td>
<td>726</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rebuilding of popular form of faith and justice, and typification of Messias.</td>
<td>Renewal of the people of Israel by Esarhaddon.</td>
<td>708</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capture of Damascus by Assyria.</td>
<td>Invasion of Tiglath-pileser.</td>
<td>730</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against the Philistines.</td>
<td>Death of Ahaz.</td>
<td>728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generally on the fate of the land and the era of Messias.</td>
<td>A summary.</td>
<td>732</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Against the Moabites.</td>
<td>In view of the Assyrian conquest.</td>
<td>728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Further success of Assyria, but check at Jerusalem.</td>
<td>Progress of the Assyrian empire.</td>
<td>710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defeat of Sennacherib.</td>
<td>Sennacherib's invasion of Jerusalem.</td>
<td>718</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overthrow of Babylon and return of the Jews.</td>
<td>Cultivation of Assyro-Babylonian power.</td>
<td>719</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cure and reproof of Hezekiah.</td>
<td>Hezekiah's sickness and vanity.</td>
<td>711</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Future of the nation and person of Messias.</td>
<td>Concluding summary.</td>
<td>728</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first historical work of Isaiah was a biography of king Uzziah (comp. 2 Chron. xxvi, 22), "Now the rest of the acts of Uzziah, first and last, did Isaiah the prophet, the son of Amoz, write." The second historical work of Isaiah was a biography of king Hezekiah, which was subsequently inserted in the annals of Judah and Israel. These annals consisted of a series of prophetic monographs, which were received partly entirely, partly in abstracts, and are the chief source from which the information in the Chronic was derived. In this work of Isaiah, although its contents were chiefly historical, numerous prophecies were inserted. Hence it is called in 2 Chron. xxxvi, 92, הַמּוֹדֵן, מִלְתָּה, The Vision of Isaiah. In a similar manner, the biography of Solomon by Ahijah is called in 2 Chron. ix, 29, "the prophecy of Ahijah." The two historical works of Isaiah were lost together with the annals of Judah and Israel, into which they were embodied. Whatever these annals contained that was of importance for all ages, has been preserved to us by being received into the historical books of the Old Testament, and the predictions of the most distinguished prophetic men have been formed into separate collections. After the book had been lost, care was taken to preserve the more diffuse annals, which also comprehended many statements, of value only for particular times and places.

The so-called "Ascension of Isaiah" is a pseudographical work of later times, originally written, it would seem, in Greek (Ασκαλαφος Ἰασίων), of which only an old Latin translation (Ascensio Isaiov) is known to scholars, until Bp. Laurence discovered and published the Ethiopic version (Oxford, 1819, 8vo). It has also been edited, with notes, etc., by Dillmann (Leips. 1877; 8vo), who has given a detailed account of the text, showing its dependence on the Book of Isaiah, Comment. at Isa. i, 5 sq.; Knobel, Prophet. ii, 176 sq.; Stichel, in the Hall. Encyclop. ii, xv, 571 sq.; Stuart's Comment. on the Apocalypse. Intro. Whiston, Authentic Records, i, 470; Gieseler, Visio Jesu illustrata (Gott. 1832); Gfrörer, Propheten veteres (Stuttgart, 1840); Jolowicz, Himmel und Welt, i, 261 sq.; Lpz. 1854; De heemelvaart van den profet Jesu, in the Godschelijke Bijdragen for 1862, vii, 529-601. See APOCRYPHA: REVELATIONS, SPURIOUS.

IV. Integral Authenticity of the Prophecies of Isaiah. - The Jewish synagogue, and the Christian Church during all ages, have considered it as an undoubted fact that the prophecies which bear the name of Isaiah really originated from that prophet. Even Spinoza did not expressly assert, in his Tractatus Theologico-Politicus (viii, 8), that the book of Isaiah consisted of a collection of prophecies by the several authors of the Old Testament. Although it is usually considered that he maintained this opinion. But in the last quarter of the 18th century this prevailing conviction appeared to some divines to be inconvenient. All those who attack the integral authenticity of Isaiah agree in regarding the book itself as an anthology, or gleanings of prophecies from several sources, especially of the Babylonian exile, although they differ in their opinions respecting the origin of this collection. Koppe gave gentle hints of this view, which was first explicitly supported by Eichhorn in his Introduction. Eichhorn advances the hypothesis that a collection of Isaiah prophecies (which might have been augmented, even before the Babylonian exile, by several not genuine additions) formed the basis of the present anthology, and that the collector, after the Babylonian exile, considering that the semil on which they were written did not form a volume proportionate to the size of the three other prophetic scrols, containing Ezekiel, Jeremiah, and the minor prophets, compiled a collection of prophecies from several sources, and added titles which were not known to the editors. In this supposition of the non-identity of date and authorship, many German scholars, and lately also Hitzig and Ewald, followed Eichhorn. Gesenius, on the contrary, maintains that all the Isaiah prophecies extant in that book originated from one author, and were of the same date. Umbreit and Köster on the main point follow Gesenius, considering chaps. xi to xlv to be a continuous whole, written by a pseudo-Isaiah who lived about the termination of the Babylonian exile. In reference to other portions of the book of Isaiah, the authenticity of which has been questioned, Umbreit expresses himself doubtingly, and Köster assigns them to Isaiah. Gesenius declines to answer the question how it happened that these portions were ascribed to Isaiah, but Hitzig felt that an answer to this question might be expected. He forcibly attempts to explain why such additions were made to Isaiah, and not to any of the other prophetic books, by the extraordinary veneration in which Isaiah was held. He says that the great authority of Isaiah occasioned important and distinguished prophecies to be placed in connection with him, and therefore he himself soon lost the force of his assertion by observing that the great authority of Isaiah was especially owing to those prophecies which were falsely ascribed to him. A considerable degree of suspicion must, however, attach to the boasted certainty of such critical investigations, if we notice that these learned men are arguing what is of Isaiah origin and what is not, although they are all linked together by the same fundamental tendency and interest. There are very few portions in the whole collection whose authenticity has not been called in question by some one or other of the various interpreters. Almost every part has been attacked either by Doderlein, or by Eichhorn (who, especially in a later work entitled Die Hebräischen Propheten, Götingen, 1816 to 1819, goes farther than all the others), or by Jung (who, among the earlier adversaries of the integral authenticity of Isaiah, uses, in his Verwichtung der Schriften in der Geschäftsliteratur, and most comprehensive and impartial, the best-grounded arguments), or by Paulus, Rosenmüller, Bauer, Berthold, De Wette, Gesenius, Hitzig, Ewald, Umbreit, or others. The only portions left to Isaiah are chaps. i, 3-9; xvii, xviii, xxvii, xxxi, and xxxiii. All the other chaps. are defended by some and rejected by others; they are also referred to with widely different dates. In the most modern criticism, however, we observe an inclination again to extend the sphere of Isaiah authenticity as much as the dogmatic principle and system of the critics will allow. Recent critics are therefore disposed to admit the genuineness of some portions of the Isaiah prophecies that are placed after the Babylonian exile, although it is only the exception of the two prophecies against Babylon in chaps. xii and xiii, and in chap. xxi, 1-10. Chapters xxviii-xxxiii are allowed to be Isaiah by Ewald, Umbreit, and others.

Divines who were not linked to these critics by the same tradition, although it is usually considered that the integrity of Isaiah, as Hesler (Jesuus un übersetzt 1788), Pippcr (Integritas Jesu, 1793), Beckhaus (Uber die Integrität der Prophetischen Schriften, 1796), Haun, in his Einleitung, who was the most able among the earlier advocates, Deresser, in his Bearbeitung des Jesu, iv, 215, and Grotius, in his De Isai, c. 6, 17, All these works have at present only a historical value, because they have been surpassed by two recent monographs. The first is by Jo. Ulrich Möller (De Authentia Ormonudarum Jesu, chap. xi-xiv, Copenhagen, 1825). Although this work professedly defends only
the latter portion of the book of Isaiah, there occur in it many arguments applicable also to the first portion. The standard work on this subject is that of Kleinert (Die Aechtkeit des Jesajas, vol. i, Berlin, 1829). It is, however, very diffuse, and contains too many hypotheses. The comprehensive work of Schiller's (Ueberführung der Eintrübung gegen die Aechtseitungen der Werthung in Jesajas, chap. xiii and xiv) of course refers more especially to these chapters, but indirectly refers also to all the other portions whose authenticity has been attacked. Since the objections against the various parts of Isaiah are all of the same character, it is very inconsistent in Köstner, in his work Die Propheten des alten Testaments, to defend, in page 102, the genuineness of chapters xiii, xiv, and xxii, but nevertheless, in pages 117 and 297, to ascribe chap. xli-xlv to a pseudo Isaiah.

We have space here only to indicate the following reasons as establishing the integrity of the whole book, and as vindicating the authenticity of the second part:

1. Externally.—The unanimous testimony of Jewish and Christian tradition—Eccles. xviii, 24, 25, which manifestly (in the words παρέκλησις των παντινύμων ἐν Σωτ. et die tóis—τά εὐπρεπεά πρίν ἡ παραγένθια ἡ ἀποστολή ἑκάστην ἒκτην ἀπαραρτιάθεται) was apparently made of the second part by Jeremiah (x, 1-16; v, 25; xxx, 31, 1 l, li), Ezekiel (xiii, 40, 41), and Zephaniah (ii, 15; iii, 10). The decree of Cyrus in Ezra i, 2-4, which plainly is founded on Isa. xlv, 28; xlv, 1, 18, accords (Gen. xxxvii, 1) that the Jews accepted the book of Cyrus Isaiah's predictions as fulfilled. The inspired testimony of the N. T., which (Matt. iii, 3, and the parallel passages; Luke iv, 17; Acts viii, 29; Rom. x, 16, 19) quotes with specification of Isaiah's name prophecies found in the second part.

2. Internally.—The congruity of topic and sentiment in the last twenty-seven chapters with the preceding parts of the book. The oneness of diction which pervades the whole book. The peculiar elevation and grandeur of style, which, as is universally acknowledged, distinguishes the whole contents of the second part, and which were to appear in the golden age of Hebrew literature. The absence of any other name than Isaiah's claiming the authorship. At the time to which the composition is assigned, a Zechariah or a Malachi could gain a separate name and book; how was it that an author of such a name as Isaiah, and of such a character, and of such reputation, and of such a position in the temple, as Isaiah was, should be silent? The second portion, as it appears, was not written by Isaiah himself. The writer to whom the book is attributed, who was to be a bold and free expositor of its language, who was neither to be afraid of the great name of prophecy, nor to be the mere instrument of a prophet's spirit, who was to carry its message into the world, and to give its weight and sanction to the faith and principles it taught, who was to be the leader of the intellectual world, and to make itself the resource of the most powerful nations on earth, who was to become the apostle of a new world of nations, who was to be the great promoter of those great national and social changes which are yet to dawn on the world, who was to be the instrument of the most wonderful reformation, who was to be the means of bringing the most important religious revelations, of which Islamism is a very great, and of which Christianity is the greatest, of which all the great intellectual, political, and religious changes in the world are to be the results, was it not the most natural thing in the world that it should be written by Isaiah himself?

For a full vindication of the authenticity of Isaiah, besides the above works, see professor Stuart On the Old Testament, Canon, p. 103 sq., and Dr. Davidson in the new ed. of Horne's Introduction, i, 855 sq., in which latter, especially, copious references are made to the latest literature on the subject. Other writers who have taken the same side are especially Hengstenberg, in his Christology, vol. ii; Havernick, Einleitung, vol. iii (1849); Stier, in his Jesajas nicht Pseude-Jesajas (1850); and Keil, in his Einleitung (1859), in which last the reader will find a most satisfactory compendium of the controversy between the advocates of this conception and those who prefer the view of a chrestological origin.

V. Origin, Contents, and Style of the Composition.—No definite account respecting the method pursued in collecting into books the utterances of the prophets has been handed down to us. Concerning Isaiah as well as the rest, these accounts are wanting. We do not even know whether he collected his prophecies himself. But we have no decisive argument against this opinion, Those critics who reject the authenticity of the book are compelled to invent other authors, and, of course, different theories with respect to compilers. None of these have proved satisfactory. (See the authorities above referred to.) According to the Talmudists, the book of Isaiah was collected by the men of Hezekiah. But this assertion rests merely upon Prov. xxv, 1, where the men of Hezekiah are said to have compiled the Proverbs. To us it seems impossible that Isaiah left it to others to collect his prophecies into a volume, because we know that he was the author of historical works, and that he would not have submitted to literary occupation would have left to others to do what he could do much better himself.

Chaps. i-xv contain a series of rebukes, threatenings, and expostulations with the nation, especially Jerusalem its head, on account of the prevalent sins, and particularly idolatry. Chap. vi describes a theophany and the prophet's own call, in the last year of Uzziah (to which the preceding chapters may also be assigned, with the exception of chap. i, 2-31, which appears to belong to the first of Ahaz). What follows next, up to chap. x, belongs to the reign of Ahaz, and consists of a sublime picture of the future judgment of the world, the first instance by the deliverance from surrounding enemies (especially Damascus and Samaria), and eventually by the Messiah, who is prepared by historical signs. The same subject is treated in a similar manner in the succeeding chapters (xii-xiv), the deliverance from Assyria being treated as the historical type of this, the next portion appertaining to the reign of Hezekiah. Then follows a series of prophecies against foreign nations, in which the chronological arrangement has been departed from, and, instead of it, an arrangement according to contents has been adopted. In the days of Hezekiah, the nations of Western Asia, dwelling on the banks of the Euphrates and Tigris, more and more resembled a threatening tempest. The prophetic gift of Isaiah was more fully unfolded in sight of the Assyrian invasion under the reign of Hezekiah. Isaiah, in a series of visions, describes what Assyria would do, as a chastising rod in the hand of the Lord, and what the successors of the Assyrians, the Chaldees, would perform, according to the decree of God, in order to realize divine justice on earth, as well among Israel as among the heathen. The prophet shows that mercy is hidden behind the clouds of divine wrath, and the appearance of the judgment is not to be slighted by the worshippers of the gods. In this and the following chapters there are several prophecies of which were uttered at various times prior to the Assyrian invasion, although isolated portions appear to belong to previous reigns (e.g. chap. xvii to the occasion of the alliance of Ahaz with Tiglath-pileser; chap. xiv, 28-32, to the death of Ahaz). With the termination of this work and the public life of Isaiah, who added a historical section in chaps. xxxvi-xlix, in order to facilitate the right understanding of the prophecies uttered by him during the most fertile period of his prophetical ministry. Then follows the conclusion of his work on earth (chap. xl to the end), composed during the peaceful residue of Hezekiah's reign, and containing a closely connected series of the most spiritual discourses touching the future history of the nation under the Messiah. This second part, which contains his prophetic legacy, is addressed to the people, and is not a collection of new prophecies, but is analogous to the last speeches of Moses in the fields of Moab, and to the last speeches of Christ in the circle of his disciples, related by John.

The proclamation of the Messiah is the inexhaustible source of consolation among the prophets. In Isaiah the Messiah is declared in clear, and to the Church were inclined to style him rather evangelist than prophet. The following are the outlines of Messianic prophecies in the book of Isaiah: A scion of David, springing from his family, after it has fallen into a very low estate, but being also of divine nature, shall, at first in lowliness, but as a prophet filled with the spirit of God, proclaim the divine doctrine, develop the law in the
truth, and render it the animating principle of national life; he shall, as high-priest, by his vicarious suffering and his death, remove the guilt of his nation, and that of other nations, and finally rule as a mighty king, not only over the covenant-people, but over all nations of the earth who will subject themselves to his peaceful sceptre.....

He will make both the moral and the physical consequences of sin to cease; the whole earth shall be filled with the knowledge of the Lord, and all enmity, hatred, and destruction shall be removed even from the brute creation. This is the survey of the Messianic kingdom as given by Isaiah, of which he constantly renders prominent those portions which were most calculated to impress the people under the then existing circumstances. The first part of Isaiah is directed to the whole people, consequently the glory of the Messiah is here dwelt upon. The fear lest the kingdom of God should be overwhelmed by the power of heathen nations is removed by pointing out the glorious king to come, who would elevate the now despised and apparently mean kingdom of God above all the kingdoms of this world. In the second part, which is more particularly directed to the Jews, the election of the entire nation, the prophet exhibits the Messiah more as a divine teacher and high-priest. The prophecy here speaks righteousness through the blood of the servant of God, who will support the weakness of sinners, and take upon himself their sorrows. The pure stands pre-eminent above all other prophets, as well as in the contents and spirit of his predictions, as also in their form and style. Simplicity, clearness, sublimity, and freshness, are the never-failing characters of his prophecies. Even Eichhorn mentions, among the first merits of Isaiah, the conciseness of his expressions, the beauty and outline of his images, and the fine execution of his speeches. In reference to richness of imagery he stands between Jeremiah and Ezekiel. Symbolic actions, which frequently occur in Jeremiah and Ezekiel, seldom occur in Isaiah. The same is the case with visions, strictly so called, of which there is only one, namely, that in chap. vi, and even it is distinguishable by its simplicity and clearness above that of the later prophets. But one characteristic of Isaiah is, that he likes to give signs—that is, a fact then present, or near at hand—as a pledge for the more distant futurity, and that he frequently assigns the foehn as the reason (comp. viii. 20; xxxvii. 30; xxxviii. 7 sq.). The instances in chaps. vii and xxxvii show how much he was convinced of his vocation, and in what intimacy he lived with the Lord, by whose assistance alone he could effect what he offers to do in the one passage, and what he grants in the other. The spiritual riches of the prophet are seen in the variety of his style, which always befits the subject. When he rebukes and threatens it is like a storm, and when he comforts his language is as tender and mild as (to use his own words) that of a mother comforting her son. With regard to style, Isaiah is comprehensive, and the other prophets divide his riches.

Isaiah enjoyed an authority proportionate to his gifts. We learn from history how great this authority was during his life, especially under the reign of Hezekiah. Several of his most definite prophecies were fulfilled while he was yet alive; for instance, the overthrow of the kingdoms of Syria and Israel; the restoration of the Asyrians, and the divine deliverance from it; the prolongation of life granted to Hezekiah; and several predictions against foreign nations. Isaiah is honorably mentioned in the historical books. The later prophets, while they usually bear the name of Hezekiah, Jeremiah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, clearly prove that his book was diligently read, and that his prophecies were attentively studied. The authority of the prophet greatly increased after the fulfillment of his prophecies by the Babylonian exile, the victories of Cyrus, and the deliverance of the covenant-people. Even Cyrus (according to the account in Josephus, I. xvi. 11, 1 and 2) was induced to set the Jews at liberty by the prophecies of Isaiah concerning himself. Jesus Sirach (xlvii, 22-25) bestows splendid praise upon Isaiah, and both Philo and Josephus speak of him with great veneration. He attained the highest degree of authority after the times of the New Testament had proved the most important part of his prophecies to be fulfilled. The Christian Church, from the time of Christ and the apostles, quote no prophecies so frequently as those of Isaiah, in order to prove that he who had appeared was one and the same with him who had been promised. The fathers of the Church abound in praise of Isaiah—Elijah. See Messiah.

VI. The following are express commentaries on the whole book of Isaiah. He is the most important being designated by an asterisk (*): prefixed: Orig., Fragmenta (in Opp. iii. 104); also Homilia (in Jerome, Opp. iv. 1097); Eusebius, Commentary (in Montfaucon's Collecta Nova); Ephrem Syrus, Exsurrito (from the Syr. in Opp. I, i. 503); Basil, Exsurrito (Gr. in his Op. L. 1518, 4to); Lactantius, Commentary (in Opp. iv. 1); also Adversaria (id. iv. 1181); Chrysostom, Interpretatio (in one-vii. (Gr. in Opp. vi. 1); Cyril, Commentary (Gr. in Opp. ii. 1 sqq.; Theodoret, Interpretation in Greek) in Opp. ii. 1; Procopius, Epitome (Gr. and Lat.; Par. 1580, fol.); Rupertus, In Evanem (in Opp. ii. 1730, 4to); Herverus, Commentary (in Pez, Tomar, III, 1); S. Archi [i.e., Rashi], Commentary (from the Heb. edit. Breithaupt, Goth. 1719, 1714, 3 vols. 4to.; D. Kimchi, Commentary (from the Heb. by Malalaneus, Florence, 1744, 4to); Abrabanel, Shemesh (ed. L'Emperor, Lugd. B. 1681, 8vo); Aquinas, Commentary (Lugd. B. 1538, 8vo; also in Opp. ii.; Luther, Exsurrito (in Opp. iii. 1941); Melancthon, Argumentum (in Opp. iii. 298); Ezech. lampadius, Hypomagnesia (Basil. 1525, 4to); Zaringius, Complomentar (Tigur. 1529, fol.; also in Opp. iii. 1683); Dieterich, Auslegung (Norimb. 1543, 4to); Calvin, Commentary (Gen. 1551, 1509, 1570, 1688, 1677, 1671, fol.; in French, ib. 1572, 4to, 1572; in English by Colton, London, 1611, 4to; by Pringle, Edinb. 1680, 4 vols. 4to.); Day, Exposition (London, 1654, 4to); Masius, Commentary (Basil. 1557, 1670, 1620, 4to); Borbasius, Commentary (Basil. 1651, 4to); Dracionis, Commentary (Lipsiae, 1658, 4to); Strigel, Concessiones (Lipsiae, 1658, 12mo); Forerius, Commentary (Venice, 1563, fol.); Antithesis, 1560, 4to; also in the Cran. A. S. Colz. S. bounth, Commentary (Argent. 1653, 8vo); Markarius, Expositio (Par. 1564; Gen. 1610, fol.); Pintus, Commentary (Lugd. B. 1651, 1657; Antv. 1657, 1572, 4to); Guttierre, Homiliae (Tigur. 1567, fol.); Bullinger, Expositio (Tigur. 1567, folio); Schnecker, Erklär. (Leipzig, 1680, 4to); Castellio, Homiliae (Salam. 1570, 4to); Meisner, Dissolutiones (Salam. 1572, 3 vols. fol.); Schneff pseud. (Tub. 1562, 1558, fol.); Osorius, Paraphrasis (Bonon. 1576, 4to; Col. Agr. 1579, 1584, 8vo); Ursinus, Commentaries (in Opp. iii.); Wigand, Adnotationes (Erford. 1581, 8vo); Guidelli, Commentary (Perus. 1588-1600, 2 vols. 4to.; Montanus, Commentary (Antw. 1598, 3 vols. 4to.); Alvarez, Commentary (Rome, 1599-1702, 2 vols. fol.; Lugd. 1716, 4to.) Ar cularius, Commentary (ed. Mentzer, Frankfort, 1697; Lips. 1658, 8vo); Arama, יִנְעַּלָּל שַׁרְפָּה יִנְעַּלָּל שַׁרְפָּה (Ven. 1698, 8vo); also in Frankfurter's Rabbinische Bibliothek). Sanclus, Commentary (Lugd. B. 1615; Antwerp and Mogunt. 1615, fol.); Heshusius, Commentary (Hal. 1617, fol.); Forster, Commentary (Vitemb. 1626, 1644, 1674, 4to). Hustedt, Commentary (Gotter. 1655, 4to); a Lapidis, In Evanem (Antw. 1622, fol.); G. Alvarez, Expositio (Lugd. B. 1623, fol.); de Acrones, Excidio (Lugd. 1642, 2 vols. fol.); Di Marino, כֶּלֶסְּוֹ (Verona, 1565, 4to); Laisme, Commentary (Paris, 1654, 4to); Laisho, הַפָּתּ (Ven. 1657, 8vo); Varenus, Commentary (Rost. 1678, 1708, 4to); Brentius, Commentary (in Opp. iv. Tub. 1675); Jackson, Annotations (London, 1692, 4to); Schmid, Commentary (ed. Sandge Thin, 1692, 1693, 1695, 1728, 4to.); Silbermann, Commentary (Amst. 1700, 4to); Cocceius, Commentary (in
from his position, and, as is customary among Roman Catholics, deprived of his personal liberty on account of propagating and cherish heretical opinions. He was returned to the theological seminary for further instruction, and released two years after. In 1778, however, he appeared before the public, defending his own position under the title of Neuer Versuch über d. Wiss.jun- gen v. Immanuel (Coblentz). He had meanwhile been reappointed to the professional dignity, and his persistency in defending his peculiar interpretations again deprived him of his position, and he was once more imprisoned and put on trial. His book was forbidden to all good Roman Catholics by all archbishops and bishops, and in 1779 a bull was issued against it by the pope. In the interim he had made his escape from prison, but, finding the ecclesiastical authorities all opposed to him, he recalled his former opinion, and was honored with ecclesiastical dignity (1780). In 1803 his income was reduced to a small pension, and he lived in want until his death in 1818. Isenrich also wrote on the dialectical points under the title of Corpus decisionum dogmat- icorum. See Walch, Neueste Recht. Geschichte, viii. 9 sq.; Schleiermacher, d. Ref. vii. 203 sq.; Henkel, Kirchengesch. vii. 199 sq.; Fuhrmann, Handb. d. Kir- chengesch. ii. 507. (J. H. W.)

Isham, Chester, a Congregational minister, was born in 1788, and, after a course of preparatory study at the Latin Grammar School in Hartford, Conn., entered Yale College, where he graduated in 1820. Shortly afterwards he went to Andover Seminary to prepare for the ministry, upon which he had decided soon after his conversion while at Yale College. In 1824, on the completion of his theological course of study, he accepted a call to a newly-formed church at Taunton, where he had been preaching during the latter part of the last year spent at Andover. The great exertions with which the work demanded of him were too severe upon his constitution, and the symptoms of consumption appearing shortly after, he went South in the hope of recovering his health. He continued failing, however, and returned to Boston April 19th, to die among his friends. Dr. Leonard Bacon, who was a classmate of Chester Ish- am at Yale, speaks very highly of his attainments and religious bearing, in Sprague's Annals of the American Pulpit, ii. 704 sq.

Isanekel (elect bond), a Russian sect which arose in 1666, under the fear that the printed Church books were tainted with error, since they differed from the old MS. copies which had been so long in use. They stood in the letter to the Scripture, deny different orders among the clergy, and any gradation of rank among the people, but under Alexander I obtained tolera- tion, though they had previously been exposed to constant persecution. See Eckardt, Modern Russia, s. v.

Ish'bah (Hebrew Yishbakh, יִשְׁבַּח, praiser; Sept. Ισαβή, a descendant of Judah, and founder ("father" of Eshthera (q. v.); he probably was a son of Mered by his wife Hodia (1 Chron. iv. 17). B.C. post 1619. See MEERED. He is perhaps the same as ISHI (q. v.) in verse 20, and apparently identical with the NAMAH (q. v.) of ver. 19.

Ish'baka'el (Heb. Yishbakeh, יִשְׁבְּקָאֵל, leaner; Sept. Ισαβακ, one of the sons of Abraham by Keturah (Gen. xxv. 2; 1 Chron. i. 32). B.C. post 2024. We are told that Abraham gave gifts to the sons of Keturah, "and sent them away from Isaac his son eastward, unto the east country" (Gen. xxv. 1-6). They settled in the region east of the Arabah, and near Mount Seir, and southward in the peninsula of Sinai (Gen. xxxvii. 28-36; Exod. iii. 1; Num. xxxi. 9, 10). See KETURAH.

It is a question whether the sons of this people are very obscure, and that it is only one who survived him (2 Sam. ii. 11). His name appears (1 Chron. viii. 35; ix. 39) to have been originally Esh- baal, בֶּן-אֶ-נָּבָל, "the man of Baal." Whether this indicates that Baal was used as equivalent to Jehovah, or that the reverence for Baal still lingered in Israelite families, is uncertain; but it can hardly be doubted that the name was only used by the people of Israel among themselves for the God of a remote past because the name is commonly known must have been substituted for the original word, with a view of removing the scandal- ous sound of Baal from the name of an Israelite king.
ISH-BOSHETH

(see Ewald, Int. Gesch. ii, 888), and superseded it by the contemporary title of Ish-bosheth ("shame") which was sometimes used as its equivalent in later times (Jer. iii, 54; xi, 13; Hos. ix, 10). A similar process appears in the alteration of Jerubbaal (Judg. viii, 35) into Jerub-besheth (2 Sam. xi, 21); Meri-baal (2 Sam. iv, 4) into Mephibosheth (1 Chron. viii, 34; ix, 40). The last three cases all occur in Saul's family three Stts. It is thought by some to be the same with Ithuri ("silver", 1 xiv, 49), these two names having considerable resemblance; but this is forbidden by 1 Sam. xxiii, 2, comp. with 1 Chron. vii, 33. See ABINADAR. He appears to have been forty years of age at the time of the battle of Gilboa (B.C. 1055), in which he was not himself present but was sent by his father in a similar manner to his brother Jonathan (1 Sam. xxx, 31), and thenceforth ceased to ascend the throne, as the eldest of the royal family, rather than Mephibosheth, son of his elder brother Jonathan, who was a child of five years old. Too feeble of himself to seize the sepoi of Saul, he was immediately taken under the care of Abner, his powerful kinsman, who brought him to the ancient sanctuary of Mahanaim, on the east of the Jordan, beyond the reach of the victorious Philistines, and he was there recognised as king by ten of the twelve tribes (2 Sam. ii, 7; iii, 17). There was no question even in those remote tribes whether they should not follow the offer of David to be their king (2 Sam. ii, 7; iii, 17). But this was overruled in favor of Ish-bosheth by Abner (2 Sam. iii, 17), who then for five years slowly but effectually restored the dominion of the house of Saul over the trans-Jordanic territory, the plain of Esdraelon, the central mountains of Ephraim, the frontier tribe of Benjamin, and eventually "over all Israel" (except the tribe of Judah, 2 Sam. iii, 9). In 2 Sam. ii, 10 Ish-bosheth is said to have reigned two years and six months; he can be understood as the successor of his father in his reign. As David reigned seven and a half years over Judah before he became king of all Israel upon the death of Ish-bosheth, it is conceived by the Jewish chronologer (Seder Olam Rabba, p. 37), as well as by Kimchi and others, that there was a vacancy of five years in the interregnum. This view was, it is true, that after his death five years elapsed before he was generally recognised as king of all Israel. If the reign of Ish-bosheth be limited to two years, the latter is doubtless the best way of accounting for the other five, since no ground of delay in the succession of Ish-bosheth is suggested in Scripture itself; for the claim of Mephibosheth, the son of Jonathan, which some have produced, being that of a lame boy five years old, whose father never reigned, against a king's son forty years of age, would have been deemed of little weight in Israel. Besides, our notions of Abner do not allow us to suppose that under him the question of the succession of the house of Saul had any part in the dispute. It is evident that he was a man of forty years of age, and it is possible that he had a son of the same age. However, the latter point is not important in the present discussion. It is sufficient to note that the reign of Ish-bosheth over Israel was nearly contemporaneous, namely, about seven years each; and that some will have it, two years—if a power so uncertain as his can be called a reign. Even the semblance of authority which he possessed he owed to the will and influence of Abner, who kept the real control of affairs in his own hands. The wars and negotiations with David were entirely carried on by Abner (2 Sam. ii, 11; iii, 8), when, shortly after the death of Saul, he made an attempt on his father's corpse, Rizpah, which, according to Oriental usage, amounted to treason (2 Sam. iii, 7; comp. 1 Kings ii, 13; 2 Sam. xvi, 21; xx, 8). Although accustomed to tremble before Abner, even Ish-bosheth's temper was roused to resentment by the discovery of his father's corpse; and thus is commenced the wrath of his late father Saul, which was in a peculiar manner sacred under his care as a son and a king. By this act Abner exposed the king to public contempt, if it did not indeed leave himself open to the suspicion of intend- ing to advance a claim to the crown on his own behalf. Abner resented this usurpation in a burst of passion, which vented itself in a solemn vow to transfer the kingdom from the house of Saul to the house of David, a purpose which from this time he appears steady to have kept in view. Ish-bosheth was too much cowed to answer; and shortly after, through the length of Abner's negotiation, David demanded the restoration of his former wife, Michal, he at once tore his sister from her reluctant husband, and committed her to Abner's charge (2 Sam. iii, 14, 15). It is, perhaps, right to attribute this act to his weakness; although, as David allows that he had done nothing in the cause, it may have been owing to his sense of justice. This trust seems to have given Abner a convenient opportu-

nity to enter into negotiations with David; but in the midst of them he himself fell a victim to the resentment of Joab for the death of Abishai. The death of Abner deprived the house of Saul of the last of its remaining sup-

port. See ANNER. When Ish-bosheth heard of it, "his hands were feeble, and all the Israelites were troubled" (2 Sam. iv, 1). In this extremity of weakness he fell a victim, probably, to a revenge for a crime of his father. The guard of Ish-bosheth, as of Saul, was taken from their own royal tribe of Benjamin (1 Chron. xi, 22). But among the sons of Benjam in were reckoned the de-

scendants of the old Canaanitish inhabitants of Beeroth, one of the cities in league with Gibea (2 Sam. iv, 2, 3). Two of those Beerothites, Baana and Rechab, in re-

membrance, it was conjectured, of the murder of their kinsmen the Gibeonicites, determined to take ad-

vantage of the helplessness of the royal house to destroy the only representative that was left, excepting the child Mephibosheth (2 Sam. iv, 4). They were "chiefs of the marauding troops" which used from time to time to attack the territory of Judah (comp. 2 Sam. iv, 2; iii, 22, where the same word ע"ע is used; Vulg. principes latronum). They knew the habits of the king and court, and acted accordingly. In the stillness of an Eastern noon they entered the palace, as if to carry off the wheat which was piled up near the entrance. The female slave, who, as usual in Eastern houses, kept the house door, and was at work in the room, had, in the heat of the day, fallen asleep at her task (2 Sam. iv, 5, 6, in Sept. and Vulg.). They stole in, and passed into the royal bedchamber, where Ish-bosheth was asleep on his couch during his midday siesta. They stabbed him in the stomach, cut off his head, made their escape, all that afternoon, all that night, down the valley of the Jordan (Arabah, A.V. "plain;" 2 Sam. iv, 7), and pre-

sented the head to David as a welcome present. B.C. 1046. They met with a stern reception from the mon-

arch, who—as both right feeling and good policy re-

quired—testified the utmost sorrow and concern. He re-

lucted them for the child Mephibosheth's uncer-

tain man, and ordered them to be executed; their hands and feet were cut off, and their bodies suspended over the tank at Hebron. The head of Ish-bosheth was carefully buried in the sepulchre of his great kinsman.
Abner, at the same place (2 Sam. iv, 9-12). See David.

Ishhi (Heb. Yishki, יִשְׁחִי, salutary; Sept. Ισσαί, Εἰς
Isaï, the name of four men.
1. The son of Appaim, and father of Sheshan, the eighth in descent from Judah (1 Chron. ii, 31). B.C. prob. post 1612.
2. The father of Zobeth and Ben-zobeth, a descen-
dant of deceased, through what line does not appear (1 Chron. iv, 20). The name is possibly a corruption for the Ishbah of ver. 17. B.C. perh. cir. 1017.
3. Father (progenitor) of several (four only are named) Simeonites who invaded Mt. Seir and disposses-
sed the Amalekites (1 Chron. iv, 42). B.C. ante 720.
4. One of the chiefs of Manasseh, of famous val-/or (1 Chron. v, 24). B.C. cir. 720.
Ishh (Heb. Ishi, יִשְׁחַי, my husband; Sept. ὁ διὸν
you, Vulg. Vir meus), a metaphorical name prescribed
for himself by Jehovah, to be used by the Jewish Church,
expressive of her future fidelity and privilege of intimac-
ity, in contrast with the spirit of legalism indicated by the title Baali, "my master" (Hos. ii. 16).

Ishbah (Hebrew Yishshakiah, יִשְׁשָּׁכָיָּה, once Yishshak'ah, יִשְׁשַּׁקָּה, 1 Chron. xii, 6; lent by Jehovah), the name of several men
difficult to be anglicized.
chief of his tribe (1 Chron. vii, 8). B.C. cir. 1618;
but in ver. 2 he is apparently made nearly contemporary
with David. See Uzzi.
descendant of Rehobiah, and great-grandson
of Moses (1 Chron. xxiv, 21; compare xxii, 17; xxvi,
where he is called Ishshahal). B.C. post 1618. See
Rehobiah.
Korhite, and one of the braves that joined David at
Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 6). B.C. 1055.
the "sons of Harim, who denounced his Gentile
wife after the captivity (Ezra x, 31). B.C. 459.
Ishiah (Ezra x, 31). See Ishiaih, 5.

Ishma (Heb. Yishma, יִשְׁמָא, desolation, otherwise
high; Sept. Ισσαί, a descendant of Judah, apparently
named (with two brothers and a sister) as a son of the
founder ("father") of Etam (1 Chron. iv, 3). B.C. cir.
1012.

Ishmael (Heb. Yisha'meel, יִשְׁמָאֵל, heard by God; Sept.
Ισσαία, Ἰσσαίας, the name of several men.
1. Abraham's eldest son, born to him by the concu-
bine Hagar (Gen. xvi, 15; xvii, 23). See Abraham:
Hagar. It may here be remarked that the age attributed
to him in Gen. xxxi, 14 is not inconsistent with
Gen. xviii, 25 (see Tuch, Comm. p. 382). The story of
his birth, as recorded in Gen. xvi, is in every respect
characteristic of Eastern life and morals in the present
age. The intense desire of both Abraham and Sarah
for children; Sarah's gift of Hagar to Abraham as
wife; the insouciance of the slave when suddenly raised to
a place of importance; the jealousy and consequent tyranny
of her high-spirited mistress; Hagar's flight, re-
turn, and submission to Sarah—for all these incidents
we could easily find parallels in the modern history
of every tribe in the desert of Arabia. The origin of
the name Ishmael is thus explained. When Hagar fled
from Sarah, the angel of the Lord found her by a foun-
tain of water in the wilderness by the way of Shur . . .
and he said, "Behold, thou art with child, and shalt bear
a son, and shalt call his name Ishmael ('God hears',
because of the Lord hath heard thy affliction") (Gen. xvi.
11). Hagar had evidently intended, when she fled, to
return to her native country. But when the angel told
her of the dignity in store for her as a mother, and the power
to which her child, as the son of the great patri-
arch, was destined to rise, she was resolved to obey his
voice, and to submit herself to Sarah (xvi, 10-18).

1. Ishmael was born at Mamre, in the eighty-sixth
year of Abraham's age, eleven years after his arrival
in Canaan, and fourteen before the birth of Isaac (xvi, 3;
xvi, 6). B.C. 2078. No particulars of his early
life occur. He preserved his circumcision when he was
seven years of age (xvii, 25). B.C. 2065. His father was evi-
ently strongly attached to him; for when an heir was
promised through Sarah, he said, "Oh that Ishmael
might live before thee!" (xvii, 18). Then were renewed to
Abraham in more definite terms the promises made
to Hagar regarding Ishmael: "As for Ishmael, I have
heard thee; behold, I have blessed him, and will make
him fruitful, and will multiply him exceedingly: twelve
princes shall he beget: and I will make him a great na-
tion" (ver. 20). Before this time Abraham seems to
have regarded his first-born child as the heir of the
principle of his belief in which was centered the
righteousness (xvi, 6); and although that faith shone
yet more brightly after his passing weakness when Isaac
was first promised, his love for Ishmael is recorded in
the narrative of Sarah's expulsion of the latter: "And
she was grievous in Abraham's sight because of
his son" (xii, 11).

Ishmael seems to have remained in a great measure
under the charge of his mother, who, knowing his des-
tiny, would doubtless have him trained in such exer-
cises as would fit him for successfully acting the part of
a desert prince. He was engaged in every way by his
father, encouraged to daring and adventure by the
hardy nomads who fed and defended his father's
flocks, and having a fitting field on that southern bor-
der-land for the play of his natural propensities, Ishmael
 grew up a true child of the desert—a wild and way-
ward boy. The perfect freedom of desert life, his con-
continuance with those who looked up to him with
mingled feelings of pride and affection as the son and
heir-apparent of their great chief, tended to make him
impatient of restraint, and overbearing in his temper.
The wild chase—speeding the chase—speeding the chase—
beemseba after the gazelles, and through the rugged
mountains of Edeni after wild goats, and bears, and
leopards, inured him to danger, and trained him for war.
Ishmael must also have been accustomed from child-
hood to those feuds which raged almost incessantly
between the "trained servants" of Abraham and their
like neighbors of Philistia, as well as to the more seri-
ious incursions of roving bands of freebooters from
the distant East. Such was the school in which the great
desert chief was trained. Subsequent events served to
fill up and fashion the remaining features of Ishmael's
character. He had evidently been treated by Abra-
ham's dependents as their master's heir, and Abraham
himself had apparently encouraged the belief. The un-
expected birth of Isaac, therefore, must have been to him
a sad and bitter disappointment. And when he was af-
terwards driven forth with his poor mother, a homeless
wanderer in a pathless wilderness, when, in the wake-
fulness of such unnatural harshness, he was brought to the
very brink of the grave, and was only saved from a pain-
ful death by a miracle; when, after having been reared in
luxury, and taught to look forward to the possession of
wealth and power, he was suddenly left to win a scanty
and uncertain subsistence by his sword and bow—we
need scarcely wonder that his proud spirit, rebelling
against injustice and cruelty, should make him what
the angel had predicted, "a wild-axe man; his hand
against every man, and every man's hand against him" (xvi,
392).

2. The first recorded outbreak of Ishmael's rude and
wayward spirit occurred at the weaning of Isaac. B.C. 2961. On that occasion Abraham made a great feast after the custom of the country. In the excitement of the moment, heightened probably by the painful consciousness of his own blighted hopes, Ishmael could not restrain his temper, but gave way to some insulting expressions or gestures of mockery. Perhaps the very name of the child, Isaac ("seed of exaltation"), and perhaps the joy of his aged mother, may have furnished subjects for his untimely satire. See ISAAC. Be this as it may, Sarah’s jealous eye and quick ear speedily detected him; and she said to Abraham, “Expel this slave and his son; for the son of this slave shall not be heir with my son Isaac. Look, the child whom I bore him is a son in whom I am delighted.” Abraham was grieved for the lad, but he was beloved; and he spared the child. And God said to Abraham, “Let not this boy be bitter against him, for in him shall the blessing of Abraham be blessed, and he shall be a people for great blessing of the Lord. For I have given him the land of Kedar, and he shall dwell in the tents of Issachar.” Ishmael was forty years old when he was weaned, and he dwelt in the tents of Kedar. And God was with him. And he became a shepherd, and he was a archer. And he dwelt in the wilderness of Paran and in the tents of Kedar, and he was a shepherd, and he became a herdsman of Ishmael. And he took the lad seven years old, and he dwelt in the wilderness of Paran. And God was with him. And he became a shepherd, and he was a herdsman of Ishmael. And he dwelt in the wilderness of Paran and in the tents of Kedar. And he was a shepherd, and he became a herdsman of Ishmael. And he took the lad seven years old, and he dwelt in the wilderness of Paran. And God was with him. And he became a shepherd, and he was a herdsman of Ishmael. And he dwelt in the wilderness of Paran and in the tents of Kedar.
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It was composed. (See also Hottinger, Hist. Orient, p. 210). At this period the Arabian desert appears to have been thinly peopled by descendants of Joktan, the son of Eber, "whose dwelling was from Meha, as thou goest unto Sephar, a mount of the east" (Gen. x. 25-30). The Joktanites, or Bene-Kedhur, are regarded by Arab historians as the first and most honorable progenitors of the Arab tribes (D'Iherbelot, Bibliothèque Orientale, s. v. Arabes). See JOKTAN.

Ishmael had twelve sons: Nebajoth, Kedar, Abdelc, Mibsam, Mishma, Duham, Massa, Hadad, Tema, Jetur, Naphish, and Kedemah. To the list of them, the sacred records (Gen. xxv. 16) add an important piece of information: "These are the sons of Ishmael, and these are their names, by their cities (םידניכים, "fortified towns"), and their camps (סינים); twelve princes according to their nations" (םינש). Every one of the twelve sons of Ishmael, therefore, like the children of Jacob, was the head of a tribe, and the founder of a distinct colony or camp. In this respect the statements in the Bible exactly accord with the ancient traditions and histories of the Arabs themselves. Native historians divide them into two races: 1. pure Arabic, descendants of Joktan; and, 2. Mixed Arabs, descendants of Ishmael. Abulfeda gives a brief account of the several tribes and nations which descended from both these original stocks (Historia Antelamica, ed. Fleischer, p. 186, 191 sq.). Some of the tribes founded by sons of Ishmael carried the names of their founders, and were well known in history. The Nabateans, who took possession of Idumea in the 4th century B.C., and constructed the wonderful monuments of Petra, were the posterity of Nebajoth, Ishmael's eldest son. See NABATEANS. The descendants of Joktar and Naphish disputed with the Israelites possession of the country east of the Jordan, and the former, described by Strabo as κατοικον παντικα (xvi, 2), gave their name to a small province south of Damascus, which it bears to this day. See TURRA. The black tents of Kedar were pitched in the heart of the Arabian desert, and from their abundant flocks they supplied the markets of Tyre (Jer. ii, 10; Isa. ix, 7; Ezek. xxvii, 21). The district of Tema lay south of Edom, and is referred to by both Job and Isaiah (Job vi, 19; Isa. xxii, 14; Fosger's Geogr. of Arabia, I, 292; Heeren's Historical Researches, ii, 107). Duham held a small province in Arabia. Since the days of Abraham the tents of the Ishmaelites have been studded along the whole eastern confines of Palestine, and they have been scattered over Arabia from the borders of Egypt to the banks of the Euphrates. As friends and foes, as oppressors and oppressed—but ever as freemen—the seed of Ishmael have "dwelt in the presence of their brethren."

Of this last expression various explanations have been given, but the plainest is the most probable: which is, that Ishmael and the tribes springing from him should always be located near the kindred tribes descended from Abraham. This was a promise of benefit in that age of inequality, when Abraham himself had come from beyond the Euphrates, and was a stranger and sojourner in the land of Canaan. There was thus, in fact, a relation of some importance between this promise and the promise of the heritage of Canaan to another branch of Abraham's offspring. It had seemingly some such force as this—The heritage of Canaan is indeed destined for another son of Abraham; but still the lot of Ishmael, and of those that spring from him, shall never be cast far apart from that of his brethren. This view is confirmed by the circumstance that the Ishmaelites did, in fact, occupy the country bordering on that in which the various tribes descended from Abraham or Terah had settled—the Ishmaelites, Edomites, Midianites, Moabites, Ammonites, etc. Most interpreters find in this passage a promise that the descendents of Ishmael should never be subdued. But we are unable to discover this in the text; and, moreover, such has not been the fact, whether we regard the Ishmaelites apart from the other Aramians, or consider the promise made to Ishmael as applicable to the whole Arabian family. The Arabian tribes are in a state of subjection at this moment; and the great Wahhabeeocracy among them, which not many years ago filled Western Arabia, is the first and most honorable progenitor of the tribe (D'Iherbelot, Bibliothèque Orientale, s. v. Arabes). See JOKTAN.

The prophecy which drew their character has been fulfilled with equal minuteness of detail. He shall be a wild ass of a man ( CancellationToken ; his hand against every man, and every man's hand against him. This means, in short, that he and his descendants should lead the life of the Bedouins of the Arabian deserts; and how the prediction has been fulfilled, and how the Bedouin manners now in existence, a recent commentator on the passage has illustrated in prose by equal force and beauty. "The character of the Ishmaelites, or the Bedouins, could not be described more aptly or more powerfully. Against them alone time seems to have no sike, and the conqueror's sword no edge. They are the most obstinate and the most persevering of all the nations, and mocked the attacks of the invaders. Ungovernable and roaming, obeying no law but their spirit of adventure, regarding all mankind as their enemies, whom they must either attack with their spears or elude with their faithful steeds, and cherishing their deserts as heavily as the limit of all the constraint of too close a neighbor, they have expanded over the whole country and the coast of Arabia, and the Bedouins are the outskirts of the nations. Plunder is legitimate gain, a daring 'robbery' is praised as valor" (Kalisch, ad loc.). See ISHMAELITE.

7. The notions of the Arabs respecting Ishmael (Isma'il) are partly derived from the Bible, partly from Jewish, and partly from native traditions. The origin of many of these traditions is obscure, but a great number may be ascribed to the fact of Mohammed's having, for political reasons, claimed Ishmael for his ancestor, and strenuously to make an imposible pedigree; while both he and his followers have, as a consequence of this assumed descent, set out to extalt that ancestor. Another reason may be safely found in Ishmael's acknowledged headship of the naturalized Arabs, and this cause existed from the very period of his settlement. See ARABIA. Yet the rivalry of the Joktanite kings of Southern Arabia, and its intercourse with classical and medieval Europe, the wandering and unsettled habits of the Ishmaelites, their having no literature, and, as far as we know, only a mesor oral tradition, all contributed, till the importance it acquired with the promulgation of El-Islam, to render our knowledge of the Ishmaelitic portion of the people of Arabia, before Mohammd, lamentably defective. That they maintained, and still maintain, a patriarchal and primitive form of life, is known to us. Their religion, at least in the period immediately preceding Mohammed, was in Central Arabia chiefly the grossest fetishism, probably learned from themselves by the posterity of the land; southwards it diverged to the cosmic worship of the Joktanite Himyritees (though these were far from being exempt from fetishism), and northwards (so at least in ancient times) to an approach to that true faith which Ishmael carried with him, and his descendants were the grandsons of. This last view was indeed illustrated by the numbers who, in Arabia, became either Jews (Karaites) or Christians (though of a very corrupt form of Christianity), and by the movement in search of the faith of the patriarchs which had been put forward, not long before the birth of Mohammed, by men not satisfied with Judaism or the corrupt form of Christianity with which alone they were acquainted. This movement first aroused Mohammed, and was afterwards the main cause of his success.

The Arabs believe that Ishmael was the first-born of Abraham, and the majority of their doctors (but the
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point is in dispute) assert that this son, and not Isaac, was offered by Abraham in sacrifice. The scene of this sacrifice is Mount Arafat, near Mecca, the last holy place visited by pilgrims, it being necessary to the completion of pilgrimage to be present at a sermon delivered thereon. Abraham, it is related, was to sacrifice his son when he forsook the heathen deities and offered him at Mekkeh, in commemoration of the offering, and to sacrifice a victim on the following evening after sunset, in the valley of Minæ. The sacrifice last mentioned is observed throughout the Muslim world, and the day on which it is made is called "The Great Festival" (Lane's *Modern Egypt*, ch. iii.). Abraham, it is related, dwelt with his mother at Mekkeh, and both are buried in the place called the "Heij," on the north-west (termed by the Arabs the north) side of the Kaabeh, and inclosed by a curved wall called the "Hattm." Ishmael was visited at Mekkeh by Abraham, and they together rebuilt the temple, which had been destroyed by a flood. At Mekkeh, Ishmael married a daughter of Mudduh or El-Mudah, chief of the Joktanite tribe Jurhum, and had thirteen children (Mirror ez-Zemâd, MS.), thus agreeing with the Biblical narrative, including the daughter.

Mohammed's descent from Ishmael is usually lost, for an unknown number of generations, to "Abraham," of the twenty-first generation before the prophet: from him downwards the latter's descent is, if we may believe the genealogists, fairly proved. But we have evidence far more trustworthy than that of the genealogists; for, with the Arabs, the names of the natives of Arabia are not traceable to the third or fourth generation, and it is scarcely possible to find one who is ignorant of his race, seeing that his very life often depends upon it. The law of blood-revenge necessitates his knowing the names of his ancestors for four generations, but no more; and this law, extending from time immemorial, has made any confusion of race almost impossible. This law, it should be remembered, is not a law of Mohammed, but an old pagan law that he endeavored to suppress, but could not. In casting doubt on the prophet's pedigree, we must add that this cannot affect the proofs of the chief element of the Arab nation being the stock of Abraham (and so, too, of Ishmael, of whom was Ishmael). Although partly mixed with the Joktanites, they are more mixed with Keturabites, et c.; the characteristics of the Joktanites, as before remarked, are widely different from those of the Ishmaelites; and, whatever theory is introduced to the contrary, we believe that the Arabs, from physical characteristics, language, the concurrence of native traditions (before Mohammedianism made them untrustworthy), and the testimony of the Bible, are mainly and essentially Ishmaelitic.

2. The father (or ancestor) of Zebediah, which latter was "a ruler of the house of Judah" under Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xix, 11). B.C. cir. 900.

3. Son of Jehohanan, and captain of a "hundred" under the regency of Jehoiada (2 Chron. xxiii, 1). B.C. 877.

4. One of the six sons of Azel, of the tribe of Benjamin (1 Chron. viii, 28; ix, 44). B.C. ante 500.

5. Son of Nethaniah, whose treachery forms one of the chief episodes of the history of the period immediately succeeding the first fall of Jerusalem (Jer. xi, 7- xli, 15, with a short summary in 2 Kings xxv, 23-25). B.C. 587. His full description is "Ishmael, the son of Nethaniah, the son of Elzaphanan, of the seed royal" of Judah (Jer. xli, 1; 2 Kings xxv, 25). Whether by this it is intended that he was actually a son of Zedeckiah, or of one of the latter kings, or, more generally, that he had royal blood in his veins—perhaps a descendant of Elizahannah, the son of David (2 Sam. v, 18)—we cannot tell. Jeremiah (xxv, 35) throws the whole into some doubt, on the expression as meaning "of the seed of Molech." He gives the same meaning to the words "the king's son" applied to Masseiah in the above passage. The question is an interesting one, and has recently been revived by Geiger (Uebersetzung, etc., p. 387), who extends it to other passages and persons. See Mosaic. Jerome (as above) further says—perhaps on the strength of a tradition—that Ishmael was the son of an Egyptian slave, Gera: as a reason why the "seed royal" should bear the meaning he gives it. During the siege of the city he had, like many others of his countrymen (Jer. xi, 11), been brought into captivity; but, to his return, he forsook the gods of the country of Basal, then king of the Bene-Ammon (Josephus, Ant. x, 9, 2). Ammonitish women were sometimes found in the harems of the kings of Jerusalem (1 Kings xi, 1), and Ishmael may have been thus related to the Ammonitish court on his mother's side. At any rate, he was instigated by the designs which he accomplished but too successfully (Jer. xi, 14; Josephus, Ant. x, 9, 3). Several bodies of Jews appear to have been lying under arms in the plains on the south-east of the Jordan, during the last days of Jerusalem, watching the progress of affairs in Western Palestine, commanded by "princes" (Hebr. "rabbim"), the chief of whom were Ishmael, and two brothers, Johanan and Jonathan, sons of Kareah. Immediately after the departure of the Chaldean army these men moved across the Jordan to pay their respects to Gedaliah, whom the king of Babylon had left as superintendent (ינפ) of the province. Gedaliah had taken up his residence at Mizpah, a few miles north of Jerusalem, on the main road, where Jeremiah the prophet resided with him (xi, 6). The Chaldeans were not wont to have isolated messengers beyond the west of the town. We can discern a high inclosed courtyard and a deep well within its precincts. The well was certainly (Jer. xii, 9; comp. 1 Kings xv, 22), and the whole residence was probably, a relic of the military works of Asa, king of Judah. Ishmael made no secret of his intention to kill the superintendent and usurp his position. Of this Gedaliah was warned in express terms by Johanan and his companions; and Johanan, in a secret interview, foreseeing how irreparably a misfortune Gedaliah's death would be at this juncture (xi, 10), offered to remove the danger by killing Ishmael. This, however, the prophet, from an evident ten men, who, according to the Hebrew text, "princes of the king" (יִנְפֵּי םנֵפֵי), though this is omitted by the Sept. and by Josephus. Gedaliah entertained them at a feast (xii, 1). According to the statement of Josephus, this was a very lavish entertainment, and Gedaliah became much intoxicated. It must have been a private one, for before its close Ishmael and his followers had murdered Gedaliah and all his attendants with such secrecy that no alarm was given outside the room. The same night he killed all Gedaliah's establishment, including some Chaldean soldiers who were there. Jeremiah appears fortunately to have been absent, and, incredible as it seems, well had Ishmael satiated his precations that for two days the massacre remained perfectly unknown to the people of the town. On the second day Ishmael perceived from his elevated position a large party coming southwards along the main road from Shechem and Samaria. He went out to meet them. They proved to be eight or nine, who, with rest clothes, and with sharp swords, etc., approached the bodies, and other marks of heathen devotion, and weeping (Sept.) as they went, were bringing incense and offerings to the ruins of the Temple. At this invitation they turned aside to the residence of the superintendent. Here they found a general assembly of men, who, in a great temple, which on a larger scale, was employed by Meho et Ali in the massacre of the Mamelukes at Cairo in 1806. As the unsuspecting pilgrims passed within the gate (Sept. court-gard) he closed the entrances behind them, and there he and his band butchered the whole number: ten only escaped by the offer of heavy
ransom for their lives. The seventy corpses were then thrown into the well, which (as in the Sepoy massacre at Cawnpore) was within the precincts of the house, and which was completely filled with the bodies. It was the same thing that had been done by John—by Johnson in some respects a prototype of Ismael, with the bodies of the forty-two relatives of Ahaziah (2 Kings x, 14). This done, he descended to the town, surprised and carried off the daughters of king Zedekiah, who had been sent there by Nebuchadnezzar for safety; with their emunah and their wealth from Chaldean guard (Jer. xlii, 11, 16), and all the people of the town, and made off with his prisoners to the country of the Ammonites. Which road he took is not quite clear; the Hebrew text and Sept. say by Gibeon, that is north; but Josephus, by Hebron, round the southern end of the Dead Sea. The news of the massacre had by this time got abroad, and Ismael was quickly pursued by Johanan and his companions. Whether north or south, they soon tracked him and his unwieldy booty, and found them reposing by some copious waters (Uṣār el-Ha bi). He was attacked, two of his braves slain, the whole of the prey recovered, and Ismael himself, with the remaining eight of his people, was forced to the shore and then passed into the obscurity from which it would have been well if he had never emerged. Johanan's foreboding was fulfilled. The result of this tragedy was an immediate panic. The small remnants of the Jewish commonwealth—the captains of the forces, the leftovers of the two prophets, the two men, the women and children—at once took flight into Egypt (Jer. xii, 17; xlvi, 5-7), and all hopes of a settlement were for the time at an end. The remembrance of the calamity was perpetuated by a fast the fast of the seventh month (Zech. vii, 5; viii, 19), which is to this day strictly kept by the Jews on the third of Tisri. (See Reland, Ant. iv, 10; Kimchi on Zech. vii, 5). The part taken by Baalis in this transaction apparently brought upon his nation the denunciations both of Jeremiah (xlix, 1-6) and the more distant Ezekiel (xxvi, 1-7), but we have no record to show how these predictions were accomplished. See 1Chron. xxiv, 19.

6. One of the "sons" of Pashur, who divorced his Gentile wife after the Exile (Ezra x, 22). B.C. 459.

Ishmael (as a later name). See 1Chron. xxiv, 19.

Ish'ma'élītē (Heb. Yešma'elīṯiṯ), יֶשֶׁמַּאֵלִיִּת, 1Chron. xxiv, 19; xxviii, 8, etc., pl. יַעֲשֹּנַּאֶלִיִּים, usually Anglicized "Ishmaelites." q, v., a descendant of Ishmael, the son of Abraham, by Hagar. He lived on a tributary with Egypt (Gen. xxvii, 25, 27; xxxix, 1); and lived a wandering life as nomad at the eastward of the Hebrews and as far as to the Persian Gulf and Assyria, i.e., Babylonia (Gen. xxv, 18), which same limits are elsewhere assigned to the Amalekites (1 Sam. xv, 7); so also the names "Ishmaelites" and "Midianites" appear to be sometimes applied to the same people (Gen. xxvii, 25, 27, 28; Judg. xviii, 22, 24). In Gen. xxv, 18, it is said, "And they dwelt from Havilah unto Shur, that is before Egypt, as thou goest towards Assyria; and he died in the presence of all his brethren." Or Ishmael's death had already been mentioned, and as the Hebrew term נָפַל—naphal—rendered "he died," properly he fell—is seldom used in the Scriptures in reference to "dying," except in cases of sudden and violent death, as when one "falls" in battle, the probability is that naphal here signifies that his territory or possession fell to him; and he died in the presence of all his brethren, immediately contiguous to the borders of the territories in which the various tribes descended from Abraham or Terah had settled—the Israelites, Edomites, Midianites, Moabites, Ammonites, etc. This interpretation is censured by the Sept. and Targums, which have died, and by the parallel passages (comp. 1 Sam. xvi, 12; 1 Chron. vii, 24; 1 Chronicles xxvi, 3; 1 Chron. vii, 4)." The twelve sons of Ishmael, somewhat like the twelve sons of Jacob, became so many heads of tribes (Gen. xxv, 18-19), which implies that in the next generation they spread themselves pretty widely abroad. It appears (Gen. xxv, 18) that Ishmaelites and Midianites were the nomadic parts of the Arabian peninsula; but in process of time they would naturally stretch more inland, eastward and southward. That they also extended their journey northwards is evident from the fact that the brethren of Joseph espied "a company of Ishmaelites coming from Arabia, while they were twenty men, and carrying spicery, and myrrh, to carry it down to Egypt" (Gen. xxxvii, 25). The company has afterwards the name of Midianites applied to it (ver. 28), probably on account of its consisting of more than one class of people, Midianites also in part; but being first called Ishmaelites, we can have no reasonable doubt that these formed a considerable portion of the caravan party. The trade of inland carriers between the countries in the north of Africa on the one side, and those in southern and western Asia (India, Persia, Babylonia, etc.) on the other, is one in which sections of the Ishmaelitish race have been known from the remotest times to take a part. It suited their migratory and unsettled habits; and they became so noted for it, that others, who did not belong to the same race, were not infrequently called Ishmaelites, merely because they followed the Ishmaelitish traffic and manners. It is impossible to say how far the descendants of Ishmael penetrated into Arabia, and how far the elements in its southern and more productive regions. As it is certain the Ishmaelitish mode of life has been always less practised there, and a modified civilization is of old standing, the probability is that the population in those regions has little in it of Ishmaelitish blood. But, with all their regard to genealogies, the Arabic races have for thousands of years been so transmuted into each other, that all distinct landmarks are wellnigh lost. The circumstance of Mohammed having, for prudential reasons, claimed to be a descendant of the son of Abraham, has led to an extension of the Ishmaelitish circle far beyond what the probable facts will bear out. See ISMAEL, 1.

Ishma'el'ah (Heb. Yəšma'ēlaṯ, יֶשֶׁמַּאֵלִא, in 1Chron. xxvi, 19 in the paragogic form Yəšma'ēlaṯ, יֶשֶׁמַּאֵלִא, heard by Jeborah, the name of two of David's officers. See DAVID.

1. (Sept. Yəṣa'elāṯ, Vulg. Sāmājōs, Auth. Vers. "Ishmaiah"). A Gibonite, one of the chiefs of those warriors who were the cause of the death of the whole of their tribe, and joined themselves to David when he was at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 4). B.C. 1046. He is described as "a hero (gibbor) among the thirty and over the thirty"—i.e. David's body-guard; but his name does not appear in the lists of the guard in 2 Sam. xxiii and 1 Chron. xi. Possibly he was killed in some encounter before David reached the throne.


Ish'mē'ēloitē in the text. (1.) see in Gen. xxvii, 25, 27, 28; xxix, 1, as a general name of the Abrahamic stock, that is, the people of Abraham, as distinguished from the Canaanites (see Balak; Eze. xxiii, 1), but elsewhere (1 Chron. ii, 17) in the strict sense of the proper Ishmaelites (as Anglicized in Judg. viii, 24; 1 Sam. xxvi, 6), with which the Heb. name corresponds.

Ish'mē'ēral (Heb. Yəshma'ēlaṯ, יֶשֶׁמַּאֵלִא, preserved by Jeborah; Septuag. Ἰσσαμαῖος, one of the "sons" of Elpaal, a chief Benjamite resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 18). B.C. ante 858.

Y'shō'd (Heb. Yshōḏ, יַשֹּד, men of garrison, i.e. in countenance or in fame; Sept. simply ἡσαμ, translates er decuriones, a son of Haman, the head or prince of the Machir of Gilead (1 Chron. viii, 18). B.C. cir. 1658.

Ish'pan (Hebrew Yšpān, יִשְׁפָּן, prob. kid, but Geneiius bald, First strong; Sept. Ἰσσαίας, Vulg. Jesapham),
One of the "sons" of Shashash, a Benjamite chief resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii. 22). B.C. ante 688.

Isb-Tob (Heb. Ish-Tob', יִשׁ-תּוֹב, man of Tob [i.e. good]; Sept. Ierou'oi; Josephus Ierou'oiog; Vulg. Iseod), apparently one of the small kingdoms or states which formed part of the general country of Aram, named with Zobah, Rehob, and Maacaah (2 Sam. x, 6, 8). In the parallel account of 1 Chron. xix Isiboth is omitted. By Josephus (Ant. vii, 6, 1) the name is given as that of a king. But though in the ancient versions the name is given as one word, it is probable that the real signification is "the men of Tob" (q. v.), a district mentioned also in connection with Ammon in the records of Jehi- thal (Judg. xi, 3, 5), and again, perhaps, under the shape of Tobh in attractions, in the history of the Maccabees (1 Macc. x, 18; 2 Macc. xii, 17).

Ish'uba (Heb. Yiechech, יְשׁ-עֶבָּה, uniform; Septuag. Ισσαού, but Ισσαοῦ in Gen.; Vulg. Jesuia), the second name of the sons of Asher (Gen. xlii, 17; 1 Chron. vii, 30, in which latter passage it is Anglicized "Ishubah"). B.C. 856. He appears to have left no issue (compare Numb. xxxvi, 44).

Ish'ua'li (1 Chron. vii, 30). See Ishu'it.

Ish'uei (Heb. Yieheech, יְשׁ-ועֶי, uniform), the name of two men.


2. (Septuag. Ισσαοῦ, Josephus Ierou'oi, Ant. vii, 6, 8; Vulg. Jesuia, Auth. Ven. "Ishuia"). The second name of the three oldest sons of king Saul (1 Sam. xiv, 49; probably the same as Arinadab (1 Sam. xxxii, 2; comp. 1 Chron. viii, 38). See Ish-bosheth.

Isido'ra of Alexandria, St., was born in Egypt about the year 318, and led for a time the life of a hermit in the wilderness of the Thebaid and in the desert of Nitria. St. Athanasius ordained him priest, and gave him the charge of a hospital, whence Isidore is also called the Hospitalator. After the death of Athanasius, Isidore courageously defended his works and his memory against the attacks of the Arians. Having got into difficulties with Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, Isidore was obliged to flee to Constantinople, where he died in 403. The Greek Church commemorates him on the 16th of January. See Palladius, Hist. Lausiacs; Hoefler, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, vii, 56. (J. N. P.)

Isido'ra, Sr., bishop of Cordova, and an eminent Spanish theologian and historian, who flourished in the 4th century, died about 400. The chronicl of Flav. Dextor mentions him as having continued St. Jerome's Chronicon to the year 880; Siegbert de Gembloux attributes to him also a Commentarius in Orosii Libros Regum; but Florez and Antonio show good grounds for discounting this assertion. Antonio even gives very strong reasons for considering this Isidore an imaginary individual, as well as another Isidore, likewise supposed to have been bishop of Cordova in 400-480, whom Dextor considers to be the author of a Liber Allocutorum and a Commentarius in Lucan. See Biburias, Nov. ad Dextrum; Antonio, Bibliotheca Hispanica veter. i, 249; Fabricius, Bibl. Med. et Infm. Latinae; Hoefler, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, xxvi, 56. (J. N. P.)

Isido'ra Mercator (or Peccator), the supposed name of a compiler who, towards the middle of the 9th century, published the famous collection of canons known as the Liber Decretalogus. See Canonici; Decre-taI. It is pretty generally conceded that this writer lived in the dominions of Charles the Bald, but his name is a matter of doubt. As for his collection, it is evidently based on that of Isidore of Seville, numerous copies of which were at the time circulating in France; but it contains besides a vast number of apocryphal add-

ditiona. Some of these pieces had already been in circulation for years, and they were not all made up by the Pseudo-Isidore. The collection of capitularies of Benedictus Levita, a deacon of Mayence (who has by some been considered as the author of the Pseudo-Isidorian collection), which was written about 840, contains already numerous extracts of the fictitious canons of the work of Mercator. They circulated at first only in Southern France. They remained unknown in Spain until the 16th century, and in Germany and Italy but few copies of them are to be found. They are compiled from the histories of Rufinus and Cassiodorus, the Liber Pontificiorum, the works of the fathers, of the councils, regular decreets, the Bible (which, according to Richter, he quotes from the Vulgate, revised by Rhabanus Maurus), and, finally, the Roman law, of which he possessed a compendium in the Visigoth language. These two latter circumstances go far to prove that the writer must have been either a native, at least, at the time, a resident of France. Mayence has sometimes been considered as the place where the pseudo-decretes were written, and Rieuf or Ogar, archbishops of that city, or even Benedictus Levita, above alluded to, as the author, but this seems very unlikely. More recent is Rhabanus Maurus, who succeeded Ogar in 847, appears entirely acquainted with their work. It must have been written about the middle of the 9th century, for it contains the decrees of the council held at Paris in 828, shows a knowledge of Rhabanus Maurus's work and the choir-books of the bishops of the time, and was first made public at the Synod of Chiers in 857. The history of this collection has never been fully traced out; much may perhaps be done for it by a careful comparison of the numerous MS. copies of it which are still extant. Among these copies, one of the most important is in the bishop's chair of Vercelli, No. 630, written in 858-867. It is thought that the Copitula Anglorum, another apocryphal document of canon law, must also be considered as the work of the so-called Isidore Mercator. See, besides the works already referred to under Decretals, Centuriators, Civitatis Theodosi Historia, vol. vi, cap. vii, and vol. iii, cap. vii; Blende, H kmus, Rm. et Turrimus vocabulum; Van Espen, De Collectio-ne Isidori, Opera, vol. iii.; Zaccaria, Antiformone, vol. i, dis. iii; Spittler, Gesch. des canonischen Rechts, p. 243; Kunstmann, Fragmenta Sidero-Pseudo-Isidori (Neue Slon, 1868). (Iforster, Unteruchung, Uber Aler, Eursprung und Zweck d. Deedelken, v. d. franzischen Isidore, Furtwangler, 1848); Same, Gesch. d. Carolinger, i, 71; Rossini, Zur Kirchen-rechtlichen Quellen u. z. den Pseudo-Isidorischen Decret- talem (Heidelberg, 1849); Hoefler, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, xvi, 71; Milman, Latin Christianity, ii, 370 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyclop. xii, 237; Hefele, in Wetzar und Weltz, Kirchen-Lex., viii, 859. (J. H. W.)

Isido'ra of Moscow, a distinguished Russian bishop, was born at Thessalonica towards the close of the 14th century. He became successively archimandrite of the convent of St. Demetrius at Constantinople, coadjutor of the bishop of Illjitsk, and, finally (in 1457), metropolitan of the whole of Russia. In the spring of 1495 he attended, at the head of a hundred Russian bishops and priests, the Council of Florence, at which the union of the Latin and Greek churches was effected. See Floren-k, Council of. Isidore and Bessarion played the most important part in that council. In June, 1445, having fulfilled his task, he returned to Moscow to proclaim the news. But the grand duke Yasili, who was displeased with the results of the council, had him thrown into prison, and condemned to be burned alive; but on the day appointed for the execution he made his escape, and fled to Moscow, where he continued his work as a martyr. As the union effected by the Council of Florence in 1439 was of very short duration, Isidore was selected by the Roman pontiff, Nicholas V, as messenger to Constantinople, to attempt again a union of the churches, but in this mission he failed. Isidore died at Rome April 27, 1463. Having witnessed the estab-
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lishment of Islamism at Constantinople, he gave an account of it in two letters, one of which was published in the Lettres Turques of Reisner, vol. iv; the second, which is dated Candia, July 7, 1453, was never printed, and is probably contained in the Riccardian Library at Florence. Some Russian annalists, especially Nikon, give external evidence of some of his sermons and his book Naumukre scheba Opoca: Drevnaya Rosiskaiia Biblioteka, vol. xi; Strahl, Der Russische Metropolit Isidor u. sein Versuch d. russisch-griechische Kirche mit d. Römisch-Katolischen zu vereinen (Tübingen, 1823); Cacciari et Obolenschi, Rerum Pontificum et Cardinalium (Roma, 1677), ii, 903; Statuta Concilii Florentini (Florence, 1518); Maimbourg, Histoire du Schisme des Grecs; Thienes, Vicissitudes de l’Eglise en Pologne et en Russie, i, 33; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxvi, 73; Neale’s History of the Council of Florence, p. 59; Covel, Account of the Greek Church, p. 117.

Isidore of Pelusium (or Pelusia), St., an ecclesiastical writer, was born at Alexandria about the year 370. He spent his life in the neighborhood of Pelusium, in a monastery of which he was abbot, and where he practised strict asceticism. He was a great admirer of St. Anthony, whom, according to tradition, he was a pupil, and whom he defended against the attacks of the patriarchs of Alexandria, Theophylact and Cyril. In the controversy waged by Cyril against Nestorius, Isidorus Pelusiotae favored the Cyrillic party, his counsels of moderation contrasting greatly with the passion and anathematizing zeal of his contemporaries. He was a firm and constant friend of the churches in Egypt against the heresies of the Greek Church, and vigorously opposed all heretical intrusions. Of his writings, which “discuss, with learning, piety, judgment, and moderation, nearly all the theological and practical questions of his age,” there remain to us yet a collection of his letters, forming five collections, some of which they are probably not all (there are more than 2000 of them) his. These letters treat almost entirely on the interpretation of Scripture. The first three volumes were published, with a Latin translation and notes, by J. de Billy (Paris, 1685, fol.), and reprinted, together with the fourth volume, by Conrad Hitzelhausen (Heidelberg, 1690, fol.), and the fifth by the Jesuit Schott (Antw. 1628, 8vo). A complete, though rather faulty edition was finally published at Paris in 1688, fol., and in Migne’s edition of the fathers, vol. lvIII (Paris, 1860). See Photius, Bibliotheca (cod. 228, 292); Schlierer, Gesch. der alten Kirche (3rd ed., Berlin, 1858, 244); Hugmann, Dissertation de Isidore Pelusiose ejusque epistolis (Göttingen, 1737, 4to); Fabricius, Bibliotheca Graeca, x, 480, 494; H. A. Niemeyer, De Isid. Pel. viva, scripta et doctrina (Halle, 1822); Tillemont, Mem. Ecclésiastiques, vol. xvii; Du Pn., Narr. Bib. des aut. eccl. iv, 6 sq.; Cellier, H. des aut. soc. xiii, 600 sq.; Neander, Kirchengesch. ii, 2, 361 sq.; Schaff, Ch. Hist. iii, 941; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. viii, 83; Hoefer, Nouv. Biogr. Générale, xxvi, 57.

Isidore of Seville, or Isidor of Hispalensis, surnamed also “the young” to distinguish him from Isidore of Cordova whose name is distinguished ecclesiastics of the 7th century, was born at Cartagena about the year 560 or 570. He was a son of Severianus and Theodora, and brother of St. Leander, his predecessor in the bishopric of Seville, and of St. Fulgentius of Cartaghe. He was brought up by his brother Leander, and was therefore natural that he should have been in the selection of a successor for the bishopric of Seville, but it was not principally owing to his relationship to Leander that he was honored with this distinguished position. His abilities fully entitled him to this distinction. When he ascended to the bishopric the ecclesiastics of Spain for a century and a half. The north and west of Europe were shrouded in moral darkness. Germany, occupied by a number of adverse tribes, was yet given to idolatry; Sweden, Norway, Denmark, Scotland, were almost unknown; England and Ireland had just received the first faint glimpse of Christianity; France was torn by the dissensions of petty monarchs, and the East itself was on the eve of the inroads of Mohammedanism. To counteract these influences, and to build up the Christian faith among his countrymen, was his first care. To this end he established schools to properly train the young, entered into relations with the bishop of Rome (Gregory the Great), and made every effort to bring the doctrinal and moral system of Christianity into harmony with the habits and institutions of those various races and nationalities which at that time composed the Hispanic-Gothic kingdom; and so successful was he in his efforts that, when the Visigoths were driven out by the Mohammedans, the Church of Spain. His abilities were further recognized by his contemporaries in permitting him to preside over the two Councils—half eclesiastical, half civil—or of Seville (619) and Toledo (Dec., 683). On both occasions he showed great zeal for the orthodox side, and strict opposition to all heretical movements. Specifically, however, he was opposed to Arianism. So able was the conduct of Isidore at these councils that the canons of them may be said to have served as a basis even for the constitutional law of the Spanish kingdom, both in Church and State, down to the time of the great councils of the 11th century. Isidore died at Seville on April 4, 686, and was canonized by the Church soon after his death. We have but few particulars of his life from his writings, except that in a letter, about the authenticity of which there is much doubt, he reveals himself as desirous of being admitted to the degree of Doctor of the Church; to prove the doctrine of the Trinity, to defend the Church against its enemies, to support the famous code of Justinian, to reprove the vanity of the world. The great reputation which Isidore enjoyed among his colleagues may be best inferred from the fact that the fathers of the 8th Council of Toledo, who call him Doctor egregius, ecclesiae catholicae novissimun, deus, praecedentibus aetateque nostro, doctissimus, doctores, ecclesiam non infimus, atque, et quod magis est, jam aeculaeorum fatorum doctissimus, cum recentia nominandus, Isidore. According to the testimony of his disciple, St. Ildefonsus, he was a man of wonderful eloquence. The same authorizes him as the author of De Genere Officiorum (generally called De Officiis ecclesiasticis), Libri Proemtorum:—De Ortu et Obiui Patrum (sanctorum):—Lib. Synonymorum (sive lamentations):—De Naturae verum:—Lib. Sententiarum:—Lib. Epithetorum: Origenis, probably the last work of Isidore. The first edition of his works, which display very extensive learning and a profound knowledge of the Scriptures and of the nature—eloquent, ascetical, liturgical, scriptural, historical, philosophical, and even philologically—and thus amply account for the authority of his contemporaries, was published by Michael Somnus (Paris, 1386, fol.); another edition, from MSS. of Alvar Gomez, and augmented by notes by J. B. Perez and Giral (Madrid, 1599, 2 vols. fol.). The edition of James Dubreuil (Paris, 1601, folio) and that of Cologne (1667) are taken from that of Madrid. The latest, which is also the considered best, is due to Arevalo (Rome, 1792-1803, 7 vols. 4to). See St. Ildefonsus, De Viris Illustribus; Sigebert de Gramboix, De Script. Ecclesiast. c. 55; Trithiem, De Script. Eccles.; MªCrie, Reformation in Spain, p. 52; Hoefer, Nouv. Liog. Générale, xxxvi, 57 sq.; Chambers, Cyclop. a. v.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. vii, 89 sq.; Smith, Dict. of Class. Biogrophy, ii, 627 sq.

Isidorus Hispalensis. See Isidore of Seville.

Isis (Ισή), an Egyptian deity, sister and wife of Osiris (q. v.), is called by the Egyptians Ἡ, and is by them said to have been born on the 4th day of the Epagomenae, or five days added to the Egyptian year of 360 days. The history of Isis is very obscure, all the information we possess on the subject being derived from Greek writers. Tradition said that her brother Osiris having married her, they together undertook the task of civilizing men, and taught them agriculture; their marriage produced Horus. Their other brother, Typhon, being at enmity with them, succeed-
Isis, the name of a Mohammedan sect, who derive their name from their founder, Isa-Aledad. They mortal lifted yet." An annual festival of ten days' duration commemorated the victory of Isis over Typhon by means of the sistrum: on this occasion a solemn fast was succeeded by processions, in which sheaves of wheat were carried about in honor of Isis, etc. After Alexander the Great, the worship of Isis was propagated throughout all those countries inhabited by the Greeks; in Greece temples were erected to her at Philus, Megara, Tithorea, and Phocia. The worship of Isis was also introduced into Rome in the time of Sulla (B.C. 86), but her temples were often closed on account of the licentiousness of her priests. (Josephus tells a story about the demolition by the worshippers of the emperor on account of an intrigue by one Mundus to secure the gratification of his passion for a Roman matron, Ant. xviii, 3, 4.) Yet, under the emperors, it found credit, and Domitian, Commodus, and Caracalla were themselves among her priests. Writers of those times say that it was in their day still the custom of the Greeks and Romans to carry a boat in solemn procession in honor of Isis on the opening of spring (March 5th). Hence, in the Roman calendar, the 5th of March is designated as Isisia martigium. As similar processions were held in honor of the Greek divinities, Tacitus claims that they also worshipped Isis; yet her name nowhere appears among them, neither is it exactly known what goddess he thus designated. "The myth of Isis, as given by Plutarch (De Iside), appears to be a fusion of Egyptian and Phoenician traditions, and the legend, like the legend of their deities, Tacitus claims that they also worshipped Isis; yet her name nowhere appears among them, neither is it exactly known what goddess he thus designated. The fable was adopted and incorporated in the mysticism of the Gnostics. Accordingly, among other representations, we find a gem containing a beetle, with Isis on the opposite side, holding two children, the emblem of material and spiritual existence. The gem the beetle is not cut on the stone, but the stone is formed into the shape of the insect, and on the convex back is represented Isis, or the Egyptian Ceres, reclining beside the Nile, with two vases of Egyptian corn, the emblem of vegetable prolificness, naturally expressed by the emblem of the sun's rays and the Nile: from the head issues the lotus, and in one hand is held a niometer, or perhaps a spade. It is the exact form of the same agricultural instrument as used at this day in the East. An amulet of Isis was held in great sanctity. See Egypt. See Herod. ii, c. 59; Ovid, Metam. ix, 776; Bunsen, Egypt's Place, i, 413; Wilkinson, Manners and Cost, iii, 276; iv, 366; Birch, Gall. Ant. p. 31; Reiche, De Isis apud Romanos cultu (Berlin, 1849); Ficker, Universal Lexikon, ix, 82; Smith, Dict. of Classical Mythol. s. v.

Gnostic Gem of Isis, on a Scarabaeus.

Isites, the name of a Mohammedan sect, who derive their name from their founder, Isa-Aledad. They
hold that the Koran was created, notwithstanding the opposition of Mohammed himself against such a statement, for he held that it was eternal, and in his day anathematized all who dared to dissent from his assertion. The Isteis, however, really avow the same belief, though they clothe it in very different language. They say that the Koran was dictated by the Almighty to his Prophet was only a transcription of the original, and that the reference of eternal could not therefore be to any copy possessed by man. But their real heresy consists in their declaration that the Koran does not contain that matchless elegance which Mohammedans generally claim as evidence of the inspiration of the book. See Broughton, Biblioth. Hist. Sac., i. 547.

Islām or Islām (Arabic), the proper name of the religion known as Mohammedanism, designates complete and entire submission of body and soul to God, his will and his service, as well as to all those articles of faith, commands, and ordinances revealed to and ordained by Mohammed his prophet. Islam, the Mohammedans say, was once the religion of all men; but wickedness and idolatry came into the world either after the murder of Abel, or at the time which resulted in the flood, or only after the flood, of the first of the greatest Arabian idolaters. Every child, they believe, is born in Islam, or the true faith, and would continue faithful to the end were it not influenced by the wickedness of its parents, "who misguide it early, and lead it astray to Magian [see Fānsuki], Judaism, or Christianity." See M'Chesney, Mohammedanism.

Islam and Isles is the invariable rendering in the Author. Vers. of the Heb. word "Sekh (Sept. πύργος, Vulg. īsula)," which occurs in the following souses, chiefly in poetry: First, that of dry or habitable land in opposition to water: as, 'I will make the rivers islands' (Isa. xliii, 15; comp. xiii, 19; ii, 2). Especially is it a maritime region or sea-court, like the East-Indian Java, which means both shore and island. In Isa. xxv, 6, the isle of Ashdod means the country, and is so rendered in the margin, particularly as this was a sea-shore. In Isa. xxiii, 2, 6, "the isle" means the country of Tyre, and in Ezek. xxvi, 6, 7, that of Chittim and Elissa, both being maritime regions. (Job xxiii, 8, "2858 means the non-guileless.) In this sense it is more particularly applied to the shores of the Mediterranean sometimes in the fuller expression "islands of the sea" (Isa. xi, 11), or "isles of the Gentiles" (Gen. x, 5; comp. Zeph. ii, 11), and sometimes simply as "isles" (Psa. lxxii, 10; Ezek. xxvi, 15, 18; xxvii, 3, 35; xxxix, 6; Dan. xi, 18): an exception to this, however, occurs in Ezek. xxvii, 2, where the shores of the Mediterranean are intended. Secondly, it is used both in Hebrew and English, according to its geographical meaning, for an island proper, i.e. a country surrounded by water, as in Jer. xviii, 4, "the isle (margin of Caphtor), which is probably that of Cyprus. "The isles of the sea" (Ezek. x, 1) are evidently put in opposition to "the land" or continent. Thirdly, the word is used by the Hebrews to designate all those countries divided from Palestine by water, as fully described in Jer. xxxv, 22, "the isles which are beyond the sea," which were hence regarded as the most remote regions of the earth (Isa. xxiv, 15; xlii, 10; lxxi, 18; compare the expression in Ezek. xlvii, 16, "the isles afar off"), and also as large and numerous (Isa. xi, 15; Psa. cxvii, 1). (See J. D. Michaelis, Spicilegium, i, 151-142.) In Isa. xi, 11, after an enumeration of countries lying on their own continent, the words "convulsed beyond the sea" are added in order to comprehend those situate beyond the ocean. It is observed by Sir J. Newton (on Daniel, p. 276), "By the earth the Jews understood the great continent of all Asia and Africa, to which they had access by land; and by the isles of the sea they understood the places to which they sailed by sea, particularly all Europe. (See Genesis, Thea. Heb., p. 88.)."-Kitto; Smith. Comp. Wild Beast.

Islands of the Blessed were, according to a very old Greek myth, certain happy isles situated towards the edge of the Western ocean, where the favorites of the gods, rescued from death, dwelt in joy, and possessed everything in abundance that could contribute to it.

Islebians is the name by which the followers of John Agricola (q. v.) are designated, in distinction from all other Antinomians (q. v.). The name is derived from their master, who was also known as the magister Islebius, because a native of Isleben, also the birth-place of Luther, with whom he was a contemporary. Sometimes the Islebians are called Nomomachi (q. v.).

Isip, Simon, an English prelate, flourished in the 14th century. But little is known of his early history. He became archbishop in 1348, having previously been canon of St. Paul's, dean of the Arches, and a member of the privy council of the king. He is especially celebrated as the founder of the college of Canterburx (now a part of Christ Church, Oxford). "He built it," says bishop Godwin, in his account of Isip, "and enriched it with good possessions, appropriating unto the same the pannages of Pagham and Masond." Perhaps more noteworthy still is his conduct towards Wickliffe, related by Neander (Ch. Hist, v, 135-6; the name is by mistake spelled Isle, and so even in the English translation by Torrey). Isip, says Neander, was a strict friend of the reformer, and in 1366 showed his predictions for Wickliffe by appointing him overseer over the Canterbury college, characterizing him "as a man in whose circumstances, fidelity, and activity he had the utmost confidence, and to whom he gave this post on account of his honorable deportment and his learning." Of course, after Isip's death in 1366 (Apr. 26), Wickliffe was deprived of his place (comp. Lewis, Life of Wickliffe, 1820, p. 9 sq.). See Hook, Ecclesiastical Biography, vi, 265. (J. H. W.)

Ismachi'ah (Heb. Ismacykah, אֵּמֵ֣כָּקָה, supported by Je'-khosah; Sept. Ἱακύπος), one of the Levites charged by Hezekiah with the superintendence of the sacred offerings under the general direction of the high-priest and others (2 Chron. xxxi, 18). B.C. 726.

Is'ma'il, a Grecized form of the name Ismael (q. v.), found in the A. V. of the Apocrypha.

1. (Ismahōl.)-The son of Abraham (Judith ii. 23).

2. (Ismakōh)-One of the priests who relinquished their Gentile wives after the Captivity (1 Esdr. ix. 22).

Isma'il, the elder son of Jafar Saduk, the sixth imam, in a direct line, from Ali Ben-Ali Talib (who makes the first of the Twelve Imams, but are incorrect), the Alie sect, also known as Fatimite, and more generally as the Shites, (q. v.), was to have been the seventh imam of the Shiites, but, as he died during his father's lifetime, Jafar appointed as his successor his younger son Kauzim. This many of the Shiites opposed, holding that, as the imam is an incorrupt emanation of the Deity, only a descendant of the direct line could assume the responsibilities of this high office, and claimed the distinction for the sons of Ismael, who alone, of the descendants of Jafar, were entitled to be imams. This contention caused a schism among the Shiites about the 2d century of the Hegira (8th century of our era), and gave rise to a new sect, under the name of ISMAELITES, OR ISMARIANS. The Abbasides (friends and followers of Abbas, the uncle of Mohammed), whose interest it was to foster all divisions between the power- ful Shiites, in order to assuage the fury of our era), and gave rise to a new sect, under the name of ISMAELITEs, OR ISMARILANS. The Abbaside (friends and followers of Abbas, the uncle of Mohammed), whose interest it was to foster all divisions between the power- ful Shiites, in order to assuage the fury of our era), and gave rise to a new sect, under the name of ISMAELITEs, OR ISMARIANS. The Abbaside (friends and followers of Abbas, the uncle of Mohammed), whose interest it was to foster all divisions between the power-ful Shiites, in order to assuage the fury of our era), and gave rise to a new sect, under the name of ISMAELITEs, OR ISMARIANS. The Abbaside (friends and followers of Abbas, the uncle of Mohammed), whose interest it was to foster all divisions between the power-ful Shiites, in order to assuage the fury of our era), and gave rise to a new sect, under the name of ISMAELITEs, OR ISMARIANS. The Abbaside (friends and followers of Abbas, the uncle of Mohammed), whose interest it was to foster all divisions between the power-ful Shiites, in order to assuage the fury of our era), and gave rise to a new sect, under the name of ISMAELITEs, OR ISMARIANS. The Abbaside (friends and followers of Abbas, the uncle of Mohammed), whose interest it was to foster all divisions between the power-ful Shiites, in order to assuage the fury of our era), and gave rise to a new sect, under the name of ISMAELITEs, OR ISMARIANS. The Abbaside (friends and followers of Abbas, the uncle of Mohammed), whose interest it was to foster all divisions between the power-ful Shiites, in order to assuage the fury of our era), and gave rise to a new sect, under the name of ISMAELITEs, OR ISMARIANS. The Abbaside (friends and followers of Abbas, the uncle of Mohammed), whose interest it was to foster all divisions between the power-ful Shiites, in order to assuage the fury of our era), and gave rise to a new sect, under the name of ISMAELITEs, OR ISMARIANS. The Abbaside (friends and followers of Abbas, the uncle of Mohammed), whose interest it was to foster all divisions between the power-ful Shiites, in order to assuage the fury of our era), and gave rise to a new sect, under the name of ISMAELITEs, OR ISMARIANS. The Abbaside (friends and followers of Abbas, the uncle of Mohammed), whose interest it was to foster all divisions between the power-ful Shiites, in order to assuage the fury of our era), and gave rise to a new sect, under the name of ISMAELITEs, OR ISMARIANS. The Abbaside (friends and followers of Abbas, the uncle of Mohammed), whose interest it was to foster all divisions between the power-ful Shiites, in order to assuage the fury of our era), and gave rise to a new sect, under the name of ISMAELITEs, OR ISMARIANS. The Abbaside (friends and followers of Abbas, the uncle of Mohammed), whose interest it was to foster all divisions between the power-ful Shiites, in order to assuage the fury of our era), and gave rise to a new sect, under the name of ISMAELITEs, OR ISMARIANS. The Abbaside (friends and followers of Abbas, the uncle of Mohammed), whose interest it was to foster all divisions between the power-ful Shiites, in order to assuage the fury of our era), and gave rise to a new sect, under the name of ISMAELITEs, OR ISMARIANS.
the Abbasside caliphs and the other Musulmans. Missionaries were sent through all the territories settled by the followers of Mohammed, at this time torn in pieces by scores of sects, to advocate the claims of the house of Ismael. They flourished in the 9th and 10th centuries under the name of Karmatians (q. v.), and constituted a most universal pleasure to Mohammed and his freemasons, admitting, however, some very dangerous tenets, and advocating the extermination of their enemies by the sword. They received additional strength in the 11th century of our era, when a family of chiefs, through the means of superstition, established an influence which enabled its members to hold several of them for two centuries to control the affairs of Persia.

The first of these chiefs was Husein Subah (from whose name the Ismaelites of this period are often called Huseini or Housain—a title, however, having no connection [as has been erroneously supposed by some] with the English word assassin, which is really equivalent to “abashish-eaters” see Assassins), who, after many years of persecution, succeeded in obtaining a stronghold, and, there fortifying himself, founded upon the Ismaelitic model a sect of his own. Besides maintaining the principles as far as for the rights of succession to the office of imam, he also introduced many new tenets more conformable to the opinions of the Sufis, or philosophical deists, than to those of orthodox Mohammedans. The Koran, he admitted, was a holy volume; but he insisted that its spirit and moral rules were the only thing he desired. He rejected the usual modes of worship, as true devotion, he said, was seated in the soul, and prescribed forms might disturb, though they could never aid, that secret and fervent adoration which it must always offer to its Creator (Malcolm, from a Persian MS.). But the principal point which Husein Subah insisted on was a complete and absolute devotion to himself and to his descendants. His disciples were instructed to consider him more as their spiritual than their worldly leader. The means he took to instil this feeling into their minds must have been powerful, from the effect which was produced. "When an envoy from Malik Shah came to Allahamout, Husein commanded one of his subjects to stab himself, and another to cast himself headlong from a precipice. Both mandates were instantly obeyed! 'Go, said he to the astonished envoy, 'and explain to your master the character of my followers!' (Malcolm, Life of Husein Subah, p. 399). Organised crime, which may be ascribed for this control of Husein over his adherents is that he formed them into a secret order, and, besides, promised them advancement from one degree to another, in the highest of which a foretaste of the life that is to come was given them. This extraordinary mode of procuring the devotion of his disciples he is said to have produced by drugs. "A youth who was deemed worthy, by his strength and resolution, to be initiated into the Assassin service was invited to the table and conversation of the grand master, or grand priest; he was then intoxicated with abashish (the hemp-plant), and carried into the garden—a true Eastern Paradise—where the music of the harp was mingled with the songs of birds, and the melodious tones of the female singers harmonized with the murmurs of the brooks. Everything breathed pleasure, rapture, and sensuality. The young man was then invited to select whatever he chose to drink from the cistern, which was full of everything around him, the hours in particular, contributed to confirm his delusion. After he had experienced as much of the pleasures of Paradise, which the Prophet had promised to the blessed, as his strength would admit—after quaffing ever-vigorous delight from the eye, ear, and mind—springing goblets, he sank into the lethargy produced by narcotic draughts, on awakening from which, after a few hours, he again found himself by the side of his superior. The latter endeavoured to convince him that corporally he had not left his seat, but that spiritually he had been reapt into Paradise, and had there enjoyed a foretaste of the bliss which awaits the faithful, who devote their lives to the service of the faith and the obedience of their chiefs. Thus did these infatuated youtha blindly dedicate themselves as the tools of murder, and eagerly seek an opportunity to sacrifice their lives, in order to become partakers of a Paradise of sensual pleasures. They boasted of the success they met with the Koran to the Moslem, but which to many might appear a dream and mere empty promises, they had enjoyed in reality; and the joys of heaven animated them to deeds worthy of hell" (Madden, Turkish Empire, ii. 185, based on Hammer's Geschichte der Assassinen). Malcolm thinks there is an improbable truth in what the orthodox Mohammedans, who hold the Assassins in great abhorrence, because "the use of wine was strictly forbidden them, and they were enjoined the most temperate and abstemious habits." But this seems to us only an additional reason why we should believe it to be true; for if Husein used the abashish to intoxicate his followers when their nerves needed strengthening for some atrocious deed, we could not expect him to advocate the free use of intoxicating beverages. Nay, its truth is further confirmed by the revelations which the fourth grand master of Husein said he had had, in which he was promised that the Ismaelites would become a mighty nation, and finally conquer the Turk and the fiery imagination of the Arab.

Husein, on account of several hill forts which he had styled 'Sheed', was given the title which signifies "the chief of the mountains," and which has been literally, but erroneously, translated "the old man of the mountain." (Malcolm, i. 401). The Ismaelites in his time spread extensively. They flourished not only in Persia, but also in Syria and Arabia, until A.D. 1233, when their triumph was checkered by the death of the capable, and a general massacre against them was inaugurated. A command was issued by the reigning prince, Mangu Khan, in the 651st year of the Hegira, "to exterminate all the Ismaelites, and not to spare even the infant at its mother's breast.... Warriors went through the provinces, and executed the fatid sentences without mercy or appeal. Wherever they found a disciple of the doctrine of the Ismaelites they compelled him to kneel down, and then cut off his head. The whole race of Kia Busurgomid, in whose descendants the grand mastership had been hereditary, were exterminated. .... Twelve thousand of these wretched creatures were slaughtered without distinction of age. .... The 'de voted to murder' were not now the victims of the order's vengeance, but that of outraged humanity. The sword was against the dagger [the weapon the Assas sinists most generally used to murder their levantines], the executioner destroyed the murderer. The sword saved for two centuries was now ripe for the harvest, and the field ploughed by the Assassin's dagger was reaped by the sword of the mogul. The crime had been terrible, but no less terrible was the punishment" (Madden, ii. 187; comp. Milman's Gibbon [Harper's edition], Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, vi. 215).

But, with all these persecutions, they still struggled on for many years, and even in our own day remains of the Ismaelites still exist both in Persia and Syria, but merely as one of the many sects and heresies of Islamism (see Mohammed, p. 396), without the prestige of the axe, without the means of retaining their former importance, of which they seem, in fact, to have lost all remembrance. The policy of the secret state-subverting doctrine which animated the followers of Husein, and the murderous tactics of the Assassins, are equally foreign to the thoughts of the Qadis and the shaykhs. These writings are preserved in the Ismaelitic and Christian traditions, glossed over with the ravings of a mystical theology. Their places of abode are, both in Persia and Syria, those of their forefathers, in the mountains of Irak, and at the foot of the anti-Lebanon" (Madden, ii. 190, 191). At present many students of Eastern history incline to the opinion that
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"the Druses" (p. 861 sq.), generally supposed to be the descendants of the Hittites, to whom they bear some characteristic resemblances (comp. Chasseaud [a native of Syria, and a very able scholar], Druses of the Lebanon, p. 361 sq.), "must be looked upon as the only true representatives in Syria of the Ismaelitan sect of the follow- ers of Ali, from whom the Assassins are derived" (Malcolm). Rome also held a connection of the Anasuris with the Assassins, especially Mr. Walpole (Travels in the further East in 1850-51 [London, 2 vols. 8vo]; compare also his Travels in the East, iii, 3 sq.). Even in India the Ismaelites are believed to have followers, and as such "the Boraks, an invidious race of merchants and bandits," are known in the British settlements of India, who still maintain that part of the creed of Hussain Subah which enjoins a complete devotion to the mandate of the high- priest" (Malcolm, i, 407, 408) are mentioned. See, be- sides the works already cited, J. F. Rousseau, Mémoire sur les Ismaïlités et les Nourrissois, with notes by De Sacy; the Rev. Samuel Lyde, The Ansairieh and Ishmaelieh, or Visit to the secret Sects of Northern Syria (London, 1858, 8vo); Asiatic Researches, xi. 43 sq. See also MOHAM- MEDIAN SHI'ITES. (J. H. W.)

Muhammad ibn Musallam, a reformer, was born on the 28th of Shawal, 1196 of the Hegira (Sept. 11, 1781), in the village of Pholah, district of Delhi. His family had furnished quite a number of distinguished theologians, and Ismaiel began early to preach and write against the superstitions practices which had been in- troduced into the doctrine of the unity of God in Hindustan. In 1819 he became connected with Ahmed Shah, a Mo- hammedan of a family of Syeds of Bareilly, in Upper In- dia, who was at this time attracting a great deal of at- tention at Delhi by superior sanctity, and by his denunciations of the corrupt forms of worship then prevalent. In 1822 and 1823 Musallam stationed himself at Chunar, and, having made a pilgrimage to Mecca, he proceeded to Delhi, determined to establish a theocratic form of government in India, and to restore Islamism to its original simplicity. The reformers inaugurated a gener- al war against the unbelief, and laying particular em- phasis on the doctrine of the unity of God, they soon succeeded in gaining considerable power by the great number of their adherents. The Sikhs (p. v.) became their chief opponents, and with them a protracted strug- gle ensued. Driven from Delhi by the civil authorities, they retired in 1827 to Panjâb (situated in the Euphrat plains, between Persia and the Indus), where they found an ally in Omar Khan, an Afghan of Panjâb. At first these united forces were successful in their war against the Sikhs, but the Afghans soon grew weary of these conquests for strange allies, and Ahmed and Is- maïl being left alone, removed to the left bank of the Indus, and there, amid rugged mountains, continued for a time the desultory warfare. Early in May, 1831, how- ever, they were surprised at a place called Balakot, in the mountains of Pakhlâk, and slain.

The followers of Ahmed and Ismaïl are called Thori- cûti or Ahmedmedvidest, and bear about them in the common practice of the Sunnis the titles of Shâhi, or "Basis of the Faith," in the Urdu, or vernacular language of Upper India, and it was printed at Calcutta. "It is divided into two portions, of which the first only is understood to be the work of Is- maïl, the second part (the Sirat Amsaatuk, published in Persian at Calcutta, and translated in the Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal) being inferior, and the production of another person. In the preface Ismaïl deprecates the opinion that the wise and learned alone can comprehend God's Word. God himself had said a prophet had been raised up among them to rule and igno- rant for their instruction, and that he, the Lord, had rendered obedience easy. There were two things essen- tial: a belief in the unity of God, which was to know no other, and a knowledge of the Prophet, which was obedience to the law. Many held the sayings of the saints to be their guide, but the Word of God was alone sufficient. They also held an intimate connection of the Anasuris with the Assassins, especially Mr. Walpole (Travels in the further East in 1850-51 [London, 2 vols. 8vo]; compare also his Travels in the East, iii, 3 sq.). Even in India the Ismaelites are believed to have followers, and as such "the Boraks, an invidious race of merchants and bandits," are known in the British settlements of India, who still maintain that part of the creed of Hussain Subah which enjoins a complete devotion to the mandate of the high- priest" (Malcolm, i, 407, 408) are mentioned. See, be- sides the works already cited, J. F. Rousseau, Mémoire sur les Ismaïlities et les Nourrissois, with notes by De Sacy; the Rev. Samuel Lyde, The Ansairieh and Ishmaelieh, or Visit to the secret Sects of Northern Syria (London, 1858, 8vo); Asiatic Researches, xi. 43 sq. See also MOHAM- MEDIAN SHI'ITES. (J. H. W.)

"the Druses" (p. 861 sq.), generally supposed to be the descendants of the Hittites, to whom they bear some characteristic resemblances (comp. Chasseaud [a native of Syria, and a very able scholar], Druses of the Lebanon, p. 361 sq.), "must be looked upon as the only true representatives in Syria of the Ismaelitan sect of the follow-
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The thirteen Rules of R. Ismael, by which alone, as he maintained, the Scriptures are to be interpreted.

Comp. the very valuable work of Dr. E. M. Pinner, Talmud Babli (tratctate Bereithah) mit deutscher Uebersetzung, etc. (Berlin, 1842, vol. 1, pp. 17-20, where Ismael's rules are given with lengthy annotations. See also the article Midrash, in the Dictionary of the Bible. 

The most important of the later Midrashim is an allegorical commentary on Exod. xiii-xxiii, 20, called Beraita, treating of the ceremonies prescribed by the Torah. Numerous editions of it have been printed; the first at Constantinople, 1515, folio; the last, to our knowledge, at Wilna, 1844, folio. It has been augmented by notes from several of the Jewish writers, and was translated into Latin by Ungolius (De Antiquitatem, vol. xiv) — תֵּיתוּלְקַי אֶתְנָחֵר אֶת הַרְפָּאִים (or הַרְפָּאִים), a work on mystic theology, of which extracts have been published in various places (Venice, 1601, 4to; Cracow, 1648, 4to), and in other works. It was printed separately under the title תֵּיתוּלְקַי אֶתְנָחֵר אֶת הַרְפָּאִים (Venice, 1677, 8vo; Zolkiew, 1833, 8vo). It was also inserted in parts in the edition of the Zohar. 

Ismael also wrote a cabalistic, allegorical treatise on the nature and attributes of God, under the title תֵּיתוּלְקַי אֶתְנָחֵר אֶת הַרְפָּאִים; also called תֵּיתוּלְקַי אֶתְנָחֵר אֶת הַרְפָּאִים.

A part of it was published in the תֵּיתוּלְקַי אֶתְנָחֵר אֶת הַרְפָּאִים of Eleazar ben-Jehudah of Worms (Amsterdam, 1701, 4to, and often). Another small cabalistic treatise on the shape and mystic properties of God, under the title תֵּיתוּלְקַי אֶתְנָחֵר אֶת הַרְפָּאִים, was published with a long commentary (Venice, 1770, 4to), etc. See Fürst, Bibl. Judencro, ii, 75 sq.; Rom. Dict. storico degli Autori Ebrei; Zunz, Die Gottesdienstlichen Vorträge der Juden (Berlin, 1832), p. 47 sq.; Gritz, Geschichte der Juden, iv, 68 sq.; Steinschneider, Catalog. Libr. Hebr. in Biblioth. Bodl. Univ., vol. 1100, etc.; Ben. Chinnam (Szegedin, 1848), i, 122 sq.

ISMAELITES. See ISMAEL.

Is'jah (Chron. xiii, 4). See ISMAEL.

Is'pah (Hebr. יִפְשַׂח, prob. bold; Septuag. Ἰσπᾶχ, one of the sons of Beriah, a chief Benjamin; originally (from the region of the Jordan) resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 16). B.C. ante 588.

Isr'ael [not Israel] (Hebr. ישראל, יִשְׂרָאֵל; Sept. דִּוִּיתוּלְקַי אֶתְנָחֵר אֶת הַרְפָּאִים, and N. T. Ἰσραήλ), the name of the founder of the Jewish nation, and of the nation itself, specially of the kingdom comprising the ten northern tribes after the schism.

The name was originally conferred by the angel Je-hovah upon Jacob after the memorable prayer-struggle at Peniel (Gen. xxxii, 29); and the reason there assigned is that the patriarch "as a prince had power (יִשְׂרָאֵל), with God and man, and prevailed" (comp. Gen. xxxii, 

10; Hos. xii, 4). The etymology is therefore clearly from the root יִשְׂרָאֵל, with the frequent adjunct יְהֹוָה, God. The verb itself occurs nowhere else than in the above passages, where it evidently means to strive or contend as in battle; but derivatives are found, e. g. יִשְׂרָאֵל סְדָרָה, a princess, and hence applied to Abraham's wife in exchange for her former name Sarai. The signification thus appears to be that of a "successful warrior with God," a sense with which all the lexicons sympathize; see G. Egesenius (Heb. Lex. s. v. and Theol. p. 1388), pugnator, i. e. miles Dei; Winer (Heb. Lex. p. 1026), lector, i. e. pugnator Dei; First (Hebr. Wörterb. s. v.), Gatt-Beherrsch.
tistinguish from priests, Levites, and other ministers (Exa vi, 16; ix, 1; x, 55; Neh. xi, 8, etc.)—Smith. The twelve tribes of Israel ever formed the ideal representative of the whole stock (1 Kings xviii, 30, 31; Ezra vi, 17; Jer. xxxi, 1, etc.). Hence also in the New Test. 4 Chron. iv, 18 (as in No. 2) to the true people of God, whether of Jewish or Gentile origin (Rom. ix, 6; Gal. vi, 16, etc.), being, in fact, comprehensive of the entire Church of the redeemed. See Jews.

ISRAEL, Kneamos on. The name Jerus (Jeroboam), which had been the national designation of the twelve tribes collectively (Exod. iii, 16, etc.), was, on the division of the monarchy, applied to the northern kingdom (a usage, however, not strictly observed, as in 2 Chron. xii, 6), in contradistinction to the other portion, which was termed the kingdom of Judah. This limitation of the name Israel to certain tribes, at the head of which was that of Ephraim; which, accordingly, in some of the prophetic writings, as e.g. Isa. xvii, 13; Hos. iv, 17, gives its own name to the northern kingdom, is discernible even at so early a period as the commencement of the reign of Saul, and affords evidence of the existence of antagonistic classes which usually led to the division of the nation. It indicated the existence of a rivalry, which needed only time and favorable circumstances to ripen into the revolt witnessed after the death of Sargon.

The chief of the Division. The prophet Abijah, who had been commissioned to announce to Jeroboam, the Ephraimites, the transference to him of the greater part of the kingdom of Solomon, declared it to be the punishment of disobedience to the divine law, and particularly of the idolatry so largely promoted by Solomon (1 Kings xi, 14-35). But while this revolt from the house of David is to be thus viewed in its directly penal character, or as a divine retribution, this does not preclude an inquiry into those sacred causes, political and otherwise, to which this very important revolution in Israelish history is clearly referable. Such an inquiry, indeed, will make it evident how human passion and jealousies were made subservient to the divine purpose.

Prophecy had early assigned a pre-eminent place to two of the sons of Jacob—Judah and Joseph—as the founders of tribes. In the blessing pronounced upon his sons by the dying patriarch, Joseph had the birthright conferred upon him, and was promised in his son Ephraim a numerous progeny; while to Judah promise was made, among other blessings, of rule or dominion over his brethren—"thy father's children shall bow down before thee" (Gen. xlviii, 19, 22; xlix, 8, 26; comp. 1 Chron. xxvii, 12). Those blessings were most largely in the blessing of Moses (Deut. xxviii, 7, 17). The pre-eminence thus prophetically assigned to these two tribes received a partial verification in the fact that at the exodus their numbers were nearly equal, and far in excess of those of the other tribes; and further, as became their position, they were the first who obtained their territories, which were also assigned them in the very centre of the land. It is unnecessary to advert to the various other circumstances which contributed to the growth and aggrandizement of these two tribes, and which, from the position these were thus enabled to acquire, above the rest, naturally led to their becoming heads of parties, and, as such, the objects of mutual rivalry and contention. The Ephraimites, indeed, from the very first, gave unmistakable tokens of an exceedingly haughty temper, and preferred most arrogant claims over the other tribes as regards questions of peace and war. This may be seen in their representation to Aachen of the tribe of Manasseh (Judg. viii, 1) and in their conduct towards Jehoshaph (Judg. xii, 1). Now if this overbearing people resented in the case of tribes so incomparably as that of Manasseh what they regarded as a slight, it is easy to conceive how they must have eyed the proceedings of the tribe of Judah, which was more especially their rival. Hence it was, that while on the first establishment of the monarchy in the person of Saul, of the tribe of Benjamin, the Ephraimites, with the other northern tribes with whom they were associated, silently acquiesced, they refused for seven years to submit to his successor of the tribe of Judah (2 Sam. iii, 9-15) even when they were represented by the true people of God, whether of Jewish or Gentile origin (Rom. ix, 6; Gal. vi, 16, etc.), being, in fact, comprehensive of the entire Church of the redeemed. See Jews.

There were thus, indeed, two powerful elements tending to break up the nation into two national kingdoms, viz.: the long-continued and growing jealousy of the Ephraimites to the tribes of Judah, another cause of dissatisfaction to the dynasty of David in particular was the arrangement just referred to, which consisted in the removal of the civil, and more particularly the ecclesiastical government, to Jerusalem. The Moses ordinances were in themselves exceedingly onerous, and this must have been more especially felt by such as were resident at a distance from the sanctuary, as it harnessed upon them long journeys, not only when attending the stated festivals, but also on numerous other occasions prescribed in the law. This must have been felt as a special grievance by the Ephraimites, owing to the fact that the national sanctuary had been for a very long period at Shiloh, within their own territory; and therefore its transference elsewhere, it is easy to discern, would not be readily acquiesced in by a people whose rights were not so definitely established, and who were not so confident of their rights, and not easily persuaded that this was not rather a political expedient on the part of the rival tribe, than as a matter of divine choice (1 Kings xiv, 21). Nor is it to be overlooked, in connection with this subject, that other provisions of the theocratic policy relative to the annual festivals would have taken advantage of by those in whom there existed already a spirit of dissatisfaction. Even within so limited a locality as Palestine, there must have been inequalities of climate, which must have considerably affected the seasons, more particularly the vintage and harvest, with which the feasts may in some measure have interfered, and in so far may have been productive of discontent between the northern and southern residents. That there were inconveniences in both the respects now mentioned would indeed appear from the appeal made by Jeroboam to his own northern subjects, who had already obtained the advantages of which to which he believed he was induced, or in the adoption of which he was at least greatly aided, by the circumstance of the harvest being considerably later in the northern than in the southern districts (Pist. Bibl., note on 1 Kings xix, 22). Again, the burdensome exactions in the form of service and tribute imposed on his subjects by Solomon
for his extensive buildings, and the maintenance of his splendid and luxurious court, must have still further deepened this disaffection, which originated in one or other of the causes already referred to. It may indeed be assumed that this grievance was of a character which appealed to the malcontents more directly than any other; and that these were the suburban overseers especially concerned in the beautifying of the capital, must have been exceedingly disagreeable to the inhabitants of the provinces, who did not in any way participate in the glories in support of which such onerous charges were required. The burden thus imposed was expressly stated to be the chief ground of complaint by the representatives of Israel headed by Jeroboam, who, on the occasion of the coronation at Shechem, waited on the son of Solomon with a view to obtain redress (1 Kings xii, 4). The long smouldering dissatisfaction could no longer be repressed, and a mitigation of their burdens was imperiously demanded by the people. For this end Jeroboam had been summoned, at the death of Solomon, from Egypt, whose presence must have had a marked influence on the issue, although it may be a question whether Jeroboam should not be regarded rather as an instrument of the cause than an instigator of the revolt. With this agrees the intimation made to him from the Lord many years before by Ahijah the Shilonite. The very choice of Shechem, within the territories of Ephraim, as the coronation place of Rehoboam, may have had for its object the representation of the ten tribes by means of so grand and imposing a ceremony. However this may have been, or in whatever degree the causes specified may have severally operated in producing the revolt, the breach now made was never healed, God himself expressly forbidding all attempts on the part of Rehoboam and his counsellors to subjugate the revolted provinces with the intimation, "This thing is from me" (1 Kings xii, 24). The subsequent history of the two kingdoms was productive, with but slight exceptions, of further estrangement.

The Extent and Resources of the Kingdom of Israel.

The area of Palestine, even at its utmost extent under Solomon, was very circumscribed. In its geographical relations it certainly bore no comparison whatever to the other great empires of antiquity, nor indeed was there any proportion between its size and the mighty population that lived on that small extent of land. For an allowance for the territories on the shore of the Mediterranean in the possession of the Phoenicians, the area of Palestine did not much exceed 13,000 square miles. This limited extent, it might be shown, however, did the present subject call for it, rendered that land more suitable for the purposes of theocracy than if it had been of a far larger area. What precise extent of territories was embraced in the kingdom of Israel cannot be very easily determined, but it may be safely estimated as more than double that of the southern kingdom, or, according to a more exact ratio, as 9 to 4. Nor is it easy to specify with exactness the tribal regions which composed the respective kingdoms. In the announcement made by Ahijah to Jeroboam, he is assured of ten tribes, while only one is reserved for the house of David; but this must be taken only in a general sense, and is to be interpreted by 1 Kings xii, 25 (compare 21); for it would appear that Simeon, part of Dan, and the greater part of Benjamin, owing doubtless to the fact that Jerusalem itself was situated within that tribe, formed portion of the kingdom of Judah (Ewald, Geschichte, iii, 409). It is to be noticed, however, that Judah was the only one of the ten tribes that was not spoken of as the one which constituted the kingdom of the house of David. The ten tribes nominally assigned to Israel were probably Joseph (Ephraim and Manasseh), Issachar, Zebulun, Asher, Naphtali, Gad, Reuben, and (in part) Dan. With respect to the conquests of David, Moab appears to have been attached to the kingdom of Israel (2 Kings iii, 4); as much of Syria as remained subject to Solomon (see 1 Kings xi, 24) would probably be claimed by his successor in the northern kingdom; and Ammon, though connected with Rehoboam as his mother's native land (2 Chron. xii, 13), and though afterwards tributary to Judah (2 Chron. xxvii, 5), was at one time allied (2 Chron. xx, 1), we know not how closely or how early, with Moab. The sea-coast between Accho and Japho remained in occupation of Israel.

With regard to population, again, the data are even more defective than with respect to territorial extent. According to the uncrowned census taken in the reign of David, about forty years previous to the schism of the kingdom, the fighting men in Israel numbered 800,000, and in Judah 500,000 (2 Sam. xxiv, 20), but in 1 Chron. xxvi, 5, 6, the numbers are differently stated at 1,100,000 and 470,000 respectively, with the intimation that Levi and Benjamin were not included (comp. xxvii, 24). As bearing more directly on this point, Rehoboam raised an army of 180,000 men out of Judah and Benjamin to resist Jeroboam (1 Kings xii, 21), and again, Ahijah, the son of Rehoboam, with 400,000 men, made war on Jeroboam at the head of an army of 800,000 (2 Chron. xiii, 8). According to the general laws observable in such cases, the numbers may be said to represent an aggregate population of from five and a half million and a half to about one thousand, or two millions, may be fairly assigned to the kingdom of Judah at the time of the separation.

Shechem was the first capital of the new kingdom (1 Kings xii, 25), venerable for its traditions, and beautiful in its situation. Solomon's son, Rehoboam, whose loving-kindness had fixed the wandering gaze of Solomon (Canut, vi, 4), became the royal residence, if not the capital of Jeroboam (1 Kings xiv, 17) and of his successors (Can. xvi, 33; xvi, 8, 17, 25). After the murder of Jeroboam's son, indeed, Bethel seems to have intended to fix his capital at Ramah, as a convenient place for anonying the king of Judah, whom he looked on as his only dangerous enemy; but he was forced to renounce this plan (1 Kings iv, 17, 21). Samaria, uniting in itself the qualities of beauty and fertility, and a commanding position, was chosen by Omri (1 Kings xvi, 24), and reigned over the kingdom of the ten tribes for about three years the onset of the hosts of Assyria. Jezreel was probably only a royal residence of some of the Israelitish kings. It may have been in awe of the ancient holiness of Shiloh that Jeroboam forbore to pollute the consecrated site of the tabernacle with the wretched abode. He chose for the religious capitals of his kingdom Dan, the old home of northern schism, and Bethel, a Benjamite city not far from Shiloh, and marked out by history and situation as the rival of Jerusalem.

III. Political and Religious Relations of the Kingdom of Israel.

But whilst, in extent of territory and of population, and it might be shown also in various other respects, the resources of the northern kingdom were at the very least double those of its southern rival, the latter embraced elements of strength which were entirely lacking in the other. The geographical position of the kingdom of Israel, which exposed its northern frontier to invasions on the part of Syria and the Assyrian hosts. But more than this, or any exposure to attack from without, were the dangers to be apprehended from the policy on which the kingdom of Israel was founded. Its opposition to theocracy, and his other interferences with fundamental principles of the Mosaic law, more especially in the matter of the priesthood, at once alienated from his government all who were well affected to that economy, and who were not ready to subordinate their religion to any political considerations. Of such there were not a few within the territories of the new kingdom. The Le-
vites in particular fled the kingdom, abandoning their property and possessions; and so did many others besides; "such as set their hearts to seek the Lord God of their fathers, to turn back to the Lord God of their fathers. So they strengthened the kingdom of Judah" (2 Chron. xi, 13-17). Not only was one great source of strength thus at once dried up, but the strongly conserving principles of the law were violently shocked, and the kingdom more than ever exposed to theisson of the heathenism which extended along its frontier.

One element of weakness in the kingdom of Israel was the number of tribes of which it was composed, more especially after they had renounced those principles of the Mosaic law which, while preserving the individuality of the tribes, served to bind them together as one people. Among other circumstances unfavorable to unity was the want of a capital in which all had a common interest, and with which they were connect- ed by some common tie. This want was by no means compensated by the advantages and amenities of Bethel and Dan. But it is in respect to theocratic and religio- nous relations that the weakness of the kingdom of Is- rael specially appears. Any sanction which the usur- pation of Jeroboam may have derived at first from the announcement made to him by the prophet Ahijah, and any support of the anti-theocratic policy. The result of the men of Judah not to fight against Israel, because the thing was from the Lord (1 Kings xii, 33), must have been completely taken away by the denunciations of the prophet out of Judah against the altar at Bethel (1 Kings xii, 1-10), and the subsequent announcements of a doom of doom from God against Jeroboam, which failed to fulfill the condi- tions on which the kingdom was given him (1 Kings xiv, 7-16). The setting up of the worship of the calves, in which may be traced the influence of Jeroboam's residence in Egypt, and the consecrating of priests who could have no moral weight with their fellow-subjects, and subordinating the tribe served to bind them together as one people. These consequences of the policy were by no means calculated to consoli- date a power from which the divine sanction had been expressly withdrawn. On the contrary, they led, and very speedily, to the alienation of many who might at the outset have silently acquiesced in the revolt of Jeroboam, even if they had not fully approved of it. The large migration which ensued into Judah of all who were fa- vorable to the former institution must still further have aggravated the evil, as all vigorous opposition would thereon cease to the onward and destructive tend- ency of the anti-theocratic policy. The natural result of the course appears in the fact that the step taken by Jeroboam was never retracted by any of his successors, one after another following the example thus set to them, so that Jeroboam is emphatically and frequently characterized in Scripture as the man "who made Is- rael to sin," while his successors are described as follow- ing in "the sin of Jeroboam." Further, as the calves of Jeroboam are referable to Egypt, so the worship of Baal, which was introduced by Ahab, the seventh of the Israelish kings, had its origin in the Tyrian alliance formed by that monarch through his marriages with Jezebel, daughter of Ethbaal, king of Sidon. Hitherto the national religion was ostensibly the worship of Jehovah under the representation of the calves; but under this new reign every attempt was made to extirpate this worship entirely by the destruc- tion of the golden calves and the suppression of his altar and the worship of Baal. It was to meet this new phase of things that the strenuous agency of Elijah, Elisha, and their associates was directed, and assumed a quite peculiar form of prophetic ministration, though still the success was but partial and temporary. See, however, under ELIJAH and ELSHA.

IV. Decay and Dissolution of the Kingdom of Israel.

The kingdom of Israel developed no new power. It was but a portion of David's kingdom deprived of many elements of strength. Its frontier was as open and as widely extended as before, but it wanted a capital for the seat of organized power. Its territory was as fer- tile and as tempting to the spoiler, but its people were less united and patriotic. A corrupt religion poisoned the sources of life, to the incalculable injury of the nation. "The Lord cut off on a new and unconquered king, and less respect was felt for an aristocracy reduced by the retirement of the Levites, the army which David found hard to control rose up unchecked in the exercise of its wild strength; and thus nine houses, each ushered in by a revolution, reigned in the throne in the midst of anarchy. Tyre ceased to be an ally when the alliance was no longer profitable to the merchant city. Moab and Ammon yielded tribute only while under compulsion. A power- ful neighbor, Damascus, sat armed at the gate of Is- rael; and beyond Damascus might be discerned the rising strength of the first great monarchy of the world. The history of the kingdom of Israel is therefore the history of its decay and dissolution. In no true sense did it manifest a principle of progress, save only in swerving more and more completely from the course marked out by Providence and predestined for the seed of Abraham; and yet the history is interesting as show- ing how, notwithstanding the ever-widening breach be- tween the two great branches of the one community, the divine purposes concerning them were accomplish- ed. That a polity constituted as was that of the north- ern kingdom did not remain uneventful and the elements of decay must be self-evident, even were the fact less clearly marked on every page of its history.

There is reason to believe that Jeroboam carried back with him into Israel the good-will, if not the substantial assistance of Shishak, and this will account for his es- caping the doom of the ten tribes in the 38th year of his reign (1 Kings xiv, 29). Jeroboam's kingdom thus outlasted his death, the 26th year of his reign (1 Kings xiv, 31). There was then a division of the kingdom into ten tribes under the reigns of his successors. It appears that the kingdom of Israel grew in power and in wealth (1 Kings xiv, 25). Jeroboam had not sufficient force of character in himself to make a lasting impression on his people. A king, but not a founder of a dynasty, he aimed at nothing beyond securing his present elevation. Without any ambition to share in the co-regency with his brother in Samaria, the natural result of the course appears in the fact that the step taken by Jeroboam was never retracted by any of his successors, one after another following the example thus set to them, so that Jeroboam is emphatically and frequently characterized in Scripture as the man "who made Is- rael to sin," while his successors are described as follow- ing in "the sin of Jeroboam."
nial people. Although Jeroboam, the founder of the kingdom, himself reigned nearly twenty-two years, yet his son and successor Nadab was violently cut off after a brief reign of less than two years, and with him the whole house of Jeroboam.

This severity closed the first dynasty, and it was but a type of those which followed. Eight houses, each ushered in by a revolution, occupied the throne in rapid succession, the army being frequently the prime movers in these transactions. Thus Baasha, in the midst of the army at Gibbethon, slew Nadab, the son of Jeroboam, and reigned in his stead, and in turn was deprived of his crown by Elah, the son and successor of Baasha, and reigned only seven days, during which time, however, he smote all the posterity and kindred of his predecessor, and ended his own days by suicide (1 Kings xvi, 16). Omri, the captain of the host, was chosen to punish the usurper Zimri, and after a civil war of four years he prevailed over his other rival Tibni, the choice of half the people. Omri, the sixth in order of the Israelitish kings, founded a more lasting dynasty, for it endured for forty-five years, he having been succeeded by his son Ahab, of whom it is recorded that he "did more to provoke the Lord God of Israel to anger than all his predecessors that were before him" (1 Kings xvi, 33); and he, again, by his son Ahaziah, who, after a reign of less than two years, died from the effects of a fall, and, leaving no son, was succeeded by his brother Jehoram, who reigned twelve years, until slain by Jehu, the captain of the army of those Gilead, who also executed the total destruction of the family of Ahab, which perished like those of Jeroboam and of Baasha (2 Kings ix, 9).

Meanwhile the relations between the rival kingdoms were, as might be expected, of a very unfriendly character. "There was war between Rehoboam and Jeroboam all their days" (1 Kings xiv, 30); so also between Asa and Baasha (1 Kings xvi, 14, 32). The first mention of peace was that made by Jehoshaphat with Ahab (1 Kings xxii, 43), and which was continued between their two successors. The princes of Omri's house cultivated an alliance with the contemporary kings of Judah, which was cemented by the marriage of Jehoram and Athaliah, and marked by the community of names among the royal children. Ahab's Tyrian alliance strengthened him with the counsels of the masculine mind of Jezebel, but brought him no further support.

The house of Omri was the last of the Israelitish enemie's. In the reign of Omri the Syrians had made themselves masters of a portion of the land of Israel (1 Kings xx, 33), and had proceeded so far as to erect streets for themselves in Samaria, which had just been made the capital. Further incursions were checked by Ahab, who, with a peace, concluded with the Syrians, which lasted three years (1 Kings xxii, 1), until that king, in league with Jehoshaphat, king of Judah, attempted to wrest Ramoth-Gilead out of their hands, an act which cost him his life. The death of Ahab was followed by the revolt of the Moabites (2 Kings i, 4), who were again, however, subdued by Jehoram, in league with Jehoshaphat. Again the Syrians renewed their inroads on the kingdom of Israel, and even besieged Samaria, but fled when panic. In the reign of Jehu "the Lord began to cut Israel short: and Hazael smote them in all the coasts of Israel (2 Kings x, 27). Their troubles from that quarter increased still further during the following reign, when the Syrians reduced them to the utmost extremities (2 Kings xiii, 7). To this more protracted years succeeded, with a return to Judah, whose king presumptuously declared war against Israel. The beginning of the reign of the great Rehoboam was marked by the affairs of the northern kingdom revived. "He restored the coast of Israel, from the entering of Hamath unto the sea of the plain; ... he recovered Damascus, and Hamath, which belonged to Judah, for Israel" (2 Kings xiv, 25, 26). Damascus was by this time probably weakened by the advance of the power of Assyria. This period of prosperity was followed by another of a totally different character. Jeroboam's son and successor Zachariah, the last of the dynasty of Jehu, was assassinated, after a reign of six months, by Shallum, who, after a reign of only one month, was slain by Menahem, whose own son and successor Pekahiah was in turn murdered by Pekah, one of his captains, who was himself slain by the men of Israel, and of the men of Ephraim, who are the Assyrians seen extending their power over Israel; first under Pul, to whom Menahem paid a tribute of threescore talents of silver, that his hand might be with him to confirm the kingdom; and afterwards of the kings xv, 19). Now the Assyrians are found pushing their conquests in every direction; at one time, in the reign of Pekah, leading away into captivity a part of the inhabitants of Israel (2 Kings xv, 29), and again coming to the assistance of Ahaz, king of Judah, then besieged in Jerusalem by the Israelites, in conjunction with the Syrians, who had somehow recovered their former ascendency. See Syria. This interposition led to the destruction of Damascus, and in the succeeding weak reign of Hoshea, who had formed some secret alliance with Egypt which was offensive to the Assyrian monarch, to the destruction of the city and the removal of its inhabitants to Assyria; and thus terminated the kingdom of Israel, after an existence of 258 years. Some gleanings of the ten tribes yet remained in the land after so many years of religious decline, moral debasement, national degradation, anarchy, bloodshed, and deluding of the eyes at the removal of the Assyrians up by the conqueror and carried to Assyria, never again, as a distinct people, to occupy their portion of that goodly and pleasant land which their forefathers won under Joshua from the heathen. (See Ewald, Einleitung in die Geschichte des Volkes Israel bis Christus, Götting, 1851; also Wilkii. διασπορά, de decem tribus Israel, in his Αγγελοτικα, p. 305 sq.; J. G. Klauber, Hist. regni Ephraim, Stuttgart, 1833.)

V. Chronological Difficulties of the Reigns compared with those of Judah. These will mostly appeal by a simple inspection of the annexed table, where the numbers given in the columns headed "nominal" are those contained in the express words of Scripture. These and other less obvious discrepancies will be found explained under the titles of the respective kings in this number of the Handbook, and may be well here to recapitulate the most prominent of them together.

1. The length of Jeroboam's reign is stated in 1 Kings xiv, 20 to have been twenty-two years, which appear to have been reckoned from the same point as Rehoboam's (i. e. in Nisan); whereas they were only current, since Rehoboam's accession took place the year following that to Jeroboam. This is confirmed by the fact that the reigns of Rehoboam (seventeen years, 1 Kings xiv, 21) and Abijah (three years, 1 Kings xv, 2) were but twenty years, and Nadab succeeded Jeroboam in Asa's second year (ver. 25). In like manner Nadab's two nominal years (ver. 25) are current, or, in reality, little over one year; for Baasha succeeded him in Asa's third year (verse 28, 33). So, again, Baasha's twenty-four years of reign (verse 33) must be reduced, for purposes of continuous reckoning, to twenty-three; for the year of Elah succeeded his father in Asa's second year (verses xvi, 8). Once more, Elah's two years (ver. 8) must be computed as but one full year, for Zimri slew and succeeded him in Asa's twenty-seventh year (ver. 10, 15).

The cause of this surpplusage in these reigns appears to be that at some point during the reign of Jeroboam the position was regular for the regnal year, which the Israelitish reign was changed (see 1 Kings xii, 82, 83) from the spring (the Hebrew sacred year) to the fall (their older and secular year), so that they overlap those of the kings of Judah by more than half a year. The reigns of the line of Judah must therefore be taken as the standard, and the parallel line of Israel adjusted by it. (The numbers thirty-five and thirty-six in 2
### Comparative Table of the Chronology of the Kings of Judah and Israel
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#### Notes
- Chron. xv, 19; xvi, 1, are evidently a transcriber's error for twenty-five and twenty-six; see 1 Kings xvi, 8.
- 2. Omri's reign is stated in 1 Kings xvi, 23 to have lasted twelve years, beginning, not as the text seems to indicate, in Asa's thirty-first year, but in his twenty-seventh (for Zimri reigned but seven days), since Ahab succeeded him in Asa's eighty-third year (ver. 29), making these really but eleven full years, computed as above. The thirty-first of Asa is meant as the date of Omri's sole or undisputed reign on the death of his rival Tibri, after four years of contest. His sixty years of reign in Tirzah (same verse) are dated from this latter point, and are mentioned in opposition to his removal of his capital at the end of this last time to Samaria (ver. 24), where, accordingly, he reigned one full or two current years, still computed as above. This last-named fact is again the key to the discrepancy in the length of his successor Ahab's reign, which is set down in ver. 29 as twenty-two years "in Samaria;" for they date from the change of capital to that place (Ahab having probably been at that time appointed viceroy), being in reality only a small fraction more than twenty years. This appears from the combination of the residue of Asa's reign (41-38=3; comp. also 1 Kings xxii, 41) and the seventeenth of Jehoshaphat, when Ahabah succeeded Ahab (1 Kings xxii, 51). Ahabiah's two years (same verse) are to be computed as current, or one full year, on the same principle as above.
- The other difficulties relate to minute textual discrepancies, not important to the chronology; some of them involve the supposed interregna. They will all be 1st discussed under the names of the respective kings to whose reigns they belong. For a complete vindication and adjustment of all the textual numbers (save two or three universally admitted to be corrupt) by means of actual tabular construction, see the Meth. Quart. Review, Oct. 1856. See also Judah, Kingdom of.

#### The Chronology of the Kings of Judah has been minutely investigated by Usher, Chronologia Sacra (in his Works, xii, 95-144); by Lightfoot, Order of the Texts of the O. T. (in Works, i, 77-130); by Halé, New Analysis of Chronology, ii, 572-447; by Clinton, Fasti Hebraici, iii, Append. § 5; by H. Browne, Ordo Saxorum, chap iv; and by Wolff, in the Studien u. Krit. (1858, iv). See also Ussziah, Abdab, Josiah.

#### Bibliography
- Israel ben-Samuel MAGHENEN, a Jewish writer of the Karaitic sect, flourished at the opening of the 14th century, at Kahara. He deserves our notice as the author of works on the Jewish laws and traditions, in which he advanced the peculiar theories of the Karaites. Thus, in his work אֹנֵּסָה הַיִּֽשָּׁרָה (written about 1306), he asserts that the animal, if killed according to law, and eaten according to prescription, develops itself in man to a higher state of being. The "shochet" (the person killing the animal) must, however, be a believer of the migration of the souls of animals into the souls of men, else it can not only not take effect, but makes the meat unfit for food. But it is also as the interpreter of the matrimonial laws that he ranks high among the Karaites. See Gritz, Gesch. der Juden, vii. 922. (J. H. W.)

#### Tса'резит (Hebr. פְּשָׁרָה, פְּשֶׁרִית, 2 Sam. xvii. 26; once [Numb. xxv, 14] גִּבְעָת פְּשָׁרָה, man of Judah. i. e. male Israelite; fem. פְּשֶׁרִית, "Israelith woman," Lev. xxiv, 10; Sept. and New Test. "Ishparim," a descendant of Jacob, and therefore a member of the chosen nation, for which, however, the simple name פְּשֶׁר (q. v.) is often employed in a collective sense, but with various degrees of extension at different times: (1) The twelve tribes descended from Jacob's sons,
Tribe of Issachar.—Issachar’s place during the jour- ney to Canaan was on the east of the tabernacle, with his brothers Judah and Zebulun (Num. ii, 5), the group moving foremost in the march (x, 15), and having a common standard, which, according to the Rabbinical tradition, was of the three colors of the rainbow and carnelian, inscribed with the names of the three tribes, and bearing the figure of a lion’s whelp (see Targum Pseudo-Jon. on Num. ii, 8). At this time the captain of the tribe was Nethaneel ben-Zuam (Num. i, 8; ii, 5; vii, 18; x, 10). He was succeeded by Igal ben-Joseph, who went as an representative of the tribe to the assembly of spies (xiii, 7), and he again by Palitei ben-Azzan, who assisted Joshua in appointing the land of Canaan (xxxiv, 26). Issachar was one of the six tribes who were to stand on Mount Gerizim during the ceremony of blessing and cursing (Deut. xxvii, 12). He was still in company with Judah, Zebulun being opposite on Ebal. The number of the fighting men of Issachar when taken in the census at Sinai was 54,400. During the journey they seem to have steadily increased, and after the mortality at Peor they amounted to 64,300, being inferior to none but Judah and Dan—to the latter by 100 souls only. The tribe was given in 1 Chron. xxvii, 14, probably the census of Joab, amount in all to 145,600.

The Promised Land once reached, the connection between Issachar and Judah seems to have closed, to be renewed only on two brief occasions, which will be noticed in their turn. The intimate relation with Zebu- lun was, however, maintained. The two brother-tribes had their premises together, and men are frequently mentioned in company. The allotment of Issa- char lay above that of Manasseh. The specification of its boundaries and contents is contained in Josh. xix, 17-25. But to the towns there named must be added Daberath (a Levitical city of Issachar, xxix, 3), 2600 cubits from which here is probably the Remeth of xix, 21 and Ilbeam (Josh. xvi, 11). The boundary, in the words of Josephus (Ant. v, 1, 22), “extended in length from Carmel to the Jordan, in breadth to Mount Tabor.” In fact, it almost exactly consisted of the plain of Esraelon or Jezreel. The southern boundary we can trace by Engannim, the modern Jenin, on the heights which form the southern enclosure to the plain; and then further westward by Taanach and Megiddo, the authentic fragments of which still stand on the same heights as they trend away to the hump of Carmel. On the north the territory nearly ceases with the places there named by Josephus, the outpost of the hills of Zebulon. East of Tabor, the hill-country continued so as to screen the tribe from the Sea of Galilee, while a detour on the S.E. included a part of the plain within the territory of Manasseh, near Beth-shean and the upper part of the Jordan valley. In a central recess of the plain stood Jezreel, on a low swelling, attended, just across the border, on the one hand by the eminence of Mount Gilboa, and on the other by that now called Ed-Duhuy, or “Little Hermon,” the latter having Shunem, Nain, and Endor on its slopes—names which recall some of the most interesting and important events in the history of Israel. See TIRIM.

The following is a list of all the Biblical localities in the tribe, with their approved or conjectural identifications:

Abez,  
Tapezze  
Kaukar-el-Hava  
Uzaa  
Issachar  
Abmahath,  
Dabarath,  
Debureth,  
Anem,  
Dozrah,  
Debureth,  
Aphek,  
Beth-gath,  
Beth-jeshim  
Beth-hazuzazees,  
Beth-sheemesh,  
Chemoth, or Chotholh  
Tabor,  
Tabor,  
Avin-gamil  
En-haddath,  
Gar,  
Hapharlim,  
Ibleam  
Joth-kain,  
Jarmuth,  

The tribe of Issachar is a richly fertile and wooded region.
ISSACHAR

Jezreel,

(Town. Zerin.
Plain, Merj Dn-Amer.
Fountain, Ain Mejdelah.
Kedesh, do. Kedeshah.
Riblah, do. See Jokneam.
Maralah, do. (Mrcieli).
Shalmon, do. Nain.
Nazarath, do. Be-Nazratham.
Rabbith, do. (Samarieh).
Ramoth, or Remeth, do. (Tell between Sun-

dela and Mukel-

bleh).
Shahazaimah, do. (Shara).
Shihon, do. (Zeh-Shyrak).
Shunem, do. Solam.

This territory was, as it still is, among the richest

land in Palestine. Westward was the famous plain

which derived its name, the "seed-plot of God"—

such is the signification of Jezreel—from its fertility,

and the very weeds of which at this day testify to its

enormous powers of production (Stanley, S. and P. p. 438).

See EKORAKON; JEZREEL. On the north is Tabor, which,

even under the burning sun of that climate, is said to

retain the glades and dells of an English wood (ibid. p. 350).

On the east, behind Jezeel, is the opening which

conducta to the plain of the Jordan—to that Beth-Shean

which was proverbially among the Rubbies the gate of

Paradise for its fruitfulness. It is this aspect of the

territory of Issachar which appears to be alluded to in

the blessing of Jacob. The image of the "sturdy he-

ass" (נַחַל נֶחָיָה)—the large animal used for burdens and

field-work, not the lighter and swifter she-ass for riding

—couching down between the two stalls," chewing the

fodder of stolid ease and quiet—is very applicable, not

only to the tendencies and habits, but to the very size

and air of a rural agrarian people, while the sequel of

the verse is no less suggestive of the certain result of

such tendencies when unrelied by any higher aspira-

tions: "He saw that rest was good and the land pleas-

ant, and he bowed his back to bear, and became a slave

to tribute"—the tribute imposed on him by the various

marauding tribes who were attracted to his territory by

the richness of the crops. The blessing of Moses com-

pletes the picture. He is not only "in tents"—in nom-

ad or semi-nomad life—but " rejoicing" in them; and it

is perhaps not straining a point to observe that he has

by this time begun to lose his individuality. He and

Zebulun are mentioned together as having part posses-

sion in the holy mountain of Tabor, which was near

the frontier line of each (Deut. xxxiii, 18, 19). We pass

from this to the time of Deborah: the chief struggle in

the great victory over Sisera took place on the territory

of Issachar, "by Taanach at the waters of Megiddo" (Judg. v, 19); but the allusion to the tribe in the song

of triumph is of the most cursory nature, not consistent

with its having taken any prominent part in the action.

One among the judges of Israel was from Issachar—

Tola (Judg. x, 1)—but beyond the length of his sway

we have only the fact recorded that he reigned out of

the limits of his own tribe—at Shamir, in Mount Ephra-

im. By Josephus he is omitted entirely (see Ant. v, 7,

6). The census of the tribe taken in the reign of David

has already been alluded to. It is contained in 1 Chron.

vii, 1-5, and an expression occurs in it which testifies to

the nomadic tendencies above noticed. Out of the

whole number of the tribe no less than 36,000 were mar-

auding mercenary troops—"bands" (גֵּ֫רְנֵ֫ר)—a term

applied to no other tribe in this enumeration, though

elsewhere to Gad, and uniformly to the irregular bodies

of the Bedouin nations round Israel. This was proba-

bly at the close of David's reign. Thirty years before,

when two hundred of the head men of the tribe had

gone to Hebron to assist in making David king over

the entire realm, different qualifications are noted in

them—they "had understanding of the times to know

what Israel ought to do . . . and all their brethren

were at their commandment." To what this "under-

standing of the times" was we have no clue (see

Bleich, Christ's, i, 190 sq.). By the later Jewish interpret-

ers it is explained as skill in ascertaining the periods

of the sun and moon, the intercalation of months, and
dates of solemn feasts, and the interpretation of the

signs of the heavens (Targum, ad loc.; Jerome, Quest.

Heb.). Josephus (Ant. vii, 2, 2) gives it as "knowing

for things that were to happen;" and he adds that the

armed men who came with these leaders were 20,000.

One of the wise men of Issachar, according to an old
Jehosh tradition preserved by Jerome. (Quatt. Hebr. on 1 Chron. xxvi. 16); was Amanias, son of Zichri, who, with 200,000 men, offered himself to Jehovah in the service of Jehovahphath (2 Chron. xvi. 16); but this is very questionable, as the movement appears to have been confined to Judah and Benjamin. The ruler of the tribe at this time was Omri, of the great family of Omri, but the movements are connected necessarily by the fact that not have been the forefather of the king of Israel of the same name—of the founder of the house of Omri—and of the house of Abah, the builder of Samaria, possibly on the same hill of Shamir on which the Issacharite judge, Tola, had formerly held his court. But, whether the word was seized at any rate was one of the eight to be found in the old Cessions was Issacharite. Baasha, the son of Ahijah, of the house of Issachar, a member of the army with which Nadab and all Israel were besieging Gibbethon, apparently not of any standing in the tribe (compare 1 Kings xvi. 2), slew the king, and himself mounted the throne (1 Kings xxv. 27, etc.). He was evidently a fierce and warlike man (1 Chron. xvi. 1), and an idolater like Jeroboam. The Issacharite dynasty lasted during the twenty-four years of his reign and the time of his son Elah. At the end of that time it was taken from him by the same man who had acquired it, and Zimri, the new king, commenced his reign by a massacre of the whole kindred and connections of Baasha; he left him “not even so much as a boy” (xvi. 11),

Distant as Jerreel was from Jerusalem, the inhabitants turned to the Persians, with which he negotiated the opening of his reign. On that memorable occasion a multitude of the people from the northern tribes, and among them from Issachar, although so long estranged from the worship of Jehovah as to have forgotten how to make the necessary purifications, yet by the enlightened piety of Hamon, the son of Phinhas, handed over the feast, and they did keep it seven days with great gladness—with such tumultuous joy as had not been known since the time of Solomon, when the whole land was one. Nor did they separate till the occasion had been signalled by an immense destruction of idolatrous altars and symbols, “in Judah and Benjamin, in Ephraim and Manasseh,” up to the very confines of Issachar’s own land—and then all the children of Israel returned every man to his possession into their own cities” (2 Chron. xxxi. 1). Within five years from this date, Shalman, king of Assyria, had invaded the north of Palestine, and after three years he took Samaria, and, with the rest of Israel, had carried Issachar away to his distant dominions. The only other scriptural allusion to the tribe is that, with the rest of their brethren of all the tribes of the children of Israel (Dan only excepted), the twelve thousand of the tribe of Issachar shall be sealed in their foreheads (Rev. vii. 7).

2. A Korite Levite, one of the door-keepers (A. V. “porters”) of the house of Jehovah, seventh son of Obed-Edom (1 Chron. xxxvi. 5). B.C. 1014.

Issendorp, Hendrik, belonged to the Evangelical Lutherans of Holland. He was called in 1728 to the charge of a Lutheran church at Purmerend. In 1737 bodily infirmities rendered a collegiate necessary. In 1743 he resigned his charge. Though obliged to desist from his ministerial work, he rendered himself eminently useful to his denomination by presenting to the Dutch a translation of some three or four hundred German hymns. See Glansin, Gereformeerde Nederland, ii. 186 sq.; also Geschiedenis van het goddelijker Gesang bij de Lutherenen in de Nederlanden door. (J. P. W.)

Isserlin, Israel ben-Petachya, a Jewish Rabbi of great distinction among Jewish scholars in the 15th century, and one of the representatives of truly learned German synagogue teachers, flourished about 1427-1470. At first he was settled over a congregation at Marburg; later he removed to Neustadt, near Vienna. Isserlin was a very liberal-minded Jew, and did much by his influence to advance the standing of Jewish scholarship in his day. More particularly was his influence felt in the theological schools of his Hebrew brethren all over Germany. From the most distant parts of Europe students flocked to the schools at Erfurt, Nuremberg, Regensburg, and Prague, where the Tekhun was expanded in most masterly manner (comp. Zunz, Zur Gesch. u. Lit., p. 167 sq.). According to Jost (Gesch. d. Judenchrons u. s. Sekten, iii, 116), Isserlin died obscurely in 1432, but this seems improbable, as First has evidence of Isserlin’s activity in 1437. His works are יִשְׂרָל יִסְרָאֵל, a collection of 854 opinions on the different fields of Rabbinism (Venezia, 1519, 4to; Furth, 1778, 4to); —טָבִיאֵל טַבִּיאֵל, on the Halachoth (Venezia, 1519, 4to, and often; Furth, 1778, 4to); —דַּרְבּוּחַ דַּרְבּוּחַ, or Expositions on Rashi’s Commentary to the Pentateuch (Venezia, 1519, 4to, and often); —דַּרְבּוּחַ דַּרְבּוּחַ, Commentary on the Book Shaab’aare Dura of Isaac Duren (Venezia, 1548, 4to, and often); etc. See Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, viii, 220 sq.; First, Bibloth. Jud., ii, 154; Fränkel, Israel Isserlin (Lub. d. Or. 1847), c. 675-678. (J. H. W.)

Isserles, Moshe ben-Israel, a celebrated Polish Rabbi, was born at Cracow in 1520. The son of a very wealthy man, and a relative of the distinguished savant Meir Katzenellenbogen ben of Papeisa, he owed an affec- tionate advantage to the fact of natural abilities. He died in 1573. The writings of Isserles are very varied, covering the departments of theological, exegetical, ecclesiastical, and even historical and philosophical literature. In all of these he was perfectly at home. His most important works are רַבִּי מֹשֶׁה, on Parashoth and other subjects of Jewish Antiquities (Venezia, 1599); —יִשְׂרָאֵל, or Commentary on the Book of Esther (Crémone, 1598, 4to; Amsterdam, 1769, 4to). For a list of all his works, see First, Bibloth. Jud., 155 sq. See Fränkel, M. s. b. Israele genannt Mosche Isserle, in the Orientalen. Literaturblatt (1847), c. 827-830; Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, iv, 472 sq. (J. H. W.)

Isahiah (a, 1 Chron. xxiv, 21; b, 1 Chron. xxiv, 25). See ISAIAH.

Isaure, besides its ordinary sense of going forth (Iz2), Chal. to flow, Dan. vii. 10; also יָצָא, extr., e. source. Prov. ix. 18, frequently of the direction or terminus of a bound and περικοιν, to run round, Gal. ii. 18), and progeny (רַבָּיָה, Gen. xlviii. 6, elsewhere “benedicted”; פָּעֲמָה, smartphones, i.e. offspring, Is. xxiii. 24; στριγις, seed, Matt. xxii. 20), is the rendering employed by our translators for several terms expressive of a purulent or unhealthy discharge, especially from the sexual organs. The most emphatic of these is יָצָא, from יָצָא, to flow, both the word and noun being frequently applied to diseased or unusual secretions, e. g. the monthly courses of women, and the seminal flux on gonorrhoea benigna of men (Lev. xv; Numb. v. 2). See Disease. A more intense and chronic form of this discharge was the “issue of blood,” or uterine hemmorhage of the woman in the Gospels (πιστις αἰματος, Mark v, 25; Luke viii, 43, 44; αἰμοποιεις, Matt. ix, 20), which, as it made her ceremonially unclean, not only filled her with grief, but also in concealing when she came in contact with the multitude and with Christ. (See monographs in bolleding, Index, p. 49; Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 141.) The term מִסְרָה, Ezek. xxiii, 20, signifies a pouring, and is applied to the emissio seminis of a stallion, to which the idiosyncratic proportions of Jews are compared in the strong language of the prophet. (See Animal. The only other term so rendered is מֵרֶח, a fountain, applied to the womb, or
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puellula muliebrosa, as the source of the menstrual discharge (Lev. xii, 7; xx, 18; comp. Ex. 29, 29).

See FLUX.

"The texts Lev. xv, 2, 3; xxii, 4; Numb. v, 2 (and 2 Sam. iii, 29, where the malady is invoked as a curse), are probably to be interpreted of gonorrhoea. In Lev. xv, 23, the term is introduced, it is merely meant that the cessation of the actual flux does not constitute ceremonial cleanness, but that the patient must abide the legal time, seven days (ver. 13), and perform the prescribed purifications and sacrifice (ver. 14). See, however, Surenhusius's preface to the treatise Zobim of the Manna, where another interpretation is given, for, as regards the specific varieties of this malady, it is generally asserted that its most severe form (gom. virilenta) is modern, having first appeared in the 15th century. Chardin (Voyages en Perse, ii, 200) states that he observed that this disorder was prevalent in Persia, but that its effects were far less severe than in Western climates. If this be true, it would go some way to explain the alleged absence of the "gom. viril." from ancient nosology, which found its field of observation in the East, Greece, etc., and to confirm the supposition that the medical form of the malady was the subject of the Roman legislation. But, beyond this, it is probable that diseases may appear, run their course, and disappear, and, for want of an accurate observation of their symptoms, leave no trace behind them. The "bed," "seat," etc. (Lev. xv, 5, 6, etc.), are not to be supposed to have been regarded by that law as contagious, but the defilement extended to them merely to give greater prominence to the ceremonial strictness with which the case was ruled. In the woman's issue, (v. 19), the ordinary menstruation seems alone intended, supposed to be prolonged (v. 25) to a morbid extent. The scriptural handling of the subject not dealing, as in the case of leprosy, in symptoms, it seems gratuitous to detail them here: those who desire such knowledge will find them in any compendium of therapeutics. See Josephus, Wars, v, 6, 5; vi, 9, 3; Mithna, Chelum, i, 3, 8; Maimon. ad Zobim, ii, 2: whence we learn that persons thus affected might not ascend the Temple mount, nor share in any religious celebration, nor even enter Jerusalem. See also Michaelis, Lives of Moses, iv, 282 (Smith). See UNCLEANNESS.

ISSUS, or, rather, Isus (Iosou), mentioned by Josephus (Ant. x, 8, 6) as high-priest between Joram and Ahasuerus; apparently corresponding to the Jehoshaphat of the Hebrew Olam. See HIGH-PRIEST.

Istalcurus. In 1 Esdr. viii, 40, the 'son of Is-talcurus' (Ezra 10, 30) is designated for 'Zabud' and of the corresponding list in Ezra (viii, 14). The Kerî has Zikkur instead of Zabud, and of this there is perhaps some trace in Istalcurus.

I's'uh (1 Chron. vii, 30). See ISHUAH.

Is'ui (Gen. xlvi, 17). See ISHUL I.

Itâla, a name attributed to the old Latin version which was the foundation of Jerome's Vulgate. See ITALIAN VERSION.

Italian (Tralatico) occurs but once in Scripture, in the translation of the "Ital. hand," i.e. Roman cohors, to which Cornelius belonged (Acts x, 1)." This seems to have been a cohort of Italians separate from the legionary soldiers, and not a cohort of the 'Legio Italicâ,' of which we read at a later period (Tacitus, Hist. i, 59, 64; ii, 109; iii, 14) as being raised by Nero (Dio Cass. lv, 24; Sueton. Nero, 19). See Biscop, On the Acts (300 sq.) Wieseler (Chronol. p. 145) thinks they were Italian volunteers; and there is an inscription in Gruter in which the following words occur: 'Coehors militorum Italorum voluntarii, quae est in Syria' (see Ackerman, Numismatic Illustrations, p. 843) (Conybeare and Howson, St. Paul's, i, 138). There is a monograph on the subject: Schwarz, De cohorte Italicâ et Augusta (Altdorf, 1720). See COHORT.

Italian School of Philosophy. By the Italian school is properly understood the blending of the Pythagorean and Eleatic systems of philosophy into one. It is sometimes, however, used of the Pythagorean system merely. The reason for designating it as the Italian school is because Pythagoras is said to have taught in Italy. See PYTHAGORAS.

The Church and the Scriptures. The earliest translation of the Bible into the modern Italian is said to have been made by Giacomo da Virgaggio (Jacopo da Veragino), archbishop of Genoa, in the beginning of the 18th century. This rests exclusively on the authority of Sixtus Senensis (Bibloth. Sumpt. lib. iv), and there is no evidence that the work is preserved. That at an early period, however, versions of parts, if not of the whole of Scripture into Italian were made, is evinced by the fact that there exist in various libraries MSS. containing them. In the Royal Library at Paris is an Italian Bible in two vols. fol. as well as several codices containing parts of the Bible in that language; in the library at Upsala is a Codex containing a history compiled from the first seven books of the O. T. in Italian; in the library of Trinity College, Dublin, is an Italian translation of the N. T., with portions of the Old, and in other libraries the relics are preserved (see Le Long, Bib. Soc. cap. vi, § 1).

The earliest printed Italian Bible is that of Nicolò di Malermi (or Malherbi), a Venetian Benedictine monk of the order of Camaldoli: it appeared under the title of Bibbia Vulgare Historiata, etc. (Ven. 1471). The translation of Malermi, however, is almost wholly a Latin translation, the original being reserved to be executed in a harsh style and carelessly (Hist. Crit. du N. T. p. 487). It was, however, repeatedly reprinted; the best editions are that superintended by Marini (Ven. 1477, 2 vols. fol.), and that issued at Venice in 1567 (1 vol. fol.). In 1550 Antonio Bruchioli issued his translation of the N. T. in Italy, which was the first edition of his translation of the entire Bible, containing a revised and corrected translation of the N. T., under the title of La Biblia che contiene Sacri libri del vecchio Testamento tradotto nuovamente da la Hebraïca verissima in lingua Toscanca, con diversi libri del N. T. tradotti da Grece in lingua Tosc. con privilegio di lo incìdo Senato Vaticano e lettera a Francesco I, Rege Christianissimo (fol. Venic, ap. Luc. Ant. Junta). This translation is said by Simon to follow in the O. T. the Latin version of Pagnini rather than to be made from the original Hebrew, and to contain many more words of Italian and barbarous construction than the original. It was put in the index of the prohibited books among works of the first class. Many editions of it, however, appeared, of which the most important is that of Zaniotti (Ven. 1540, 3 vols. fol.). Bruchioli's version of the O. T. in a corrected form was printed at Geneva in 1562, along with a new version of the N. T. by Galvani and Bonsignori; this was reprinted in 1572. In 1560 this notes are added, and especially an exposition of the Apocalypse. The translation of Marmocchi, though professedly original, is, in reality, only a revised edition of that of Bruchioli, the design of which was to bring it more fully into accordance with the Vulgate. Several translations of the Psalms (some from the Hebrew) and of other parts of Scripture appeared in Italy between the middle and end of the 16th century, and a new translation of the N. T. by a Florentine of the name of Zacharia, appeared in 1542 at Venice, and at Florence in 1544. These translations are now extremely rare. The Jew David de Pompis issued a translation of Ecclesiastes with the original Hebrew (Ven. 1578).

In 1607 appeared at Geneva the first Protestant Italian version—that of Giovanni Diodati (La Biblia: See I Libri del Vecchio e del Nuovo Testamento [sm. fol.]). To this is attached a brief marginal translation. This version was made directly from the original texts, and stands in high esteem for fidelity. It has been repeatedly reprinted. Being in the plain Luochese dialect, it is especially adapted for circulation among the common people, and is now adopted by the Bible Societies.
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The N. T. appeared at Turin in 1769, and the O. T. in 1779, both accompanied with the text of the Vulgate, and with copious notes, chiefly from the fathers. This work received the approbation of pope Pius VI. It was printed for Chief Dr. G. F. Le Couteur, and in the pure Tuscan dialect. Repeated editions have appeared; one, printed at Livorno (Leghorn), and those issued by the British and Foreign Bible Society (Lond., 1813, 1821), want the notes, and have consequently been placed in the index of prohibited books. To read and circulate text edition of the New Testament, a translation which was, till lately, a grave offense, as the well-known case of the Madia in Florence proves. See VURSIONS.

ITALIC Version (Vetus Itala), the usual name of the old Latin version of the Scriptures, used prior to the days of Augustus and Jerome, and probably made in Northern Africa in the 2d century. The Italic, however, is a proper translation of this old Latin version, which was in use in Northern Italy, or around Milan. Fragments of it have been preserved by Blanchini and Sabatier (Eadie, Eccles., Dict. s. v.). Portions containing the books of Leviticus and Numbers have been published by Eadie (London, 1843). An ancient Codex is in his library. See LATIN VERSIONS.

ITALY (Italia, of uncertain etymology), the name of the country of which Rome was the capital (Acts xviii., 2; xxvii., 1, 6; Heb. xii., 24). This, like most geographical names, was differently applied at different periods. In the earliest times the name "Italy" included only the little peninsula of Calabria (Strabo, v. 1). The country now called Italy was then isolated by a number of nations distinct in origin, language, and government, such as the Gauls, Ligurians, and Veneti on the north, and the Pelasgi, Sabines, Etrurians, etc., on the south. But, as the power of Rome advanced, these nations were successively annexed to the great state, and the name "Italy" extended also, till it came to be applied to the whole country south of the Alps, and Polybius seems to use it in this sense (i, 6; ii, 14). For the progress of the history of the world, see Smith's Dictionary of Classical Geography, s. v. From the time of the close of the republic it was employed as we employ it now, i.e. in its true geographical sense, as denoting the whole natural peninsula between the Alps and the Straits of Messina. In the New Testament it occurs three, or, indeed, more correctly speaking, four times. In Acts x, 1, the Italian cohort at Cesarea (αποστάραι των Ἰταλίων, A. V. "Italian band"), consisting, as it doubtless did, of men recruited in Italy, illustrates the military relations of the imperial peninsula with the provinces. See ANZAR. In Acts xviii., 2, where we are told of the expulsion of Aquila and Priscilla with their compatriots from Italy, we are reminded of the large Jewish population which many authorities show that it contained. Acts xxvii., 1, where the beginning of St. Paul's voyage "to Italy" is mentioned, and the whole subsequent narrative, illustrates the trade which subsisted between the peninsula and other parts of the Mediterranean. Lastly, the words in Heb. xiii., 24, "They of Italy (οἱ Ἰταλοὶ) ἐλάχιστα σαλέουσαν," whatever they may prove for or against this being the region in which the letter was written (and the matter has been strongly argued both ways), are interesting as a specimen of the progress of Christianity through the West. A few fragments of the divisions and history of ancient Italy may be found in Anthon's Class. Dict. s. v. Italia. See ROMA.

ITALY, MODERN, a kingdom in Southern Europe, with an area of 112,852 square miles, and a population in 1870 of 50,500,000 inhabitants. The name originally belonged to the southern point of the Apennine peninsula alone; at the time of Thucydides it embraced the whole southern coast from the river Luan, on the Tyrrenian Sea, to Metapontum, on the Sicilian Straits; after the conquest of Tarentum by the Romans it was extended to all the country from the Sicilian Straits to the Arno or Rubicon; finally, at the time of Augustus, it came to be used of the whole of the peninsula. In a still wider sense it was, under Constantine, the name of one of the four chief divisions of the Roman Empire, and was divided into three (according to others into four or two) dioceses—Illyria, Africa, and Italy Proper. But this wider significance died out with the dissolution of the Roman Empire, and the name has since been confined to the Apennine peninsula. It denoted a country, the people of which gradually took up one national, united by the same language, literature, and habits, but which never, for any length of time, constituted one political commonwealth. Not until 1859 did the national aspirations for unity succeed in erecting by far the larger portion of the peninsula into the kingdom of Italy; in 1866 Venetia, in 1870 the duchy of Rome, and in 1871 the republic of Rome completed the structure of national unity.

I. Church History.—(1.) The planting of Christianity in Italy can be traced to the first years of the Christian era. The apostle Peter, according to old accounts, visited Rome as early as A.D. 45, but no satisfactory evidence can be adduced for the assertion that the Roman theologians that Peter was at any time bishop of the church of Rome, and still less that he held this office for twenty-five years. In 58 the Christians, together with the Jews, were expelled from Rome by order of the emperor Claudius. This ban was not removed until the time of the emperor Vespasian (A.D. 69-79). The event of 62 (Acts xii., 25) indicates that the Church in Rome was at that time fully organized. Under Nero, Peter and Paul were probably put to death, together with numerous other professors of Christianity. Among those who were put to death under Domitian (81-96) was Flavius Clemens, a nephew of Clement I. In the time of Trajan and Nerva (98-98), many different churches in Italy, besides those of Rome, trace their foundation to assistants of the apostles; thus Barnabas is said to have established the Church of Milan, Mark the Church of Aquileia, Apollinaris the Church at Ravenna. The churches of Lucua, Fiesole, Bologna, Bari, Benevento, Capua, Naples, Palermo, Syracuse, Pavia, Urbino, Mantua, Verona, Fies, Florence, and Sienna also claim to be of apostolic origin. That many of the churches were really organized during the first century is not doubted, but hardly any of them has a documentary history which ascends beyond the beginning of the 2d century. Even the beginning of the Church of Rome is so involved in obscurity that it is not known in which order the first four bishops succeeded each other. From the beginning of the 2d century bishoprics rapidly increased, and down to the year 311 there are enumerated many seats of bishops in all the provinces of Italy, the first epistle of St. Clement (A.D. 90) to the Corinthians, Soter (A.D. 175 sq.) was written to the bishops of Campania, and his second to the bishops of Italy. The Roman bishop Zephyrinus (203-211) addressed his first epistle to all the bishops of Sicily, and Eusebius his third to the bishops of Tuscia and Campania. A "Provincial Synod of Rome," consisting of twelve bishops, was presided over by Telesphorus (142-154); it was followed by a synod under Anicetus (167-175); another in 197; and many more in the 3d century. At the beginning of the 4th century Christianity was so firmly established throughout Italy that the papacy could meet no notable resistance when Christianity under Constantine the Great became the religion of the state. The apostacy of Julian retarded but little the victory of Christianity, which became complete when, towards the close of the 4th century, Constantius exterminated paganism by law. At the beginning of the 5th century the close of the early period of the Church one of the three great bishops of the Christian Church (Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch), the churches of Italy became subordinate to his superintendence and jurisdiction; only the Church provinces of the metropolitan of Milan and Aquileia remained independent of the jurisdictions of the Church of Rome for many more centuries. The more the power of the bishops of Rome rose, the more the Church his4
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Italy is absorbed in her history, the history of the papacy and Rome. In no other country of Europe was the unity of faith better preserved and less interrupted than in Italy. The rule of the Arian Goths (488-568) lasted too short a time to establish Arianism on a firm foundation, and all the following changes in the secular government of the country recognised the profession of Catholicism. Opinion divided almost equally between Church and State. During the Middle Ages was but little disturbed by heretical sects; the Catharists and Pasagii never became powerful, and soon disappeared; only the Waldensians, in the remote valleys of Piedmont, survived all persecution. See PAPACY.

The Reformation.—Italy, like other countries, had her forerunners of the Reformation, the most prominent of whom was the Dominican monk Savarola (q.v.), who fearlessly advocated a radical reform of the Church. The revival of the classical studies on the one hand, and the corruption which prevailed at the papal court on the other, disposed at the beginning of the 16th century many minds towards abandoning the doctrines of Rome. In general, however, the tendency towards freethinking was stronger among the malcontents than the wish for a religious reform. One of the first impulses towards a reaction was made in the time of Leo X by some twenty excommunicated, who formed a society for the purpose of rekindling in the Church a spirit of piety in opposition to the prevailing corruption. Among them were Cajetan, subsequently founder of the order of the Theatines; Caraffa, subsequently pope Paul IV; and Cardinal Gonzaga, eventually cardinal. All of them desired to effect a reformation within the Church, though some of them strongly inclined towards the reformatory doctrine of justification by faith alone. This to class of reformers belonged also Brucioli, who published an Italian translation of the Bible (1530-1532), and the most prominent of this movement were Foscarini, bishop of Modena; San Felice, bishop of Cava; cardinal Morone, Grimani, patriarch of Aquileia, and Folegno, a pious Benedictine of Monte Casino. In consequence of the frequent intercourse of Upper Italy with Germany, and the sympathy of the writings of Luther and other reformers began to circulate in Italy from the beginning of the Reformation. To evade the Inquisition, they were generally published either anonymously, or under the name of other authors.

Venice appears to have been the first city of Italy in which the Reform took root. This was chiefly due to its constant intercourse with Germany, and to the independent position maintained by that republic towards the see of Rome. As early as 1520 Luther received news from Venice that a great need was felt there of evangelical preachers and books, and in 1528 he was informed that the cause was making good progress. The fact that Venice was a refuge for all who in other parts of Italy were persecuted for their faith was likewise favorable to the progress of Protestantism. The proceedings of the Diet of August (1530) excited the attention of the friends of the Reformation at Venice. A high degree, and Lucio Paulo wrote a pressing letter in their name to Melanthon, imploring him to resist the last. Even priests were found in the evangelical party, as Valdo Lupetino, provincial of the Franciscans, who advised his relative, M. Flacius, of Ilyria, afterward of the champion of Protestantism in the service of Germany, where he would learn a better theology than he would find in a convent (1537). Through such men, who were in personal communication with the reformers, Venice remained regularly connected with Wittenberg. In 1539 Melanthon sent an epsistle to Venice which affords most valuable information concerning the position of the evangelical party in that city at that time. The evangelical party increased not only in the city of Venice, but in the whole territory of the republic, particularly at Vicenza and Treviso, and it does not appear that the government ever interfered with its peaceful development.

It is only after 1540 that, at the stagnation of Rome, the Protestants of the Venetian republic began to experience serious difficulties. Although very numerous, they had not till then organized themselves into a society. They were obliged to observe the greatest caution and secrecy. They were without a leader, and, besides, there were differences of opinion dividing them. But in 1541, George the Aquila, and secretary of the English ambassador, succeeded in uniting them. He also wrote to Luther, asking him to obtain for the Protestants, through the intercession of German Protestant princes, permission from the pope to act according to the dictates of their consciences. But the council showed only the points of difference. He also invoked the mediation of Luther to allay the manifold divisions which weakened the Protestants of Venice. As Italy had intercourse with Switzerland as well as with Germany, both the Reformed and the Lutheran reformations had found their adherents; and, in particular, disputes arose about the doctrine of the Eucharist. Bucer had in vain endeavored to heal these difficulties, and it was now expected that Luther would be more successful. The answer of Luther expressed, however, distrust towards the Swiss and their doctrines, and warned the people against the works of Bucer. The declamation was on the same side; the tone of Luther's answer, as he knew the Italians to be only too prone to indulge in discussions and arguments on disputed points of doctrine. Probably about this time secret societies began to be formed for the discussion of theological doctrines privately. Basically anti-Trinitarian; and those anti-Trinitarian schemes which, in the following century, separated Italian Protestantism from that of other countries, originated in them. About 1542 the principles of Protestantism were introduced into Istria by Paolo Vergerio, bishop of Capo d'Istria, and for a while made rapid progress, but was soon interrupted. After opposing Protestantism for a long while, particularly in Germany, where he was for a while papal legate, and took part as such in the Conference of Worms, Vergerio was, by the reading of Luther's works, which he had procured for the purpose of refraining them, brought to embrace their views. His first convert was his brother, the bishop of Pola. Both now labored zealously, and with great success, to evangelize their dioceses, until in 1545 the Inquisition finally interfered, and Vergerio was obliged to flee.

Next to Venice, Ferrara became one of the principal centers of Protestantism. It was introduced there by Renata, wife of Hercules II, duke of Ferrara, and the daughter of Louis XII, king of France. She had become acquainted with the doctrines of the Reformation through Margaret of Navarre, and when she came to Ferrara in 1527, she soon found herself surrounded by persons holding the same views. Some were scholars who held offices in the university or at court, while others were refugees who, persecuted in their own country for their Protestant opinions, found there a safe refuge. Calvin himself spent a few months there in 1536, and ever after remained in active correspondence with the duchess; also Hubert Languet, who distinguished himself in the history of the French Reformation. Among the Italians were Filippo and Calcagno, a friend of Contarini and Poole: Peter Martyr Vermigli, Aonio Palerio, and Celio Secundo Carbone, who won over Peregrino Morato, the tutor of the young Renata, to Protestantism. The learned daughter of Morato, Olympia, whose letters express a truly evangelical spirit, was one of the ornaments of the court, and the companion of the young daughter of Renata.

From Ferrara probably the movement spread over to Modena, which belonged also to the dukedom of Ferrara. Already in 1530 a papal rescript commanded the Inquisition to use every exertion to suppress the heretical tendency among the monks of the dioce of Ferrara. Yet the movement did not really break out until 1549, when the learned Sicilian Paolo Ricci came to Modena.
and established a congregation there. Ladies of high rank protected the new doctrine, especially a certain countess Rangone. As a sign of the spirit of opposition against Rome, we may mention the satires which were published, as, for instance, a letter purporting to come from Jesus Christ, and worded in the manner of the papal bulls, denouncing the pope and the Church, and calling for the overthrow of the Church itself. Cardinal Morone, bishop of Modena, although evangelically inclined himself, complained much in his letters (1640-1654), written during his stay in Germany as papal legate for the progress of Protestantism in his diocese, and said he was told that Modena had become Lutheran. But with the news of the progress of the Reformation came also the information that the differences concerning the Eucharist had arisen, and Bucer wrote to the Protostants of Modena and Bologna to heal the breach (1541). At Bologna, the Germans who came there to attend the university gained many supporters to evangelical views; the most important among them was Giovanni Mollio, a Minorite, who labored long as a preacher and professor. The presence of the Saxon ambassador, John of Planiz, who came in 1542 with Charles V, afforded an opportunity to present a request in which they asked for the convocation of a synod, and expressed their inclination for the German princes who had protected Protestantism in their states. They hoped by the council to get fresh from the yoke of Rome, and to obtain religious liberty at such a time that their efforts would only prove a mission to use their Bibles without being on that account considered as heretics. The movement was propagated also through other parts of the Papal States, at Faenza and Imola; and in Rome itself there were many who privately agreed with the doctrines of Luther. In Naples, the principles of the Reformation were time and time again by the German soldiery in 1527, and they appear to have taken root, for an imperial edict was issued in 1586 to counteract the Protestant tendencies by threatening the severest punishments against the so-called heretics. Yet in the same year the emperor himself sent to Naples the man who was destined to play the most important part in the evangelization of Italy. Juan Valdez came to Naples as secretary of the vicerey. Position, education, intelligence, and character combined to make him influential. A small but eminent circle silently followed him, now receiving by subscription and the promotion of an inner, living Christianity. Among them were count Galeazzo Caracciolo, nephew of pope Paul IV; the martyr Pietro Carnevaschi, Roman protonotary; Giulia Gonzaga, duchess of trajetto; Vittoria Colonna, the widow of Pescara; and the noble confessor Antonio Mazzocchi. Valdez only continued his evangelizing labors for four years: he died in 1540. But his work was continued by two of his followers, Pietro Martyr Vermiglione and Bernardino Occhino. The former, having been sent as prior to an Augustinian convent at Naples, read some of Bucer's and Zwingle's works, and, having become converted to their doctrines, he began working in the same direction as Valdez. He delivered lectures on the epistles of St. Paul, which were attended not only by his own monks, but also by the most distinguished members of the clergy and the laity. In the mean time the Capuchin Occhino, confessor of Paul IV, general of his order, and one of the most eminent men of the Church at the time, was invited to preach the Lent sermons at Naples, first in 1556, and again in 1559. An attentive reading of the Bible had already caused him to regard faith as the only means of salvation; his intercourse with Valdez strengthened these views; he began preaching justification by faith, and gained many adherents by his fiery eloquence. Although none of these men thought as yet to separate from the Church of Rome, they were soon looked upon with suspicion by the authorities. The Theologian, friend of the zealot Caraffa, was the first to call attention to them. Vermiglione was summoned to appear, and to justify himself, but was saved from any annoyance this time by the interference of several cardinals. Soon after, having been at Naples for about three years, he demanded his recall; and having been appointed prior at Lucca, he began to labor for the evangelization of this new field. New persecutions finally decided him to separate openly from the Church of Rome, and to go to the country for safety. Three of his most intimate disciples accompanied him: Paolo Lasio, afterwards professor at Strasbourg, Theodotus Trebbiolo, and Giulio Terenziano. Eighteen others followed him soon after; among them Cesare Martinengo, who died later of the Italian persecution at Geneva; Em. Tremelio, who, after various vicissitudes, became professor of Hebrew at the Academy of Sedan, and H. Zanchi, who occupied a distinguished place among the most eminent theologians of Germany. At Florence Vermiglione met with Occhino, who, stimulated by his example, also sacrificed his position, and left Italy. Another champion of the Reformation, the learned Celio Secundo Curione, replaced for a while Martyr in the congregation at Lucca, and afterwards labored at various places, until he also was obliged to seek safety in flight, and went to Switzerland. The movement was general throughout Italy. Many admitted that no reforms were to be expected from the Church or its hierarchy, and separated from it, some silently, others openly; the latter inclined more and more to a union with the Protostants of Germany and Switzerland. Still a large number retained the belief of the Church and the necessity of the necessary reforms, either by the long-wished-for council, or by other concessions. The evangelical tendencies finally acquired such influence, even among the clergy, that pope Paul III thought it best to make apparently some concessions; he appointed Contarini, Bembo, and Frengi, and also Caraffa, members of the college of cardinals. As a preliminary step towards the convocation of a council, he formed them, together with some other prelates, into a congregation, with the mission of drawing up a project of the reforms most needed. Soon, however, the uncompromising opponents of all reformatory measures gained the ascendency with the pope, and it was resolved to put down the reformatory movement at any price. A superior tribunal of the Inquisition was established at Rome, with full power of life and death in all cases concerning religious truths and practices; and the different provinces. The pope alone had the power of pardoning those they had condemned. The new institution was soon adopted in Tuscany, Milan, and Naples; all the Italian states gave it the necessary support. Venice itself was unable to resist its introduction, though heresy judges were joined to the inquisitors. Books were also subjected to the judgment of the Inquisition; after 1543 no book was permitted to be published without its sanction, and soon there appeared lists of forbidden books. Next to the Inquisition, the Council of Trent proved a heavy blow to Italian Protestantism. Many who were not of the society of Jesus were induced to return to the old fold; many others left their native land for safety, and a great number became martyrs to their faith in dungeons or at the stake. Rome gave the signal of most of the persecutions which the Protostants suffered in Italy. Caraffa had spies everywhere, and wherever they went more than their mission, in flight were Occhino and Vermiglione. The congregation which had been established by them and Valdez at Naples was subjected to severe attacks as soon as the latter was dead; many of its members gave way under the persecution, and the others were obliged to flee. The only remaining publication was the "Morte di Montalbano," a Franciscan, still officiated among them for some time, but
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she was obliged to leave Naples in 1548. An Augus-
tian from Sicily, Lorenzo Romano, subsequently shared
the same fate, who had laboured faithfully for the
holy cause.

The congregation founded at Lucca by Peter Vermigl
met with the same fate. Rome compelled the senate in
1545 to issue severe edicts against the Protestants, who
here also submitted to outward conformity, and by so
doing lost the spirit which had animated them, so that
when in 1552 the Inquisition came to Rome, they found
the greater number became reconciled to the Church.
Many, however, resisted to the last, and a number of
prominent citizens left for Geneva, Berne, Lyon, and
other places. See Inquisition.

The prospect of escapes, died of starvation, or was
no longer able to protect her fellow-Protestants. A papal
decree commanded that all suspicious persons should be examined; imprisonment, banishment, death, or, at best, flight, was the usual fate of the accused. Fannio, of Faenza, fell a martyr to his faith. Renata herself was much persecuted by her husband, but remained steadfast, and after her husband's death retired to France, where she showed herself a courageous protector of the Protestants. All Italy was
awed into obedience by the Inquisition. The prisons at
Rome were filled with prisoners brought from all parts
of Italy. Mollie, having returned from Naples to Bologna, was arrested, and brought to Rome to be examined. The Gospel had made great progress among the
Franciscans, especially in Upper Italy; a large number
of them were imprisoned, others escaped, and most of
them were compelled to recant. The persecution became still more violent when Caraffa himself, aged seventy-nine years, and in his last days, had the misfortune to be charged with the name of Paul IV. To purify and restore the Church was his chief aim, and, in order to attain this, he was most zeal
ous in the persecution of all unbelievers and heretics.
He spared none—not even the leaders of the moderate reform party. The most distinguished of these (Con-
tarini being dead), cardinal Morone, remained a prisoner
until the pope's death, in the castle of St. Angelo. Bishop
Foscari, of Modena, and San Felice, of Cava, were
also arrested, while cardinal Poole was summoned to
come from England to justify himself. Among the chief
points of accusation against Morone were that he doubted the correctness of the decisions of the Council of Trent, especially in regard to justification; that he rejected the efficiency of good works, and advised his
hearers to trust only in the redeeming sacrifice of Christ.
The first martyr in the reign of Paul IV was Pomponio
Albergati, of Florence. He, who had been educated in the
spirit of evangelical views at Padua, died courageously
at the stake. Under Pius IV, the Inquisition did not re-
lent in its work. He was himself present at an auto-
da-fé at which Ludovico Pascali, a minister of the Wal-
denses of Calabria, was executed. When the Domin-
ican Giolieri, former president of the Inquisition, and a
worthy disciple of Caraffa, ascended the papal throne in
1566, under the name of Pius V, the Inquisition entered
a new era of prosperity. He accomplished the final
suppression of Protestantism in Italy. Prisoners were
sent to Rome from all parts of Italy. The duke of Flor-
eence himself sent there, as his peace-offering, the emi-
inent apostolical protonotary, Pietro Camescechi, whom
his learning, piety, and position had heretofore protect-
ed, and who now became a martyr. The same fate be-
fell Antonio del Pagliarici (Aonio Falcaro), who, as pro-
fessed reformer, had acquired universal reputation, and
who is generally consid-
ered as the author of the treatise Del Beneficio di
Christo, a truly evangelical work, which, by its clear
exposition of the doctrine of justification by faith, gain-
eared many adherents to Protestantism.

The numerous Protes-
tants of Venetia also experienced the
effects of the papal persecution, although the repub-
clic resisted the Inquisition, and sought to counteract it
by a number of decrees. Already, in 1542, the papal
nuncio Della Casa procured the arrest of a priest, Giulio
Milanese, and, soon after, that of the provincial of the
Minorites, Baldo Luponino. The former, however, suc-
cceeded in making good his escape. In 1546 pope Paul
III gave a bull absolving the Catholics of the country, some recanted, and others were im-
prisoned for life. The persecution was still more vio-
lent in the neighborhood of Venice than in the city it-
self. The bishop of Bergamo himself, Soranzo, was
obliged to go to Rome to give an account of his faith,
which was录入 by the Inquisition. He was sentenced to
banishment to the best of the greatest dangers. Altii-
eri, who had so often obtained protection for the Italian
Protestants from the princes forming the League of
Smalcald, was at last in danger himself, and, after many
years exile, in 1555, he was allowed to return to Italy,
and took up his residence at Brescia in 1560. After 1557, foreigners who were on
his study or commerce received, however, some degree of
protection. This encouraged the native Protestants, who
called a minister, and again formed a congregation in
private. They were soon betrayed, and most of them
imprisoned. The senate now for the first time consent-
et that their offence should be punished by death. They
were not burnt, however, but thrown into the sea at
night. Baldo Luponino was among these. The de-
struction of the little church of the Waldenses, who,
since the end of the 14th century, had settled at St.
Pisto in Calabria, was decreed in 1566. A few years later
episodes of the sad history of Italian Protestantism.
The other evangelical communities of Locarno, etc., met
with the same fate.

(3.) Church History from the Suppression of the Reforma-
tion until the present Day.—Throughout the 16th,
17th, and 18th centuries Italy remained dismembered
into a number of small states, which prevented the peo-
ple from becoming one consolidated nation. Its ecle-
siastic history during this period is as unimportant as
the political. Only once an era of ecclesiastical re-
formation appeared, when Leo I, pope and pontiff of
Tuscany, brother of emperor Joseph II, attempted, by
the agency of Scipio Ricci, bishop of Pistoia and Prato,
to reform the polity of the Church. At a synod of his
clergy which Ricci assembled at Pistoia (1786), and
which was largely attended, the principles of the Galli-
can Church, and of the most liberal faction of the
Church, were adopted; the prerogatives claimed by the popes, and, in
particular, the claim of infallibility, were severely de-
nounced, many superstitious ceremonies were abolished,
and it was determined that public worship should be
conducted in the language of the people, and that the
bishops and clergy should be paid by the crown. Many
enactments were opposed by most of the bishops of Tus-
cany, and when Leopold ascended the imperial throne of
Austria, the hierarchy obtained a complete victory.
The territorial changes which the French republic
and the first Napoleon introduced in Italy were not of lon-
duration, but the revolutionary ideas which during this
period had been kindled in the minds of many Italians
survived. A secret society, the Carbonari, which at
first aimed at the introduction of a universal republic,
but subsequently had the establishment of a national
union and the introduction of liberal reforms, and, in
particular, religious toleration, for its chief object, spread
with great rapidity throughout the peninsula, and be-
came the rallying-point for all the educated Italians
who wished to break the omnipotent influence of the
Church upon the political and social affairs of the
people. The Carbonari succeeded in 1821 in compelling
the government of the Two Sicilies to grant a liberal
constitution, but an armed intervention of the Austrians
soon restored the absolute power of the king and the
despotic influence of the Church. It was, however, ap-
parent that the great masses of Italy only yield to
military force, and that the desire to be independent of the
people from the influence of the priests, and, in particular,
from the temporal rule of the popes, became stronger
every year. In 1830 a new revolution broke out in the
papal provinces, and within a fortnight four fifths of the
States of the Church had made themselves free from
papal rule, and constituted themselves an independent state. Again it required the armed intervention of Austria to arrest the success of the liberal and anti-papal movement throughout Italy. The accession to the throne of Sardinia of Charles Albert in 1831 gave, however, to Italy one prince who openly adhered to the principles of the national liberal party, and therefore awakened great hopes for the future. In the same year Mazzini organized the secret society Young Italy, which repeatedly attempted insurrections for the purpose of establishing an Italian republic. All these attempts were, however, checked; and it is generally agreed that the breach between the Italian people and the Church of Rome. The liberal priest V. Gioberti, in his work on the moral and political prudence of the Italians (1849), endeavored to prove that a reconciliation between the national liberal party and a reformed papacy was possible, and that the best way for securing a political regeneration of Italy was the establishment of a confederation of the several states, with a liberal pope at its head. When, in 1846, Gregory XVI died, and the new pope, Pius IX, seemed to adopt some of the views of Gioberti, the belief in the practicability of the scheme found many adherents among the liberal party, but they greatly feared that the ultramontane party looked upon them with distrust, and even regarded many steps taken by the new pope as a mistaken policy.

The revolutionary movements of 1848 at first appeared to afford a great hope to the liberals of the country. In Rome a Constituent Assembly was called, which on Feb. 5, 1849, abolished the temporal power of the pope, and proclaimed the Roman republic. The greatest enemies of the papacy in Italy, Mazzini and Garibaldi, were at the head of the republic, which, however, only a few months later (June 4), was struck down by the French troops, which Louis Napoleon, the president of the French republic, had sent there for the restoration of the temporal power. But, although the revolutionary movements, which, if successful, would have abolished throughout Italy the prerogatives of the Church of Rome, were unsuccessful, one of the state governments, Sardinia, remained favorable to the cause of national union and of a liberal legislation in the province of Church affairs. The Legislature, in 1850, adopted liberal laws, introduced by the minister Siccardi (hence called the Siccardi laws), which provided, 1, that all civil rights and obligations were to be held in civil courts and in civil law, and were to be subject to the common law; 2, that all priests in criminal cases be subject to the jurisdiction of the state; 3, that criminals may be arrested in churches and other sacred places. When archbishop Francesco, of Turin, resisted the civil law, the state, he was punished; and when he refused the sacraments of the Church to the dying minister Santa Rosa, he was deposed from his office (Sept. 26, 1850) and exiled. The archbishop of Cagliari shared his fate. In the threatening allocations of the pope (the first dated Nov. 1, 1860), the government replied by sequestrating the revenues of the archbishop. In consequence of the violent opposition made to the government by the monks, the minis try of Cavour (1852-1858), the greatest Italian statesman of modern times, issued the stringent laws of March 2, 1855, by which the convents of all monks who did not devote themselves to public instruction, but to the nursing of the sick were suppressed (381 out of 905). The papal anathemas against the authors of these laws remained without the least effect. On the contrary, when the king of Sardinia, in consequence of the war against Austria and the unsuccessful revolutions in Paris and southern Italy, united all the provinces of Italy, with the only exception of a part of the papal territory and of Venice, into the kingdom of Italy, the liberal Sardinian laws were not only retained, but made more stringent. Nobody seemed to care about the Church laws against those who apostatized from the patriotic and royal squares of the States of the Church), and on Jan. 1, 1866, the obligatory civil marriage was introduced. The government and the Parliament were fully agreed in the wish to complete, as soon as possible, the unity of Italy, by the annexation of Venetia and the remainder of the papal territory, inclusive of the city of Rome. In accordance with the plan of Cavour, the Parliament, as early as 1861, united with the province of Milan the capital of Italy, though they expressed willingness to give to the pope full guarantees for the free and independent exercise of his ecclesiastical functions. The movements of Garibaldi showed that the inhabitants of the papal provinces alone, aided by volunteers from Italy, were able to depose the papal government, and unite the territory with the kingdom of Italy; and it required the presence of a large French army in Rome to maintain the defeated papal rule. Venetia was obtained as a result of the war of 1866, but the expedition of Garibaldi against Rome in 1867 led to a new occupation of the papal territory by a French army.

The wretched financial condition of Italy, which had become more threatening than ever by the war of 1866, and the September convention of 1864, by which the government engaged to assume a part of the papal debt, led to a very oppressive taxation. In June 1867, the government, as a temporary measure, took the church property, though for a time delayed, was urgently demanded by the Parliament and public opinion as the only escape from a general bankruptcy, and the government therefore laid a bill before the Parliament which met on March 22, 1867; but the committee elected by the Parliament rejected the bill, and the property was taken as too compromising and not sufficiently radical, and in the very first article of its own draft demanded the abdication of all monastic institutions, and the confiscation of the whole property of the Church. The government yielded to the views of the committee, and, after several modifications had been agreed upon by the government and the Parliament, both chambers adopted the bill for the sale of the Church property by an immense majority (the lower chamber, on July 27, by 296 votes against 41; the senate, on Aug. 12, by 64 against 29). The actual sale began at Florence on October 26, 1867, though the property had not been purchased, and even the church property was sold at auction; the sale had been issued to the amount of 400 million francs. The new excommunications pronounced against all buyers of Church property failed to have any effect; the government and the overwhelming majority of both chambers unswervingly persisted in carrying out the new laws concerning the Church and its property. The Ecumenical Council which was opened by the pope at Rome on Dec. 8, 1869, was unable to improve the influence and the prospects of the papacy among the Italians. The government, the Parliament, and the people at large repudiated the claims of the council more generally than was done in any other purely Catholic country. The nation became more impatient than ever for the overthrow of the temporal sovereignty of the pope, and the incorporation of his states with the kingdom; and when, in 1870, the Franco-German war caused the withdrawal of the great powers, and ultimately led to the destruction of the French Empire, the Italian government could no longer resist the popular pressure for the annexation of the papal states. In September, 1870, count Ponza di San Martino was sent to Rome, and, in the name of the Italian government, proposed to the pope to renounce the temporal rule and to dissolve his army; he was, in this case, to retain the Leonine part of Rome, a civil list, and the right of diplomatic representation. The government also offered to guarantee the free exercise, by the pope, the bishops, and the priests, of their ecclesiastical jurisdiction, and the immunity of all cardinals and ambassadors. When the pope rejected all these offers of conciliation,
promised, on Sept. 11, the Italian troops, in compliance with numerous petitions from the subjects of the pope, entered the States of the Church, and on Sept. 20, by the occupation of the city of Rome, put an end to the temporal power of the pope. A note from cardinal Antonelli, the secretary of state, to the foreign governments, was also published, in which he stated that the ultramontane party in all the countries re-echoed the protest, and many princes, both Catholic and Protestant, were called upon to interfere and to restore the pope to his throne. The pope issued a new brief of excommunication, in which he said, "We declare to you, wretched and degenerate, that, throughout the Church, that all those (in whatever notable dignity they may shine) who have been guilty of the invasion, usurpation, occupation of any of our provinces, or of this holy city, or of anything connected therewith, and likewise all who have commissioned, favored, aided, counseled, adhered to them, and all others who promote or carry out the things aforesaid, under any pretext whatever, and in any manner whatever, have incurred the greatest excommunication (excommunicatio maior), and the other censures and penalties which have been provided in the holy canons of the apostles and councils and in the decennial acts of the ecumenical councils, in particular that of Trent." None of all these measures produced the least effect. When the first Parliament of all Italy met, the king declared, "We entered Rome in virtue of the national right, in virtue of the compact which unites us. The capital rule over the pope, to recognize the national dignity of the States, is the exclusive power of the popes. We have solemnly given to ourselves: freedom of the Church, entire independence of the pope in the exercise of his religious functions, and in his relation to the Catholic Church." None of the foreign governments interrupted its amicable relations with the Italian government. In July, 1621, the government transferred its seat to Rome, where, in spite of all the papal excommunications, it received the enthusiastic applause of a large majority of the Italian people, and where it was at once followed by the representatives of all the foreign governments.

Although nearly all the bishops and the overwhelming majority of the priests showed themselves as partisans of the papacy in its struggle against the government and the public opinion of Italy, the idea of reforming the Church by rejecting all or much of the corruption which had crept into it during the Middle Ages and in modern times, and by reconciling it with the civilization of the 19th century, found more adherents among the priests of Italy than among those of any other country. In a political point of view, the reformers desired the Church, in particular, to abandon the temporal rule over the pope, to recognise the national sovereignty, and to aid in carrying through a separation between Church and State. In the province of religion they all wished to restrict the power of the bishops, to enlarge that of the bishops, and one portion went so far as to enter into amicable relations with the High-Church party of the Church of England. They had an organ, the Examinatore di Firenze; and as even one of the six hundred bishops (cardinal D Andrea), and the Jesuit Passagli, who had long been regarded by the ultramontane party as one of their ablest theologians, and other men of high prominence, declared their concurrence with the part or the whole of the reformatory projects, there seemed to be good reason for hoping lasting results from the movement. More recently, the reformatory movement in Germany, headed by Dr. Dölzinger, has found the warmest sympathy among the Italian reformers.

After the suppression of the Reformation in the 16th century, cruel laws made it for more than two hundred years impossible for any Italian to declare himself a Protestant; only the Waldenses (q. v.), in their remote valleys, maintained with difficulty, and amidst great persecutions, their organization. At the close of the 17th century the victorious French republic recognised the human rights of the Waldenses, and proclaimed religious toleration; but the restored monarchies revived some of the most intolerant laws, and even the Waldenses were placed in so unbearable a position that it required the intervention of England and Prussia to secure for them the merest toleration. At length the liberal constitutions of 1796, which guaranteed the civil rights in Sardinia; they were allowed to step forward out of their seclusion in the valley, and, with the most hearty sympathy of all friends of religious toleration, opened a chapel in the capital of the kingdom, Turin. In the remainder of Italy the persecution of the Protestants continued. This persecution of the Protestants means the most tyrannical of the Italian governments, startled the whole civilized world by its cruel measures against the Madali couple, against count Guicciardini and Dominico Cecchetti, and only the most energetic remonstrances of the foreign powers prevailed upon the hand of the Turin banker Malan. Many Italians, however, who were eager to embrace Protestant views, did not share all the views of the Waldenses, especially those on the ministry and the Church, and, after the establishment of the Kingdom of Sardinia, each one of the Italian States, with the exception of the Pia and the kingdom of Mazzarola and count Guicciardini are the best known. Moreover, a number of missionaries were sent out by the Protestant churches of the United States, Great Britain, and other countries, who laid the foundation of several independent organizations, whose importance has thus received the nucleus of a Protestant population. In some places the fanaticism of the priests caused riots against Protestants, none of which was so bloody as that in Barletta in 1865; but the government of Italy, the immense majority of the Italian Parliament, have assured the complete triumph of the cause of religious toleration.

II. Statistic. — Nearly the whole population of Italy is nominally connected with the Roman Catholic Church. The total population of the kingdom was estimated in 1851, at 4,450,457 souls, of whom 3,616,000 were Roman Catholics, 36,000 Jews, and 100,000 members of the Greek Church. Practically a large portion of the population is no longer in communion with the Church of Rome, as can easily be proved by the fact that the government and Parliament have been for years in open conflict with Rome, and utterly disregarding and ignoring the laws of the Church: that the claims of the pope have only a few advocates in the Parliament, and that, in particular, the radical party, with men like Mazzini and Garibaldi at their head, have openly and formally renounced the religious communion with Rome.

According to the Papal Almanac (Annuario Pontificio) for 1888, the country had, exclusive of Rome and of the six suburban sees (the sees of the cardinal bishops), Ostia, Porto, Palestrina, Frascati, Albano, and Sabina, 268 dioceses, which were distributed among the former Italian states as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arch-</th>
<th>Arch-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bishopric</td>
<td>Bishopric</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naples</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>States of the Church</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sardinia</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuscany</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of these dioceses, 11 archbishops and 63 bishops are immediately subject to the pope, and without connection with an ecclesiastical province, while 87 archbishops are heads of ecclesiastical provinces, containing, besides them, 155 suffragan bishops. The dioceses of
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Italy, in point of territorial extent, are smaller than in any other country; and while the (nominally) Catholic population is no more than one eighth of the Roman Catholic population of the world, it has more than one fourth of the inhabitants of the Catholic Church. This has not been because there have been fewer converts than bishops, but because there have been more converts than bishops at every council; and as they generally hold the most ultramontane views, they have considerably contributed to the success of ultra papal theories within the Catholic Church. The government of Italy has expressed a wish to reduce the number of dioceses, and the number of bishops. This will not be done without a struggle for the control of the church; and as the Italian bishops have been kept vacant since the establishment of the kingdom.

The secular clergy in 1866 had about 115,000 members, or about 1 to every 245 inhabitants, showing a relatively larger number of priests than in any other country of the world. The number of priests, 1,234,186, in 17,000,000 clergy, Italy had in 1860 more than 60,000 monasteries in 2050 establishments, and about 30,000 nunns in 302 establishments. The most numerous among the monastic orders are the Franciscan monks, with 1,227 houses; the Dominicans, with 140; the Augustinians, with 90; the Carmelites... 125; the Jesuits, with 57; the Brothers of Charity, with 49; the Redemptorists, with 31; the Franciscan nuns, with 89; the Sisters of Charity, with 50. The convicts were formerly very rich, but a large portion of their property was confiscated during the French invasion in the war of 1870, and the beginning of the 19th century. More recently the government of Italy has suppressed a large portion of the convents, and confiscated their property. In 1866, the total number of convents suppressed amounted to over 2,000, with 38,000 inmates; of these, 1,252, with 29,328 inmates, belonged to the mendicant orders, and 1,162, with 18,185 inmates, were of other orders.

Popular instruction, which until recently was chiefly in the hands of monks and nuns, is, according to official accounts, in a very low condition. In 1865, of the entire male population, only 2,020,269 were able to read; of the female population, 1,298,854, 1,002,186 were able to write. Of every 100 people, there were, unable to read—in Lombardy, 599; in Piedmont, 603; in Tuscany, 773; in Modena, 799; in the Romagna, 802; in Parma, 818; in the Marche, 851; in Umbria, 858; in Naples, 890; in Tarento, 950; in Catania, 911. Since the establishment of the kingdom of Italy public instruction has made great progress. From 1860 to 1873 the number of male teachers increased from 12,475 to 17,694; that of female teachers from 663 to 8,817. The number of educational institutions amounted in 1865 to 43,510, of which, in 1872, 18,287,706 children. In the same year Italy had 104 gymnasia, with 8268 pupils; 79 lyceas, with 5773 pupils; and 135 seminaries, with 10,659 pupils. There were 21 universities, 16 of which were state and 5 free. Six have been declared the government by the following institutions: Turin, Padua, Bologna, Florence, Naples, and Palermo. The number of students had in 1881 decreased to 11,728, from 15,668 in 1862.

The Church of the Waldenses is the only fully organized Protestant Church in Italy. It consists of 16 comunions, with a membership of 22,000. Its governing body is called the Table. The Protestant Church in Florence had in 1869 3 professors (Revel, Geymonat, and De Sanctis) and 14 students, of whom were formerly Catholic priests. According to the report made to the Waldensian Synod in 1866, evangelical work was carried on in 1865 by 29 pastors, with over 3000 members, which were thus distributed: 7 in Piedmont, 3 in Lombardy, 1 in Emilia, 3 in Liguria, 4 in Tuscany, 1 in the district of Naples, 1 in Sicily, 1 in the Isle of Elba, and 2 in France for Italians. To work these stations it employed 19 pastors, 11 evangelists, and 29 teachers—in all, 59 agents. The number of attendants upon public worship was reckoned at from 2000 to 2500; that of communicants at 1095. According to the latest official returns the Waldensian Church had in 1866-67 43 churches and 38 mission churches throughout Italy. The ordained pastor numbered 37, evangelists 6, male and female teachers 56, the total number of salaried agents being 124. The Methodist Episcopal Church entered this field in 1872. The work is now organized into an Annual Conference with two districts, with (1889) 17 preachers, 968 members, and property valued at $105,390. There is a theological school at Florence. The Nice Quarterly Evangelical and Missionary Commission has therefore been kept vacant since the establishment of the kingdom.

The secular clergy in 1866 had about 115,000 members, or about 1 to every 245 inhabitants, showing a relatively larger number of priests than in any other country of the world. The number of priests, 1,234,186, in 17,000,000 clergy, Italy had in 1860 more than 60,000 monasteries in 2050 establishments, and about 30,000 nunns in 302 establishments. The most numerous among the monastic orders are the Franciscan monks, with 1,227 houses; the Dominicans, with 140; the Augustinians, with 90; the Carmelites... 125; the Jesuits, with 57; the Brothers of Charity, with 49; the Redemptorists, with 31; the Franciscan nuns, with 89; the Sisters of Charity, with 50. The convicts were formerly very rich, but a large portion of their property was confiscated during the French invasion in the war of 1870, and the beginning of the 19th century. More recently the government of Italy has suppressed a large portion of the convents, and confiscated their property. In 1866, the total number of convents suppressed amounted to over 2,000, with 38,000 inmates; of these, 1,252, with 29,328 inmates, belonged to the mendicant orders, and 1,162, with 18,185 inmates, were of other orders.

Popular instruction, which until recently was chiefly in the hands of monks and nuns, is, according to official accounts, in a very low condition. In 1865, of the entire male population, only 2,020,269 were able to read; of the female population, 1,298,854, 1,002,186 were able to write. Of every 100 people, there were, unable to read—in Lombardy, 599; in Piedmont, 603; in Tuscany, 773; in Modena, 799; in the Romagna, 802; in Parma, 818; in the Marche, 851; in Umbria, 858; in Naples, 890; in Tarento, 950; in Catania, 911. Since the establishment of the kingdom of Italy public instruction has made great progress. From 1860 to 1873 the number of male teachers increased from 12,475 to 17,694; that of female teachers from 663 to 8,817. The number of educational institutions amounted in 1865 to 43,510, of which, in 1872, 18,287,706 children. In the same year Italy had 104 gymnasia, with 8268 pupils; 79 lyceas, with 5773 pupils; and 135 seminaries, with 10,659 pupils. There were 21 universities, 16 of which were state and 5 free. Six have been declared the government by the following institutions: Turin, Padua, Bologna, Florence, Naples, and Palermo. The number of students had in 1881 decreased to 11,728, from 15,668 in 1862.

The Church of the Waldenses is the only fully organized Protestant Church in Italy. It consists of 16 comunions, with a membership of 22,000. Its governing body is called the Table. The Protestant Church in Florence had in 1869 3 professors (Revel, Geymonat, and De Sanctis) and 14 students, of whom were formerly Catholic priests. According to the report made to the Waldensian Synod in 1866, evangelical work was carried on in 1865 by 29 pastors, with over 3000 members, which were thus distributed: 7 in Piedmont, 3 in Lombardy, 1 in Emilia, 3 in Liguria, 4 in Tuscany, 1 in the district of Naples, 1 in Sicily, 1 in the Isle of Elba, and 2 in France for Italians. To work these stations it employed 19 pastors, 11 evangelists, and 29 teachers—in all, 59 agents. The number of attendants upon public worship was reckoned at from 2000 to 2500; that of communicants at 1095. According to the latest official returns the Waldensian Church had in 1866-67 43 churches and 38 mis-
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ITCH, 'itch, 'ych, 'ych, 
which, from 'ykh, to scratch and to burr, an inflammatory irritation of the skin, threatened to the Israelites as an infliction in case of idolatry (Deut. xxviii, 37); probably some cutaneous or eruptive disorder common in Egypt, but of what peculiar character is uncertain, if, indeed, any peculiar malady is intended. See DISEASE.

Ith, Johann, a German theologian and philosopher of some note, was born at Berne, Switzerland, in 1747. In 1761 he was appointed to the chair of philosophy at the university of his native place, where he had also pursued his studies, but in 1769 he entered the ministry, and settled at Siselen, where he lived until 1799, when he was elected dean and president of the committee of education and religion in the canton of Berne. He died in 1818. Besides a number of philosophical, philological, pedagogical, and even homiletical works, he wrote Versuch einer Anthropologie oder Philosophie der Menschen (Berne, 1784–5, 2 vols.; new ed. 1803 sq.), which is a valuable work: Verhältnisse d. Staats z. Religion u. Kirche (ibid. 1789, 2 vols.); —Ssittelehre der Brahminen (ibid. 1794, 8vo), really a reproduction of his translation of Esuar-Vidam, an old Hindustani work on morals and religion. See Krug, Philos., Wörterbuch, ii, 558. (J. H. W.)

Ithacius. See IACUS.

Ith'ai (1 Chron. xi, 31). See IITAL.

Ith'amar (Heb. Ithamar), יֶתְמָר, palm-leaf; but according to Fürst, not high, i.e. little; Sept. Ithamäp; Josephus Ιτθαμαρ, Αυτοί, vii, 3); the fourth and youngest son of Aaron (1 Chron. vi, 8). B.C. 1658. He was consecrated to the priestly office by the anointing oil (Exod. vi, 38; Numb. iii, 3, 9); and after the death of Nahah and Abihu (Lev. x, 1 sq.), as they left no children, he and Eleazar alone remained to discharge the priestly functions (Lev. x, 6, 12; Numb. iii, 4; xxvi, 60 sq.; 1 Chron. xxiv, 2). Nothing is individually recorded of him, except that the property of the tabernacle was placed under his charge (Exod. xxxix, 21), and that he superintended all matters connected with its removal by the Levitical portions of Gershon and Merari (Num. iv, 29). The sacred utensils and their removal were intrusted to his elder brother Eleazar, whose family was larger than that of Ithamar (1 Chron. xvi, 14), and, with his descendants, he was the possessor of common priests till the high-priesthood passed into his family in the person of Eli, under circumstances of which we are ignorant. See Elliott Abiathar, whom Solomon deposed, was the last high-priest of that line, and the pontificate then reverted to the elder line of Eleazar in the person of Zadok (1 Kings ii, 27). See High-Priest. The traditional tomb of Ithamar is still shown near that of his brother Eleazar in the hill of Phinehas (Schwarz, Palest., p. 151). A priest by the name of Daniel, of his posterity, returned from Babylon ( Ezra vii, 2; 1 Esdr. viii, 29).

Ithai (Heb. Ithieth), יֵתְהַיֵּה, for יֵתְהַיְּה, God with me, or, according to Fürst, the property of God; Sept. Ithai; Vulg. Ethel; but in Prov. xxxi, 1, both translated Ithai, cum quod Dei et Deus et Deum succurrit, the name of two men.

1. A person mentioned along with Ucal in Prov. xxxi, 1, apparently as one to whom the words of Agur's prophecy had been addressed. B.C. perhaps cir. 990. See AGUR. Gesenius (Theol. Heb. p. 88) thinks that Ithai is the name of the family or the disciples of Agur, to whom he inscribed his aphorisms; others think that both words as appellatives, and render the whole clause as follows: "Thus spake the man: I have tooled for God, I have tooled for God, and have ceased" (see Stuart's Commentary, ad loc.).

2. The son of Bezai and father of Masseiah, a Benjamite, one of whose posterity returned with a party from Babylon (Neh. xi, 7). B.C. long ante 586.

Ith'mah (Heb. Ithmackh, יֵתְמָקָה, orphœage; Sept. Ithmûd), a Moabite, and one of David's supplementary body-guard (1 Chron. xi, 46). B.C. 1046. See David.

Ith'nan (Heb. Ithmân, יֵתְמָן, bestowed, otherwise distance; Sept. Ithmâyn [but the Vul. MS. joins it to the preceding word, Ithmânu, and the Alex. to the following, Ithmânu, Vulg. Ithmam], one of the cities in the south of Judah, mentioned between Hazor and Ziph (Josh. xv, 29); perhaps along the southern edge of the highland district. It cannot have been the Ithma of the Osmosicon (Ithmâ, the modern Ithma), for this is in the mountains west of Hebron (see Keil's Commentary, ad loc.). The enumeration in vers. 32 requires us to join this with the following (there being no copula between), Ithman-Ziph, i.e. Zephatah (q.v.). See Judah.

Ith'ra (Heb. Ithâra, יֵתְרָה, excellence; Sept. 'Itô, Vulg. Jetra), an Israelite (probably an error of transcription — see Themen, Commentary, ad loc.); a Jeredite, according to the Sept. and Vulg.; but [more correctly] an IthmæElite, according to 1 Chron. ii, 17, and father of Amanas (David's general) by Abigail, David's sister (1 Kings ii, 40, 41), where called Jethrah (2 Sam. xvii, 25). B.C. ante 1025.

Ith'ran (Heb. Ith'ran, יֵתְרָן, excellent), the name of one or two men.


2. (Sept. 'Itpô, Vulg. Jethram). Apparently one of the sons of Ezion-geber, the great-grandson of Reuben (1 Chron. vii, 37); probably the same as Jethre in v. 58. B.C. long post 1565.

Ith'réam (Heb. Ithréem, יֵתְרֵאֵם, superabundance of the people; Sept. Ithreônaï, Ithreôni; Josephus 'Ithreônaï [A.V. s. i, 4]), David's sixth son, born of Eglaah in Hebron (2 Sam. iii, 5; 1 Chron. iii, 8). B.C. 1045. In the ancient Jewish traditions (Jerome, Quast. Heb. in 2 Sam. iii, 5; v. 23) Eglaah is said to have been Michal, and to have died in giving birth to Ithream; but this is at variance with the Bible.

Ith'tire, or, rather, Je'thrite (Heb. Ithána, יֵתְהַיָּה, Sept. Ithâna and Ithâni, but Ithâni in 1 Chron. ii, 53; Vulg. Jetjritas and Jetjrenus or Jetjreus), the posterity of some Jethro mentioned as resident as priest in Karth-jearim (A.V. "the Ihtrites" 1 Chron. i, 53); probably the descendants of Hobah, the brother-in-law of Moses (who settled in this region, Judges ii, 10), and so called as being thus the posteriority of Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses. See JENNE. Two of David's famous warriors, Ira and Gareb, belonged to this clan (2 Sam. xxii, 38; 1 Chron. xi, 40). See DAVID. Ira has been supposed to be identical with "Ira the Jairite," David's priest (2 Sam. xx, 25). According to another supposition, Jethro may be only another form for IHANA (2 Sam. xvii, 25), the brother-in-law of David, and it is possible that the "Ihrites," as a family, sprung from him. According to still another supposition, the two Ithra may be heroes of David's time, one of them coming from JARRIN, in the mountains of Judah, one of the places which were the "haunt" of David and his men in their freebooting wanderings, and where he had "friends" (1 Sam. xxx, 27; comp. 51).

Itinerancy, a word which Methodism has adopted in its ecclesiastical terminology as expressing one of the most characteristic forms of Church organization. Wesley's plans for the revival of Christian life throughout the United Kingdom rendered it necessary that he should travel from town to town. He did so quite systematically through his long life. Very early a few talented laymen were commissioned by him to preach in the societies which he had organized during his own absence, for he usually stayed but a day or two in any one place. These lay preachers, or "help-
ers," as he called them, soon multiplied to scores, at last to hundreds; but the societies demanding their labors in the intervals of the great preacher's visits multiplied still faster. As early as the third Conference (May, 1746), he saw the necessity of extending and methodizing the labors of his "helpers" on some plan of "itinerancy." He appointed them, therefore, to definite "circuits" this year. The word "circuit" has ever since been an important technical term in Methodism. The "Minister's Conference, show that the whole country was mapped into seven of these "itinerant" districts. Wales and Cornwall each constituted one; Newcastle and its neighboring towns another. That of Yorkshire comprised seven counties. London, Bristol, and Evesham were the head-quarters of others. By 1749 there were twenty of these "rounds" in England, two in Wales, two in Scotland, and seven in Ireland; and at Wesley's death there were seventy-two in England, three in Wales, seven in Scotland, and twenty-eight in Ireland. The circuits were long, comprising at least thirty "appointments" for each month, or about one a day. The preacher, "met weekly, and last from one circuit to another, usually every year, and invariably every two years; sometimes from England to Scotland, Ireland, Wales, and back again.

The "circuit system" has been retained in England down to our own day; by which the churches of the large cities, are combined under a "circuit" pastorate. In "America," the societies in cities, and also the large societies in the country, are generally "stations," each being supplied by its own pastor. The "circuit system," however, is maintained among the feaster churches, and quite generally in the Far West, and also on the frontier settlements of the country.

Two other characteristic features of Wesley's system rendered the "itinerancy" not only possibly, but notably effective. The "local" ministry—consisting of gifted laymen in secular business—supplied the pulpits in the "regular" or "class" preachers; and the "leads" or ministers, in the latter could appear in any given place on their long circuits but once a fortnight, in most cases but once a month, and in others but once in six weeks. Thus public ministrations were kept up every Sunday. The class-meeting, comprising twelve "members," under an experienced "leader," met weekly, and last from one circuit to another. A most lax pastoral supervision of the whole membership was maintained in the absence of the authorized pastor or itinerant. See Lay Ministry.

In these facts, so coordinate and co-operative, we have the chief explanation of the remarkable success of Wesley's system. So long as the circuits, in our own country especially, were five or six hundred miles in extent, including scores or hundreds of societies or "appointments," each of which was regularly visited, at intervals of four or six weeks, by the "circuit preacher," and meanwhile the "local preachers" and "class-leaders" kept each fully supplied with Sabbath, and, indeed, almost daily religious services. In nothing, perhaps, does the legislative genius of Wesley, so highly estimated by Southey, Macaulay, and Buckle, more strikingly appear than in this combination of pastoral provision and itinerant preaching.

If its adaptation to England was eminent, it was pre-eminent in America, where the customary local pastorates of other denominations seemed to afford no adequate provision for the prodigiously advancing population and settlement of the country. "Methodism, with its lay ministers, met this necessity in a most decided manner through the propagating and systematically training of religion to this overflowing population; it was to lay the moral foundations of many of the great states of the West. The older churches of the colonies could never have supplied them with "regular" or educated pastors in any proportion to their rapid settlement. Methodism met this necessity in a manner that should command the national gratitude. It was to become at last the dominant popular faith of the country, with its standard planted in every city, town, and almost every village of the land. Moving in the van of emigration, it was to supply with the means of religion the frontier, from the Canadas to the Gulf of Mexico, from Pugil's Sound to the Gulf of California, and to plant in them the seed of tens of thousands of souls. It was to raise up, without delay for preparatory training, and thrust out upon these circuits, thousands of such itinerants, tens of thousands of "local" or lay preachers and "exhorters," as auxiliary and unpaid laborers, with many thousands of class-leaders, who could minister pastoral supervision over the infant societies in the absence of the itinerant preachers, the latter not having time to delay in any locality for much more than the public services of the pulpit. Over all these circuits it was to maintain the watchful jurisdiction of travelling presiding elders, and over the whole system of "preaching travelling" and "exhorting" how shall to whom the entire nation was to be a common "diocese" (Stevens, History of Methodism). "Without any dispa- ragement of other churches, we may easily see that they were not in a state to meet the pressing wants of the country. The pulpit of prayer and instruction, the preacher untended and enfeebled, was destitute of the episcopal order, had to wait long, and urge her plea ardent upon the attention of the bishops of England before they could procure consecration for any of her ministers (and, as is well known, the non-existence of a bishop involves amongst the Episcopalians the non-existence of the Church), so that this community was not in a position to undertake to any great extent an aggressive service. The principles of the Independents, which subordinate the call of a minister to the voice of the Church, placed a bar in the way of their seeking the outlying popula- tions, who could minister pastoral supervision over the call; and, though the Presbyterian system is not neces- sarily so stringent in these matters as Independent churches acting on their theories, yet, as they cannot move without the action of their synodical bodies, there was little prospect of their doing much missionary work. Thus this whole system rests upon the hands of the Methodist itinerant. The men were admirably fitted for their task. Rich in religious enjoyment, full of faith and love, zealous and energetic, trained to labor and ex- erction, actuated by one single motive—that of glorifying God, the thought of the souls in distress; always ready to follow the immigrants and "squatters" in their peregrinations wherever they went. American society was thus imbued with Christian truth and principle, as well as accustomed to religious ordinances, in its normal state" (London Quarterly Review, October, 1848, p. 120).

Wesley started with no "theory" of ministerial itin- erancy. The expediency of the plan alone led to its adoption; but he died believing in it as a theory, as, in- deed, the apostolic plan of evangelization. In his esti- mation, it not only had a salutary effect on the evangelists, by keeping them energetic and chivalrous, but it had also the advantage of enabling them to sit anywhere, and minister the truth to many places, and it made small abilities available on a large scale. He says that he be- lieves he should himself preach even his congregation asleep were he to stay in one place an entire year. Nor could he "believe that it was ever the Lord's will that we should enter the ministry, and not the mission of religion to this country;" for "we have found," he writes, "by long and constant ex- perience, that a frequent exchange of teachers is best. This preacher has one talent, that another. No one whom I ever yet knew has all the talents which are needful for beginning, continuing, and perfecting the work of grace in a church."

There can be no question that an itinerant ministry has the sanction of the highest scriptural examples. Christ was an itinerant. His ministry in the flesh was...
got a settled pastorate; he went about doing good.

The twelve disciples were itinerants, both before and after the crucifixion and resurrection. They went from city to city preaching the Gospel of the kingdom. And the preacher before them were itinerants. Samuel had his tent in the field as a pastor, so did Elisha, and a tent of Bochim in the field as a pastor. The greatest problem for other denominations to solve is "unemployed ministers." Thus a writer in the "Intelligencer," speaking of the trials resulting from a want of an itinerant ministry in the Reformed (Dutch) Church, says of Methodism: "No man who can work and wants to work, and is committed to the work of the Gospel, can be unemployed." The whole of this sacred book breathes the spirit of itinerancy; and all the transactions recorded in it, in reference to the ministry, agree with this spirit. Nay, it is unquestionably true that in the early Christian Church, though many were in favor of a set ministry, most of the Christian preachers were "itinerants." In the Latin Church, itinerant preachers have ever been employed: they form a special religious order—a class of preaching monks (comp. D'Aubigné, "Histoire de la Reformation," v. 102). Thus Berenger, in France, employed itinerant preachers. "This kind of preaching, which always reappears in England in the grand epochs of the Church" (ibid. p. 103). But if Wycliffe and the Reformers were first in their efforts to introduce itinerant preaching, it is to Wesley, nevertheless, that alone is due the credit of organizing "itinerancy" as a permanent and universal scheme of ministerial labor throughout a large denomination. The itinerancy has always been a feature cherished with jealous care by the Methodist bodies, and with respect to bishops it is heeded about by one of the restrictive rules in the Methodist Episcopal Church (the Discipline, Powers of the General Conference). The length of time for which the travelling preachers may remain on the same "charge" (whether a circuit or station) has varied at different times in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and is now limited to three years. "Presiding elders can remain only four years on the same "district."" To the advantages and disadvantages of the itinerant system, no one has given a more unbiased account of the objections that have thus far been presented against the continuance of "Itinerancy" than Dr. Crane ("Modern Quarterly Review," Jan., 1863, p. 72 sq.), and we follow him in the main, supplementing it only with what comes from other churches.

1. "The people are restricted in the choice of their pastor." If thisibe true, no other system so soon reme diates the difficulty as the itinerancy, for it secures at the same time a pastor a further change within a short period, without inflicting dishonor or injustice.

2. "At certain fixed intervals it removes the pastor with whom the people have become acquainted, and substitutes a stranger in his place. In return, it affords the church the benefit of the varied endowments of many ministers, and, moreover, keeps ministers and people in vigorous action.

3. "Societies and congregations have less cohesive force than their own goods demands." This, of all objections, has been the one most frequently urged, and is, perhaps, the one most difficult to meet. However, it may be answered with a view to obviate this evil that many have advocated an extension of the term of service to five or more years.

4. "The change sometimes comes inopportune." If this happen in some instances, and they can, after all, be but few, much greater are the advantages which arise from this system, as it never leaves a church without a pastor, and at the same time also secures to the minister the interest of the people, as he is able, at the same time, to apprise them of the work of his associates in the Gospel field. The greatest problem for other denominations to solve is "unemployed ministers." Thus a writer in the "Intelligencer," speaking of the trials resulting from a want of an itinerant ministry in the Reformed (Dutch) Church, says of Methodism: "No man who can work and wants to work, and is committed to the work of the Gospel, can be unemployed." The whole of this sacred book breathes the spirit of itinerancy; and all the transactions recorded in it, in reference to the ministry, agree with this spirit. Nay, it is unquestionably true that in the early Christian Church, though many were in favor of a set ministry, most of the Christian preachers were "itinerants." In the Latin Church, itinerant preachers have ever been employed: they form a special religious order—a class of preaching monks (comp. D'Aubigné, "Histoire de la Reformation," v. 102). Thus Berenger, in France, employed itinerant preachers. "This kind of preaching, which always reappears in England in the grand epochs of the Church" (ibid. p. 103). But if Wycliffe and the Reformers were first in their efforts to introduce itinerant preaching, it is to Wesley, nevertheless, that alone is due the credit of organizing "itinerancy" as a permanent and universal scheme of ministerial labor throughout a large denomination. The itinerancy has always been a feature cherished with jealous care by the Methodist bodies, and with respect to bishops it is heeded about by one of the restrictive rules in the Methodist Episcopal Church (the Discipline, Powers of the General Conference). The length of time for which the travelling preachers may remain on the same "charge" (whether a circuit or station) has varied at different times in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and is now limited to three years. "Presiding elders can remain only four years on the same "district."" To the advantages and disadvantages of the itinerant system, no one has given a more unbiased account of the objections that have thus far been presented against the continuance of "Itinerancy" than Dr. Crane ("Modern Quarterly Review," Jan., 1863, p. 72 sq.), and we follow him in the main, supplementing it only with what comes from other churches.

1. "The people are restricted in the choice of their pastor." If this be true, no other system so soon reme diates the difficulty as the itinerancy, for it secures at the same time a pastor a further change within a short period, without inflicting dishonor or injustice.

2. "At certain fixed intervals it removes the pastor with whom the people have become acquainted, and substitutes a stranger in his place. In return, it affords the church the benefit of the varied endowments of many ministers, and, moreover, keeps ministers and people in vigorous action.

3. "Societies and congregations have less cohesive force than their own goods demands." This, of all objections, has been the one most frequently urged, and is, perhaps, the one most difficult to meet. However, it may be answered with a view to obviate this evil that many have advocated an extension of the term of service to five or more years.

4. "The change sometimes comes inopportune." If this happen in some instances, and they can, after all, be but few, much greater are the advantages which arise from this system, as it never leaves a church without a pastor, and at the same time also secures to the minister the interest of the people, as he is able, at the same time, to apprise them of the work of his associates in the Gospel field. The greatest problem for other denominations to solve is "unemployed ministers." Thus a writer in the "Intelligencer," speaking of the trials resulting from a want of an itinerant ministry in the Reformed (Dutch) Church, says of Methodism: "No man who can work and wants to work, and is committed to the work of the Gospel, can be unemployed." The whole of this sacred book breathes the spirit of itinerancy; and all the transactions recorded in it, in reference to the ministry, agree with this spirit. Nay, it is unquestionably true that in the early Christian Church, though many were in favor of a set ministry, most of the Christian preachers were "itinerants." In the Latin Church, itinerant preachers have ever been employed: they form a special religious order—a class of preaching monks (comp. D'Aubigné, "Histoire de la Reformation," v. 102). Thus Berenger, in France, employed itinerant preachers. "This kind of preaching, which always reappears in England in the grand epochs of the Church" (ibid. p. 103). But if Wycliffe and the Reformers were first in their efforts to introduce itinerant preaching, it is to Wesley, nevertheless, that alone is due the credit of organizing "itinerancy" as a permanent and universal scheme of ministerial labor throughout a large denomination. The itinerancy has always been a feature cherished with jealous care by the Methodist bodies, and with respect to bishops it is heeded about by one of the restrictive rules in the Methodist Episcopal Church (the Discipline, Powers of the General Conference). The length of time for which the travelling preachers may remain on the same "charge" (whether a circuit or station) has varied at different times in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and is now limited to three years. "Presiding elders can remain only four years on the same "district."" To the advantages and disadvantages of the itinerant system, no one has given a more unbiased account of the objections that have thus far been presented against the continuance of "Itinerancy" than Dr. Crane ("Modern Quarterly Review," Jan., 1863, p. 72 sq.), and we follow him in the main, supplementing it only with what comes from other churches.

1. "The people are restricted in the choice of their pastor." If this be true, no other system so soon reme diates the difficulty as the itinerancy, for it secures at the same time a pastor a further change within a short period, without inflicting dishonor or injustice.

2. "At certain fixed intervals it removes the pastor with whom the people have become acquainted, and substitutes a stranger in his place. In return, it affords the church the benefit of the varied endowments of many ministers, and, moreover, keeps ministers and people in vigorous action.

3. "Societies and congregations have less cohesive force than their own goods demands." This, of all objections, has been the one most frequently urged, and is, perhaps, the one most difficult to meet. However, it may be answered with a view to obviate this evil that many have advocated an extension of the term of service to five or more years.

4. "The change sometimes comes inopportune." If this happen in some instances, and they can, after all, be but few, much greater are the advantages which arise from this system, as it never leaves a church without a pastor, and at the same time also secures to the minister the interest of the people, as he is able, at the same time, to apprise them of the work of his associates in the Gospel field. The greatest problem for other denominations to solve is "unemployed ministers." Thus a writer in the "Intelligencer," speaking of the trials resulting from a want of an itinerant ministry in the Reformed (Dutch) Church, says of Methodism: "No man who can work and wants to work, and is committed to the work of the Gospel, can be unemployed." The whole of this sacred book breathes the spirit of itinerancy; and all the transactions recorded in it, in reference to the ministry, agree with this spirit. Nay, it is unquestionably true that in the early Christian Church, though many were in favor of a set ministry, most of the Christian preachers were "itinerants." In the Latin Church, itinerant preachers have ever been employed: they form a special religious order—a class of preaching monks (comp. D'Aubigné, "Histoire de la Reformation," v. 102). Thus Berenger, in France, employed itinerant preachers. "This kind of preaching, which always reappears in England in the grand epochs of the Church" (ibid. p. 103). But if Wycliffe and the Reformers were first in their efforts to introduce itinerant preaching, it is to Wesley, nevertheless, that alone is due the credit of organizing "itinerancy" as a permanent and universal scheme of ministerial labor throughout a large denomination. The itinerancy has always been a feature cherished with jealous care by the Methodist bodies, and with respect to bishops it is heeded about by one of the restrictive rules in the Methodist Episcopal Church (the Discipline, Powers of the General Conference). The length of time for which the travelling preachers may remain on the same "charge" (whether a circuit or station) has varied at different times in the Methodist Episcopal Church, and is now limited to three years. "Presiding elders can remain only four years on the same "district."" To the advantages and disadvantages of the itinerant system, no one has given a more unbiased account of the objections that have thus far been presented against the continuance of "Itinerancy" than Dr. Crane ("Modern Quarterly Review," Jan., 1863, p. 72 sq.), and we follow him in the main, supplementing it only with what comes from other churches.
stay has measurably remedied, but it is a question whether a still longer term would not deprive the itinerant of one of the greatest blessings, health. It is held by competent judges, and the point is also made by Dr. Crano, that the itinerancy is conducive to health and long life, as the vital forces of a pastor settled over a congregation for many years in succession are necessarily subjected to a fearful strain, and thus what appears at first a family deprivation turns out really to be a great blessing to the household. See the host of the articles and books already referred to, Hodgson, Ecclesi. Polity of Methodism defended, especially p. 95–118; Porter, Compendium of Methodism.

Ittah-Kazin (Heb. אַתָּה-קָזִין, ṭṭṭ. q.v., time [according to First, people] of the judge, only with local, ṭṭṭ. q.v.; Sept. ἦταν ημ Universität von Basel (within Issachar), between Gath-hepher and Rammon-methoas (Josh. xix. 13), therefore a very short distance (east) from Sephorrus (Seffuriah). It is, perhaps, identical with the Κατά Κασίμονα usually regarded as the site of Cais (q.v.) of the N.T.

Ittai (Heb. אִיתָי, ṭṭṭ., near or at times, otherwise possessive), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Ecc~33~). Son of Ribai, a Benjamite of Gibeah of the thirty heroes that David led with him (2 Sam. xxiii, 29), called, in the parallel passage (1 Chron. xi. 31) ITITAI (Heb. אִיתָי, ṭṭṭ., a fuller form; Sept. ἦταν ἀνθρώπου, B.C. 1046. 2. (Sept. ṭṭṭ. and so Josephus) v. c. 690). "ITITAI the Gittithe, i.e. the native of Gath, a Philistine in the army of King David. He appears only during the rebellion of Absalom, B.C. cir. 1025. We first discern him on the morning of David's flight, while the king was standing under the olive-tree, below the city, watching the army and the people defile past him. See David. Last in the procession came the 600 heroes who had formed David's band during his wanderings in Judah, and who had been with him at Gath (2 Sam. xv, 18; comp. 1 Sam. xxiii, 13; xxvii, 2; xx, 5, 10; and Josephus, Ant. vii, 9, 2). Among these, apparently commanding them, was Ittai the Gittite (v. 19). He caught the eye of the king, who at once addressed him, and besought him as a "stranger and an exile," and as one who had but very recently joined his service, not to attach himself to a doubtful cause, but to return with his brethren and abide with the king (v. 19, 20). But Ittai is firm; he is the king's slave (ḳūlā, A.V., "s servant"), and wherever his master goes he will go. Accordingly, he is allowed by David to proceed, and he passes over the Kedron with the king (xxv, 22, Sept.), with all his men, and "all the little ones that were with him." These "little ones" (ḳūlā, ἄνδρα, "all the children") must have been the families of the band—their "households" (1 Sam. xxvii, 8). They accompanied them during their wanderings in Judah, often at great risk (1 Sam. xxx, 6), and they were not likely to leave them behind in this fresh commencement of their wandering life.

When the army was numbered and organized by David at Mahanaim, Ittai again appears, now in command of a third part of the force, and (for the time at least) enjoying equal rank with Joab and Abishai (2 Sam. xviii, 2, 5, 12). But here, on the eve of the great battle, we take leave of this valiant and faithful stranger; his conduct in the fight and his subsequent fate are all left to conjecture. Nor is it mentioned in the lists of David's captains and of the heroes of his body-guard (see 2 Sam. xxiii; 1 Chron. xi, lists which are possibly of a date previous to Ittai's arrival in Jerusalem.

An interesting tradition is related by Jerome (Questa. Heb., on 1 Chron. xx, 2), that Solomon was the son of the basileus of Milcom (A.V. "their king"). But, by the law, it was forbidden to any Israelite to touch either gold or silver of an idol. Wherefore they say that Ittai the Gittite, who had come to David from the Philistines, was the man who snatched the crown from the head of Milcom; for it was lawful for a Hebrew to take it from the hand of a man, though not from the head of the idol. The main difficulty to the reception of this legend is the interaction of health and long life, as the vital forces of a pastor settled over a congregation for many years in succession are necessarily subjected to a fearful strain, and thus what appears at first a family deprivation turns out really to be a great blessing to the household. See the host of the articles and books already referred to, Hodgson, Ecclesi. Polity of Methodism defended, especially p. 95–118; Porter, Compendium of Methodism.

The expression "thy brethren" (xx, 29) we may infer that there were other Philistines besides Ittai in the six hundred; but this is uncertain. Ittai was not exclusively a Philistine name, nor does "Gittite"—as in the case of Obed-edom, who was a Levite—necessarily imply Philistine parentage. Still David's words, "stranger and exile," seem to show that he was not an Israelite.—Smith. Others, however, have hazarded the supposition that this Ittai is the same as the preceding, having been called a Gittite as a native of Gittai, as Benjamin (2 Sam. iv, 9), and a "stranger and an exile" as a Gibeonite, who, having fled from Beeroh, a Gibeonite town (Josh. ix, 17), had, with his brethren, taken up his residence in Gittain. All this is very improbable. See GITTITE.

Ittig, Thomas, a German Lutheran divine, was born at Leipzig Oct. 31, 1643. He studied at the universities of Leipzig, Rostock, and Strasburg. After filling the pastorate at Halle, he, in 1686, professed the Lutheranism of the university of his native city. In 1691 he was transferred to the chair of theology. He died April 7, 1710.

Ittig was a very able man, but he lacked all tolerance towards those who chose to differ from him, and in some of his writings he is quite severe against other religious bodies than Lutheranism. He was elevated as a collector of the writings of the apostolic fathers (see below). His principal works are, Animadversiones in censuram fiscalitatis theologicae Personarum, etc. (Leipz., 1695, 4to)—De Herrisacri arxi apostolici et apostolico procissi (Leipz. 1690 and 1708, 4to)—Prolegomena ad Plurimi Josephi opera Graeco-Latina (Cologne, 1691, fol.)—Bibliotheca Patrum apostolicalorum Graeco-Latina, Leipz. 1699, 8vo (above alluded to)—Operum Clementia Avschiudum Supplementum, etc. (Leipz., 1708, 8vo)—Exercitationum Theologicae Variar argomenti, etc. (Leipz., 1709, 8vo)—Exercitationum theologicae de novis fanumgeniis quod- roundum nostrae etatis purgatorios (Leipz. 1708, 4to)—De Synodi Carentionum a reformationis in Gallia ecclesiis anno 1651 celebratur indulgentia erga Lutheranos, etc. (Gott. 1702, 4to)—Isauriculae episcoporum Romae, etc. (Leipz. 1709) (above alluded to)—Catholicae Ecclesiae primi a Christo natum seculi undecima Capita de scholas in ecclesiasticis et scriptoribus ecclesiasticis, etc. (Leipz., 1709, 4to)—Sedescahia de autorum qui de scholas ecclesiasticis ordinare (Lpz. 1711, 8vo)—Historia Concilii Cnivncn (Leipz., 1714, 4to)—Opuscula variar, edita cura Christiani Ludovici (Leipz. 1714, 8vo). See Kern, De Vitro, Obivo, Scripturac Th. Ittagi epistola Dissertatio (Leipz. 1710); Acta Eruditorum Lipsiensi, p. 221; Nicco- lon, Memoires, xxii, 241—252; Sam. Osmundis, Dissert. var. 2, 160; 8. sess. 146; Ech. u. Griso, Alph. Ech. J. Fabricius, Hist. Bibliothec. v. 140, 1401, 303, 310, vi. 456; Hoefer, Nouv. B. Générale, xxxvi, 106; Fuhr- man, Handwörterbuch d. Kirchengeschichte, ii, 515.

Ittura (Ittura), a small district in the N.E. of Palestine, forming the tetrapyrites of Philip, in connection with the adjacent territory of Trachonitis (Luke iii, 1). The name is supposed to have originated with the name of Ithram, the son of Ishmael. In 1 Chron. v, 19, this name is given as that of a tribe or nation with which Reuben (beyond the Jordan) wasured; and, from its being joined with the names of other of Ishmael's sons, it is evident that a tribe descended from
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his son Jetur is intimated. In the latter text the Sept.
takes this view, and for "with the Hagarites, with Jetur,
and Nephish, and Nobad," reads "with the Hagarites,
and Iuraneas, and Nephishenae, and Nabadeans." The
text seems to be still preserved in that of Jetur,
where it is bound up with that of the other branches; but
however, has lately been disputed by Wetstein [Reise-
berichte, p. 88 sq.] on the precarious ground of the pres-
cent dependent situation of the district.) We may thus
take the district to have been occupied by Ishmaed's son,
whose descendants were dispossessed or subdued by the
Amorites, after which they took this place as a part of the
kingdom of Bashan, and subsequently to have belonged
to that half tribe of Manasseh which had its possessions
east of the Jordan. From 1 Chron. v, 19, it appears
that the sons of Jetur, whether under tribute to the
Amorites (as some suppose), and forming part of the
kingdom of Bashan or not, were in actual occupation of
the country, and were dispossessed by the tribes beyond
the Jordan, who now conquered and colonized the little
province of Jetur, which lay between Bashan and Mount
Hermon ("in Libano monte" according to Muratori,
Tab. Asiae, p. 670). The district of the Extile tribe and oth-
er border countries were taken possession of by various
tribes, whom, although they are called after the original
names, as occupants of the countries which had received
those names, we are not bound to regard as purely de-
sendants of the original possessors. These new Iuras-
neans were probably subjugated by kings of Damascus (1
Kings xvi, 26), who reconquered the province, then called by its
Greek name Iuranae, and gave the inhabitants their
choice of Judaism or banishment (Joseph. Ant. xiii, 11, 3).
While some submitted, many retired to their own
rocky fastnesses, and to the deities of Hermon adjoining.
Nowhere are we more fully acquainted with the Iuranes
than in a distinct people in the time of Pliny (Hist. Nat., v, 28).
They extended their incursions as far as Phoenicia, but
submitted to the Romans under Pompey (Appian, Mith-
ridat, 106), and appear to have been able to retain their
native prince all of them. Iuranae was first formally an-
nexed to the province of Syria by Claudius (Titus
Ann. xvi, 23, 1; Dio Cassius, lix, 12), having been previ-
ously included in Perea as part of the dominions of Her-
or. (See F. Münter, De rebus Iuraneorum [Hav. 1824]).
As already intimated, Herod the Great, in dividing his
domains among his sons, bequeathed to their sons, bap-
tized Philip, as part of a tetrarchy composed, according to Lactant.
Trachonitis and Iuranae; and as Josephus (Ant. xvi, 10, 1;
comp. xvii, 8, 1) mentions his territory as composed of
Auranitis, Trachonitis, and Batanea, some have thought
(Roland, p. 106; Lightfoot, Hor. Heb.) that the evan-
gelists regarded Auranitis and Panisus included under
Iuranae, a name loosely applied by ancient writers
(see Pliny, v, 19; Epiphanius, Hares, 19; comp. Paulus,
Comment, i, 811; Wetstein, i, 671). But it properly
indicated a well-defined region distinct from Auranitis.
Pliny rightly places it north of Bashan and near Dam-
ascus (v, 23), and J. de Vitry describes it as adjoining
Trachonitis, and lying along the base of Libanus, be-
tween Tiberias and Damascus (Gesta Dei, p. 104; comp.
p. 771, 1098). The districts mentioned by Luke and
Josephus were distinct, but neither of these historians
give a full list of all the little provinces in the tetrar-
chy of Philip. Each probably gave a name to each such
as were of most importance in connection with the
events he was about to relate. Both Batanea and Au-
ranitis appear to have been included in the "region of
Trachonitis" (Tetrarchia Trachonitis) and as Josephus
mentions this, the "house of Zemodorus" which was
given to Philip, it unquestionably embraced Iuranae (Ant.
xvi, 10, 8). According to Strabo (xvi, 755 sq.), the
country known to classical writers was hilly (comp. Jace,
de Vitriaco, p. 1074), with many ravines and hollows; the
inhabitants were regarded as the most barbarous of the
Cimmerians (Philop., 145), who, being despised as the
resources of agriculture (Apul. Florid. i, 6), lived by rob-
bery (Strabo, xvi, 750), being skillful archers (Virgil,
Georg. ii, 448; Lucan, vii, 290, 514). The present Jeder
probably comprehends the whole or greater part of the
proper Iuranae. This is described by Bureschardt (Gryna, p. 286) as
"living south of Jebelkessosse, east of Jebel es-
Sheike (Mount Hermon), and west of the Haj road." It
was conquered by Trajan in A.D. 114. The upper part
by Gaulanitis, on the west by Hermon, and on the north
by the plain of Damascus. It is table-land, with an undu-
lating surface, and has little conical and cup-shaped
hills at intervals. The southern section of it has a rich
soil, well watered by numerous springs, and streams from
Hermon. The greater part of its northern section is entirely
different. The surface of the ground is covered
with jagged rocks, in some places heaped up in huge
piles, in others sunk into deep pits; at one place smooth
and naked, at another saimed with yawning chasms, in
whose rugged edges rank grass and weeds spring up.
The rock is all ancient, and the formation similar to that
of the Lejah. See Akebono. The molten lava seems
to have issued from the earth through innumerable pores,
to have spread over the plain, and then to have been
rent and shattered while cooling (Porter, Handbook, p.
465). Jeder contains thirty-eight towns and villages,
ten of which are entirely desolate, and all the rest contain
only a few families of poor peasants, living in
wretched hovels amid heaps of ruins (Porter, Damascus,
ii, 272 sq.). See Robinson, Bib. Res. Appendix, p. 149;

Itzchaki, also called Ben-Ja’an, and by the long
Arabic name of Aba Ibranaa Isaac Ibn-Kastor (or Sab-
tar) ben-Ja’an, a Jewish philosopher of great celebrity,
and commentator, was born in A.D. 1052 at Tiberias. Like
many other Jewish savans, he followed the medical pro-
fession, and so distinguished himself that he was ap-
pointed physician to the princes of Denia and Mug’ahidt,
and to Ali Ibdal Adadula. He died in 1507. Itzchaki
wrote (1) a Hebrew grammar, called י”תפוין י”ב, The
Book of Syntax; and (2) on Biblical criticism, called י”תפויי י”וכ, The Work of Itzchaki. Neither of
these works is now known to us, but from Aben-Ezra,
who quotes them, we learn that Itzchaki was one of the
earliest assailants of the Masonic authorship of some
portions of the Pentateuch. Thus he is said to have
maintained that the portion in the Pentateuch which describes
the kings of Idumea (Gen. xxxvi, 30, etc.) was written
many centuries after Moses (comp. Aben-Ezra, Commentar-
ies on Gen. viii, 2; comp. ibid. xvi, 11, Note 1). See
Gritz, Geschichte der Juden, vi, 53; Zeitschrift der
deutsch. morgenl. Gesellschaft, 1854, p. 551; 1855, p. 888.

Itzchaki, Solomon. See Rashi.

'Yvah (Heb. ירחא, for ירחא, an overt-
turning or ruin, as in Ezek. xxii, 32; Sept. 'Aovai, but in
Isa. xxxvii, 18, unites the preced. word into י”אشؤون), a city of the Assyrians whence they brought
colonists to repeople Samaria (2 Kings xviii, 34; xix,
18; Isa. xxxvii, 18, where it is mentioned in connection
with Hen and Sephurravim; also in the cognate form
אש, 2 Kings xvii, 34, where it stands in connection
with Babylon and Cuthah). Sir H. Rawlinson thinks
that the site must be sought in Babylonia, and that it
is probably identical with the modern حير, which is the
1c of Herodotus, i, 179), a place famous for bituminous
springs (see Rich, First Memoir on Babylon, p. 64, and
Chesney, Euphrates Expedition, i, 43, 1849), lying on the
Euphrates, between Sippa (Sephurravim) and
Anah (Henah), with which it seems to have been politi-
cally united shortly before the time of Sennacherib (2
Kings xix, 13). He also regards it as probably the
Ahava (א”חא) of Ezra (viii, 15). He believes the
name to have been originally derived from that of a
Babylonian god, who was connected with the sky or Ether,
and to whom the town is supposed to have been dedi-
cated (Rawlinson, Herodotus, i, 606, note). In the
Talmud the name appears as א”חא (א”חא), whence might
possibly be formed the Greek Ιού and the modern Ιού
(where the Ι is merely the feminine ending); if we might suppose any connection between the Greek and the Talmud.
Isidore of Charax seems to intend the same place
by his Amorica (Martyrions saec. iv). The latter have not thought that it occurs as Ιεύς in the Egyptian inscriptions of the time of Thothmes III, about B.C. 1450
(Birch, in Ostra Egyptiacae, p. 80). But these conjectures are destitute of any great probability, as the form of the name is not well corrobore. See AV.

Ιεύς, L. E. SILLIMAN, D.D., LL.D., a theologian of some note, more especially on account of his defection from the Protestant Episcopal Church to Romanism, was born in Meriden, Conn., Sept. 16, 1797. His parents removed to New York State while he was quite young, and he was prepared for college at L. doctrine. At the outbreak of the war in 1812, he served his country for one year, and in 1816 finally entered upon his collegiate course at Hamilton College, pursuing, at the same time, studies preparatory for the work of the ministry. He had been reared in the Presbyterian Church, but in 1819, when impatience obliged him to quit the college, he joined the Protestant Episcopal Church, and continued his theological education at N. Y. City under bishop Hobart, at whose hands he received deson's orders in 1822, and whose son-in-law he became in 1825. His first parish was Batavia, N. Y.; but he removed to New York a few months later and received a call to Trinity Church, Philadelphia, which he at once accepted, bishop White ordaining him to the priesthood. In 1827 he was called to Christ Church, Lancaster, Pa., and the year following became assistant rector of the same church. In 1831 he was transferred to N. Y. City. This connection he served six months later, to assume the rectoryship of St. Luke's Church, N. Y. In 1831 he was honored with the bishopric of North Carolina, where he became very popular, and for a time wielded great influence; but in 1848 he began to advocate doctrines inadmissible by any Protestant Churches and the doctrines, and distrust and alienation on the part of his diocese led him to renounce publicly his mistaken course. But so inclined had he become to the Roman Catholic view of the apostolical succession, and the need of an "infallible" interpreter of the Scriptures, that he soon avowed his former opinions, and in 1834, while in Europe, publicly submitted to the authority of Rome. Of course, this caused his deposition from the bishopric of N. Carolina. In defense of his course, he published The Trials of a Mind in its Progress to Catholicism (Boston, 1854, 8vo), in which he set forth the Roman Catholic view of the development of the episcopacy. Finally, the Protestant Episcopal Church does not possess a regular apostolical succession (p. 146-157), he felt obliged to accept the Church of Rome as the true Church. This course was very naturally pursued by bishop Ives, who, while yet in the Episcopal Church, had always inclined to High-Churchism. "Sitting upon the pinnacle of High-Churchism, the head easily turns, or becomes so dizzy as to fall down into the abyss of Popery." Ives fell, like Doane, and Wheaton, and Markoe, by carrying out the High-Church principles to their legitimate results. After his was employed as a witness of diocesan rhetoric in St. Joseph's Theological Seminary, and as lecturer on rhetoric and English literature in the convents of the Sacred Heart and the Sisters of Charity. Ex-bishop Ives evidently was a man of good parts and noble intentions; for during the last years of his life we find him interested, not only in the work of the church, but in the education of the public school children: here nearly 2000 children are now provided for. He died Oct. 13, 1887. Ives published also a volume of sermons On the Apostles' Doctrine and Fellowship, and on the 24th Psalm (Maurice, 1844, 8vo). See New Englander, Aug. 1855, art. iv; Princeton Review, xxi, 491 (on his sermons); Appleton, American Cyclopaedia, annual of 1867, 411 sq.; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 945. (J. H. W.)

Ιέρος, JOSPH, the historian of the English Baptist,
was born in 1773, pursued his studies at the Bristol Academy, and for twenty-nine years was pastor of a Baptist church in London. His principal publications are, (1) an edition of the "Acts of the Apostles; Notes on the life of John Bunyan; — (2) Treatise on Baptism and Communion: — (3) The Life, Times, and Opinions of John Milton: — (4) History of the English Baptists (4 vols. 8vo). The last, his most important work, is highly commended by Robert Hall for the value of its historical substance and for the quality of the author's style. His Life of Bunyan continued to be the chief authority upon the subject, until the growing public appreciation of the "ingenious dreamer" enlist ed in the illustration of his life the classic pen of Southey and the minute diligence of Mr. Offler. Mr. Ivey's death occurred in 1884. See G. Pritchard, Memoirs of the Life and Writings of Joseph Ivey (London, 1885, 8vo).

Ιβος, bishop of Chartres (Carontenius). Little is known of the life of this prelate beyond what we can learn from his works. The exact date of his birth is not ascertained (it is supposed to have been about 400), neither is his descent, although some say that he was of low extraction ("ex genere minime nobili," Gallia Christiana, viii, 1126), while others give him a noble parentage ("in agro Belgacense natus nobili sanguine nobilissimum traxit," Vita D. Ironii, Paris ed. 1647). He studied philosophy and rhetoric at Paris, then theology under the convent of Bee; he was made superior of the convent of St. Quentin, in which office he acquired great reputation as a theologian and canonist. In 1909, upon the deposition of the bishop of Chartres for simony, Ivo was appointed in his place, yet his predecessor had still such strong local interest that Ivo had to institute negotiations directly by the pope (Crim II), and was only installed in 1092, at Capua. He is one of the prelates who contributed most to the extension of papal authority, yet he did not hesitate to speak plainly against the abuse of the system of curacy; in the Paris edition of his life he is even praised as one of the defenders of the Gallican liberties. In the difficulty about the question of threnodie (q. v.), raised by Hildebrand and his followers, the course of Ivo was marked by great moderation, arising, not from weakness, but from a desire of conciliating and meeting justice to all parties, to whom he endeavored to show the preserving spirit of the hierarchy when it began to accuse pope Paschal II of heresy for having yielded to emperor Henry V. His private character, as well as his learning, gave him great influence. When Philip I repudiated his legitimate wife to marry another, he alone had the courage to resist him, and neither pope nor emperor could induce him to sanction the misdeed; and by his noble and straightforward course he excited the admiration of the people and nobility, who all took his part. He died in 1115 (according to Richter and Mijer, in 1125), and was canonized in 1570 for May 20. As a writer, he is known as the author of a Pescwornia and a decremen (see Canons and Decretals, Collections of); also of 287 Letters (Paris, 1588-85, 1610), which shed much light on the history of his time, and show in how high an estimation his opinions were held. 24 ecclesiastical discourses on synods, festivals, etc., and, finally, a short chronicle of the French kings. The most complete collection of his works has been published at Paris in 1647, fol., but it does not contain the Pescwornia. In Migne's edition of the fathers Ivo's works were reprinted in 1856 (Paris). See Hist. Lit. de France, x. 1024 sq. Also in: Eckermann, Real-Encyclopädie, xvi. 559 sq. Moesheim, Eccles. Hist. ii, 180 sq.; Cellier, Hist. des Ant. Soc. xxi, 425 sq.; Schricker, Kirchengesch. xvii, 13 sq., xxvi, 12 sq.

Ινόθος (ινόθος, shēkobim), elephant's tooth: see A. Benary, in the Berliner Jb. Jahrhücher, 1881, No. 36: 1 Kings x, 22; 2 Chron. ix, 21; and so explained by the Targum, ומקב, and Sept. אֵלֶּחַ דְּלָא. 1 Kings x, 22; 2 Chron. ix, 21; and so explained by the Targum, ומקב, and Sept. אֵלֶּחַ דְּלָא.
IVORY

also simply ἴβος, a tooth, Psa. xiv. 8; Ezek. xxvii. 15; Amos vi. 4; N. T. ἴβος, of ivory, Rev. xviii. 12. It is claimed that no word in Biblical Hebrew denotes an elephant, unless the latter portion of the compound ἴβον-κακίν is supposed to have this meaning. Gesenius derives it from the Sanscrit वान, "an elephant;" Kell (on 1 Kings x. 22) from the Coptic ἵβος; while Sir Henry Rawlinson mentions a word habon which he met with in the Assyrian inscriptions, and which he understands to mean "the large animal," the term being applied both to the elephant and the camel (Journ. of Asia. Soc. xii. 465). It is suggested in Gesenius's Thesaurus (s. v.) that the original reading may have been ΒΑΧΣΙΑ, "ivory, ebony" (compare Ezek. xxvii. 15). By some of the ancient nations these tusks were imagined to be horns (Ezek. xxvii. 15; Pliny, viii. 4; xvii. 1), though Diodorus Siculus (1, 55) correctly calls them teeth. As they were first acquainted with elephants through their ivory, which was an important article of commerce, the shape of the tusks, in all probability, led them into this error. They are genuine teeth, growing in themselves, and in sunglasses, the upper jaw, the whole mass of secretions which in other animals form the upper incisor and canine teeth. They are useful for defence and offence, and for holding down green branches, or rooting up water-plants; but still they are not absolutely necessary, since there is a variety of elephant, the Indian forests entirely destitute of tusks, and the females in most of the races are either without them, or have them very small; not turned downwards, as Bohart states, but rather straight, as correctly described by Pliny. Only two species of elephants are recognised—the African and the Indian—easily distinguished from each other by the size of the ear, which in the former is much larger than in the latter. The tusks of the African elephant attain sometimes a length of 8 or even 10 feet, and a weight of 100 to 120 pounds; but those of the Indian elephant are much shorter and lighter, whilst in the females they often scarcely project beyond the lips. "Elephant's tooth," or simply "elephant," is a common name for ivory, not only in the Oriental languages and in Greek, but also in the Western tongues, although in all of them teeth of other species may be included. There can be no doubt, for example, that the famous "ivory of Ashur," a material which is possible ivory obtained from the hippopotamus was known in Egypt at least as early as that obtained from the elephant. This kind of ivory does not split, and therefore was anciently most useful for military instruments. See ELEPHANT.

The Egyptians at a very early period made use of this material in decoration. The corner of a small ivory box in the Egyptian collection at the Louvre is "inscribed with the name imperator-nefer-ka-re, or Neper-ches, adopted by a dynasty found in the upper line of the tablet of Abidos, and attributed by M. Bunsen to the fifth... In the time of Thothmes III ivory was imported in considerable quantities into Egypt, either in boats laden with ivory and ebony from Ethiopia, or else in tusks and cups from the Ruten-.. The celebrated car at Florence has its linchpins tipped with ivory" (Birch, in Trana. Off. Roy. Soc. of Lit. iii. 24 series). The specimens of Egyptian ivory work, which are found in the principal museums of Europe, are, most of them, in the opinion of Mr. Birch, of a date anterior to the Persian invasion, and some even as old as the 18th dynasty. The practice of inlaying or covering the walls with ivory and other valuable substances was in very extensive use among the Egyptians, who used it likewise for ornamenting articles in inlaid wood, as may be seen in the British Museum. Amongst the articles of household furniture there is a seat with four turned legs inlaid with ivory, brought from Thbes; also a high-backed chair on lion-footed legs; the back solid, inlaid with panels of darker wood, with lotus flowers of ivory. The ivory used by the Egyptians was prin-

cially brought from Ethiopia (Herod. iii. 114), though their elephants were originally from Asia. The Ethiopians, according to Diodorus Siculus (1, 55), brought to Sesostris "ebony and gold, and the teeth of elephants." Among the tribute paid by them to the Persian kings were "twenty large tusks of ivory" (Herod. iii. 19). The processions of human figures bearing presents, etc., still extant on the walls of palaces and tombs, attest, by the black, crisp-haired bearers of huge teeth, that some of these came from Ethiopia or Central Africa; and by white men similarly laden, who also bring an Asiatic elephant and a white bear, that others came from the

Tribute of Elephants' Tusks brought to Thothmes III.

(Eub.)

East. In the Periplus of the Red Sea (c. 4), attributed to Arrian, Coloe (Culis) is said to be the chief mart for ivory. It was thence carried down to Adoulis (Zula, or Thula), a port on the Red Sea, about three days' journey from Coloe, together with the hides of hippopotamuses, tortoise-shell, apes, and slaves (Pliny, vi. 54). The elephants and rhinoceroses from which it was obtained were killed further up the country, and few were taken near the sea, or in the neighborhood of Adoulis. At Polemon Theron was found a little ivory like that of Adoulis (Periplus, c. 3). Ptolemy Philadelphus made this port the depot of the elephant trade (Pliny, vi. 54). According to Pliny (viii. 10), ivory was so plentiful on the borders of Ethiopia that the natives made door-posts of it, and even fences and stalls for their cattle. The author of the Periplus (c. 16) mentions Rapsa as another station of the ivory trade, but the ivory brought down to this port is said to have been of an inferior quality, and for the most part found in the woods, damaged by rain, or collected from animals drowned by the overflow of the rivers at the equinoxes" (Smith, Dict. of Class. Geography, a. v. Rapsa). The Egyptian mersch was traded for ivory and oxen, access to Barrygs, the port to which was carried down the commerce of Western India from Ozenne (Periplus, c. 49).

The Assyrians appear to have carried on a great traffic in ivory. Their early conquests in India had made them familiar with it, and (according to one rendering of the passage) their artists supplied the luxurious Ty-

Apes, Elephant, and Ivory as Tribute. (From the Nimrud Obelisk.)
The practice of inlaying and veneering wood with ivory and tortoise-shell is described by Pliny (xvi, 84). By the luxurious Phoenicians ivory was employed to ornament the boxwood rowing-benches (or "hatches" according to some) of their galleys (Ezek. xxvii, 6). The skilled workmen of Hiram, king of Tyre, fashioned the great ivory throne of Solomon, and overlaid it with pure gold (1 Kings x, 18; 2 Chron. ix, 17). The ivory thus employed was supplied by the caravans of Dedan (Isa. xxxi, 13; Ezek. xxvii, 15), or was brought from the East (Homer, Od. xxii, 200), as also among the Egyptians (Wilkinson, Ant. Eg. iii, 169). As an instance of the superabundant possession and barbarian use of elephants' teeth may be mentioned the octagonal ivory hunting-tome built by Akbar, about twenty-four miles west of Agra: it is still standing, and bristles with 126 enormous tusks disposed in ascending lines, each ten on each face. Mr. Roberts, remarking on the words of Amos (vi, 4), they "that lie upon beds of ivory, and stretch themselves upon couches," refers the last word, in conformity with the Tamil version, to swinging cots, often mentioned in the early tales of India, and still plentifully used by the wealthy. It does not appear that they were known in Western Asia, or that figures of them occur on Egyptian bas-reliefs. It is more likely that polka (those luxurious travelling litters) are meant, which were borne on men's shoulders, while the person within was stretched at ease. They were in common use even among the Romans, for Cicero fell into his assassin's hands while he was attempting to escape in one of them towards Naples. Among the Romans, inlaying with ivory seems to have become, at length, rather a common method of ornamenting the interior of the mansions of the wealthy; for Horace mentions it as an evidence of his humble way of life that "no walls inlaid with ivory adorned his house." 

Ivy (ειρων) is mentioned but once in the Scriptures, and that in the Apocrypha, namely, in 2 Macc. vi, 7, while it is said that the Jews were compelled, when the feast of Baccus was kept, to go in procession carrying ivy to this deity, to whom it is well known this plant was sacred. Ivy, however, though not mentioned by name, has a peculiar interest to the Christian, as forming the "corruptible crown" (1 Cor. ix, 25) for which the competitors at the great Isthmian games contended, and which St. Paul so beautifully contrasts with the "incorruptible crown" that shall hereafter encircle the brows of those who run worthily the race of this mortal life. In the Isthmian contests the victor's garland was either ivy or pine. See Crown.

The term καταστής or κατάττες seems to have been applied by the Greeks in a general sense, and to have included many plants, and among them some climbers, as the convolvulus, besides the common ivy (Hedera helix), which was especially dedicated to Bacchus, and which was distinguished by the name of "Hedera poética, Dionysia ant Bacchiocca, quod ex ea poëtarum corona consuetur." It is well known that in the Dionysia, or festivals in honor of Dionysius, and in the processions called Βάτων, with which they were celebrated, women also took part, in the disguise of Bacche, Naiades, Nymphes, etc., adorned with garlands of ivy, etc. (Ovid, Fasti, iii, 786). Bacchus is generally thought to have been educated in India, and the Indian Efdhès has been supposed to be the origin of the name. The fact of Bāghēs being a compound of two words signifying tiger and master or lord, would appear to confirm the identity, since Bacchus is usually represented as drawn in his chariot by a tiger and a lion, and tigers, etc., are described as following him in his Indian journey. As the ivy, however, is not a plant of India, it might be objected to its being characteristic of an Indian god. But in the mountains which bound India to the north both the ivy and the vine may be found, and the Greeks were acquainted with the fact that Mount Meru is the only part of India where ivy was produced. Indeed, Alexander and his companions are said to have crowned themselves with ivy in honor of Bacchus. The ivy, Hedera helix, being a native of most parts of Europe, is too well known to require special notice. See Bacchus.

Ixora, a divinity of the East Indians, or the worshippers of Brah. They hold him to be of infinite endurance, and illustrate this belief by saying that Brah himself, desirous of seeing Ixora's head, ascended...
and father of three sons (Exod. vi, 18, 21; Num. xvi, 1; 1 Chron. vi, 2, 18, 38; xxiii, 12, 18). In Num. iii, 19, his name is Anglicized "Izahar." His descendants are called Izharithes (Heb. יזריתים; Sept. Ἰζαρίτης; 1 Chron. xxiv, 22; xxvi, 23, 29, in the first of which passages it is Anglicized "Isharites"). B.C. post 1656. See also Zohar. "In 1 Chron. vi, 22, Aminadab is substituted for Ishar, as the son of Kohath and father of Korah, in the line of Samuel. This, however, must be an accidental error of the scribe, as in ver. 58, where the same genealogy is repeated, Izhar appears again in his right place. The Codex Alex. in ver. 22 reads Israh in place of Aminadab, and the Aldine and Complut. read Aminadab between Izhar and Korah, making another generation. But these are probably only corrections of the text. (See Burington, Geneal. of the O.T.)" (Smith).

Israh'ah (Heb. יִשְׂרָאֵל, חֲרוֹבֵית, sprout of Jehovah sc. into the world), the name of one or two men. 1. (Sept. Ἰσραῆλ; Vulg. Israhia). The "son of Uzzi, and grandson of Tola, the son of Issachar (1 Chron. vii, 9). B.C. cir. 1014. See OBAJAH. 2. Sept. omits, but some copies have Ἰσραηλᾶς, others Ἰσραήλ (Vulg. Iseraia; A. V. "Jezrahiah.") The superintendent of the singers (doubtless a Levite) who celebrated the completion of the walls of Jerusalem after the Exile (Neh. xii, 43). B.C. 446.

Iz'rahite (Heb. יִצְרָחִית, only with the art. יִצְרָחִית, the indigenous, prob. by error of transcription for יִצְרָחִית, a Iz'rahite [but Fürst makes it a man's name = Izra'iah], and this again for יִצְרָחִית, Izra'el). Sept. has Ἰσραήλ v. Ἰσραηλᾶς; Vulg. Jeserites), a patriotic epithet of Shamshu, one of David's generals (1 Chron. xxvii, 6), prob. a former or present-descended from Zerah, Judah's son. See EZRAHITE.

Iz'ri (Heb. יִצְרְיָה, יִצְרְיָה, the Jererite, otherwise a former; Sept. Iseri; Vulg. Iseri), the leader of the fourth division of Levitical singers under David (1 Chron. xxvii, 11); prob. the same with Zeri, of the sons of Jeduthun, mentioned in ver. 3. B.C. 1014.

J.

Ja'lan (Heb. יָאָלָן, יָאָל, vester; Sept. has two names, יָאָלָן וְאָלָן, other copies simply לָאָלי or לָאָלי; Vulg. Jacob), the last named of the sons of Ezer, son of Seir the Horite (1 Chron. i, 42, where it is Anglicized "Jakhan"); called in the parallel passage (Gen. xxxvi, 27) by a simpler form of the same name, Ἰαλάν. B.C. ante 1694. His descendants appear to have settled in the northern part of the Arabah. He was the forefather of the Bene-Jaakan (q. v.), round whose wells the children of Israel twice encamped, once after they left Moseroth, and just before they went on to Hor-Hagglad (Numb. xxxiii, 39-42), and again in a reverse direction after the left Kadash-harnes, and before they reached Mount Hor or Mosera (Deut. x, 6). See BEREHOTH-BENE-JAANK.

Ja'ak'ob (Heb. יָאָכֹב, יָאָכֹב, vester; Sept. has two names, יָאָכֹב וְאָכֹב, other copies simply לָאָכוֹב or לָאָכוֹב; Vulg. Jacob), one of the prosperous descendants (הַנֵּסֵת נֶס, prince) of Simeon that emigrated to the valley of Geedor (Gerar) (1 Chron. iv, 36). B.C. apparently cir. 710.

Ja'ala (many Ja'ala) (Heb. יָאָלָה, יָאָלָה, 'izah); Sept. 'izah (v. r. 'izah), one of the Nethinim ("servants of Solomon") whose descendants (or perhaps a place whose former inhabitants) returned from the Captivity with Zerubbabel (Neh. vii, 58); called in the parallel passage (Exra ii, 56) by the equivalent [the final z or h] by Chaldean) name Jaalah (יָאָלָה, Sept. 'izah). B.C. ante 536.

Ja'lah (many Ja'lah) (Exra ii, 56). See JAALAA.

Ja'lam (many Ja'lam) (Heb. יָאָלָם, יָאָלָם, concomber; Sept. Ἰαλάμ), the second named of Ezer's three sons by Ahilamah in Canaan (Gen. xxxvi, 5, 14; 1 Chron. i, 35). B.C. post 1694.

Ja'an (See DAN-JAAN.

Ja'anai (some Ja'anai) (Hebrew יָאָנָא, יָאָנָא, mourner, otherwise for יָאָנָא, answered by Jehovah; Sept. Ἰανναί v. Ἰανναί, Vulg. Janai), one of the chief (Idites residents in Bashan (1 Chron. vi, 12). B.C. between 1098 and 792.

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

Ja'ar'or-er'egim (Hebrew יָאָרָרּ אֶרֶגִּים, יָאָרְוֶרְו נָדְיֵה; Sept. Αἰαρόουρος, Vulg. Saltus polynuarius), according to the present text of 2 Sam. xxii, 19, a Betheleemite, and the father of Elhanan, who slew Goliath (the words 'and the name were added in the A. V.). In the parallel passage (1 Chron. xx, 5), besides other differences, Jair is found instead of Jaare, and Oregus
Jaazau 720

Jaazzer

4. The son of Hoshaiah, a Maacathite, who seeth in conjunction with Johanan, the son of Kareah, after the downfall of Jerusalem, first in submitting to the Babylonian governor Gedaliah, and, after his assassination, in requesting Jeremiah's advice as to the proper course to pursue for the salvation of the remnant (Jer. xii. 1). He appears to have assisted in recovering Ismael's prey from his clutches (comp. Jer. xii. 11). After that he probably went to Egypt with the rest (Jer. xiii. 4, 5). He is doubtless the same person called Azariah, the son of Hoshai, who rejected the divine council and so assisted in driving the remnant into Egypt (Jer. xiii. 1). B.C. 587. See JEREMIAH.

Jaazzer (Hebrew Zeazzer, "Jaazzer", 1 Chron. vi. 81; xxvi. 91; elsewhere the more abbreviated form "Jaaz", Zeazzer, helper; Sept. Σαζηνός [2 Sam. xxvii. 5, Σαζηνός]; Ath. Ver. "Jaazzer" in Numb. xxii. 82; xxvi. 35, at the place where "Jaazzer", a city on the east of the Jordan, taken by the Israelites under Moses from the Amorites (Numb. xxii. 92), and assigned, with other neighboring places of Gilgal, to the tribe of Gad (Numb. xxxii. 1, 3, 55; Jos. xiii. 29); it is probably a Levitical city (Jos. xxxi. 9; 1 Chron. vi. 81). It must have been of some importance, for it gave its name to a large section of country. The "land of Jaazzer" was fertile, and its rich pastures attracted the attention of the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh (Numb. xxxii. 1). As it is mentioned between the boundary of Dibon and Dor, near the city of Besor, it was probably a high plain north of Heshbon (Numb. xxxii. 3). It was allotted to the Merarite Levites (Jos. xxi. 89; 1 Chron. vi. 81), but in the time of David it would appear to have been occupied by Hebronites, i.e. descendants of Kohath (1 Chron. xxi. 81). It seems to have given its name to a district of land, or "daughters" town of (Numb. xxi. 82, A.V. "villages"); 1 Macc. v. 8). It is mentioned in connection with the census under David (2 Sam. xxiv. 6; 1 Chron. xxvi. 81), and was among the Moabite places that experienced the desolating march of the Chaldean invaders (Isa. xvi. 8; Jer. xviii. 92, in which it is said to be a "city of Jaazzer""); the "countryside" of. In the "bardenas" proclaimed over Muab by the prophets, Jaazzer is mentioned so as to imply that there were vineyards there, and that the cultivation of the vine had extended thither from Sidon (Isa. vi. 89; Jer. xiii. 82) to the exiles that remained in the hands of the Ammonites (1 Macc. v. 8). According to Eusebius (Onomast. s. v. Ζαζηνός), it lay 10 R. miles west (south-west) of Philadelphia (Rabbath-Ammon), and 15 from Heshbon. Josephus calls the place Jaazora (τα Ζαζορά Αρχ. xii. 81, 1), and Ptolemy Geographia (Yazgoria, v. 163; Zach's Mention [xviii. 429]) thinks it is found in the present ruins called Sper or Sur (Burckhardt's Trav. in Syria, p. 355, 357), but this is too near Rabbah according to Zimmerman's map, which gives the village of Sper at the head of a wady of the same name, at the proper location to correspond with that of Eusebius. Rümper (Palae. p. 254) thinks it is rather the Ain Hasir (Burckhardt, Trav. p. 609); but this is in consequence of the statement of Eusebius in another place (Onomast. s. v. Ζαζηνός), that it lay eight miles from Philadelphia, confounding Jaazzer with Hazor (see Keil's Comment on Jer. xiii. 35). As to the "latter passage" of "land of Jaazzer" mentioned by Ath. Ver. (Numb. xxii. 92), which Gesenius (Comment, on Isa. vi. 8) thinks an error, while Reid confounds it with the Jabbock (Palestina, p. 825), and others with other streams (Bitching, Erdbeek, xi. 898); it is probably (see Hirtig, Commun. zv. Jer. p. 190) the Jazer (or the upper name of the river, see (Prof. Stuart, in the Bibl. Repose, 1836, p. 157). With this identification Schwarz coincides (Palestina, p. 230). Porter (in Kittles Cyclopaedia, s. v.) suggests that "the land of Jazer" must have extended to the shore of the Dead Sea, and that the "sea of Jazer" may therefore have been so called by the inhabitants of the district, just as the northern lake took the name of Tiberias, and "Genesaret," and "Chinnereth." But this is unconfirmed by
any other passage. In Numb. xxi, 24, where the present Hebrew text has הַנִּכְבֶּה (A.V. "strung"), the Sept. has put הַנִּכְבֶּה. Burckhardt, in travelling from Es-Salt to Heshbon, passed the last-named—above ruined town, called סֵיר, situated on the side of a hill, and immediately below it was the source of a stream which ran down to the Dead Sea. Soon after this, in Syria, there appears to have been on the left (east) of the road, and below them the road is the source of the wady סֵיר (Burckhardt), or מְגִיב Es-Sir (Seetzen), answering, though certainly in position, yet imperfectly in character, to the παραλήπερ of Eusebius. Seetzen conjectures that the sea of Jabbok has been at the source of this brook, considerable marshes or pools sometimes existing at these spots. (Comp. his earlier suggestion of the source of the wady Serku, p. 333.) סֵיר, or סֵיר, is shown on the map of Van de Velde as 9 Roman miles W. of Amman, and about 12 from Heshbon. There can be little doubt that this is the Jazer of the Bible (Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 328). The prophecies of Scripture are fulfilled. The city and country are alike desolate. The vineyards that once covered the hill-sides are gone; and the wild Bedawin from the eastern desert make cultivation of any kind impossible (Porter, Syria, and Palaestina, pp. 198 sqq.).

Jāzzīlī (Heb. only in the paragogic form Yāzzîlî; מָזִיֵל, comforted by Jehovah; Sept. Yalel v. τ. Ωζιθή, apparently a third son, or a descendant of Merari the Levite, and the founder of an independent house in that family (1 Chron. xxiv, 26, 27) (B.C. ante 1044); but neither he nor his descendants are mentioned elsewhere (compare the lists in xxiii, 21-23; Exod. vi, 19). The word Beno (בְּנֹז), which follows Jaziziah, should probably be translated "his son," i.e. the son of Merari. But the text is in such a state that it is hard to know in what light to regard the person to whom it is assigned. Elsewhere the only sons of Merari mentioned are Mahli and Mushli (Exod. vi, 10; Num. iii, 33; 1 Chron. vi, 4 [A.V. 19]; xxii, 21).

Jāzzīl (Heb. Yāzzīlî, מָזְיֶל, comforted by God; Sept. Yelbāl v. τ. Ωζιθή, a Levitical musician among those of the subordinate part (1 Chron. xv, 18); doubtless the same as the Azziel who was one of those that performed the song of Moses (Deut. xxxii, 10). It is not known whether he is of the house of Levi or of Judah.)

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

Jab'īl (Heb. Yeb'dîlî, מַבַּדְל, a stream, as in Isa. xxx, 25; xlv, 4; Sept. Yeb'dîl Josephus Yodb'dylc, Ant. i, 2, 2), a descendant of Cain, son of Lamech and Adah, and brother of Jubal; described in Gen. iv, 20 as "the father of such as dwell in tents, and have cattle." B.C. cir. 2500. This obviously means that Jabal was the first who adopted that nomadic life which is still followed; and by numerous Arabian and Tartar tribes in Asia (compare Buttman, Mythologus, i, 164 sqq.). Abel had long before been a keeper of sheep (Gen. iv, 2); but Jabal invented such portable habitations (formed, doubtless, of skins) and transportable vessels to remove the people from one place to another, when they led their flocks to new pastures. See TENT. Bochart (Hieroz. i, 44, near the end) points out the difference between his mode of life and Abel's. Jabal's was a migratory life, and his possessions probably included other animals besides the sheep. The shepherds who dwelt within have found the land on which they dwelt sufficiently productive for the constant sustenance of their IV.-Z z
the sources of the Jabok, and into the plains eastward (Judg. xi, 18-22)" (Porter in Kitto, s.v. It is now called the Zerka or Wady Zerka) (from its "blue" color. Realms of J. A. A., p. 25; but, according to Schwarz, Palest., p. 52, from a fortress of the same name on the caravan route from Damascus to Mecca). Its sources are chiefly on the eastern side of the mountains of Gilgal, and it also drains a portion of the high plateau of Arabia beyond. In its passage westward across the plains it passes more than once passes under ground. The upper branches and tributaries are mere winter streams. At the point where the two main branches from Jerash and Ammon unite, the stream becomes perennial, and often, after heavy rain, is a foaming, impassable torrent. But where it flows is narrow, deep, and in places wild. Throughout nearly its whole course it is fringed by thickets of cane and oleander, and the large clustering flowers of the latter give the banks a gay and gorgeous appearance during the spring and early summer" (Porter, Handbook for S. and P., p. 310). Higher up, the sides of the ravine are clothed with forests of evergreen oak, pine, and arbutus; and the undulating forest glades are carpeted with green grass, and strewn with innumerable wild flowers. The scenery along the banks of the Jabok is probably the most picturesque in Palestine; and the ruins of towns and villages and fortresses in the surrounding mountains side the country as interesting as it is beautiful. The water is pleasant, and, by the bed being rocky, the stream runs clear (Burchhardt's Syria, p. 347; Iby and Mangles, Travels, p. 519; Buckingham, Palestines, L. 109; Lindsay, ii, 125).

**Jabesh** (Heb. Yabesh, יַבֵּשׁ, dry, as in Job xii, 25; Ezek. xvii, 29, etc.; also written fully Yebesheth, יְבֵשֶת, 1 Sam. iv, 9; xxii, 11; 2 Sam. ii, 22; 1 Chron. x, 12, first time), the name of a place and also of a man.

1. (Sept. in Sam. 'Iḇeši, in Chron. 'Iḇešîc) The shorter form (1 Sam. vi, 3, 9, 10; xx, 12, 13; 1 Chron. x, 12 only) of the name of the city elsewhere called JABESH-GILEAD (q.v.).

2. (Sept. 'Iḇešîc or 'Iḇešî or 'Iḇešîc in Chron. 'Iḇešîc) יַבֵּשֶת or יַבֵּשֶת or יַבֵּשֶת (in Chron. 'Iḇešîc) גָּלְיָה or גָּלְיָה תִּיְרָה; Josephus Ida-

**Jabesh-gilead** (Heb. Yabesheth 'Gilead, יַבֵּשֶת גִּילָּאָד, [also יַבֵּשֶת גִּילָּאָד, see JABESH, by which simple form it is sometimes called]; Sept. 'Iḇešîc or 'Iḇešî or 'Iḇešîc in Chron. 'Iḇešîc) יַבֵּשֶת or יַבֵּשֶת or יַבֵּשֶת in Chron. xvi, 2, 11, 'Iḇešîc (Am. vi, 5, 1), and 'Iḇešîc (Am. v, 1). A town mentioned (1 Kings xvi, 29; 2 Kings xviii, 8), in the land of Gilead, distant a night's journey from Bethshan (1 Sam. xxxii, 11; 2 Sam. ii, 4; xxii, 12). In the sense denoted in this juxtaposition, Gilead included the half tribe of Manasseh (1 Chron. xxvii, 21), as well as the tribes of Gad and Reuben (Num. xxxii, 1-42) east of the Jordan; and of the cities of Gilead, Jabesh was the chief, lying within the limits of the half tribe of Manasseh east.

It is first mentioned in connection with the cruel vengeance taken upon its inhabitants for not coming up to Mizpeh on the occasion of the fierce war between the children of Israel and the tribe of Benjamin. Every male of the city was put to the sword, and all the virgins—to the number of 400—seized to be given in marriage to the 600 men of Benjamin that remained (Judg. xxi, 8-14). Nevertheless the city survived the loss of its males, and is next memorable for the siege it sustained from Nahash, king of the Ammonites, the raising of which formed the first exploit of the newly-elected king Saul, and procured his confirmation in the sovereignty. The inhabitants had agreed to surrender, and to have their right eyes put out (to incapacitate them from military service), but were allowed seven days to ratify the terms. The townspeople sent out a large army, and came to their relief (1 Sam. xi). This service was gratefully remembered by the Jabeshites, and about forty years after, when he and his three sons were slain by the Philistines in Mount Gilboa (1 Sam. xxxi, 8), the men of Jabesh-gilead came by night and took down their corpses from the walls of Bethshan, where they had been exhumed and thrown, then buries the bodies under a tree near the city, observing a strict funeral fast for seven days (ver. 13). "Jabesh-gilead was on the mountain, east of the Jordan, in full view of Bethshan, and these brave men could creep up to the tall along wady Jalil without being seen. So God had that day hidden them from the accusal sepulchre in the tribe of Benjamin (2 Sam. xx, 14). Jabesh still existed as a town in the time of Eusebius, who places it on a hill six miles from Pella, towards Gerasa (Onomast. a.v. 'Aḇanāsā and 'Iḇašîc). Mr. Buckingham thinks it may be found in a place called 'Iḇaz or 'Iḇez, marked by ruins upon a hill a spot not far from which, according to the above indications, Jabesh must have been situated (Travels, ii, 130, 134). It was more probably situated on the present wady Jables, which Burchhardt (Trav. in Syria, p. 289) describes as entering the Jordan not far below Beisan. According to Schwarz (Pabest, p. 234), the area of this wady is about 450 m. in length and the mouth is about 100 m. wide. This wady runs on this wady ten miles east of Jordan; but Dr. Robinson, during his last visit to this region, sought in vain for any village or ruins by that name (which, he says, is applied exclusively to the wady), but thinks the site of Jabesh-gilead may be marked by that of the ruins called by the Arab ajnâr (the bed of the wady), high upon the wady, on the south side, on a hill, and containing columns as he was informed (new ed. of Researches, iii, 319). It is about six miles from the ruins of Pella, near the line of the ancient road to Gerasa (Van de Velde, Travels, ii, 349-52; Porter, Handbook for Syria and Palest., p. 317; Stanley, Sinai and Pal., p. 290).

**Jabz** (Heb. Yabtes, יַבְּס, according to 1 Chron. iv, 9, afflication, sc. to his mother, apparently by transposition from the root בָּשָׁנ, Sept. יָבְשָׁהוּ and יָבְשָׁהוּ or יָבְשָׁהוּ, the name of a man and also of a place.

1. A descendant of Judah (B.C. post 1612), but of what particular family is not apparent, although we have this remarkable account of him inserted among a series of their officers: 1 Chron. iv, 18. And Jabz is described as "young and able"— than his brethren: and his mother called his name Jabz, saying, Because I bare him with sorrow (דָּשָׁנ, 'o'orb). And Jabz called on the God of Israel, saying, Oh that thou wouldst bless me indeed, and enlarge my coast, and that thine hand might be with me, and that thou wouldst keep me from evil, that it may not grieve me (דָּשָׁנ, 'o'orb). And God granted him that which he requested (1 Chron. iv, 9, 10). It is very doubtful whether any connection exists between this genealogy and that in ii, 50-55. Several names appear in both—Hur, Ephrathah, Bethlem, Zareathith (in A.V. iv, 2 inaccurately "Zorathites"), Joash, Caleb: and there is much similarity between others, as Rechab and Rechab, Ezbon and Esbanites; but any positive connection seems undeniable. The Tarbog identifies Jabz and Othniel. For the traditional notices of this person and his character, see Clarke's Comment. ad loc.

2. A place described as being inhabited by several families of the scribes descended from the Kenites, and allied to the Rechabites (1 Chron. ii, 85). It occurs in a notice of the progeny of Salma, who was of Judah, and closely connected with Bethlem (ver. 51), possibly the father of Boaz: and also—though how is not clear—with Joab. The Tarbog states some curious particulars which, however, do not much elucidate the difficulty, and are rather an objection to a worthy tradition and of mere invention based on philological grounds. Rechab is there identified with Rechabiah, the son of Elizeer, Moses's younger son (1
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Chron. xxvi, 25), and Jabez with Othniel the Kenite, who bore the name of Jabez "because he founded by his counsel (יְבֵּצָה) a school (בֵּצָה) of disciples called Tirasithes, Shimeaithes, and Sucathites." See also the quotations from Talmud, Temurah, in Buxtort's Lex. col. 966, where a similar derivation is given. As the place appears to have been situated within the territory of Judah, it may have been settled by the numerous posterity of the above person by the same name (comp. "the men of Rechah," 1 Chron. iv, 12). The associated names would seem to indicate a locality near, if not identical with Kirjath-jearim (comp. in the same region Kirjath-sepher, or book-town, implying the literary character of the inhabitants), and the inhabitation of the same families appear to have dwelt (1 Chron. ii, 58, e.g. the Ithrites = Kenites, the Shumathites = Samethites.

Jabez, Isaac Ben-Salomo Ben-Isaac Ben-Joseph, a Jewish commentator of some note, flourished in the 15th century. Of his personal history we are uninformed, but his works, of great celebrity in the 15th century, still continue to be considered valuable contributions to exegetical literature; and Frankfurter, in his "Rabbinic Bible," inserted the following, which are, however, rather compilations from different expositors than the original productions of Jabez: (1) על הדבר, or Commentary on the Psalms:—(2) דברי הימים, or Commentary on Proverbs:—(3) דבריYEVEH, or Commentary on Proverbs:—(4) דברי YEVEH, or Commentary on the Song of Songs:—(5) דברי YEVEH, or Commentary on Ruth:—(6) דברי YEVEH, or Commentary on Lamentations:—(7) דברי YEVEH, or Commentary on the Book of Ecclesiastes:—(8) דברי YEVEH, or Commentary on the Book of Esther:—(9) דברי YEVEH, or Commentary on Daniel:—(10) דברי YEVEH, or Commentary on Ezra and Nehemiah. Besides these, Jabez wrote יְבֵּצָה, or homiletical Commentary on the Haphtaroth, or Sabbath Lessons from the prophets (Belvire, near Constantinople, 1538, folio): יְבֵּצָה, or Commentary on the Pentateuch. See Wiel. Ribloch. Hebraea, i, 694; iii, 617 sq.: iv, 886; Frum. Bibloth. Jud. ii, 2; Steinschneider, Catalogus Libr. in Bibloth. Bodl. col. 1125: C. D. Ginsburg, in kitto, s. v.

Jabin (Heb. יבּיִין, discoverer; Sept. יְבָשִּׁי [v. r. יְבָשִׁי in Ps. xxx. 13], Josephus יְבָשִּׁי, Ant. v. 5, 1), the name of two kings of the Canaanitish city Hazor. See Hazor. It was possibly a royal title, like Agag among the Amalekites, and Abimelech of Gilead.

1. A king of Hazor, and one of the most powerful of all the princes who reigned in Canaan when it was invaded by the Israelites (Josh. xi, 1-14). His dominion seems to have extended over all the north part of the country; and after the ruin of the league formed against the Hebrews in the south by Adoni-zedek, king of Jerusalem, he assembled his tributaries near the waters of Merom (the Lake Huleh), and called all the people to arms. This coalition was destroyed, as the one in the south had been, and Jabin himself perished in the sack of Hazor, his capital, B.C. cir. 1615. This prince was the last powerful enemy with whom Joshua combated, and his overthrow seems to have been regarded as the crowning act in the conquest of the Promised Land, leaving only the Amakim in the mountains of Judah and Ephraim to be dispossessed in detail (Josh. xi, 21-25, 26, 33, 34).

2. Another king of Hazor, and probably descended from the preceding (Judg. iv, 2, 3), with whom some (Maurer, Comment. on Josh. xi; Hervey, Genealogies, p. 229) have confounded him (see Hiëronym. Elistri, ii, 1, 58, & alii; Mauvieux, Ant., ix, 10-15). While Joshua was in command of one of the servitudes of the Israelites, probably when they lay under the yoke of Cushan or Eglon, the king of Hazor was reconstructed. The narrative gives to this second Jabin even the title of "king of Canaan"; and this, with the possession of 900 iron-armed war-chariots, implies unusual power and extent of dominion. The iniquities of the Israelites having lost them the divine protection, Jabin gained the mastery over them; and, stimulated by the memory of ancient hostilities, oppressed them heavily for twenty years, B.C. 1429-1409. From this thraldom they were relieved by the great victory won by Barak in the plain of Esdraelon, over the hosts of Jabin, commanded by Sisera, one of the most renowned generals of those times (Judg. iv, 1-16). Such was the deep-commitment of the king of Hazor was not yet, however, entirely broken. The war was still prolonged for a time, but ended in the entire ruin of Jabin, and the subjugation of his territories by the Israelites (Judg. iv, 24). This is the Jabin whose name occurs in Ps. lxxxxiii, 10. See Hazor.

Jabineau, Henri, a French religious writer, born at Etampes near the opening of the last century, was, after completing his studies at Paris, appointed professor or at the Vitré-le-Français College on his refusal to subscribe the formulary generally submitted before a candidate is permitted to enter the priesthood. But his attainments were of such superior order that the archbishop of Châlons-sur-Marne waived this obligation, and Jabineau was consecrated a priest, and he became rector at the College of Vitré. But he soon exchanged the rostrum for the pulpit, where, on account of his liberal views, he was several times interdicted. In 1768 he entered the lawyer's profession, and during the Revolution wrote a number of pamphlets against the French clergy of the Roman Catholic Church. He died in July, 1792, shortly before the publication of the decree of the National Assembly against priests (Aug. 26, 1792). The most important of his writings are, Comptence de la puissance temporelle relativement à l'érection et aux changements des sièges épiscopaux (Paris, 1790, 8vo; 1790, and often)—Explication des principes de la foi Catholique sur l'Eglise, recueilli des instructions familiaires de M. Joub... (published shortly after his death, Paris, 1792, 8vo). See Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Générale, xxvi, 142.

Jablonski, Daniel Ernst, a distinguished German theologian, was born at a little village near Dantzic Nov. 26, 1804. The name of his father, a preacher, was originally Fugger, but was changed in after life exchanged for it for Jablonki, deriving the name from that of his native place, Jablunka, a small village in Silesia. Young Jablonski was educated at the gymnasium of Lyssa, in Prussian Poland, and at the University of Frankfort on the Oder (now constituting the Berlin University), where he applied himself to literature and philosophy, but more especially to theology and the oriental languages. In 1860 he visited the universities and libraries of Holland and England, and spent considerable time at Oxford. On his return in 1868 he was appointed preacher at one of the reformed churches of Magdeburg, which place he left two years later in order to assume the rectorship of the gymnasium at Lyssa. In 1869 he was made court preacher at Königsberg, and in 1868 his name procured him the place of preacher to the king at Berlin. But still other honorable offices awaited him. Thus, in 1878 he was made member of the Consistory, in 1729 a Church councillor, and in 1738 he was elected president of the Royal Academy of Sciences at Berlin. At the request of the king, Frederick I, he labored earnestly but unsuccessfully, to accomplish an union of the Protestant churches; and was finally called to Berlin May 25, 1741. The greater part of his life had been devoted to severe study, and he was eminently successful as a preacher. Dr. Hagenbach (Hurst's transl. of Oh. Hist. of 18th and 19th Cent. i, 410, 412) says that Jablonski was a bishop among the Moravians (1808), and even was "the eldest of the Moravian bishops," and that he consecrated both David Nisschmann (q. v.) and
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count Zinzendorf for the episcopal office. At the instance of the queen, he was honored as early as 1706 with the degree of doctor of divinity. Jablonski translated into Latin the eight discourses of Richard Bentley against Atheism, the treatise of Joseph Woolward on the History of London, and the history of Hurren on predestination and grace; but he is especially celebrated by an edition of the Hebrew Bible, with notes and an introduction, published under the title of Biblia Hebraica cum notis Hebraicis (Berlin, 1693, 2 vols. 4to; 2d ed. 1712, 12mo). The preface has since been printed in other editions of the Hebrew Bible, and 18 editions have been printed, a list, by Leusden, of 2924 select verses, in which all the words to be found in the Bible are contained. He also published an edition of the Talmud, and wrote a number of religious works, the most important of which is Christliche Predigten (Berlin, 1716, etc., 10 parts, 4to).

Many of Jablonski’s writings bear on the state of the Church in Poland. One of the most able of them is the Historia Consensus Sionismni-inter religiose regnas Poloniae et Lituaniae (Berlin, 1731, 4to), etc. See Ersch u. Gruber, Allg. Encyklop. s. v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gen., xxvi, 146 sq.; Kitto, Cyclop. of Bib. Lit. & v. s. v.; Herzog, Real-Enzyklop. d. v.

Jabnoël (Hebrew Yabno‘el), built by God; Sept. יבנשי, but יבנוש in Josh. xix, 33), the name of two persons.

1. A town on the northern boundary of Judah, between Mount Baalah and the Mediterranean (Josh. xv, 11); probably the same elsewhere (2 Chron. xxvi, 6) called Jabned (v. q.) or Jabno‘a (1 Macc. iv, 15, etc.).

2. A city on the border of Naphthali between Nekeb and Lakum (Josh. xiv, 33). Schwarz (Palest. p. 181, 182) affirms that the later name of Jabnoel was Kefri Yumah, “the village by the sea,” and on Talmudic grounds (comp. Reband’s Palest., p. 545, 716) locates it on the southern shore of Lake Merom, and thinks it identical with the Jerusalem mentioned by Josephus as lying in this section of Upper Galilee (Ἰωναθά, Λίφα, 37; Ἰωναθω, War, ii, 20, 6). This is not improbable, as the boundary-line here described appears to have extended from the northern limit of Palestine along the eastern bounds of Naphthali to the southern limit of Joseph. It is probably the site visited by Dr. Robinson, on the declivity of the western mountain south of Lake Huleh, with a wady containing a small stream on the south of the village, and a few ruins of the Jewish type (Later Researches, p. 361, 362).

Jabneh (Heb. יבניא, יבניא, a building; Hamaner, Mecell. Phem, p. 256, compares the Arabic Yabnur; Sept. יבנושו, v. יבנשיו and יבנשיו, Vulg. Jabnitis, a Philistine town near the Mediterranean, between Joseph and Ashdod, whose wall king Uzziah demolished (2 Chron. xxvi, 6). It is probably this place whose name many of the copies of the Sept. insert in Josh. xv, 36 (Ὑβανου, Ἰωναθω), Cod. Vat. Iωναθω). In later times (Josephus, War, l, 7, 7; Strabo, xvi, 759; Pliny, v, 14), under the name of Jumna (Ἰωναθώ, 1 Macc. iv, 15; Ἰωναθα, 1 Macc. v, 68; x, 69; 2 Macc. xii, 8), it was inhabited by Jews as well as Gentiles (Philo, Opp. ii, 575). According to Josephus (Ant. xii, 8, 6), Gorgias was governor of it; but the text of the Macabbees (2 Macc. xii, 92) has Iudama. At this time there was a castle of the name of Tooth on a high rock that overtopped the vessels lying there, Judas set fire, and the conflagration was seen at Jerusalem, a distance of about twenty-five miles (2 Macc. xii, 9). The harbor is also mentioned by Pliny, who, in consequence, speaks of the town as double—due James (see Reband, p. 283). Like Ascalon, it was probably the harbor of the title of Mebo’ah, perhaps a Coptic word, meaning the “place on the sea” (Kenrick, Φανίσιον, p. 27, 29). Pompey took the place from the Jews and joined it to the province of Syria (Josephus, War, ii, 1, 7, 7). Its distance from Jerusalem was 240 stadia (2 Macc. xii, 7), from Diospolis twelve Roman miles (Itin. Anton.), from Ascalon 202 stadia (Strabo, xvi, 759).

At the time of the fall of Jerusalem, Jabneh was one of the most populous places of Judea, and contained a Jewish school of great fame, whose learned doctors are often mentioned in the Talmud. It was visited by Josephus (Wars, ii, 20, 6); Strabo (xvi, 759); Otho, Ier. Rabb., p. 283 sq.; Sperchius, Dis. de Academia Jambenni episcopi rectoribus, Viteb. 1749; Lightfoot, Acodem.Juln, histor, in his Opp. ii, 87 sq.). The Jews called this school their Sanhedrim, though it only possessed a faint shadow of the authority of that great council. See Maimonides, Sefer ha-ḥina, section 102; Lightfoot, ii, 141-143). In this holy city, according to an early Jewish tradition, was buried the great Gamaliel. His tomb was visited by Parchi in the 14th century (Zunz, in Asher’s Benj. of Tuluji, ii, 439, 440; also 96). In the time of Eusebius, however, it had dwindled to a small place (ῥήμα), merely requiring casual mention (Onomasticon, xv, Ἰωναθώ). In the 6th cen-
JABRUDA 725

JACKAL

Jabruda (Jacob's Well), a city of Palestine mentioned by Pudelym (v, 15), and as an episcopal city by St. Paulus (Geogr. Sacr. p. 294): now Yebri, a village, but still the seat of a bishop: rather more than an hour to the east of the great caravan road from Damascus to Jerash, midway between these two cities (Porter, Damascus, i, 960).—Van de Velde, Mem. 3:29; Robinson, Later Researches, p. 556.

Jachin (Heb. Yakan, zavith, mourner; Sept. 'isaiv, i. e. 'isaiv, one of seven chief Gaites "brothers resident in Bashan (1 Chron. v, 10). B.C. between 1059 and 782. Also see Akax.

Jachin (Heb. Yakin, isayim, firm; Sept. 'isaiv, i. e. 'isaiv, the name of three men and also of a pillar. 1. The fourth named of the sons of Simeon (Gen. xlvii, 11), called Jach in 1 Chron. iv, 24. His descendants are called Jachim in 1 Chron. vi, 20; and Isai in 1 Chron. iv, 22). 2. The head of the twenty-first "course" of priests as arranged by David (1 Chron. xxxiv, 17). B.C. 1014.

Jachin, one of the priests that returned to Jerusalem from the Exile (1 Chron. ix, 10; Neh. xi, 10). B.C. 536.

Jachin (Sept. in Kings I Kings iii, Alex. Alexi, isayim; i. e. Alex. Alexi, in both cases "colossus in brass," "Gebel" in the Aramaic (Isayim; Vulg. Jachin, Jachin, and Boaz were the names of two columns (the former on the right hand [south], the latter on the left) set up according to the Phoenician style: compare Menander in Josephus, Ant. viii, 5, 3; see V. Est., 244, 324, 326; Movers, Phön. 1, 203). In the porch (zem3) of Solomon's Temple stood these columns (Kings vii, 15—22; 2 Chron. iii, 17; comp. Jer. iii, 21), and doubtless of symbolical import (Simonia, Onomasticon, p. 480, 469). See Architecture: Temple. Each was eighteen cubits high and twelve in circumference, or four in diameter. They were formed of brass (copper or bronze, perhaps some more precious alloy) four fingers in thickness (1 Kings, 11), 50.

The capitals (quadrangular, Jer. iii, 28; 1 Kings vi, 17; 18: 22; 2 Chron. iii, 15). The description of the ornaments (of the same metal, Jer. iii, 22) of the capitals (1 Kings vii, 17; 2 Chron. iii, 15, 14; 12; Jer. iii, 22, 17; 2 Kings xi, 18) of the Temple, is given (Hitzig, Jerem. p. 493), either on account of the brevity or in consequence of some corruption in the text, and it is therefore no wonder that antiquarians (see Lamy, De Taberna, fod. p. 1043 sq.; Meyer, Blätt. f. k. k. Würth, i, 18 sq.; i, 81 sq.; Grünser, in the Stuttgart, Kuhn, 1831, No. 77 sq.; Keil, Tempel Solomons, p. 95 sq.; Schnaase, Gesch. der bld. Kunste, i, 245, 290) and architects (Schmidt, Bibl. Mathem., p. 285 sq.) should have varied greatly in their views and reconstructions on this subject. The text (1 Kings vi, 4, 8, 16; Scheuchzer, Phys. secr. iii, tab. 148 sq.) is varied: see Meyer, ut supra. It is clear, however, that the capitals were swelling at the top, and lily-shaped (1 Kings vii, 18, 20; comp. Josephus, Ant., viii, 3, 4). For discussions of various points connected with the subject, see Rosenmüller on Jer. iii, 22; Meyer's Bibelkommentar, p. 257; John, iii, 261; Movers, Chron. p. 232; Hirt, Gesch. d. Baukunst, tab. 3, fig. 20; Böttcher, Prob. alttest. Schriftfaul, p. 355; Keil, Comment. on 1 Kings vi, 15. Monographs on the subject have been written by J. G. Michaels, 1858, Unver. Legel, 1858, and Rülke, Berl. 1858; especially M. Plessen, De columna aenae, Viteb, 1714; also in Ugodini Theokerus, x; compare the treatises of Lightfoot, Keil, Hirt, and Bardwell on Solomon's Temple.—Winer, i, 520. See also BOAZ, PILLAR.

Jachin, ABRAMAH. See LEWI, SABBATAI.

Jachinite (Numb. xxxvi, 12). See JACHIN I.

Jacinth (iakouc, the hyacinth, properly a flower of a deep purple or reddish blue (iakouc, hyacinthin, i. e. hyacinth-colored, "of jacinth," Rev. ix, 17); hence a precious stone of like color (Rev. xxii, 20). Considerable doubt prevails as to the real mineral thus designated; but if indeed this particular stone be it, it is not rather any purplish or azure gem. According to Dr. Moore (Anc. Mineralogy, p. 169), it is most nearly related to the siercon of modern mineralogists. The hyacinth or jacinth stone was of various colors, from white or pale green to purple-red. Pliny speaks of it as shining with a golden color, and in much favor as an amulet or charm against the plague (Hist. Nat. xxxvii, 9). It occurs in the Sept. for wpay, Exod. xxxv, 5; also for wpay, Exod. xxxv, 4; but is usually supposed to represent the Heb. wpay, "figure" (q. v. (Rosenmüller, Bibl. Alterthumsk. i, p. 38). See GEM.

Jakkal, the Persic skala, Turkish jakal, comis austere of Linnaeus, has been thought to be denoted by several Hebrew words variously rendered in the Author. Vers. See FOX, DRAGON, WHELK. It is a wild animal of the canine family [see WOLF, Dog], which in Persia, Armenia, likewise Arabia (Niebuhr, Besch. 166), and even in Syria (Russell, Aleppo, ii, 61) and Palestine (around Jaffa, Gaza, and in Galilee, Hasselquist, Trav. p. 271; among the hills of Judæa, Robinson, ii, 432; iii, 188), is frequently met with, attaining a large size (three and a half feet in length), and so closely resembling a fox in color and general appearance as to be at first readily mistaken for that animal. But the jackal has a somewhat peculiarly formed head, not greatly unlike that of a shepherd's dog, about seven inches long, with a very pointed muzzle, and yellowish-red hair.
Eastern Jackals.

which resembles that of the wolf. The color of the body is yellowish-gray above, whitish below; the back and sides sometimes of mixed gray and black; the shoulders, thighs, and legs uniformly tawny-yellow. The tail is round, projecting, and reaching hardly to the heel. The eyes are large, with a round pupil. It is gregarious in its habits, hunting in packs (generally preying upon smaller animals and poultry, but frequently attacking the larger quadrupeds), the pest of the countries where it is found. It burrows in the earth, preferring forests and caverns, where it usually lies hid during the daytime; but at night it issues in companies (sometimes very large) on predatory incursions among the villages, and often the immediate vicinity of towns. Its favorite food is fowls or carrion, and it will break into graves to make a meal upon the corpse, and even carry off and devour young children if found unprotected.

In a wild state, this animal has an intolerably offensive odor. Colonel Hamilton Smith, in his Canidae, states that the jackals form a group of crepuscular and nocturnal canines, never voluntarily abroad before dark, and then hunting for prey during the whole night; entering the streets of towns to seek for offals, robbing the hen-roosts, entering out-houses, examining doors and windows, feasting upon all dressed vegetables and ill-secured provisions, devouring all the carrion they find exposed, and digging their way into sepultures that are not carefully protected against their activity and voraciousness; and in the fruit season, in common with foxes, seeking the vineyards, and fattening upon grapes. They congregate in great numbers, sometimes as many as two hundred being found together, and they howl so incessantly that the annoyance of their voices is the theme of numerous apologues and tales in the literature of Asia.

This cry is a melancholy sound, beginning the instant the sun sets, and never ceasing till after it has arisen. The voice is uttered and responded to by all within hearing, in an accent of every possible tone, from a short, hungry yelp to a prolonged crescendo cry, rising octave above octave in the shrillness, and mingled with dismal whinings, as of a human being in distress.

Their nocturnal howl has a peculiar wailing tone (Russel, *Aloepus*, p. 62; Russegger, *Reise*, iii, 125), greatly resembling the cry of a child. "These sinister, guilty, woe-begone brutes, when pressed with hunger, gather in gangs among the graves, and yell in rage, and fight like fiends over their midnight orgies; but on the battlefield, however, no proof of that howl! denotes exclusively the fox, and that *ijin*, and Solomon's little foxes, refer solely to jackals; particularly as these animals were, if really known, not abundant in Western Asia, even during the first century of the Roman empire; for they are but little noticed by the Greek writers and sportsmen who resided where now they are heard and seen every evening; these authorities offering no remark on the most prominent characteristic of the species, namely, the chorus of howlings lasting all night—a habit so intolerable that it is the invariable theme of all the Semitic writers since the Hegira whenever they mention the jackal. We may therefore infer that *sh dul*, if a general denomination, and that *ijin*, if the etymology be just, is derived from howling or barking, and may designate the jackal, though more probably it includes also those wild Canide which have this habit. Indeed, as Ehrenberg (*Icon. et descr. mamal. de 2*) has remarked, it is likely that travellers have usually confounded the jackal with the canis *Syriacus*, while a thorough treatise on the canis *caninus* is still a desideratum (see Wood, *Mammal. Anim.*, p. 56).

There is also another name for it in O. T., *Py* (uben plural by Chaldaism, *Py", *tamin", regarded by others as the singular, whence a true plural, *Py", *tamin", "dragons"), described as a wild animal inhabiting deserts, and uttering a plaintive cry (Job xxx, 29: Mic, i, 8); often joined (in poetical parallelism) with *Py", "daughter of the ostrich," and *Py", *ijin* (Isa, xiii, 22; xxxix, 13; xili, 20). The Syriac understands the jackal, and the Arabic the wolf (comp. Pococke, *Comm. in Mic. ad loc.; Schnurter, *Die Philol.* p. 326 sq.). It is possibly no more than the canis *Syriacus* after all. Bochart (Herviis, iii, 222 sq.) interprets it of an enormous kind of serpent. See DRAGONS.

Jackson, Arthur, an English Nonconformist divine, was born in Suffolk in 1590. He studied at Trinity College, Cambridge, became lecturer, and afterwards minister of St. Michael's, Wood Street. He frequently received the living of St. Faith's, but was ejected for nonconformity in 1662, and died in 1666. His annotations are still esteemed. His writings are principally in the exegetical department, and are generally considered valuable even in our day. Of these the best are, *A Helpe for the Understandinge of the Holy Scripture* (Camb. 1645, 8 vols. 4to):— *Anecdotes on...*
Jackson, Cyril, a celebrated English divine, was born in 1742. He was educated at Oxford University, and, after holding several benefices, was appointed dean of Christ Church, Oxford, which position he held until the time of his death, April 9, 1819.

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

Jackson, John, an English Arian divine and great Hebraist of the last century, was born at Lisleys, in Derbyshire, in 1710, and educated at Oxford University, and at Jesus College, Cambridge, where he took his bachelor's degree, but could not obtain that of master of arts on account of his Arian principles. In 1712 the corporation of Doncaster presented him with the rectory of Bostington, but the chancellor of the duchy of Lancaster having been asked why the churchman thus selected and consecrated was not a papist, he removed to the hospital, and in 1729 succeeded to its mastership. He died in 1763. Jackson carried on a lively controversy with several of England's most distinguished orthodox writers; divines; more especially with Bishop Warburton (q. v.). He also wrote a large number of works, the principal of which are, The Duty of a Christian set forth and explained in several practical Discourses, being an Exposition of the Lord's Prayer, etc. (Lond. 1728, 12mo):—The Existence and Unity of God proved from His Nature and Attributes, being a Vindication of Dr. Clarke's Demonstration of the Being and Attributes of God, etc. (Lond. 1784, 8vo):—The Belief of a future State proved to be a fundamental Article of the Religion of the Hebrews, and held by the Philosophers, etc. (Lond. 1745, 8vo):—Chromological Account, etc., for the Entertainment of J. C. MS. Years (Lond. 1752, 2 vols. 4to), and many other controversial pamphlets. See Dr. Sutton, Memoirs of the Life and Writings of J. J., etc. (Lond. 1764, 8vo);—Chalmers, Gen. Biog. Dictionary, s. v.;—Hook, Eccles. Biog. s. v.;—Hoeft, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxv, 142;—Allibone, Dict. of Authors, s. v.;—Garton, Biog. Dict. s. v.

Jackson, John Freylinghusen. See Jackson, William I.

Jackson, Samuel, a Wesleyan minister, who held the highest offices in the gift of the Wesleysans, and for many years was one of the greatest powers of English Wesleyanism, was born at Scraton, Yorkshire, Feb. 10, 1788. He was particularly prominent in the South-West circuit in 1805. He studied at the Wesleyan Institution, "he always took a lone path," says a writer in the London Quart. Rev. 1863, p. 261, "must be attributed the awakening among them (the Wesleysans) of that religious jealousy for the younger members of their societies and congregations, which of late has so much elevated their system of Sunday-school instruction, and has thrown the burden of a more thorough, ministerial oversight and training around multitudes of their youth, who might otherwise have passed unheeded under the perils that precede adult age. For some years before his death concern for the spiritual welfare of the young became a passion with Mr. Jackson; he wrote and preached the best sermons on the subject. He was plain in language, masculine in sentiment, ever abundant in simple but forcible illustrations. He died suddenly, Aug. 4, 1861. His brother Thomas, another celebrated minister of the Wesleysans, edited the sermons of Samuel Jackson, and prefaced them with a memoir of the author (London, 1863, 8vo).

Jackson, Thomas, D.D. an eminent English divine, was born at Willingdon, Durham, in 1579. He studied at Queen's College, Oxford, and after 1596 at Corpus Christi, of which he became vice-president. He was afterwards appointed successively vicar of Newcastle, president of his college in 1630, prebendary of Winchester in 1638, and, finally, dean of Peterborough in 1638. He died in 1640. Dr. Thomas Jackson enjoyed a great reputation for piety and learning; he was profoundly read in fathers and possessed a breadth of judgment. His works (commentaries, among these a valuable commentary on the Apostles' Creed, and sermons), which rank very high, form a magazine of theological knowledge, and are remarkable also for elegance and dignity of style. Southey places him among the very best of English divines, and George Herbert says, "I bless God for the confirmation Dr. Jackson has given me in the Christian religion against the Atheist, Jew, and Socinian, and in the Protestant against Rome." A new edition of his works, with a copious index, was published in 1824 (12 vols. 8vo). See Darling, Cyclop. Biblio. s. v.;—Biographia Britannica, s. v.;—Fuller, Worthies; Wood, Athenae Oxonienses (see Index, vol. i);—Hook, Eccles. Biog. s. v.

Jackson, William (1), born in 1782, was one of the earliest ministers of the Reformed (Dutch) Church in New Jersey. He began his studies for the ministry with the Rev. John Freylinghusen, whose daughter he married in 1757. The church at Bergen, N. J., which was the first of any denomination in the state, had existed ninety years without a pastor, being unable to procure one from the mother country. In 1758, in union with the Church on Staten Island, a call was made upon Mr. Jackson which bound him to go to Holland, complete his studies, and obtain ordination from the Classis of Amsterdam. These churches were to pay him £100 for his support while absent. Four years and three months elapsed before his return in 1757, when he assumed full pastoral charge, dividing his services equally between the two congregations. These facts show both the tenacity of Church life and the devotion of the people to the idea of a thoroughly educated ministry. The Cetus and Conferentie troubles, which had so long rent the churches, and which grew out of this very question of an educated ministry, were finally adjusted in 1771, through the intervention of Drs. John H. Livingston (q. v.) and his associates, and both Mr. Jackson and these churches rejoiced in the consummation. See REFORMED DUTCH CHURCH. His ministry lasted thirty-two years (1757-1789), when he became insane. He died in 1815. Mr. Jackson's literary and theological attainments were attested by academic degrees conferred by Yale, Columbia, and Princeton colleges. He was celebrated as a pulpitr orator, preaching in the Dutch language. His voice was commanding, and his popularity was such that "in Middlesex and Somerset counties he was visited as a field-preacher," and was constantly invited to Whitefield. On one occasion, at the Raritan church, the assembly was so large that he had to leave the pulpit and take a station at the church door to deliver his sermon, and the throng outside was greater than that which filled the building. His ministry was useful, acceptable, and successful with great and powerful congregations. One of his five sons, the Rev. John Freylinghusen Jackson, was for many years the pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church at Harlem, New York, where he died in 1836, at the age of sixty-eight years. He was a laborious, faithful, and devoted minister, and distinguished for his easy and graceful delivery. Books: Minutes of Classis and Township of Bergen; Corwin's Manual of the Reformed Church, p. 120. (W. J. R. T.)

Jackson, William (2), an English divine, broth
er of Cyril Jackson, born in 1750, was educated at Westminister School and Christ Church, Oxford. He obtained the degree of D.D. in 1779, and became, after having been preacher at Lincoln’s Inn, canon of Christ Church, regius professor of Greek in 1811, and bishop of Oxford. He died in November, 1815. He published some of his sermons (1784–1804). See Rich, Bibliotheca Americana, i, 317.

Jackson, William, D.D. (3), a Congregational minister, was born in Cornwall, Conn., Dec. 14, 1768. At the age of sixteen, when about commencing his studies preparatory for college, his mind became deeply impressed with religious truth, and he at once decided to devote himself to the ministry. He entered Dartmouth College in 1786, and graduated in 1790. For a time he taught a school in Wethersfield, Conn., but, finding that his services were needed in the Church, he commenced finally the study of theology under Drs. Spring and Simmons. In 1789 he was licensed to preach, and he performed ministerial labors first near his home, and afterwards in New Jersey. A call which had been given him by the Congregational Society at Dorset, Vt., in 1793, when feeble health obliged him to decline, was renewed three years after, and this time accepted. He was ordained Nov. 27, 1796. In 1807 he was obliged to ask his people for an assistant; and though his task had thus been made easier, his health continued to fail him, and he died Oct. 15, 1812.

In 1837 Middlebury College of which he had been a corporation member for several years, conferred on him the doctorate of divinity. Dr. Jackson possessed a mind of high order, sanctified by earnest devotion to the interests of the Church. "Dr. Porter, late of Andover, the companion of his youth, and particular friend in college, said of him, 'He is the only minister of his age who has kept up with the times. His mental enterprise and puniting for progress never left him.' "—Dr. J. Malby, in Sprague, Anns. of the American Pulpit, ii, 336.

Ja‘cob (Heb. Yaqobh), גַּפְּרֹת, suppliant, from גַּפְּרֹת, to bite the beet [to which significance there is allusion in Gen. xxv, 26; xxvii, 36; Hos. xii, 8; ] Sept. and N.T. 'Isaiah; Θεομιστός, which latter is identical with the Greek name for "James"), the name of two men in the Bible.

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

1. His conception is stated to have been supernatural (Gen. xxv, 21 sq.). Led by peculiar feelings, Rebekah went to her father’s house, where she was joined by her brother, through the intercession of Abraham, and was informed that she was about to become a mother, that her offspring should be the founders of two nations, and that the elder should serve the younger circumstances which ought to be borne in mind when a judgment is pronounced on her conduct in aiding Jacob to secure the privileges of birthright to the exclusion of his elder brother Esau. He was born with Esau, when Isaac was 60 and Abraham 150 years old, probably at the well Laahai-roi.

As the boys grew, Jacob appeared to partake of the gentle, quiet, and retiring character of his father, and was accordingly led to prefer the tranquil safety and pleasing occupations of a shepherd’s life to the bold and daring enterprises of the hunter, for which Esau had an irresistible predilection. The latter was his father’s favorite; however, while Rebekah evinced a partiality for Jacob (Gen. xxvi, 27, 29).

That selshness, and a prudence which approached to cunning, had a seat in the heart of the youth Jacob, appears but too plainly in his dealing with Esau, when he exacted from a famishing brother so large a price for a mess of pottage as the surrender of his birthright (Gen. xxvii, 28). B.C. cir. 1865. (See Kitto, Daily Bible Illust. ad loc.)

The leaning which his mother had in favor of Jacob would naturally be augmented by the conduct of Esau in giving up his birthright, doubtingless to his parents’ wishes, two Hittite women, who are recorded as having been a gift of men to Isaac and Rebekah (Gen. xxvi, 34, 35). B.C. 1646.

Conspicuous thus prepared the way for procuring the transfer of the birthright, when Isaac, being now old, proceeded to take steps to pronounce the irrevocable blessing, which acted with all the force of a modern testamentary bequest. This blessing, then, it was essential that Jacob should receive in preference to Esau. Here Rebekah appears as the chief agent, Jacob as the mere instrument in her hands. Isaac directs Esau to procure him some venison. This Rebekah hears, and urges her reluctant favorite to personate his elder brother. Jacob suggests difficulties; they are met by Rebekah, who is ready to incur any personal danger so that her object be gained (see Thubron, Land and People ii, 355). Her voice is obeyed, the food is brought, Jacob is equipped for the deceit; he helps out his fraud by direct falsehood, and the old man, whose senses are now failing, is at last with difficulty deceived (Gen. xxvii). B.C. 1297.

It cannot be denied that this is a most reprehensible transaction; to carry on a deceit so truly painful and sad a mother conspires with one son in order to cheat her aged husband, with a view to deprive another son of his rightful inheritance. Justification is here impossible; but it should not be forgotten, in the estimate we form, that Chief among the circumstances in favor of the nepotism were the circumstances in which the son of Abraham had been reared, the qualities that he had afterwards demonstrated, and the prospect to her was dark and threatening which arose when she saw the neglect of Esau at the head of the house, and his hateful wives assuming command over him.

For the sale of his birthright to Jacob, Esau is branded in the N. Test. as a "profane person" (Heb. xii, 16).

The following sacred and important privileges have been mentioned as connected with primogeniture in patriarchal times, and as constituting the object of Jacob’s desire: (a) Superior rank in the family (see Gen. xlix, 3). (b) A double portion of the father’s property (see Ex. xix, 35). (c) The priestly office in the patriarchal church (see Numb. xvii, 17–19). In favor of this, see Jerome, ad Ezech. Jps. lxxiii, § 6; Jarchi, in Gen. xxvii; Estius, in Hebr. xvi, 2; Aben-Ezra (see Deut. xxxii, 17, and Gen. lxxiv, 22). (d) The priestly office in the patriarchal church (see Numb. xvii, 17–19). In favor of this, see Jerome, ad Ezech. Jps. lxxiii, § 6; Jarchi, in Gen. xxvii; Estius, in Hebr. xvi, 2; Aben-Ezra (see Deut. xxxii, 17, and Gen. lxxiv, 22). (e) The priestly office in the patriarchal church (see Numb. xvii, 17–19). In favor of this, see Jerome, ad Ezech. Jps. lxxiii, § 6; Jarchi, in Gen. xxvii; Estius, in Hebr. xvi, 2; Aben-Ezra (see Deut. xxxii, 17, and Gen. lxxiv, 22). (d) The conditional promise or solemnization of the heavenly inheritance (see Carthwright in the Crit. Sacra on Gen. xxvii). (e) The promise of the covenant, by which all the nations of the earth should be blessed, though not included in the birthright, may have been so regarded by the patriarchs, as it was by their descendants (Rom. ix, 8, and Shuckford, viii).

The whole subject has been treated in separate essays by Vitringa in his Obserent. Sacr. i, 11, 2; also by J. H. Huttinger, and by J. J. Scheider. See Eysk, De sancta sanctorum praep. Ewarii (Wittenb. 1729); Gmelin, De benedict. paterna Esavro a Jacobo praeposita (Tib. 1706); Heydegger, Hist. Patriarchi, ii, 14. See BIRTHRIGHT.

With regard to Jacob’s acquisition of his father’s blessing (ch. xxviii), few persons will accept the excuse offered by St. Augustine (De Civ. Dei, xiii, 11): "It is not in the deceit which he practised: that it was merely a figurative action, and that his personation of Esau was justified by his previous purchase of Esau’s birthright. It is not, however, necessary, with the view of cherishing a Christian spirit, to heap opprobrium upon an fallenible man whom the choice of God has rendered venerable in the eyes of believers. Waterland (iv, 289) speaks of the conduct of Jacob in language which is neither wanting in reverence nor likely to encourage the extenuation of guilt: ‘I do not know whether it be justly imputed to Jacob; in particular, I suspect that it is not. But there were several very good and laudable circumstances in what Jacob and Rebekah did, but I do not take
upon me to acquit them of all blame. Blunt (Undes. Univ.) observes that none "of the patriarchs can be set up as a model of Christian morals. They lived under a code of laws that were not absolutely good, perhaps not so good as the Levitical: for, as this was but a preparatory for the more perfect law of Christ, so possibly was the patriarchal for the future law of Moses."

The circumstances which led to this unhappy transaction, and the retribution which fell upon all parties concerned in it, have been carefully discussed by Benson (Hulsean Lectures [1822] on Scripture Difficulties, xvi, xvii). See also Woodgate (Historical Sermons, i) and Malbone (Leaves of Joseph), x, xv. The first mention of the prophecies concerning Esau and Jacob, and on Jacob's dying blessing, see bishop Newton, Discourses on the Prophecies, § 3, 4.

Punishment soon ensued to all the parties to this iniquitous transaction (see Jarvis, Church of the Redeemer, p. 47). Fear seized the guilty Jacob, who is sent by his father, at the suggestion of Rebekah, to the original seat of the family, in order that he might find a wife among his cousins, the daughters of his mother's brother, Laban the Syrian (Gen. xxxviii). Before he is dismissed, Jacob agrees to a solemn blessing. It is obvious that he was on the point of being kept alive in the young man's mind the great promise given to Abraham, and thus to transmit that influence which, under the aid of divine Providence, was to end in placing the family in possession of the land of Palestine, and, in so doing, to make it "a multitude of people." The language, however, even to the age of Joseph, suggests the idea that the religious light which had been kindled in the mind of Abraham had lost somewhat of its fulness, if not of its clearness also, since "the blessing of Abraham," which had originally embraced all nations, is now restricted to the descendants of this one patriarchal family. And so it appears, from the language which Jacob employs (Gen. xxxviii, 16) in relation to the dream that he had when he tarried all night upon a certain plain on his journey eastward, that his idea of the Deity was little more than that of a local god. "Surely the Lord is in this place, and I knew it not."

Nor does the language which he immediately after employs show that his ideas of the relations between God and man were of an exalted and refined nature: "If God will be with me, and will keep me in the way that I go, and will give me bread to eat and raiment to put on, so that I come safely to my father's house in peace, then shall the Lord be my God."

The vision, therefore, with which Jacob was favored was not without occasion, nor could the terms in which he was addressed by the Lord fail to enlarge and correct his conceptions, and make his religion at once more comprehensive and more influential. Jacob's vision at Bethel is considered by Miegie in a treatise [De Scolla Jacobo] in the Theaurus monum Theologico-Philosophicus, i, 195. See also Augustine, Serm. cxvii; Kurz, History of the Old Covenant, i, 893.

2. Jacob, on coming into the land of the people of the East, accidentally met with Rachel, Laban's daughter, to whom, with true Eastern simplicity and politeness, he showed such courtesy as the duties of pastoral life suggest and admit (Gen. xxix). Here his gentle and affectionate nature displays itself under the influence of that habitude and the fair form of the youthful maiden. "Jacob kissed Rachel, and told her his mind, and his voice and wept." It must be borne in mind, however, that Jacob himself had now reached the mature age of seventy-seven years, as appears from a comparison of Joseph's age (Gen. xxx, 25; xlii, 46; xlv, 7) with Jacob's (Gen. lix, 31). He was 100 years old when his uncle the space of a month, Laban inquires of him what reward he expects for his services. He asks for the "beautiful and well-favored Rachel." His request is granted on condition of a seven years' service—a long period, true, but to Jacob "they seemed but a few days for the love he had to her." When the time was expired, the crafty Laban availed himself of the customs of the country in order to substitute his elder and "tender-eyed" daughter, Leah. In the morning Jacob found how he had been beguiled; but Laban excused himself, saying, "It must not be done in our country, to give the younger before the first-born." Another seven years' service gains for Jacob the beloved Rachel. Leah, however, has the companion of being of being the mother of the first-born, Reuben; three other sons successively follow, namely, Simeon, Levi, and Judah, sons of Leah. This fruitfulness was a painful subject of reflection to the barren Rachel, who employed I ngua on this occasion that called forth a reply from her husband which shows that, mild as was the character of Jacob, it was by no means wanting in force and energy (Gen. xxx, 2). An arrangement, however, took place, by which Rachel had children by means of her maid, Bilhah, of whom Dan and Naphtali were born. Two other sons, Gad and Asher, were born to Jacob of Leah's maid, Zilpah. Leah herself bare two more sons, namely, Issachar and Zebulun; she also bare a daughter, Dinah.

At length Rachel herself bare a son, and she called his name Joseph. As this part of the sacred history has been made the subject of cavi on the alleged ground of anachronism (see 1 Ch. iv, 25), it may be well to present here a table showing the chronological possibility of the birth of these children within the years allotted in the narrative (Gen. xxxii, 32; xxx, 24).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Father</th>
<th>Mother</th>
<th>Birth</th>
<th>R.C.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Reuben</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2500B.C.</td>
<td>1919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Simeon</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2500B.C.</td>
<td>1918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Levi</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2500B.C.</td>
<td>1917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Judah</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2500B.C.</td>
<td>1916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Dan</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>2500B.C.</td>
<td>1915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Naphthali</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>2500B.C.</td>
<td>1914</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Gad</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>2500B.C.</td>
<td>1913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Asher</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>2500B.C.</td>
<td>1912</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Zebulon</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td>Rachel</td>
<td>2500B.C.</td>
<td>1911</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Dinah</td>
<td>F</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2500B.C.</td>
<td>1910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Joseph</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2500B.C.</td>
<td>1909</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Jacob's polygamy is an instance of a patriarchal practice quite repugnant to Christian morality, but to be accounted for on the ground that the time had not then come for a full expression of the will of God on this subject. The mutual rights of husband and wife were recognized in the history of the Creation, but instances of polygamy as frequent among the patriarchs as among the sacred records, from Gen. iv, 19 to Herod (Josephus, Ant. vii, i, 2). In times when frequent wars increased the number of captives and orphans, and reduced nearly all service to slavery, there may have been some reason for extending the recognition and protection of this custom. In the case of Jacob, it is right to bear in mind that it was not his original intention to marry both the daughters of Laban. (See, on this subject, Augustine, Contra Finatum, xxii, 47-54.)

Most faithfully and with great success had Jacob served his uncle for fourteen years, when he became desirous of returning to his parents. At the urgent request of Laban, however, he is induced to remain for an additional term of six years. The language employed upon this occasion (Gen. xxx, 25 sq.) shows that Jacob's character had gained considerably during his absence, both in strength and comprehensiveness, the means which he employed in order to make his bargain with his uncle work so as to enrich himself, prove too clearly that his moral feelings had not undergone an equal improvement (see Baumgarten, Comment, i, 276), and that he was in the original tenacity of purpose, and the sons of his mother in deceit, had produced some of their natural fruit in his bosom. (Those who may wish to inquire into the nature and efficacy of the means which Jacob employed, may, in addition to the original narrative, consult Michaelis and Rosenmuller on the subject, as well as the following: Jussoe's Qwestus in Gen.; Plien, Hist. Nat. vii, 10; Oppian, Cyneget. i, 330 sq.; Michaelis,
The prosperity of Jacob dispelled and grieved Laban, so that he seemed no longer desirable. His wives are ready to accompany him. Accordingly, he set out, with his family and his property, "to go to Isaac his father in the land of Canaan" (Gen. xxxvi) (B.C. 1907). It was not till the third day that Laban learned that Jacob had fled, when he immediately set out in pursuit of his丢失的 goods. He was destined to a decisive battle. Laban had been spared from the whole narrative to be so plainly the true state of matters, that it seems needless to refer to other views that have been taken of it. But Jacob was not the man at any time to repel force with force, and he had now learned, by a variety of experiences, where to make the real search for Jacob andstaff that he had left behind. His impressions, however, on getting the intelligence, were those of trembling anxiety and fear; but, on recovering himself a little, he called to his aid the two great weapons of the believer—pains and prayer. He first divided his people, with the flocks and herds, into two companies, so that if the one were attacked the other might escape. Then he threw himself in earnest prayer and supplication on the covenant-mercy and faithfulness of God, putting God in mind of his past loving-kindnesses, at once great and undeserved; reminding him also of the promise he had made him in the presence of his brother; since the promise of the covenant, with the promise of his gracious presence, and implying his present need to establish the hopes he had inspired by granting deliverance from the hands of Esau. So ended the first night; but on the following day further measures were resorted to by Jacob, though still in the same way. Aware of the certain vigilance of his brother, and how "a gift in secret pacifieth anger," he resolved on giving from his substance a munificent present to Esau, placing each kind by itself, one after the other, in a succession of droves, so that on hearing, as he passed drove after drove, the touching words, "A present sent to my lord Esau from your servant Jacob," he might be like the pouring of live coals on the head of his wrathful enemy. How could he let his fury explode against a brother who showed himself so anxious to be on terms of peace with him? It could scarcely be, unless there were still in Jacob's condition the grounds of a quarrel between him and his God not yet altogether settled, and imperilling the success even of the best efforts and the most skilful preparations? But that there really was something of the sort now supposed seems plain from what ensued. Jacob had made his preparations, all his calculations; and, with his numerous family and large possessions, he has again reached in safety the borders of Canaan. But is there still no danger in front? Shortly after parting with Laban, he met, we are told, troops of angels, apparently a double band, and wearing somewhat of a warlike aspect, for he called the place in honor of them, by the name of Mahanaim (two camps) (Gen. xxxii, i, 2). Whether this sight was presented to him in vision, or took place as an occurrence in the sphere of ordinary life, may be questioned, though the latter supposition seems best to accord with the narrative; but it is not of material moment, for either way the appearance was a realty, and bore the character of a specific revelation to Jacob, adapted to the circumstances in which he was placed. It formed a fitting counterpart to what he formerly had seen at Bethel; angels were then employed to indicate the peaceful relation in which he stood to the heavenly power; when he obeyed to retire from Canaan, and now, on his return, they are again employed with a like friendly intent—to give warning, indeed, of a hostile encounter, but at the same time to assure him of the powerful guardianship and support of heaven. The formation of the angel was not longer maintained; for, on sending messengers to his brother Esau with a friendly greeting, and apprising him of his safe return after a long and prosperous sojourn in Mesopotamia, he learned that Esau was on his way to meet him with a host of 400 men. There could be no reasonable doubt, especially after the preliminary intimation given through the angelic bands, as to the intention of Esau in advancing towards his brother with such a force. The news of Jacob's reappearance in Canaan, and that no longer as a dependant upon others, but as possessed of ample means and a considerable retinue, awoke into fresh activity the slumbering reverence of Esau, and led him, on the spur of the moment, to resolve on bringing the controversy to a decisive issue.
JACOB 731 JACOB

next conflict, he maintained his ground, till the heavenly
ly combatant touched the hollow of his thigh and put it
out of joint, in token of the supernatural might which
this mysterious antagonist had at his command, and
showing how easy it had been for him (if he had so
pleased) to gain the mastery. But even then Jacob
would not quit his hold; nay, all the more he would re-
tain it, since he could not hold it. And Jacob should also,
it was plain he had to do with one who had the power
of life and death in his hand; he would, there-
fore, not let him go till he obtained a blessing. Faith
thus wrought mightily out of human weakness—strong
by this mysterious intervention, in the importunity for the favor of heaven, as expressed in
Hos. xii. 4: "By his strength he had power with God;
yea, he had power over the angel, and prevailed; he
wep and made supplication unto him." In attestation
of the fact, and for a suitable commemoration of it, he
had his name changed from Jacob to Israel (combatant
or wrestler with God); "for as a prince," it was added,
by way of explanation, "last thou power with God and
with men, and hast prevailed." Jacob, in turn, asked
after the name of the person who had wrestled with
him—not as if any longer ignorant who it might be, but
wishing to know his son's, in order that he might give
of God's head, as this had now appeared to him, embodied in
a significant and appropriate name. His request, howev-
er, was denied; the divine wrestler withdrew, after hav-
ing blessed him. But Jacob himself gave a name to the
place: he called it Peniel (the face of God), "for," said he,"I have seen God face to face, and
my life is preserved" (Gen. xxxii, 25-31). The contest
indicated that he had reason to fear the reverse; but his
preservation was the sign of reconciliation and blessing.
This mysterious intervention has been a fruitful source of
difficulty and misinterpretation (see Hofmann, Varría
Sacra, 185 sq.; Heumann, Synagog. diss., i, 147 sq.).
The narrator did not, we think, intend it for the account
of a dream or illusion (see Ziegler in Henke's Nat. Mrg., ii,
29 sq.; Hengstenberg, Bibl., p. 51; Hertzler, Geist der
Hebr. Poesie, i, 266; Smith's Bib. Dict., p. 460). A literal inter-
pretation may seem difficult, for it makes the Omnipot-
tent vanquish one of his own creatures, not without a
long struggle, and last at only by a sort of art or strata-
gem (compare similar accounts in heathen mythology,
Hauer, Heb. Mythol., i, 351 sq.; Movers, Phän. i, 483;
Bede, Hist. eccl., iv, 16). The custom of the same name
was said that the only way to express the narrative is to
dwell without the origin of our own associations, and
endeavor to contemplate it from the position in which its
author stood (see Bush's Note, ad loc.). Still, the ques-
tion remains, what was the sense of these words in their
exact sense? The question is far from settled in these terms? (see De Wette, Krit. d. Jtsch. p. 132;
Ewald, Israeliten, i, 453; Rosenmüller, Schol., ad loc.)
The design (says Wellbeloved, ad loc.), "was to encour-
age Jacob, returning to his native land, and fearful of
his brother's resentment, and to confirm his faith in the
existence and providence of God. And who will venture
to say that in that early period any other equally
efficacious means could have been employed?" (Comp.
the language already quoted [ver. 29].) A very obvious
end pursued throughout the history of Jacob was the
development of his religious convictions; and the event
in question, no less than the latter, has been enthrall the
dreams he had, may have materially conduced to so
important a result. That it had a lasting spiritual effect
upon Jacob is evident from the devout tenor of his after
life. (For a beautiful exposition of this event, see
Charles Wesley's poem entitled "WrestlingJacob.")

Compared Krummacher, Jacob Wrestling [Lond. 1885].

After this night of anxious but triumphant wrestling,
Jacob rose from Peniel with the sun shining upon him
(an emblem of the bright and radiant hope which now
illuminated his inner man), and went on his way hali-
ing—weakened corporeally by the conflict in which he
had engaged, that he might have no confidence in the
flish, but strong in the divine favor and blessing. Ac-
cordingly, when Esau approached with his formidable
host, all hostile feelings gave way; the victory had been
already won in the higher sphere of things, and he who
turned the hearts of kings like the rivers of water,
made the heart of Esau melt like wax before the liberal
gifts, the humble demeanour, and earnest appeal of the
brother. Then Jacob told—"and Jacob's heart was kindled
also, for the present at least, and for anything that appears
during the remainder of their personal lives, they main-
tained the most friendly relations.

4. After residing for a little on the farther side of
Jordan, at a place called Succoth, from Jacob's having
erected there three booths (Hebrew sukkoth) for his cattle, he
crossed the Jordan, and pitched his tent near Shechem,—ultimately the centre of the Samaritans. [In the re-
cieved text, it is said (Gen. xxxiv., 18), "He came to
Shalem, a city of Shechem"—but some prefer the read-
ing Shelom. "He came in peace to city of Shechem."]

There he bought a piece of ground from the family
of Shechem, and obtained a footing among the people as a
man of substance, whose friendship it was desirable to
cultivate. But ere long, having, by the misconduct of
Hamor the Hivite (see Dinah) and the base value of
his first-born son, the young men of Shechem in Canaan, Jacob is divinely directed, and,
under the divine protection, proceeds to Bethel, where
he is to "make an altar unto God, that appeared unto
thee when thou didst come from the face of Esau thy
brother" (Gen. xxxiv., xxxv). (B.C. cir. 1900). And en-
to the day, he commanded, first he purified his family
from "strange gods," which he hid under "the oak
which is by Shechem," after which God appeared to
him again, with the important declaration, "I am God
Almighty," and renewed the Abrahamic covenant.
With Bethel established for Ephraim, his beloved
Rachel lost her life in giving birth to her second son,
Benjamin (Gen. xxxv., 16-20) (B.C. cir. 1899). At
length Jacob came to his father Isaac at Mamre, the
family residence, in time to pay the last attentions to
the aged patriarch (Gen. xxxv., 37) (B.C. 1898). The
complete reconciliation between Jacob and Laban at
this time is shown by their uniting in the burial rites
of their father. Not long after this bereavement, Jacob
was robbed of his beloved son, Joseph, through the jeal-
ousy and base fraud of his brothers (Gen. xxxvii) (B.C.
1896). This loss is the occasion of showing Jacob's
strong and tender paternal feelings; for, on seeing
what appeared to be proofs that "some evil beast had
devoured Joseph," the old man "rent his clothes, and
put sackcloth upon his loins, and mourned for his son
many days, and refused to be comforted" (Gen. xxxvii,
35).

A widely extended famine induced Jacob to send his
sons down into Egypt, where he had heard there was
corn, without knowing by whose instrumentality (Gen.
xxxiii, 26) (B.C. 1875). The patriarch, however, retained
his youngest son Benjamin, "lest mischief should befall
him," as it had befallen Joseph. The young men re-
turned with the needed supplies of corn. They related,
however, that they had been taken for spies, and that
there was but one way in which they could disprove
the charge, namely, by carrying down Benjamin to "the
lord of the land." This Jacob vehemently refused (Gen.
xxxvii, 36). The pressure was so great, and the length
forced Jacob to allow Benjamin to accompany his
brothers on a second visit to Egypt; whence, in due
time, they brought back to their father the pleasing in-
telligence, "Joseph is yet alive, and he is governor over
all the land of Egypt." How naturally is the effect of
this on Jacob told—and Jacob's heart was kindled
also, for the present at least, and for anything that appears
during the remainder of their personal lives, they main-
tained the most friendly relations.

When, however, they had gone into particulars, he added, "Enough, Joseph my son is yet
alive; I will go and see him before I die." Touches
of nature like this suffice to show the reality of the
history before us, and, since they are not unfrequent in
the book of Genesis, they will of themselves avail to sustain
its credibility against all that the enemy can do. The passage, too, with others recently cited, strongly proves how much the character of the patriarch had improved. In the whole of the latter part of Jacob's life he seems to have gradually parted with many less desirable qualities, and to have become at once more truthful, more energetic, more constant, affectionate, more wily, in the largest sense, a word which, as it is seldom used, requires encouragement. "In the visions of the night," Jacob goes down to Egypt (B.C. 1874), and was affectionately met by Joseph (Gen. xlvii. 29). Joseph proceeded to conduct his father into the presence of the Egyptian monarch, when the man of God, as an act of reconciliation and dignity which the religion gives, instead of offering slavish adulation, "blessed Pharaoh." Struck with the patriarch's venerable air, the king asked, "How old art thou?" What composition and elevation is there in the reply, "The days of the years of my pilgrimage are a hundred and thirty years; few and evil have the days of the years of my life been, and have not attained unto the days of the years of the life of my fathers in the days of their pilgrimage" (Gen. xlviii. 10). Jacob, with his sons, now entered into possession of some of the best land of Egypt, where they carried on their pastoral occupations, and soon began to grow rich in large share and as a quantity. The aged patriarch, after being strangely tossed about on a very rough ocean, found at last a tranquil harbor, where all the best affections of his nature were gently exercised and largely unfolded (Gen. xlviii. sq.). After a long and eventful journey, being informed that his father was sick, went to him, when "Israel strengthened himself, and sat up in his bed." He acquainted Joseph with the divine promise of the land of Canaan which yet remained to be fulfilled, and took Joseph's sons, Ephraim and Manasseh, distinguishing them by an adoption equal to that of Reuben and Simeon, the oldest of his own sons (Gen. xlviii. 5). How impressive is his benediction in Joseph's family (Gen. xlviii. 10, 16): "God, before whom my fathers Abraham and Isaac did walk, the God which fed me all my life long unto this day; the angel which redeemed me from all evil, bless the lads; and let my name be named on them, and the name of my fathers; and let them grow into a multitude in the midst of the earth." "And Israel said unto Joseph, Behold, I die; but God will be with you, and bring you again unto the land of your fathers." (ver. 21). Thus having enquired of his sons the venerable patriarch pronounced on them also a blessing, which is full of the loftiest thought, expressed in the most poetical diction, and adorned by the most vividly descriptive and engaging imagery (see Stähelin, Anlaufsversionen in Jacobi exegyesia, Heidelberg, 1927), showing how deeply religious his character had become, how freshly it retained its fervor to the last, and how greatly it had increased in strength, elevation, and dignity: "And when Jacob had made an end of commanding his sons, he gathered up his feet into the bed [i.e. knelt towards the bed's head (see Delitzch in Heb. xi. 21) rather than bowed over the top of his staff as Stuart, ad loc. (see Staff)], and yielded up the ghost, and was gathered unto his people" (Gen. xlix. 33), at the ripe age of 147 years (Gen. xlviii. 29). B.C. 1857. His body was embalmed, carried with great care and pomp into the land of Canaan, and deposited with his fathers, and his wife Leah, in a cave of Machpelah. The mournful pursuit of this funeral procession is ingeniously supposed by Dr. Kittel (Piet. Hist. of Jews, i. 136) to have been the more circuitous one afterwards taken by the Israelites by the way of Mount Seir and across the Jordan, the object being to carry with them the coffin of the Philistines, who lay in the direct route. Dr. Thomson objects to this as an unnecessary deviation (Land and Book, ii. 385), urging that the Bethghas, which Jerome identifies with the Area-Atad or Abel-mizraim (q. v.), as the scene of the mourning ceremonies, lay near Gaza; but in this case it is certainly difficult to explain the constant statement that the spot in question was situated "beyond the Jordan," as it clearly implies a crossing of the river by the caudaciel.

In the list of Jacob's lineal descendants given in Gen. xlvi. 8-27, as being those that accompanied him on his removal to Egypt, there is evidence that the list was rather made up to the time of his decease, or perhaps (even Ne Uganda, his Postotaulis, is 290 sq): for we find mention not only of the eldest (some of whom will appear to be even grandsons) of Benjamin, at the date of that emigration a youth (see xlvii, 20, 30-34), but also the children of Pharez, at that time a mere child (comp. xxviii, 1). See Benjamin. Therefore, the genealogical difficulty in making out the total of seventy persons there stated, as well as the sum of sixty-six included in it, and likewise the aggregates of the posterity of the several wives as there computed. This difficulty is further enhanced by the number seventy-five assigned by Ne-ohen (Acts vii. 14) to Jacob's family at the same date. This last statement, however, cannot be disposed of in the manner frequently adopted by including the wives of Jacob and his sons (for it does not appear that they are all referred to, and it is probable that they would have swelled the number more largely if admitted), but is rejected by those who, adhering without scruple or caring to discuss its accuracy) from the Sept., which gives that total in the passage in Genesis, but inconsistently attributes nine sons to Joseph in place of two. Of all the explanations of the other discrepancies, that which alleges that the genealogists wished to give the exact number of the genealogical list of Chronology, ii. 180), but it has the inauspicious objections of including Jacoh himself' among the number of his own posterity, and of not conforming to the method of enumeration in the text. A comparison of Num. xxvi, 6 shows that the name of Eliah, the son of Pallu and grandson of Reuben, and the name of Joseph, the eldest of his own sons (Gen. xlviii. 5), shows that the descendant of Jacob from their state of alienation from God by recalling to their memory the repeated acts of God's favor shown to their ancestor. Malachi, (i, 2) strengthens the desponding hearts of the returned exiles by reminding them that subsequent generations would have inherited the favor which was bestowed upon Jacob was not withheld from them. Besides the frequent mention of his name in conjunction with those of the other two patriarchs, there are distinct references to events in the life of Jacob in four books of the N.T. In Rom. ix, 11-15, Paul adds the history of Jacob to prove that the favor of God is independent of the order of natural descent. In Heb. xii, 16, and xii, 91, the transfiguration of the saint and his possession of land at Shchem, are cited in John i, 51, and iv, 12. Stephen, in his speech (Acts vii. 16, mentions the famine which was the means of restoring Jacob to his lost son in Egypt, and the burial of the patriarch in Shchem.

In Jacob may be traced a combination of the quiet patience of his father with the acquisitiveness which seems to have marked his mother's family; and as in Ishmael, the migratory and independent character of Abraham was developed into the enterprising habits of a warlike hunter-chief. Jacob, whose history occupies a larger space, leaves on the reader's mind a less favorable impression than either of the other patriarchs with whom he is connected in the N.T. (Matt. viii, 11). But, in considering his character, we must bear in mind that we know not what limits were set in those days to the knowledge of God and the sanctifying influence of the Holy Spirit. A timid, thoughtful boy would acquire no self-reliance in a secluded home. There was little scope for the exercise of intelligence, wide sympathy, generosity, frankness.

up a stranger to the great joys and great sorrows of natural life—deaths, and weddings, and births; inured to caution and restraint in the presence of a more vigorous brother; secretly stimulated by a belief that God designed for him some superior blessing, Jacob was perhaps in a fair way to become a narrow, selfish, deceitful, disappointed man. But, after dwelling for more than half a lifetime in solitude, he is driven from home by the provoked hostility of his more powerful brother. Then, in deep and bitter sorrow, the outcast begins life afresh long after youth has passed, and finds himself brought first of all unexpectedly into that close personal communion with God which elevates the soul, and then into that enlarged intercourse with men which is capable of drawing out all the better feelings of human nature. An unseen world was opened. God revived and renewed to him that slumbering promise, over which he had brooded for three-score years since he had learned it in childhood from his mother. Angels conversed with him. Gradually he felt more and more the watchful care of an ever-present spiritual Father. Face to face he wrestled with the representative of the Almighty. And so, even though the moral consequences of his early transgressions hung about him, and saddened him with a deep knowledge of all the evil of treachery and domestic envy, and partial judgment, and filial disobedience, yet the increasing revelations of God enlightened the old age of the patriarch; and at last the timid "supper-planter," the man of subtle devices, waiting for the salvation of Jehovah, dies the "soldier of God," uttering the messages of God to his remote posterity. (See Nie- meyer, Charokk. ii, 290 sq.; Stanley, Jewish Church, i, 58 sq.) For reflections on various incidents in Jacob's life, see Bp. Hall's Contemplations, bk. iii; Blunt, Hist. of Ja- cob (Lond. 1832, 1860).

Many Rabbinical legends concerning Jacob may be found in Eisenmenger's Hist. Judæoth., and in the Jera- lem Targum. (See also Otho, Let. Rabb. p.286; Hambur- ger, Talmud. Wörterb. a. v.). In the Koran he is often mentioned in conjunction with the other two patriarchs (chap. ii, elsewhere). See MOHAMMEDANISM.

JACOB also occurs in certain poetical and conventional phrases, borrowed from the relations of the patriarch to the theocracy and state. "God of Jacob," יִבְנוֹסָא (Exod. iii, 6; iv, 5; 2 Sam. xxviii, 1; Ps. xx, 2; Isa. ii, 3); or simply "Jacob" (Ps. xxiv, 6, where the term יִבְנוֹסָא appears to have fallen out of the text); also "mighty One of Jacob," יִבְנְזָא (Ps. xxxii, 2), are titles of Jehovah as the national deity. "Jacob" frequently stands for his posterity or the Israelitish people; but poetically chiefly, "house of Jacob," יִבְנָא יִשְׂרָאֵל (Exod. xix, 3; Is. ii, 5, 6; viii, 17; Amos iii, 13; Is. vii, 2; Mic. ii, 7; Obad. 17, 18), "seed of Jacob," יִבְנָא יִשְׂרָאֵל (Isa. xiv, 19; Jer. xxxii, 26), "sons of Ja- cob," יִבְנָא יִשְׂרָאֵל (1 Kings xviii, 37; Mal. iii, 6), "con- gregation of Jacob," יִבְנָא יִשְׂרָאֵל (Deut. xxxii, 4), and simply "Jacob," יִשְׂרָאֵל (Num. xxii, 7, 10, 21, 23; xxiv, 5, 17, 19; Deut. xxxii, 9; xxxiii, 10; Ps. xiv, 7, 11; Lv. 5, Is. xxviii, 6; Jer. x, 25; xxxi, 11; Amos vi, 7; vii, 8, 11; xxxv, 7), all put for the house or family of Jacob; whence the expression "in Jacob," יִבְנָא יִשְׂרָאֵל (Gen. xliv, 7; Lam. ii, 3), i.e. among the Jewish people. Very generally the name is used for the people as an individual, and with the epithets appropriate to their patriarchal progenitor, e.g. "Jacob, my servant" (Isa. xlv, 1; xlv, 4; xlvii, 20; Jer. xxx, 10; xlv, 27, 28), "Jacob thy (Edom's) brother" (Obad. 10). In like manner with the term Israel, "Jacob" is even spoken of the kingdom of Ephraim, which had arrogated to itself the title proper only to the entire nation (Isa. ix, 7; xvii, 4; Mic. i, 5; Hos. x, 11; xii, 3); and, after the destruction of the northern kingdom, the same expression is employed of the remaining kingdom of Judah (Nah. ii, 3; Obad. 10).
See Isaiah, Discriminative uses of "Jacob" and "Israel" (London, 1854). Comp. Isra'il.

JACOB WELLS (γεννῶν τοῦ Iακωβ), on the curb of which Christ sat down during his interview with the Samaritan woman at Sychar (John, vii. 10-12), at the foot of Mount Gerizim (Arvieux, ii, 66; Schubert, iii, 136). It is bored through the solid rock, and kept covered with a stone by the Arabs (see Hackett's Illustrations, p. 199 sq.). It is thus described by Porter in Murray's Handbook for Syria, ii, 940: "Formerly there was a square hole opening into a carefully built vaulted chamber, about ten feet square, in the floor of which was the true mouth of the well. Now a portion of the vault has fallen and completely covered up the mouth, so that nothing can be seen but a shallow pit, half filled with stones and rubbish." Dr. Wilson (Lands of the Bible, ii, 57) carefully measured the well, and found it nine feet in diameter, and seventy-five feet deep. It was probably much deeper in ancient times, as there are signs of considerable accumulation of stones and rubbish below its present bottom; and Maundrell (March 24) says that in his time it contained thirty-five yards of water, and five feet deep. It contains at times a few feet of water, but at others it is quite dry. Over the well there formerly stood a large church, built in the 4th century, but probably destroyed before the time of the Crusades, as Sseull (p. 45) and Phocas do not mention it. Its remains are just above the well, towards the south-west, merely a shapeless mass of ruins, among which are seen fragments of gray granite columns still retaining their ancient polish (Robinson's Biblical Researches, iii, 132). (For other descriptions, see Hamesveld, ii, 396 sq.) See Simeon.

2. JACOB (Iακωβ) was the name of the father of Joseph, the husband of the Virgin Mary (Matt. i, 15, 15). B.C. ante 40. See Mary.

JACOB OF EDessa (so called after the name of his residence), one of the most celebrated Syrian writers and theologians, flourished in the second half of the 7th century. He was born in the village of Indikib (in Antioch), and in early life entered the monastic order. About the year 651 he was appointed bishop of Edessa; but his zeal for the cause of the Church often led him astray, and he made many enemies among the clergy, and finally resigned the episcopal dignity, retiring to a life of seclusion in a monastery near Tarsus. He began an extended study of the Syriac Version of the Old Testament, and made many valuable corrections and annotations, of which parts still remain to us (compare Sylvester de Saey, in Eichhorn's Biblioth. bibl. Litter. viii, 571 sq.; Notices et extraits des MSS, ii, 648 sq.; Eichhorn, Bibl. bibl. Litter. ii, 370; the same in d. A. T. ii, § 360 sq.). After the decease of his successor at Edessa he was invited to resume the duties of the bishopric, but he died while on his journey, June 5, 708. Jacob of Edessa was a zealous advocate of Monophysitism, and he is greatly revered by the Jacobites (q.v.), while he is highly esteemed also by the Monorites. He was distinguished for his thorough knowledge of the Syriac, Hebrew, and Greek, and translated a number of Greek works into Syriac, a task which he so ably discharged that he was honored with the surname of "interpreter of the books" (in the Syriac, Ṣeγὶ ܕܥܕ ܢܐ, ܩܕܕ ܦܠ). He wrote commentaries and scholia on the O. T. and N. T., and his works are contained in the Latin edition of Epanom (comp. Assemani, Biblioth. Orient. i, 476 sq.). See Herogn, Real-Encyclopädie, vi, 379 sq.; Holle Encyclopädie, 2d. lexi. xiii, 165-167. (J. H. W.)

JACOB OF HUNGARY, surnamed the Master, a fanatic and adventurer, and the chief of the Pastoureux or Shepherds, is supposed to have been a native of Hungary, though nothing definite is known as to his origin. In his youth he joined the Cistercian order, but is said to have forsaken it and embarked for a life of constant travel. He, however, is a matter of doubt, some even reversing the order of his conversion from one faith to the other. He was also represented as having learned the occult arts from the Moors of Spain, and also as having been a traitor to France. At any rate, we find him at Easter, A.D. 1251, heading a popular movement in favor of his being elected the next emperor, and then a prisoner at Cassarea. The king, apparently forsaken by the nobility and clergy, was the idol of the people. Jacob travelled through the provinces, preaching a crusade in which none but the poor and lowly should take part, God having forsaken the populous and the great on account of their pride, and the clergy on account of their licentiousness. He claimed to have visions, to have received a direct message from the Virgin, etc. "He was an aged man," says Milman, "with a long beard, and pale, emaciated face; he spoke Latin, French, and German in the same fluid persuasive- ness; he preached without authority of pope or prelate." The eloquence of the Master of Hungary stirred the lowest depths of society. The shepherds, the peasants, left their flocks, their stalls, their fields, their ploughs; in vain friends, parents, wives remonstrated; they took no thought of wealth or choice of life. So, as one of them, "as the leadstone draws the iron," he soon had a large number of followers, who received the name of Pastoreus or Pastoureaux, from the fact that the first and the most of his followers were shepherds or peasants. Both the magistrates and queen Blanche, thinking they might become adventures in securing an liberation of the king, encouraged them for a time. Soon, however, their ranks were swelled by a number of vagrants, thieves, highwaymen, and all the scum of the population, attracted by the prospect of spoils. They had started from Flanders in the direction of Paris, and when they reached Amiens they numbered 30,000. These recruits wore daggers, swords, battle-axes, and all the implements of warfare. Received and entertained by the citizens of Amiens, they gained new adherents, and their number swelled to 60,000, and on their arrival at the gates of Paris they were the same formidable body of 100,000 armed men. Siamonsi says: "Their hatred of the priests was as great as their hatred of the infidels. They had preachers who never had been ordained; their teachings were far from orthodox, and they assumed the right of setting aside ecclesiastical discipline; they granted divorces and permitted marriages with the priests denounced as contrary to the canons." They were especially bitter against the monastic orders, and a number of monks were murdered by them. The authorities began to regret having encouraged them; yet they were allowed to enter Paris, and Jacob went so far as to officiate publicly in the church of St. Eustache. Several murders marked their stay in the capital. Finding his forces considerably increased, Jacob divided them into several bands, under pretense of embarking them at different points for the Holy Land. One of these bands went to Orleans, where they massacred all the priests and monks that they could find, then went to Bourges, where the priests carefully keeping out of the way, they attacked the Jews, demolishing their synagogues and plundering their houses. Effective measures were at last taken to put a stop to these excesses. They were excommunicated by the Church, and the authorities invited the people to arm against and war on them. Jacob was still in the capital. One day, by order of the queen, an executioner mingled with the crowd who surrounded him, and, while he was preaching, cut off his head with a single blow of the axe. At the same time, a number of knights chased the followers, who were dispersed. The other bands met with the same fate, and an end was put at the same time to the depredations and to the sect. See Matthew Paris, Hist. Angliae; Guillaume de Naguis, Chron. in Spicili.

From this account of Jüterbog (or Jacobus Cisterciensis, etc.) we learn that he was born at Jüterbog about 1385. When yet quite young he entered the Cistercian monastery De Paraduio, situated in Poland, and afterwards went to Cracow to procure the doctorate. Distinguished for scholarship and piety, he soon became the acknowledged leader among his fellow monks, and was finally elected abbot of the monastery. Some time after he removed to Prague, but, growing dissatisfied with the many fulminations of men who professed to have quitted the world to seek an alliance with God, but who, in truth, had only entered the monastic order because it was the road to distinction, he advocated a reform of the Church, and at a time fostered the thought of forsaking the monastic life altogether. He changed to the Carthusian order, removed to one of their monasteries at Erfurt, was here also greatly beloved for his superior abilities, and became prior of the monastery. He died in 1645. Jacob of Jüterbog was also regarded as an authority of the mystics of the 14th century, and virtually a forerunner of the Reformation—one of the Johannes preparing the way for Luther. Characteristic of his efforts for a reformatory movement are his Sermones notables et formales de tempestr et de sanctis:—Libelli tres de arte curandi evita (in Joh. Wesseli Opus, Amst. 1617);—Libre de veritate dicendi;—Tract. de causis multarum passionum (in Peczeli Biblioth., ascet. vii);—De indulgentiis;—De neglecienda Prelaturum (in Walch, Monum., med. or., ii, Fasc. 1);—De septem ecclesiis statutaribus opusculum (Walch, Fasc. 2).

Especially in the last work he declares that a reform of the Church could only be effected by subj ecting the whole clergy, from the pope downward, to a thorough change. He vehemently opposed the absolute power of the papal chair, the right of the pope to control the councils, and naturally enough denied the infallibility of the so-called "vicar of Christ." See Ullmann, Reformers before the Reformation, i, 298, 299; Trithemii Catal. illustr., vironum, i; Herzog, Real-Encykl., vi, 380, 381; Bibliotheca Sacra, i, 484 sq.

Jacob of Lontos, a Jewish Rabbi who flourished in England at the opening of the 14th century, was appointed by king John, at the commencement of his reign, when yet friendly to the Jews, and uninfluenced by the disquisitions of the fanatical prelate Stephen Langton, as chief Rabbi of England ("prosbyteryus omnium jurisdictionis totius Angliciae"). Jacob was a man of great learning; especially conversant with Jewish tradition, and held in high esteem by Jews and Gentiles. Even the king hesitated not to call him his dear friend ("dilectus et familiaris noster"). Unfortunately, we have no knowledge of any of his literary productions, which, by a man of his abilities, must have been valuable, especially as an index to the history of the Jews in England under king John. See Gritz, Gesch. d. Juden, vii, 16. (J. H. W.)

Jacob of Missa (Jacobi de Missa, also called, on account of his small stature, Jacobellus, i. e. Jacob the Short), one of the most prominent figures in the polemical controversy inaugurated by Huss, was born about the second half of the 14th century, at Missa, in Bohemia. He was educated at the University of Prague, and then became priest at Trina, and ultimately at Prague, in the jurisdiction of the Breslavienses. He was led to inquire into the antiquity of the Roman Catholic mode of administering the sacrament, and, after a careful study of the writings of the early Church, became convinced that the Roman Church had no right or authority to deprive the laity of the cup, and by his tongue and by his pen he became a vociferous and uncompromising opponent of the malpractice, himself also deviating from the usage, and administering the cup to the laity. Excommunicated by the archbishop of Prague, he challenged the university authorities to refute his arguments, and further defended his course by his pen: Venaticus u. Replieatio contra Andreas Brodumor. The apologetic work which he thus so successfully received from the pseudonym of Theodorus, was neither serious to the Council of Constance, just then in session, and every effort was made to refute Jacob of Missa. But soon Huss also came forward, and declared that the early fathers had been taught by the disciples that Christ desired both the wine and the bread to be given to the laity, and when arranged as a heretic before the bar of the council, he still continued to reiterate his former statements (compare Hist. et Monum. J. Huys atque Hieron. Prognosis, Novinum, 1715, i, 52 sq.; V. d. Hardt, Magnum acceunenium Constantii Concilium, etc., iv, 291). Jacob of Missa, thus encouraged by the attitude of Huss, a classmate of his at the university, more vigorously than ever defended his position, and sought further to prove the accuracy of his statements in Demutratio per testimonia Scripturarum patrum atque doctorum communicationem calices in pcele Christianae esse necessarium. (in V. d. Hardt, Magnum, iii, 804 sq.). Of course his opponents could not long continue in silence, and they naturally, though awkwardly enough, endeavored to refute him by proofs from the Bible and the Church fathers. Perhaps the most able, i. e. the most ridiculous of all, and the most vehement of the opposition documents, was the anonymous Epistola de altitudine (in V. d. Hardt). There were even some who attempted to prove that the deprivation of the cup had its sanction in the Old-Testament Scriptures! Thereupon the council convened at Constance (the 13th session, June 15, 1415) again condemned the course of Jacob of Missa, although it virtually admitted that he had claimed for himself (see Giesler, Kirchen Gesch. II., ii, 227 sq., in the 4th ed.);

Jacob again defended his course by an Apologia pro communione pibla, which was replied to by the celebrated Gerson in his Conc. publ. concens. J. de Missa et Bohemorum quaestionis, doctet sub nom. monasterum uberos discutientiem. Notwithstanding the frequent denunciations of his course, he continued to hold his parish, and even took up his pen in behalf of many other peculiar doctrines of the Romanists. Thus he opposed the Waldensians on the doctrine of purgatory (in V. d. Hardt, De purgatorio animarum. On their comments (in Walch, Monum. med. or., i, fasc. iii, p. 1 sq.) he also wrote De juramento, de antichristo, and prepared a translation of the works of Wycliffe. He died at Prague, Aug. 9, 1425. The result of the controversy on the cup resulted, as is well known, in a triumph for the Unionists. See Missa, De Missa, etc., primo Exorcistici. Caelica per eccles. Bob. ridad (Altdorf, 1578, 4to); Spittler, Gesch. d. Kirche i. iweil. Abendnach. p. 49 sq.; Schriickh, Kirchengesch. xxiil, 382 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encykl., vi, 384 sq.; Gillett, Life of Huss (1871, 2 vols. 8vo). (J. H. W.)

Jacob of Nabis (often surmised Jacob the Great), the instructor of Euphrasie the Syrian, and a relative of Gregory the illuminator, flourished as bishop of Nabis (Zoba) in the first half of the 4th century. The little that is known of him makes it out to have been a man "distinguished for ascetic holiness and for miraculous works," clothed in rough garments, like many of the early characters, in such a mythic dress that the character is often placed in a most ridiculous light (comp. Stanley, Eastern Church, p. 193). In his early life he "spent many years as a hermit in forests and caves, and lived like a wild beast on roots and leaves," clothed in a rough garment, and named the third pillar of the world (comp. Schaff, Chronicle, ii, 399).
He died about 338. As a writer, Jacob of Nisibis hardly gained distinction; his authorship is even questioned by many. A number of works are attributed to him, but under his name are preserved only an Armenian translation of a letter to the bishops of Seleucia and Edessa (which may have been preserved by direction of Assemani for the Vatican (Bibl. Ori. i, 557 sq., 632). An edition, with a Latin translation and notes, was prepared and published by cardinal Antonelli (1756, folio; Venice, 1765; Const. 1824). See, besides Schaff and Stanley, Neumann, Gesch. d. Armen. Lit., p. 18 sq.; Dietrich, Uebers. av. Jacob. der Nisib. Hezorh, Real-Encyklopädie, vi., 396. (J. H. W.)

Jacob of Sarco, a celebrated writer and teacher of the Syrian Church, was born at Curtanum, on the Euphrates, in 452. He was made a presbyter in 505, and attained the distinction of bishop in 519. He was honored by the surname of “doctor” (Syri. Mal-pânu), and by that of “the universal” (Syri. Tābêko). He was the author of an innumerable number of works. Thus not less than 768 homilies in verse are attributed to him (of which Barhebræus had 182), besides expositions, an anaphora, a form of baptism, hymns, and letters. But evidently many works are falsely attributed to him, as Assemani (Bibl. Orient. ii, 532) has proved. Many of his writings are still used in the Syrian churches at public worship, and have also been translated into Arabic. Several of his hymns are contained in the Brev. ferdle Syr. and in the Offic. Dom. (Rome, 1578), a poetic eulogy which he pronounced on Simeon the Stylist which has been translated into German by Dr. Leberecht in (his Leben und Werken des heil. Simeon Syntichus, Innsbruck, 1855, 8vo, p. 279-298). See Eberlidge, Syr. Churches (Lond. 1816, 12mo), p. 241 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, vi., 397.

Jacob of Vitry (Jacobi de Vitricio, or Jacobus Vitrivacu), so named after his native place, was born in the second half of the 12th century. He was a presbyter in the see of Moissac, or, as some say, in Paris, when, attracted by the celebrated sanctity of Maria of Oignes, he removed to her place of residence, the diocese of Liege. She received him kindly, and influenced him to take a position in the diocese. At the request of the pope he began preaching against the Albigenses, and finally devoted himself to that service, and was made bishop of Liége in 1186. He died at Jerusalem, travelling through France to levy contributions. While thus engaged he was elected bishop of Acre, and at the request of pope Honorius III went to the Holy Land. He there performed a noble work; among other things, he provided for the children of the Saracens whom the Christians had taken, baptized them, and intrusted them to the care of pious Christian women. After the retirement of the Christians from Damietta, he resided in 1225 the episcopal office, and returned to Oignes. In 1229 pope Gregory IX appointed his bishop of France, De Saint, and the Holy Land. He died at Rome May 1, 1240. The writings of Jacob de Vitry are valuable. He profited greatly by his stay in the Holy Land, gathering much of the material necessary for the preparation of his principal work, the Historia Orientalis, generally entitled History of Jerusalem, pretended to be the text (1597), also by Martine and Durand. Theor. nov. Aedoeotorum, l. iii (Par. 1717). This work of Jacob de Vitry is divided into three parts. The first contains the history (this as well as the others are made by Eusebius of Jerusalem, in the second, a short review of the text of the Western church, with a particular attention to the history of the different Church orders, and the extent and value of pilgrimages; in the third he returns to the East, and, beginning with the General Council of Chalcedon, closes with the surrender of Damietta. This last part of the work does not seem to be the production of Jacob, but, in all probability, was written by some other hand, to add to the completeness of the work, and to enable it to serve as a whole work to Jacob, and defends his view by stating, in commendation of part third, “L’auteur avait vu de ses yeux ce qu’il raconter” (in accordance with the statement in the preface of the work, p. 1048). This work has been translated into French, and inserted in the Collection des historiens des revues médièves, de France, de Belgique, etc., and his letters are also of great importance to the historian: Jacob de Vitrício episcopus mæsæ in Lotharingiam de capiteone Damieata (published by Longin in the first part of the Geeta Dei per Francos, and Epsidem episcopus quattuor ad Honoriam III Popem (in Martene and Duand’s above-mentioned works, and some volumes); a life of the celebrated St. Mary of Oignes; and sermons on the Gospels and Epistles, of which a portion was published at Antwerp in 1575. See Cellier, Hist. des Lettres Sacrées, xiii, 587 sq.; Bibliotheca Belgica, i, 542; Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, vii., 398. (J. H. W.)

Jacques De Voragine, archbishop of Genoa, and author of the Legenda aurea, was born at Virlaggio, near Genoa, in 1290. He joined the preaches friars at Genoa in 1244, and became provincial of the order for Lombardy in 1267. For services rendered to the church and to his country, he received different ecclesiastical pensions, and was regularly made archbishop of Genoa in 1292, and died in 1298. His reputation rests exclusively on a compilation of legends which he wrote under the title of Legenda Sancorum, or Legenda aurea (also known as the Historia Longobardorum, on a short Lombard chronicle it contains, attached to the text, the life of pope Belacius). The work consists of a series of fanciful biographies, some compiled from older works, others merely made up of the traditions current among the people and in convents. Many of the elements of these biographies are taken from apocalyptic Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, and martyrologies, and are to be found in other ancient and contemporary works, such as the Passional, the legends of Mary, etc. Some of them are inventions of the Middle Ages, and show how quickly fables become mixed up with history: such are the lives of Dominic and of king of France. In the world most famous is the story of the pilgrimage of a thirteenth-century prelate to the Holy Land, informing the end of the saint, in the life of the apostle James. The only original part of the work is the section of the story of the pilgrimage of a thirteenth-century prelate to the Holy Land, informing the end of the saint, on the life of each saint, in which Jacob attempts to give an explanation of the meaning of their names, and these explanations consist in wonderful etymologies and wild speculations, such as could be expected from an ignorant monk unacquainted with either Greek or Hebrew. The work was soon esteemed at its just value. The superior of the order, Berengarius de Landora, subsequently archbishop of Compostella (+1393), commissioned Bernardus Guiliotinus, afterwards bishop of Lodève (+1381), to write a life of the saints from authentic sources. Bernardus, who was a zealous bishop, set to work and published the work in four volumes. This, however, did not meet with much success. The Legenda of Jacob became the Legenda aurea, and gained in popularity not only because it was shorter than the voluminous compilation of Bernardus, but especially on account of its extravagant descriptions and relations of miraculous occurrences, which suited the spirit of the Middle Ages much better than a plain, truthful narration of facts. Many translations of it were made into German, French, Italian, Spanish, and English, and after the discovery of printing many editions of it were published. There were particular attention to the history of the different Church orders, and the extent and value of pilgrimages; in the IV.—A A A
the book is very important as an index to the superstitious spirit of the Middle Ages. Among the other works of Jacob de Voragine we may mention Sermones de tempore et quadragesimales (Paris, 1500; Venice, 1589, 2 vols.). — Sermones de dominica per annum (Venice, 1544, 4to, and 1566, fol.). — Sermones de sanctis (Venice, 1562, 2 vols. 4to). — Sermones de temporibus (Lyons, 1505; Venice, 1580). — Mariæ vniue sermes de E. Mariae Virgine (Venice, 1497, 4to; Paris, 1503; Mayen, 1616, 4to). The latest editions of his collected sermons appeared at Augsburg (1760, 4 vols. fol.). All these sermons are mere sketches; those on the saints are full of fables, and can be considered as a sort of supplement to the Legend of the Virgin. The 160 sermons on Mary treat, in alphabetical order, of the virtues, perfection, and miracles of the Virgin. Lenz, in his Gesch. d. Homerik (Brunswick, 1839, 1, 577), gives a German translation of one of them as specimen. Jacob also wrote in defense of the Dominicans, and doubtless against the attacks of St. Amour, a Defender in contra impugnatorem fratres Predicatortu, qui non vivant secundum vitam apostolicae (Venice, 1594). An abridgment which he prepared of the Summa virtutum et virorum of Wm. Perlatus, and his De operibus et opusculis S. Augustini have never been overlooked (Quisquell, and Echard, l, 438). His chronicle of Genoa, down to 1297, has been published by Muratori, Scriptores rerum Italic. il, 1 sq. The assertion, made by Sixtus Senesia (Eribibio, Sacra, lib. iv.), that Jacob wrote an Italian translation of the Bible, appears to be erroneous: no such work has ever been found, nor is there any evidence of any contemporary writer; it is, moreover, highly improbable that the compiler of the Legenda aurea should have considered it desirable or profitable to give the fiction-loving people the Scriptures in the vernacular. See Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, vi, 369.

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

Jacob ben-Asher ben-Jechiel ben-Uli ben-Eliahu ben-David, also called Baal Ha-Turim, after his celebrated Talmudic work, was born in Germany about A.D. 1290. At the age of eighteen he was an eye-witness of the fearful massacres of his Jewish brethren, which began in Bavaria April 20, 1298, under the leadership of Rindlehirsch, and soon spread over France and Spain. The Jews of Toledeo, and by which more than 100,000 persons were slaughtered in less than six months. The in- currenc of the lives of Jews led him to emigrate in 1303. For more than two years he and his family moved from town to town, until they found a resting-place at Toledo, in Spain. Though in very straitened pecuniary circumstances, he began at once literary labors, and as the re-
ter life he embraced Christianity. He died about the middle of the 16th century. See Kitto, Journ. Soc. Lit. 1868, p. 621; Rake Cyclop. i. 458; Rosa, Histor. storico
degli Autori Ebrei, s. v.; Fürst, Bibliothe. jud. ii, 17; Eichhorn, Einleitung in d. A. T. § 394. See RABBINICAL
BIBLIES. (J. H. W.)

Jacob ben-Eleazar, a Jewish grammarian, flourished at Toledo in the first half of the 12th century.
He distinguished himself by a work entitled סֶפֶכֶר (the book of completion), which investigates the
nature of the vowel-points of Hebrew, and also the etymology of proper Hebrew names; it was freely used by
Kippels, and the most esteemed of all Arabic writers. Jacob ben-Eleazar was a sound grammarian, laid down some
excellent rules respecting the Hebrew syntax, and materially aided the development of philology in Spain at a
time when Biblical exegesis was much neglected and the study of the Talmud was paramount (Dr. Ginsburg,
in Kitto, s. v.). He was also active in the correc-
tion of the Hebrew text of the O. Test., and for this
purpose relied on the celebrated Codex Hillali or He-
Hali, one of the most ancient and celebrated Hebrew
codices. It was written, according to some, at Hilla, a
town built near the ruins of the ancient Babel, and hence the title by which the Masorah is designated; oth-
ers, however, held that it was the production of Rabbi
Moses ben-Hillel. It bears date from the beginning of
the 7th century, according to Sakkuto, who in his day
(circa 1500) saw a portion of the Codex, and pronounced
it to be 900 years old, and cites Kimchi (Jachasen, ed.
Filipowski, Lond. 1857, p. 220) as saying in his grammar on
Numb. xv. 4, that the Pentateuch of this Codex was
in his day extant at Toledo. The probability is that a
greater portion of it, if not the whole, was destroyed at
Leon, in Spain, where it was last deposited, during the persecution of the Jews and the destruction of all Jew-
ish writings in 1197. Jacob ben-Eleazar's correction of the
text of the O. T. Scriptures by the aid of this cele-
brated Codex makes it, therefore, doubly valuable for all
critical students of the Hebrew text. See Bensenthal
and Lebrecht's Rodacum Liber (Berlin, 1847), p. 15, 36;
Geiger, in Ozar Nachmatiel I (Vienna, 1857), p. 199 sq.;
Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, vi, 182; Kitto, s. v. See MANU-
SCRIPTS, BIBLICAL.

Jacob ben-Machir Tinbon. See PROPAT.

Jacob ben-Meier. See TAM.

Jacob ben-Shehbat Gerundi, a celebrated
Cabalist who flourished about the middle of the 13th century, deserves our notice because of his efforts to
counteract the influence which some of the better edu-
cated and more liberal-minded Jewish Rabbis of the 13th and 14th centuries exerted in behalf of the intro-
duction of a philosophical mode of interpretation insu-
agurated by the renowned Maimonides. Many others of his conservative brethren, he confronted the
liberals with harsh terms and low and vulgar epithets,
and thereby only strengthened the cause of his adver-
saries. Thus he called the Maimonists "heretics and
transgressors of the law," and asserted that "they seek
only the furtherance of the temporal good, of the earth-
ly life, the defence of life and property, but deny all fu-
ture rewards and punishments," etc. These gross mis-
representations are contained in a work which he pub-
lished in defence of the cabalistic mode of interpreta-
tion. See Grätz, Geschichte der Juden, vii, 85; note
3, p. 442-459. See CABALA; MAIMONIDES. (J. H.
W.)

Jacob Baradæus. See JACOBITES.

Jacob Berab, a Jewish Rabbi, born A.D. 1474 at
Maqueda, near Toledo, Spain, was obigated by persecu-
tion to leave his native land when only eighteen
years old. After many years of travel through Egypt to
Jerusalem, and thence to Damascus, he at last found a
nesting-place in Safat (about 1584). Possessing a large
fortune and great thirst for honor, he sought distinc-
tion among his Palestinian brethren. Honored by the
Rabbi of his own immediate vicinity, he succeeded in
re-establishing (1588) the Sanhedrin in the Holy
Land, which, no doubt, he intended to serve as the
starting-point for the re-establishment of the Jewish
kingdom. Unfortunately, however, for the Jewish cause,
there was no authority at Jerusalem, where he resided;
and when Berab sought a reconciliation with the chief
Rabbi, Levi ben-Chabib, by appointing him next in au-
thority, the consummation of the project failed, to the
great detriment of Judaism all over the world. A con-
troversy between the two parties ensued, which ended
with the death of Rabbi Levi ben-Chabib, and Jacob
Berab destroyed the hope of a re-establishment of ordination
and of a Jewish state. See Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, ix,
ch. ix and x; Jost, Geschichte d. Judentums, iii, 128 sq.
See JEWS. (J. H. W.)

Jacob Emden Ashkenasi (shortened Jabez), a
Jewish Rabbi of great distinction among the Hebrews
of the last century, was born at Amsterdam in 1696. He
was the son of Chacham Zewi, another Rabbi of the
celebrated Zewi family. Being banished from their
homes, his father's family sought a refuge first in Po-
land, later in Moravia. Possessing of a considerable
fortune, Jacob devoted most of his time to the study of
the Jewish Scriptures, and to the exclusive study of the
various Talmudic studies, which he considered likely to be derogatory to
his firm belief in the authenticity of Rabbinical writ-
ings. Even the position of Rabbi, which was frequent-
ly offered him, he hesitated to accept, lest it should in
the least interfere with his studies. But, once persuaded
and accepted the sacred duties of a Rabbi, he never after always called Jacob Emden, although in the official
papers of the Danish government he is called Herschel.
He soon returned to private life, and became a resi-
 dent at Altona (about 1730), near Hamburg. But, if
Jacob did not retain an official position in the syn-
agogue, he certainly continued to work actively for the
good of Israel; and as, by his zeal for the cause of the
Jewish religion, he often censured, both by pen and
tongue, those who departed from the old and wonted
way, he thus made it possible for his adversaries, of
whom, like his father, he had not a few, to stigmatize
him as the "grand inquisition," etc. If Jacob Emden ever desired to be considered for improper con-
duct, it is for his relation towards Rabbi Eibeschitz, who
was his competitor for the rabbship of the Altona, Ham-
burg, and Wandsbeck congregations, which Jacob did
not care to fill, but which he would gladly have had the
honor to decline. (Compare Grätz, v. 397 sq.) Emden
was especially severe against all the Cabalists, and
many were the books that he issued to contradict their
teachings. He even denied the authorship of some of the
cabalistic writings; thus he pronounced the book
Zohar to be a spurious production of his own century,
etc. He placed himself in a very ridiculous light by a
judgment which he gave on Jewish traditional law, upon
which the advice of Moses Mendessohn had also been
obtained, and in which, differing from this great man, he
addressed him more like a teacher than a pupil. Jacob
Emden directed the issue of this pamphlet against his
firmly opposed colleague, Samuel Dubno. His writings, according to his own state-
ment, cover no less than 64 different works. The most
important of them are his contributions to the history of the fanatics of the last century, known as the followe-
rs of Sabbatai Zewi (q. v.). They are, רדניב, ידרו
דוויה לזרוו, taken from the celebrated polemical work by Jacob
Saadottas, on the sad fate of Sabbatai Zewi (Amst. 1737,
4to) — לזרוו, ידרו דוויה לזרוו, the most ably conducted po-
lemic against Zoharites and Sabbatians, consisting of
different brochures (Alton. 1736, 4to) — , which
another controversy, לזרוו ז"ל ור"ל, on the subject of Zewi and his
followers, Altona, 1769, 4to) — , on the
Sabbatians who espoused the Christian faith (Altona,
Jacob, Henry, an English Nonconformist, was born in the county of Kent in the second half of the 17th century. He was educated at St. Mary's Hall, Oxford. He had secured the living of Cheriton, a place in his native county, but appearing before the public in print as an advocate of a reform of the English Church ("Reasons proving the Necessity of Reforming our Churches in English and Anglian," 1604), was deprived of his parish and even obliged to flee the country. After residing some time in Holland he returned to England, and founded the first Independent (Congregational) church in that country. See INDEPENDENTS. In 1624 he emigrated to New England, and here he died after his arrival. Henry Jacob was an extensive writer, but his writings are almost without exception of a polemical nature, and at present very scarce. The most important are, a reply to bishop Wilson's Sermons on Redemption (preached in 1597, pubd. 1598, 8vo), entitled Treatise on the Sufferings and Victory of Christ (Lond. 1606, 8vo), and Defence of the same (1606, 4to). See Strype, Life of Whitefield; Allibone, Dict. of Auth.; i, 948; Hook, Eccles. Biol. vi, 378.

Jacob, Stephen, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Argyle, N.Y., Feb. 28, 1789; was converted in Feb. 1810; entered the itineracy in June, 1812; was supernumerary in 1818; and died April 24, 1919. He was a zealous, acceptable, and useful preacher, and devotedly pious. —Minutes of Conferences, i, 327.

Jacobi, Friedrich Heinrich, one of Germany's most eminent philosophers, was born at Düsseldorf January 25, 1743. His father was a wealthy merchant, and, anxious to be assisted by his son, sent him to the University of Heidelberg. When only sixteen years old, Jacobi was sent to Frankfurt on the Main to learn the business. But he daily evinced fondness for a literary profession, and a short time after, having removed to Geneva, he was further invited to study by associates, some of whom was the great mathematician Le Sage. The death of his father obliged him to return to Düsseldorf, to look after the business interests of the family. He, however, at the same time, continued his studies, which were now becoming multifarious, not to say contradictory, and, according to one of his biographers, "presented the strange appearance of a philosophical composite, including in his single personality the quadripartite variety of an enlightened 18th century man, a mystic, an atheist, and a theist." Appointed a member of the Exchequer, he had much more leisure afforded him than while at the head of his father's business, and he now not only gave himself up to study, but also to authorship, to which he had been encouraged by his literary associates, among whom figured some of Germany's most noted names. His first productions were a collection of letters by an imaginary philosopher, Abélard, and the publication of his "Essay on the Birth of the New Religion" (1777, and often), which, like some of the productions of his friend and present associate Götze, incorporated the philosophical opinions of the writer. Brought more prominently to the notice of the government, he was honored with a financial position in the state's service, and he removed to Munich. But his unmitigating exposure of the imprudent and injurious tendency of the Bavarian system of finance made him many enemies, and he retired to his estate at Pempelfort, near Düsseldorf, where his hospitable nature soon gathered about him "celebrated guests from all quarters of the cultivated world," and it was only natural that he should now continue his literary productions. Among other literary works he published for the advancement of New Church controversies with Mendelssohn (in Briefe über die Lehre von Spinoza (Bresl. 1785, and often) on the doctrines that had been advocated by the pansophist Spinoza, whose philosophy had at this time been almost forgotten. This he further and more ably prosecuted in Wider Mendelssohn (in Briefe über die Lehre von Spinoza (Bresl. 1786), and Quer Diatribe of German Protestantism, p. 156 sq.). It was this controversy with Mendelssohn, which had originated with the discovery by Jacobi that the friend of the former, Lessing, the author of Nathan, was a Spinozist, which Mendelssohn was determined to refute, but which actually laid even the latter open to the charge of advocating pantheistical doctrines, that first brought clearly to light the philosophical opinions of Jacobi, and stamped him as the "philosopher of faith." The points of Jacobi's position are thus stated by Schweikert (History of Philosophy, transl. by Seeley, p. 272): "(1) Spinoza is faithful to the divine; (2) Every religious demonstration leads to fatalism and atheism; (3) In order that we may not fall into these, we must set a limit to demonstrating, and recognize faith as the element of all metaphysical knowledge." Principles like these, advocated by Jacobi, inspired the atheism was, naturally enough aroused universal opposition in the philosophical world. "It was charged upon him that he was an enemy of reason, a preacher of blind faith, a despoiler of science and of philosophy, a fanatic and a papist." To controvert these opinions, he determined to expound his principle in an immeasurable knowledge; he published David Hume über d. Glauben, oder Ideeitumus u. Realismus (Bresl. 1787, 8vo). This brought down upon him the followers of Kant, and shortly after he even estranged the admirers of Fichte by his Sendeschreiben an Fichte (1790). His controversial opponents, however, never failed to acknowledge the great abilities of Jacobi, and the sincerity of his character and opinions. When the troubles arising out of the French Revolution extended to Germany, Jacobi retired to Holstein, whence he removed successively to Wandsbeck, and after the German Wars, hence he was called, in 1804, to Munich, to assist in the formation of the new Academy of Sciences, of which he was, in 1807, appointed president. In 1811 he further involved himself in a controversy with another philosophical school, that of Schelling, by the publication of a work Von d. göttlichen Dingen u. d. Weisheit (Leipzig, 1811). The time of the dispute was waged rather bitterly; but, notwithstanding the unfavorable estimate which Schelling drew, in his reply, of the literary and philosophical merits of Jacobi, the latter continued to maintain a high rank among sincere and honest inquirers after truth; and even if it must be confessed that Jacobi was exclusively occupied with detached speculations, and that he rather prepared than established a system of philosophy, yet it remains undisputed that the profundity and originality of his views have furnished materials of which more systematic minds have not scorned to avail themselves for the construction of their own systems. Jacobi died at Munich March 10, 1819. Besides the philosophical productions already mentioned, he wrote Über d. Untermenschen d. Kréticusmus d. Vernunft u. Verständ zu bringen (Bresl. 1802, 8vo). All his works were published posthumously by the Wolfenbüttel Academy, the University of Leipzig, and at the time of the publication of his philosophical works, 1820, the philosophy of his day, as it had flowed down from Kant to Schelling, in a very peculiar relation. He was incited by each of these systems: he learned from each, and on each of them he exercised his strength. But he was not satisfied by either of them; yet he was most strongly repelled by pantheism, whether the earlier pantheism of Spinoza, whom he highly esteemed as a man,
or its later form in Schelling's natural philosophy, ... Jacobi did not despise reason; he rather pleaded for it; but reason was not to him a faculty for the creation, discovery, or production of truth from itself. By reason he could not be without an idea of its act, an act to which, what we perceive, the immost and original sense. He did not regard reason and faith as being in conflict with each other, but as one. Faith inwardly supplies what knowledge cannot gain. Here Jacobi united with Kant in acknowledging the insufficiency of our knowledge to produce a true and irrefragable knowledge of the real; but the vacant place which Kant had therefore left in his system for divine things—Jacobi filled up by the doctrine of faith" (Hurst's Hagenbach, Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Cent. ii, 283 sq.). The whole philosophy of Jacobi is perhaps best stated thus: "All demonstrative systems are necessarily built on fatalism; he, on the other hand, is irreconcilable with man's consciousness of the freedom of his rational nature. The general system of nature, indeed, and man himself, so far as he is a part of that system, is pure mechanism; but in man there is unquestionably a power which transcends and is superior to sense, or that faculty which is bound up and regulat- ed by the laws of nature. This higher energy is liberty or reason, and consequently sense and reason reveal to man two distinct spheres of his activity—the sensible or visible world, and the invisible or intelligible. The former makes known what we may admit of demonstrative proof than that of sense and reason themselves. Now sense and reason are the supreme and ultimate principles of all intellectual operations, and as such legitimate them, while they themselves do not receive their legitimation from aught else; and the foundations of both are neither formal nor the sphere of demonstration than the existence of sensible and intelligible objects about which they are conversant. But this existing system of things cannot have originally proceeded either from nature or from man's intellect or reason, for both nature and the human mind are finite and conditionate, and there must be something exterior to these worlds which implies the existence of sensible and intelligible objects about which they are conversant. Now as man's liberty consists in his personality or absolute individuality, for this constitutes his proper essence, hence the mechanism of nature is hereby distinguished from man's liberty in virtue of the individual character, therefore that which is superior both to nature and to man must be perfectly and supremely individual; God consequently is one only, and strictly personal. Moreover, as the ground of all subsistence, he is the only being whose existence is not, even the principle of reason, he cannot be irrational. Of the existence of this divine intelligence, however, all direct proof is as impossible as a demonstration of existence simply. Gen- erally, indeed, nothing can be known except upon testi- mony, and whatever rests on testimony is not certainty, but faith, and such a faith or belief, when its object is the existence of a good and supreme being, is religion." It is apparent, then, that Jacobi may appropriately be look- ed upon as an advocate of religion, but by no means can he be admitted to have been a Christian philosopher; for, although he believed in a revelation of God, he was "far from taking sides with the believers of revelation, in the ecclesiastical sense of the word." If it is proper to class the influence of Jacobi's philosophy with that of Fichte and Schelling, as Farrar (Critical History of Free Thought, p. 238) does, it is well at least to concede that these philosophical systems all together certain- "for being the学 of religion, without any reference at all to the beginning of the 18th century, and were tend- ing to redeem alike German literature and theology." Their first effect was to produce examination of the primary principles of belief, and to excite inquiry; and, though it has only re-enforcing the idea of morality, "they ultimately developed a sense of the impossi- bility of the infinite spirit, and developed the sense of dependence, of humility, of unselfishness, of spirituality. They produced, indeed, evil effects in pantheism and ideology, but the results were partial, the good was gen- eral. The problem, What is truth? was through their means remitted to men for reconsideration; the answers are not on the one hand that it is ultimate, but it is that which I can know; from the other, it is that what I can intuitive- ly feel, threw men upon those unalterable and infallible instincts which God has set in the human breast as the everlasting landmarks of truth, the study of which lifts men ultimately out of error." One of the most cele- brated advocates of this view was Schleiermacher (compare Hagenbach, ii, 382 sqq., 399), though, of course, the former only prepared the way for the latter; and, indeed, this "faith philosophy," "with some slight modifications in each case, consequent upon their philosophical system," is the theory not only of Jacobi and, not, as he has supposed, after sel (author of "Limits of Religious Thought"), and probably, also, of the Scotch philosopher Hamilton (compare Cocke, Christianity and Greek Philosophy, p. 70 sq.). See Herbart, "Biographie in the Bibliothek christlicher Denker" (Leipsic, 1830), i; Max Jacobi, Brief- wechsel zwischen Götze u. Fr. H. Jacobi (Leipsic, 1846); Gervinus, Geschichte d. poet. Nat. Lit. d. Deutschen (3d edit.), iv, 556 sqq.; Chalybauey, Hist. Specul. Phil., p. 60 sqq.; Ersch u. Gruber, Algem. Encycl.; English Cyc- lop. s. v.

**Jacobites** is the name by which the different com- munities in Syria, Mesopotamia, and Babylonia, who hold to the Monophysite doctrine, have been known since their union, about the middle of the 6th century. See EUTYCHIANISM; MONOPHYSITES. The most prominent party in occupying the union of these Monophys- ites, who, near the middle of the 6th century, was very weak, and threatened with extermination, was Jac- ob (or James) Albarian, or Bardas (or Zanazas), a zealous disciple of Severus, a monk and presbyter of the convent of Phasile, near Nisibis, and it is after this Jac- ob that the united Monophysites were named after their union, and not, as has been supposed, after James, the brother of Christ, or Jacob the patriarch, or after Dioscorus, who was called Jacob before his ordin- ation, It is true, however, that these communities are sometimes designated as the Severians, Dioscorians, Eutychians, and even as the Theodocians (for the Egyptian Monophysites, see THEODOSIUS II; for the Ethiopians, see MENLAM CHURCH; and for the Abyssinian, see ABBYSSIN- IAN CHURCH). The surnames of Jacob who united the Monophysites, however, have no bearing on his relation to the sects, but are strictly personal. Thus the coarse- ness of the title of the patriarch of Antioch was an honor for the benefit of his party (says D'Herbelot, Bibliothéque Orientale, p. 455) gained him the name of Barudri (i. e. a coarse horse-blanket; compare Assemani, ii, 66, 414; Makrizi, Geschichte der Kopten, edited by Wustenfeld; Eutychius, Annales, ed. Pococce, ii, 144, 147). Jacob was made bishop of Edessa in 541, and then, says Dr. Schaff (Ch. History, iii, 775), "this remarkable man de- voted himself for seven and thirty years with unwearied zeal to the interests of the persecuted Monophys- ites. 'Light footed as Aasahel' (2 Sam. ii, 18), and in the garb of a beggar, he journeyed hither and thither and thither, amid the greatest dangers and privations, to the patriarchate of Antioch; ordained bishops, priests, and deacons; organized churches; healed divisions; and thus saved the Monophysite body from impending extinc- tion." He died in 578.

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

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

Staement#s. It is generally believed that the Jacobites with the Roman Catholics, hold to the septenary number on the sacraments, but Etheridge says (p. 144) that "this must be taken in a qualified sense, as they have no distinct service of confirmation, nor do they use extreme unction, unless it be sometimes imparted to members of the priesthood. Official communion, too, is scarcely known among them, and in the Eucharist, while they profess to recognize the real presence, it must not be understood in the Papite sense of transubstantiation, but the presence of the Saviour which accompanies, in an undecorated manner, the elements of the bread and wine: a species of consubstantiation, illustrated by Bar Salib (in Matt. xxviii, Cod. Syr. Clement. Vat. 16, fol. 29) under the idea of iron in union with fire, and receiving from it the properties of light and heat, while its own nature remains unaltered" (comp. Bar-Helemeus, Memorah Kadali, or the "Lamp of the Saints," fundam. vi, sect. 2). At the celebration of the Eucharist they administer newly-made unleavened bread (Rödiger, however, in Herzog, Real-Ency\n2lopädie, vi, 400, asserts that they use leavened bread), commingled with salt and oil, and of both kinds, but generally dipping, like the Nestorians, the cake into the wine. The bishop and deacons dip it out of baptismal fonts, and then, as I have been told, very improbably, to have performed by imprinting on the subject (of course infante), with a burning iron, the figure of the cross, on some part of the body, generally the arm, sometimes even the face.

The doctrine of purgatory they wholly ignore, though it is termed among them the "clergy. The native form of this quote is:"

Descent. Their origin they attempt to trace linearly from the first Hebrew Christians. Dr. Wolf (Journal, 1889) says, "They call themselves the Bnay Israel (the children of Israel), whose ancestors were converted by the apostle James," and maintains that "there can be least doubt that their claim to being the descendants of the Jewish Christians of old is just. Their physiognomy, mode of worship, their attachment to the Mosaic law, their liturgy, their tradition, so similar to the Jewish, the technical terms in their theology, all prove that they are real descendants of the Abrahamic stock. They certainly followed the Jews at one time in subjecting their male members to circumcision (comp. Sah\n2liac, Itinerancy, viii, 1). One thing is peculiarly characteristic of the Jacobites: they practise the adoration of the saints, and particularly worship the mother of Christ. As teachers and saints, they revere some of the most prominent actors in the Church History of the early centuries, particularly Jacob of Sarug, Jacob of Edessa, Dioscorus, Severus, P. Fullo, and Jacob Bar\ndeous; but Eutyches they ignore. (Compare Assemani, Bibli. Orient. ii, diss. de Monophys. 8 & 10; Rese\ndot, Hist. Patr., Aec. p. 133 sq.; id. Lycipr. ii, 108.)

The Jacobites also impose upon themselves excessive fasts: "five annual lents, during which both the clergy and the laity abstain not only from flesh or eggs, but even from the taste of wine, of oil, and of fish" (Gibb, Doctrine and Fall of the Eastern Empire, iv, 501, comp. Athenagoras' Description of the Eastern Church).

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

By the side of the patriarch, who holds the highest office in the Church, there is a secondary officer at the head of the Eastern Jacobites, the Maphrian (Syrian, Maph\n3ria, i.e. the fructifier), or Primas Orientalis, whose mission it is to ordain bishops, and also to consecrate the patriarch elect by the laying on of hands. He occupies the clerical degree, the same as the present bishop of Antioch; and the see is called by the present name of Antioch. The see is located at Mosul, and its jurisdiction extends over the Jacobites of the East residing beyond the Tigris and a portion of Mesopotamia; the rest of Mesopotamia, Syria, Phoenicia, Palestine, and Egypt, is under the immediate control of the patriarch of Antioch. (On Ordination, see Etheridge, Syr. Ch. p. 147 sq.) With the diocese of the patriarch there comes in contact the patriarchate of the Copts (q.v.), and of late years both churches have sustained a bishop at Jerusalem.

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

At the time of its greatest prosperity the Jacobite Church produced many men remarkable for the profundity of their views, their teachings, and their writings. No less than 150 archbishops and bishops have been counted in the different ages of the sect, of whom 76 are named. They have a system of books which are said to be of great use, and of which a part has been published by
Tullberg (Upsala, 1850); John, bishop of Dara, in the 9th century; Moses Bar-Khîpa († 913), whose treatise on Paradise was translated into Latin by Andr. Massius; Ignatius († 1258); and the 13th century, author of commentaries on the Bible and other theological works (Assemani, ii, 156–211); Jacob, bishop of Tagrit in the 13th century; and especially Gregorius Barbarasius; Bar-Hebraeus, in the 15th century, who was perhaps the greatest and noblest man of the Eastern Church, who was most learned in all the sciences, and Néstorians, by Greeks and Armenians, all of whom forgot the disputes which were agitating at that time the Eastern Church, and gathered at his grave to mingle their tears for the loss of a truly virtuous and great man. The work of Biblical criticism known as Rosarium Kardamata, is also, as shown by the words (Hier. Syn. Rome, 1829, 8vo, p. 206, 212), due to the Jacobite Church.

The present condition of this sect is thus described by the Rev. George Percy Badger (Nestorians and their Ritual, p. 60): "The present hierarchy of the Jacobites in Turkey is that of a patriarch, who claims the title of 'Patriarch of Antioch and successor of St. Peter,' eight metropolitanals, and three bishops. Of these, one resides in Mosul, one in the convent of Mar Mattai, in the same district, one at Urfa, one at Diarbekir, or Kharpit, one at Jerusalem, one at Mar Girius, three in Jesus. All these are called metropolitanals for personal, without any regular dioceses. . . . The bishops generally are illiterate men, but little versed in Scripture, and entirely ignorant of ecclesiastical history. They scarcely ever preach, and their episcopal visitations are confined to occasional ordinations, and to the collection of tithes from their several dioceses. All of them can, of course, read the Syriac of their rituals, but few thoroughly understand it. . . . As might naturally be expected, the lower orders of the Syrian clergy are generally more illiterate than the bishops; and how can it be otherwise? . . . Such being the awkwardness and inefficiency of the clergy, it is not strange that the religious knowledge and vital godliness are at a very low ebb among the Syrian laity. Notwithstanding the comparative influence of this community, I believe that there do not exist among them more than twenty small schools in the whole of Turkey, where their population amounts to something like 100,000 (Etheridge says 150,000). The following is a rough estimate in villages of the proportion of their numbers in the different districts: (1) Jebel Tur, 150 villages; (2) district of Urfa and Gawar, 50 villages; (3) Kharpit, 15 villages; (4) Mar Maris, 7 villages; (5) East Mesopotamia; (6) Damascus, 4 villages, making in all 230 villages now inhabited by Syrians." (Comp. Richard Pococke, Travels in the East, ii, 208; Niebuhr, Reisebeschreib., vol. ii; Buckingham, Trav. in Mesopotamia, i, 321, 341; Robinson, Palestine, iii, 400 sq.)

As early as the 14th century the Roman Catholic Church used her influence to effect a union of the Jacobite and Western churches under the sway of Rome. But, although many accessions have been obtained from the Jacobites, they have not yielded entirely, as did the Copts in the 10th century. The first really important accessions to Rome were those of Rabbula, who, under Andreas Achigian, when the convert, at that time quite numerous, styling themselves "Syrian Catholics," elected him as a rival patriarch. He was followed by Petrus (Ignatius, vol. xxxvii), who did not continue long in his apostolic office, as the opposition was too strong for Rome (Assemani, ii, 482). This, however, by no means discouraged the Papsists, for the undertaking was resumed shortly afterwards; and they have for some time past sustained in Syria a patriarch who resides at Haleb, and they have even "Catholic Jacobite convents."

The inferiority of the Syrian Catholics to the Jacobites has induced the Protestants of England and America to establish missions among them, and they have thus far met with tolerable success. See Assemani, Bibl. Or. ii; Diss. de Monophys., § 1–10; Neale, East., Church of England, iii (see Index); Abudachus, Hist. Jacobitarum (Oxf. 1700); Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Rom. Emp. (Harper's ed.), iv, 551 sq.; Migne, Dict. des Ordres religieux, ii, 501; Th. Greek, under "East. Kirche", Lect. a. v.; Herzog, Realencyklop., vi, 496, (D. H. W. Jacobs, David, a minister of the Lutheran Church, was born in Franklin County, Pa., Nov. 22, 1805. He was educated at Jefferson College, Canonsburg, Penn. (class of 1825). While at college he was particularly distinguished as a linguist, and in the absence of the professor of languages was requested to hear the recitations in Latin and Greek. He commenced his theological studies under the direction of the Rev. Dr. B. Kurtz, and completed them in the Theological Seminary at Gettysburg in 1827. The same year he took charge of the classical department established in connection with the seminary, from which Pennsylvania College took its origin. He was very successful as a teacher. No one ever pursued his work more nobly, or with an aim more exalted. He received license to preach the Gospel in 1829, but his health was so delicate that he seldom officiated in the pulpit. He died Nov. 30, 1830, in the twenty-fifth year of his age, at Shearer's, Grinnell, Iowa, and was returning from a trip to the South, whither he had gone in pursuit of health. In talent he was above the ordinary standard, a ripe scholar, and those who were brought in contact with him appreciated his excellent character, and acknowledged his eminent services.

JACOMB, THOMAS, D.D., a pious Nofonostomist divine who took a prominent part in the ecclesiastical affairs of England in the 17th century, was born in Leices
tershire in 1682. He studied at Magdalen Hall, Oxford, and subsequently became fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge. During the Rebellion he obtained the living of St. Martin, Ludgate, but was ejected in 1662, during the Bishops' Visitations, but was reappointed in 1671. He died March 27, 1687. Stoughton (Ecc. Hist. of Engl. [Ch. of the Restoration], i, 165) says that Jacomb, while a member of the Savoy Conference [see INDEPENDENTS], in which he figured very prominently, "is described as a man of superior education, of a staid mind, of temperate passions, moderate in his counsels, and in the management of affairs, not vehement and confident, not imposing and overbearing, but receptive of advice, and yielding to reason." He was one of the continuators of Poole's Annotations. His works, which are now scarce, are, a Defence of the Dedication of Holy Church [London, 1668, 8vo] — Several Sermons on the visit Christo
er of the Epistle to the Romans [18 on the 1st, 2d, 8d, and 4th verses] [London, 1672, 4to].—Darling, Cyclop. Biblog. a. s. v.; Stoughton, Eccles. History [Ch. of the Resto
roration], ii, 504, 505.

JACQUELOT, ISAAC, a French Protestant theologian, was born at Vassy Dec. 16, 1647. He became a minister in 1668, and was colleague of his father, the pastor of Vassy, until obliged to leave in consequence of the revocation of the Edict of Nantes. He resided first at Heidelberg, then (1666) at La Haye, where he became pastor of a French congregation. In consequence of some trouble he had with Jurieu, Benoit, and others he accepted an offer of the king of Prussia, who had heard him preach, and had learned to esteem Jacquelot, and in 1702 he settled at Berlin as pastor of a French church. He died there Oct. 20, 1708. He wrote Dissertations sur l'Existence de Dieu (La Haye, 1697, 4to; Paris, 1744, 3 vols. 12mo) — Discours sur le Messie (La Haye, 1699, 8vo).—La Conformité de la Foi avec la Raison (Amst. 1705, 8vo).—Réponse aux Entretiens composés par M. Bagle contre la Conformité, etc. (Amsterdam, 1707, 8vo) — Traité de la vérité et de l'Inspirations du Vieux et du Nouveau Testament (Rheims, 1716, 4to).—Cours de Philosophie (Gen. 1759, 2 vols. 12mo); and a number of controversial pamphlets against Benoit, Jurieu, Werenfels, etc. See Hist. des Ouvrages des Savants (Dec. 1708); Vie de Jacquelot (in the Dissert. sur l'Exist. de Dieu, Paris ed.,
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JACQUEMIN, James Alexis, a French Roman Catholic priest, was born at Nancy Aug. 4, 1750. He entered a religious life, and was finally made a parish priest of his native city. He met with considerable success in the pulpit, but when, in 1778, he was appointed professor of theology in the University of Nancy, he readily accepted this new position. During the first years of the French Revolution he was one of the editors of the newspaper called Le Catéchisme de Nancy. In 1791, refusing to adhere to the civil constitution of the clergy, he was obliged to leave France, and he settled in Germany, where he joined his bishop, De la Fare, also an exile. The latter having appointed him his vicar-general, Jacquemin returned to France, though exposed to great danger, during the Reign of Terror. He subsequently became professor of philosophy in the College of Nancy. In 1823 he was made bishop of St. Die, but age and infirmities soon compelled him to resign this office, and he retired to Nancy, where he died, June 16, 1832. He wrote De Inscriptiones Verbi Domini; Recueil des mémoires de l'Abbe Bourdaloue, pour servir à l'Histoire du Jacobinisme (Hamburg [Nancy], 1801; Paris, 1817, 2 vols. 12mo). See Henrin, Annaire Biographique (1880-84); Biog. des Hommes vivants; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxvi, 219. (J. N. P.)

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

JAC'BUS (Iaconhoicv v. r. Iânohoicv, Vulg. Accusus), given in the Apostrophe (1 Esdr. ix, 48) as the name of one of the Levites who supported Ezra in reading the law; evidently the ACKUB (q. v.) of the corresponding Heb. text (Neh. viii, 7).

Jad'a (Heb. Yada', 7,77, knowing; Sept. 'Iânoq and Dánâq), the last named of the two sons of Onam, a descendant of Judah through Jerahmeel; his two sons are likewise mentioned (1 Chron. ii, 28, 20). B.C. post 1612.

Jad'a (Heb. Yaddâ', 7,77, probably by erroneous transcription for 7,77, 'Yâdâ', 'Ido', rather than for 7,77, 'Yaddâ', id., as in the margin; Sept. 'Iânoq v. r. 'Aâdâ, Vulg. Jeôdo), one of the "sons of Nebu who divorced their Gentile wives after the Exile (Ezra x, 49). B.C. 459.

JADDAI. See JADDA.

JADDÉS. See JADDA.

JADDÉS, a name of the priests of the genii among the islanders of Ceylon. The pagodas or chapels where they officiate have no revenue, and any pious person who builds a chapel officiates in it himself as priest. The exteriors of these chapels are painted with representations of halberds, swords, arrows, shields, and the like. The natives call these chapels Jâcco, i.e. the devil's tenement, Jâco or Jâcca signifying devil; the islanders of Ceylon, like many other savage tribes, worship the devil because of his wickedness and evil propensities (comp. Lubbock, Origin of Civilization, p. 150 sqq.). The Jâddes, when he celebrates the festival of Jacoo, shaves his head. See Knox, Description of Ceylon, pt. iv, ch. v.; Broughton, Biblioth. Hist. Sac. i, 499; Davy, Account of Ceylon, p. 118. (J. H. W.)

Jad'du'a (Heb. Yad'du'a, 7,77, known; Sept. 'I'ânoq, 'Iânoq, 'Iânoq), the name of two men after the time of the Captivity.

1. One of the chiefs of the people who subscribed the sacred covenant drawn up by Nehemiah (Neh. xii, 21). B.C. cir. 410.

2. The son of Jonathan, and the last high-priest mentioned in the Old Testament (Neh. xii, 11, 22). He is doubtless the person alluded to by Josephus (Iânoq, Ant. xi, 8, 3-6) as exercising the pontifical office at the time of the destruction of Tyre by Alexander the Great (B.C. 332), and as coming forth from Jerusalem at the head of the priestly body to meet the advancing conqueror, and tender him the submission of the city. See ALEXANDER. In this case his name must have been inserted by the great Synagogue after the Scripture canon (q. v.), and been made up by Ezra (B.C. cir. 406). See CHRONICLES. "We gather together certainly that he was priest in the reign of the last Persian king Darius, and that he was still high-priest after the Persian dynasty was overthrown, i.e. in the reign of Alexander the Great. For the expression 'Darius the Persian' (Neh. xii, 22) must have been used after the accession of the Grecian dynasty; and, had another high-priest succeeded, his name would most likely have been mentioned. Thus far, then, the book of Nehemiah bears out the truth of Josephus's history, which makes Jaddu a high-priest when Alexander invaded Judea. But Josephus's story of his interview with Alexander is not, on that account, necessarily true, nor his account of the building of the Temple on Mount Gerizim during Jaddu'a pontificate, at the instigation of Sanballat, both of which, as well as the accompanying circumstances, may have been derived from some apocryphal book of Alexandrian growth, since, lost, in which chronology and history gave way to romance and Jewish vanity. Josephus seems to place the death of Jaddu a after that of Alexander (Ant. xi, 8, 7). Eusebius assigns twenty years to Jaddu'a pontificate." See Hervey, Genealogy of our Lord, p. 52, J. Jarvis, Church of the Restored, p. 291. See HIGH-PRIEST.

Jad'on (Heb. Yadon), 7,77, judge; Sept. has Elôdôw [but most eds. omit], Vulg. Judon), a Meronothite who assisted in reconstructing the walls of Jerusalem after the return from Babylon (Neh. vii, 7). B.C. 446.

JADON (Iânoq) is the name given to Josephus (Ant. viii, 8, 5) to the man of God from Judah who withstood the altar at Becher—probably intending Indo the seeer. By Jerome (Qu. Hebr. 2 Chron. ix, 29) the name is given as Jaddo.

Jadd'ly (Heb. Yad'll, 7,77, a wild goat or ibex, as in Ps. civ, 18; Job xxxix, 1; Sept. 'Iânoq, Josephus 'Iânoq), the wife of Heber the Kenite, and the slayer of the oppressor of the Israelites (Judg. iv, 17-22). B.C. 1409. Heber was the chief of a nomadic Arab clan who had separated from the rest of his tribe, and had pitched his tent under the oaks, which had in the Bible the name of "oaks of the wandering" (A. V. plain of Zaanaim, Judg. iv, 11), in the neighborhood of Kedelesh-Naphthali. See Heber. The tribe of Heber had maintained the quiet enjoyment of their pastures by adopting a neutral position in a troublous period. Their descent from Jethro secured them the favorable reception of the Israelites, and they were sufficiently important to conclude a formal peace with Jabin, king of Hazor. See KENITE.

In the headlong rout which followed the defeat of the Canaanites by Barak, Sisera, abandoning his chariot and the chariots of his servants, with 900 horsemen, fled unattended, and in an opposite direction from that taken by his army. On reaching the tents of the nomad chief, he remembered that there was peace be-
tween his sovereign and the house of Heber, and therefore applied for the hospitality and protection to which he was thus entitled (Harmer, Obs. i, 460). "The tent of Jael" is expressly mentioned either because the hermit was a frequent guest at Heber's (Gen. iii, 22), or because the Kenite himself was absent at the time. In the sacred seclusion of this almost inviolable sanctuary (Pococke, Hist. ii, 5) Sisera might well have felt himself absolutely secure from the incursions of the enemy (Cahen, Progn. vol. xxvi); and although his host, being among the Kenites, he would not have ventured openly to violate all idea of Oriental propriety by entering a woman's apartments (D'Herbort, Bibliothèque Orientale, s. v. Ha-ram) he had not received Jael's express, earnest, and respectful entreaty to do so. See Harms. He accepted the invitation, and she flung the quilt (772p3p7) A. V. "a mantle," evidently some part of the regular furnish- niture of the tent) over him as he lay wearily on the floor. While thirst prevented sleep, and he asked for water, she brought him buttermilk in her choicest vessel, thus ratifying with the semblance of officious zeal the sacred bond of Eastern hospitality. Wine would have been inadmissible to quench his thirsts of Jael possibly have been eschewed by Heber's clan (Jer. xxxvii, 2). Curdled milk, according to the quotations in Harmer, is still a favorite Arab beverage, and that this is the drink intended we infer from Judg. v, 25, as well as from the occasion of the song (Jdg. xxxi). A. V., 5, 4), although there is no reason to suppose with Josephus and the Rabbis (D. Kimchi, Jacob, etc.) that Jael purposely used it because of its sopori- fic qualities (Bochart, Hieros. i, 473). But anxiety still prevented Sisera from composing himself to rest until he had secured his position against the rising sun. She would faithfully preserve the secret of his concealment; till at last, with a feeling of perfect security, the weary and unfortunate general resigned himself to the deep sleep of misery and fatigue. Then it was that Jael took in her left hand one of the great wooden pins (A. V. "nail") which fastened down the cords of the tent, and in her right hand the mallet (A. V. "a hammer") used to drive it into the ground, and, creeping up to her sleeping and confiding guest, with one terrible blow dashed it through Sisera's temples deep into the earth. With one swift, fruitless agony, with one contortion of sudden pain, "at her head he fell; where he bowed, there he fell down dead" (Judg. v, 27). She then waited to meet the pursuing Barak, and led him into her tent, that she might in his presence claim the glory of the deed! See Barak.

Jael, doubtless recognizing the saying of Deborah, that God would set Sisera into the hand of a woman (Judg. iv, 9; Josephus, Ant. v, 5, 4), and hence they have supposed that Jael was actuated by some divine and hidden influence. But the Bible gives no hint of such an inspiration, and it is at least equally probable that Deborah merely intended to intimate the share of the honor which would be assigned by posterity to her own exertions. If, therefore, we eliminate the still more monstrous supposition of the Rabbis that Sisera was slain by Jael because he attempted to offer her violence—the murder will appear in all its ghastliness. A fugitive received *dubhil* (or protection) at her hands—he was miserable, defeated, weary—he was the ally of her husband—he was her invited and honored guest—he was in the sanctuary of the harem—above all, he was confiding, defenseless, and asleep; yet she broke her pledged faith, and, under the guidance of her vengeance, she fell on the trusted and unprotected slumberer. Surely we require the clearest and most positive statement that Jael was instigated to such a murder by divine suggestion. See Harms. See Hospitality.

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

It is much easier to explain the conduct of Jael than to account for the apparently eulogistic notice which it receives in the triumphal ode of Deborah and Barak; but the following verse of the same lines will help to remove the difficulty: There is no doubt that Sisera would have been put to death if he had been taken alive by the Israelites. The war-usages of the time warranted such treatment, and there are numerous examples of it. They had, therefore, no regard to her private motives, or to the particular relations between Heber and Jael, but they held her only as the instrument of accomplishing what was usually regarded as the final and crowning act of a great victory. The unusual circumstance that this act was performed by a woman's hand was, according to the notions of the time, so great a humiliation that it could hardly fail to be dwelt upon in contrasting the result with the proud confidence of victory which had at the outset been entertained (Judg. v, 30). Without stopping to ask when and where Deborah claims for herself any infallibility, or whether, in the passionate moment of patriotic triumph, she was likely to hold such passages with so much care to scrutinize the moral bearings of an act which had been so splendid a benefit to herself and her people, we may question whether any moral commendation is directly intended. What Deborah stated was a fact, viz. that the wives of the nomad Arais would unhesitatingly help Barak as a public benefit to herself as a popular heroine. "She certainly was not 'blessed' as a pious and upright person is blessed when performing a deed which embodies the noblest principles, and which goes up as a memorial before God, but merely as one who acted a part that accomplished an important purpose of heaven." In the same sense, though in the opposite direction, Job and Jeremiah cursed the day of their birth; not that they meant to make it the proper subject of blame, but that they wished to mark their deep sense of the evil into which it had ushered them—mark it as the commencement of a life-heritage of sorrow and gloom. In like manner, and with a closer resemblance to the case before us, the psalmist pronounces happy or blessed those who should dash the little ones of Babylon against the stones (Ps. cxxxxvii, 9), which no one who understands the spirit of Hebrew poetry would ever dream of construing into a proper sanction. The burden would be the ruin and destruction of the children, as true heroes of righteousness. It merely announces, under a strong individualizing trait, the coming recompense on Babylon for the cruelties she had inflicted on Israel; her own measure should be meted back to her; she who should be the instrument of effecting it would execute the purpose of God, through the agency of others.
ideal exaltation of Jael be viewed in the light of these cognate passages, and it will be found to contain nothing at variance with the verdict which every impartial mind must have been forced to form on her conduct.

It is, in reality, the work of God's judgment, through her instrumentality, that is celebrated, not her mode of carrying it into execution; and it might be as just to regard the heathen Medes and Persians as a truly pious people because they are called God's 'sanctified ones' to do it. 

Hence, the passage on Behemoth (Ps. xxxii. 8), as from what is said in Deborah's song, to consider Jael an example of righteousness — See DEBORAH.

As to the morality of the act of Jael for which she is thus applauded, although it can not fairly be justified by the usages of any time or people, yet the considerations urged by Dr. Robinson (Biblical Repert., 1831, p. 897) are of some force: "We must judge of it by the feelings of those among whom the right of avenging the blood of a relative was so strongly rooted that even Moses could not take it away. Jael was an ally by blood of the Israelitish nation; [Sisera, the general of] their chief oppressor, who had mightily oppressed them for the space of twenty years, now lay defenceless before her; and he was, moreover, one of those whom Israel was bound by the command of Jehovah to extirpate. Perhaps, too, she felt called to be the instrument of God in working out the designs of his great deliverance. Thus exterminating the chief of their heathen oppressors. At least Israel viewed it in this light; and, in this view, we can not reproach the heroine with that as a crime which both she and Israel felt to be a deed performed in accordance with the mandate of heaven."

"We must, moreover, not forget the halo with which military success gilds every act in the popular eye, and that, in times of war, many things are held allowed and even commendable which would be repudiated in peace. Dr. Thomson, indeed (Jamiad and Book, ii, 146 sq.), justifies Jael's course by the following considerations: 1. Jabin, although a powerful and cruel king, was not without some kind of conscience. He had, therefore, inflicted much injury upon them in common with their neighbors the Israelites, and may have been probably — probably was — essentially inoffensive to Jael herself.

We are not to assume that Bedouin laws were of strict force among the settled Kenites. 3. Jael must have known her act would be not only a blow against Jabin, but a gleam of revenge upon Kenites, had it not been doubly inflicted much injury upon them in common with their neighbors the Israelites, and may have been probably — probably was — essentially inoffensive to Jael herself.
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JAGGER 747  JAHATH

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

Jaggarnaut, or Jaggarnaut Puri, or Puri, is the title of a town on the coasts of Orissa (85° 54' long. and 19° 45' lat.), celebrated as one of the chief places of pilgrimage of the Hindus in India. It contains a temple erected to Vishnu in A.D. 1198, in which stands an idol of this Indian deity, called Jaggarnaut (commonly Jaggarnaut), a corruption of the Sanscrit Jagnyadhara, i.e. lord of the amulet. The idol is a carved block of wood, with a frightful visage, painted black, with a distended mouth of a bloody color. On festival days the throne of the idol is placed upon a stupendous movable tower sixty feet high, resting on wheels, which render the ground deeply as they turn slowly from east to west. Attached to it are six ropes of the length and size of a ship's cable, by which the people draw it along. The priests and attendants are stationed around the throne, on the car, and occasionally address the worshippers in bilabial songs and gestures. Both the walls of the temple and the sides of the car are covered with emblems, in large and durable sculpture. Obscenity and blood are the characteristics of the idol's worship.
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This may have given rise to the supposition that the worship of Jaggarnath (as Max Muller [Chipsa, i, 57] spells it) was originally in honor of Vishnu. See Newcomb, Cyclop. of Missions, p. 495: Sterling, Account of Orissa (see Index).

Jagurs are the hermits of the Baniana, a sect in East India. There are three distinct classes of them: (1) the Van-aphrasats, (2) the San-jasis, and (3) the Avadouts. The Van-aphrasats live in forests, many of them married and having children, feeding on the herbs and fruits that grow wild; but they scruple to pluck up the root of anything, considering it a sinful act, as they believe the soul to be contained in the root, supposing everything to possess a spiritual life; and, of course, believing also the transmigration of souls. The Sin-jasis affect greater abstinence, oppose marriage, betel, and all pleasures whatsoever. They have but one daily meal, which must be on the earthen-ware, and live on alms. They generally take their dye with red earth, and always carry a large bamboo cane in their hands. The class is a regular nomad tribe; they do not even stay two nights in the same place. They are taught in their sacred writings to look forward with desire to the separation of the soul from the body. Lust, anger, avarice, pride, revenge, and the love of this world they consider their most formidable enemies, and pray to their gods to deliver them from one and all of these sins.

The last-named class, the Aradouts, forseke their families, both their wives and their offspring, and anything that would make one of them dependent on the other for production. Thus they deny themselves even the use of those things which the other two classes of Jagurs are wont to enjoy. They are habilitated only with a small piece of linen cloth to cover their sex. Their food they procure from strangers, to whose houses they go when hungry, and eat anything that is offered them. These devotees, especially frequent the sacred Hindu rivers and the neighborhood of great temples, both for religious motives and in order to obtain most really alms and food, particularly milk and fruits. They have one Oriental custom, viz. rubbing their body with ashes, no doubt to free themselves from the stain of sin. See Desert, on the Religion, etc., of the Brahmins, p. 105; Frey, Curr. vol. iii; Craufurd, Sketches of the Hindoos, i, 235 sq.; Broughton, Biblioth. Hist. Soc. i, 499. (J. H. W.)

Ja’gor (Heb. Ygor), “place of sojourn; Sept., ‘iyyiyip v. r. ‘A’sip, a city on the south or Idumean border of Judah, mentioned between Eder and Kinah (Josh. xvi, 21). “Its name might perhaps indicate that it was one of the fortified camping-grounds of the border Arabs” (Kitto). “The Ja Gor, quoted by the Babylonian Talmud (Palest, p. 99) from the Talmud as one of the boundaries of the territory of Ashkelon, must have been further to the north-west” (Smith). The position of the town here considered can only be conjectured as not very far from the Dead Sea. It is mentioned among the towns set off to Simeon (Josh. xix, 2-8), though it probably was one of them. It was possibly situated in wady Jurrah, which runs into the south-west end of the Dead Sea.

Jah (Heb. Yah, 1, a contraction for 11, Jehovah, Pae. iv, viii, 4, elsewhere rendered “Lord”). See JUHOVAH: HALELJUAH. It also enters into the composition of many Heb. names, as ADONIJI, ISRAEL, etc.

Ja’hash (Hebrew Yachash, ‘abb, prob. for 11, union; Sept., ‘ub, but ‘ub 1 in Chron. vi, 43, and 1 ly’uch v. r. ‘Iq’ 1 in 1 Chron. xxiv, 22), the name of a descendant of Judah and of several Levites.

1. A son of Shimei and grandson of Gershom, the son of Levi (1 Chron. xxiii, 10); yet no such son is mentioned in ver. 9, where the three sons of Shimei are by some error (probably the transposition of the latter clause) attributed to his brother Laadan, while in verse 11 Jahash is stated to have been “chief” (i.e. most numerous in posterity) of the four sons of Shimei. A similar disagreement appears in the parallel passage (1 Chron. vi), where the name of Gershom (prob. by the transposition of Shimei’s name into the preceding verse), and again (ver. 20) as a son of Libnah (i.e. Laadan), instead of Shimei (comp. Zimnah, the son of Jahash, ver. 20, 42). B.C. considerably post 1556.

2. Son of Reiah (or Haroeh), of the posterity of Hethron, and father of two sons (1 Chron. iv, 2). B.C. post 1612.
3. One of the sons of Shelomoth (or Shelomith), a descendant of Jizhar, of the family of Kohath, appointed to a prominent place in the sacred services by David (1 Chron. xxvi. 28). B.C. 1014.

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

Jahaz (Heb. יָחָז, יֹחָז, trodden down, Isa. xv. 4; Jer. xliv. 84; Sept. יֹאָסֹא; also with πι local and in pause, Ἰαχάζ, Yoh' tah, Numb. xxii. 28, Sept. τικ ιαοσα; Deut. ii. 92, Sept. τικ ιαοσα; and this even with a prefixed, יְחָז, יְחָז, Judges xli. 20, Sept. יֹאָסֹא; but likewise with πι paragogic, ὸχάζ, Yoh' tah, Sept. יֹאָסֹא, Josh. xxii. 18; A. V., "Jahazah;" יֹאָסֹא, Jer. xxii. 21, "Jahazah;" יֹאָסֹא, Josh. xxxi. 36; "Jahazah;" Ἰαχάζ, τικ ιαοσα, 2 Chron. vi. 78, "Jahazah"); a town beyond the Jordan, where Sihon was defeated, in the borders of Moab and the region of the Ammonites (Numb. xxii. 23; Deut. ii. 32; Judges xx. 20), situated in the tribe of Reuben (Josh. xiii. 18), and assigned to the Merarite Levites (Josh. xxxi. 36; 1 Chron. vi. 78).

In Isa. xxiv. 4; Jer. xliv. 21, it appears as one of the Medians, and then ( Jer. v. 28) as one that suffered from the transit of the Babylonian conquerors through the "plain country" (i.e. the Mishor, the moat, Belka). The whole country east of the Dead Sea had originally been given to the Moabites and Ammonites (Gen. xix. 36-38; Deut. ii. 19-22), but the warlike Amorites from the west of the Jordan conquered it, and expelled them from the region north of the river Arnon. From the Amorites the Israelites took this country, but subsequently the Ammonites claimed it as theirs (Judg. vi. 13), and on the decline of Jewish power the Moabites and Ammonites again took possession of it. Hitzig (Zts. Jda. ad loc.) regards Jahaz and Jazah as different places (so Keil on Josh. ad loc., urging that they are distinguished in the passages of Jer.; but this is unnecessary (so Winer, Rufus, s. v. Jahaz), and at variance with the philology. It appears to have been situated on the edge of the desert (see Rumer, Züg d. Izr. p. 58; Hengstenberg, Bibl. Com., p. 530). See EXODUS. From the terms of the narrative in Numb. xxii. and Deut. ii we should expect that Jahaz was in the extreme south part of the territory of Sihon, but yet north of the River Arnon (see Deut. ii. 24, 36; and the words in verse 31, "begin to possess"), and therefore concludes this position as a description of Jazza is mentioned by Schwarz (Palaest. p. 227, "a village to the south-west of Dibhan"); but this lacks confirmation, especially as Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast. s. v. Ἰαοσα, Jassa) place it between Medeba (Μεδεβα) and Dibon (Διθηνος, Debrathaim); and the latter states that "Jahaz has its opposite the Dead Sea, at the boundary of the region of Moab." These requirements are met by supposing Jahaz to have been situated in the open tract at the head of wady Waleh, between Arnon on the east, and Jebel Humeh on the west.

Jahaz'zah (Josh. xiii. 18) or Jazzah (Josh. xxi. 86; Jer. xliv. 21). See JAHAZ.

Jazzeah (Heb. יַחְצֶאָה, יַחְצָא, beheld by Je- horah; Sept. יָוּסָא, son of Tikvah, apparently a priest, one of those deputed by Ezra to ascertain which of the people of Tekoa were the married Gentile wives after the return from Babylon (Ezra x. 15). B.C. 455.

Jazzeel (Hebrew Yachzziel, יַחְצֶאָל, beheld by God; Sept. יָוּסָא, Yosia, Ιωσια, Αυσία), the name of five priests also from JEZREEL.

1. The third son of Hebron, the grandson of Levi through Kohath (1 Chron. xxiii. 19; xxiv. 33). B.C. probably post 1618, perhaps 1014.

2. One of the Benjamite warriors who joined David at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii. 4). B.C. 1009.

3. One of the priests who preceded the sacred ark with trumpets on its removal to Jerusalem (1 Chron. xvi. 6). B.C. cir. 1014.

4. The son of Zechariah, a Levite of the family of Asaph, who predicted to Jehoshaphat his triumph over the host of the Moabites with such decided assurance. See ZECHARIAH, 1. He is nowhere mentioned in the Scripture, but his prophecy on this occasion is given in full: "Then upon Jahaziel, the son of Zechariah, the son of Benaiah, the son of Jeiel, the son of Mattaniah, a Levite of the sons of Asaph, came the Spirit of the Lord in the midst of the congregation; and he said, Horns are come to my people Israel, and to Jerusalem, and thou, king Jehoshaphat, thus saith the Lord unto you, Be not afraid nor dismayed by reason of this great multitude; for the battle is not yours, but God's. To-morrow go ye down against them: behold, they come down before the cliff of Ziz; and ye shall find them at the end of the brook, before the wilderness of Jeruel. Ye shall not need to fight in this battle: set yourselves, stand ye still, and see the salvation of the Lord with you, O Judah and Jerusalem: fear not, nor be dismayed; to-morrow go out against them, for the Lord will be with you" (1 Chron. xx. 14-17). B.C. cir. 936.

5. One of the "sons" of Shechaniah, whose son (Ben-)Jahaziel, but his name is not otherwise given; indeed, there is evidently some confusion in the text: comp. ver. 3 is said to have returned from Babylon with 300 males of his retainers (Ezra viii. 5). B.C. ante 439. See SHECHANIAH.

Jah'dai (Heb. Yahok'dhe, יָהְכּּדֶא, prob. grasper; Sept. Ιαδαϊ, a descendant apparently of Caleb, of the family of Hezron; his sons' names are given, but, as his own parentage is not stated (1 Chron. ii. 47), it can only be conjectured that he was the son of the preceding Gazez, the son (different from the brother) of Haran (ver. 46). B.C. prob. post 1012. Various other suggestions regarding his name have been made, as that Gazez, the name preceding, should be Jahdai (Houbigant, ad loc.); that Jahdai was a concubine of Caleb (Grunenberg, quoted by Michaelis, Ahas, ad loc., etc.); but these are mere groundless suppositions (see Burrington, i. 216; Bertheau, Comment. ad loc.).

Jah'del (Heb. Yachddeel, יָכִדֶאֶל, made joyful by God; Sept. Ιαδηδη, one of the famous chieftains of the tribe of Manasseh, resident in northern Bashan (1 Chron. vi. 24). B.C. apparently 720.

Jah'no (Heb. Yahnō, יָהָנוּ, his union; otherwise for יַחְצָא, united; Sept. Ιακχαι, son of Buz and father of Joshuaiah, of the descendants of Abiahu, resident in Gilead (1 Chron. vi. 14). B.C. between 1093 and 782.

Jah' Nebeli (Heb. Yechnel, יֵהְכִנִל, hoping in God; Sept. Ιακχαελ, the last named of the three sons of Zebulun (Gen. xvi. 14; Numb. xxvi. 26). His descendants are called Jachilekites (Heb. Yechnel, יֵהְכִנִל). Sept. Ιακχαελ, Numb. xxvi. 26). B.C. 1856.

Jah'nelel (Numb. xxvi. 26). See JACHIEL.

Jah'mai (Heb. Yahmaw, יָהָמָא, protector; Sept. Ιαμάע, one of the "sons" of Tola, grandson of Issachar (1 Chron. vii. 2). B.C. cir. 1618.

Jahn, Johann, a distinguished German Roman Catholic theologian and Orientalist, who was born at Tassa, in Moravia, Aug. 18, 1790. He studied at the Gymnasium of Znaim, the University of Olmiz, and the Rom. Cath. Theological Seminary of Bruck, entered the Church, and was for some time a priest at Maiz. In 1782 he received the doctorate from Olmiz, and, after having filled with great distinction the position of professor of Oriental languages and Biblical hermeneutics at Bruck, he was, in 1789, called to the University of Vienna as professor of the Oriental languages, dogmatists, and Biblical archaeology. At this high school he labored successfully for seventeen years, amid suspicions and hostilities from the Roman Church, which pains his ingenuous spirit. Some words in the preface of his Einleit. in d. gott. Bücher d. allen Brudes (Vienna, 1768, 1802, 1805, 2 vols. 8vo); the assertion that
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the books of Job, Jonah, Judith, and Tobit are didactic poems; and that the demoniacs in the N. T. were possessed with dangerous diseases, not with the devil, were made charges against him. In 1792 complaints of his unsoundness were laid before the emperor Francis II by cardinal Magazzini, which resulted in the appointment of a special commission to examine the charges. Although it was decided in his favor, his detractors, being convinced of the novelties in his teaching, took care to make attacks in the future on expressing opinions likely to lead to interpretations contrary to the dogmas of the Church, and even suggested a change of the obnoxious passages (comp. Henke, Archiv f. d. neueste Kirchengesch., i., p. 33; P. J. S. Huth, Versuchs einer Kirchengesch. d. 18. Jahrh., ii, 375, 376). Though he honestly and willingly submitted, his detractors continued their machinations till he was (in 1806) removed from the congenial duties of an office to which he had dedicated his life, and was made, merely, of course, to prevent scandal which might have resulted from a deprivation of all dignity, canon or Domherr in the metropolitan church of St. Stephen. Even before he was compelled to resign his professorship, two of his books, Introductio in libros sacros Veteris Testamenti in compendium redacta (Vienna, 1804), and Archaelogia Biblioth. Occid. et eorum lectionum variatete subjunct (Vienna, 1805, 5 vols.; vol. i. and ii. 2d edition, 1817-1825)—Lexicon Arabico-Latinum, Christochronia Arabica accommodatum (Vienn. 1805)—this work was considered the best of its kind until the publication of a similar production by Sylvester de Sacy. His Biblical Hebrew dialect, and grammatical and critical reflections on several biblical subjects, are very numerous, and he wrote, Biblioth. Archaelogia (Vienna, 1803, 5 vols.; vol. i. and ii. 2d edition, 1817-25)—Lexicon Arabico-Latinum, Christochronia Arabica accommodatum (Vienn. 1805), etc. Some time after his death appeared Nachträge zu Jahn's theol. Werken, published from his MSS. (Tbingen, 1821), which contained six interesting dissertations on various biblical subjects, and with them some letters of Jahn, giving a clue to the motive of the editor's intentions directed against him. Jahn's memory deserves to be cherished by all true lovers of Oriental scholarship. He furnished text-books for the study of those languages superior to any of his time, and, although they are at present obsolete, he certainly aided modern scholarship by furnishing superior tools. As a theological writer he was clear and methodical, and his numerous works, of which several enjoy an English dress, "diffused a knowledge of Biblical subjects in places and circles where the books of Protestants would scarcely have been received. The latter, however, have appreciated his writings—fully as much as Romans and Catholics. He was not profound in any one thing, because he scattered his energies over wide a field; but he was a most useful author, and one of his books (the Archaelogia) is still the largest and best on the subjects of which it treateth. The theologian of the Roman Church is certain exceedingly liberal, so much so that Hengstenberg (on the Pentateuch) rather finds fault with him. See Felder, Gelehr., Lex. d. Kathol. Geleitdeek, 1., 337.; H. Döring, D. gelehrten Theologen Deutschland's, ii, 7 sq.; Meusel, Gelehrte Deutschland's (4th ed.), ii, 510.; x, 3, 904, xiv, 224.; xvi, 235.; xxvi, 19.; Wisch u. Gruber, Altp. Encyk.; Klotz, Bibl. Cycl. s. v.; Werner, Gesch. d. Kathol. Theol., p. 273 sq.

Jah'zēel (Heb. Yachzeē, יַחַזְּעֵל, allotted by God; Sept. Ἰαχωζί, the first named of the sons of Naphthali (Gen. xlii., 24). His descendants are called JACTIONides (Heb. Yachzeē'tim, יַחַזְּעֵעַתִּים, Sept. 'Aqonēi, Numb. xxvi., 48). In 1 Chron. vii., 13, the name is written JAHZEL (יַחַזְּלֵא, id., Sept. 'Irāqāi). B. C. 1856.

Jah'zēelite (Numb. xxvi., 48). See JAHZEEL.

Jah'zerah (Heb. Yach'zerah, יַחַצְּרָה, returner; but Gesenius prefers to read יַחַצְּרָה, i.e. JAHASSAH; Sept. Ἰαξάνα, Vulg. Jezara), son of Mehu-lam and father of Adiel, a priest (1 Chron. vii., 12). B.C. long ante 536. He is probably the same with Ahabah, the father of Azareel (Neh. xi., 13), since the preceding and the following name are alike.

Jah'zēel (1 Chron. vii., 13). See JAHZEEL.

Jailor (ἀκουσμόμενος, guard of a prisoner, Acts xvi., 28, 29, 36). See PRISON.

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

Their peculiar doctrines are that "all objects, material or abstract, are arranged under nine categories, called Tattvas (truths or principles), of which we need notice only the ninth and last, called Moksha, or liberation of the vital spirit from the bonds of action, i.e. final emancipation. In reference to it the Jainas not only affirm that there is such a state, but they define the sense of the emancipated state, the place where they live, their tangible qualities, the duration of their existence, the distance at which they are from one another, their parts, natures, and numbers. Final emancipation is only obtained in a state of manhood (not in that of a good demon, or brute), which is possessed of five senses: while possessing a body capable of voluntary motion, in a condition of possibility; while possessing a mind, through the sacrament of the highest asceticism, in that path of rectitude in which there is no retrogression; through the possession of perfect knowledge and vision; and in the practice of the duties of their arts, which in the practice of their duties, as they are divided into religious and lay orders—Yatis and Sravakas. Both, of course, must place implicit belief in the doctrines of their saints; but the Yatis has to lead a life of abstinence, taciturnity, and continence; he should wear a thin cloth
over his mouth to prevent insects from flying into it, and he should carry a brush to sweep the place on which he is about to sit, to remove any living creature out of the way of danger; but, in turn, he may dispense with all acts of worship, while the Śrāvaka has to add to the observance of the religious and moral duties the practical worship of the saints, and a profound reverence for his teacher. The seeming ascetic, practice the four virtues—liberality, gentleness, piety, and pance; he must govern his mind, tongue, and acts; abstain at certain seasons from salt, flowers, green fruits, roots, honey, grapes, tobacco; drink water three times a day, and never leave a liquid uncovered, lest some insect should be drowned in it; it is his duty, also, to visit daily a temple where some of the images of the Jaina saints are placed, walk round it three times, make an obeisance to the image, and make some offerings of fruits or flowers, while pronouncing some such formula as Salutation to the Saints, to the Pure Existences, to the Sages, to the Teachers, to all the Devout in the world.' The reader in a Jaina temple is a Yati, but the ministrant priest is not seldom a Brahman, since the Jainas have no priests of their own, and the presence of such Brahmanical ministrants seems to have introduced several innovations in their worship. In Upper India the ritual in use is often intermixed with formulas belonging more properly to the Saiva and Śākta worship (see Hindu Sects under INDIA), and images of Śiva and his consort take their place in Jainas temples. In the south of India they appear, as mentioned before, to observe also the essential rites of Śākta or Śanaśkāra of the Brahmanical Hindu. The festivals of the Jainas are especially those relating to events in the life of their deified saints; but they observe, also, several common to other Hindus, as the spring festival, the Śrīpanchami, and others. "

The sect is divided into two principal factions—the Digambaras and the Śvetāmbaras. The name of the former signifies "sky-clad," or naked, and designated the ascetics who went unclad; but at present they wear colored garments, and dis habilitate only at meal-times. The name of the latter faction means "one who wears white garments." But it is not mainly in dress that these two factions are distinct from each other; there are said to be no less than seven hundred different points upon which they split, 84 of which are considered vital by each party. Thus, e.g. "the Śvetāmbaras decorate the images of their saints with ear-rings, necklaces, armlets, bracelets, rings, crowns, and jewels, while the Digambaras leave their images without ornaments. Again, the Śvetāmbaras assert that there are twelve heavens and sixty-four Indras, whereas the Digambaras maintain that there are sixteen heavens and 100 Indras. In the south of India the Jainas are divided into two castes; in Upper Hindustan, however, they are all of one caste. It is remarkable that amongst themselves they recognise a number of families between which no intermarriage can take place, and that they resemble in this respect also the ancient Brahmanical Hindus, who established similar restrictions in their religious codes.

"As regards the pantheon of the Jaina creed, it is still more fantastic than that of the Brahmanical sects (whereupon he is borrowed to a great extent, but without any of the poetical and philosophical interest which inheres in the gods of the Vedic time. The highest rank amongst their numberless hosts of divine beings—divided by them into four classes, with various sub-divisions—they assign to the deified saints, whom they call Jina, or Arhat, or Tirthakara, besides a variety of other generic names. The Jainas enumerate twenty-four Tirthakaras of their past age, twenty-four of the present, and twenty-four of the age to come; and they invent new names amongst the human attributes of the most extravagant character. Notwithstanding the sameness of these attributes, they distinguish the twenty-four Jinas of the present age from each other in color, stature, and longevity. Two of them are red, two white, two blue, two black; the rest are of a golden hue, or a yellowish-brown. The other two peculiarities are regulated by them with equal precision, and according to a system of decrement, from Rākshaka, the first Jina, who was 500 poles in stature, and lived 8,400,000 great years, down to Māheśvara, the twenty-fourth, who had degenerated to the size of a man, and lived 100 great years, after which a man who has outlived the age of his predecessor, Pārśvadbhāka, not exceeding 100 years. The present worship is almost restricted to the last two Tirthakaras; and, as the statures and years of these personages have a reasonable possibility, H. T. Colebrooke inferred that they alone are to be considered as historical personages. As, moreover, the disciples of Mahāvīra there is one, Indrabhūti, who is called Gautama, and as Gautama is also a name of the founder of the Buddhist faith, the same distinguished scholar concluded that, if the identity between these names could be assumed, it would lead to the further surmise that both these sects are branches of the same stock. But against this view, which would assign to the Jaina religion an antiquity even higher than 543 B.C. (the date which is commonly ascribed to the appearance of Gautama Buddha), several reasons are alleged by the Mahāvīra or 24th teacher, the date, however, of the origin of the Jaina faith, as the same scholar justly observes, it is immersed in the same obscurity which invests all remote history amongst the Hindus. We can only infer from the existing Jaina literature, and from the doctrines it inculcates, that it came later into existence than the Buddhist sect." See Colebrooke, History of Ancient Hindoo Literature, pp. 164 to 165. See also, The 500 Essays; Wilson, Works. i (London, 1862); Trevor, Ind, its Natives and Missions, p. 109 sqq. Comp. INDIA; HINDUISM.

Ja'yr (Hebrew Žafr, 'ṣāfr, enlightener; Sept. Iasís, Iasip; but in 1 Chron. ii, 22, 25, two copies Iasip; in Esth. ii, 5, Iasip; compare Iasúç, Mark v, 22; Joseph, iii, 14; 1 Kings iv, 18) is the name of three men, also of one other of different form in the Hebrew. 1. The son of Segub, which latter was of the tribe of Manasseh on his mother's side (see ABDON), but of Judah on his father's (1 Chron. ii, 22); but Jar is reckoned as belonging to Manasseh (Numb. xxiii, 41; Deut. iii, 14; 1 Kings iv, 18), probably on account of his exploits and possessions in Gilead, where he appears to have been brought up with his mother (comp. 1 Chron. ii, 21), being perhaps an illegitimate child (see Raumer in Tholuck's Liter. Anz. 1856, p. 11), or, at all events, her son by another husband. But Jos. (Pestel, p. 160), although his paternity is not specifically mentioned, might strictly be claimed as an appointed to the tribe of Judah (Josh. xix, 34). See JUDAH UPON JORDAN. He distinguished himself in an expedition against the kingdom of Bashan, the time of which is disputed, and may probably be referred to the last year of the life of Moses (B.C. 1618), and which seems to have formed part of the operations connected with the conquest of the country east of the Jordan (1 Chron. iii, 23; Numb. xxiii, 41; Deut. iii, 14). He settled in the part of Aroer bordering on Gilead, where we find the small town that is taken (retaken) by him named collectively Havoth-jair (Jos. xiii, 33; 1 Chron. ii, 33; Josh. xiii, 14; Josh. xiii, 30; 1 Kings iv, 18; 1 Chron. ii, 22). See HAVOTH-JAIR. These are variously stated to have been twenty-three (1 Chron. ii, 22), thirty (Judg. xiv, 4), and sixty in number (1 Chron. ii, 23; Josh. xiii, 30; 1 Kings iv, 18, in which last passage they are said to have thirty-two or thirty-six specially assigned to him). The discrepancy may easily be reconciled by the supposition (warranted by Numb. xxxiii, 39, 40) that although Jair, in conjunction with his relatives, captured the whole sixty cities composing the Gileadite district of the kingdom of Og in Bashan (Deut. iii, 4), only twenty-three of the sixty-eight special cities were assigned to him, whereas, at a later date, his portion may have received some accretions; or the number attributed to his descendant of the same name may be only a round or approximate estimate, as being about one half the entire
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number. (For other methods of adjustment, see Wiener's Rekordverzeichn. s. v. Jair.)

2. The eighth judge of Israel, a native of Gilead, in Manasseh (Josephus, Ant. v. 7, 6, i'asipcy), beyond the Jordan, and therefore probably descended from the preceding, with whom, indeed, he is sometimes confounded.

He ruled for thirty-two years (B.C. 1199-1231), and his obsequies are indicated in a manner characteristic of the age in which he lived; "He had thirty sons, that rode on thirty ass-colts ( ''; and they had thirty cities ( ''; again), which are called Havoth-jair, in the land of Gilead" (Judg. x. 3, 4). A young ass was the most valuable beast for riding then known to the Hebrews; and that Jair had so many of them, and was able to assign a village to every one of his thirty sons, is a strikingly evident sign of his wealth (see Kittel's Daily Bible Illustrat., or Judg. v. 6-10). The twenty-three villages of the more ancient Jair were probably among the thirty which this Jair possessed. His burial-place was Camon, doubtless in the same region (Judg. x. 5). It is probably one of his descendants (so numerous) that is called a Jairite (Heb. Yairi, ''; Sept. i'iapk. 2 Sam. xx. 26). Possibly, however, the genuine reading was Yairi, the Jothrite. See IAIR.

3. A Benjamite, son of Shimeu and father of Mordecai, Esther's uncle (Esth. ii. 5). B.C. ante 598.

4. (Heb. Yair, ''; marg., but text Yair, ''; perhaps awake. Sept. i'iapk, Vulg. corruptly saltus.) The father of Elhanan, which latter slew the brother of Goliath (1 Chron. xx. 5). In the parallel passage (2 Sam. xx. 19) we find, instead of Jair, "Jareb" ( ''; apparently the plural of the other word, q. d. ''; a forest; Sept. i'iapk. Vulg. again saltus), with the addition of 'Orsin ( ''; probably coseers; Sept. 'Ipsinofos, Vulg. populus), which has probably been errorely taken by transcribers from the latter part of the same verse (see Kennicott's Diaries on the Hebrew Text, i. 78). B.C. ante 1018. See ELHANAN.

JA'RITE (2 Sam. xx. 26). See JAIR, 2.

Jairus (i'asip, see JAIR), an otherwise unknown ruler of the synagogue at Capernaum, whose only daughter Jesus restored to life (Matt. ix. 24, 22; Mark viii. 41; comp. Matt. ix. 18). A.D. 27.

Some have wrongly inferred from our Saviour's words, "The maid is not dead, but sleepeth" (Ruttenberg, in the Human. Beitr., z. Nutz. u. Vermihr. 1761, p. 88; Olshausen, Comment. i. 291), that the girl was only in a swoon (see Neeb, Leben Jesu, p. 347).

Jairi's (i'asip) also occurs in the Apocalypse (Esth. xi. 2) as a Greekized form of the name of Jair (q. v.), the father of Mordecai (Esth. ii. 5).

Jakan (1 Chron. i. 42). See JAKAN.

Jakeb (Heb. Yakeb, ''; pious; Sept. 'Ikanos [reading Ἰακάν], Vulg. venens [reading Ιακάν]), a name given as that of the father of Agur, the author of the proverbs in Prov. xxx. 1 sq. Interpreters greatly differ as to the person intended. See AOUR. The traditional view is that it gives the word a figurative or import (q. d. ''; obedience, sc. to God); and it will then become an epithet of David, the father of Solomon, a term appropriate to his character, and especially so as applied to him by a son. Others understand a real name of some unknown Israelite; and, in that case, the most probable supposition is that it denotes the father of "the men of Hezekiah" (perhaps composed of them, or in their time), and thus incorporated with the proverbs of Solomon. But the allusion to these latter compilers in Prov. xxx. 1, appears only to relate to an editing on their part of literary effusions (in part, perhaps, retained in the text), and to have formed a new number of new settlements. In October, 1865, a negro insurrection broke out, in the course of which several government buildings were stormed by

Hitzig (in Zeller's Thol. Yahw. 1844, p. 283), assimilated to by Bertheau (Kurzes. Exeg. Handb., ad loc.), and renders the clause thus: "The words of Agur, the son of her who was obeyed (reading Ἰακάν) in Massa," and in an extended comparison with the parallel passage (xxi. 1), defends and illustrates this interpretation, making Ja'keh to have been the son and successor of a certain queen of Arabia Petraea, chiefly on the ground that the phrase Ἰακάν will bear no other translation than The words of Lemuel, king of Massa. But if the construction be thus rendered more facile in this passage, it is more difficult in the other, where Ἰακάν cannot be brought nearer his version than The son of Ja'keh of Massa. Even this rendering violates in both passages the Masoretic punctuation, which is correctly followed in the Luth. Vers.; and the interpretation proposed after all, attributes both name (Agur and Lemuel) to the same person, without some good reason for such variation as there would be if they were ascribed as epithets to Solomon. See ITHEL.

Ja'kim (Heb. Yakim, ''; establishe), the name of two men. See also JEHIOAKIM.

1. (Sept. 'Elaiokv. v. r. I'akim, Vulg. Jacim.) The head of the twelfth division of the sacerdotal order as assigned by David (1 Chron. xxv. 19). B.C. 1018.

2. (Sept. 'Elaiokv. v. r. I'akim, Vulg. Jacim.) One of the "sons" of Shimhi, a Benjamite resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii. 19). B.C. apparently cir. 588.

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

Jakut. See Siberia.

Jalon (Heb. Yalon, ''; lodger; Sept. 'Iaros v. r. 'Iamov, the last-named of the four sons of Ezra, of the tribe of Judah, and apparently of a family kindled with that of Caleb (1 Chron. iv. 17). B.C. prob. cir. 1618.

Jamaibo. See Yamabo.

Jamaica, one of the largest islands of the West Indies, was discovered by Columbus in 1494, and received in 1514 the name Isla de San Jago. In 1605 the native population had become nearly extinct. For a time Jamaica remained under the administration of the descendants of Diego, the son of Columbus; subsequently it fell by inheritance to the house of Braganza; in 1655 it was occupied by the English, and in 1670 formally ceded to England, which has ever since retained possession of it. The only slaves ceased in the importation of slaves ordinances, or the slave trade, and in 1838 the slaves obtained their entire freedom. The negro population increased very rapidly, and, according to a census taken in 1861, there were, in a total population of 441,264, only 13,816 whites, mostly English, against 945,374 negroes and 81,065 mulattoes. The colored population has always complained of being oppresssed and ill-treated by the former slaveholders, who own nearly the whole of the landed property, and a large number of them have withdrawn from the towns and plantations into the interior of the island, where they have formed a number of new settlements. In October, 1865, a negro insurrection broke out, in the course of which several government buildings were stormed by
the insurgents, and a number of plantations plundered. The English governor, Eyre, suppressed the insurrection with a severity which caused his suspension from office, and the appointment of a special commission of investigation. The latter had, however, no practical result, and the Queen's Bench, to which the case of governor Eyre had been referred by the jury, declined to institute a trial.

Before the abolition of slavery the planters were in general opposed to the religious instruction of the slaves. In 1754 the Moravian Brethren commenced a mission in Jamaica, encouraged by several of the planters, who presented them with a site called Captain's Hill. The work was, however, but slow. From the beginning of the mission to 1804 the number of negroes baptized was 938. From 1838, when complete liberty was granted to the negroes, the Moravian mission prospered greatly; and in 1850, the number of souls under the care of the mission at the several stations was estimated at 1300. In 1842 an institution for training native teachers was established. In 1867 the mission numbered 14 churches and chapels, with 11,850 sittings, 9,550 attendants at divine worship, and 4,400 members. The number of schools was 17, and of students in the mission's schools of English Wesleyans was commenced by Dr. Coke in 1787. It soon met with violent opposition, and the Legislative Assembly of the island and the town council of Kingston repeatedly passed stringent laws for cutting off the slave population from the attendance of the Wesleyan meetings, and for removing the missionaries and the chapel from the laborers and the mission stations. From 1807 to 1815 the missionary work was accordingly interrupted, and it was only due to the interference of the home government and the English governors of Jamaica that it could be resumed. But every insurrectionary movement among the negroes led to a new outcry against the missionaries, in particular the Wesleyan, against whom, at different times, special laws were issued. A great change, however, took place in public opinion after the abolition of slavery, when the House of Assembly of the island and the Common Council of Kingston co-operated to aid in the erection of Wesleyan chapels and schools. In 1846 the number of church members in connection with the Wesleyan mission amounted to 26,585; but from that time it began to decrease, and in 1853 had declined to 19,476. In 1867 the Wesleyans had 75 churches and chapels, with 34,105 sittings, 21,756 attendants of public worship, 26 ministers, 14,061 members, 5,107 Sunday-schools, and 846 day schools, with 2,563 scholars. The English Baptists entered upon their mission in Jamaica in 1814. It soon became very prosperous: in 1839 it numbered 21,000, and in 1841, 27,706 members; in 1867, 32,542 members, 141 churches, and 72 out-stations. They have a college at Clifton, with theological instruction. In 1888 the United Presbyterianists had in Jamaica 46 churches, 92 ministers, and 8,814 members; the United Methodists 10 churches, 9 ministers, and 8,408 members. The general religious statistics in 1867 were as follows:

- Church of England: 87, 39,710 members.
- United Presbyterian's Free Church: 26, 7055.
- Roman Catholics: 6, 990.
- Jewish: 505.
- Church of Scotland: 8, 254.

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

Jamblichus, or Jamblichus (Ἰάμβλιχος), a celebrated Neoplatonic philosopher of the 4th century, was born at Chalcis, in Cilicia-Syria. What little we know of his life is derived from the works of Eunapius, a Sophist, whose love of the marvelous renders his testimony doubly doubtful. He seems, however, to have studied under Anaximander and Porphyry, and resided in Syria until his death, which occurred during the reign of Constantine the Great, and probably before 313 A.D. (Suidas, s. v. Τάμβλιχος; Eunapius. Jamblichus, Η ἤθος γόρρου 113, 16-20). He was deeply versed in the philosophical system of Plato and Pythagoras, as well as in the theology and philosophy of the Egyptians and Chaldeans, and enjoyed great reputation, being praised by all the philosophers of his time, even the equal of Plato. In his life of Pythagoras he appears as a Syncretist, or compiler of different systems, but without critical talent. So far as can be gathered from his works in Proclus's commentary on the Timaeus, he went even further than him in substance of arguments, subdividing Plutonius's trinity, and deriving therefrom a series of triads. 'Jamblichus distinguishes first three purely intelligible triads, then three intellectual ones, thus forming the νοερόν enneadic series, and the νοερόν. By the side of the great triads on the love of truth, justice, and beauty, it is to transmit the action of the former. He is also distinguished from Plutonius and Porphyry by an almost superstitious regard for numerical form. All the principles of his theology can be represented by numbers: the monad, the supreme unit, principle of all unity, as well as all diversity; two, the interlude of the first manifestation or development of unity; three, the soul, or θεία, the principle which brings all progressive beings back to unity; four, the principle of universal harmony, which comprises the causes of all things; eight, the source of motion, taking all beings away from the supreme reality to dispose them through the world; nine, the principle of all identity and of all perfection; and finally, ten, the result of all the emanations of the τὸ τέλος. Neither Plutonius nor Porphyry, whatever their regard for Pythagoras's doctrines, ever went to such an extent in reducing their principles to numerical abstractions" (Vacherot, Hist. Crétique de l'Ecole d'Alexandrie, vol. ii.). Jamblichus did not acquiesce in the doctrine of the earlier Neoplatonists, but thought that man could be brought into direct communication with the Deity through the medium of theurgy; and this system of theurgy he divided into two parts, the Πεθανομενος βίος (published first by J. Arcarius Theodorus, Franeker, 1598, 4to; best ed. L. Kuster, Amst. 1707, 4to; and Th. Kiesling, Lpz. 1815, 2 vol. 8vo); —Προφητικοί λόγοι εἰς φιλοσοφίαν (Th. Kiesling, Lpz. 1813, 8vo) —Προφητικοί λόγοι τῶν ἑνωμένων (Vilbelin, Anecdota Graeco, ii. 198 sqq.; J. F. Fries, Copenhagen, 1790, 4to). —Προφητικοί λόγοι, τῆς ἀρχηγοῦ (Ch. Wechel, Paris, 1543, 4to; Tr. Ast. Lpz. 1817, 8vo). 2. The Προφητικοί λόγοι, in one book, in which a priest named Abammon is introduced as replying to a letter of Pythagoras. He endeavors to vindicate the truth, purity, and divinity of Egyptian religion and its theology, and maintains that man, through theurgic rites, may commune with the Deity. There has been some controversy concerning the authenticity of this work, but Tennemann and other eminent critics think there are no grounds for doubt. The date of Jamblichus is July 1704, 4to; Brucker, Historia critica Philosophiarum, ii. 390, 431; Tillemont, Hist. des Empereurs, vi. 246; Tene-
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the same name given to them, an unprecedented oversight that would produce continual confusion in the family; besides, the law did not allow a man to be married to two sisters at the same time (Lev. xxviii, 18), as Joseph in that case would have been; nor would either of these objections be obviated by supposing the two Marys to have been half-sisters. The only palatable conjecture is that they are called sisters (i.e., sisters-in-law), because of their marriage to two brothers, Cleophas and Joseph; a supposition that is strengthened by their apparent intimacy with each other, and their similar connection with Jesus intimated in John xix, 25. Cleophas (or Alphaeus) seems to have been anywhere between Joseph, and dying without issue, Joseph married his wife (probably before his marriage with the Virgin, as he seems to have been much older than she) according to the Levirate law (Deut. xxv, 5); on which account his oldest son by that marriage is styled the (legal) son of Cleophas, as well as (reputed half-) brother of Jesus. See ALPHAUS; MARY. This arrangement meets all the statements of Scripture in the case, and is confirmed by the declarations of early Christian writers. (See No. 5, below.) The only objection of any force against such an arrangement of the statement, occurs towards the latter part of our Saviour's ministry, that "neither did his brethren believe on him" (John vii, 5), whereas two of them, at least, are in this way included among his disciples (namely, James and Jude, if not Simon); and, although they are mentioned in Acts i, 14 as subsequently present at the ascension, yet it is discovered in John vii, 7 seems too decisive to admit the supposition that those there referred to sustained so prominent a position as apostles among his converts. A more likely mode of reconciling these two passages is to suppose that there were still other brothers besides those chosen as apostles (or mentioned particularly anywhere (perhaps only Joseph and one younger), who did not believe on him until a very late period, being possibly convinced only by his resurrection. Indeed, if three of these brethren were apostles, the language in Acts i, 14, requires such a supposition; for, after enumerating the eleven (including, as usual, James, Simon, and Jude), that passage adds, "and with his brethren." Whether these mentioned brothers (as indeed may also be said of the sisters, and perhaps of Simon) were the children of Mary, Cleophas's widow, or of the Virgin Mary, is uncertain; yet in the early Christian church, among other persons (Luke ii, 7), as well as in the intimation of temporary abstinence only in Matt. i, 25, there seems to be implied a reference to other children (see VIRGINS); but, be that as it may, there can be no good reason given why such should not have been the case; we may therefore conjecture that while James, Simon, Jude, and Joseph's children by Cleophas's widow, and the first three were of sufficient age to be chosen apostles, all the others were by the Virgin Mary, and among them only some sisters were of sufficient age and notoriety at Christ's second visit to Nazareth to be specified by his townsman (Matt. xiii, 55; Mark vi, 3), Jospe and the children of the Virgin generally being the "brethren" that did not believe in Jesus till late (John vii, 5; Acts i, 14). See JUDE. To the objection that if the Virgin had had other children, especially sons (and still more, as children of Joseph), she would have expressed direction of Jesus, her eldest son, would have decided her residence with "the beloved disciple," who was eminently fitted, as Christ's favorite, no less than by his amiable manners and comparative affluence, to discharge that duty. See JHN. (See Meth. Quart. Rev. Oct. 1861, p. 670-672.) See on the No. S, below.

There have been three principal theories on the sub-
ject: 1. For the identity of James, the Lord's brother, with James the apostle, the son of Alpheus, we find (see Routh, Relig. Sacr. i, 16, 43, 220 [Oxon. 1846]) Clemens of Alexander (Hypotyposeis, bk. vii, apud Eusebius, H. E. i, 12; ii, 1) and Chrysostom (in Gal. i, 19). This hypot-
thesis, being warmly defended by St. Jerome (in Matt. xii, 49) and St. Augustine (in Matt. xii, 55), in the Protevangelium of James, and the Pseudo-Apostolic Constitution of the 3d century (Thi-
olo, Cod. Apoc. i, 228; Const. Apost. vi, 12). It is ac-
cepted by Eusebius (Commu. in Evan. xvi, 6; H. E. i, 12; ii, 1). Perhaps it is Origen's opinion (see Comm. in Joh. ii, 12). St. Epiphanius, St. Hilary, and St. Ambrose we have already mentioned as being on the same side. So are Victorinus (Vit. Phil. in Gal. apud Maii Script. rer. novel. coll. [Rome, 1828]) and Gregory Nyssen (Opp. ii, 844, D. [Paris ed. 1618]), and it became the recognized position of the Greek Church. But, according to Dr. Na-
sis, put forward at first by Bonosus, Helvidius, and Jo-
vianus, and revived by Herder and Strauss in Germany, is that James, Joseph, Jude, and James the son of Joseph and Mary, while James the apostle and James the son of Alpheus (whether one or two persons) were different from, and not under the title of "brothers and sisters" of our Lord. English theologial
critics have been divided between the first and se-
cond of these views, with, however, a preference on the whole for the first hypothesis. See, e.g. Lander, viii, 495 (London, 1876); Peene, in Minor Works, i, 250 (Oxf.
1844), and On the Character, i, 360 ii, 224 (Oxford, 1848); Thordikke, i, (Oxf. 1844); Horne's Introd. to H. S. iv, 497 (Lond. 1844), etc. On the same side are Lightfoot, Wituus, Lampe, Baumgarten, Semler, Gader, Eichhorn, Hug, Berthold, Guericke, Schneckenburger, Meier, Stei-
ger, Giesler, Theile. Lance, Taylor (Ops. v, 29 [London, 1849]), Wilson (Op. vi, 673 [Oxf. 1859]), and Cave (Life of St. James) maintain the second hypothesis with Vas-
sius, Banage, Valesius, etc. The third is held by Dr. Davidson (Introd. New Test. vol. iii) and by Dean Alford (Greek Test. iv, 87). Our own position, it will be per-
ceived, is that the differences of opinion arise from confus-
ing with (1) the identity of the two Jameses, with (2) the Levirate marriage of Joseph and the widow of Alpheus, and with (3) that these were all the children of Joseph and in part of Mary. See JAMES, EPITHELIO OF (below).
the other individuals called the brethren of Jesus stood in the same relation. It is also urged that in the Acts, after the death of James, the son of Zebedee, we read only of one James; and, moreover, that it is improbable that our Lord would have committed his mother to the care of the beloved disciple had there been sons of Joseph living, whether the offspring of Mary, or of Mary’s former husband. Neither of these statements, however, have ever been alleged that in several early Christian writers, James, the brother of the Lord, is distinguished from the son of Alpheus, that the identity of the names Alpheus and Cleophas is somewhat uncertain, and that it is doubtful whether the word Alpheus, and his brethren, and his mother in Acts is understood to mean that Alpheus and Cleophas were related to our Lord, the narrative in the Evangelists and the Acts presents some reasons for suspecting that they were not the persons described as “the brethren of Jesus.”

(1) The brethren of Jesus are associated with his mother in a manner that suggests their standing above the world hate you,” etc.), if they were related to our Lord, the narrative in the Evangelists and the Acts presents some reasons for suspecting that they were not the persons described as “the brethren of Jesus.”

(2) It is explicitly stated that at a period posterior to the appointment of the twelve apostles, among whom we find “the son of Alpheus,” “neither did his brethren believe in him” (John vii, 5; Litte’s Comment). Attempts, indeed, have been made by Grotius and Lardner to dispense with the force of this passage, as if it meant merely that their faith was imperfect or wavering—“that they did not believe as they should,” but the language of Jesus is decisive: “My time is not yet come, but your time is always ready; the world cannot hate you, but me it hates” (compare this with John xvii, 19, 18; Acts vii, 53: ‘the world hate you’), etc."

As to the supposition that what is affirmed in John’s Gospel might apply to only one of his brethren, it is evident that, admitting the identity, only one brother of Jesus would be left out of the “company of the apostles” (so the language in Acts i, 15, 14, is opposed to the identity in question); for, after enumerating the apostles, among whom, as usual, is “James, the son of Alpheus,” he adds, “they all continued with one accord in prayer and supplication with the women, and Mary, the mother of Jesus, and with his brethren,” From this passage, however, we learn that by this time his brethren had received him as the Messiah. That after the death of the son of Zebedee we find only one James mentioned, may easily be accounted for on the ground that probably only one, “the brother of the Lord,” remained at Jerusalem; and, under such circumstances, the absence of the historical narrative of the son of Alpheus is not more strange than respecting several of the other apostles, whose names never occur after the catalogue in i, 13. Paul’s language in Gal. i, 19 has been adduced to prove the identity of the Lord’s brother with the son of Alpheus by its ranking among the apostles, but others contend that it is by no means decisive (Winer, Grammatik, 4th edit., p. 517; Neander, History of the Planting, etc., ii, 5 [Engl. transl.]).

Dr. Nie- meyer (Charakteret der Bibel, i, 389 [Halle, 1880]) enumerates not less than five persons of this name, by distinguishing the son of Alpheus from James the Less, and assuming that the James last mentioned in Acts i, 13 was not the brother, but the father of Judas. Amidst this great disagreement of views (see in Winer’s Realwörter, s. v. Jacobus; Davidson’s Introduction to the N. T. iii, 302 sq.; Horne’s Introduction, new ed. iv, 591, n.; Princeton Review, Jan., 1865), the most probable solution of the main question is that given above (No. 2), identifying James, the son of Alpheus, with one of the apostles, the literal brother of our Lord, and the man whose name in the sister-in-law of the Virgin by virtue of the marriage of both with Joseph (see also Alfred, Prolegg, to vol. iv, pt. ii of his Comment, p. 88 sq.). This Levirate explanation is summarily dismissed by Andrews (Life of our Lord, p. 198) and Jan. 16, 1843 (in the Appendix to his sermon “Prophecy and Usurpation, intro. to epist. of James, p. 19) as “needing no refutation;” but, although conjectural, it is the only one that makes it possible for James to have been at once Christ’s brother and yet the son of Alpheus. If he was likewise the same with the son of Mary, the wife of Cleophas, the theory may be said to be demonstrated. Other treatises on the subject are Dr. Mill’s Accounts of our Lord’s Brethren Vindicated (Cambridge, 1843); Schaff, DasVerhältniss des Jacobus, Bruders des Herrn, und Jacobus Alphai (Berlin, 1842); Gabler, De Jacobo, epistolar usw. (Alzey, 1877). For other monographs, see Vol. vi, p. 737 (Baj.)

If we examine the early Christian writers, we shall meet with a variety of opinions on this subject. Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. ii, 1) says that James, the first bishop of Jerusalem, brother of the Lord, son of Joseph, the husband of Mary, is named the Just by the ancients on account of his eminence. He uses their religious language in his Evangelical Demonstration (iii, 5). In his commentary on Isaiah he reckons fourteen apostles, viz. the twelve, Paul, and James, the brother of our Lord. A similar enumeration is made in the “Apostolic Constitutions” (vi, 14) “Epaphroditus, and Theophilus, last speak of James, the Lord’s brother, as being the same as the son of Cleophas.” They suppose that Joseph and Cleophas were brothers, and that the latter dying without issue, Joseph married his widow for his first wife, according to the Jewish custom, and that James and his brethren were the offspring of this marriage (Lardner’s Credibility, ii, 118; Works, iv, 548; i, 165; v, 169; Hist. of Heretics, ch. xi, § 11; Works, v, 527; Supplement to the Credibility, ch. xvii, Works, vi, 188). A passage from Josephus is quoted by Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. ii, 23), in which James, the brother of “him who is called Christ,” is spoken of as a confessor (De Josip, etc.), Chrysostom and Photius (Ep. 157), are not likely. Eusebius follows this account in a passage of his history, but says elsewhere that he was appointed by the apostles (Hist. Eccles. ii, 23). Cilicius of Alexandria is the first author who speaks of his episcopate (Hyginus, bk. iv, sp. Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. ii, 1), and he alludes to it as a thing of which the chief apostles, Peter, James, and John, might well have been ambitious. The same Clement reports that the Lord, after his resurrection, delivered the gift of knowledge to James the Just, to John, and Peter, who, he says, delivered it to the rest of the apostles (Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. ii, 13). According to Hegesippus (a convert Jew of the 2nd century) James, the brother of the Lord, undertook the government of the Church along with the apostles (apud ev. 7) and as held in the highest veneration by the Jews (ap. Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. ii, 23). It is to be accounted for is Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. ii, 23). But in the account he gives of his martyrdom some circumstances are highly improbable (see Euthy, Reliquiae Sacrae, i, 229), although the event itself is quite credible (A.D. 62). In the apoc-
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The Gospel according to the Hebrews, he is said to have been precipitated from a pinnacle of the Temple, then assaulted with stones, and at last dispatched by a blow on the head with a fuller's pole (Lardner's *Supplement*, ch. xvi, *Works*, vi, 174; Neander, *Planting*, etc., ii, 9, 22). 

Eusebius gives the same account that Hegesippus does, and says that different accounts have evidently copied it for the most part from him. He adds a few particulars which are probably mere assertions or conclusions of his own (Her. xxiv, 4; lxxvii, 18). 

He calculates that James must have been ninety-six years old at the time of his death, and adds (on the authority of the Historia Eusebii, Clemens, and others) that he wore the vrsiak on his forehead, in which he probably confounds him with St. John (Polyc. apud Eusebii, *Hist. Eccles.*, v, 24. But see Cotta, *De Lam. post. App. Jom. Jac. et Marci* [Tib. 1753]). Gregory of Tours reports that he was buried, not where he fell, but on the Mount of Olivies, in a tomb in which he had already buried Zacharias and Simon (De glor. mart., i, 27). The monument—part excavation, part edifice—which is now commonly known as the "Tomb of St. James," is on the east side of the so-called Valley of Je- hoshaphat. The question about the monument in question is that St. James took refuge there after the capture of Christ, and remained, eating and drinking nothing, until our Lord appeared to him on the day of his resurrection (see Quaresmius, etc., quoted in Tober, Sidoa, etc., p. 299). The legend of his death there seems to be first recorded in a monastic Chronicle (Annali Benedictinorum; see *Early Trans*, p. 176). By the old travellers it is often called the "Church of St. James." Eusebius tells us that his chair was preserved down to his time (on which see Heinichen's *Excursus* [Exc. 24, ad Euseb. Hist. Eccles. vii, 19, vol. iv, p. 357, ed. Burton]). We must add a strange Talmudic legend which appears to relate to St. James. It is found in the Midrash Koheloth, or Commentary on Ecclesiastes, and also in the Tract Abodah Zdrakh of the Jerusalem Talmud. It is as follows: "R. Elezer, the son of Dama, was bitten by a serpent, and there came to him a man, a son of Saphar Sceanna, to heal him by the law of Jesus, the son of Pandareus, but R. Ismael suffered him not to say: 'That is not allowed thee, son of Dama.'" He answered, 'Suffer me, and I will produce an authority against thee that is lawful," but he could not produce the authority before he expired. And in his anger he said to this: 'If a man say: 'I shall live in thee' (Lev. xviii, 5). But it is not said that he shall die in them." The son of Pandareus is the name that the Jews have always given to our Lord when representing him as a magician. The same name is given in Epiphanius (Her. lxxviii) to the grandfather of Joseph, and by John Damascene (De Fide Orth. iv, 15) to the grandfather of Joachim, the supposed father of the Virgin Mary. For the identification of James of Sceanna (a place in Upper Galilee) with James the Just, see Mill (*Historic. Critical. of the Gospel*, p. 318, Camb. 1840). For the apocryphal works ascribed to James, see JAMES, SPHINXUS WRITINGS OF.

JAMES, EPISTLE OF; said, according to Eusebius (*Hist. Eccles.*, ii, 23, to be the first of the so-called Catholic epistles (αφιχεων), as being addressed to classes of Christians rather than to individuals or particular communities. The Apocalypse is said by Eusebius to be a work of Dispersion. 

I. Author.—As the writer simply styles himself "James, a servant of God end of the Lord Jesus Christ," the question as to whom this may designate has been a subject of keen and prolonged controversy, since, as Eusebius has again remarked, there were several of this name. James the Great, or the son of Zebedee, was put to death under Herod Agrippa about the year 44, and, therefore, the authorship cannot with any propriety be ascribed to him, though a Syriac MS., published by Widmamstadt, and an old Latin version, published by Martinay and Salaster, make the ascription. The authorship has been assigned by not a few to James the Less, a μητρικος, the son of Alpheus or Cleophas, and by others to James, the Lord's brother. Many, however, maintain that the two names were borne by the same individual, James being called the Lord's brother either as being a cousin or adoptive brother of Jesus (Lange, *Art. Jacobus in Herzog's Enzyklopaedie*), or as a son of Alpheus or Cleophas. The title of Brother of Jesus—the opinion of Epiphanius and Theophylact; or as a son of Joseph by a former marriage—the view of St. Chrysostom, Hilary, Cave, and Bussan. On the other hand, it is held by some that James, son of Alpheus, and James, brother of our Lord, were distinct persons, and the reason of the confusion being a matter standing, according to the representation of the Gospel, in the same relation with him to their common mother Mary—as in Matt, xii, 47; xxiii, 55; Mark vi, 3; John ii, 12; Acts i, 14. On the whole, we are inclined to the former hypothesis, but we cannot enter into the question, referring the reader to the previous article, and to that on BROTHERS OF OUR Lord. There are also three excellent monographs on the subject: Blom, *Theol. Disser., de filiis fratrii eurou* (Lugd. Bat. 1839); Schaff, *Das Verhaltnisse des Jacobus Bruders des Herrn* (Berlin, 1841), 4to; and *Theol. Disser., de Joseph, fratre nostri Domini* (Groningen, 1854). For the other side, see Mill on the *Mythical Interpretation of the Gospel*, p. 219, ed. sec., 1861. 

Dr. Mill held the perpetual virginity of Mary, or that she was, in ecclesiastical language, ἐκκορυμματισμενη, and thus virtually foreclosed the entire investigation. The title of Brother of Jesus seems to have been partly adopted by St. Peter (Matt, xxvi, 71; Acts i, 14) on this as well as on the opposite theory as having their prototypes in the Anti-doricamarians or Helvidians of the 4th century. 

According to our view, the author of this epistle was the Lord's brother, and an apostle, or one of the twelve. In Gal. ii, 9, Paul classes him with Peter and John, all three being as well as John, called the brother of James (Eusebii, Hist. ii, 23) to have received the government of the Church, μετὰ τῶν ἀποστόλων, but not as ἀπόστολος, as Jerome wrongly renders it, but along with the ἀποστόλοι—as the natural rendering is—or was received by them into a collegiate relation. In the pseudo-Clementine, and in the Apostolical Constitutions, however, he is traditionally separated from the apostles. It is quite groundless on the part of Wieseler (*Studien und Kritiken*, 1842), Stier, and Davidson to argue that the James mentioned in the first chapter of Galatians is a different person from the James son of Alpheus, and that James of Jerusalem is the James of the apostolic age. Now, again, we have Paul distinctly acknowledging the high position of the brethren of the Lord when he ranges them between "other apostles" and "Cephas" in 1 Cor. ix, 5. By universal consent James was called ὁ ἁγιασμένος, and, being martyred, was succeeded by a cousin, Symeon, sent on of the council of the Church, the archbishop of the Church of Jerusalem, and a son of Alpheus (ὄντα ἁγιασμένον τοῦ Κυρίου συμβέβηκεν). Thus James was the superintendent of the Church at Jerusalem, and, probably on account of continuous residence, possessed of higher influence there than Peter, the apostle of the circumcision, who could only be an occasional visitor. "Certain from James (τινὶς ἀπὸ Ἰακώβου) went down to Antioch, before whom Peter prevenerated, as if he had stood in awe of the stricter Judaic principles of James and his party (Acts xv; Gal. ii). It seems, therefore, very natural that one occupying this position in the theoretical meaning of the word, ἁγιασμένος τοῦ νόμου—that for their sakes, and to ward off their hostility, he advised the apostle Paul to submit to an act contrary to his believing conscience, that is, to the suspension of the Dispersion. He sympathized so strongly with the martyrdom of the Jews who believed and yet were zealous of the law—Σαρακατα τοῦ νόμον—that for their sakes, and to ward off their hostility, he advised the apostle Paul to submit to an act contrary to his believing conscience, that is, to the suspension of the Dispersion.

The opinion that the author of this epistle is different from James, the son of Alpheus, and not an apostle, is held by Clement, Herder, De Wette, Neander, Kora,
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Schaff, Winer, Stier, Rothe, and Alford. Davidson, while holding the opinion that the Lord's brother and James the apostle are different persons, ascribes the epistle to the latter. But the theory seems to violate all the probabilities that may be gathered from the early fathers and historians. That James, the Lord's brother, is James the apostle, is an opinion maintained by Barnabas, Clement, Justin, Irenaeus, Eusebius, Eusebius of Cæsarea, Meier, Gieseler, Theile, and the most of other writers.

II. Canonical Authority.—The epistle is found in the Syriac Peshito in the 2d century, a version which circulated in the neighborhood of that country to which James and his readers belonged, and the translator and his apostles appear to have been in close communion. For inserting James in their canon, as they exclude the Second and Third Epistles of John, the Epistle of Jude, and the Apocalypse. There are clauses in Clement of Rome (Ad Cor. xxxii) and in Hermas (Mandat. xii, 15) which probably may refer to correspondent portions of this epistle, though, perhaps, they may only allude directly to the Septuagint. The quotation from the Latin version of Irenaeus (Adser. Hær. iv, 16) appears to be more direct in the phrase "et amicus Dei vocatus est." But this phrase, found also in Clement, seems to have been borrowed from the 2d century, and the whole analogy is explained by the same appellation. We cannot, therefore, lay such immediate stress on these passages as is done by Kern, Wiesinger, and others, though there is a presumption in favor of the opinion that passages in the apocryphal fathers, bearing any likeness of style or thought to the apostle, are of the same age, and are direct quotations, which are either direct imitations or unconscious reproductions. This epistle is quoted by Origen (In Joam., in Opert. iv, 306); and the Latin version of Rufinus uses the phrase Jacobus apostolus as a preface to a quotation. This father quotes the epistle also as ascribed to James—iv υς γεωργιος Ignatius, 1st and 2nd epistles to the Corinthians, and Origen says that the doctrine "faith without works is dead" is not received by all—οὐχ ἡμῶν ὄντων. Clement of Alexandria does not quote it, but Eusebius says that he expounded all the catholic epistles, including, however, in the range of his commentaries the Epistle of Barnabas and the so-called Apocalypse of Peter. Tertullian seems to make no reference to it, though Credner suppose an allusion to it, 23 in the second book Adevereus Judaeos (Opere, ed. Oehler, ii, 704). Eusebius places it among the Antilegomena (Hist. Ecles. ii, 25; iii, 25), saying that the first reference to the name of James he had just spoken of its author's death, 1st and 2nd to the epistle as one of the ancients have mentioned it; subjoining, however, that it and Jude were used in most of the churches. In other places Eusebius quotes James without hesitation, calling the epistle by the sacred title of γραφή, and its author δί υρν υποστολής. Jerome is very explicit, saying that James wrote one epistle, which some asserted had been published by another in his name, but that by degrees and in process of time ("paullatim tempore procedente") it obtained authority. Jerome's assertion may arise from the fact that there were several persons named James, and that confusion on this point was one means of throwing doubt on the epistle. There seems to be also an allusion in Hippolytus (ed. Lagarde, p. 122) to ii, 13, in the words η γεωργίου διαλεγεται ἡ διαλεɡεται ἡ διαλεgementh—began" along with himself (ὑπάκου) "by the word of truth," and all of them bearing the "good name" (ἀγαθὸν ὄνομα). The first verse of the second chapter implies also that they held "the faith of our Lord Jesus Christ, the Lord of Glory," and they are exhortcd not to hold it inconsistently, along with manifest respect of persons, or showing unfounded social preferences. They are told besides, in ὑπὸ τοῦ παπῶν.
It is not so easy to determine the time at which the epistle was written. Many place the date about the year 60—close on the martyrdom of James the Just, or not long before the destruction of Jerusalem—as Michaelis, Pecquet, and some others. But the view might, from the sentiment which is expressed in the letter, have been written earlier—say in the year 54 or 55. For the former part of it might be written by James to the Hebrews, to which epistle it was added. The latter contains a form of greeting to the Jews, which, though it seems to be used more often as a form of address to the Hebrews, was written to the Jews, and not to the Gentiles, as the early Christian epistles are generally understood to be.
fall (so Macknight infers from v. 1); for at that time the old controversy appears to have been somewhat revived. De Wette adduces the allusion to the name "Christians" in ii, 7, as an evidence in favor of the late date; but this would only require a date later than that of St. John. This would imply a preponderance in favor of the interval between Paul's two imprisonments at Rome, or about A.D. 62.

VI. There are two points in the epistle which demand a somewhat more lengthened notice. These are, (a) ii, 14-26, which has been represented as a formal opposition to Paul's doctrine of justification by faith; and (b) v, 14, 15, which is quoted as the authority for the sacramental extremities undecided.

(a) Justification being an act, not of man, but of God, both the phrases "justification by faith" and "justification by works" are inexact. Justification must either be by grace or of reward. Therefore our question is, Did or did not James hold justification by grace? If he did not, his statement here is erroneous. Now there is not one word in James to the effect that a man can earn his justification by works; and this would be necessary in order to prove that he held justification of reward. Still Paul does use the expression "justified by faith" (Rom. v, 1), and James the expression "justified by works" as faith only. Here is an apparent opposition. But, if we consider the meaning of the two apostles, we see at once that there is no contradiction either intended or possible. Paul was opposing the Judaizing party, which claimed to earn acceptance by good works, whether the works of the Mosaic law, or works of piety done by themselves. In opposition to these, Paul lays down the great truth that acceptance cannot be earned by man at all, but is the free gift of God to the Christian man, for the sake of the merits of Jesus Christ, appropriated by each individual, and by the influence of the Holy Spirit on the heart. James, on the other hand, was opposing the old Jewish tenet that to be a child of Abraham was all in all; that godliness was not necessary, if but the belief was correct. This presumptuous confidence had transferred itself, with perhaps double force, to the Christianized Jews. They had said, "Let a man say, "Lord, Lord," and that was enough, without doing his Father's will. They had recognised the Messiah: what more was wanted? They had faith: what more was required of them? It is plain that their "faith" was a totally different thing from the "faith" of Paul. Paul tells us again and again that his "faith" is a "faith that works by love;" but the very characteristic of the "faith" which James is attacking, and the very reason why he attacked it, was that it did not work by love, but was a bare absence of the head, not influencing the heart; a faith such as devils can have, and tremble. James tells us that "fides informis" is not sufficient on the part of man for justification; Paul tells us that "fides formativa" is sufficient: and the reason why fides informis will not justify us is, according to James, because it lacks that special quality, the addition of which constitutes its fides formativa. See (3) supra, Subject; Bullinger, cop. 21 et Examen Censura; Taylor's Sermon on "Faith working by Love," viii, 284 (Lond. 1850); and, as a corrective of Bull's view, Laurence's Bampton Lectures, iv, v, vi. Other discussions may be found in Knapp, Scripta, p. 511; Reuss, Theologie, ii, 924; Hofmann, Schriftlexicon, i, 683; Wainlaw's Sermons; Wood's Theology, ii, 408; Watson's Institutes, ii, 614; Lechler, Das Apostol. und nachapostolische Zeitalter, p. 163. For monographs, see Walch, Bibliothec Theologica, iv, 941; Danz, Worterbuch, s. v. Jacobus. See JUSTIFICATION; Faith.

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

VII. Contents.—The errors and sins against which James warns his readers are such as arose out of their
situations. Perfection—παρακολούθησιν is a prominent idea, and it is often a frequent epithet—the "perfect work" of patience, the "perfect" gift of God, the "perfect law" of liberty or the new covenant, faith "made perfect," and "perfect" being the supreme man. It is clear, from a knowledge of their circumstances, does not set before them an ethical system for their leisurely study, but selects the vices of opinion and life to which their circumstances so markedly and so naturally exposed them. Patience is a primary inculcation, it being essentially the object in view which is this central thought. Trials develop patience, and such evils as produce trials are not to be ascribed in a spirit of fatalism to God. Spiritual life is enjoyed by believers, and is fostered by the reception, and specially by the doings of the word; and true religious service is unworldly and disinterested work, and is thereby chosen by the royal law—faith without works is dead—tongue and temper are to be under special guard, and under the control of wisdom—the deceits of casualty are to be eschewed—contemptuous covetousness is to be avoided as one of the works of the flesh. With these, and others, pride. Rich oppressors are denounced, and patience is enjoined on all; the fitting exercises in times of gladness and of sickness are prescribed; the efficacy of prayer is extolled and exemplified; while the conclusion animates his readers to do for others what he has been doing. He teaches the existence to convert them from "the error of their way" (see Stanley's *Sermons and Essays on the Apostolic Age*, p. 297).

The epistle contains no allusion to the cardinal doctrines of Christianity, though they are implied. It was not the writer's object either to discuss or defend them. It would be an unnatural perversion of his design to say that Christianity had not penetrated his own spiritual life, or that he was only in a transition state between Judaism and Christianity. He might not, indeed, have the free and unhampered view of Paul in presenting the Gospel. But a true Christianity is implied, and his immediate work lay in preserving private Christian duties, which he does in the style of the Master himself.

VIII. Style and Language. — The similarity of this epistle in tone and form to the Sermon on the Mount has often been remarked. In the spirit of the Great Teacher, he sharply reproves all externalism, all sectishness, inconsistency, worldliness, ostentation, self-deception, and hypocrisy. Thus in the first chapter as a sample. comp. i, 2, Matt. v, 10-12; i, 4, Matt. v, 48; i, 5, Matt. vii, 7, i, 9, Matt. v, 3; i, 20, Matt. v, 22, etc. The epistle, in short, is a long and earnest illustration of the golden rule, as laid down by our Lord, in figures in building on the rock and building on the sand. The composition is the abrupt and stern utterance of an earnest, practical soul—a rapid series of censure and counsels—not entirely disconnected, but generally suggested by some inner link of association. Often a general law is epigrammatically laid down, while a peculiar sin is reprobated or a peculiar virtue enforced—or a principle is announced in the application of it. The style is vigorous—full of imperatives so solemn and categorical as to dispel all idea of resistance or compromise, and of interrogations so pointed that they carry their answer with them. It is marked by epithets so bold and forcible that they give freshness and color to the dic tion. The clauses have a rhetorical beauty and power, and as in men of fervent oratorical temper, the words often fall into rhythmical order, while the thoughts occupy the thoughts of poetry. An accidental hexameter is found in i, 17 [provided it be lawful to make the last syllable of διδάσκω long].

The Greek is remarkably pure, and it is difficult to account for this comparative purity. Hegesippus, as quoted by Eusebius, says that James's believing brethren desired him to address the crowds assembled at the Passover; for there were brought together "all the tribes, with also the Gentiles"—πάσας αἱ φυλαὶ μετὰ καὶ τῶν ἱθονίων; and Greek must have been the lan guage employed. It is therefore quite preposterous on the part of Boiten, Beholdt, and Schott to suspect that the Greek of this epistle is a translation from an Aramaean original.

Remarks have sometimes been traced between this epistle and the first Epistle of Peter, and these may be accounted for by the fact that both authors were somewhat similarly circumstanced in relation to their readers. But Hug's and Bleek's inference is a rash one—that Peter must have read the epistle of James. In a letter of the Epistle of James (2:17—24) there is a protest against laxity of morals—against supine and easy acquiescence in the truths of the Gospel without feeling their power or acting under their influence, while it presents such ethical lessons as the Church, placed in multiple relations to a world of sense and trial, has ever need of to contemplate and sustain it in its progress towards perfection.

IX. Commentaries. — The following are the exegetical treatises expressly on the whole epistle; a few of the most important we prefix an asterisk (*): Didymus Al exandrinus, in Ep. Epist. (in 1907). 2, 11, 21, 24, 28, 32; Althamer. *Ascendit (Agr. 1527, 8vo); Zuingle, *Adm patres (Tigur. 1535, 8vo; also in Opp. iv, 34); Forleng, *Commentarius (Lugdun. 1555, 8vo); Lógenhagen, *Admonitios (Antw. 1571, 8vo; 1572, 12mo); Hemingia, *Commentary (London, 1577, 4to); Feuardent, *Commentariorum (Paris, 1579, 4to); Meteor, *Commentarius (Paris, 1580, 8vo); Braun, *Commentarius (Paris, 1605, 4to); Turlington, *Lectures (London, 1606, 4to); Winckelmann, *Explication (Giess. 1608, 8vo); Steuart, *Commentarius (Insg. 1610, 4to); Pas, *Commentaria (Antwerp, 1617, 1623; Lugd. 1620, 8vo); Lorin, *Commentarium [incl. Jude] (Paris, 1622, 4to); Mogendorff, *Commentariorum (in Opp.); Laurent, *Commentarius (Asmt. 1635, 1662, 4to); Kerner, *Predigten (Ulm, 1639, 8vo); Mayer, *Exposition (London, 1639, 8vo); Price, *Commentary (London, 1642, 8vo; also in the Catr. Sacre); *Manton, *Commentary (London, 1655, 4to; 1840, 1844, 1844, 4vo); Brocock, *Commentarius (Hafni. 1841, 1706, 4to; Frankfurt, 1665, 8vo); Schmidt, *Disputationes [incl. Ephes. etc.] (Argent. 1685, 1699, 4to); Creiz, *Predigten (Frankl. 1694, 8vo); Smith, *Friedberg (Amst. 1698, 4to); Creighton, *Verklaring [incl. John's ep.] (Franck. 1704, 4to); Griesenwerth, *Predigt (in 1708). 129, 131, 133; *Am merk (Stuttgart, 1711, 8vo); Michaelis, *Introductio (Hal. 1722, 4to); Benson, *Paraphrase (Lond. 1738, 4to; with the other caths. ep. ib. 1749, 1756, 4to; in Latin, Hal. 1747, 4to); Heisen, *Discertationes (Brem. 1739, 4to); *Hanson, *Verklaring (Gron. 1745, 4to); *Damm, *Am merk (Ber. 1747, 4to); Buzer, *Ammerk (Ber. 1750, 8vo); Heidegger, *Ammerk (Ber. 1754, 8vo); *Jacobi, *Predigt (Ber. 1835; 8vo; tr. by Ryland, London, 1838, 8vo); *KERN, *Erklarung (Tub. 1838, 8vo); Scharlings, *Commentarius [incl. Jude] (Havn. 1840, 4vo); *Stier, *Auflösung (Barmen, 1845, 8vo); Cellier, *Commentarius (Königs. 1854, 8vo; also in 1788); Semler, *Commentaries and Essays, p. 291; *Neander, *Exalter (Berlin, 1850, 8vo, being vol. vi of his ed. of the Heilige Schrift; tr. by Mrs. Conant, N. Y. 1859, 12mo); Drieucke, *Predig ten (Lpz. 1851, 8vo); *Patterson, *Commentary (in the Journ. of the Soc. of London, 1851, 200 sq); *Wiesinger, *Commentarius (Königs. 1854, 8vo; also in 1788); *Videbrand, *Bibelausdruck (Berlin, 1859, 8vo); *Burckley, *Predigten (Vienna, 1861); *Lindley, *Lectures (London, 1862, 12mo); *Hermann [edit. Bouman],
of Mary dying without issue. He was the grandson, as Mary was the granddaughter, of Margaret Tudor, through whom the Scottish line claimed and eventually obtained the inheritance of the crown of England after the failure of the claim of Henry VIII. The son of Mary and Darnley (or king Henry, as he was called after his marriage) was born in the castle of Edinburgh June 19, 1566, and was baptized according to the Roman Catholic ritual in Stirling Castle December 17 following, by the names of Charles James. The murder of Darnley took place Feb. 10, 1567, and was followed by the early marriage with Bothwell on May 15 of the same year; her capture by the insurgent nobles, or Lords of the Congregation as they called themselves, at Carberry, on June 14; her consignment as a prisoner to the castle of Lochleven on the 17th, and her forced resignation of the crown on July 24, in favor of the young Philip, when he was crowned at Stirling on the 28th as James VI, being then an infant of a little more than a year old. It was at this time that the final struggle was raging in Scotland between the two great interests of the old and the new religion, which, besides their intrinsic importance, were respectively identified with the French and the English alliance, and which, together with the old and the new distribution of the property of the kingdom, made the minority of James stormy beyond even the ordinary experience of Scottish minorities. Before his mother's marriage with Bothwell had been consummated, George Buchanan, a zealous adherent of the Presbyterian Church, during the minority of the young king, the Earl of Morton had been assigned the regency; but Jane's guards being anxious to control themselves the affairs of state, in 1578 Morton was driven from power, and James nominally assumed the direction of affairs. Morton, however, soon succeeded in re-establishing himself, and held the government for a short period, when he was finally deposed, and the young king again obtained the control of state affairs. He was at this time only twelve years of age, and was assisted by a council of twelve nobles. Once more great rejoicings were manifest throughout the land. All parties hailed the event as the advent of a new era, and to those who were anxious to bring the prospects of power and prosperity. Presbyterians relied on the early training of the prince; Romanists on the descendency of the young ruler, and, regarding his mother as in some sense a martyr to their cause, supposed it would naturally make James incline to, if not openly espouse Romanism. The pope wrote pleasant letters to the young monarch, and Jesuits were dispatched with all haste to serve, in the garb of Puritans, the cause of Rome. The greater, then, was the discontent among his Roman Catholic subjects when James showed predilections for the Presbyterian Church. Shortly after his accession, the "Book of Policy," which up to our day remains the guide of the Scottish Church in ecclesiastical government and other affairs of a similar nature, was issued. Another very important step taken was the publication of a confession of faith by the General Assembly, which the king approved and swore to (comp. Sack, Church of Scotland, ii, 5 sq.). New presbyteries were established throughout the realm, and it seemed as if the Puritans were to be the only favorites, when, on a sudden, by a successful conspiracy of a party of nobles, James was imprisoned, with the endeavor to force him to more favorable actions in behalf of his Roman Catholic subjects. The whole affair is known in English history as the "Raid of Ruthven." A counterplot in 1585 secured the freedom of the monarch, but from henceforth a new policy was inaugurated, in which he was wholly controlled by the Presbyterians. Resolutions were published, known as the "black resolutions," which aimed at the total abrogation of the Pres-
byzantine Church. Severe persecutions followed, and it seemed for a time as if James had actually turned to Romanism. After the death of his mother, Elizabeth courted the favor of James, and a treaty was finally concluded between them, by which the two kingdoms bound themselves to an offensive and defensive alliance against all foreign powers who should invade their territories, or attempt to disturb the reformed religious establishments of either. This action, of course, at once favored the Protestant subjects of James; for his severity toward them increased, and the Puritans were arrayed against each other, and James was called upon to settle the dispute. Biased in favor of the episcopacy, James, however, decided on a conference of the two parties, anxious to display his "proficiency in theology" and "defeat the artificiety of applauding his polity and skill, and making his chosen line of conduct at least appear to result from partial inquiry" (Baxter, *Eng. Ch. History*, p. 560). As yet no separate church had taken place, neither had the Puritans even renounced episcopacy, nor did they question regal supremacy; they were objected to being bound against the dictates of their conscience to the observance of certain performances; they desired purity of doctrine, good pastors, a reform in Church government and in the Book of Common Prayer; in short, a removal of all usages which savor of Romanism. A contingent of Episcopal troops assembled at Hampton Court in January, 1604, and the points of difference discussed in James's presence, he himself taking, as might have been expected, a conspicuous and most undignified part. "Church writers, in dealing with this subject, have felt compelled to emplor the utmost ingenuity and artifice of their eloquence, to set forth the authority of the king and the bishops of this period, which a Nonconformist would almost hesitate to use" (Skene). On the episcopal side appeared archbishop Whittig, assisted by bishops Bancroft, Bilson, and others; on the side of the Puritans appeared four divines, headed by the celebrated Mr. Sprat, at the time president of Corpus Christi College, Oxford. "It is obvious, from the whole proceedings, that the conference was summoned for a purpose opposed to its ostensible aim. It was not intended to bring the two parties in the Church into harmony; more probably, the object was to fortify and extend the establishment (Skene). The attitude of the king pleased the church men, and "the prelates accepted him with devout gratitude. The more his character became revealed to them, the greater was their satisfaction. When he almost swore at the Puritans, Whiglclit declared that his majesty spoke by the exspectation of God's Spirit (comp. Baxter, *Ch. Hist. of England*, p. 559), and Bancroft that he was melted with joy, for that, since Christ's time, such a king had not been. When he drivelled they held up their hands in amaze at his wisdom. Indeed, it seems that "the two parties fully understood each other, and had criticised, with some degree of tact the ambitious designs of the prelates, and the prelates had sufficient learning, and sufficient knowledge of the theory of morals, to know that they were dealing with a dissembler and a fool. But it served their purposes to play into each other's hands. The king could put down Puritanism in the Church, and "harry all Brownists and Anabaptists out of the land, and the bishops, in their turn, could extol the supremacy of the monarch" (Skene). But, as if the ungenerous and ungracious action of the king had not yet reached the climax of his mischievous device, in the year following, and framed a new set of canons to insure conformity. "These laws—laws so far as the clergy are concerned—still delude the constitution and character of the English Episcopal Church. ... They are now little else than monuments of a past age of intolerance. The general disposition of the ecclesiastical establishments of the present day. Old bloodhounds of the Church, with their teeth drawn and their force exhausted, they are gazed at with as much contempt as they once excited fear" (Skene). Baxter (p. 563) says of these laws, "Some of them have become obsolete; but the Church of England still perseveres, and its toleration law, does not consist in the rule of his pledged obedience, although there may be cases in which attention to the...
with other innovations previously made since his accession to the throne of England, brought the Scottish Church—in government, in ceremonies, and in its position in relation to the civil power—very nearly to the model of the ecclesiastical establishment of England. Change, however, as the king might, the constitution and ordinances, which were without number made and again, public opinion by no means altered even for a moment, and the 19th century still finds Scotland true to her Puritanic notions of the 16th century. The king had succeeded in securing the adoption of the "five articles of Perth" (q.v.); he had succeeded in suppressing the Scotch Presbyterian Church, but he failed to conquer it.

In England, also, the shortsighted policy of James now brought distrust and discredit. The execution of Raleigh and the denial of assistance to the Protestant Bohemians, both sacrifices to the court of Spain, the latter even at the expense of his son-in-law, whom the Bohemians had chosen for their king, hardly justify Baxter in the statement that king James's object was the consolidation of the Protestant interests, and that his treatment of the Puritans was marked by a leniency strongly contrasted with the severity of a policy adopted by his predecessors, and naturally occasioning a difference of opinion as to its wisdom and propriety (p. 568). If toleration was the policy of James I, it did not manifest itself against the Independents, who, "after repeated and fruitless applications for toleration" (Baxter, p. 572), were not allowed to go to distant places where they could follow the dictates of their conscience. Certainly the state did not pay the expenses of these pilgrim fathers in 1619 because they were Puritans, but simply because they were likely to settle and to cultivate land otherwise almost worthless. In 1624 James was finally driven, both by the Independents of Parliament to his policy in seeking a closer alliance with Spain and by the clamor of the people for a war with that country, to dispatch an army into Germany to recover his son-in-law's possessions. But, as if his measure of tribulation was not yet full, this enterprise proved a total failure, and brought discredit upon the English name. The king also assumed a ridiculous attitude on the question of the observance of the Sabbath. Roman Catholicism is wont to look upon Sunday as a holiday; the Puritans, however, desired it observed as a Christian day of rest. To obviate those objections, the king fixed a "Book of Sports," advising the people that Sunday was not to be a day mainly for religious rest and worship, but of games and revels (Sketes, p. 47). See SABBATARIAN CONTROVERSY. This reign, so detrimental to the interests of the English and Scottish State and Church of Christ, were finally brought to a termination by the death of James, March 27, 1625. Severe as may have been some of the historians who have written the fate of this king, none can be said to have exaggerated the many despicable features of his character; and we need not wonder that his vacillating course towards his subjects, favoring first the Puritans, then the Episcopalians; tightening first the reins, and then loosening them against the Romanists—all inspired, not by the true spirit of toleration, but by artful designs, well enabled us to repeat of him Macaulay's judgment, that James I was "made up of two men—a witty, well-read scholar, who wrote, disposed, and harangued, and a nervous, drivelling idiot who acted."

James I was a voluminous writer, and, though he was far from deserving the surname which the flattery of his contemporaries accorded him, "Solomon the Second," he was certainly not wholly wanting in literary ability, and, had he pursued a literary life instead of governing a state, it is barely possible that he might have earned a much higher position among his fellow-beings. It brings to mind the prophetic utterance of his tutor, that James was better fitted to be a scholar than a ruler. The writings of James which deserve mention here are, Fruitful Meditation upon a part of
the Revelation of St. John (Lond. 1598) — Dæmonologie, a dialogue in three books in defence of the belief in Witches (Lond. 1597, 4to); and yet the king withal hesitated not to punish his subjects for a like faith — Br. 

Nicholas and — instructions to his son Henry (who died in 1619) in which James lays down his opinions on the power of the throne over the State and Church, and which, for the doctrines it contained on Church government, was censured as libellous by the Synod of St. Andrew's (Lond. 1599) — Tractatus Noii Triplex Cæsars, an apology for the oath of allegiance that James took to his Roman Catholic subjects, which was answered by cardinal Bellarmine, and produced a long controversy and many other publications on both sides, for an account of which, see a note by Dr. Birch in the Appendix to Harris's Life of James — Protostasia Antivestris, in qua re suam exponit sententiam de confederatarum ordinis effectis et actis in consu. Vorstius (London 1612), the successor of Arminius as professor of divinity at the University of Leyden, whom he accused of heresy (see Vorstius), etc. A complete edition of his works was published in folio (London, 1616), and a Latin translation by bishop Montague in 1618. A morose and melancholy disposition was published at Frankfurt-on-the-Main in folio in 1689. He is also said to have written a metrical version of the Psalms, completed up to the 81st Psalm (Oct. 1631, 12mo). See James Welwood, Memoirs of the most material Transactions in England for thirty years preceding the Revolution (London 1700, 8vo); Peyton, Divine Catastrophe of the kings Family of the House of Stuart (1731, 8vo); Wilson, Life and Reign of King James I (1653, 4to, and reprinted in Bp. Kennet's Complete History, vol. ii); Lingard, History of England, vols. viii and ix; Baxter, Ch. Hist. ch. xii; Collin, Eccles. Hist. i, ii; Halian, Const. Hist. (see Index); and Raumer, Gesch. v. Europa, vol. v; Rudolph, Geschichte d. Reformation in Schottland, vol. ii; Soame, Elizabethan History, p. 515 sq.; Skeats, History of the Free Churches of England, p. 35 sq; Hunt (the Rev. John), Religious Thought in England (Lond. 1870, 8vo), vol. i, ch. ii and iii; English Cyclop. s. v.; Hervey, Regius Desiderii. v. vi, 891 sq. See England (Church of); Puritans. (J. H. W.)

James II of England and VII of Scotland, son of Charles I and Henrietta Maria, was born October 15, 1633. In 1645 he was created duke of York. In 1648, during the civil war which resulted in the deposition of his father, he made his escape to Holland, and thence to France, where his mother resided. The early education of the duke of York had, by the wish of his father, been intrusted to Protestants, but his mother, a bigoted Romanist, now improved her opportunity, and the prince was surrounded by Roman Catholic influences, and, to be more readily inclined to Popery, was assured that the unfortunate end of his father was due only to his strict adherence to Protestantism, and that no prince could hold the reins of government successfully who was not supported by Rome. In 1662 he entered the French army under general Turenne, and served in it until the peace concluded with Cromwell (Oct. 1655) obliged James to quit the territory of Louis XIV. He then was offered a position in the army of Spain, which he accepted. At the Restoration (May, 1660) he returned to England, and was immediately made admiral of the English fleet and actually engaged in the naval wars with Holland (1664-1672), which are generally supposed to have been instigated by this prince and his brother for the especial purpose of crushing the Dutch as a Protestant people, and to disable them from interfering with the re-establishment of popery in England, to which they themselves inclined, he twice commanded the English fleet, and was eminently successful. In 1660 he married Anne, daughter of lord chancellor Hyde, and the reason generally assigned for this act is that the lady was far gone with child when the marriage was completed; or else she lived only a few years (she died March 31, 1671), suffering, it is supposed, from neglect, if not the positive ill-usage of her husband, who, notwithstanding his professions of zeal for religion, indulged in a large share of the reigning licentiousness, and kept a mistress almost from the date of his marriage. A few months before her death the duchess had signed a declaration of her reconciliation to the ancient faith, in which James avowed his own adherence to the same, and publicly avowed his conversion to popery, an act which, although his concealed inclinations had been long suspected, did not fail to create a great sensation, especially as, from his brother's want of issue, he was now looked upon as Charles's probable successor. In 1668, in which the duke of York now stood among the English was further manifest by a second attempt to pass in Parliament a bill excluding him from the right of succession to the throne, which would have been successful had not Parliament suddenly been prorogued (May 27, 1679). In 1680 he returned again to England, but so great was the opposition towards him that Charles was obliged to send him down to govern Scotland (see above); in 1682 the duke of York now stood among the English was further manifest by a second attempt to pass in Parliament a bill excluding him from the right of succession to the throne, which again failed by another prorogation of the council of the nation. This time, no doubt, the effort was mainly the result of the despicable relation which the prince sustained towards the Meal-tub Plot, an attempt on the part of his co-religionists to counteract — and in this they were grievously disappointed — the effect of the Titus Oates plot discoveries. In 1682, when Charles was involved in difficulties with his concubine, the duke of York was suspected of having secret correspondence with her, and knowing so well how to make himself an indispensible counsellor of his brother, that, in spite of the Test Act, he became (much more than Charles himself) "the mainspring and director of the conduct of public affairs." It was the death of Charles II, Feb. 6, 1685, that the duke of York now stood among the English was further manifest by a second attempt to pass in Parliament a bill excluding him from the right of succession to the throne, which again failed by another prorogation of the council of the nation. This time, no doubt, the effort was mainly the result of the despicable relation which the prince sustained towards the Meal-tub Plot, an attempt on the part of his co-religionists to counteract — and in this they were grievously disappointed — the effect of the Titus Oates plot discoveries. In 1682, when Charles was involved in difficulties with his concubine, the duke of York was suspected of having secret correspondence with her, and knowing so well how to make himself an indispensible counsellor of his brother, that, in spite of the Test Act, he became (much more than Charles himself) "the mainspring and director of the conduct of public affairs." It was the death of Charles II, Feb. 6, 1685, that the duke of York now stood among the English was further manifest by a second attempt to pass in Parliament a bill excluding him from the right of succession to the throne, which again failed by another prorogation of the council of the nation. This time, no doubt, the effort was mainly the result of the despicable relation which the prince sustained towards the Meal-tub Plot, an attempt on the part of his co-religionists to counteract — and in this they were grievously disappointed — the effect of the Titus Oates plot discoveries. In 1682, when Charles was involved in difficulties with his concubine, the duke of York was suspected of having secret correspondence with her, and knowing so well how to make himself an indispensable counsellor of his brother, that, in spite of the Test Act, he became (much more than Charles himself) "the mainspring and director of the conduct of public affairs." It was the death of Charles II, Feb. 6, 1685, that the duke of York now stood among the English was further manifest by a second attempt to pass in Parliament a bill excluding him from the right of succession to the throne, which again failed by another prorogation of the council of the nation. This time, no doubt, the effort was mainly the result of the despicable relation which the prince sustained towards the Meal-tub Plot, an attempt on the part of his co-religionists to counteract — and in this they were grievously disappointed — the effect of the Titus Oates plot discoveries. In 1682, when Charles was involved in difficulties with his concubine, the duke of York was suspected of having secret correspondence with her, and knowing so well how to make himself an indispensable counsellor of his brother, that, in spite of the Test Act, he became (much more than Charles himself) "the mainspring and director of the conduct of public affairs." It was the death of Charles II, Feb. 6, 1685, that the duke of York now stood among the English was further manifest by a second attempt to pass in Parliament a bill excluding him from the right of succession to the throne, which again failed by another prorogation of the council of the nation. This time, no doubt, the effort was mainly the result of the despicable relation which the prince sustained towards the Meal-tub Plot, an attempt on the part of his co-religionists to counteract — and in this they were grievously disappointed — the effect of the Titus Oates plot discoveries. In 1682, when Charles was involved in difficulties with his concubine, the duke of York was suspected of having secret correspondence with her, and knowing so well how to make himself an indispensable counsellor of his brother, that, in spite of the Test Act, he became (much more than Charles himself) "the mainspring and director of the conduct of public affairs." It was the death of Charles II, Feb. 6, 1685, that the
gagements to govern constitutionally, and heedless of ominous intimations which reached him, in the shape of addresses, that the religion of his subjects was dearer to them than their lives, he proceeded to carry out his projects with a recklessness amounting to infatuation" (Barlow, 1687, pp. 19-20). The king, James showed, says Hume (Hist. of England, Harper's edition, vi, 286), "that either he was not sincere in his professions of attachment to the laws, or that he entertained so lofty an idea of his own legal power that even his attachment to the laws was of little value to secure the liberties of the people." Not satisfied with his avowed confession of Romanism, he even made unnecessary and offensive displays of his religious principles, and thereby greatly wounded the pride of his subjects.

The mass was openly celebrated with great pomp at Westminster in Passion Week of this year (1687); an agent was sent to Rome to announce the king's submission to the so-called vicar of Christ; a close alliance was entered into with France; and it was even generally hinted that "the Church of England was in principle so closely allied to the Roman Catholic that it would not be difficult to prepare the way for the admission of the English into the bosom of the Roman Catholic Church", (comp. Sir John Dalrymple, Memoirs of Great Britain, Appendix, pt. i, p. 100-113; Fox, Hist. of early Part of the Reign of James II.)

All this, too, was done at a time when "there was among the English a strong conviction that the Papists were in league with the Papists of their religion were concerned, thought himself free from all the ordinary rules of morality; nay, that he thought it meritorious to violate those rules, if by so doing he could avert injury or reproach from the Church of which he was a member;" at a time when "Roman Catholic cassants of great eminence had written in defence of their religion, the doctrines of the Jesuits, and the attacks of the Papists" (comp. Macaulay, Hist. of England, Harper's edition, ii, 5 sq.). It was certainly sheer madness (and we need not wonder that the so-called successor of Peter even so declared it) to still further aggravate the opposition of his subjects by persecution for religious belief. Himself all too conscious of the land, shrewdly foreseeing, in the session complete toleration, which, after all, was only "natural and right", it seems simply preposterous to find him persecuting the Puritans. Almost immediately after his accession to the throne James II convoyed the Parliament of Scotland, where the majority of the population was firmly attached to the Presbyterian discipline, and where prelacy was abhorred as an unscriptural and as a foreign institution, and demanded new laws against the unruly Presbyterians, who already "closely associated the episcopal polity with all the evils produced by twenty-five years of corrupt and cruel maladministration, a slavish spirit, the Scottish Parliament compounded with the royal request, forbidding under the death penalty breach in any Presbyterian conventicle whatever, and even attendance on such a conventicle in the open air (May 6, 1685). A short time afterwards the Parliament of England was convoked (May 19), which, as readily as the Scottish, complied with the demands of the king, but, to his great sorrow, nevertheless evinced the possibility of opposition to popery, for which he was anxious to secure concessions. But while both Parliaments were thus acquiescing in the demands of the king, the countries were invaded, and this afforded the king a favorable pretext for the introduction of Romanists into the ranks of the army, in spite of the legal test of conformity to the Established Church which was required to be taken by every person filling any public office; and when, after a successful suppression of the insurrectionary attempts, the king reassembled Parliament, he not only extended the right of Roman Catholics would now be continued, but requested extra supplies for the increase of the army, evidently for the purpose of adding largely men of his own confession to the rank and file of the army; and when the people rise up and demand this right, the king peremptorily prorogued Parliament, after sitting but fourteen days, more than a week. James, however, was determined to continue the policy initiated, and ordered patents to be made out under the great seal for every Roman Catholic officer that he had appointed, and upon the same principle continued the benefit of some Protestant divines who claimed to have been converted to Romanism.

Quite different continued to be his dealings with the dissenters. Everywhere they were made to feel "the weight of the arm of the conqueror," especially in the provinces that had lately been subject to invasion, to which the Papists as well as the Papists claim, that dissenters had lent their aid. Thus were the Nonconformists ground between the Papists on the one hand and the High-Church clergy on the other, while the former made their advantage of the latter, concluding that when the dissenters were destroyed, or thoroughly exasperated, and the clergy were by themselves, they should be a match for the hierarchy, and capable of establishing that religion which they had been so long aiming to introducet' (Neale, Puritans, ii, 319).

Roman Catholic churches were everywhere opened, Jesuits and regular priests came in numbers from abroad, and the number of priests, even in the capital, grew. Westminster monasteries or churches were opened under their control in the English metropolis even, men were forbidden to speak disrespectfully of the king's religion, and all seemed turning in favor of Rome, when at length the eyes of the clergy of the State Church were opened, and they deemed it high time to preach against the difference of religious tendencies. An open rupture with the State Church had become inevitable; for the king, having been made acquainted with the position which the clergy of the Church of England had taken to recover the people, who were deserting their churches in numbers, and to rescue the Protestant religion from those to whom it had been forced, circular letters to the bishops, accompanying them with an order to prohibit the inferior clergy from preaching on the controverted points of religion. It could not be otherwise than that these persevering attempts of his against the established religion, as well as upon the law and upon the constitution, were eventually in the end successful, with the Episcopalian, to be productive of the most important consequences. Finding that to carry his schemes in favor of Romanism he must strengthen himself by the opponents of the State Church, he suddenly, in the beginning of April, 1687, published the famous Declaration of Indulgence, a paper at once suspending and dispensing with all the penal laws against dissenters, and all tests, including even the oaths of allegiance and supremacy, heretofore required of persons appointed to offices civil or military; but at the same time he repeated his promise, "already often repeated and often violated, that he would respect the Established Church and the enjoyment of her legal rights." At first the dissenters hailed the seeming approach of a new era, and great were the rejoicings in behalf of a declaration which secured them liberty of conscience, and threw open the doors of the public worship of God; but the king felt not a little encouraged at the course when addresses came to him from some of the dissenters (though they afterwards proved to have represented only a small faction; comp. Neale, Puritans, ii, 328). Emboldened, he immediately showed his predictions for his Church. The real power under the crown were put into the hands of Romanists. The earl of Castlemaine was at the same time
publicly sent as ambassador extraordinary to Rome to express the king's obedience to the pope, and to effect the reconciliation of the kingdom with the "holy see." In return the pope sent a nuncio to England, who received the bishops during the reign, and was solemnly received at court, in the face of the act of Parliament declaring any communication with the pope to be high treason. Four Roman Catholic bishops were consecrated in the king's chapel, and sent to exercise the episcopal function, each in his particular diocese in Scotland and England, as well as in Ireland, offices of all kinds, both in the army and in the state, were now filled with Roman Catholics; even those of the ministers and others who had shown themselves disposed to go furthest along with the king were, on the same or very little, lost his favor, if they refused to conform to the ancient religion. At last James's "eye was delighted with the aspect of Catholicism imparted to his metropolis by the spectacle of monks traversing its streets in the habits of their respective orders, he was gratified by the presence of an Italian prelate, D'Adda, as nuncio, to whose address he entertained a sanguine hope of obtaining a Parliament elected under the new corporation charters, which should furnish a majority of his adherents, while the lords were to be swamped by a creation of peers compliant with his wishes. The Nonconformists, he calculated, would support the bishops. A long series of "the most important" and he was weak enough to imagine that his declaration of indulgence placed him in favorable contrast with the French monarch, to whose exiled Protestant subjects, since the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, he had been induced by the spirit actuating the sovereigns of France and of Great Britain, in pursuance of common religions, in subservience to similar political objects (Baxter, Ch. Hist. p. 589). The dissenters, in particular, soon learned to comprehend the reality of the situation—that a league of the court and Romanism was dependent on their assistance for its success to overtend the Episcopalians and secure victory to popery; and when they did comprehend the scheme, "notwithstanding the renewed sufferings to which they might be exposed, they took part against it. . . . Independents, Baptists, and Quakers vied with each other in showing them by their action (clergy) their contempt of them—not even Penn (q. v.—was in favor of the toleration of Roman Catholicism. No man who valued the civil liberties of England dreamed of giving a foothold to the professors of that intolerant creed. Three generations had not sufficed to wipe out the memory of its curse on England. Thousands still living could recollect the Vaudois massacres, and the streets of London were at that moment crowded with sufferers from the revocation of the Edict of Nantes." (Skeat, p. 83). The Nonconformists, almost as a body, refused to recognize the act of indulgence, many of them by counsels because they saw in the encroachment against the laws a prerogative which, if not resisted, might lead ultimately to the establishment of popery as the religion of the state. But, whatever were the reasons of the dissenters, the attempt of the king to gain their support evinced a fallacy. He could not have been daily conversant with the event which the king had opened with the Church must soon reach a climax. An attempt had already been made to compel the University of Cambridge to confer a degree of master of arts on a Benedictine monk. This was not persevered in; but soon after, a vacancy having happened in the presidency of Magdalen College, Oxford, the vice-president and fellows were ordered by royal mandate to fill it up by the election of a person named Farmer, a late convert to popery (for whom was afterwards substituted Parker, bishop of Oxford, who avowed himself a Romanist at heart), and on their refusal were cited before an ecclesiastical commission and expelled. See Hucuot, Jons (1). Determined, if possible, to please the divines during the latter part of his reign, and to have no enemies among them, James evidently needed to carry out successfully his projects, James published, April 27, 1688, a second declaration of indulgence to dissenters, and commanded it to be read by the clergy immediately after divine service in all the churches of England. On this, Sancroft, archbishop of Canterbury, and his colleague in Scotland and England, as well as those in Bath and Wells, Turner of Ely, Lake of Chichester, White of Peterborough, and Trelawney of Bristol—met in the archbishop's palace at Lambeth, May 18, and drew up a petition to the king, representing their aver- sion to obey the order, for many reasons, and especially because the declaration was founded upon such a dispensing power as Parliament had often declared illegal. For this they were all, June 8, sent to the Tower, on the charge of publishing a false, fictitious, malicious, pernicious, and seditious libel. The history of the trial, and the verdict of it, June 29, 1688, which the nation approved, and which was hailed by the whole kingdom as a great national triumph, forms one of the most glowing passages in the splendid narra- tive of Macaulay (ii, 235). This defeat, however, in no degree checked for a moment the infatuated king. To satisfy the Episcopalians and his admirers, he appointed such of the judges, Powel and Holloway, who had appeared to favor the bishops; he issued orders to prosecute all those clergymen who had not read his declaration, that is, the whole Church of England, two hundred excepted; he sent a mandate to the new fellows whom he had ob- truded on Magdalen College to elect for president in the room of Parker, lately deceased, one Gifford, a doc- tor of the Sorbonne, and titular bishop of Madura; and he is even said to have nominated the same person to the see of Oxford. It was in the midst of this great contest with the Church that the nation that, James, a son was claimed to have been born to James, received, however, by the people with a strong suspicion that the child was supposititious, and that the queen had never been delivered or been pregnant at all. For this notion, however, it is now generally admitted that there was no such child; he was born, who, in all probability, would restore popery, in which, no doubt, he would be instructed from earliest infancy, turned the Protetants' eyes towards James's son-in-law, the prince of Orange, "for the deliverance of our country from the perils with which it was threatened. He was authorized by the king to come and bend the head of the king, educated and learned with consternation that his own son-in-law, in obedience to their call, was preparing to land upon his coasts." On the night of the same day on which the seven prelates of the English Church had been pronounced not guilty, an invitation was dispatched to Wil- liam, prince of Orange, signed by seven of the leading English politicians, to come over to England and occupy the throne. November 5, William landed at Torbay with 14,000 men. Vainly did James now attempt to regain his subjects' confidence by retracing his steps; but, on his return, he was received by his subjects with mingled surprise and disappointment, and, finding himself deserted not only by the nation, but even by his own children, he retired to France, where he was hospitably received by his co-re- ligionist and royal friend, Louis XIV, and obliged to live upon a pension settled upon him by the king of the Low Countries. Frequent allusions to these facts become daily more apparent than the means by which he died, "effecting a revolution (November, 1698) which has deserved the epithet of glorious, not less through its bloodless character than from its identification with those civil and religious liberties which it secured to every class of Englishmen." See, besides the author- ities cited under James I, in Scotland, ii, 146 sq.; Stoughton, Ecclesiastical Hist. of England (see Index); Macaulay, Hist. of England, vol. i and ii; Clarke, Life of James II (Lond. 1816, 2 vols. 4to), De-
James, John, a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Madison County, Tenn., October 19, 1832. He joined the Church at thirteen years of age, was admitted to the Preachers' College in 1852, and appointed to Carthage Circuit. He then removed first to Mount Vernon Circuit, next to Oceola Circuit, then to Fredericktown, and finally to Ozark Circuit. He died in the midst of the work in the fall of 1857.—Min. Assn. Conf. Methodist Episcopal Church South, ii, 14.

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

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

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

Jামিন (Hebrew יבמ', ימע', lit. the right hand, hence luck, as often; i. q. Felix; Sept. ימוא and יַמַע, but v. r. ינמוא in 1 Chron. ii, 27, and omits in Neh. viii, 7), the name of three men. See also בַּנְיָם.

The second named of the three sons of Ram, the fourth in descent from Judah (1 Chron. ii, 29). B.C. cir. 1658.

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


Jam'lech (Heb. Yâmâlîk, Yâmâlîk; Sept. 'Aômâlîk, Yâmâlîk; Vulg. Jemilech), a chief-
tain (נִשְׁדֶדָא) of the tribe of Simeon, apparently one of those families which increased so greatly that they invaded the valley of Gedor in the time of Hezekiah, and dis-
possessed the Hamites (1 Chron. iv. 34). B. C. cir. 711.

Jam’nia (Ταυρία τ. ι. Ταυρία), a Greecized or later form of the name of the city JARMEL (q. v.), used in the New Testament (Matt. xix. 39; xx. 40); and Josephus (Αυτ. i. 22; xiv. 4; Ερ. ι. 7, 7).

Jam’ni (א v. Ταυίσια, η ιούμηρης), an inhab-
itant of JAMNIA (2 Mac. xii. 8, 9, 40) or JARMEL (q. v.).

Janduna. See John of Janduno.

Janeway, Jacob J., D.D., a Presbyterian min-
ers of note, was born in the city of New-York in 1774, and graduated at Columbia College in 1794. He joined the Presbyterians, but not the last years of his life at New Brunswick, N.J., where he died in 1858. Mr. Jane-
way wrote quite extensively. His most important con-
tributions are commentaries on Romans, Hebrews, and Acts (Philad. 8 vols. 18mo.);—Internal Evidence of the Holy Bible:—Review of Dr. Schaff on Protestantism, etc. See (Pha.) Preb. May. May. 1853.

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

Janeway, John, a very pious and promising young man, was born at Lillie, Hertfordshire, in 1638, of religious parents, entered Cambridge at seventeen, and at eighteen was converted, in part by means of Baxter’s St. Paul’s. He now glowed for the salvation of souls, especially of those nearly related to him; secret prayer became his element. On leaving college, his father be-

ing dead, he went to live in the family of Dr. Cox, where his health sank under his studies and labors, and he finished his short course suddenly in June, 1657. His dy-
ing bed was a scene of triumph.—Middleton, Works, iii. 362.

Jangling, vain (μαθαιόν, frivolous or empty
talk).

Janítor, persons appointed to take care of the
doors of the churches in time of divine service, and to
make a distinction between the faithful and the cate-
chumens, and communicated persons, and others not entitled to admission. See Door-keepers.

Janizaries (Jeni-taherî, “new soldiers”), a Turkish military force which was for some time recruited from Christian prisoners taken by the Turks, more especially during the Crusades. They were originated by the Osmanli Emir Orchan, about 1330, of young Christian prisoners, which, after having been distributed among the Turkish husbandmen in Asia, there to learn the Turkish language, religion, and manners, were com-
pelled to embrace Mohammadianism. This treatment of Christian prisoners sprang from theMohammadian doctrine that “all children at their birth are naturally disposed to Islamism,” and they reasoned that, by en-
forcing the conversion of the young captives to the true faith, and enrolling them in the ranks of the army of the faithful, they were serving both their temporal and eternal interests. But after a time the recruiting of the Janizaries was also undertaken among the Chris-
tian subjects of the Mohammadians, and the execution of this terrible scheme inspired terror and consternation among the vanquished Christian populations of Asia Minor, Thrace, and Anatolia, where the new tax of flesh and blood on families severed the nearest and dearest connections. In the period of 300 years the custom to raise annually for this branch of the Turkish army no less than 1000 Christian youths; and it is esti-
mated by Von Hammer that no less than 500,000 young Christians were thus converted into Mohammedan Turk-
ish soldiers (compare Creasy, Hist. Ottoman Turks, 21 sq.). In the second half of the 17th century the old system of filling the ranks of the Janizaries exclusively with compulsory conscripts from the Christian subjects of the Turk was finally abandoned, as the many privi-
leges which these soldiers enjoyed as body-guard of the sultan, etc., induced many young Turks to seek admi-
ission to their body. There were two branches of Jani-
zaries, one regularly organized, dwelling in barracks in Constantinople and a few other towns, and whose num-
ber at one time amounted to no less than 60,000, af-


to 25,000; and the other composed of irregular troops, called Janjaks, scattered throughout all the towns of the empire, and amounting in number to 300,000 or 400,000. At the head of the whole Janizary force was the Aga, who held his ap-
pointment for life, and whose power was almost without limit. In times of peace they acted as a police force, and were sometimes employed by the Turkish army, and were noted for the wild impetuosity of their attack. But the many privileges which were bestowed on them soon began to make them very unruly — and their history abounds in conspiracies, assassina-
tions of sultans, viziers, ages, etc., and atrocities of every kind; so that, by degrees, they became more dangerous to the country than any foreign enemies. Attempts to reform or dissolve them were always un-
successful, till sultan Mahmoud II, in 1826, being op-
posed in some of his measures by them in Constantin-
ople, displayed the flag of the Prophet, and succeeded in arousing on his own behalf the fanatic zeal of other portions of his troops. Their own aga deserted them, they were defeated, and their barracks burned, when 8000 of them perished in the flames. June 17, 1826, a proclamation announced the Janizaries forever abol-
blished. Everywhere in the empire they were persecuted unheard of, innumerable. All these were repea-
ted, and an equal number driven into exile.” See Fra-
zer (the Rev. W. V.), Turkey, Ancient and Modern (Lon-
don, 1854, 8vo), p. 406; Creasy, Hist. of Ottoman Turks, chiefly founded on Von Hammer (London, 1856, 2 vols. 8vo.);—Browning, Turkey;—Scull, Turkish History, i. 182 sq.;—Fowke, Turkey (R. E.);—J. E. R., Turkish Empire (London, 1862, 8vo). ch. xiii; Macfarland, Constantinople in 1828.

Jánova (Iavóv, prob. for Heb. יֶבֶש, yanah, frow-
ishing, although no corresponding name occur in the O. T.), the father of Melche and son of Joseph, named as the sixth in ascent from Christ on his mother’s side (Luke iii. 24). B. C. cir. 200. See Genealogy or Christ.

Jannæus. See Alexander Jannæus.

Jannâm (Iavvīc, probably of Egyptian etymology [see below]). Jannes and Jambres are thought to have been two of the Egyptian magicians who attempted by their enchantments (בֶל, Exod. vii. 22, etc.; or בֶל, Exod. vii. 11, secret arts) to counteract the in-
fluence on Pharaoh’s mind of the miracles wrought by Moses (see Exod. vii. viii.). Their names occur nowhere else in the Old Testament (2 Tim. iii. 8, 9), where Paul says no more than that they “withstood Moses,” and that their folly in doing so became manifest (2 Tim. iii. 8, 9). He became acquainted with them, most probably, from an ancient Jewish tradition, or, as Theodoret expresses it, “from the unwritten teaching of the Jews.” They are found frequently in the Talmudic and Rabbinical writings.
but with some variations. Thus, for James we meet with Δαμασκόν, Damascus, and Δαμαςκοῦ, Damascus. Of these, the last three are forms of the Hebrew דמשק, which has led to the supposition that Ιαυνάγιν is a contracted form of the Greek Ιαυνάγινος. Some critics (Pfeiffer, Düb. ver. i, 253) consider these names to be of Egyptian origin, and in that case the Jewish writers must have been misled by a similarity of sound to adopt the forms above mentioned, as the Mishna (Sanhedr. 98, b; Chol. 19) has done in the case of other unhistorical proper names (Majus, Observat. sacr. ii, 42). For Jambres we find Ἀμμάθεια, Ammahiah, and in the Shalsheleh Hakkhobola (xiii, 2) the two names are given Ἀμμαθίαν, Ammathias, i. e. Johannes and Ambrosius! The Targum of Jonathan inserts them in Exod. vii, 11. The same writer also gives as a reason for Pharaoh's edict for the destruction of the Israelite male children that "this monarch had a dream in which the land of Egypt appeared in one scale and a lamb in another; that on awakening he sought for its interpretation from his wise men; whereupon Jannes and Jambres (יווחי, יוחים) said, "A son is to be born in the congregation of Israel who will desolate the whole land of Egypt." Several of the Jewish writers speak of Jannes and Jambres as the two sons of Balaam (Talmud, Jala. Rab. 14; Tikk. Nez. 52a, b), and assert that the two men were the youth (ьерех, Jerach. Shebitseh sekher) who went with him to the king of Moab (Numb. xxii, 21). Arabian tradition assigns them a place in Egyptian history (see the Asiatic Journal, 1845, No. 7, p. 78). Their graves were located in Egypt (Pallad. Lausiac. 20). The Pythian-gothic philosopher Numanus mentions these persons in a passage preserved by Eusebius (Prefatio Evangel. ix, 8), and in his Origen (c. Oris. iv, p. 386 ed. Sponer); also Pline (Hist. Nat. xxx, 1), and apparently Apuleius Apol. p. 94. The Arabs mention the names of several magicians who opposed Moses; among them is none resembling James and Jambres (D'Herbelot, s. v. Mousa ben Amran). There was an ancient apocryphal writing entitled Jannes and Mambre, which is referred to by Origen (in Matt. Comment. § 117; Opera, v, 29), and by Ambrosiaster, or Hilary the Deacon: it was condemned by pope Gelasius.

Jannes appears to be a transcription of the Egyptian name Ḥnḥn, which will be rendered herein as Jannes. It was given to members of two kings: one of the eleventh dynasty, the father or ancestor of Sereset I of the twelfth; the other, according to our arrangement, fourth or fifth king of the fifteenth dynasty, called by Manetho Ιαννας or Ιαννας (Josephus), or Ίαννας (Africanus). See Poole, Horæ Egyptianæ, p. 174, 175. There is also a king bearing the name Annu, whom we assign to the second dynasty (Hor. Ap. p. 101). The significations of Aïn is doubtful: the cognate word Aïnt means a valley or plain. The earlier king Aïn may be assigned to the 21st century B.C.; the latter is thought to have been the second precess of Joseph's Pharaoh. This shows that a name which may be reasonably supposed to be the original of James was in use at or near the period of the sojourn in Egypt. The names of the ancient Egyptians were extremely numerous, and very fluctuating in use; generally, the most prominent at any time were those of kings then reigning or not long dead.

See Wetstenii Nov. Test. Graec. ii, 362: Buxtorf, Lex. Tol. Rabl, colb. 945: Lightfoot's Sermon on James and Jambres (in Works, vi, 89): Erubin, or Miscellanies, ch. xxvii (Lambert, ed. iv, p. 333); Lambeth, ch. xxxv (in Works, vi, 381); Fabric. Pseudop. V. T. i, 813; Thilo. Cod. Apocryph. i, 553; the dissertations De Jannae et Jambre de Zentragr (Argent. 1899); Gros- Mus (Hafn. 1707); Michaelis (Hal. 1747); and Hermann, De pseudoharmoniae quo Harmonia (Jen. 1745).

Janning, Conrad, a Dutch theologian, was born at Groningen Nov. 16, 1650. He received his early edu-
cation from his uncle, J. Tinka, a pastor at Groningen. As his parents were devoted Romanists, they were un-
willing to have him educated at the Protestant university of his native city. He was therefore sent to a Jesuit College in Westphalia, and afterwards to Antwerp. In 1679 he was associated with the Bolandists in the gigantic labors of preparing the Acta Synodalia, and in 1681 he visited Rome, where he completed his theological studies. In Rome and throughout Italy, and on his whole route, he collected materials for the above-named work. He re-
turned to Antwerp in 1688, but soon made another tour, visiting different cities of Germany and the Netherlands, in the quest of further materials. In 1697 he again went to Rome, and rendered important service in the work to which his life was devoted. To his indefatigable labors this stupendous task is under very great obligations, as thirteen volumes are ascribed to his pen. Different judgments may be formed of this work. Prof. H. de Groot, of the Groningen University, a man of eminent attainments in Church History, and distinguished by his writings in this department, thus speaks of the work of the Bolandists: "With many fables and worthless legends, they communicate a great number of important biographies, which are generally well written, and in the earlier portions, for the most part, also with impartiality. For a knowledge of Church History in the primitive times, and, above all, in the Middle Ages, both the lives and the elucidations are often of inestimable value." Augustinus died on August 22, 1698. After his death his scholars continued the work, and published it under the title: Glasius, Godgeleerd Nederland, ii, 159 sq.; Geschiedenis der Christelĳke Kerk, by Profs. De Groot, Ter Haar, Kist, Moll, etc., v, 84. (J. P. W.)

Janoah (Heb. Yano'ah, יָנֹאַח, rest; 2 Kings xv, 29; Sept. Ιαονᾶ, Ιαονᾶ, Iao'naos; but in Josh. vi, 6, 7 with יאון, Yano'ah, יָנֹאַח, Ιαονᾶ, to Janoah; Sept. 'Iao'nos v. Ιαονᾶ, Ιαονᾶ, or even Ιαονᾶς; Vulg. Janos; A. V. "Janoah"), the name probably of two places.

1. A town on the N.E. border of Ephraim (see Keil and Delitzsch, Comment. on Joshua, etc., p. 177, Clarke's ed.), and consequently in or near the Jordan valley (Josh. xvi, 6, 7). Euseb. and Jerome state that in their time it was still a village in the district of Acrabatine, twelve miles east of Neapolis, the ancient Sichem (Onomasticon s. v. Ιαονᾶ, Iaon). About three and a half hours (12 miles) east of Nabali, a name that was a thing in the little village of Ιανουίν, situated in a vale which descends the eastern slope of the mountains of Ephraim to the Jordan. The village is now mostly in ruins, but it has a few houses inhabited, and its ancient remains are extensive and interesting. Entire houses and walls are still existing, but covered with immense heaps of earth and rubbish. The dwellings of the present inhabitants are built upon and between the dwellings of the ancient Janoah" (Van de Velde, Travels, ii, 308). Janoah being situated on the side of the mountain range, the border "went down" to Araroth, which lay in the valley of the Jordan. About a mile up the vale of Janoah is a little fountain, and on a hill above it the protruse ruins of another ancient town which is now called Khirbet Ιανουίν ("ruined Ιανουίν") (Robinson, B. ii, iii, 287).

2. A town of Northern Palestine, situated apparently between Abel-beth-Maacha and Kedesh, and within the boundaries of Naphtali. It is mentioned in several other cities, on the first invasion of Palestine by Tho-

Pfleger, king of Assyria (2 Kings xv, 29). It is mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome, but they strangely con-

founded it with Janoah, a town of Ephraim (Onomasticon, s. v. Janon), and in this they are followed by Reland (Palaestina, sb. 39), and usually by Schmerling, Schmar- Pelat, p. 147), and others. The modern village of Ιανουίν, which stands on the brow of a mountain between Abel and Kedesh, and which contains the massive ruins of a large and strong castle, would answer to the situa-
tion, and the names have some slight radical affinity. For a description of Hunt, see Porter, Handbook fo
JANOOAH

Syria and Palestine, p. 444.—Kitto, s. v. A ruin called Yanah, on a hill S.W. of Haddata (Robinson, Later Researches, p.58), seems by its name to have more correspondence to Janoah than Hinnun; but it lies in the centre of Gentile Galilee, and Tiggæo-Philip's march seems rather to have followed the hills along the Huleh plain.—Van de Velde, Memoir, p.924.

Janoah (Josh. xvi, 6, 7). See JANOAH, 1.

JANOW, Matthias von, one of the most celebrated reformers before the Reformation, and one of the three diagrams of all religious historians of Huss [see WALDHAUSEN and MÍLICEK] on whose teachings in their day, more than on all the territorial agrandizements of the German empire, the most important results of the latter half of the 14th century were staked (Gillet, Huss, i, 37), was the son of a Bohemian knight. Of the early history of Matthias we know but very little. He was educated at the University of Prague, where he was a zealous disciple of Milíček (q. v.), and he is often called Magister Parisiensis, because he spent six years at the University of Paris, and obtained his master's degree there. He travelled extensively, and no doubt attained great popularity as a preacher, when quite young. He was ambitious to secure some prominent position, and succeeded; on a visit to Rome in 1386, in obtaining the appointment of prebendary at Prague, and confessor of Charles IV. He entered upon the duties of this office Oct. 12, 1384, and continued therein until his death, Nov. 30, 1389. The writings of Janow does not seem to have been a very eloquent preacher, but he certainly a man of very earnest and deep piety, zealous for his Master's cause, anxious to purify the Church from the evils and corruptions which then threatened the extinction of the religious feeling; and hence his small may have been his influence in the pulpit, "It was more than compensated by the influence he exerted through his writings, and by his scientific exposition of principles. In his works we may find not only the reformatory ideas which passed over from him to Huss, but also the inceptive germ of those Christian principles which at a later period were unfolded in Germany by Luther, although the latter never came under the influence of Matthias of Janow" (Neander, Ch. Hist., v, 192).

In his earlier period of life, disgusted with that spiritual pride and contempt of the laity which characterized the priesthood of the 14th and 15th centuries, he was impressed by Milíček's ideas of the universal priesthood of all Christians, more especially after he had been placed in the confessional, where he had great opportunity to inform himself more minutely of the good or bad in all classes of society, and of the religious wants of the people. This may be clearly seen not only from his own narrative of the change which he experienced (see Neander, Ch. Hist., v, 194 sq.; Gillett, Huss, i, 28 sq.), but also from his writings, collected under the title of De regulis Véteris et Noot Testament, of which, unfortunately, the greater part still remains in MS. form (for extracts, see Jordon, Verkäfer d. Husitelehums in Böhmen [Lpz. 1846]).

Presel, in Herzog, s. v., says that the work might more appropriately have been entitled Inquiries concerning true and false Christianity. "It is chiefly taken up with reflections on the history of the times, and hints concerning the future, based on the prophecies of the Old and New Testaments, on the prophetical elements which they contain. Although there is a great deal in the details which is arbitrary, particularly in the apocalyptic calculations, yet grand prophetic glances into the future are also to be found. He portrays the utter corruption of the Church in its parts, and explains the causes of it" (Neander). The main object of the work, however, was the rejection of the authority of human traditions, and the substitution in their stead of the supreme authority of the divine Word. He tries everything by this test. The conduct of the bishops and the priests is severely arraigned. The antichrist, he asserts, has already come. He is nei-

JANSEN

 ther Jew, Pagan, Saracen, nor worldly tyrant persecuting Christendom, but the man who opposes Christian truth and the Christian life in the way of deception; he is and will be the most wicked Christian, falsely styling himself by that name, assuming the highest station in the Church, and possessing the highest consecration, according domination over all ecclesiastics and laymen; one who, by the working of Satan, knows how to make subservient to his own ends and to his own will the corporations of the rich and wise in the entire Church; one who has the preponderance in honors and privileges of the rich and mighty in the Church, if we consider both the properties of Christ, the Holy Scriptures, the sacraments, and all that belongs to the hopes of religion, to his own aggrandizement and to the gratification of his own passions; deceitfully perverting spiritual things to carnal ends, and in a sly and subtle manner employing what was designed for the salvation of a Christian people, he means to lead them astray from the truth and power of Christ (Neander, v, 196 sq.; Gillett, p. 30 sq.). It is apparent, from the tenor of Janow's writings, that he took higher ground than the other Hussite forerunners, Waldhausen and Milíček—the earliest Bohemian reformers—though he stood in true tradition. He was not ambitious to attain to the priesthood only, but to the laity also belonged the communion of both kinds; not to the popes only, who had haughtily exalted themselves, belonged the right to govern, but all bishops should state the same privileges; in short, his idea was that the organim of the Church is one in which all the members should be connected according to their several ranks, and co-operate together like the head and members in the human body (comp. Reichel, See of Rome in the Middle Ages, p. 600). We need not wonder that Janow, although he did not suffer the punishment of a heretic, was not long permitted to cast abroad seeds which must result in the overthrow of the papal hierarchy, and the removal of many strong barriers which protected the priesthood in those days of darkness and of sin. Having urged upon the monks the need of the reform, and given the points of his system as impressed by his own narrative of the change which he experienced, he writes, "At last remains for us to demonstrate how that Reformation by the overthrow of the antichrist himself to lift up our heads and see our redemption near." Sixteen years after his death (1410), his writings, it is generally admitted, were committed to the flames, together with those of Wickliffe. See Palacky, Geschichte der Böhmen, III, i, 175 sq.; Neander, Church History, v, 192 sq.; Gillett, Huss and his Times, i, 26 sq. (J. L. W.)

Jansen or Janssenius, Cornelius (I.), a distinguished Belgian theologian, was born at Hulb in 1510. He studied theology in Brussels, and acquired at the same time a thorough knowledge of Greek and Hebrew. In 1558 he went to Tongerlo as professor of theology, and became successively curate of St. Martin at Courtray in 1550, dean of the theological faculty of Louvain in 1562, and was soon after sent by Philip II to the Council of Trent. On his return to the Netherlands he was made bishop of Ghent in 1568. He died April 10, 1576. His works on Scripture enjoyed great reputation. He wrote Concordia Evangeltica et ejusdem Concordiae ratio (Louvain, 1549, 8vo)—Para-phrase in one volume (Louvain, 1549, 8vo)—Commentaries in Opera Omnia (Louvain, 1549, 8vo).
Jansenius Cornelius (2), a celebrated Dutch divine and founder of the Jansenists, born at Accoy, near Paris, in 1585, was the hibit, or natural nephew, of the above Cornelius Jansen, the Bp. of Ghent. He received his early education at Utrecht, and in 1602 entered the university at Louvain as a student of philology and theology. While at this high-school he seems to have made an acquaintance with the Frenchman, Jean Baptiste Duvergier (q. v.), de Hauranne, generally known by the name of St. Cyr. “Both he (i.e. Cyr) and Jansenius were there brought into contact with some who in secret cherished the doctrines of grace although in the communion of Rome, and thus they reduced everything to a relative and utilitarian basis, which was uniformly held in the Church. There also they both saw and felt the evil workings of the Jesuits; they marked the inroads which that system was making on all doctrinal truth and practical morality.”

But Jansenius's serious industry brought on sickness, and he was ordered to retire to the mission of Büsau. While thus engaged, he had imbibed a strong dislike to the lax views of theology and morality advocated by the Jesuits. Jansenius took the ground, in opposing the Jesuits, that life stands in the closest relation to practical doctrinal precepts. He thought it impossible to attain true spiritual life and grace, and live the full and abundant life of our Lord, while at the same time, which alone inculcates true humility. On the ground that pride was the cause of the fall, he sought to destroy all feeling of individual power, giving up human free agency to divine grace, and declaring human nature to be thoroughly corrupt, and unable by itself to do any good. While he believes these to have been the doctrines of Augustine himself, yet, as an obedient son of the Church of Rome, which, while he was anxious to purge her from the Pelagianism of the Jesuits, he dearly loved, he in his will, written half an hour before his death, said, “I have not published the Auggustinis, I fear that it would be difficult to make any changes in it; yet, should the Holy See require such, remember that I am an obedient son, and willing to submit to the Church in which I have lived till death.”

The Augustinis is divided into three parts. In the first Jansenius gives a historical account of Pelagianism, which hereby exalted the power of free-agency, and denied the original depravity of human nature, and consequently, original sin. In the second part the writer sets forth the views of St. Augustine on human nature, both in its state of primitive purity and in its state of degradation after the fall. In the third part, finally, he presents the ideas of St. Augustine touching grace, by which Christ redeems us from our fallen state, also the predestination of men and angels. The fundamental proposition of the work is that, “since the fall of Adam, free-agency exists no longer in man, pure works are a mere gratuitous gift of God, and the predestination of the elect is not an effect of his presence, but a free volition.”

This, it will be perceived, is a close reproduction of the views presented by Calvin in the preceding century. Such principles were, of course, in direct opposition with those advocated in Spain and Holland by the Jesuits Molina and Lessius, who wished to conciliate the loyalty of the Counter-reformation and retain a certain amount of human free-agency. Jansenius, besides, had personally incurred the hatred of the “Order of Jesus” by causing the Jesuits to be excluded as professors from the University of Louvain; and, though the work had failed to excite much attention, the Jesuits were determined now to be revenged on their enemy. The Augustinis thus became the occasion of a theological
controversy by far the most important in its doctrinal, social, and even political results which has agitated the Roman Catholic Church since the great Reformation of the 16th century. The whole weight of the order of the Jesuits having been brought into play to cause the condemnation of a work at Rome, and speedily done by Pope Urban VIII, in his bull In eminenti, March 6, 1642. "So decisive a point would not have been gained by the Jesuits had they not succeeded in directing the attention of the papal court to a passage in which Jansenius brought forward a statement of St. Augustine's permissibilistic doctrine, although not at the same point, (without reference, of course, to that father) he had been condemned at Rome. This was an inroad on papal infallibility, and this caused the rejection of the work." But if the book of Jansenius had failed to excite much attention, the issuing of a bull against its use, and all this at the instigation of the Jesuits, provoked no little interest. Especially strong was the opposition against the bull in Belgium and in France, and many were the partisans thus secured for the Augustinian, a number of whom—perhaps even the most—were animated, in all like Saint-Sulpice, by doctrinal predilection that ran by an antipathy to the laxity of the moral teachings of the Jesuits, with which the opposition to the Augustinian was, of course, always identified. The very strongest of the partisans of the Augustinian were the recluses of Port-Royal (q. v.), a celebrated association of scholars and divines, and that of Port-Royal, that figured some of the greatest names in the Church of France of the 17th century. One of these, Antoine Arnauld (q. v.), in 1643 published his De la frequente Communion, based on the predestination doctrine of Augustine and Jansenius, and thereby heaped more live coals on the heads of the now already much-maligned Jesuit order. The former the Dominicans in different countries divided in opinion, those of Spain and Italy enlisting on the side of the Jansenists (as the advocates of the Augustinian came by this time to be called), those of France siding with the Jesuits. Even the Sorbonne, of whom Arnauld was a member, was divided; and, after an earnest strife between the contending parties, had waged in France for some time, both decided in 1651 to carry it to Rome, and plead their cause before the infallible judge. In 1649, Cornel Synder, of the theological faculty at Paris, at the instigation of the Jesuits, made a communication to the court of the Sorbonne, and the propositions, and had admitted them to the Sorbonne as forming the substance of Jansenius's work. These the Jesuits now presented at Rome, satisfied that if they could only once obtain the condemnation of these as heretical, the fall of Jansenism was of course secured. On March 19th, 1651, the Jesuits finally succeeded in their end, and Innocent X, in his bull Cum occasione, at the instigation of his cardinal Chigi, condemned the five propositions, which had been most couched in somewhat ambiguous language, so as to admit of very different explanations, the object of the Jesuits being to procure their condemnation in any sense or in any form. They are as follows: (1) That there are divine commands which virtuous and pious persons, though they would gladly perform the same, cannot possibly obey, because God has not given them that measure of grace which is absolutely necessary to enable them to render such service. (2) That one in the state of nature can resist the influence of divine grace when it operates on the heart. (3) That, in order to make the actions of men meritorious, it is not necessary that they be free from necessity, but only from restraint. (4) That the semi-Pelagians greatly err when they affirm that the will of man has power to receive or to resist the influence of prevenient grace. (5) That they are semi-Pelagians who assert that Jesus Christ, by his passion and death, made an atonement for the sins of all men. The pope pronounced the first and the last proposition condemned, and blaspheous, and his edict was followed that of the other three simply heretical. The friends and adherents of Jansenius admitted the propriety and justice of condemning these propositions, but maintained that they were not found in the work of Jansenius.

France was at this time at enmity with Rome, and cardinal Mazarin, though but little interested in these theological questions, believed this a favorable opportunity to magnify the importance of the case, and defend him with account of his arrest of cardinal Retz (q. v.). He held an assembly at the Louvre, March 26, 1654, in which thirty-eight bishops took part, and which declared that the pope's decision should be considered as applying positively to Jansenius's doctrine, since all who held in any way to the condemned propositions should be dealt with as heretics. This decision was communicated to the heads of all the dioceses throughout France, and approved by the pope September 29. In January, 1660, the Sorbonne also took direct action against the Jansenists by condemning two letters of Arnauld, in which the determined that he could not find the five condemned propositions in Jansenius's writings. He also hit upon an expedient which not only rendered the bull for a time harmless, but which initiated a new movement against the doctrine of papal infallibility. "True," he said, "the see of Rome does not have the faculty to decide with respect to doctrine, and every good Catholic must submit to its decree; but the Holy See may misapprehend fact (as in the papal condemnation of Galileo's theory of planetary movement), whether a book contains certain statements or not. They may be the highest names of the church at their disposal. Let the five propositions be heretical, yet, with the exception of the first, they are to be found neither in letter nor in spirit in the writings of Jansen. Thus arose the celebrated distinction of de facto and de jure.

The Sorbonne now demanded of Arnauld that he should discontinue his opposition to the church authorities in different countries. He, and sixty others with him, still refusing to submit, were expelled from the theological faculty. A general assembly of the clergy was also convened in September of this year, and the following formula was adopted on the motion of De Marcq, archbishop of Tou-

It is generally agreed that the decision of the five propositions of Cornelius Jansenius, contained in his book entitled Augustinianum, and which the pope and bishops have condemned, said doctrine not being that of St. Augustine, whom Jansenius has explained wrong-
that every noble and scholar should be removed from Port-Royal. This sharpened the pen of Pascal, and forth came the eighteen famous Provincial Letters (Lettres à des provinciaux). "In these remarkable letters the author showed with extraordinary force how narrow the question really was—whether five propositions in the Augustinians or not, when no one had there pointed them out. The Jesuits, by the provisions of their constitution, received a reprimand for the condemnation of Dr. Arnauld had been obtained; and, besides touching on doctrinal points which were involved, he firmly and manfully attacked the shameless casuistry of the Jesuits. These letters had a wonderful efficiency, for their power was felt even by those who had not read them. The Jesuits, in their turn, started a reply, and the controversy became more obvious. Voltaire has said that in wit the earlier of them were not excelled by the comedies of Molière, while the latter rivalled the productions of Bossuet in eloquence; in fact, that they constituted an epoch in French literature. Says Hallam (Introd. Literature of Europe, Harri-er's edition, ii, 335): "These letters did more to ruin the name of Jesuit than all the controversies of Protes-
tantism, or all the fulminations of the Parliament of Paris." "All Europe," says Macaulay (History of Eng-
lnd, ii, 46), "read, admired, and laughed. But only to have shed even among high dignitaries of the Church of St. Peter's chair staggered and reeled under the sudden attack, and, as a set-off for it, cardinal Chigi, now Alexander VII, not only confirmed the position of his predecessor, and again declared that the five propositions were contained de facto in Augustinis, but, imita-
tion, to all such authorities, accompanied it by the re-
quisition that every one holding a spiritual office in the Church of Rome should abjure these errors by sub-
scribing a formula prescribed for that purpose. This inquisitive and oppressive act subjected the Jansenists to still severer persecutions, and continued the heated controversy, in which impartiality on both sides was unen-
lileged. A great point was made by the Jesuits of the infallibility question. See INFALLIBILITY. But, as the controversy continued, it took a wider range, and came to embrace such topics as the rights of the bishops as co-contradistinquished from those of the pope, the critical views of theology and morality, all ably censured by Pascal, as we have already seen; the vast and alarming power of the Jesuits, and even many usages of the Church of Rome. The opposition, which thus far had seemed to come mainly from Port-Royal recluses, was found to have spread among high dignitaries of the Church: four bishops refused to sign the formulary which Rome dictated, and many others of this high position in France took the ground of "respectful silence." In 1688 king Louis succeeded in obtaining the sanction of Rome for a compromise, substantially on the basis of Arnauld's distinction de facto and de jure, and of respectfu-
silence.

"Jansenistic principles now came far more wide-
diffused. The authorities of the Church of Rome thought a Jansenist was not necessarily a heretic; the schools of Port-Royal flourished even more than before the persecution, and impudence on both sides was increased. The incumbents of the papal chair even became one of her recluses, and Racine one of her students. The incursions of the papal chair even became the friends of Port-Royal, and obtained no little aid from it in their opposition to the Jesuits, which In-
ner XI more successfully extirpated. The Jesuits were exasperated the Jesuits more than ever, and the great friend and protector of Jansenism at court, the duch-
ces of Longueville, having died, they succeeded in gain-
ning over Louis XIV, who, it is said, "abhorring Jansen-
ism quite as much as he abhorred Protestantism, and very much more than he abhorred atheism," had abstained from open violence only at the instance of the duchess of Longueville. An edict was issued forbid-
dng the admission of new members to Port-Royal, and the recluses were ordered to "quit the valley of Port-
Royal at once and forever," while Dr. Arnauld, the principal supporter of Jansenism, was obliged to flee from France, and to seek a refuge in the Low Countries, where he died in 1699. His brother and last personal disciple of 
Cyrn died in 1695. In the same and the following year passed away also the great supports of Jansenism, and it was already whispered among the Jesuits and at the French court that the heretical movement had been successfully eradicated, when suddenly the crippled Jan-
senism received a fresh start. A republic of Jansenists was organized at the university of Paris, P. Quensel, a man of learning, zeal, and spiritu-
ality of mind, had published the New Testament with annotations which were of a practical and edifying char-
acter, but strongly tinged with Jansenistic doctrines. It had been published in successive portions from 1671 to 1687. It had not been seen at first with much approbation. The Sorbonne had approved it; pope Clement XI had commended it; François Harlé, archbishop of Paris, an avowed enemy of the Jansenists, had express-
ed his approbation of it; Louis Antoine de Noël's, bishop of Chartres, subsequently archbishop of Paris, and finally a cardinal, who was then a zealous advocate of the Jansenistic doctrines, had even taken the work under his special protection, and enj oined its perusal in a diocese. It had been and still was eagerly read, and had already passed through many editions. An-
other edition in 1675 was followed by the publication of the thirteenth in 1679. In 1690 a new work by Quensel, which was published under the title of Le nouveau Testament en Francais, avec des refexions morales sur chaque ver-
s, pour en rendre la lecture plus utile, et la meditation plus aisée. The author had never signed the five propositions, and his confessor now put the question to the Sorbonne "whether it might not be said that the spiritual person who had done no more than maintain the 'reverential silence,' as some of the bishops had done," and the reply from the Sorbonne came that, with regard to points of fact, respectful obedience was suffi-
cient obedience. But hardly had the cas de conscience, as it is technically termed, become a question, when, in 1705, when pope Clement XI condemned it in the most severe terms (Feb. 12, 1703), and complained to the king of those who so thoughtlessly stirred up the old contro-
v.ey. Finally, the bull Unam Dominii (July 15, 1703), renewed and renewed the preceding condemnation of the five propositions. This bull was accepted by the assembly of the clergy, and registered in Parliament. But with it the Jesuits were by no means quieted. They desired complete victory. Another edition of Quensel's Reflexions morales having become necessary, the exemption of the Port-Royalists, which made it one of their duties to distribute it freely among the people, they determined that it also should be suppressed. They per-
severed in their efforts to secure the condemnation of the work by the papal see until at last success crowned their undertaking. In 1708 Clement XI pronounced against it, and in 1712 it was prohibited by a papal edict as "a text-book of undisguised Jansenism." By this time the king of France (Louis XIV) and the Jesuits were in league together, and we need not wonder that the Jan-
senists, as opponents of the Jesuits, were severely dealt with. Indeed, it is asserted that this bull, as well as many others that were issued about this time in Rome, and aiming at the French Church, were one and all dic-
tated in Paris. Says Tregelles (Jansenists, p. 38), "The king and the Jesuits procured whatever bulls they wanted com-
missioned from the pope. They then did everything to set forth the Jansenist heresy, they were returned from Paris to Rome with corrections and alterations, to which the pope acceded." No wonder, then, that the bull of 1712 was in 1713 followed by another still severer, fa-
mous as the bull Unigenitus, by which were condemned all of the writings of Quensel, and all that had ever been or might ever be written in their defence. It also sin-
gled out 101 propositions from the works of Quensel "as false, captious, evil sounding, offensive to pious ears, scandalous, pernicious, rash, and injurious to the Church and its customs; contumelious, not against the Church merely, but also against the secular authorities;
seditious, impious, blasphematic, suspected of heresy, and also savoring of heresy itself; also favoring heresies; heresies, and schism, erroneous, nearly allied to heresy, often condemned; and, furthermore, also heretical; and sundry heresies, especially those contained in the well-known propositions of Jansenius, and that, too, in the sense in which those were supposed by the bull to be espoused. The bull did not specify what the propositions belonged severally to each of those heads of condemnation. "This was the triumph of doctrinal Jesuitism: Le Tellier, the king's Jesuit confesser, arranged the terms of the bull. It seemed as if every feeling of piety towards God, and every sentiment of his grace, were extinguished throughout the Papal Church—as if all who adhered to all to many doctrines that had been regarded as orthodox were to have their feelings and their consciences outraged." But the Gallican clergy was by no means agreed as to the acceptance of the bull, although the Jesuits earnestly pressed it. Some were in favor of its unconditional acceptance, others desired to make a qualifying declaration, and still others wished the qualification to be made by the pope himself. After much dispute, the king himself decided the matter by making submission to the bull binding in Church and State. France, having handed over, in his new edicts, relating to the controversy which this famous bull provoked, are found in the great Parisian library.

The death of Louis XIV left the fate of Jansenism still unsettled, while it also caused a relaxation of the repressive measures. The regent, due to the state of Orleans was urged to refer the whole controversy to a national council, and the leaders of the Jansenist party appeared to a general council. The Jansenist party thus formed, which numbered four bishops and many inferior ecclesiastics, were called, from this circumstance, the Appellants (q. v.); the representatives of the pope, and a change in the policy of the regent, brought the Appellants into disfavor. Even the Parliament of Paris was forced to submit, and registered the papal bull in a lit de justice (June 4, 1720), although with a reservation in favor of the liberties of the Gallican Church. The Appellants for the most part submitted, the recusants being visited with severe penalties; and, on the accession of the new king, Louis XV, the unconditional acceptance of the bull was at length formally accomplished, so far as the general public were concerned. From this time forward the Jansenists were rigorously repressed, and their great stronghold, the University of Paris, having been already, in 1766, 11, destroyed by convivances of the king and the Jesuits, a large number emigrated to the Netherlands, where they formed a community, with Utrecht as a centre. (See below, Jansenists in Holland.)

"During the eighteenth century Jansenism degenerated in France. In 1727 Francois de Paris died, and was buried in the cemetery of St. Medard, in Paris. He was of an honorable family, and had early shown a religious turn of mind. His patrimony he bestowed upon the poor, and earned his livelihood by weaving hose. In 1720, at the age of thirty, he was made dean of St. Medard, Cardinal de Noailles would gladly have invested him with a higher office, but he declined. In 1722 he resigned his deaconship, and retired to a wilderness. He soon returned to Paris, where he lived in seclusion and poverty, denying himself the ordinary comforts of life, and comprehending the joy of poverty. In 1728, a magnificent monument was erected to his memory by his brother, a member of the French Parliament, who subsequently renounced his worldly position and property, and lived a life of seclusion and asceticism. To the grave of Francois de Paris multitudes flocked. There, in various ways, they testified their superstitious regard and veneration, and there marvellous cures were claimed to be wrought and miracles said to be performed. Strong religious emotions were manifested, and some were seized with convulsions. Some were favored with the spirit of prophecy, and predicted the overthrow of Church and State. Such predictions were heard until within a short time previous to, and even during the revolution of 1789. As late as 1840 multitudes of religious pilgrims still resolved to the spot, on the anniversary of his death, and crowned with garlands the grave of De Paris. The superstition and fanaticism which prevailed at his grave soon after his death were not wholly confined to the community of believers, but were shared by a considerable and a body of men of learning and rank. Those of the latter class who made themselves most conspicuous were Hieronymus N. de Paris, the parliamentary member just alluded to; C. Folard, widely and favorably known by his observations on the history of Polybius; and Louis Be

Y

---

Jansenists in Holland. —Although the fanatic ex-
cesses to which Jansenism had gone in France for a time darkened its prospects of ultimate success, it must be conceded, even by Roman Catholics of the most ultramontane class, that Jansenists in the 16th and 19th centuries preserved "a pure and unalloyed doctrine of the purity of morals and a deeper faith" than their opponents the Jesuits, who for the last 200 years have appeared in behalf of the infallibility of the pope only to strengthen and to preserve their own existence as an order. It was this characteristic feature of the Jansenists (as of the evangelical doctrine) the way for them. When persecution had driven them from France, "we find traces of them in Vienna and in Brussels, in Spain and in Portugal, and in every part of Italy" (Ranke, *Hist. Papacy*, London, 1851, ii, 293). Everywhere they now disseminated their doctrines, but it is especially in Regulorum Holland that the sect has been most successful, and has maintained itself to our own day. In the days of Philip II of Spain, Utrecht had been raised to the dignity of an archiepiscopal see (A.D. 1557). The other United Provinces, on throwing off the Spanish shackles, became Calvinists, but Utrecht and Haarlem continued faithful to the Roman hierarchy. To this part of a country, where the evangelical life had taught even the Roman Catholic communist a spirit of toleration, the Jansenists directed their steps, and it is here alone that they still appear as a definite, tangible body. Their organization in Holland dates partly from the forced emigration of the Jansenists under King Louis XIV, and partly from the controversy about Queen at the opening of the last century; but their success as an independent sect (if we may thus style adherents of the Roman Catholic communion, but defenders of the evangelical doctrine) dates from the day when the vicar apostolic, Peter Codde, an intimate friend of Arnauld, was suspended by Clement XI in 1702 from his position on account of his firm adherence to Jansenist principles, was allured to Rome, treacherously detained there for three years in defiance of all canons and laws, and then, when the chosen of God, the friend of the Jesuits (so a Jesuit sometimes designates himself), appeared in his stead. The chapter of Utrecht, thus deprived of the man of their choice, refused to acknowledge the new vicar named in Codde's place, and angrily joined themselves to the Appellant party in the French hierarchy. To government of Holland also interfered in 1708, suspended the operation of the papal bull, and deprived De Cock of the archbishopric. Codde, on his return, did all that he could to repair the injuries sustained by the Jansenists during the incumbency of De Cock, who had made many converts, and who was ever the champion of thirty years' standing, of their living, and had approved his Jesuitical friends instead. At length, in 1725, they elected an archbishop, Cornelius Steenloven, for whom the form of episcopal consecration was obtained from the French bishop Vorlet (titular of Babylon), who had been suspended for Jansenist opinions. A later Jansenist archbishop of Utrecht, Meindarts, established in 1742 Haarlem and in 1758 Deventer as his suffragan sees; and in 1763 a synod was held, which sent its acts to Rome, in recognition of the primacy of that see, in which the Church of Utrecht expressed its inalienable right. Since that time the formal succession has been maintained, each bishop, on being appointed, notifying the pope of his election, and craving confirmation. The popes, however, have uniformly rejected all advances, except on the condition of the acceptance of the bull *Unigenitus*. In 1789 the Holy See refused to comply with this demand, and have even refused to be bought over to the Church of Rome, as was attempted in 1828. The recent act of the Roman see in defining as of catholic faith the dogma of the immaculate conception of the blessed Virgin Mary has been the occasion of a new persecution, in which the Jansenists enlighten us, and work his will in us. We sign ourselves, with veneration, very holy father, the humble servants of your holiness." Then follow the signatures of the metropolitan archbishop and the two bishops. This letter, dated Sept. 6, 1856, is accompanied by a pastoral exhortation addressed to the faithful. To this document is replied by a formal anathema dated Dec. 4, of which the following is an extract: "The sacred congregation of the most eminent and most reverend cardinals of the holy Romish Church, inquisitors general throughout the Christian republic against heretical perversity, having heard the report of the committee acting in the name of our holy father, pope Pius IX, do now condemn the views published by the three false, schismatical bishops of the province of Utrecht. . . . The sacred congregation forbid all persons, of every state and condition, in any way, and under any pretext, to print, read, or obey them, or to keep or deliver them in their houses, or read it; every one must instantly give it up to the bishops or to the inquisitors." The Jansenists are genuine Roman Catholics, but they refuse a servile obedience to Rome. They have also come to deny the infallibility of the pope altogether, and recognize him only as the "head of the bishops," placing the highest authority of the Church in a general council. They circulate the Scriptures, and insist on inward piety. They denominate themselves Roman Catholica of the episcopal clergy. They still number about 6,000 souls, and are divided between the bishop of Utrecht and Haarlem. Their clergy are about thirty in number, with a seminary at Amersfoort, which was founded in 1726. The name of their present archbishop is Van Santen, whom Rome has again and again vainly endeavored to induce, by the basest of means, to sign the prescribed formula of submission (Cone*cta Ital.* p. 80 sq.). So far as they can be said to possess a theological system, it may be described as a compound of Jansenist and ultra-Gallican principles. 

*Other Works of Jansenius.*—Besides the work which gave rise to the schismatic movement in the Roman Catholic Church, Jansenius wrote many other works, among others: 

3. *De Venæ Reformatione* (1627; translated into French by Arnauld d'Andilly).—*Alexiziphormcum pro civibus Sylvios Ducenasius, adversus ministrorum suorum auctoritate, sicre Responsio brevis ad libellum eorum procuratorium* (Louvain, 1639).—*Spongia naturae, quodis Alexiziphormianus aspirat*; *G. V. Versius* (Louvain, 1631, 8vo).—*Tetrateuchus, sive commentarius in quatuor Evangelia* (Louvain, 1639, 4to).—*Pentateuchus, sive commentarius in quinque libros Moses* (Louvain, 1641, 4to).—*Analec ta in Proverbiis, Ecclesiasten, Sopiennium, Hubacum et Sophium* (Louvain, 1648).—*Discours sur la justice armee et les regnes Gallie, Libri II* (1633). 

JANSSEN

Pétercession de Mr. de Paris (1787, 1745; written by Montgeroult); Reuchlin, Gesch. von Port-Royal (Hamb. 1838, 1844); Geschichte dogmatique sur les miracles du temps (1787); Geschichte der Christelijcke Kerk, door Profs. De Groot, Ter Haar, Kist, Mol, Nieuwenhuis, etc., vol. v (Amsterdam, 1859); Colonie, Dict. des lieux Jansenistes, etc.; Ste. Beuve, Port Royal, vol. i and ii; Tre- gelles, in Kittos Journ. Soc. Lit. Jan. 1851, and since in separate and enlarged form, The Jansenists [London, 1851, 12mo]; Mrs. Schimmelpennick, Select Memoirs of Port-Royal; Déclaration des Évêques de Hollande, etc. (Paris, 1827); Gerberon, Hist. de Jansenism; Voltaire, Siècle de Louis XIV, ii, 264; Rapin (Jesuit), Histoire de Jansénisme, edit. by Domenech (Paris, 1861, 8vo); Am. Bible Soc., Am. Rev. 1860, Aug., vol. ii. See JESUITS; PORT-ROYAL.

Jansen, Ellert, an Anabaptist martyr, suffered during the persecutions of the Anabaptists near the middle of the 16th century. He was imprisoned at Amsterdam, 1616; and 1606.

Jansenian. See Jansenius, 2.

Jansse, Lucas, a distinguished French Protestant theologian and writer, was born at Rouen about 1605. He studied theology at the Huguenot seminary situated at the laterly celebrated Sedan, and was pastor at Rouen from 1632 to 1682, when age and infirmities obliged him to resign. At the Propagation of the Edict of Nantes he retired to Rotterdam, where he died April 24th, 1686. Jansse was a man of solid learning and lively imagination. He made himself especially conspicuous by a pamphlet—La Mesme traversé en l'Écriture (Villefranche [Rouen], 1647, 12mo)—in which he ridiculed Véron for having, in an edition of the Louvain Bible published at Paris in 1646, translated the beginning of Acts xi, 2 by "As they said mass unto the Lord." In order to avoid persecution, Jansse destroyed a large number of copies; but it was often reprinted, as in Recueil de plai- siniers (Villefranche [Rouen], 1654, 12mo), and alone under the title Le Miracle du P.Véron sur la Messe (Lond. 1699, 12mo). He wrote also, Traité de la Fian du Monde (Rouen and Quevilly, 1656, 8vo)—Le Christien au Pied de la Croix (Rouen, 1668, 8vo); and other works.

Jansenboy, the family name of several Dutch theologians; mostly as missionaries of the Dominican order.

Cornelius, born near the beginning of the present century, was educated at Louvain, then went to Ita- ly, and, after preaching and teaching for some time, the Congregated Propaganda, in 1629, to the northern provinces on mission work, and, as his special field, Saxony was designated. Failing, however, to make many converts in this country, the very cradle of Protestantism, he was ordered to remove to Flanders. On his return to Italy in 1637, he was lost at sea (Oct. 11). He wrote several works of some note, mostly of a polemical nature, amongst which, of especial interest to us, his Défense de la Foi Catholique.

Dominicus, brother of the former, born at Amster- dam March 14, 1647, was also dispatched to the northern provinces at the same time as his brother Cornelius. He was put in charge of the town but the order was countered by imprudent conduct finally resulted in his expulsion from the city; and although the order was afterwards revoked, by reason of his pledges to be more considerate and fair in their representations of the Reform- ers, he quittd Hamburg in 1634 and retired to a Domin- ian convent at Cologne. In 1648 his superiors sent him to Prague, where he died March 14, 1647. While at Cologne, Dominicus published several sermons in defence of the doctrines and usages of the Roman Catholic Church, but they are rather of an inferior order.

Nicholas was born at Zierickzee, on the island of Schouwen, Zeeland, in the second half of the 16th cen- tury. He was a regular tall, strong and solidish man, a German garb at Anvers, he was appointed regent and then superior of the college at Lire, in Brabant, and afterwards professor of theology at Louvain. His superior ability pointed him out as one of the ablest men for missionary labor among the Lutherans of Denmark, and he was intrusted with this service. His popular ability in the way of several sermons in Denmark, Norway, and other: northern provinces, he went to Rome to give an account of his labors, and to propose the measures necessary to re-establish Romanism in those countries. In 1629 he was again dispatched to the same countries, this time reinforced by his brother Jan. He was next sent to England, in making much of an impression on the Protestants, who had heard and seen enough of Romanism and its workings to be satisfied that salvation did not flow through that channel. While he was treated with the utmost liberality by both the government and the people among whom he came to print, the profession of the Roman Catholics of the region, the converts for his religion were few, if any. But it must be conceded that Rome had well chosen the man who was likely to make converts for popery, if such a thing had been possible. Nicholas was certainly a man of great erudition and well-sounding speech even at the admiration of his opponents. He died November 21, 1634. His works are, Panegyrique de St. Thomas d'Aquin (Louvain, 1621, 8vo);—1° de St. Dominique (Anvers, 1622, 8vo);—Defensio Fidelis Cathol. (Anvers, 1631, 8vo), etc. See Touron, Hommes illustres de l'ordre de St. Dominique; Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Gr. xxvi, 385 sq. (J. H. W.)

Janssenius, Erasmus (Lat. ERASUS Johannis), a Dutch Unitarian theologian, was born about 1540. He was rector of the College of Antwerp, but his advocacy of Socinianism obliged him to resign his office in 1567. He was next regent of the College of Cambrai (Diet Frize), but, in consequence of new persecutions, he went in 1579 to Frankfort, and thence to Poland, where he settled at Cracovia in 1584. Here he asked to be permitted publicly to defend his opinions. The demand was granted, and the renowned Faustus Socinus was his opponent. Their controversy lasted two years (29th and 30th of November, 1584), and passed off calmly; but, both having subsequently published an account of the proceedings, they accused each other of incorrecetness. Janssenius, however, in being offered the pastorate of a Unitarian congregation at Clausenburg, in Transylvan- ia, retraced his former principles, and adopted those of Socinus (q. v.), who, as is well known, by his great ability not only silenced all the anti-Trinitarians that differed from his views, but finally even gained them all over to his side (comp. Krasinski, Reformation in Poland [Lond. 1840, 2 vols, 8vo, 132]. Janssenius is supposed to have died near the close of the 16th century. His principal works were, Clara Demonstratio Antichristi immediate post mortem apostolorum corrupse regnum in Ecclesia Christri (1584, 12mo) [this work gave rise to the persecutions which obliged Janssenius to retire to Poland];—Antitheseon, Anti-Fidei, Anti-Scripturæ, et Anti-Erasmi vero Deo (anon. 1585, 12mo; with a refutation by Jernel Zanchius, Neustadt, 1586, 4to).—Scriptum quo causas propter quas vita eternius contagit complucerit, etc. (1589):—Epistola ad Faustinum Sociumin, with an answer of the latter dated April the 28th, in Rhen. Arch. Fili Dei eruditorum, et ad epistolem inter Erasum Joh- annem et Faustinum Socium, etc. (Cracov. 1585, 12mo);—De Quatuor Monarchiaca:—Commentarii in Apoc- lypsin. He published also, the Bibliorum Para 11, ed Libri Prophetici, Latina recensio ex Hebrew facta,
contrary, maintained "that the Supper was, according to the teaching of the Scriptures and that of the Reformed Church, instituted for the regenerate, who possessesthe holy and spiritual life and its attributes. This controversy greatly agitated the Church, and its effect was in some places to restrain men from a public profession of their faith, and to deter those who had already made a profession from coming to the communion. A somewhat intermediate view, presented and advocated by the common people, not so much to conciliate the Church, as to defend the ancient and finally prevailed in the Church. His view is substantially this: All who have made a public profession of their faith, whether they possess the internal evidence of having been truly converted or not, must be regarded as believers, and, as such, entitled to and bound to observe this ordinance; and the minister must invite all such to come to the communion, as being their privilege and duty. This view is substantially in harmony with the theory and practice of most evangelical denominations in this country. See Geschichte van de Christelijke Kerk in de 18de eeuw, door A. Ipejui, vii, 401 sq.; Geschichte der Niederländischen lKerk, door A. Ipejui en J. Dermout, iii, 612 sq.; Glasius, Godge- leerd Nederland, ii, 175 sq. (J. P. W.)

Januarius is a name under which some fourteen martyrs are honored in the Roman Catholic Church. A family prefixed the name of the saint of Naples, who is usually called Januarius, to their old inscriptions. There is a monument in Turin to the memory of a certain Januarius Vintius. The name seems to have belonged especially to Africa and Southern Italy. Its popularity is proved by the large number of martyrs bearing it, which is surpassed by few others (perhaps only the names of Alexander, Felix, John, etc.). The best known among them is St. Januarius, bishop of Benevento, who was beheaded in the early part of the 4th century (according to the Neapolitan tradition, at Pozzuoli, where many Christians suffered a like fate, in 305).

The saint's day is Sept. 19. Januarius is the patron of Naples, and his head and skull are revered; and looked upon as holy relics, are kept in the chapel El Tesoro, in the cathedral of Naples, where they were placed Jan. 13, 1437. According to tradition, a pious woman gathered at the place of his execution two bottles of his blood, and presented them to bishop Severus of Naples. On three festivals each year, the chief of which is the day of the martyrdom, Sept. 19, and on occasions of public danger or calamity, as earthquakes or eruptions, the head and the phials of the blood are carried in solemn procession to the high altar of the cathedral, or of the church of St. Clare, where, after prayer of greater or less duration, the blood is exposed; or brought into contact with the head, is believed to liquify, and in this condition is presented for the veneration of the people, or for the conviction of the doubter. It occasionally happens that a considerable time elapses before the liquefaction takes place, and sometimes it altogether fails. The latter is regarded as an omen of the worst import; and on those occasions when the miracle is delayed beyond the ordinary time, the alarm and excitement of the congregation rise to the highest pitch, as it is represented in such a case to be an evil sign for the city and the whole country. The blood is exposed three times every year, particularly on the first Sunday in May, and in cases of especial public affliction. The process of the performance of this so-called miracle is kept secret by the clergy of Naples. Of late years the liquefaction of the blood was interpreted as a sign of the saint's goodwill towards the city and the whole country; but this interpretation of Ferdinand II, for Garibaldi, and for Victor Emanuel with equal ease, which would seem to indicate that the saint is indifferent to the political fate at least of his devout worshippers. Addison, in his Travels, speaks of the performance (in his notices of Naples) thus: "I had twice an opportunity of seeing the operation; the phial being tendered, and must confess that, so far from thinking it a real miracle, I look upon it as one of the most bungling tricks I ever saw."
Another Januarius, said to have suffered under Felix, has Jan. 7 assigned to him in the Martyrology of the Romish Church. Still another, said to have suffered martyrdom in Africa with Paul and Gerontius, has Jan. 13. Veda names April 8 for a Januarius of Africa, along with Macaria and Maximus. July 10 is kept in honor of two saints of like name, one of which belonged to the seven sons of Felicitas, who are said to have been put to death towards the end of the 2d century at Rome; the other suffered martyrdom in Africa with Felix and Nabor, who were transferred to Milan. July 11 is sacred to a Januarius who died at Nicopoli. Another suffered martyrdom at Carthage, together with Philippus, Catulminus, etc., July 15. A Januarius, together with Felicitissimus and Agapetus, fell a martyr under Decius at Rome, and the Church observes Aug. 6 in his memory. October 18 is the anniversary of the Spanish martyrs Faustus and Januarius, who suffered at Cordova. On Oct. 24 there is mention made of a Januarius who, after being long persecuted, was, together with Felix, Audactus, etc., put to death and buried near Carthage. The island of Sardinia also has a Januarius, in whose honor they keep Oct. 25. On Dec. 2 we find a Januarius, with Severus, etc.; and another in Africa Dec. 15. See Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, iv, 433 sq.; Plerer, Univ. Lex. s. v.; Wetzer and Welte, Kirchenlex. v, 500; Zell, Römische Epigraphik, ii, 88; Monumenta Taurinensia, ii, 119; J. G. Kegeler, Neueste Reisen (Hanov. 1785); Acta Sanctorum, iv, 446; Chambers, Cyclopaedia, s. v.; Broughton, Biblioth. Sac. ii, 502.

Ja'num (Heb. Janum', דַּבּוֹ, slumber, otherwise for זַבּוּ, propagation; Septug., ταυτίζειν v. ταυτολαχ. Vulg. Janum'), a town in the mountains of Judah, mentioned between Eshem and Beth-tappauh (Josh. xv, 58). The Heb. text has דַּבּוֹ (as if Yamin', יָמִין, right), which is corrected in the Masoretic marg.; many copies have Janus', דַּבּוֹ, flight, as in the Eng. margin "Janus." The Syriac version has Ḥalum. Eusebius (Onomast. s. v. Ταυτολαχ.) mentions a place, Janus, three miles south of Lejio, but admits that it cannot be the locality in question. M. de Sauley (Nah. i, 457) thinks the site may possibly be marked by the ruins of Jenbeh, at the foot of a hill nearly south of Hebron; but, according to Dr. Robinson, the remains are little more than those of caves (Bib. Rev. ii, 472). The associated names appear to indicate a district immediately north-west of Hebron (U. O. Y. Comment. on Josh. iv, 5). The position corresponds with that of a ruined site, Ras Jubeh, marked on the first edition of Van de Velde's map immediately on the west of the road directly north from Hebron to Jerusalem, and adjoining Khurbet en-Nasara; but the identification of the map conduced both with these sites, although the latter is explicitly mentioned in the Memoir (p. 247) as "a ruined village" visited by him as well as by Dr. Robinson (Researches, i, 317).

Janus. See JANUM.

Janua, a very old Roman divinity, whose name is merely a different form of Dianus (probably the sun). The worship of this divinity held a high place in the regards of the Romans. "In every undertaking his name was first invoked, even before that of Jupiter, which is the more singular, as Jupiter was unquestionably the greatest of the Roman gods. Perhaps it may be taken as a verification of the tradition that Janus was the oldest of them, and ruled in Italy before any of the others came thither. (See below, our reference to Janus presiding not only at the beginning of the year, but over the beginning of each month, each day, and the commencement of all enterprises. On New Year's day people made each other presents of figs, dates, honey-cakes, sweetmeats, etc.; wore a holiday-dress, saluted each other kindly, etc. The pious Romans prayed to Janus to clothe with the highest honors of his class the "Filio of Mattutinos Pater (Father of the Morning)." Janus is represented with a sceptre in his right hand and a key in his left, sit-

Colin with head of Janus.

Januarius, a Latin priest, born at Pittsgrove, N. J., April 25, 1816, graduated at Princeton, and took the highest honors of his class in 1833, and then pursued a theological course of study at Princeton Seminary, teaching at the same time in Lafayette College, where he so ably discharged his duties that he was urged to accept a professorship. But Janvier preferred the missionary work; and he was licensed and ordained by the West Jersey Presbytery, his father, also a minister, preaching on the occasion. He went to India and there was for several years superintendent of the mission press; he also prepared a translation of the Pentateuch and Psalms into Punjabi, and aided in the preparation of a Punjabi dictionary and other works in this department. He began his work without pay and obliged him to seek recreation, and he came on a visit to his native country in 1859. In 1860 he returned again to the missionary work, but he continued only a short time to serve his Master here on earth: March 25, 1864, he was murdered by a Sikh at Amadpur, India. "He was aocrat of a high order; learned, wise, gentle, humble, winning; whose loving, benevolent life preached most touchingly the Gospel of his Master," was the testimony of one of the papers of India after the assassination of Mr. Janvier. Another collaborator (the Rev. J. T. Gracey) wrote to the Methodist New Yorker, in April, 1864, that "great excitement prevailed among the people," and that Janvier's funeral "was attended, with marked respect, by thousands of natives." See Wilson, Prob. Hist. Am., 1866, p. 117 sq. (J. H. W.)

Janvier, René-Ambroise, a French Benedictine monk, was born at Sainte-Osmane, on the Main, in 1618. He was one of the most distinguished historians of the 17th century, and is celebrated for his Latin translations of several Jewish commentaries, among which are translations of Kimchi's commentary on the Psalms entitled R. Dav. Kimchi Commentarius in Psalmo (Paris, 1666, 4to). He died at Paris April 25, 1892. See Hoeber. Nouv. Diction. Elém. iv, 563; Hauret, Hist. Littér. de la Congreg. de St. Maur, p. 101.

Jao. See Jeovah; Valev'tislanim.
JAPAN

JAPAN, a country in Eastern Asia, consisting of a great number (about 3850) of large and small islands, which are situated between 30° 20′ and 54° 24′ N. lat., and between 147° 34′ and 164° 30′ E. long. It is divided into Japan proper, which embraces the large islands, and the outer islands, of which the principal is Sittokof, and Kiussiu (with a number of adjacent islands), and the dependencies, to which belong Joso, with adjacent islands, the 174 Kuriles, the less known (89) Bomie, and the Lieu Kuei Islands. The population is generally estimated at from 33 to 40 millions; its area at about 365,000 square miles.

The history of Japan, according to the traditions of the country, begins with the dynasty of the heavenly gods, consisting of seven generations, and reigning from four to five million years. It was followed by the dynasty of the earthly gods, consisting of five generations, and reigning 2,342,167 years. The native soulaunis (the Asains) was at a very early period (according to some as early as B.C. 1246) pushed back by the immigrants from China. Probably Simmu (the divine warrior), the founder of the Japanese empire, with whom the authenticated history of the country begins, was also a Chinese. He first conquered Kiussiu (about B.C. 667), subsequently Nipon, where he erected a palatial temple (Dairi) to the sun goddess (Miako), and constituted himself ruler, under the honorary title of Mikado. When he died he was regarded as a national hero. His successors, with the annals of the modern Japan, are filled with narratives of the deeds of members of the orders in Japan. Besides Xavir, the greatest missionaries were Valignani, father John Baptist, a Spanish Franciscan, Philip of Jesus, a Mexican Franciscan, both crucified at Nagasaki, father Charles Spina, etc. The last Catholic priest who entered Japan was Sodotli, who in 1709 found means to land, but was never again heard of.

The state of the country, the population, the great numbers of the Japanese, who had returned from a perilous situation in the administration of the Mikado, the Koey, (1414–55); he added to his title Kubo the word Sama. Henceforth he and his successors resided in Yedo, while Miako remained the residence of the Mikados; his dynasty was in 1384 supplanted by another, but the separation of the ecclesiastical and secular authority remained unchanged.

In the middle ages, all the European nations visited Japan, which, up to this time, had been only known to them from Arabian geographers, and from the accounts given in the 13th century by the traveller Marco Polo, after his return from China. Through the efforts of three runaway Portuguese sailors, who in 1545 had landed, were crucified, and who, having by storms been driven to the Japanese island Yanega, had found a kind reception at the residence of the prince of Bungo, in Kiussiu, a lively commercial intercourse arose with Portugal, which soon proved to be of immense value to the latter country. In 1549 the celebrated Jesuit missionary Francis Xavier, who had converted a Japanese at Goa, arrived in Japan. During a stay of two years he visited the territories of several princes and founded missions, which he confided to zealous priests of his order. The Roman Catholic faith spread rapidly, and soon the Catholic Church numbered among its converts the Buddhist priests. The Buddha, priests made a desperate resistance to the progress of Christianity, but a number of the Daiomios favored it, as they expected from the success of Christianity great commercial advantages. In 1562 the prince of Oomura, and soon after the princes of Bungo and Ariton, embraced Christianity, and sent a splendid embassy (embracing also three princes), with rich presents, to pope Gregory XIII and to king Philip II of Spain. But when the suspicion arose that the Daiomios who had embraced Christianity intended, with the aid of foreign Christian governments and with the native Chinese population, to establish their entire independence, the Kubo Sama Fide Yose, an upstart who, being of low birth, had in 1585 usurped the dignity of Kubo Sama, curtailed the rights of the subordinate princes, took from the Mikado everything except the administration of the ecclesiastical affairs, and issued a stringent edict against Christianity, which had been favored by his predecessor. This edict provided for the expulsion of all the missionaries and the destruction of the churches. It was not executed at once, but in 1596 a real persecution of the Christians began, the beginning of a religious and civil war which lasted for forty years. Fide Yose died in 1598, while preparing for the invasion and conquest of Korea, and he was succeeded by his grandson, Yie Yazoo, prince of Mikaya, whose descendants have reigned at Yedo until the present day. Yie Yazoo made the dignity of Kubo hereditary in the three houses founded by his sons, shut the Mikado up in his palace at Miaco, and gave to the country a legislation conditioned under which it remained at peace for more than two hundred years.

In the mean while the Dutch had gained a footing in Japan, and, from commercial jealousy against the Portuguese, aided and encouraged the Kubo Sama in his proceedings. The leaders of the clergy, who were chiefly Japanese, were likewise encouraged by the aid of the small British garrison of his minor son, Yie Yazoo, prince of Mikaya, whose descendants have reigned at Yedo until the present day. Yie Yazoo made the dignity of Kubo hereditary in the three houses founded by his sons, shut the Mikado up in his palace at Miaco, and gave to the country a legislation conditioned under which it remained at peace for more than two hundred years.

In the mean while the Dutch had gained a footing in Japan, and, from commercial jealousy against the Portuguese, aided and encouraged the Kubo Sama in his proceedings. The leaders of the clergy, who were chiefly Japanese, were likewise encouraged by the aid of the small British garrison of his minor son, Yie Yazoo, prince of Mikaya, whose descendants have reigned at Yedo until the present day. Yie Yazoo made the dignity of Kubo hereditary in the three houses founded by his sons, shut the Mikado up in his palace at Miaco, and gave to the country a legislation conditioned under which it remained at peace for more than two hundred years.
last-named treaty abrogated the disgraceful stipulations concerning Christianity to which the Dutch had formerly been compelled to submit, and an additional stipulation of Jan. 30, 1856, allowed them to celebrate divine worship outside the exclusive ports. In 1857, several of the foreign treaties made further concessions to the four treaty powers, and the same rights were, by a treaty of Oct. 9, 1858, extended to France. From Jan. 1, 1859, the ports of Nagasaki, Hakodate, and Kanagawa; from Jan. 1, 1860, the port of Negato, and another port on the western coast; and, as a consequence of the ushing of Hiroo, the port of Osaca, were opened. Foreigners were allowed to reside in these places, to purchase landed property, to build houses and churches, and to celebrate their divine worship; from Jan. 1, 1862, they were also permitted to reside in Yedo. Gradually other Christian nations, as Portugal, Prussia, Spain, and Austria, likewise sent expeditions to Japan, which requested and obtained the conclusion of similar treaties.

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

The great change which, during the period from 1854 to 1870, took place in the relations of Japan to the world, and in the conduct of its affairs, was the result of many violent commotions, and affecting important transformations at home. The policy pursued by the Tycoon at Yedo was bitterly opposed and resisted by many of the most influential Daimios, and a large portion of the Japanese at large. On this occasion it was found that the European governments which had concluded treaties with the Tycoon had been greatly mistaken concerning the true nature of the office of the Tycoon. They had regarded him as being the absolute ruler of Japan; whereas, in fact, the Mikado, although actually confined to the religious functions, was still universally looked upon as the head of the state, and the highest arbiter in all quarrels between the Tycoon and the Daimios. In union with the Daimios, the Mikado now asserted his sovereignty with considerable success. When some of the Daimios committed crimes, it was supposed that the government could not possibly be accused of complicity, and hence in many cases the Mikado was able to bring them to punishment, and the European powers had themselves to enforce their claims against the princes of Satsuma and Negato. Ultimately a fierce civil war broke out between the Tycoon and a number of the northern Daimios on the one hand, and the Mikado and the majority of the Daimios on the other, which resulted in the abolition of the office of the Tycoon (1868), and the restoration of the Mikado to the full power of actual ruler. The successful Mikado, however, did not, as many expected, change the foreign policy of his predecessors, and endeavored to preserve the most friendly relations with foreigners, and to elevate the country to a level with the most civilized nations of Europe and America. In May, 1869, a large congress of Daimios was held at Yedo, and from that time to the middle of the year 1871 many important reforms in the internal condition have partly been carried through, partly begun.

The authorization given by the Japanese government to foreign residents of a free exercise of the Christian religion in the open ports was, of course, eagerly embraced by both the Protestant and the Roman Catholic churches. Missionaries of both established themselves in several of the ports, attending both to the religious wants of the foreign residents, and preparing for missionary operations among the natives. The appearance of Roman Catholic missionaries at Nagasaki brought to light the fact that a number of the descendants of former Christians in Japan still secretly adhered to the Roman Catholic faith, and now hoped for permission to exercise it openly. The government, however, did not give the expected permission, but in 1867 arrested and imprisoned some twenty of the native Christians. After an imprisonment of six months, the French chargé d'affaires obtained in December their liberation. In the following year, however, the persecuted native Christians were publicly executed in Nagasaki, and one of the official decrees published by the government: "As the abominable religion of the Christians is strictly prohibited, every one shall be bound to denounce to the proper authorities such persons as appear suspicious to him, and a reward shall be given to him for doing. Although the sect of the Christians has been many centuries ago persecuted most rigorously by the Ranku government, its entire extermination had not been arrived at. As, however, the number of the followers of the Christian doctrine has lately considerably augmented in the island of Honshu, near Nagasaki, whose peasants secretly adhere to it, after mature consideration it has been ordered by the highest authority that Christians shall be taken into custody, according to the rules laid down in the annexed document. As the Christian doctrine has been prohibited in this country, and the priests and other notables thereof have been severely punished for their audacity, those whose custody customary shall be confined shall therefore instruct them of what is right, with leniency and humanity, and shall do their best to again make good men of them. But if some should not repent and acknowledge their error, they shall be most severely punished without any mercy. Those whom it concerns shall keep this well in mind, and denounced to the proper authorities every one who shall prove incorrigible. Those men (Christians), until they have repented, shall not be allowed to have any intercourse with the inhabitants of the place where they are consigned. They shall be used to clear land, or to work in the lime-pits, or the gold and coal mines, or for any work their officers may think fit to employ them on. They shall live in the mountains and forests. One portion of rice shall be allowed per head to the respective Daimios for the span of thirty years; to commence from a day to be determined hereafter. They shall be brought in small detachments to the places mentioned below. The Daimios shall, as soon as they receive the information of the arrival of the persons allotted to them, send soldiers to take them over. The above mentioned proceedings have been common knowledge. The following Daimios shall take over the Christians allotted to them at their respective palaces at Osaca." This decree was followed by a list of thirty-four Daimios who had Christian prisoners allotted to them, in numbers varying from 30 to 24 each. The following decree was posted at the gates of Yokohama: "The Christian religion being still forbidden in the same manner as formerly, is strictly interdicted. The devilish sect is strictly prohibited."

On the 7th of July 114 native Christians, chiefly men and women, were landed at Nagasaki, on board the Japanese steamer Sir H. Parkes, at Nagasaki, and carried away to the mines of the north for penal servitude. The protest of the consuls at Nagasaki and the ministers at Yedo were of no avail. The Congress of Daimios which met in 1869 showed itself likewise very hostile to Christianity. The only one member of the national diet to vote for it, while 210 voted for a resolution declaring Christianity to be opposed to the state. Another resolution to inflict severe penalties for bringing back the apostates to one of the religions of the country was negatived by 176 against 60. Japan has long had many religious sects which have lived peaceably together. The three principal sects are the Sinto religion, Buddhism, and the sect of Shinto. The original and most ancient is the Sinto or Shintoism.
sect, which is founded on the worship of spirits, called
in the Japanese language Kami, in the Chinese Sin, 
who control the actions of men, and all visible and in-
visible things. The chief of these spirits is Yen Zio 
Dai Sin, which means Great Spirit of the Heavenly 
Light, who receives the highest honors from all religious 
paths. It was established, it is said, that the Kami are 
Kamia receive divine honors. Most of these are the 
spirits of distinguished men, who were canonized on ac-
tount of their merits. Their number is not limited, but 
the Mikado still possesses the right to canonize promi-
inent men, and thus to elevate them to the dignity of a 
Kami. With the exception of Jay, which is the most re-
owned and the oldest, and the one bound to visit it at least 
one in the course of his life. The second religion is 
Buddhism, which was introduced from Corea, but 
received many modifications in Japan, and gradual-
ly became followed by the people as the guide of their 
affairs. The sect known as Sinto, or the school of 
philosophers, comprises the followers of Confucius, and 
includes the people of the best education.

The great political revolution through which Japan 
passed in 1868, by the abolition of the office of the Ty-
coon and the Sinto establishment of the grand priests: if 
the Mikado, was accompanied by an effort to effect a 
complete change in the state religion of the country. 
An American missionary writes on this subject, under 
the date of Dec. 26, 1868, as follows: "Here the Buddh-
ist religion is, or was, the established religion, and the 
priests have the monopoly of burying people and pray-
ing for them afterwards. The aboriginal Sinto religion 
had fallen into disuse, poverty, and consequent disfavor 
and disgrace. This state of things commenced about 
three hundred years ago under Yie Yazoo, the founder of 
the sect of Confucianism in Japan, who was often beaten, 
and at his flight, and in other times of calamity, he and 
his adherents found shelter and sympathy in many a Buddhist 
money. At last, when he reached the throne, he liberally rewarded all those 
priests who had befriended him in his adversity, paying 
them a fixed sum out of the public treasury, and be-
stowing grants of land to be held as temple grounds, 
the revenue from which was devoted to the support of 
the temple. From that time Buddhism flourished in Japan, and 
Sintoism decayed. The nation followed the example of 
the victorious Tycoon, and thus Buddh-
ism became established and popular. Still, as the Ty-
coon did not ignore the Mikado, but allowed him to be 
the nominal head of Japan, and even paid some outward 
respect to him, in the same way Buddhism did not 
ignore or displace Sintoism, of which the Mikado is pont-
ifex maximus. Where the aboriginal Sinto gods were 
worshipped before, the Buddhist divinities did not 
replace or superecede them, but were added to them, and 
thus, in many places, a singular union was effected. 
Buddhism and Sinto divinities are worshipped togeth-
er, and the priests of both divisions often reside in the 
same temple. Wherever is the case such temples are 
called Ryoby, i.e., 'union temples.' Thus there are 
true Buddhist, pure Sinto, and the mixed or union 
temples. During the recent revolution a great effort 
has been made by the adherents of the Mikado to re-
vote the ancient faith, and cast off whatever is of for-
gone origin, whether derived from China or India. Ef-
forts are made to eliminate the whole mass of Chinese 
characters from the language and literature of the land, 
and to return to the ancient, simple, and alphabetical 
manner of writing. The same principle is at work in 
the reaction against the established religion, which is of 
foreign origin, introduced from China and India 1500 
years ago. Since the Mikado's government has been 
formed, the priests have been decreed that their ancient 
Sinto divinities are worshipped in the same temple, 
the former are to be set aside, and the latter alone re-
venerated. The priests of the former religion are urged 
to embrace the ancestral and national faith, in which 
case they may continue to hold their places. At vari-
ous points of the empire there are only Sinto temples. 
The ancient god holds his place, but, not be-
ing a popular god, his shrine is forsaken by officiating 
priests and worshippers. The present government has 
made inspection, and found that in many cases these 
shrines, so sadly neglected, are the shrines of the 
true and ancient gods. These are to be re-erected, and en-
dowed with government support. What has been taken 
from the disendowed Buddhists will, no doubt, most of 
it be given to the Sintos. Now, when one of these old 
temples is re-erected and endowed, the office of priest in 
the temple becomes divine. It becomes divine, and it becomes the source of revenue from government, but the people suddenly wake up to a knowledge of the fact that this same forgotten god, in the olden time, worked wonders. The early history of the 
divinity is involved in obscurity, and on the princi-
ple 'Omne ignotum pro magnifico,' it is magnified;
but the people attach a great importance to their offerings to these ancient demons.

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

Protestant missions were in 1870 supported in Japan 
by three American denominations: the Presbyterian 
Church, the Dutch Reformed Church, and the Protes-
tant Episcopal Church. Several missionaries teach sec-
cular branches in the government schools. Progress 
has been made with the translation of the Bible into Japan-
ese, and Bible-classes have been formed, but up to 1871 
but few of the natives had made a profession of Chris-
tianity. The Presbyterian missionaries, who had sta-
tions at Yokohama (begun in 1859) and Yeddo (begun 
in 1860), had been in their labors to the recognition of only 
three natives. The Protestant Episcopal Church sup-
ported one missionary bishop and one missionary. See 
Charloix et Crasset, Histoire de Japon (Paris, 1754); 
Sir Rutherford Alcock, The Capitall of the Tycoon (Lon- 
d. 1880); Siebold, Nipon; Archie zur Beschreibung von 
Japan (Leir, 1822-25); American Annual Cyclopadia, 
1868, 1870, (A. J. S.), See our Supplement, &c.
Japhet ( Heb. יָפֵת, Ṭapheth, ṿapheth, in pause Yapheth, יָפֶה, wide-spread- ing [comp. Gen. ix. 27], although some make it signify ūfar, referring to the light complexion of the Japhethites; Sept. Ἰάφθης; Josephus Ἰάφθης, Ant. i, 4, 1), one of the three sons of Noah, mentioned last in order (Gen. v. 29; vii, 10; viii, 17; ix, 18; x, 1; Chron. iv. 14), usually though it appears as north (Gen. x. 21) (comp. ix. 24) that he was the eldest of Noah’s sons, born one hundred years before the flood (Michaelis, Spicil. ii, 66). B.C. 2616. He and his wife were two of the eight persons (1 Pet. iii, 20) preserved in the ark (Gen. vii. 7). In Gen. x. 2 sq. he is called the progenitor of the extensive (Gen. xi. 11), Hamitic, (Gen. xii. 6, 9, 20), of the Armenians, Medes, Greeks, Thracians, etc. (comp. Synecclus, Chron. p. 49; Mala, Chronogr. p. 16; see Tuch on ver. 27). See ETHNOGRAPHY. De Wette (Krtil, p. 72) justly repudiates the opinion of the Targumim, both Jonathan and Hieros, who make Japheth the progeni- tor of the African tribes also. The Arabian traditions (D’Herbelot, Biblioth. Orient.) attribute to Japheth wonder- ful powers (Weil, Biblische Legenden, viii, 40), and enumerate eleven of his sons, the progenitors of as many Asiatic nations, viz. Gin or Dhin (Chinese), Schelah (Slavonians), Chabur, Gomari, Chakhi (Georgians), Khat- lage, Khozar, Ros (Russians), Sussan, Gaz, and Torgaze. In these traditions he is called Aboulteric (Hottinger, Hist. Orient. p. 37). To the seven sons of Japheth mentioned in Gen. x. 2 and 1 Chron. i. 5, the Sept. and Euse- bius add an eighth, Elath, though not found in the text. Sorini, Man. Mytholog. i, 222; Beck, Phyl. iii, 1; and Haase, Entdeckung, i, 181) identify Japheth with the ʾIṣṭāq of Greek fable, the depository of many ethnog- raphical traditions (see Smith’s Dict. of Classical Biog- r. a. V. Jacetus), while others, again, connect him with He- reus, mentioned by the ancient historian Sanchoniathon, his act of moral piety, in conjunction with Sem, as re- thought in Gen. ix. 20-27 (where some understand the clause, “He shall dwell in the tents of Shem,” to refer to God, and not to Japheth), became the occasion of the prophecy of the extension of his posterity (see Heng- stenberg’s Christology, i, 42). See SHEN.

Japheth ben-Ali al-Levi (called in Arabic Ḥabūl A-li Ḥusayn b. Ali al-Levi al-Borsj), a very able Karaita grammairian and commentator on the Old Testament, flourished at Basra, in Arabia, during the latter half of the 10th century. He is reputed to have written a history of the Karaites (q.v.), of which traces still re- main (Josephus, Ant. i, 100), of the tractates which cover twenty MS. volumes preserved in Paris and Leyden. He distinguished himself by his literary labors, and obtained the honorable appellation of μαγείτα, the great teacher, and a place among those who are mentioned in the Karaita Prayer-book. The late eminent Orientalist Munk brought, in 1841, from Egypt to the royal library at Paris, eleven volumes of this commentary, five of which are on Genesis and many sections of Exodus, Leviticus, and Numbers; two volumes are on the Psalms, one is on Proverbs, and one on the Five Megiloth. They are written in Arabic, preceded by the Hebrew text and an Arabic translation. The indefatiga- ble Finsterer has examined the entire twenty volumes and made extracts from them. This work, of such gigantic magnitude, although it has exercised great in- fluence on the development of Biblical exegesis (as may be concluded from the fact that Aben-Ezra had them con- stantly before him when writing his expositions of the O. T., and that he quotes them with the greatest respect), has not as yet been published, and we have still only the fragments which Aben-Ezra gives us. Japheth was also an extensive polemical writer, and engaged in controversies with the disciples of Saadia (q.v.); but for which we have not seen appear in any of the possessed the proper requisites. See Ginsburg in Kitto, s. v.; Jos. Israelitische Anwahlen (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1841), p. 76: Bargès, Rabbi Japheth ben-Hillel Barosemi Karaita in Paul, Commentarlii Prefatio (1846); Finsterer, Itinera Kadmoniorum (Vienna, 1863), p. 169; Supplement, p. 181, etc.; Grätz, Geschicke der Juden, v, 342.

Japheth ben-Saidi, a descendant of the above, and another great Karaita, in all probability also born at Basra, flourished from about 1160-1200. His col- laborated work in defence of Karaitism entitled Ḥa-Akhat ha-Tora, which he is supposed to have written about 1167, he wrote commentaries on the Pentateuch and other books of the O.T. Finsterer fancies, and not with- out reason, that this is the Japheth whom the Karaites describe as the instructor of Aben-Ezra, and asserts that Ezra’s quotations from the commentary on Exodus, 39: viii, 13; ix, 16; x, 5, 21, belong to this Japheth, and not to the former. His commentaries are still in MS., both in the Paris and Leyden libraries. See Finsterer, Itinera Kadmoniorum, p. 222 sq. and 185 sq. Supplement; Grätz, Geschicke der Juden, vi, 905 sq.; Kitto, Bibl. jud. s. v. See KARAITEs.

Japhia ( Heb. יַפִּית)’a, see śepáld, Sept. Ias- tiq v. I. Ḥayyai and Ḥayyai, but Ḥaysi in 2 Sam. v. 15, the name of two men, and also of a place.

1. The king of Lachish, who joined the confederacy at the instance of Adoni-zedek against Joshua, but was defeated and taken prisoner, and put to death in the cave of Makkedah (Josh. x. 3 sq.). B.C. 1618. 2. One of the sons of David (q.v.) by some one of his full wives whose name is not given, born at Jerus- alem (2 Sam. v. 15; 1 Chron. iii. 7; xiv, 6). B.C. post 1046.

3. A town on the eastern part of the southern boundary of Zebulun, situated on high ground between Da- herath and Gath-hepher on the north (Josh. xix. 12). Reland (Palest, p. 825) thinks it is the town Sycumon (יוֹפָעִימ) or ʾIṣermoni, Steph. Byz. Ἶσεμωνι, on the Mediterranean, opposite Carmel, between the Ionian and Arabic Mons, Pharnacia (v. 15, 5), and belonging to the iba. Antion, twenty Roman miles from the latter; called Ḥoph (Ḥeṭa) in the time of Eusebius (Onom. s. v. Ḥeṭa), and still extant (Goliot, Not. ad Afrag. p. 132) under the name of Ḥeṭsa (Robinson’s Researches, i, 194). He also regards it as the Jebus of Pliny (v. 19), which Ge- senius, however (Thesaur., p. 618), a distinction is established from Syccainum. This point does not agree with the requirements of the text. The place has been iden- tified by Dr. Robinson (Researches, iii, 200) with the modern village Ḥafas, about a mile and a half south- west of Nablus (Schubert, Reise, iii, 293), where the Italian monks fix the residence of the apostle James (Baumer, Poldat, p. 127). See Quaresmius, Eclekto, ii, 493; and Early Travels, p. 186: Maundeville calls it the “Castle of Saffra.” So, too, Von Harff, A.D. 1498 (Fuggerfahrt, p. 196). Although situated in a valley, the tribal line must have crossed (went upon, text of Joshua) the hills on the south of it (Keil, Comment, ad loc.). It contains about thirty houses, with the remains of a church, and has a few single palm-trees. Eusebius and Jerome doubtless refer to this place, as “Japheth, in the tribe of Zebulun,” still called Jophet, or the ancient of Jophet” (Onom. s. v. Japhet). The Jophet (Iopsa) for- tified by Josephus (Life, 37, 45) was probably the same, a large and strong village of Galilee, afterwards cap- tured by Trajan and Titus, under the orders of Vespa- بيان. In the storm and sack of the place, according to the mention of the two thousand of his inhabitants were put to the sword, and 2100 made captives (War, ii, 20, 6: ii, 7, 31). With this location De Sauley (Verrat. i, 13) and Schwarz (Palestine, p. 170) coincide, as also Van de Velde (Memoir, p. 321) and Porter (Handbook, p. 385).

Japhet (Heb. יָפֶה, Ṭapheth, ṿapheth, deliverer; Sept. Ἰάφθης; Var. Ἰαβθης, a son of Heber and great-grandson of Asher; several of his sons are also named (1 Chron. vii. 32, 33). B.C. between 1800 and 1658. It is also a branch of a descendant of Japhetites, “Ishphleti, Ṽaphetl,” Heb. יפאתל, Sept. Ἰαβθης, Vulg. Japhetli, Auth. Version “Japhleti,” that are mentioned in Josh. xvi, 5 as hav-
ing settled along the border between Ephraim and Dan, near (north of) the present Jaffa road, apparently east of Beth-horon, possibly at the present Beit Unia. Others, however, regard the name in this locality as a trade route of one of the petty tribes of aboriginal Canaanites (compare the Archaeological Record, pp. 69, 83). In 2 Sam. xvi, 32; the Ophnite, "Ophn," Josh. xvi, 24.

Japhleti (Josh. xvi, 8). See Japhlet.

Ja'pho (Josh. xix, 40). See JOPPA.

Jaquelot. See JACQUELOT.

Ja'rah (1 Chron. ix, 42). See JEHODAH.

Jarchi. See RASHI.


Jareb (Heb. Yareb', יַ֣רְאֶב, i. e. יַ֣ד יִשָּׁם, contentions, i.e. an adversary) occurs as a proper name in the Author of Kings, iv, 6; in Ezra, v, 6, where a "king of Jareb" (גֵּ֣רֵב) is mentioned. See Zerubbabel, 39, 39, 39, (Sept., Βασίλειος Ἰαρόπαλης, Vulg., reg. ut proverb) is spoken of as the false refuge and final subjugator of the kingdom of Israel. It probably is a figurative title of the king of Assyria (mentioned in the same connection), who, like the Persian monarchs, affected the title of "the great king" (Michaelis, Suppl. ad bibl. to "be great"); he was spoken of in irony towards the faithless nation as their greatest scourge (Genesius, Thes. Heb. p. 1286). Had Jareb been the proper name of the king of Assyria, as it would be if this rendering were correct, the word preceding (גָּרֵ֥ב, melēk, "king") would have required the article. That it is rather to be applied to the country than to the king may be inferred from its standing in parallelism with Asshur. Such is the opinion of Fritsch (Handb. ü. x., v.), who illustrates the symbolic usage by a comparison with Rahab as applied to Egypt. At the same time he hazards a conjecture that it may have been an old Assyrian word, adopted into the Hebrew language, and so modified as to express an intelligible idea, while retaining its original form. The clause in which it occurs is supposed by many to refer to Judah, in order to make the parallelism complete; and, with this in view, Jarchi interprets it of Almah, who sent to Tiglath-Pileser (2 Kings xvi, 8) to aid him against the combined forces of Syria and Israel. But there is no reason to suppose that the two clauses do not both refer to Ephraim, and the allusion would then be, as explained by Jerome, to Pul, who was subsidized by Menahem (2 Kings xv, 19), and Judah would be indirectly included. Other interpretations of the most fanciful character have been given (Glass, Phil. Soc. iv, 3, 17, p. 644). See Jareb.

Ja'red (Heb. Yer'ed, יֵ֥רד, in pause Ya'red, יֵ֣רֵד, descendent; Sept. Tαφές, N. T. Ιαυτής, Josephus Ιαυτής), the name of a town.

1. The fourth antediluvian patriarch in descent from Seth, son of Mahalaleel and father of Enoch; born B.C. 5712, died B.C. 2750, aged 962 years; 162 years old at the birth of his heir (Gen. v, 15-20; 1 Chron. i, 2, "Jared"); Luke iii, 37.

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

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

Jare'elah (Heb. Yaareziah, יָֽאָרֵ֥יה, nourished by Jehovah; Sept. Taqagias, one of the "sons" of Jerahmeel, a chief Benjamite resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. vi, 27). B.C. probably ante 1550.

Ja'ra (Heb. Yara, יַּרָּא, etymology unknown but probably Egyptian; Sept. Ταναδία, Vulg. Jaroch), the Egyptian slave of a Hebrew named Sheshan, who married the daughter of his master, and was, of course, made free. As Sheshan had no sons, his posterity is traced through this connection (1 Chron. ii, 34-41), which is the only one of the kind mentioned in Scripture. Jerahmeel thus became the founder of a chief house of the Jerahmeelites, which continued at least to the time of king Hezekiah, and from which sprang several illustrious persons, such as Zachah in the reign of David, and Azariah in the reign of Josiah (1 Chron. ii, 31 sq).

Ja'ra (B.C. prob. ante 1550.—Kitto). It is supposed by some that the name of Sheshan's daughter whom Jareh married was Ahlai, from the statement in ver. 31, compared with that in ver. 34; but the masculine form of the word, and the use of Ahlai elsewhere (1 Chron. xi, 41) for a man, is adverse to this conclusion. As Sheshan's oldest grandson by this marriage was called Attai, and as the genealogy runs through him, it is supposed by others that Ahlai is a clerical error for Attai; while others think Ahlai (אַ֨הלָּי, disjoiner, from אָלָ֖וי) was a name given to Jarah on his incorporation into the family of Sheshan. Others conjecture that Ahlai was a son of Sheshan, born after the marriage of his daughter. At what time this marriage occurred we cannot certainly determine, but as Sheshan was the seventh in descent from Hezon, the grandson of Judah, it could not well have been much later than the settlement in Caanan (B.C. 1612), and on the presumption that there are no lacune in the pedigree, it would naturally fall much prior to the Exode (B.C. 1558). In 1 Sam. xxx, 15, mention is made of an Egyptian who was servant to an Amalekite, and there is no reason why it should seem strange that an Egyptian should also be found in the family of a Hebrew, especially as, being a Jerahmeelite, he had (supposing the event to have occurred in Palestine) his possessions in the same territory as the Amalekites, in the south of Judah, nearest to Egypt (1 Sam. xxvii, 10; comp. 2 Sam. xxiii, 20, 21; Josh. xv, 20, 21; 1 Chron. xvi, 18). See Burrell's Genaeal; Beetson, Genealogy; Hervey's Geneal. p. 84; Bertheau on 1 Chron. ii, 24, etc.). See SHESHAN.

Ja'rib (Heb. Yarib, יָֽרְב, an adversary, as in Ps. xxxiv, 1, etc.; Sept. Ἰαυτίδας, Iapitēs), the name of three or four persons.

1. A son of Simon (1 Chron. iv, 24); elsewhere (Gen. xlvi, 10, etc.) called JACHIN (q. v.).

2. One of the popular chiefs dispatched by Ezra to
procure the company of priests in the return to Jerusalem (Ezra viii, 16). B.C. 469.

3. One of the priests of the kindred of Joshua that divorced their Gentile wives after the Exile (Ezra x, 16). B.C. 469.

4. A Gracized or corrupt form (1 Mac. xiv, 29; compare 16:27). See Josh. (q. v.).

Jar·imoth (Iq. Jemōtẖ), a Gracized form (1 Esd. ix, 28) of the Heb. name (Ezra x, 27) Jeremoth (q. v.).

Jark·son. See Mc·Jark·son.

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

Jarmoch (Reland, Palestina, p. 288) or Jarmuk (Schwarz, Palest, p. 53), a river of Palestine (ιάρμος) mentioned in the Talmud (Parah, viii, 10; Bava Batra, 74b) as emptying into the Jordan; the Hiero·nax (q. v.) of the Greek and Roman writers, and the modern Yarmuk.

Jarmuth (Heb. יָרְמוּת, הֵרְמָת; habitat, height; Sept. Iq. Jami·chòś), the name of two places. 1. A town in the plain of Judah (Josh. xv, 35), inhabited after the Babylonian captivity (Neh. xi, 29); originally the seat of one of the Canaanitish kings [see Pira·m] defeated by Joshua (Josh. x, 8, 6, 21; xii, 11; xxv, 10). 2. Xerxes (Istamnus, etc., see Iq. Jami·chòś) sets down Jarmuk or Jerus as ten Roman miles from Eleutheropolis towards Jerusalem, but elsewhere Jarmuth (s. v. Iq. Jami·chòś, doubtless the same place) less correctly at four miles' distance, although in the neighborhood of Esdraelon, which is ten miles from Eleutheropolis. Dr. Robinson (Researches, ii, 844) identified the site as that of Jarmuth, a village about seven miles north-east of Beit-Jibrin (Schwarz, Palest, p. 85). As the name implies, it is situated on a ridge (tell Er·mud or Ar·muth), a different pronunciation for Yarmuth: Van de Velde, Narratives, ii, 198). It is a small and poor place, but contains a few traces, in its bewn stones and ruins, of former strength and greatness (Porter, Handbook, p. 281; Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 324; Tobler, Dritte Wunderkun. p. 120, 462).

2. A Levitical city in the tribe of Issachar (Josh. xxii, 20), sometimes called Rimeth (Josh. xix, 21) and Ram·oth (1 Chron. vi, 73). Schwarz (Palest, p. 157) supposes it was the Ramah of Samuel (1 Sam. xix, 22), which he identifies with the modern village of Ramah, north-west of Shechem; but this place lies within the territory of Manasseh. The associated names seem to indicate a fortress or stronghold on the eastern edge of the plain of Esdraelon. See Remeth.

Jaro·áth (Heb. יָרְוָך, יָרְוָח, perhaps born under the new moon; Sept. has 'A'dal v. 'A'dal, Vulg. Jaro, son of Gilead and father of Hurri, of the Gadites resident in Bashan (1 Chron. v, 14). B.C. long ante 782.

Jarque or Xarque, D. FRANCISCO, a South American Jesuit, flourished in the 17th century. He is distinguished as the author of Estudios presentes de las Misiónes en el Tucumán, Paraguay y Bío de la Plata (1687, 4to), for which his intimate knowledge of the native element eminently fitted him. It is remarkable how the Jesuits have succeeded in acquiring foreign languages, and how thorough and accurate is their knowledge of the inscriptions with whom they are brought in contact. (J. H. W.)

Jarratt, DEVEREUX, an early Protestant Episco·pal minister, was born in the county of Kent, Va., Jan. 6 (O. S.), 1732-33. His early education was neg·lected, and he had few opportunities of receiving in·struction in youth, but he so far improved himself as to be able, at the age of nineteen, to take charge of a neighbor·ing school. Soon after, he entered a family, in which one part of his duties was to read a sermon of Flavel's every night—a task which he performed at first with reluctance. The effect of these discourses was to con·vince him of sin. He now pursued Russell's Sermons and Burke's Exposition of the N. T.; but, being sub·jected to many temptations, he relaxed in his former state. He was finally relieved by a passage in Isaiah (Isa. liii, 4, 5), that led him to enter to the ministry. That purpose he went to England in 1762. On his return he served at Bath, Va., where he was eminently successful after some time, although at first his labors appear to have been disregarded. He died January 29, 1801. He was the author of three volumes of Sermons, and A Serv·ant of Letters (London, 1780); republished in 1806 in connec·tion with his Autobiography.—Sprague, Am. v, 214; Meth·odist Quarterly Review, 1855, p. 502.

Jarrige, PIERRE, a French Jesuit, who was born at Tulle in 1605, is celebrated in history by his desertion from and severe attacks upon the Jesuitical order. He was a very popular teacher and preacher at the time, when he joined the Calvinists in 1647; but, meeting with great opposition in France, and his life even being threatened, he went to Leyden, Holland, where he preached under the auspices of the State Church. Meanwhile the Jesuitical order condemned him to suffer death, first by means of a fire. This he avoided by burning so that he disappeared. He wrote the celebrated work of his, Les Jésuites sur Téchajils (Leyden, 1649, 12mo, and often), in which he thoroughly exposed the workings of that nefarious clerical order. A controversy ensued, which finally resulted in the re·turn of Jarrige, in 1650, to the Jesuits,—due, no doubt, more to weakness of mind against his life than anything else. He certainly turned the table like a zealous Jesuit, and now again condemned as heretics the very Christians with whom he had so lately associated, and whose cause he had professed to have embraced. He died Sept. 29, 1690. See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Général, xxi, 983 sq.; Bayle, Historical Dictionary, q. v.

Jarry, PIERRE-FRANÇOIS THÉOPHILE, a French Ro·man Catholic religious writer, was born at St. Pierre, Normandy, in March, 1764. After completing his stud·ies at Paris, he was appointed curate at Escot; but, re·fusing to sign the clerical obligation demanded by the revolutionists, he was obliged to leave the country in 1791. In 1798 the bishop of Auxerre met Jarry in Ger·many, and appointed him grand-vicar, and a short time after the exiled Pius VI appointed him archdeacon and canon of Liege, Belgium. Prevented, however, from as·suming the functions of this position, he resided at Mun·ster, and was instrumental in the foundation of the Collège de count Stolberg (q. v.). After the Restoration, he re·turned to Falaise. He died at Lisieux Aug. 31, 1830. Jarry wrote quite extensively, especially against the usurpations of the Revolutionists of France. His theo·logical works of note are, Dissert, sur l'Épiscopat de St. Pierre à Autuncho, avec la défense de l'authenticité des écrits des Saints Pères (Paris, 1807, 8vo) — Événements d'une Dissert. (of the abbot Emery) sur la mitigation des peines des damnés (Leipsic, 1810, 18vo). See Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxvi, 386.

Jarvis, Abraham, D.D., a bishop of the Prot·estant Episcopal Church, was born in Norwich, Conn. May 12 (O. S.), 1734. He was A.B. at Yale in 1761, and became a lay reader at Middleton, where two years after, he settled as rector, having previously received ordination in England. In 1776 he presided at a convention of the Episcopal clergy held at New Hamps·hire, where it was voted that he was the duly qualified and lawful bishop. In 1797 he was elected bishop. He subsequently removed to Cheshire, N. H., and died May 3, 1813. His style of preaching is said to have resembled that of Til·lottson and Sherlock. He published Two Sermons. See Sprague, Am. vi, 235.

Jarvis, Samuel FARMER, D.D., LL.D., was born at the Manse, March 12, 1786, and passed A.B. at Yale College in 1805. In 1811 he took charge of St. Michael's Church, Bloomingdale, and in 1818 became rector of St. James's, N. Y. He afterwards became pro·
JASER

fessor of Biblical literature in the Gen. TheoL. Seminary, X. Y. In 1819 the doctorate of divinity was conferred on him by the University of Pennsylvania, and the degree of LL.D. in 1837, by Trinity College, Hartford. When rector of St. Paul's, Boston, in 1826, he embarked for Europe to procure materials for a work on Church history. During an absence of nine years, he examined all the ancient authors on the subject to which his attention was directed, and, on his return, commenced A Complete History of the Christian Church [portions of it were published in 1844 and 1860], which remains unfinished. He was appointed historiographer of the Church, and occupied various posts of honor in the ecclesiastical world. A list of his writings is given by Allibone, Dict. of Autor., i. 956.

Jas'a'il (Ιασαίλος v. r. Ιασαίλος), a Grecized, or, rather, corrupt form (1 Esdr. ix, 30) of the Hebrew name (Ezra x, 29) Shalal (q. v.).

Jasher (Heb. Ḥaṣerah), יָשֶׁר, sleeping, as in Cant. viii, 10, etc.; Septuag., Ἰασείρ v. r. Ἰασαίρ, a person, several of whose "sons" are named as among David's famous bodyguard (2 Sam. xvi, 22), called in the Hebrew text Hasham (1 Chron. xi, 34). Other discrepancies also occur between the two passages: the former names three, while the latter makes the first (Jonathan) son of the next, and both (with slight verbal variations) assign special patronymics to the last two. Perhaps the two accounts may best be reconciled by supposing that the two braves referred to as being Jonathan Ben-Shammah (or Ben-Shageh), and Abiam Ben-Sharar (or Ben-Sacar), grandsons of Jashar (or Hashem) of Gizon, in the mountains of Judah—hence called Harares, B.C. considerable ante 1466. This name Kenevictz believes (Introduction, i, 201–3) lies concealed in the word rendered "the Gizonite" in Chronicles, and accordingly proposes to read in both places "Guni, of the sons of Hashem; Jonathan, the son of Shamha the Hararite;" his view being supported by the Sept., which reads νιὸν Ἀρδήν ὑπὸ Γεβεία τοὺς Ἰδωνων, νος Ίασαίρ ᾧ Αρδήν. However, the text of the 2 before 277, and the prefixed to the name read by him as Gouni, are objections to this view, and Bertheau may probably be right (Chron. p. 134), that יָשֶׁר is due to a repetition of the last three letters of the preceding word, "the Shaalmonite" (יהשלמון), and that we should simply read Hashem the Gizonite. In the list given by Jerome, in his Questions Hebravius, Jasher and Jonathan are both omitted. See David.

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

I. Views of the Incident in Joshua's Career.—The book of Jasher has attracted attention because it is appealed to in connection with the account of the sun and moon standing still. The compiler of the book of Joshua refers to it as containing a record of the miracle in question. It is therefore impossible to do justice to our subject without entering into an interpretation of the wonderful phenomenon on which so much ingenuity has been wasted. The misspent time which has been devoted to the passage in Joshua makes a critic sad in-
reading וְיִתְנֶשׁ for וְיֵתְנֶשׁ, and a similar transposition will account for the rendering of the same version in Samuel. This is interpreted by
"the book of the law," and this is followed by Jarchi, who gives, as the passage alluded to in Joshua, the prophecy of Jacob with regard to the future greatness of Ephraim (Gen. xlviii, 19), which was fulfilled when the sun stood still at Joshua's bidding. The same Rabbi, in the name of Samuel, refers us to Genesis, "the book of the upright, Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob," to explain the allusion to the book of Joshua; and Jerome, while discussing the "etymology of Israel," which he interprets as "rectus Dei," incidentally mentions the fact that Genesis was called "the book of the just" (Lib. Genesis, suppl. eis eis, id est, iustorum), from its containing the histories of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel (Comm. in Jex. xxiv, 2). The Talmudists attribute this tradition to R. Johanan. R. Eliezer thought that by the book of Jasher was signified the book of Deuteronomy from the expressions in Deut. vi, 18; xxxii, 7, the latter being quoted in proof of the skill of the Hebrews in archery. In the opinion of Rabbi Samuel ben Nachman, the book of Judges was alluded to as the book of Jasher (Aboda Zarah, c ii); and that it was the book of the twelve minor prophets was held by some Hillelites (B. Bab. ci, ad loc., jurtorum), from its containing the histories of Abraham, Isaac, and Israel (Comm. in Jex. xxiv, 2). The Targum interprets the idea of the eunuch, who was of a military nature; but Montanus, regarding rather the etymology, considered it a collection of political and moral precepts. Abiath, taking the lament of David as a sample of the whole, maintained that the fragment quoted in the book of Joshua was part of a funeral ode composed for Barak, and designed to celebrate his achievements. At the same time, he does not conceive it necessary to suppose that one book only is alluded to in both instances. It must be admitted, however, that there is very slight ground for any conclusion beyond that which affects the internal form, and that the song can be confidently asserted with regard to the contents.

From the passage above referred to (2 Sam. i, 18—"Also he bade them teach the children of Israel [the use of the bow]"), it has been supposed by some (see Dr. Adam Clarke's Comment. ad loc., and Horne's Introd. vol. i) that the book of Jasher contained a treatise on archery; but it has been observed (see Parker's translation of De Wette's Introd. i, 301) that, according to the ancient mode of citation, which consisted in referring to some particular word in the document, "the bow" which the children of Israel were to be taught indicated the poetical passage from the book of Jasher in which the "bow of Jonathan" is mentioned (2 Sam. i, 22). One writer (Rev. T. M. Hopkins, in the Biblical Repository, 1846, p. 97 sq.) rashly proposes to reject both references to the book in question as spurious, and even the whole account of the miracle in Joshua.

Eisler (Eisler's, § 169) endeavors to deduce an argument in favor of the late composition of the book of Joshua from the circumstance of its citing a work (viz. the book of Jasher) which "points to the time of David. inasmuch as his lamentation over Saul and Jonathan is not a prominent feature here (Wob. Bibl. Hebr. ii, 218), as has been supposed. For (although the American translator of De Wette's Introd. looks upon this as quite improbable) that the book may, as a collection of poems, have received accusations at various periods, and, nevertheless, been still quoted by its original name. Dr. Palfrey, who adopts this view of the book of Jasher, has left its contents for the reform the composition of Joshua to the time of Saul.

III. Attempted Reproductions of the Work. — 1. Although conjecture might almost be thought to have exhausted itself on a subject so barren of promises, a scholar of our own day has not despaired of being able not
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only to decide what the book of Jasher was in itself, but of reconstructing it from the fragments which, according to his theory, he traces throughout the several books of the Old Testament. In the preface to his Jashar, or Fragments of Archetype Carminum Hebraicorum in Masoretico Verbo Testamenti textus possis tessellata (London, 1848, 1866, 1870), Dr. Donaldson advances a scheme for the arrangement of the fragments. With this he connects his own idea of its scope and contents. Assuming that, during the tranquil and prosperous reign of Solomon, an unwonted impulse was given to Hebrew literature, and that the worshippers of Jehovah were desirous of possessing something on which their faith might rest, the book of Jasher was perhaps written, or, rather, compiled to meet this want. Its object was to show that in the beginning man was upright, but had, by carnal wisdom, forsaken the spiritual law; that the Israelites had been chosen to preserve and transmit this law of uprightness; that David had been made king for his religious integrity, leaving the kingdom to his son Solomon, in whose reign, after the dedication of the Temple, the prosperity of the chosen people reached its culminating point. The compiler of the book was probably Nathan the prophet, assisted, perhaps, by Gad the seer. It was thus the first offspring of the prophetic schools, and ministered spiritual food to the greater prophets. Rejecting, therefore, the authority of the Masoretic text, as founded entirely on tradition, and adhering to his own theory of the origin and subject of the book of Jasher, Dr. Donaldson proceeds to show that it contains the religious marrow of holy Scripture. In such a case, of course, absolute proof is not to be looked for, and it would be impossible here to discuss what measure of probability should be assigned to a scheme elaborated with considerable ingenuity. Whatever ancient fragments in the sacred books of the Hebrews exhibit the nature of uprightness, celebrate the victories of the Israelites, and point out the future blessedness, have, according to this theory, a claim to be considered among the relics of the book of Jasher. Following such a principle of selection, the fragments fall into seven groups. The first part, the object of which is to show that man was created upright (גוחל, ḫ̄âḏār), but fell into sin by carnal wisdom, contains two fragments—an Elohistic and a Jehovahistic, both poetical, the latter more full of the narrative. The first includes Gen. i, 27, 28; vi, 1, 2, 4, 5; vii, 21; vi, 6, 8; the other is made up of Gen. ii, 7, 9—15, 18, 25; iii, 19, 21, 23, 24. The second part, consisting of four fragments, shows how the descendents of Abraham, as being upright (גוחל, ḫ̄âḏār), were adopted by God, while the neighboring nations were rejected. Fragment 1, Gen. i, 18—27; fragment 2, Gen. iv, 2—8, 16; fragment 3, Gen. xvi, 1—4, 15, 16; xvii, 9—16, 18—20; xxi, 1—14, 20; 21; fragment 4, Gen. xxxv, 20—34; xxxvii, 1—10, 14, 18—20, 25—40; iv, 18, 19; xxxvi, 34; xxxvi, 2; iv, 23, 24; xxxvi, 8; xxxvii, 9; xxxvi, 35; xxxvi, 46; xxxvi, 8, 11—19; xxix, 1, etc., 24, 29; xxxv, 22—26; xxxvi, 25—29; xxxvi, 8, 14—10; xxxviii, 31, 32. In the third part is related, under the figure of the Deluge, how the Israelites escaped from Egypt, wandered forty years in the wilderness, and finally, in the reign of Solomon, built a temple to Jehovah. The passages in which this is found are Gen. vi, 5—14; vii, 6, 11, 12; viii, 7, 8, 12; vi, 29; viii, 4; Kings vii, 1; viii, 20; Deut. vi, 18; Ps. v, 4. The third fragments of the fourth part contain the divine laws to be observed by the upright people, and are found in (1) Deut. v, 1—22; (2) vi, 1—6; Lev. xix, 18; Deut. x, 12—21; xi, 1—5, 7—9; (3) viii, 1—3; vi, 18—60, 25—35. The blessings of the upright, and their admonitions, are the subject of the fifth part, which contains the songs of Jacob (Gen. xlix, 27; xxxiii, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22); of Moses (Exod. xiv, 28, 30, 31, 32); and of Deborah (Judg. vi, 1—20). The seventh is a collection of various hymns composed in the reigns of David and Solomon, and contains David's song of triumph over Goliath (1 Sam. ii, 1—10); his lament for Saul and Jonathan (2 Sam. i, 19—27), and for Abner (2 Sam. iii, 33, 34); his psalm of thanksgiving (Psa. xcvii, 2; Sam. xxi, 1); his triumphal ode on the conquest of the Edomites (Psa. lx), and his prophecy of the Messiah's kingdom (2 Sam. xxiii, 1—7), together with Solomon's Epithalamium (Psa. xlv), and the hymn sung at the dedication of the Temple (Psa. cxlviii).

It cannot be denied that the critic has shown great ingenuity and constructive skill in elaborating his theory. His commentaries on the individual fragments are often exhibits of striking and just remarks, with a right perception of the genius of some portions of the OT. Yet we must pronounce the attempt a failure. The leading positions are untenable. Donaldson's arguments are often weak and baseless. Most of the contents which he assigns to the book of Jasher never belonged to it, a view which he, in some cases, explicitly disowns. The whole work is far from being a work of genius which he selects, etc. But it is needless to enter into a re-examination of the hypothesis, ingeniously set forth in elegant Latin, and supported with considerable acuteness. Most of the book of Jasher cited in Joshua and 2 Samuel is lost. It is very improbable that laws such as those in Deut., xxxii, 1—29, or historical events, as those in Josh. i, 4—11, ever belonged to it. It is also a most unfortunate conjecture that מנה, in Gen. xlix, 10, is abridged from מנה, or, even if it were, that it furnishes a proof of the poem being written while Solomon was king (p. 27).

We are persuaded that the critic gives great extension of meaning to the Hebrew word מנה, in making it almost, if not altogether, an appellation of the Israelitish people. When he assumes that it is contained in מנה, the notion is erroneous (p. 25).

Among the many strange results of Donaldson's arrangement, she concludes that Shem, Ham, and Japheth, and the sons of Noah, who is Israel under a figure, but of Adam; and the circumstances of Noah's life related in Gen. i, 18—27 are transferred to the latter. Cain and Abel are the sons of Shem, Abraham is the son of Abel, and Esau becomes Lamech, the son of Methuselah.

2 and 3. There are also extant, under the title of the "book of Jasher," two rabbinical works, one a moral treatise, written in A.D. 1394 by R. Shabbatai Carmuz Levi, of which a copy in MS. exists in the Vatican library; the other was written by Jacob ben-Meir, or R. Tam, who died in 1171, and contains a treatise on Jewish ritual questions. It was published at Cracow in 1866, 400, and again at Vienna in 1811, but incorrectly. No translation of either was ever made.

4. An anonymous work under the same name was published at Venice in 1625, at Cracow in 1626, and at Prague in 1688. It contains the histories of the Pentateuch, Joshua, Judges, and intermixes many fabulous things. It gives (Ixxxvii, 64) the account of Joshua's miracle nearly in the words of Scripture, making the sun to stand still "thirty-six times" (פָּאָר, pâʾar), i.e. hours; but does not bring the history down later than the conquest of Canaan. The preface itself states that it was discovered at the destruction of Jerusalem by Sildus, one of the officers of Titus, who, while searching a house for the purpose of plunder, found in a secret chamber a vessel containing the books of the law, the prophets, and Hagiographa, with many others, which a venerable man was reading. Sildus took the old man under his protection, and built for him a house at Seville, where the books were safely deposited, and thence this one was conveyed to Naples, where it was printed. The book in question is probably the production of a Spanish Jew of the 13th century (Abicht, De livr. Rcri, in Theol. Nor., viii, 1, 525—54), a German version of it, with additions, was published by R. Jacob at Frankfort-on-the-Main (1764, 4vo), with the title "perfect and right." A stereotyped translation of this
work was published in New York in 1840, under the direction of M. M. Noah, with certificates of its fidelity to the original by eminent Hebrew scholars who had examined it.

5. The above works must not be confounded with the various editions of a fabrication which was first secretly printed at Bristol, and published in London in 1791 (4to), by one names Jacob Basser, the acknowledged author who was its real author. It was entitled "The Book of Jasher, with Testimonies and Notes explanatory of the Text: to which is prefixed Various Readings: translated into English from the Hebrew by Alcuin of Britain, who wrote the book into the Holy Land. This book was noticed in the Monthly Review for December, 1751, which describes it as "a palpable piece of contrivance, intended to impose upon the credulous and ignorant, to sap the credit of the books of Moses, and to blacken the character of Moses himself." The preface, purporting to be written by Alcuin, contains an account of the finding of the book in MS. at Gazzah, in Persia, and the way in which it was translated. Having brought it to England, Alcuin says that he left it, among other papers, with a clergyman in Yorkshire. After two pages of various readings, the book itself follows, divided into thirty-six sections, and the testimonies and notes are appended. The editor states, in a dedication at the beginning, that he bought the MS. at an auction in the north of England, and affirms that Wickliffe had written on the outside, "I have read the book of Jasher twice over, and I much approve of it as a piece of great antiquity and curi- ossity. It was an ancient poem, and a part of the canon of Scripture." This clumsy forgery was reprinted at Bristol in 1827, and published in London in 1829 (4to), as a new discovery of the book of Jasher. A prospectus of a second edition of this reprint was issued in 1833 by the editor, who therein styles himself the Rev. C. R. Bond. This literary fraud has obtained a notoriety far beyond its merits in consequence of the able critiques to which it gave rise, having been again exposed in the Dublin Christian Examiner for 1831, and elaborately refuted by Horne in his Introduction (ut sup., 1831, vii, 41-6). See, besides the literature above referred to, Hilliger, De Libro Recti (Lips. 1714); Nolte, De Libro Justorum (Helmst. 1719); Wolf, De Libro Rectorum (Lips. 1742); Steger, De vocabulo כּוֹסֵל (Kiel, 1808); Anon. Jasher referred to in Josh. and Sam. (London, 1842); Hopkins, Plumbline Fopera (Auburn, 1862, ch. vii); and the periodicals cited by Foole, Index, a.v., Compare Joshua.

Jashobeam (Heb. Yashobam, יָשֹּבֶם, dweller among the people, or returner to the people, otherwise, to whom the people return, or a returning people; Sept. in 1 Chron. xi, 11, יָשֹּבֶּ֣ה v. r. יָשֹּבֶּ֣ה; in 1 Chron. xii, 6, יָשֹּבֶּ֣ה v. r. יָשֹּבֶּ֣ה; Vulg. Jeshem, but Jashobam in 1 Chron. xxvii, 2), the name of several of David's favorite officers.

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

2. "Son" of Hachmoni, one of David's worthies, and the first named in the two lists which are given of them (1 Chron. xii, 8; 1 Chron. xii, 11). One of these texts is held to have suffered through the negligence of copyists, and, as Jashobeam is not otherwise historically known, commentators have been much embarrassed in comparing them. The former passage attributes to him the defeat of 800, the latter of 500 Philistines; and the question has been whether there is a mistake of figures in one of these accounts, or whether two different expeditor are recorded. Further difficulties will appear in comparing the two texts. We have assumed Jashobeam to be intended in both, but this is open to question. In Chronicles we read, "Jashobeam, the Hachmonite, chief of the captains: he lifted up his spear against 300 men, slay him by one at a time;" but in Samuel [margin.], "Joash-basseb et the Tachmonite, chief among the three, Adino, of Ezni, who lifted up his spear against 800 men, whom he slew." That Jashobeam the Hachmonite and Joash-bash-shebeth the Tachmonite are the same person, is clear; but may not Adino of Ezni, whose name forms the immediate antecedent of the exploit, which, as related here, constitutes the sole discrepancy between the two texts, be another person? Many so explain it, and thus obtain a solution of the difficulty. But a further comparison of the two verses will again suggest that the whole of the verse last cited must be, in fact, broken and interpolated; and if we take the last clause from him and assign it to another, but in doing this we leave the "chief among the captains" without an exploit, in a list which records some feat of every hero. We incline, therefore, to the opinion of those who suppose that Jashobeam, or Jo- ash-bash-shebeth, was the name or title of the chief, Adino and Ezni being descriptive epithets, and Hach- monite the patronymic of the same person; and the remaining discrepancy we account for, not on the supposition of different exploits, but of one of those corrupt words which professional writers often append to the names of those of whom they speak; and therefore to Jashobeam, who was the first of the three (2 Sam. xxiii, 17-18; 1 Chron. xiii, 15-19). B.C. 1045.

3. We also find a Jashobeam who commanded 24,000, and did duty in David's court in the month Nisan (1 Chron. xxviii, 2). He was the son of Zabadiel; if, therefore, he was the same as the foregoing Jashobeam, his patronymic of "the Hachmonite" must be referred to his race or office rather than to his immediate father. See Hachmoni.

Jas'hab [or Jas' veh] (Heb. Yashakub, יָשָּׁק, returner; once by error, יָשָׁק, Yashak), in text 1 Chron. vii, 1; Sarcar, Punt, in Numb. Yoseph, יֵשֹּׁפֶּה, Sept. יֵשֹׁפֶּה, the name of two men, or, perhaps, the last is rather a place. See also SHEAR-JASHUB.

2. The third named of the four of the tribe of Issachar (1 Chron. viii, 26; 2 Chron. xxvi, 24); called Joes (perhaps by contraction or corruption [or possibly only by substitution, both having the same meaning, one from בֵּית, in the parallel passage (Gen. xlvii, 13). B.C. 1856. His descendants were called Jashubites (Hebrew Yashakib, יָשָּׁק), Sept. יֵשֹׁפֶּה, Numb. xxvi, 24).

2. One of the "sons" (former residents) of Bani, who divorced his Gentile wife after the Exile (Esra x. 29). B.C. 435.

Jash ub-lehem (Heb. Yashub-lehem, יָשֻׁב-לֵהֶם, "in pause" La'hem, יָשֻׁב-לֵהֶם, returning home from battle or for food; Sept. ἀποδιώκθη αὐτόν ou v. i. ἀναφέρεται αὐτόν εἰς Λα'hem, Vulg. reversi sunt in La'hem), apparently a person named as a descendent of Shelah, the son of Judah (1 Chron. iv, 22). B.C. perhaps cir. 995, since it added at the end of the list. "And these are ancient things. These were the potters, and those that dwell among plants and herbs together with the king [Solomon; but, according to some, Pharaoh, during the residence in Egypt for his work.] Possibly, however, "it is a place, and we should infer from its connection with Maresha and Choeza—Ychoza be of Choeza or Jeshub— that it lay on the western side of the tribe, in or near the Shepheriah or the Shephelah. The Jewish explanations, as seen in Jerome's Quast. Hebr. on this passage, and, in a slightly different form, in the Tarqum on the Chronicles (ed. Wilkins, p. 29, 30), mentions of Moab as the key to the whole. Choeza is Elinelech. Joash and Saraph are Mahlon and Chilion, who had
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The dominion in Moab from marrying the two Moabite damsels: Jashub-Lehem is Naomi and Ruth, who returned (Jashubi) to bread, or to Beth-lehem, after the famine: and the ancient words point to the book of Ruth as the source of the whole.

Jashubite (Num. xxvi, 24). See Jashub, 1.

Jasidanea. See Yezi. 1.

Ja‘ai‘el (1 Chron. xi, 46). See Jaa. 1.

Jā‘son (‘šowm, he that will cure, originally the name of the leader of the Argonauta), a common Greek name, which was frequently adopted by Hellenizing Jews as the equivalent of Jesus, according to the company Josephus, Ant. xii, 5, 1; Aristob. Hist. apud Papyry, p. 7), probably with some reference to its supposed connection with ἰάσωμα (i.e. the healer). A parallel change occurs in Acantrim (Eliakim), while Nicolaus, Donthina, Meneiaus, etc., were direct translations of Hebrew names. It occurs with reference to several men in the Apocrypha, and once in the New Testament.

1. JASON, THE SON OF ELKAZER (comp. Exclus. 1, 27, Ἱασωμός τὸς Ἑλκαζῆς, Codex A), was one of the commissions sent by Judas Maccabaeus, in conjunction with Eupolemus, to conclude a treaty of amity and mutual support, with the Romans. B.C. 161 (1 Macc. xvi, 17; Josephus, Ant. xii, 10, 6).

2. JASON, THE FATHER OF ANTIPATER, who was an envoy to Rome to renew the treaty, at a later period, under Jonathan Maccabaeus, in conjunction with Numenius, the son of Antiochus (1 Macc. xii, 16; xiv, 29), is probably the same as No. 1.

3. JASON OF CYRENE, in Africa, was a Hellenizing Jew of the race of those whom Polynes Soter sent into Egypt (2 Macc. i; Josephus, Ant. xii, 1; Pseudoconn, ii, 176). He wrote in five books the history of Judas Maccabaeus and his brethren, and the principal transactions of the Jews during the reigns of Seleucus IV Philopator, Antiochus IV Epiphanes, and Antiochus V Eupator (B.C. 187-162), from which five books most of the second book of Maccabees (q. v.) is abridged.

In all probability it was written in Greek, and, from the fact of its including the wars under Antiochus V Eupator, it must have been written after B.C. 162. The sources from which Jason obtained his information are unknown, and it is not certain when either he or his epitomizer lived. All that we know of his history is contained in the few verses of the 2d Macc. ii, 19-28.

4. JASON, HIGH-PRIEST, was the second son of Simon II, and the brother of Onias III. His proper name was Jason, but he had changed it to that of Jason (Ἰάσωμος ᾗ ἄνων μετωποσαῖον) [Josephus, Ant. xii, 5, 1]. Shortly after the accession of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, Jason offered to the king 440 talents of yearly tribute if he would invest him with the high-priesthood, to the exclusion of his elder brother (4 Macc. iv, 17) (B.C. cir. 175). Jasonus says that Onias III was dead on the accession of Jason to the high-priesthood, and that Jason received this post in consequence of his nephew, Onias IV, the son of Jason and his wife, an infant (Ant. xii, 5).

Jason also offered a further 150 talents for the license "to set him up a place of exercise, and for the training up of youth in the fashions of the heathen" (2 Macc. iv, 7-9; Josephus, Ant. xii, 5, 1). This offer was immediately accepted by Antiochus, and Jason built a gymnasium at Jerusalem. The effect of this innovation was to produce a stronger tendency than ever for Greek fashions and heathenish manners, and they so increased under the superstition of the wicked Jason that the priests despaired the Temple, and "hardened to be partakers of the unlawful allowance in the place of exercise, after the game of Diceus (q. v.) called them forth" (2 Macc. iv, 14). Some of the Jews even "made themselves uncircumcised," that they might appear to be Greeks when they were naked (1 Macc. i, 15; Josephus, Ant. xii, 5, 1). At last, as was the custom of the cities who used to send embassies to Tyre in honor of Hercules (Curcius, iv, 2; Polybius, Hist. xxxi, 20, 12), Jason sent special messengers (Σαραπισχὸς) from Jerusalem, who were the newly-elected citizens of Antioch (Ἄντιοχος Ἔπιφανος; comp. 2 Macc. iv, 9), to carry 300 drachmes of silver to the sacrifice of that god. See Hercules. The money, however, contrary to the wish of the sender, was not used for the expenses of Hercules, but for the support of the triremes, because the bearers of it did not think it proper (κατὰ τὰς μακαρίας) to employ it for the sacrifice (2 Macc. iv, 19, 20). In B.C. 172 Jason also gave a festival to Antiochus when he visited Jerusalem, Jason and the citizens leading him by torch-light and with great shoutings (2 Macc. iv, 19, 22). Josephus, in speaking of this visit, but says that it was an expedition against Jerusalem, and that Antiochus, upon obtaining possession of the city, slew many of the Jews, and plundered it of a great deal of money (Ant. xii, 5, 9). The crafty Jason, however, soon found a yet more cunning kinsman, who removed him from his office in much the same manner as he had done with his brother, Onias III. Menelaus, the son of Simon (Josephus, Ant. xii, 5, 1; Simon's brother, 2 Macc. iv, 28), governor of the Temple, having been sent by Jason to Antiochus, knew how, through flattery and by offering 900 talents more than Jason, to gain the favor of the king. He accordingly immediately gave him the office of high-priest, and Jason was forced to flee into the country of the Ammonites (2 Macc. iv, 26). See Menelaus.

In B.C. 170, Antiochus having undertaken his second expedition into Egypt, there was a rumor that he was dead, and Jason made an attack upon Jerusalem and committed many atrocities. He was, however, forced again to flee into the country of the Ammonites (2 Macc. v, 5-7). At length, being accused before Aretas, king of the Arabs, he was compelled "to flee from city to city, pursued of all men, and being held in more contempt than as an open enemy of his country and countrymen," and eventually retired into Egypt (2 Macc. v, 8).

He afterwards retired to take refuge among the Lacedaemonians, "thinking there to find succor by reason of his kindness" (2 Macc. v, 9; compare 1 Macc. vii, 21; Josephus, Ant. xii, 4, 10; see Pseudoconn, ii, 149; Franchel, Monastichia, 1859, p. 456), and perished miserably "in a strange land" (comp. Dan. xii, 30 sq.; Macc. i, 12 sq.). His body remained without burial, and he had "none to mourn for him" (2 Macc. v, 5, 10). See High-Priest.

5. JASON OF THessalonica was the host of Paul and Silas at Philippi. In consequence of this house was assaulted by the Jews in order to seize the apostle, but, not finding him, they dragged Jason and other brethren before the ruler of the city, who released them on security (Acts xvii, 5-9). A.D. 48. He appears to have been the same as the Jason mentioned in Rom. xvi, 21 as one of the Seven Men of Paul, and perhaps he accompanied him from Thessalonica to Corinth (A.D. 54). He was not one of those who accompanied the apostle into Asia, though Lightfoot conjectures that Jason and Secundus were the same person (Acts xx, 4). Alford says Secundus is altogether unknown (Acts i. c.). According to tradition, Jason was bishop of Tarsus (Fabricius, Luz Evangelii, p. 91, 92).

Jasper (Ἰασπίς, jaspehke, prob. polished or glittering, ἰαστρος), a gem of various colors, as purple, cerulean, but mostly green like the emerald, though duller in hue (Pliny, Nat. Hist. xxxviii, 9, 9; Epiphanius, De Gem. § 6; Braun, De Vest. Succur. ii, 19). It was the last of the twelve inscribed in the zodiacal signs, represented as a shield on Exod. xxiii, 20; xxxiii, 13, and the first of the twelve used in the foundation of the new Jerusalem (Rev. xxi, 19): the difference in the order seems to show that no emblematical importance was attached to that feature. It was used in the Tarsian whetstone (ἰκυφυγία, the wall of the new Jerusalem (Rev. xxi, 18). It further appears among the stones which adorned the king of Tyre (Ezek. xxviii, 13). Lastly, it is the emblematical image of the glory of the divine Being (Rev. iv, 3). The characteristics of the stone, as far as they are specified in Scripture (Rev. xxi, 11), are

---

The document contains information about various historical figures, events, and religious contexts, mostly from the Jewish and Christian traditions. It refers to figures such as Jason, who was accused of treason and fled to Egypt, and Menelaus, who replaced him as high priest. It also mentions the Jespers of Thessalonica and Tyre, and discusses the significance of the gem Jasper in the New Testament. The text is rich in historical and religious detail, reflecting the complex interactions between Judaism, Hellenism, and the early Christian Church.
that it was 'most precious,' and 'like crystal' (καρφαλονωμένον), not exactly as clear as crystal, as in the A.V., but of a crystal hue: the term is applied to it in this sense by Diodorus Siculus (v. 109: λίθος ιδυαίος καὶ πις τεχνῶν εἰς καρφαλονωμένον). We may also infer from Rev. iv, 8 that it was a stone of brilliant and transparent light." The ancient Jasper thus appears to have been frequently translucent, but the modern is opaque. A brown variety existed in Egypt. The Jasper is also anumber of other varieties; others being comprehended under various precious stones not readily identifiable (Rosenmüller, *Bibl. Alterthum*, IV, i, 42; Moore's *Anc. Min.* p. 168). What is now properly called Jasper by mineralogists is a sub-species of rhombohedral quartz, of several varieties, mostly the common, the Etiopian, and the Striped Jaspis or Tertiary Jasper. It is a yellowish, white, green, reddish, etc., sometimes spotted or banded; occurring either in masses or loose crystals, and susceptible of a fine polish (see the *Lond. Encyclopædia*, s. v.). See Gem.

**Jaspis**, Gottfried Siegmund, a German theologian, born at Meissen April 8, 1766. He was educated at the University of Leipzig, and entered the ministry in 1792 as pastor at Pichau. In 1814 he was called to the Niculai church at Leipzig, where he died, Feb. 15, 1823. While he distinguished himself greatly as a preacher, it is particularly as a writer in Biblical literature that Jaspis's name deserves to be mentioned here. He wrote an excellent Lect. on the apostolic epistles (Lips. 1783-55; new ed. 1821, 8vo). His polemical and homiletical works are now no longer regarded as of any value. "He was a man of pure and serious, and pious, and a good scholar and preacher."—*Kitto, Cyclop. s. v.*—Adelung's *Addenda* to Jocher, *Gesch. der Lehren, s. v.*

**Jassasa**, At. (or the Spy), a Mohammedan name for a beast which is to be one of their signs of the approach of the day of judgment: "When the sentence shall be ready to fall upon them, we will cause a beast to come forth unto them out of the earth, which shall speak unto them. It is supposed by them that it will appear first in the temple of Mecca, or on Mount Saba, or in the territory of Tayef. She is to be a monster in size, and so swift that no human being shall be able to pursue her in her rapid flight through this world, marking the believers from the unbelievers, "that every person may be known, and shall know what he really is." See Sale, *Prelin. Dissert. de lo Koran*, p. 79; Broughton, *Biblioth. Hist. Sac.* i, 506.

**Jauinia** (Ἰαυϊνία), the Græceized form (1 Esd. ix, 30) of the Heb. name (Ezra x, 29) JASHUB (q. v.).

**Jataka** (literally relating to birth) is the name of a Buddhististic work consisting of a series of books which contain about an account of 550 previous births of Sakyamuni, or Buddha. Several tales that pass under the name of *Record of Fables* are to be found in this collection of legends. See Buddhism.

**Jatāla** (Arāp v. i' Arāla), a corrupt Greek form (1 Esd. v, 28) of the Heb. name (Ezra x, 42; Neh. vii, 45) ATER (q. v.).

**Jathniel** (Heb. Yathnīl, יָתְנִיֵל), given by God, otherwise praiser of God; Sept. No'Sin v. No'Za, v. 1'Zoràh, the fourth son of Meshelemiah, one of the seventy-two gate-keepers of the Temple (1 Chron. xxvi, 2). B.C. 1014.

**Jat'ir** (Heb. Yattir, יַטִּיר [in Josh. xv, 48, elsewhere "defective" *m*]), pre-revenient; Sept. *1'Qēr* or *1'Zor*A, a city in the mountains of Judah (Josh. xv, 48, where it is named between Shamir and Soco) assigned to the priests (Josh. xxii, 14; 1 Chron. vi, 57). It was one of the places in the south where David used to haunt in his freebooting days, and to his friends in which he sent gifts from the spoil of the enemies of Jehovah (1 Sam. xxx, 27). The two Ithrite heroes of David are admitted as having been stationed at Jatir (2 Sam. xxiii, 38; 1 Chron. xi, 40) fairly possibly from Jattir, living memorials to him of his early diffi-
culties. According to Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast.* s. v. Jethir), it was in their day a very large hamlet inhabited by Christians, twenty Roman miles from Eleutheropolis in the district of the Darabs near Molath (Reland, *Palästina*, p. 885). It is identified by Halm in the Jewish traveller; but the passage is defective, and little can be gathered from it (Zinz, in Asher's *Benj. of Tudda*, ii, 442). The required position answers nearly to that of the modern village of *'Al'īya, discovered by Dr. Robinson (*Researches*, ii, 194, 625) in this region, "marked by caves upon a hill" (comp. Wilson, *Lands. of Bible*, i, 188), and situated fifteen miles south of Hebron, and five north of Moladah (Schwarz, *Palestine*, p. 105). It contains extensive ruins (*Tristram, Land of Israel*, p. 388).

**Jauffret, Gaspard Jean André Joseph**, a French Protestant theologian, was born at La Roque-Brouse, province, Dec. 18, 1799. He was educated at Ton- lon and Aix, then entered the Church, and was made canon of Aup. He subsequently went to Paris, where he continued his theological studies under the priests of St. Roch and St. Sulpice, and in 1791 established the periodical *Annales des Études*. In 1796 he took a stand against the civil constitution of the clergy. He afterwards became one of the editors of the *Annales Religieuses*. About 1801 he acted as vicar-general of Cardinal Fesch, at Lyon, during the latter's embassy to Rome, and he was one of the four who made the attempt to reconcile the Catholic and Protestant churches to the Concordat. Cardinal Fesch subsequently called him to Paris, where Jauffret established a number of religious societies, and obtained many privileges for divers congregations of monks and nuns through the influence of his patron. Made chaplain of the emperor, he was in July, 1806, appointed bishop of Metz, and consecrated Dec. 3 of the same year, still retaining his imperial chaplainship. This position he improved by establishing a number of seminaries and Roman Catholic schools all kinds. In 1810 he was one of the persons sent to meet the archduchess Maria Louisa, and subsequently became her confessor. In 1811 he was rewarded for his zeal in promoting the divorce of Napoleon from his first wife by the archbishopric of Aix; but he never really held this position, on account of the difficulties between the pope and the emperor, and finally felt constrained to renounce it. He died at Paris May 18, 1823. He wrote *De la Religion et de la Philos*. (1775, 2 vols. 8vo; 3d ed. 1815);—*Mémoire pour servir à l'Hist*., *de la Religion et de la Philosophie* (Anon. Paris, 1862, 2 vols. 8vo), besides a number of controversial and practical works on the *De la Religion* (in 64-74; *Chronique Religieuse*, vi, 298-308; Quérard, *La Franc. Littérature*; *Hofrat, Nouv. Buv. Générale*, xxvi, 410 sq. (J. N. P.)

**Java**, an island in the Malay archipelago, and, after Sumatra and Borneo, the largest in the Sunda group. It is the principal seat of the Dutch power in the East. The island is 680 miles long, by 330 miles broad, and has an area of 49,700 square miles. The population has very rapidly increased since the beginning of the 19th century. While in 1812 it amounted only to 4,500,000 inhabitants, it increased in 1845 9,560,000 (of whom 106,000 Chinese, 31,216 Arabs, 16,437 Europeans and their descendants, and 511 slaves); in 1864, 13,649,680 (26,460 Europeans, and 156,300 Chinese); and in 1884, 20,835,654 (Europeans, 35,000; Chinese, 215,000). The natives belong to the Malay race, but to two different nations—the Javanese in the east, and the less numerous and less civilized people in the west. They are a peaceable, frugal, and industrious people, who have made great progress in agriculture than any other people of Asia except the Chinese and Japanese. In 1827 Java was invaded by the Arabs, who subjugated the whole island, and established in it the Moham- medan rule. In 1830 only in a very small portion of Java remains a few thousand worshipers of Buddha and Brah- ma remain. The ruins of many temples, images, and
tome prove, however, that at an early period Brah-
manism struck deep root among the people. The
Portuguese, who came to Java in 1575, as well as
the British of the Society of Jesus, the Dutch, who
established themselves in Java in 1594, and
steadily advanced in the conquest of the island
until only two native states were left—Soerakarta, or
Solo, with 690,000 inhabitants, and Djodjikarta, with
340,000 inhabitants. From 1811 to 1816 the island was
under the rule of the Dutch, who, having conquered
Java in 1811, in 1816 it was restored to the Dutch. In
consequence of the bad administration a number of outbreaks took
place, among which, in particular, that of Djepo Negro,
in 1825, was very dangerous, until at length the gov-
ers, Van der Capellen and Jan van den Bosh, suc-
ceeded, by encouraging agriculture and other mea-
sures, in developing the productivity and prosperity of the
island to a high degree. In accordance with a decree
of Jan. 1, 1860, slavery was abolished in Java, as well
as in all the Dutch colonies. During the rule of the
Portuguese the Catholic missionaries and several native
congregations, of which only a few remain, are
at Batavia and Depok. The Dutch government
was decidedly opposed to missionary labor, and Protes-
tant missions were not begun until the island passed,
in 1811, under the rule of England. The first society in the
field was the London Missionary Society, which was
soon followed by the English Baptists. But both
missions confined their efforts chiefly to the Chinese and
the Malays. Their missionaries were allowed to remain
after the restoration of the Dutch administration, but
they had to submit to many restrictions, until, in 1842,
all the non-Dutch missionaries in the island were
forbidden to perform any missionary labours. Thus only
the Rotterdam Missionary Society, which had begun its
operations in Batavia and the neighborhood in 1820,
was able to continue the missionary work. A new
impulse was given to the labors of this society by a journey
of inspection in Java, the part of its inspection sta-
tion was established at Samarang, and a second very
promising field opened in the province of Surabaya, with
Modjo Warno as centre, whence the mission extended to
Kediri and Malang. The society, in 1866, supported
in the neighborhood, in particular among the Malays and Chinese, and took sev-
eral steps to establish the Society of Christian Missions
and the Dutch Indian Missions.
In 1854 the Mennonite Missionary Society at Amster-
dam (Doodgezinde Vereeniging) began its operations at
Djapara, while the Nederlands Zendingen Vereeniging,
which was established in 1858, opened missions among
the Sundanese, to whom it has also undertaken to give
a translation of the Bible. It employed in 1866 five
missionaries, and had four stations. The Nederl.
Gere-
formeerde Zendingen Vereeniging has also established
several missions (in 1866 three missionaries) in Java,
and the Utrecht Missionary Society has begun mission-
ary operations on the neighboring island of Bali, where
Buddhism is prevalent. The Protestant missions continue
to be anything but favorable to the missions,
but patronize the diffusion of education, and has rec-
established for that purpose a native normal school at Bandong. The Roman Catholic Church has a
vital force in the city of Batavia. The govern-
ment pays the salaries of eight priests. The Catholic
population consists almost exclusively of Dutch soldiers
and Indo-Portuguese.—Newcomb, Cyclopaedia of Mis-
sions; Grinnelmann, Missions-Atlas; Wetter u. Wilte,
Kirchen Lexikon, xii, 563, 591.
(A. J. S.)

Javan (Hebrew יִוָּאָן, יָאָן, of foreign origin),
the name of a person (borrowed from that of his descen-
dants) also of a city in the island of Java. The govern-
ment pays the salaries of eight priests. The Catholic
population consists almost exclusively of Dutch soldiers
and Indo-Portuguese.——Newcomb, Cyclopaedia of Mis-
sions; Grinnelmann, Missions-Atlas; Wetter u. Wilte,
Kirchen Lexikon, xii, 563, 591.

1. Sept. יִוָּאָן (Hebrew יִוָּאָן, יָאָן, of foreign origin),
the name of a person (borrowed from that of his descend-
ants) also of a city in the island of Java. The govern-
ment pays the salaries of eight priests. The Catholic
population consists almost exclusively of Dutch soldiers
and Indo-Portuguese.——Newcomb, Cyclopaedia of Mis-
sions; Grinnelmann, Missions-Atlas; Wetter u. Wilte,
Kirchen Lexikon, xii, 563, 591.

2. Sept. יִוָּאָן (Hebrew יִוָּאָן, יָאָן, of foreign origin),
the name of a person (borrowed from that of his descend-
ants) also of a city in the island of Java. The govern-
ment pays the salaries of eight priests. The Catholic
population consists almost exclusively of Dutch soldiers
and Indo-Portuguese.——Newcomb, Cyclopaedia of Mis-
sions; Grinnelmann, Missions-Atlas; Wetter u. Wilte,
town of Arabia Felix, whence the Syriacs procured manufactures of iron, cassia, and calamus (Ezek. xxvii, 19); present the Sarmas mentioned in the Cunei. (p. 187) as "a town of Yemen," and "a port of Inambah." Some confound this with the preceding name (Credner and Hitzig, on Joel iii, 6; see Meier on Joel, p. 166), but Tuch (on Gen, p. 210) suggests that it may have been so named as having been founded by a colony of Greeks. B. Weckerling (see Haverkamp ad loc.) in an associated word (נַפַּע from Usal, for נַפַּע, guen, i.e. thread), some critics have thought they find another place mentioned in the same vicinity (see Bochart, Pha- leg, i, ii, 21; Rosenmüller, Bibl. Geog. iii, 296-305).

Javelin is the rendering in the Auth. Vers. of two Heb. terms: נְעַלָּה (chanah), so called from its flexibili- ty, a lance (1 Sam. xviii, 10, 11; xix, 9, 10; xx, 33; elsewhere "spear"); and נְעִיל (ro'mach, from its pierci- ng), a lance for heavy-armed troops (Numb. xxv, 7; 3, 17, i.e. spear-head, 1 Kings xviii, 28; "buckler," incorrectly, 1 Chron. xii, 8; elsewhere "spear"). See ARMOR.

Jaw (usually and properly קַנַּה, lehi'), rendered also "jaw-bone," once בְּכַנְיָא (malochaim), "Jaw," Pan. xxii, 15, elsewhere "prey;" also בְּכַנְיָא, methaloth, "jaws," Job xxxix, 17; "jaw teeth," Prov. xxx, 14; "cheek teeth," Joel i, 6. The denuded jaw-bone of an ass afforded Samsen (q.v.) a not unsuitable weapon (see Seiflerhorn, De mollis austin, Tübingen, 1716) for the greatest carnage which he once effected (Judg. xv, 15). See LEIT.

Jay, William, a very distinguished English Independent minister, was born at Tisbury, county of Wilts, May 8, 1769. He was the son of a poor stone-cutter, and obtained his education by the influence and charity of friends he made as a youth, distinguishing himself even then in great natural abilities and early acquisition. When not quite sixteen years of age he began preaching, and before he had passed his minority he is said to have delivered no less than 1000 sermons. Like Wesley, he often preached out-doors; and he himself relates the history of his early life thus: "In the milder seasons which would allow of it, we often addressed large numbers out of doors; and many a clear and calm evening I have preached down the day on the corner of a common, or upon the green turf before the cottage door. These neighborhoods were supplied sometimes weekly and sometimes nightly, both on week-days and on the Sabbath. We always on the Sabbath avoided, if possible, the church hours; and on week-days we commonly omitted the services during the hay and corn harvest, that we might not give reasonable offence to the farmers, or entice the peasants away from their labor before their usual time. I would also remark that we did not always, in these efforts, encounter much opposition; indeed, I remember only a few instances in which we suffered persecution from violence or rude- ness." Jan. 31, 1791, he was made preacher of Argyle Chapel, Bath, and here he labored for sixty-two years with great distinction. Jay was not excelled even by the greatest of pulpit orators for which England has been so justly celebrated within the last 100 years. John Foster calls him the "prince of preachers;" Sheridan pronounced him "the most natural orator" he had ever heard. Janma Havelock, as a lover who filled him "with wonder and delight;" and Beckford as possessing a mind like a "clear, transparent stream, flowing so freely as to impress us with the idea of its being inexhaustible." He died Dec. 27, 1838, "beloved and trusted by religious professors of all sects" (London Athenæum, Sept. 30, 1834). "Mr. Jay was not only a pious and eminently successful preacher, but a very genial and interesting man; a sagacious observer, yet of child-like simplicity in taste and disposition; possessed of a fine, though sometimes quaint humor; a most instructive and pleasant companion, rich in anecdote and remi- niscence, and able, from personal knowledge, to give living sketches of most of the eminent men who had appeared in the religious world, high-flying bigotry excepted, during the latter part of the 18th and the earlier part of the present century. . . . He was not a strict Calvinist, for he did not believe in the 'exclusive' part of the Calvinistic creed in any form. He believed in 'two grand truths'—that if we are saved, it is entirely of the grace of God; and if we are lost, it will be on account of ourselves. He held to these firmly, though he might not see the connection between them. 'The connection,' he says, 'is like a chain across the river; I can see the two ends, but not the middle; not because there is no real union, but because it is under water. As to his relation to me, Mr. Jay inclined, in his way, to Presbyteryanism, with a special leaning, perhaps, on one point—that of mutual ministerial oversight and responsi- bility—to Wesleyan Methodism. But he did not believe any particular form of polity to be of divine au- thority" (London Quart. Review, 1854, p. 558 sq.). Best known of his varied and extensive writings are Morning and Evening Exercises (vol. i-v of the collective edition of his Works, ed. of 1842) —The Christian Contemplator (vol. vi of his Works; —Mornings with Jesus (1845, 8vo). His Works were published entire (Bath, 1842-44, 12 vol.; London, 1853, 3 vols; 8vo). See Autobiogra- phy of the Rev. William Jay, with Remarks on Some distinguished Contemporaries, Selections from his Cor- respondence, etc., edited by George Redford, D.D., LL.D., and John Angell James (London, 1854, 8vo; 3d ed. 1858). Wilson, Memoir of Jay (1855, 8vo); Wallace, Portrait- ures of Men (1857, 2nd ed.) Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 607; Princeton Review, v, 359 sq.; Meth. Quart. Review, v, 383. (J. H. W.)

Jayadeva, a celebrated Hindu poet, who, according to some, lived about the middle of the 11th, according to others about the middle of the 16th century after Christ. His most renowned work is the Gitagovinda, an extensive poem in honor of the Hindu deity Krishna (an incarnation of Vishnu) and his wife Radha. It is interpreted both in a literal and a mys- terial sense.

Jaynes, Peter, a pioneer Methodist Episcopal min- ister, born at Marblehead, Mass., in 1778, entered the itinerancy in 1797, and in 1805-6 was stationed in Bos- ton, where he died Sept. 5, 1806. Mr. Jayne was a man of great promise and rare abilities. His style was terse and vigorous, his piety consistent, and his manners in- genuous. His early death was deplored by his brethren as the eclipse of a morning star. See Minutes of Con- ferences, i, 146; Stevens, Memorials of Methodism, i, ch. xxiv, 304.

Jaz'ar (גַּזִּירַ ו' ya'zir), a Gounced form (1 Mac. v, 8) of Jazzer (q.v.).

Jazzer (Name. xxiiii, 1, 5; Josh. xxxii, 39; 2 Sam. xxiv, 5; 1 Chron. vi, 81; xxvii, 31; Isa. xvi, 8, 9; Jer. xliv, 32). See JAZZER.

Jaziz (Heb. Ḥāzīz, יָזוּז prominent; Sept. Ḥāzīz, v. t. 'Aziz), a Hagarite overseer of David's flocks (1 Chron. xxvii, 31), which were probably pastured on the east of Jordan, in the nomad country where the fore- fathers of Jacob had for ages roaming (comp. 19-39). B.C. 1014. See HAGARITE.

Jealousy (אֵרֶץ, אֵרֶץ), properly the feeling of suspicion of a wife's purity (Numb. v, 14); often used of Jeovah's sensitive regard for the true faith of his Church (Exod. xx, 5, etc.; 2 Cor. xi, 2). See Mar- riage. The same term is sometimes used for anger or indignation, or an intense interest for the honor and prosperity of another (Isa. xxvii, 5; 1 Cor. x, 22; 22; Jez. 1, 14; vii, 2). Conjugal jealousy is one of the strongest passions of our nature (Prov. vi, 34; Cant. viii, 6). When God is said to be a jealous God, or to be moved to jeal- ousy, or when the still stronger expression is used, "Je- hoval, whose name is Jealous" (Exod. xxiv, 14), we are
to understand this language as employed to illustrate, rather than to represent, the emotions of the divine mind. The same causes operating upon the human mind would produce what we call anger, jealousy, repentance, grief, etc., upon these occasions. It is ascribed to the mind of God, this language is used because such emotions can be represented to us by no other. Thus God is represented to us as a husband, related to His Church by a marriage covenant that binds her to be wholly for him, and not for another. The marriage altar in the temple is the heart to the approach of a rival; and the thought of such affection being alienated or corrupted fills the soul with grief and indignation. So God commends the purity, the fervency, and the sincerity of his love to his Church by the most terrific expressions of jealousy. See Idolatry.

JEALOUSY, IMAGE OF (ἐνοχὴ πνεύματος, Sept., εἴπων τοῦ ζηλοῦσα, Vulg. idolor zeli), an idyllic object seen by the prophet in that remarkable vision which portrayed to him the abominations that called down the divine vengeance on Jerusalem (Ezek. viii, 8). See Imagery, Chamber of. It stood upon a pedestal (ἡ ἀρχή) within the inner or priests' court of the Temple, adjoining the great altar, and seems to have been identical with the column of Asaph among the lusty youths that had the audacious effrontery to erect within the sacred precincts (2 Kings xxii, 7). See Ashrethoth. This idol, arresting the attention of all who came to worship just as they entered, claimed, as the rival of Jehovah, their adoration, and thus was peculiarly offensive to the God of heaven (see Henderson, Commentary, ad loc.; Bindermann, De tolo zeli, Freib. 1757). See Idol.

JEALOUSY-OFFERING (ἔνοχη ἐνοχῆς, Septuag. Swivανοκυρίοις, Vulgate oblatio sotothor) was the name of a "meat-offering" which a husband was to bring when he subjected his wife, under charge of adultery, before the priest, to the ordeal of the bitter waters (Numb. v, 11 sq.). It consisted of a tenth of an ephah of barley-meal, without oil or frankincense. The priest must wave it (ver. 25), and burn a handful on the altar (ver. 26). The Mishna gives more minute directions (Sotah, ii, 1; iii, 1, 6). See Adultery. Barley, as an inferior grain to wheat (Phedrus, ii, 8, 9), was symbolical of the suspected condition of the wife (Philo, Opp. ii, 907). Oil and incense, as emblems of joy and piety, were obviously unsuitable to the occasion. See Offering.

JEALOUSY, WATERS OF CURSE, (צראות, Numb. v, 19, bitter waters that curse, Sept. τὸ ἔργον τοῦ ἶππαρκοῦρον, Vulg. aqua invenien- sima in quas maledicta congruit, A. V. "this bitter water that cause the curse") (see Acoluthi, De aquis amartis maledictionem inferentibus [Lips. 1621]). When a Hebrew wife was suspected of adultery, her husband brought her first before the judges, and, if she still asserted her innocence, he required that she drink the waters of jealousy, that God might, by these means, discover what she attempted to conceal (Numb. v, 12, etc.). The further details are thus described by Dr. Clarke (Com. ad loc.) from the rabbinical authorities (comp. Wagenesel's Sota, pass.): 14: The man then produced his witnesses, and they were heard. After this, both the man and the woman were conveyed to Jerusalem, and placed before the Sanhedrin; and if she persisted in denying the fact, she was led to the eastern gate of the court of Israel, stripped of her own clothes, and dressed in black, before great numbers of her own sex. The priest then told her that, if she was really innocent, she had nothing to fear; but if guilty, she might expect to suffer all that the law had denounced against her, to which she answered 'Amen, amen.' The priest then wrote the terms of the law in this form: 'If a strange man hath not come near you, and you are not polluted by forsaking the bed of your husband, these bitter waters, which I have cursed, will not hurt you; but if you have polluted yourself by coming near to another man, and gone astray from your husband, may you be accursed of the Lord, and become an example for all his people; may your thigh rot, and your belly fall out; may these cursed waters enter into your belly, and, being swallowed therewith, may your thighs putrefy.' After this, the priest filled a pitcher out of the brazen vessel near the altar of burnt-offerings, cast some dust of the pavement into it, mingled something with it as bitter as wormwood, and then read the curse to the woman, who received it, in case of perjury, by an other priest in the mean time tore off her clothes as low as her bosom, made her head bare, untied the tresses of her hair, fastened her clothes (which were thus torn) with a girdle under her breast, and then presented her, with the tenth part of an ephah, or about three pints of barley-meal. The other priest sprinkled of what was left of jealousy or bitterness to drink, and, as soon as the woman had swallowed them, she gave her the meal, in a vessel like a frying-pan, into her hand. This was stirred before the Lord, and part of it thrown into the fire of the altar. If the husk of the curse was mingled in the cup, it was instantly carried out with these symptoms upon her, and died immediately, with all the ignominious circumstances related in the curses."

This ordeal appears to have contained the essence of an oath varied for the purpose of peculiar solemnity, so that a woman would naturally hesitate to take such an oath, understood to be an appeal to heaven of the most solemn kind, and designed to be accompanied, in case of perjury, by most painful and fatal effects. The drinking appears to have been a symbolical action. When "the priest wrote the curses in a book," and washed those curses into the water which was to be drunk, the water was understood to be impregnated as it were, or to be structured with the terrors of the accountability of which it received; so that now it was metaphorically bitter, containing the curse in it. The drinking of this curse, though conditionally effective or non-effective, could not but have a great effect on the woman's mind, and an answerable effect on the husband; it was designed to cure and to dissipate. We read of no instance in which the trial took place; and, if the administration of the ordeal were really infrequent, we may regard that as an evidence of its practical utility, for it would seem that the trial and its result were so dreadful that the guilt was often confessed and their punishment earnestly exerted to do, than go through it. The rabbis say that a woman who confessed in such circumstances was not put to death, but only divorced without dowry. It has been well remarked that this species of ordeal could not injure the innocent at all, or punish the guilty except by a miracle, whereas in the ordeals by fire, etc., in the Dark Ages, the innocent could scarcely escape except by a miracle. See Adultery.

Jeanes, Henry, an English divine, was born at Alnensy, county of Somerset, in 1611, and was educated at Oxford University. He held first the rectory of Bibercomb and Capland, and, after Walter Raleigh's expulsion, the rectory of Chedzoy. He died in 1602. Jeanes wrote several theological tracts: The Image Unbroken, was generally believed to be written by James Watt ascribes the work to Joseph Jane (see Allibone, Dict. of Authors, p. 957).—Hook, Eccles. Biogr. vi, 280. Je'ärīm (Heb. יְאֵרִים, יְבָאֵרִים, forests; Sept. Ια- ρηῆς), the name of a mountain on the border of Judah, between Mount Seir and Beth-shemesh (Josh. xv, 10):
stated to be the site of Chebalon (q.v.). Kaola stands, seven miles due west of Jerusalem, "on a high point on the north slope of the lofty ridge between wady Ghurab and wady Isma'il. The hill is the northern continuation of wady Beii-Hanina, and the former runs parallel to and northward of it, and they are separated by this ridge, which is probably Mount Jearim" (Robinson, New Researches, p. 154). "Forests, in our sense of the word, there are none; but we have the latest traveller that "such thorough woods, both for loneliness and obscurity, he had not seen since he left Germany" (Tobler, Wanderung, 1857, p. 178).—Smith. Perhaps the hill behind Kuryet el-Knab may be Mount Seir; from it the border "passed over (wady Ghurab) to the shoulder " of Mount Jearim . . . and then went down to Beth-shemesh." It may be that a considerable district of the mountains in this locality was called Jearim, for Boast is called Kirjath-Jearim ("the town of Jearim"); and if so, then we can see the reason why the explanatory phrase is added, "Mount Jearim, which is Chebalon," to limit the more general appellative to the narrow ridge between the two lands (see Keel on Josh. 3; loc. cit. Vetter, Handbook for S. and Pal. p. 290). See Kirjath-Jearim.

Jesus (Heb. Yehus, יֵעָשׁ, trodden hard, i. e. perhaps, firmness; Sept. Ἰησοῦς, the name of the ancient Canaanitish city which stood on Mount Zion, one of the hills on which Jerusalem was built (Jebus, Josh. xvii, 8; xviii, 16, 25). In Judg. xix, 10 it is identified with Jerusalem and in I Chron. xvi, 4, 5, the only other passage in which the city is mentioned, it is identified with the city of Zion, subsequently called the castle or city of David. The sides of Zion descended precipitously on the west and south into the deep valley of Hinnom, and on the east into the Tyropoion, which separated it from Moriah. On the north side a branch valley, the upper part of which was swept round by the Euphrates, was a ledge of rock on which a massive tower was afterwards founded, perhaps on the site of an older one. Recent excavations on the site remarkably corroborate these facts. See Jerusalem. Jesus was thus naturally a place of great strength; and, being strongly fortified besides, it is not strange that the Jebusites should have glorified in it as impregnable (see Rose, Premum Jebusorum castri expugnati, Alt. 1729), and that the capture of it by David should have been considered one of his most brilliant achievements (2 Sam. v, 8). Even after the walls were secured, and Jerusalem founded and made the capital of Israel, Zion was always held in respect. It seemed that in addition to the "castle" on the summit of the hill there was a lower city or suburb, perhaps lying in the bottom of the adjoining valleys; for we read that the children of Judah had captured and burned the Jebusites (Josh. xi, 7, 8), while afterwards it is said that the Benjamites did not drive out the Jebusites that inhabited Jerusalem" (ver. 21). The Jebusites still held the "castle," which was within the allotted territory of Benjamin, but the children of Judah drove them out of the lower town, which was situated within their borders. This is, in substance, the explanation given by Josephus (Ant. v, 2 and 5). See Jebusite.

Jesus (Heb. Yehus, יֵעָשׁ, a word used in the original of a place and its inhabitants.

1. "Jesus"וּאֵשׁ—the Jebusite; Sept. Ιησοῖς, Ἰησοῦς, Vulg. Jebusorum, the name employed for the city of Jesus, only in the ancient document describing the landmarks and the towns of the allotment of Judah (ver. xvi); described in the same way as a real, and last place, the explanatory words, "which is Jerusalem," are added. In the first, however, our translators have given it as "the Jebusite." A parallel to this mode of designating the town by its inhabitants is found in this very list in Zemarim (xxviii, 22), Avim (xxvii, 20), Onphi (ver. 24), and Japhletite (xvi, 5), etc.

2. "Jebusit" or "Jebusites," forms indiscriminately employed in the A. V., although in the original the
name, whether applied to individuals or to the nation, is never found in the plural; always singular. The full form is יִבְשִׁיט, but in a few places—viz. 2 Sam. v, 6; xxiv, 16, 18; 1 Chron. xxii, 18 only—it is "defectively" written יבשיט. Without the article, יִבוּשּׁי, it occurs in 2 Sam. v, 8; 1 Chron. xi, 6; Zech. ix, 7. In the first of these two the force is much increased by removing the article introduced in the A. V., and reading "and smite a Jebusite." See JEBUSITE.

Jebusite (Heb. יִבְשִׁיט, יִבְשִׁיט, Sept. Ἰβυσσοαῖος, but Ἰβυσσοῖς in Josh. xv, 8; xvii, 29, or Ἰβυσσοί in Judg. xix, 11; 1 Chron. vi, 4; also Ἰβυσσοῖς in Josh. xviii, 16, and Ἰβυσσοί in Ezra ix, 1. A. V. "Jebus" in Josh. xviii, 16, 28), the name of the original inhabitants of Jebus, frequently mentioned (usually last in the list) amongst the seven Canaanitish nations doomed to destruction (Gen. x, 16; xxvi, 21; Exod. iii, 8, 17; xiii, 5; xxiii, 22; xxxii, 20; xxiv, 11; Num. xxxii, 39; Deut. vii, vii, 11; x, 17; Josh. iii, 10; ix, xi, 3; xii, 8; xxiv, 11; Judg. iii, 5; 1 Kings ix, 20; 1 Chron. i, 14; 2 Chron. viii, 7; Ezra i, 4; Neh. vi, 8). They appear to have descented from a grandson of Ham (Gen. x, 16). "His place in the list is between Beth and the Amorites (Gen. x, 16; 1 Chron. i, 14), a position which the tribe maintained long after (Num. xxii, 29; Josh. xi, 3); and the same connection is traceable in the words of Ezekiel (xxx, 49), who addresses Jerusalem as the fruit of the union (בְּהֹרֶנוֹ, אֲנָדֹלָה). At the time of the arrival of the Israelites (see Jour. Soc. lit. Oct. 1851, p. 167) they were found to be a considerable tribe on the west of Jordan (Josh. ix, 1), seated on one of the hills of Judah (some have wrongly inferred Moriah from 2 Chron. iii, 1, but in 2 Sam. v, 9 it is clearly identified with Zion), between the Hittites and Amorites (Num. xiii, 30; Josh. x, 3), where they had founded a city called Jebus (Josh. xviii, 28; comp. xix, 10), probably after the name of their progenitor, and established a royal form of government, being then ruled by Adoni-zedek (Josh. x, 20). See SALEM. They seem to have been a warlike nation, and, although they were terrified with much slaughter, and Adoni-zedek, their king, slain by Joshua (Josh. x), and though a part of their city seems to have been afterwards taken, sacked, and burned by the warriors of Judah (Judg. i, 8), yet they were not wholly subdued, but were able to retain at least their Herodian position. See also the more emphatic statement of it till the time of David (2 Sam. v). Being situated on the border (Josh. xv, 8; xviii, 16), between Judah and Benjamin, to either of which it is indifferently ascribed (Josh. xxv, 63; xviii, 29; Judg. i, 21), it was only to this latter that the text is restricted, and the city or tribe's name occurred to the scribes of the LXX, which at that time, as the tribe of Judah's, became the site of Solomon's Temple (2 Chron. iii, 1). It appears that the Jebusites subsisted under his reign in the state of tributaries or slaves (2 Chron. viii, 7), and even so continued to the times of the return from Babylon (Ezra ix, 1). See JERUSALEM.

The Jebusites are spoken of mostly in the O.T. for the city itself inhabited by them (i.e., "city of the Jebusites," Judg. xix, 11), as in Josh. xv, 8; xviii, 16; also poetically, in later times, for its successor, Jerusalem (Zech. ix, 7). See JEBUSITE.

Jebusites. The site of the triumphal Acts of the Apostles, the ashes of Barnabas, after his martyrdom in Cyprus, are said to have been buried in a cave where the race of the Jebusites formerly dwelt, and previous to this is mentioned the arrival in the island of a pious Jebusite, a kinsman of Nero (Acts. Apost. Apost. p. 72, 73, ed. Tisch.).

Jecamiah (1 Chron. iii, 18). See JECAMIAH.

Jechieli ben-Joseph, of Paris, a Rabbi, flourished in the 18th century. He was a disciple of the celebrated Jehudiah Sir-Leon (q. v.). But little is known of the early history of his life. In the prime of life he find him in Paris, at the head of a theological school, and an officiating Rabbi in the capital of France. During the reign of Louis IX the Romanists made every effort to cause the expulsion of the Jews from France, where they were enjoying at this time special favors. They accused the Jews of manifold crimes, and asserted that the Talmud contained disrespectful language towards Jesus, etc.; and though the king hesitated to believe this, he was finally persuaded to appoint a commission of both Christians and Jews to search the Talmud for obnoxious passages. Of the four Rabbis appointed, Jechieli ben-Joseph headed the Jewish commission, and he alone, in the main, carried on the disputation, which resulted unfavorably to the Jews. In the dispute Jechieli displayed great ability and learning, but it is to be deplored that he injured his cause in the eyes of the historian by the assertion which he made that the name of Jesus occurring in the Talmud does not refer to Jesus the Christ. See JESUS in France; Wagenseil, Tela ignea Saturae (2 vols. 4to); Grütz, Geschichte der Juden, vii, 115 sqq. (J. H. W.)

Jechoniah (2 Kings xv, 2). See JECOILLAH.

Jechonias (יִכְהוֹנְיָיָא), a Grecized form of two Hebrew names occurring in the Apocrypha and N. T.,

1. In Esth. i, 4; Bar. i, 3, 9; Matt. i, 11, 12, for king JEHODOKIN (q. v.).

2. In 1 Esd. viii, 92 for SHECHANIAH (q. v.), who encouraged Ezra in the matter of divorcing the Gentile wives (Esth. iv, 2).

Jecoliah (Heb. יֵכְלוֹיָה, יֵכְלוֹיָה, 2 Chron. xxviii, 3, where the text erroneously has יִכְלֹיָה; Auth. Vers. "Jecholiah;" in 2 Kings xv, 2, the paragogic form יֵכְלוֹיָה, יֵכְלוֹיָה, able through Jecohia, Sept. יִכְלָיָה; Josephus 'Αρχίλας, An. ix, 10, 1; Vulg. Jecelio), a female of Jerusalem, mother of king Uzziah, and consequently wife of king Amaziah, whom she appears to have survived her character is inferred from the general piecy of her son. B.C. 824-800.

Jecomaiah (1 Chron. iii, 16, 17; Jer. xxviii, 29; xxviii, 20; xxxviii, 4; xxix, 1; Esth. vi, 6). See JECOHACHIN.

Jecomoias (יִכְהוֹמְיָא), a Grecized form (1 Esd. ix, of the name elsewhere given (2 Chron. xxxviii, 9) as CASONIAH (q. v.).

Jedusor (יֵדְעֹשְׂר), a less correct form (1 Esd. ix, 30) of the Hebrew name (Ezra x, 29) ADAIAH (q. v.).

Jedaiah (Heb. יֵדְיוֹתָה), the name of several men, of different form in the original.

1. (יֵדְיוֹתָה, invoicer of Jehoram; Sept. ὁ ἐπαράτος τοῦ Ἰερουσαλήμ), Son of Shimmir and father of Alon, of the ancestry of Zedekiah, chief sibemuel, who migrated to the valley of Gedor (1 Chron. iv, 37). B.C. c. 640. See note 71.

2. (Same Hebrew name as preceding; Sept. Ιεροσαλημ), Son of Harunaph, and one of those that repaired the walls of Jerusalem after the exile (Neh. iii, 10). B.C. 446.

3. (יִכְלָיָה, knowing Jehoram; Sept. ἔπετρυς τοῦ Ἅδηα), a priest who officiated in Jerusalem after the exile (1 Chron. xi, 10; Neh. xi, 10; in which latter passage, however, he is styled son of Johanan, evidently the same as the Jehoiarib with whom he is mentioned in the former passage). From Ezra ii, 86; Neh. vii, 89.
he appears to have belonged to the family of Josua (793 of his relatives having returned with him from Babylon), so that he is probably the same with the priest Jediah enumerated (Neh. xii. 6) amongst the contemporaries of Ezra, who returned with Zerubabel (the name apparently being repeated in verse 7; comp. ver. 19, 21, where the same repetition occurs, although with the mention of different sons), and probably also identical with the Jediah whom the prophet was directed to crown with the symbolical wreath (Zech. vi. 10, 14). He may have been the same that

Jedu (Ezioy), a corrupt form (1 Esd. v. 24) for the Hebrew name (Ezra ii, 36) Jeddaiah (q. v.).

Jedia'el [most Jed'iah] (Heb. Yedia'eel, ידיהאל, known by God; Sept. 'Izdab, 'Adamah, 'Idlab), the name of at least three men.

1. One of the sons of Benjamin (1 Chron. vii. 6), whose sons (ver. 10) and descendants are enumerated as being 17,200 warriors in David’s census (ver. 11). He is, perhaps, identical with Azthahel (1 Chron. viii. 1). See Benjamin; Jacob.

2. A Shimeiite (q. v.); one of David’s famous bodyguard (1 Chron. xi. 45); probably the Manasseite of the same name who joined David’s troop at Ziklag (1 Chron. xi. 20). B.C. 1053–1046.

3. The Levite of the Levitical family of Elisaph, second son of Meshelemiah, and one of the gate-keepers to the tabernacle or Temple (1 Chron. xxvi. 2). B.C. 1014.

Jed‘iah (Heb. Yediahah, ידיהָה, beloved; Septuag. Ἰδιάδα, Josephus ‘Ithah, Ant. xi. 4, 1), daughter of Adaiah of Bozath and mother of king Josiah, consequently wife of king Amon, whom she appears to have survived (2 Kings xxiii. 1). Her character may be inferred from the piety of her son. B.C. 648–639.

Jedidi‘ah (Heb. Yedidaiyah, ידידיה, beloved by Jehovah; Sept. ‘Izdaddi), the name specially given by the Lord to Solomon (q. v.) at his birth, through Nathan, in token of the divine favor reserved for him (2 Sam. xiii. 25).

Jedduth. See Jeduthun.

Jedna (Iduna), a town mentioned by Eusebius and Jerome (Onomast., 344, xvi. 4) east of Joppa by the desert, six miles from Eleutheropolis towards Hebron,” precisely in which location stands the modern village Idhna (Robinson, Researches, ii. 404).

Jed’uthun (Hebrew Yeduthun, ידועתון or ידועתון; also ידועתון, Yeduthun, in 1 Chron. xv. 38; Neh. vii. 17; Psa. xxx. and lvii. titles; lauder; Sept. Tladaun, but Tladaun in 1 Chron. iv. 16), a Levite of Merari’s family, and one of the four great masters of the Temple music appointed by David (1 Chron. xvi. 41, 42; xxv. 1, etc.). B.C. 1014. From a comparison of 1 Chron. xv. 17, 19, with 41, 42; xxxv. 1, 3, 6; 2 Chron. xxxiv. 17, some infer that he was identical with Ethan (q. v.). In 2 Chron. xxxiv. 15, he bears the title of “the king’s seer.” His sons sometimes appear as recording the same office (1 Chron. xxx. 1, 3), at others as door-keepers of the sacred edifice (1 Chron. xvi. 42). His name is also put for his descendants (Jeduthunites, sons of Jeduthun), who occur later as singers and players on instruments (2 Chron. xxxiv. 15; Neh. xi. 17). In the latter signification it occurs in the superscriptions to Psa. xxx. xlvii., ixviii; but Aben-Ezra supposes it to denote here a species of song, and Jarchi a musical instrument. The form of the phrase (ידועתון, “upon Jeduthun”) favors the latter interpretation (Gesenius, Thes. Heb. p. 569), indicating a kind of instrumental music, or perhaps a style or tune of performance (Ewald, Heb. Poésie, i. 250). The phrase is introduced by Jeduthun: a conclusion strengthened by finding a phrase indicative of authorship (דועתון, “to Jeduthun,” i.e. composed by him), ascribed in a similar connection (Psa. xxxix. titile), since he is elsewhere recognised as an inspired character (2 Chron. xxxiv. 15). See Musician.

Joojeebhoj, Sir Jemsejhir, a Parsee merchant prince and great philanthropist, who was born of poor parents at Bombay, July 15, 1788, and at the age of twenty had already amassed a fortune which secured him the title of Sir. He visited Europe and the East, spent a good portion of his fortune in the endowment of schools and hospitals. From 1822 to 1858 he reported to have spent “upwards of a quarter of a million pounds sterling in founding, endowing, or supporting undertakings of a purely benevolent character,” but what is more noteworthy is that the Parsee merchant by no means confined his charitable efforts to his own confession: Christian, Hindu, and Mussulman also shared the benefits of his magnanimous acts. In 1857 queen Victoria conferred on him the honor of knighthood—the first occasion on which that dignity was bestowed on an Eastern. He died April 15, 1859.

Joo‘li (I’lly or I. Lami), a corrupt Grecized form (1 Esd. vii. 38) of the Heb. name (Ezra ii, 56) Jalaal (q. v.).

Joo‘lius (I’llyus or I. Lly), a Grecized form (1 Esd. viii. 92) of the Heb. name (Ezra x, 2) Jeleel (q. v.).

Joo‘leer (Hebrew I’leer, "לְאֵר", abridged for Abbeer; Sept. "A'lyihi", a son of Giles of Manasseh (Num. xxvi. 30); elsewhere (Josh. xvii. 2, etc.) called Azurrez (q. v.). The patronymic Jeezerites (יהזירות, Heb. יזרית; Sept. "A'lyihi") is in like manner applied to his descendants (Num. xxvi. 30), elsewhere called Zusiteratees (Judg. vii. 11, etc.).

Jeezer (Num. xxvi. 30). See Jezer.

Jeffeery, John, an English theologian, was born at Ipswich in 1647. He studied at Catharine Hall, Cambridge, entered the Church, and was appointed rector of Dennington, Suffolk; then of a parish in Norfolk. His exemplary conduct, sound teachings, and great exertion rendered him very popular. In 1667 he obtained the livings of Kirton and Falkenhain, and in 1694, Tiloton, with whom he was intimately acquainted, made him archdeacon of Norfolk. He died in 1720. Jeffer was much opposed to religious controversialists, hating that they generated more heat than light. He published Sir Thomas Browne’s Christianity Ancient and Modern, and a work on the consciences, taken from Dr. Witshead’s papers. A complete collection of his own Sermons and Tracts was published (London, 1758, 2 vols. 8vo). See Memoirs prefixed to the collection; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxxvi. 622; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i. 959.

Jeffries, George, an English lawyer of the crown, born about 1640, was chief justice of the King’s Bench during the reign of James II, and is execrated in ecclesiastical history for his conduct towards Baxter (q. v.) and Fairfax (q. v.). He seems to have been a man of low inclinations, and a ready tool in the hands of the court. In the year 1688, after the flight of king James, he was recognised at London during the riots by the rabble, and, after having suffered far more than the bitterness of death, he was safely lodged in the fortress (the Tower of London), where some of his most illustrious victims had passed their last days, and where his own life was destined to close in unspeakable ignominy and horror; he died April 18, 1689. No one has better delineated his character than Macaulay (History of England), and we refer our readers to this able master for further details. See also Neale, History of the Puritans, ii, 317 sq., 341.

Je’gar-sahadu’tha (Chald. Ye’gar - Sahadthah, "Ye’gar-sahadthah, פַּלֶק הַתְּמִימִי", pile of the testimony; Sept. Πῶλος τῆς παραπτώσεως, Vulgate tumultus testis), the Aramaean name given by Lalish, a Syriac to the island of stones erected as a memorial of his league with Jacob, whereas the latter styled it (Gen. xxxii. 47) by the equivalent Hebrew name of Gal-Ed (q. v.).
plies someunion of civil and religious functions (2 Chron. xxxv. 8). B.C. 628.

8. (Sept. 'Issa'ah v. r. 'Isaiah.) The father of Obadiah, which latter returned with his relatives of the sons of Joab, 218 males, from Babylon with Ezra (Ezra viii. 9). B.C. ante 469.

9. (Sept. 'Ishah v. r. 'Isaiah, also 'Issaiah v. r. 'Alisaiah.) One of the "sons of Elam (? Persian) who divorced his Gentle wife after the exile (Ezra x. 26); probably the same with the father of Shechaniah, who proposed that measure (verse 2). B.C. 459.

10. (Sept. 'Ishah v. r. 'Isaiah.) One of the priests, "sons" of Harim, who divorced his Gentle wife after the captivity (Ezra x. 26). B.C. 459.

Jehiel (1 Chron. xxvi. 21, 22). See JEHIEL.

Jehizkiel (Heb. Yehezkiyeh), in the para.

Jehudah (Heb. Yehudah, יְהוּדָה, Jehovah's living one; Sept. 'Ishah, a Levite associated with Obed-edom as door-keeper of the sacred ark when brought by David to Jerusalem (1 Chron. xxiv. 24); elsewhere (ver. 18) called JEHIEL (q. v.).

Jehu (Heb. Yehez, יְהֵז, God's living one), the name of several men.

1. (1 Chron. ix. 55.) See JEHOIACHIN.

2. (1 Chron. x. 44.) See JEHIEL.

3. (Sept. 'Issaiah or 'Issah, but v. r. 'Issah in 1 Chron. xvi. 5.) One of the Levites of "the second degree" appointed by David to execute the music on the occasion of the removal of the ark to Jerusalem (1 Chron. xv. 18, 26, in which latter passage they are said to have performed "with psalteries on Alamoth"). He is apparently the same with the person mentioned (verse 24) by the synonymous name JEHU, although, from the similar collocation of names, others have confounded this with the JEHU of ch. xvi. 5, a name of different signification. He is probably identical with the one named as chief among the sons of the Levites of the third course (1 Chron. xxi. 31) assigned to the Levites of the Levitical tribe (i. e., at Nazioth) by David in charge of the Temple porters (1 Chron. xxiii. 8), and hence likewise with the Gershonite with whom were deposited the gems offered by the people for the sacred structures and utensils (1 Chron. xxii. 31; 2 Chron. xxi. 22), and David's orderly (1 Kings xx. 12). He is doubtless the JEHU of 2 Kings vii. iv. son of Jehiel of Bithron (2 Kings xiv. iv.).

4. (Sept. 'Issaiah v. r. 'Issah, Vulg. 'Abiel.) A Hachmonite ("son of Hachmoni") who appears to have been tutor in the royal family towards the close of David's reign (1 Chron. xxvii. 9). B.C. cir. 1050. "The mention of Athithophel (ver. 26) seems to fix the date of this list as before the revolt. In Jeroboam's 'gruet, Horeb' on this passage, Jehiel is said to be David's son Chiloab or Daniel; and 'Achammon,' interpreted as 'Saphanishmaeus, is taken as an alias of David himself" (Smith)."
to have been usually omitted in times of order and of regular succession (the oldest brother, Johan [1 Chron. iii. 15], having apparently died without issue, and Zedekiah being yet too young [2 Chron. xxvi. 11]). He found the land full of trouble, but free from idolatry. Instead, however, of following the excellent example of his father, Jeconiah, he fell into the error and crimes of his predecessors, and, under the encouragements which his example or indifference offered, the idols soon reappeared. He is therefore described by his contemporaries as an evil-doer (2 Kings xxiii, 32) and an oppressor (Ezek. xix, 9), and such is his traditional character in Jewish history; but his disposition seems to have been lamented by the people (Jer. xxxi, 10; Ezek. xix, 1).

Pharaoh-necho, on his victorious return from the Euphrates, thinking it politic to reject a king not nominated by himself, removed him from the throne, and set thereon his brother Jehoiakim. That deposed king was at first taken as a prisoner to Riblah, in Syria, but was eventually carried to Egypt, where he died (2 Kings xxiii, 30-35; 2 Chron. xxxvi, 1-4; 1 Chron. iii, 15; Jer. xxix, 12, 10). See Prideaux, Connection, an. 610; Ewald, Gesch. Irr. iii, 719; Rosenmuller, Schol. in Jer. xxxii, 11. See Judah, Kingdom of.

Jehoiash (Heb. Yehoash; יְהוֹאָשָׁה, Yeho’ash-given; in most of the passages in 2 Kings only; more usually in the contracted form Tadoh, יְתֹדָה, “Joash,” Sept. Tadie, Jeremiah 1-2 (Oschacy), the name of two kings. See also Joash.

1. The son of king Ahaziah by Libnah of Beersheba, was born B.C. 884; made king at the age of seven years, and reigned eight over the separated kingdom of Judah forty years, B.C. 877-857. Jehoash, when an infant, was secretly saved by his aunt Jehoiachin, who was married to the high-priest Jehoiada, from the general massacre of the family by Athaliah, who had usurped the throne. See Jehoiada. Jehoram having himself killed all his own brethren, and all his sons, except Ahaziah, having been killed by the irruption of the Philistines and Aramians, and all Ahaziah’s remoter relations having been slain by Jehu, and now all his sons being put to death by Athaliah (2 Chron. xxii. 4, 17; xxiii. 1, 8, 9, 10), the house of David was reduced to the lowest ebb, and Jehoash appears to have been the only surviving descendant of Solomon. By the high-priest and his wife the child was privately brought up in this chamber connected with the Temple till he was in his eighth year, when Jehoiada deemed that the state of affairs required him to produce the youthful heir of the throne to the people, and claim for him the crown which his ancestors had so unrighteously usurped. Finding the influential persons whom he consulted favorable to the design, everything was secretly but admirably arranged for producing Jehoash, and investing him with the regalia, in such a manner that Athaliah could have no suspicion of the event till it actually occurred. On the day appointed, the sole surviving scion of David’s illustrious house appeared in the place of the kings, by a particular pillar in the Temple court, and was crowned and anointed with the usual ceremonies. The high-wrought enthusiasm of the spectators then found vent in clapping of hands and exulting shouts of “Long live the king!” The joyful uproar was not, however, confined to the walls of the temple, but extended from that sacred palace, and brought Athaliah to the Temple, from which, at a word from Jehoiada, she was led to her death. See Athaliah.

Jehoash behaved well during his minority, and so long as he remained under the influence of the high-priest. Excepting that the high-priest’s houses were still resorted to for incense and sacrifice, pure religion was restored, large contributions were made for the repair of the Temple, which was accordingly restored, and the country seems to have been free from foreign invasion and internal disturbances. But when his venerable adviser died the king seems to have felt himself relieved from a yoke, and, to manifest his freedom, began to take the contrary course to that which he had followed while under pupillage. Gradually the persons who had possessed influence formerly, when the house of David was contaminated by its alliance with the house of Ahab, insinuated themselves into his councils, and ere long the worship of Jehovah and the observances of the law declined, and he became involved in idolatries and idolatrous usages. The prophets then uttered their warnings, but were not heard; and the infatuated king had the atrocity of ingratitude to put to death Zechariah, the son and successor of his benefactor Je-

holaida. For these deeds of Jehoash was made more incor-

moral, and the calamities of the nation fell upon his head. He saw his realm devastated by the Syrians under Hazael; his armies were cut in pieces by an enemy of inferior numbers; and his was even besieged in Jerusalem, and only preserved his cap-

tal and crown by giving up the treasures of the Tem-

ple. Besides this, a painful embitterment all his
day, and at length he became so odious that his own servants conspired against him, and slew him on his bed. They are said to have done this to avenge the blood of Zechariah, who at his death had cried, “The Lord look upon it and require it,” and it is hence probable that the expression ascribed to these calamities of his life and reign to that infamous deed. See Zechariah. Jehoash was buried in the city of David, but in a place in the sepulchre of the kings was denied to his remains (2 Kings xi; xii; 2 Chron. xxiv.). He is one of the three kings (Ahaziah, Jehoash, Azariah) omitted from the genealogy of Christ (Matt. xi. 11). With regard to the different accounts of the Syrian invasion given in 2 Kings and in 2 Chron., which have led some (as Thienius and many other commentators) to imagine two distinct Syrian invasions, and others to see a direct contradiction, or at least a strange incom-

pleteness in the narrative, as Winebarger expressly

states in the minds of the critics. See Syria. The narrative given above, which is also that of Keil and E. Bertheau (Ezech. hands. z. A. T.) as well as of Josephus (Ant. ix, 8, 4), perfectly suits the two accounts, which are merely different slantings of the one full account contained in the original chronicles of the king-

dom. See Judah, Kingdom of.

2. The son and successor of Jehoahaz, king of Israel: reigned thirteenth over the separate kingdom sixteen (nominal) years, B.C. 856-838, and for about one year in Samaria. He was the son of Jehoahaz (2 Kings iv. xiv; 1; comp. with xii, 1, xiii, 10). When he succeeded to the crown the kingdom was in a deplorable state from the devastations of Hazael and Benhadad, kings of Syria, of whose power at this time we had also evi-

dence in the preceding article. Jehoash, it is true, lowered the claims of his predecessors, not by insisting on keeping up the worship of the golden calves; but, apart from this, he bears a fair character, and had intervals, at least, of sincere piety and true devotion to the God of his fathers (comp. Josephus, Ant. ix, 6, 8). Indeed, custom and long habit had so established the views of political expediency on which the schismatical establish-

ments at Dan and Bethel were founded, that at length the reprehension which regularly recurs in the record of each king’s reign seems rather to apply to it as a mark of the continuance of a public crime than as indicative of the character of even the most respectable prince, which is to be sought in the more detailed ac-

counts of his own conduct. These accounts are favor-

able with respect to Jehoash. He held the prophet El-

shah in high honor, looking up to him as a father. When he heard of his last illness he repaired to the bedside of the prophet, he sat for hours and wept over him as “the chariot of Israel and the horses thereof.” The prophet promised him deliverance from the Syrian yoke in Aphek, the scene of Ahab’s great victory over a former Benhadad (1 Kings xx, 26-30). He then bid him smite upon the ground, and the king smote three times and then stayed. The prophet rebuked him for staying, and limited to three his victories over Syria.
These promises were accomplished after the prophet's death. God took compassion upon the extreme misery of Israel, and, in remembrance of his covenant with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, interposed to save them from entire destruction. In three signal and successive victories Jehoshah overcame the Syrians, and retook from them the towns which Hazael had rent from Israel; and, in remembrance of his covenant with Ahaz, Jotham, and Hezekiah, interposed to save them from entire destruction. These three victories made Jehoshah more potent than that of Judah. Jehoshah, however, sought no quarrel with that kingdom, but he nevertheless became involved in a war with Amaziah, king of Judah. The grounds of this war are given fully in 2 Chron. xxvi. See Amaziah. The hiring of 190,000 men of Israel and 100 talents of silver by Amaziah as the only instance on record of such a transaction, and implies that at that time the kingdom of Israel was free from all fear of the Syrians. These mercenary soldiers, having been dismissed by Amaziah, at the instigation of a prophet, without being allowed to take part in the Edom expedition, returned in great wrath to their own country, and sacked and plundered the cities of Judah in revenge for the slight put upon them, and also to indemnify themselves for the loss of their share of the plunder. It was to avenge this injury that Amaziah, on his return from his triumph over the Edomites, declared war against Jehoshah, in the name of the prophet; but Jehoshah, when he received the defiance from Amaziah, answered with becoming spirit in a parable (q. v.), which by its images calls to mind that of Job; for the cool disdain of the answer must have been, in fact, exceeding galling to Amaziah: "The thistle that was in Lebanon sent to the cedar that was in Lebanon, saying, Give thy daughter to my son to wife; and there came by a wild beast that was in Lebanon and trod down the thistle. This was admirable; nor was the application less so: 'Thou hast indeed smitten Edom, and this beast hath lifted his up-gloried this, and tarry at home; for why shouldst thou meddle to thy hurt, that thou shouldst fall down, even thou, and Judah with thee.' In the war, or, rather, action which followed, Jehoshah was victorious. Having defeated Amaziah at Beth-shemesh, in Judah, he advanced to Jerusalem, broke down the wall to the extent of 400 cubits, and carried away the treasures both of the Temple and the palace, together with hostages for the future good behavior of the rest of the army. Jehoshah himself did not long survive this victory; he died in peace, and was buried in Samaria (2 Kings xiv. 1-17).

Jehoshah, Kingdom of

Jehos'hah (Heb. Yehoschāhān, יְהוֹשָׁחָה, Jehoshah-haraned, q. d. Θεοδόσιος), the name of several men. See also JOSHAH; JOHN, etc.

7. (Sept. τοῦ Ἰωανῶτ). One of the priests who celebrated with music the reparation of the walls of Jerusalem (Neh. xii. 42). B.C. 446. He was perhaps the same with No. 4 or No. 8.

8. (Sept. τοῦ Ἰωανῆ). A leading priest, the "son" of Amariah, and contemporary with Joiakim (Neh. xi. 13). B.C. cir. 406. He may have been identical with the preceding.

Jeho'ch'acin (Heb. יְהוֹצָכָן, יְהוֹצָכָן, Jehoachtan-appointed; Sept. ὰγαθίῳ in 2 Kings xxiv. 6, 8, 12, 15; xxvi. 27; Ἰωακίς in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 8, 9; Ἰωακίς in Jer. iii. 31; Josephus Ἰωακίμος, Ant. x. 6, 8; 7, 1; N. Test. Ἰωακίς, "Jehonias," Matt. i. 11, 12; contracted once Ἰωκάιμ, Ὄγκαιμ, Ezek. i. 2, Sept. Ἰωακείς, Auth. Vers. "Jehoachin," also in the contracted forms JECOIAH (יְיוֹכָאָה), Yechon, Sept. Ἰωακίς in Jer. xxvii. 20; xxviii. 4, xxix. 2, 1; Chron. iii. 16, 17; but omit in Easb. ii. 6; likewise paragogic יְיוֹכָאָה, יְיוֹכָאָה, Jer. xxiv. 1, Sept. Ἰωακίς, and CONIAH (κωνιαή, only paragogic יְיוֹכָאָה, יְיוֹכָאָה, Jer. xxiv. 24, 28; xxvii. 1, Sept. Ἰωακίς), son of Jehoiachin, king of Judah, by Nehushah, daughter of Elhanathan of Jerusalem; he succeeded his father as the nineteenth monarch of that separate kingdom, but only for three months and ten days, B.C. 598. He was then eighteen years of age according to 2 Kings xxiv. 6, but only eight according to 2 Chron. xxxii. 29. Many attempts have been made to reconcile these dates (see J. D. Müller, Die heb. durr. tribunen regni Jud. adscrivis, Lipsia, 1745; Oeder, Freie Untersuch. über einige Allt.-Bücher, p. 214; Offerhaus, Sprülely, p. 193), the usual solution being that he had reigned ten years in conjunction with his father, so that he was eight when he began his reign, and but eighteen when he began to reign alone. There are, however, difficulties in this view which, perhaps, leave it the safest course to conclude that "eight" in 2 Chron. xxxvii. 9, is a corruption of the text, such as might easily occur from the relation of the numbers eight and eighteen. (All the versions read eighteen in Kings, and so the Vulg. and many M.S. of the Sept. in Chron., as well as at 1 Esd. i. 43. Among recent commentators, Keil, Theinuus, and Hitzig favor the reading eighteen, while Borthoeff prefers eight. The language in Jer. xxi. 24, 30 is not decisive, for the epithets there applied to Jehochiah do not necessarily imply adult age, although they more naturally agree with it. The same remark applies to the allusion in Ezek. xix. 5-9. The decided probaration, however, in 2 Kings xxiv. 9, and in 2 Chron. xxxvi. 9, would hardly be used of a mere child. The mention in 2 Kings xxiv. 9 of his mother Jeconiah, who, though not necessarily implying her minority, for the queen-dowager was a very important member of the royal family. The number eight, indeed, would bring Jehoiachin's birth in the year of the beginning of the captivity by Nebuchadnezzar's invasion, and thus exactly agree with the language in Matt. i. 11, but the expression "and his brethren" added there, as well as the language of the following verse, agrees better with a less precise correspondence, as likewise the qualifying "about" indicates. The argument drawn from his father's age at death, thirty-six (2 Kings xxiv. 36), is favorable to Jehoiachin being twelve—that is, at the time, for most of these kings became fathers very early, Josiah, e. g., at fifteen (2 Kings xxiii. 1, comp. with xxiii. 36.). He was therefore, born in B.C. 616. Jehoiachin followed the evil courses which had already brought so much disaster upon the royal house of David, and, despising the people of Judah, he seems to have very speedily indicated a political bias adverse to the interests of the Chaldaean empire, for in three months after his accession we find the generals of Nebuchadnezzar again laying siege to Jerusalem, according to the predictions of Jeremiah (xxxi. 24-30). Jehoiachin himself lived three years in Egypt, when Egypt was still prostrate in consequence of the victory at Carchemish, and when the Jews had been for three or four years harassed and distressed by the in-
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Jehoiachin's fellow-captive. But the apocryphal books are more communicative. Thus the author of the book of Baruch (i, 8) introduces 'Jehoiachin, king of Judah,' into his narrative, and represents Baruch as reading his prophecy in his ears and in the ears of the king's sons, and the nobles, and elders, and people, at Babylon. At the hearing of Baruch's words, it is added, they wept, and fasted, and prayed, and sent a copy of the writing to Jerusalem, to Jehoiakim, the son of Je- likiah, the son of Shallum the high-priest, with which purchase burnt-offerings, and sacrifices, and incense, bidding them pray for the prosperity of Nebuchadnezzar, and Belshazzar his son. The history of Susanna and the Elders also apparently makes Jehoiachin an important personage, for, according to the author, the husband of Susanna was Joakim, a man of great wealth, and the chief person among the captives, to whose house all the people resorted for judgment—a description which suits Jehoiachin. 

Africanus (Ep. of Orig.; Ruth, Red. Soc. ii, 118) expressly calls Susanna's husband king, and says that the king of Babylon had made him his royal companion (εὐσώφρονος). He is also mentioned in 1 Esd. v, 5, but the text seems to be corrupt. That Zedekiah, who in 1 Chron. iii, 16 is called "his son," is the same as Zedekiah his uncle (called son in Jer. xxvi, 30) would be useful in determining the successor on the throne, seems certain. But it is probable that "Assir" (𒇹𒇹𒇹مري = captive), who is reckoned amongst the family of Jeconiah in 1 Chron. iii, 17, may really have been only an appellation of Jeconiah himself (see Bertheau on 1 Chron. iii, 16). 

In the genealogy of Christ (Matt. i, 11) he is named in the received text as the "son of Josiah," his grandfather, the name of Jehoiachin having probably been omitted by erroneous transcription. See Genealogy. In the dark portrait of his early character by the prophet (Jer. xxiii, 80), the expression "Write ye this man childless" refers to his having no successor on the throne, for he had children (see Matt. Qur. Rev., Oct., 1862, p. 602-4). See Salathiel. 

Josephus, however (Ant., 7, 7, 1), gives him a fair character (see Keil, Commentary on Kings, p. 692). The compiler of 1 Esd. gives the name of Jechnias to Jehoahaz, the son of Josiah, who reigned three months after Josiah's death, and was deposited and carried to Egypt by Pharaoh-necho (1 Esd. i, 34; 2 Kings xxiii, 30). He is followed in this blunder by Eph phanius (i, 21), who says "Jehoiaqin begat Jehonias, who is also called Shallum. This Jehonias begat Jehochiah, who was called Zedekiah and Joakim." It has its origin, doubtless, in the former, and the latter kept at Babylon, the Greek by writers ignorant of Hebrew. See Judah, Kingdom of.

Jehoiada (Hebrew יְהוֹיָדָא, מְאֹדָה, Jehoehu, known; Sept. 'Ελεοδή, 'Ελεοδή, 'Ελεοδή, the name of two or more priests.

1. The father of Beniah, which latter was one of David's chief warriors (2 Sam. viii, 18; xx, 28; xxiii, 20, 22; 1 Kings i, 42, 45, 46, 48, 49), and was (2 Sam. xx, 33; 1 Chron. xi, 22, 24; xxvii, 17; xxvii, 35) B.C. 946. He is mentioned as the governor of Jerusalem, and when Athaliah slew all the royal family of Judah after Ahaziah had been put to death by Jehu, he and his wife stole Jehoahaz from amongst the king's sons and hid him for six years in the Temple, and eventually replaced
him on the throne of his ancestors. See ATHALIAH. In effecting this happy revolution, by which both the throne of David and the worship of the true God according to the law of Moses were rescued from imminent danger of destruction, Jehoiada displayed great ability and prudence. Allowing patiently the influence of Athaliah, and we may presume, her foreign practices and preferences—had produced disgust in the land, he at length, in the 7th year of her reign, entered into secret alliance with all the chief partisans of the house of Da-
v and of the true religion. He also collected at Jeru-
salem Levites from the several cities of Judah and Israel, probably under cover of providing for the Tem-
ple services, and then concentrated a large and conceal-
red force in the Temple by the expedient of not dismiss-
ing the old courses of priests and Levites when their
successors came to relieve them on the Sabbath. By
means of the consecrated shields and spears which Da-
v had taken in his wars, and which were preserved in
the treasury of the Temple (comp. 1 Chron. xviii, 7-11;
xvi, 20-28; 1 Kings xiv, 26, 27), he supplied the cap-
tains of hundreds with arms for their men. Having
then divided the priests and Levites into three bands, which were posted at the principal gates of the courts with people favorable to the cause, he pro-
duced the young king before the whole assembly, and
crowned and anointed him, and presented to him a
COPY OF THE LAW according to Deut. xvii, 18-20. See HILKIAH. The excitement of the moment did not
make him forget the sanctity of God's name; none
but the priests an ministering Levites were permitted
by him to enter the Temple, and he gave strict orders
that Athaliah should be carried without its precincts
before she was put to death. In the same spirit he in-
shugurated the new reign by a solemn covenant between
himself as high-priest, and the people and the king, to
renounce the Baal-worship which had been introduced by
the house of Ahab, and to serve Jehovah. This was
followed up by the immediate destruction of the altar
and temple of Baal, and the death of Mattan, his priest.
He then gave orders for the due celebration of the Tem-
ple service, and, at the same time, for the perfect re-
establishment of the monarchy, all which seems to have
been effected with great vigor and success, and without
any cruelty or violence. The young king himself, un-
der this wise and virtuous counsellor, ruled his kingdom
with a firm and gentle hand, and promoted all
during the lifetime of Jehoiada. The reparation of
the Temple, in the 23rd year of his reign, of which a full
and interesting account is given in 2 Kings xii and 2 Chron.
xxiv, was one of the most important works at this pe-
riod. At length, however, Jehoiada died, and for his
spiritual services to his God, his king, and his country, which have earned him a place amongst the very fore-
most well-doers in Israel, he had the unique honor of
burial amongst the kings of Judah in the city of David.
—Smith. His decease, though at an advanced age, yet
occurred too soon for the welfare of the nation and of
Jehoshaphat, who thereupon immediately fell into idolatry
and was even guilty of the most cruel ingratitude to-
wards the family of Jehoiada. See JEHOSHAH. 1. His
age at his death is stated (2 Chron. xxiv, 15) to have
been 130 years, which Hervey (Genealogy of our Lord, p. 304) proceeds to fix at 150, in order to lessen the
presumed disparity between Jehoiada's age and that of
his wife, as well as on the ground that a man of 90 could
hardly have exhibited such energy as he displayed in
displacing Athaliah; but the change is wholly arbitrary
and unnecessary. Josephus, in his history (Ant. ix, 7, 1, while it is not clear which was the text of his Hebrew
Bible account; but in his list of the high-priests (Ant.
x, 8, 6), the corresponding name seems to be Azoraimus
(Άσωραμύς, perhaps by corruption for "Joram"). In
the Jewish chronicle (Seder Olam), however, it corre-
ctly appears as Jehokakh, and with a date tolerably
agreeing to the scriptural citations to the temple services. In both
authorities, many of the adjoining names are additional to
those mentioned in the O.T. See HIGH-PRIEST. It is
probably this Jehoiada who is alluded to in Jer. xxix, 26
as a pre-eminent incumbent of the office (see Rosen-
müller and Hitzig, ad loc.), and he is doubleless the same
with the Berechiah (בָּרֵכִיָּה) of Matt. xxiii, 25
See ZEDEKIAH.
3. (Neh. iii, 6). See JOSEDA. Jehoi'akim (Heb. Yahyakîm, יְהוֹיָ֣קִים, Jeho-
vah-established; Sept. Ἰωσεύκης, oftenter Ἰωσεύκης, Jose-
phus Ιωάκιμος; compare JOSIAK, JOKIN), the sec-
ond son of Josiah, the(son of his father and mother, Je-
mah (probably the Dunah of Josh. xv, 52); born B.C.
634, and eighteenth king of the separate throne of Ju-
dah for a period of eleven years, B.C. 609-598. He
is mentioned in 2 Kings xxiii, 34, 35, 36; xxiv, 1, 5, 6, 19;
1 Chron. iii, 15, 16; 2 Chron. xxxvi, 4, 5, 8, Jer. i,
xiii, 18, 24; xxiv, 1; xxv, 1, 21, 22, 23; xxvi, 1, 20;
xxvii, 4; xxxiv, 1; xxxvi, 1, 5, 26, 27, 30, 32, xxxvi, 1;
xiv, 1; xlii, ii, 401, Engl. trans.). There exists the most striking
contrast between his beautiful name and his miserable
fate (Jer. xxxii, 19). (See Eckhird, Von Ezech-Begräbnis,
Lpz. 1710.) See NAME.
Jehoiakim's younger brother Jehoiash, or Shallum, as
he is called Jer. xxvi, 11, and had been the first to
make king by the people of the land in the presence of his
father Josiah, probably with the intention of following
up Josiah's policy, which was to side with Nebuchad-
nezzar against Egypt, being, as Prideaux thinks, bound
by oath to the kings of Babylon (R. 50). See Jeho-
ash, Pharaoh-neco. There was therefore no
all resistance with his victorious army, immediately de-
posed Jehoash, and had him brought in chains to Rib-
lah, where, it seems, he was on his way to Carmiche-
al (2 Kings xxiii, 33, 34; Jer. xxii, 10-12). See NACHO.
He then set Eliakim, his elder brother, upon the throne
—through—changed his name to Jehoiakim (see above)—and,
having charged him with the task of collecting a tributa-
ty of 100 talents of silver and one talent of gold =
3,500,000, in which he mulcted the people of the land for
Josiah that had taken in the war with Babylon, he en-
ployed to Egypt, taking Jehoash with him, who died there in captivity 2 Kings xxiii, 24;
—Ezek. xix, 4). Pharaoh-neco also himself returned no more to Jerusalem; for, after his
great defeat at Carmesin in the fourth year of Jehoiakim,
he lost all his Syrian possessions (2 Kings xxiv, 7 Jer. xlix, 2), and his successor Psammetichus (Herod. ii, 6)
made no attempt to recover them. Even thus far, played no part in Jewish politics during the seven
or eight years of Jehoiakim's reign. After the battle
of Carmesin, Nebuchadnezzar came into Palestine as
one of the Egyptian tributary kingdoms, the capture of
which was the greatest triumph of his reign. He found Jehoiakim quite powerless. After a short
siege he entered Jerusalem, took the king prisoner, bound him in fetters to carry him to Babylon (2 Chron.
xxxvi, 6, 7), and took also some of the precious vessels of
the Temple and carried them to the land of Shinar,
to the temple of Bel his god. It was at this time
in the fourth, or, as Daniel reckons, in the third year of
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his reign [see NEBUCHADNEZZAR], that Daniel and Hananiah, Michael and Azariah, were taken captives to Babylon (Dan. i, 2), but Nebuchadnezzar seems to have considered them not guilty, as did the ancient and wise king, and to have accepted his submission, and reinstated him on the throne, perhaps in remembrance of the fidelity of his father Josiah (q. v.). The year following the Egyptians were defeated upon the Euphrates (Jer. xlvii, 2), and Jehoiakim, when he saw the remains of the defeated army collected, resolved to come in person and have in person to have accepted his submission, and reinstated him on the throne, perhaps in remembrance of the fidelity of his father Josiah (q. v.). The year following the Egyptians were defeated upon the Euphrates (Jer. xlvii, 2), and Jehoiakim, when he saw the remains of the defeated army collected, resolved to come in person and attempt to have in person to have accepted his submission, and reinstated him on the throne, perhaps in remembrance of the fidelity of his father Josiah (q. v.). The year following the Egyptians were defeated upon the Euphrates (Jer. xlvii, 2), and Jehoiakim, when he saw the remains of the defeated army collected, resolved to come in person and have in person to have accepted his submission, and reinstated him on the throne, perhaps in remembrance of the fidelity of his father Josiah (q. v.).

In the same year the prophet collected a prophecy of his prophecies to be written out by his faithful scribe Jeremiah, and published in the court of the Temple. This coming to the knowledge of the king, he sent for it, and had it read before him. But he heard not much of the bitter denunciations with which it was charged before he took the roll from the reader, and, after cutting it in pieces, threw it into the brazier which, it is said, was afterwards sent to 2 Kings xxiii, 84, where Eliahik or Jehoiakim is said to have succeeded his father Josiah, whereas the reign of Jehoahaz intervened. This was also so short, however, as not to be reckoned in the succession. In Matt. x, 11, in the large text, the name of Jehoiakim (Ioeaiqim, "Jakin") is given in place of Josiah, son of Amon, and grandson of Josiah; but in some MSS. it is supplied, as in the margin (see Strong's Greek Harmony of the Gospels, note on § 9). See GENEALOGY.

Josephus's history of Jehoiakim's reign is inconsistent neither with Scripture nor with itself. His account of Jehoiakim's death and Jehoachin's ascension to the throne is not only a) inconsistent with the Scriptures, but the former of the two crimes he had committed was to have been dragged away and buried "with the burial of an ass," without pomp or lamentation, "beyond the gates of Jerusalem" (Jer. xxii, 19, 20; xxxvi, 8; see 1 Chron. iii, 18; xxxvii, 1; 2 Kings xxiv, 4, 6-8). Yet it was not the object of Nebuchadnezzar to destroy altogether a power which, as tributary to him, formed a serviceable outpost towards Egypt, which seems to have been the great final object of all his designs in this quarter. He therefore still maintained the throne of Judah, paid tribute to Nebuchadnezzar, and anointed the son of the late king. Nor does he appear to have removed any considerable number of the inhabitants until provoked by the speedy revolt of this last appointed of Jehoiachin.

The expedition against Judah in Jer. xxxvi, 30, "He shall have none to sit upon the throne of David," is not to be taken strictly; and yet, as the reign of Jehoiachin was for only thirteen weeks, Jehoiakim may be said to have been comparatively without a successor, since his son scarcely sat down upon his throne before he was deposed. The same account of the expedition against Judah is given in 2 Kings xxiv, 84, where Eliahik or Jehoiakim is said to have succeeded his father Josiah, whereas the reign of Jehoahaz intervened. This was also short, however, as not to be reckoned in the succession. In Matt. x, 11, in the received text, the name of Jehoiakim (Tseaiqim, "Jakin") is given in place of Josiah, son of Amon, and grandson of Josiah; but in some MSS. it is supplied, as in the margin (see Strong's Greek Harmony of the Gospels, note on § 9). See GENEALOGY.

Josephus's history of Jehoiakim's reign is inconsistent neither with Scripture nor with itself. His account of Jehoiakim's death and Jehoachin's ascension to the throne is not only inconsistent with the Scriptures, but the former of the two crimes he had committed was to be only his own inference from the Scripture narrative. According to Josephus (Ant. x, 6), Nebuchadnezzar came against Judaea in the 8th year of Jehoiakim's reign, and compelled him to pay tribute, which he was unable to pay, and then proceeded against him; he took Jerusalem, and on hearing that the king of Babylon had gone to invade Egypt, such a campaign at this time is extremely improbable, as Nebuchadnezzar was fully occupied elsewhere; it is possible, however, that such a rumour may have been set afloat by interested parties. Josephus then inserts the account of Jehoiakim's ascension to the throne of Judah's prophecy in his fifth year, and concludes by saying that a little time afterwards the king of Babylon made an expedition against Jehoiakim, who admitted Nebuchadnezzar into the city upon certain conditions, which Nebuchadnezzar immediately broke: that he slew Jehoiakim, and put to death the nobles of the land, carried away the captives to Babylon, and set up Jehoiachin for king, but almost immediately afterwards was seized with fear lest the young king should avenge his father's death, and so sent back his army to besiege Jerusalem; that Jehoiachin, being a man of just and gentle disposition, did not like to expose the city to danger on his own account, and therefore surrendered himself, his mother, and kindred to the king of Babylon's officers on condition of the city suffering no harm, but that Nebuchadnezzar, in direct violation of the conditions, took 10,582 prisoners, and made Zedekiah, the youngest of Jehoiachin, whom he kept in custody. See JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

All the accounts we have of Jehoiakim concur in ascribing to him a vicious and irreligious character. The writer of 2 Kings xxii, 37 tells us that he did that which was evil in the sight of Jehovah, a statement which is repeated in 2 Chronicles xxiv, 9, and 2 Chronicles xxxvi, 5. The latter writer uses the yet stronger expression "the acts of Jehoiakim, and the abominations which he did" (ver. 8). But it is in the writings of Jeremiah that we have the fullest portraiture of him. If, as is probable, the 19th chapter of Jeremiah belongs to this reign, we have a detail of the abominations which Jehoiakim committed at Jerusalem under the king's sanction, with which Ezekiel's vision of what was going on six years later, within the very precincts of the Temple, exactly agrees: incense offered up to "abominable beasts," "women weeping for
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B.C. cir. 1033. See AMNON. Again, when, in a later stage of the same tragedy, Amnon was murdered by Absalom, and the exaggerated report reached David that all the princes were slaughtered, Jonadab was already aware of the real state of the case. He was with the king and had a message to reassure him (2 Sam. xiii, 22, 33). See ABSALOM.

2. A son or descendant of Rechab, the progenitor of a peculiar tribe, who held themselves bound by a vow to abstain from wine, and never to relinquish the monastic life (Jer. xxxvi, 6—19). See RECHAB. It appears from the account of him (1 Chron. vii, 35) that his tribe ("the rider") belonged to a branch of the Kenites, the Arabian tribe which entered Palestine with the Israelites. One settlement of them was to be found in the extreme north, under the chieftainship of Heber (Judg. iv, 11), retaining their Bedouin character and a name which derived its name from their nomadic habits. The main settlement was in the south. Of these, one branch had nestled in the cliffs of Engedi (Judg. i, 16; Numb. xxxiv, 21). Another had returned to the frontier of their native wilderness on the south of Judah (Judg. i, 16). A third and scattered settlement, probably by the various branches of the Kenite tribe (see Judg. i, 16; iv, 11), were inculcated by Jehonadab with the utmost minuteness on his descendants or retainers; the more so, perhaps, from their being brought into closer connection with the inhabitants of the settled districts. The vow or rule which he prescribed to them is preserved to us: "Ye shall drink no wine, neither ye nor your sons forever. Neither shall ye build houses, nor sow seed, nor plant vineyard, nor have any: but all your days ye shall dwell in tents; that ye may live long in the land whither ye be strangers." (Jer. xxxvi, 6, 7.) This life, partly monastic, partly Bedouin, was observed with the tenacity with which, from generation to generation, such customs are continued in Arab tribes; and when, many years after the death of Jehonadab, the Rechabites (as they were called from his father) were invited by Jehu to take refuge from the Chaldean invasion within the walls of Jerusalem, nothing would induce them to transgress the rule of their ancestor, and, in consequence, a blessing was pronounced upon them and by them the prophet Jeremiah (xxxvi, 19): "Jehonadab, the son of Rechab, shall not want a man to stand before me." See RECHABITE.

Bearing in mind this general character of Jehonadab as an Arab chieftain, and the founder of a half-religious sect, perhaps in connection with the austere Elijah, and the Nazarites mentioned in Amos ii, 11 (see Ewald, Afterthinner, p. 92, 98), we are the better able to understand the stand given on which he appears before us in the historical narrative (2 Kings x, 15 sqq.). B.C. 888. Jehu was advancing, after the slaughter of Beth-elek, on the city of Samaria, when he suddenly met the austere Bedouin coming towards him (2 Kings x, 15). It seems he was already known to each other (Josephus, Ant. ix, 6, 6). The king was in his chariot; the Arab was on foot. It is not altogether certain which was the first to speak. The Hebrew text—followed by the A.V.—implies that the king blessed (A. Vers. "saluted") Jehonadab. The Sept. and Josephus (Ant. ix, 6, 6) interpret the decision of the king as that he would have its peculiar appropriateness. The king then proposed their close union. "Is thy heart right, as my heart is with thy heart?" The answer of Jehonadab is slightly varied. In the Hebrew text he vehemently replies, "It is, it is; give me thine hand in the face of the Lord thy God. It is;" and Jehu then rejoins, "If it is, give me thine hand." The hand, whether of Jehonadab or Jehu, was offered

Thammuz," and men in the inner court of the Temple, "with their backs towards the temple of the Lord," worshipping "the sun towards the east" (Ezek. viii). The vindictive pursuit and murder of Urijah, the son of Shemaiah, and the indignities offered to his corpse by the people of Tyre, were a prophetic warning of the coming war of God against Jerusalem and Judah, are samples of his ireligion and tyranny combined. Jeremiah but narrowly escaped the same fate (Jer. xxvi, 20—24). The curious notice of him in 1 Esd. i, 38—that he put his nobles in chains, and caught Zeraco, his brother, in Egypt, and brought him thence to Jerusalem—also points to his cruelty. His daring impetity in cutting up and burning the roll containing Jeremiah's prophecy, at the very moment when the national fast was being celebrated, has been noticed above (see also Stanley, Jewish Church, ii, 597 sqq.). His oppression, injustice, cruelty, selfishness, luxury, and tyranny are most severely rebuked (Jer. xxii, 13—17); and it has frequently been observed, as indicating his thorough selfishness and indifference to the sufferings of his people, that, at a time when the land was so impoverished by the devastations laid upon it by Egypt and Babylon in the Babylonian and Median empires, he built magnificent luxurias for himself (Jer. xxii, 14, 15). See EMARGY, CHAMBERS OF.

Jehoiarib (Hebrew Yehoyarib, יְהוֹיָרִיב, whose cause Jehovah defends; Sept. τοῦ Ἰαβαρίου τοῦ Ἰαμαθαίον, a distinguished priest at Jerusalem (1 Chron. i, 10), head of the first of the twenty-four "courses" (1 Chron. xxiv, 7). B.C. 1014. Of these courses, only four are mentioned as having returned from Babylon—those of Jediah, Immer, Pashur, and Harim (Ezra ii, 36—39; Neh. vii, 39—42); and Jewish tradition says that each of these was divided into six, so as to preserve the original number with the original names (Talm. Hedor. iv, p. 68, col. i in ed. Bomberger). This might account for our finding, at a later period, Mattathias described as of the course of Joiarib (1 Macc. ii, 1), even though this course did not return from Babylon (Prideaux, Connexion, i, 136, 8th ed.). We find, however, that some of the descendants of Jehoiarib did return from Babylon (1 Chron. i, 10; Neh. vi, 10; see JEDIDAI); we find, also, that in subsequent lists other of the priestly courses are mentioned as returning, and in one of these that of Jehoiarib is expressly mentioned (Neh. x, 2—8; xii, 1—7), and among the sons of Mattenai as chief of the house of Joiarib in the days of Jeshua (xii, 19). The probability, therefore, is that, the course of Jehoiarib did go up, but at a later date, perhaps, than those four mentioned in Ezra ii, 36—39, and Neh. vii, 39—42. To the course of Joiarib Josephus tells us he belonged (Ant. xi, 6, 1; Lifshitz, § 1). See PRIEST.

Jehonadab (Hebrew Johanan, יְהוֹנֶנָּדָב, to whom Jehovah is liberate, 2 Sam. xiii, 5; 2 Kings x, 15, 23; Jer. xxxviii, 8, 14, 16, 18; sept. יואנָדָב, Avth. Version "Jonadab," except in 2 Kings x, 15, 23, also in the contracted form YONADAB, יְוֹנָדָב, 2 Sam. xiii, 3, 32, 35; Jer. xxxvi, 6, 10, 19; sept. יואנָדָב), the name of two men.

1. A son of Shimieah and nephew of David, a very crafty person (תְּפְלָל יְוֹנָדָב; the word is that usually translated "wise," as in the case of Solomon, 2 Sam. xiii, 3), i.e. apparently one of those characters who, in the midst of great or royal families, are often found in their household, and are renowned, for being acquainted with the secrets of the whole circle in which they move. His age naturally made him the friend of his cousin Amnon, heir to the throne (2 Sam. xiii, 3). He received from the prince an advice that was some unknown grief—"Why art thou, the king's son, gone out from the king's presence?—and, when he had wormed it out, he gave him the fatal advice for enjoining his sister Tamar (ver. 5, 6).
and grasped. The king lifted him up to the edge of the chariot, apparently that he might whisper his secret into his ear, and said, "Come with me, and see my zeal for Jehovah. It was the first indication of Jehu's design. Now the king, the chief of Baal, was a representative that the stern zealot would be a fit conductor. Having intrusted him with the secret, he (Sept.) or his attendant (Heb. and A.V.) caused Jehonadab to proceed with him to Samaria in the royal chariot. Jehonadab was evidently held in great respect among the Israelites generally; and Jehu was alive to the importance of obtaining the countenance and sanction of such a man to his proceedings; and as it is expressly said that Jehonadab went out to meet Jehu, it seems probable that the people of Samaria, alarmed at the menacing letter which they had received from Jehu, had induced Jehonadab to go to meet and appease him on the road. His venerated character, his rank as the head of a tribe, and his neutral position, well qualified him for this mission; and it was quite as much the interest of Jehonadab to conciliate the new dynasty, in whose founder he beheld the minister of the divine decrees, as it was that of Jehu to obtain his occurrence and support in proceedings which he could not but know were likely to render him odious to the people. So completely had the worship of Baal become the national religion, that even Jehonadab was able to conceal his purpose under the mask of conformity. Nor could he act in this kingly spirit of Jehu hypothetically but the only occasion on which he is expressly mentioned is when (probably from his previous knowledge of the secret worshippers of Jehovah) he went with Jehu through the temple of Baal to turn out any that there might happen to be in the mass of pagan worshippers (2 Kings xii. 23). See Jezeu.

Jehon'athan (Heb. יְהוֹנָתָן, יְהוֹנָתָן, יְהוֹנָתָן; Sept. יְהוֹנָתָן), the full form of the name of four men.

1. The oldest son of king Saul (1 Sam. xiv. 6, 8, 21; xviii. 1, 3, 4; xix. 2, 4, 6, 7; xx throughout, and all later passages except 1 Chron. x. 2, in all which the A.V. has "Jonathan" [q.v., as the Hebrew likewise elsewhere has].

2. Son of Uzziah, and superintendent of certain of David's storehouses ("םוֹזָה", the word rendered "treasures" earlier in the verse, and in 27, 28 "cellars") (1 Chron. xxvii. 25). B.C. 1014.

3. One of the Levites who were sent by Jehoshaphat through the cities of Judah, with a book of the Law, to teach the people (2 Chron. xxvii. 8). B.C. 810.

4. A priest of the high-priestly family of Shimeon (verse 6) when Joaikim was high-priest—that is, in the next generation after the return from Babylon under Zerubbabel and Joshua. B.C. post 536.

Jehoram (Heb. יְהוֹרָם, יְהוֹרָם, יְהוֹרָם; A.V. "Horam," "Joram," "Jehoram"), 2 Kings xi. 15, 17, 21; 12, also the contracted form Joram (יְדָרָם, יְדָרָם), 2 Sam. viii. 10; 2 Kings viii. 16, 21, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29; ix. 10, 14, 15, 16, 17, 22, 23, 24; xii. 18; 2 Chron. viii. 9, 10, 14, 15, 5, 6, 9, 16; xxii. 1, 5, 6, 7, 11; Sept. עֶדֶרְיָה, עֶדֶרְיָה, "Edreia"; A.V. "Joram," "Jehoram"), 2 Kings xi. 15, 17, 21; 12, also the contracted form Joram (יְדָרָם, יְדָרָם, יְדָרָם), 2 Sam. viii. 10; 2 Kings viii. 16, 21, 23, 24, 25, 28, 29; ix. 10, 14, 16, 19; xii. 15, 17, 22, 23; 1 Chron. xxiv. 10, the name of five men.

1. Son of Joa, king of Hamath, sent by his father to come to Jehu, whom he commanded to speak to the king of Shishak (2 Kings viii. 10); "He is highly spoken of in the Talmud (Berokhot, 10b.), but he did not remove the golden calves introduced by Jeroboam.) The impression on the king's mind was probably strengthened by the subsequent incident of Naaman's cure, and the temporary cessation of the inroads of the Syrians, which doubtless resulted from it (2 Kings vi.). See Naaman. Accordingly, when, a little later, again broke out between Syria and Israel, we find Elisha befriending Jehoram. The king was made acquainted by
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the prophet with the secret counsels of the king of Syria, and was thus enabled to defeat them; and, on the other hand, when Elisha had led a large band of Syrian soldiers, whom God had blinded, into the midst of Samaria, Jehoram reverentially asked him, "My father, shall I smite them?" and, at the prophet's bidding, not only forborne to kill them, but made a feast for them, and then sent them away out of his sight. This procedure was quite foreign from the Syrian invasions for the Israelites (2 Kings vii, 28). See BEN-HADAD. What happened after this to change the relations between the king and the prophet we can only conjecture. But, putting together the general life of Elisha (2 Kings iii, 1-3) with the fact of the prevalence of Baal-worship at the end of his reign (2 Kings x, 21-28), it seems probable that when the Syrian inroads ceased, and he felt less dependent upon the aid of the prophet, he relapsed into idolatry, and was rebuked by Elisha, and threatened with a return of the calamities from which he had escaped. Refusing to repent, a fresh invasion by the Syrians and a close siege of Samaria actually came to pass, according probably to the word of the prophet. Hence, when the terrible incident arose, in consequence of the famine, of a woman boiling and eating her own child, which immediately followed the siege, Elisha predicted the son of Shaphath, and determined to take away his life. The message which he sent by the messenger whom he commissioned to cut off the prophet's head, "Behold, this evil is from Jehovah, why should I wait for Jehovah any longer?" coupled with the fact of his having on several occasions received similar warnings, is not without bearing that many remonstrances and warnings, similar to those given by Jeremiah to the kings of his day, had passed between the prophet and the weak and unstable son of Ahab. The providential interposition by which both Elisha's life was saved, and the city delivered is narrated in 2 Kings vii, and Jehovah appeared to have returned to friendly feelings towards Elisha (2 Kings vii, 4). B.C. cir. 888-884. See ELISHA.

It was very soon after the above events that Elisha went to Damascus, and predicted the revolt of Hazael, and his accession to the throne of Syria in the room of Ben-hadad; and it was during Elisha's absence, probably, that the conversation between Jehoram and Gehazi, and the return of the Shunanmites from the land of the Philistines, recorded in 2 Kings viii, took place. Jehoram seems to have thought the revolution in Syria, which was immediately followed by Elisha's prediction, a good opportunity to pursue his father's favorite project of recovering Ramoth-gilead from the Syrians. He accordingly made an alliance with his nephew, Ahaziah, who had just succeeded Jehoram on the throne of Judah, and the two kings proceeded to strengthen the eastern frontier against the Syrians by fortifying Ramoth-gilead, which had fallen into Jehoram's hands, and which his father had perished in the attempt to recover from the Syrians. This strong fortress thenceforth became the head-quarters of the operations beyond the river. Hazael was scarcely settled on the throne before he took arms and marched against Ramoth, in the environs of which the Israelites sustained a defeat. Jehoram was wounded in the battle, and obliged to return to Jezebel to be healed of his wounds (2 Kings viii, 29; ix, 14, 15), leaving his army in the charge of Jehu, one of his ablest and most active generals, to hold Ramoth-gilead against Hazael. Jehu, however, in this interval was anointed king of Israel by the messenger of Elisha, and immediately he and the army under his command revolted from their allegiance to Jehoram (2 Kings ix, ix, and Jehu, hastily marching to Jezerel, surprised Jehoram, wounded and defended as he was. Jehoram, going out to meet him, fell pierced by an arrow from Jehu's bow on the very plat of ground which Ahab had wreted from Naboth the Jezerelite, thus fulfilling to the letter the prophecy of Elisha (1 Kings xxi, 21-29). B.C. 888.

See JEHU.

5. (Josephus 'I'oe~a~os, Ant. ix, 5, 1.) The eldest

son and successor of Jehoshaphat, and fifth king on the separate throne of Judah, who began to reign (alone) at the age of thirty-six years, and reigned three years, B.C. 887-884. It is indeed said in the general account (2 Chron. xxv, 5, 20; 2 Kings viii, 16) that he began to reign at the age of thirty-two, and that he reigned eight years; but the conclusions deducible from the fact that his name is mentioned in the place in which we find the name of Israel (2 Kings viii, 16), show that the reign thus stated dates back three years into the reign of his father, who from this is seen to have associated his eldest son with him in the later years of his reign, as, indeed, is expressed in that last cited passage (see Reil's 'Com., on 2 Kings i, 17; Reine, Harmon. vitae Josaphati, Jen, 1718, and Dyes, de num. amor. regni Josephi, ib.). This appears to have been on the occasion of Jehoshaphat's absence in the conflict with confederate invaders, the Moabites, Ammonites, and Edomites (2 Chron. xxvii); and must be distinguished from a still earlier co-regency (2 Kings i, 17), apparently during the allied attack upon the Syrians at Ramoth-gilead, in which Ahab lost his life. See JEHOSSHAPHAT. Jehoram's daughter Jehosheba was married to the high-priest Jehoida (q.v.). He had himself unhappily been married to Athaliah, whom he had slain before his brother Ahab. Athaliah it seems to have neutralized all the good he might have derived from the example of his father. One of the first acts of his reign was to put his six brothers to death and seize the valuable appanages which their father had in his lifetime bestowed upon them. After this we are not surprised to find him giving up the liberties of that new and strange kind—the Phcenician— which had been brought into Israel by Jezebel, and into Judah by her daughter Athaliah. For these atrocities the Lord let forth his anger against Jehoram and his kingdom. The Edomites revolted, and, according to the last cited passage (Gen. xxxvii, 40), established their permanent independence. It was as much as Jehoram could do, by a night-attack with all his forces, to extricate himself from their army, which had surrounded him. Next Lilion, the city of the priests (Josh. xxi, 13), one of the strongest fortified cities in Judah (Josh. xvi, 8), and perhaps one of those "fenced cities" (2 Chron. xxvi, 3) which Jehoshaphat had given to his other sons, renounced allegiance to Jehoram because he had forsaken Jehovah, the God of his fathers. But this seemed only to stimulate him to enforce the practice of idolatry. He was in the time of his reign the author of a writing from Elijah the prophet admonishing him of the dreadful calamities which he was bringing on himself by his wicked conduct, but even this failed to effect a reformation in Jehoram. See ELISHA. At length the Philistines on one side, and the Arameans and Cushites on the other, grew bold against a king forsaking the God, and in repeated invasions spoiled the land of all its substance; they even ravaged the royal palaces, and took away the wives and children of the king, leaving him only one son, Ahaziah. Nor was this all: Jehoram was in his last days afflicted with a frightful disease in his bowels, which, from the time it appeared to him, in describing it, appears to have been malignant dysentery in its most shocking and tormenting form (see R. Mead, Bibl. Krankh. 44; but comp. Bartholin. Med. Bibl. c. 12, G. Detharding, De morbo reg. Joram, Rostock, 1731). See JEHOSHEBA, i.e. Jehovah is blessed. A most unfortunate reign. His name appears, however, in the royal genealogy of our Saviour (Luke, "Joram, Matt. i, 8). See JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

Jehoshab'ehith (2 Chron. xxii, 11). See JEHOSHUBA.

Jehosh'aphat (Heb. Jehoshaphat), יְהוָשָׁפָט, Je
JEHOASHAPHT

lounah-judged, i. e. vindicated; Sept. ‘Iwosap, sometimes in the contracted form JOSHAPHT ([C],[C], JOS-
shaphat, 1 Chron. xi, 43; xv, 24; ’Iwosap, A. V., in the latter passage “Jehoshaphat”; N. T. ’Iwosap, ‘Josaphat,” Matt. i, 8; Josephus ’Iwosaproto), the name of six men.

1. A Mithinite, one of David’s famous body-guard (1 Chron. xi, 43; Heb. and A. V. “Josaphat.”) B.C. 1046. He was one of thenobles appointed to blow the trumpets before the ark on its removal to Jerusalem (1 Chron. xv, 24; Heb. “Josaphat”). B.C. cir. 1043.

2. Son of Ahilud, and royal chronicler (q. v.) under David and Solomon (2 Sam. viii, 16; xx, 24; 1 Kings iv, 3; 1 Chron. xviii, 15). B.C. 1041.


5. The fourth separate king of Judah (“Israel” in 2 Chron. xxii, 2, last clause, is either a transcription’s error or a general title), being son of Asa (by Azubah, the daughter of Shilhi), whom he succeeded at the age of thirty-five, and reigned twenty-five years. B.C. 912-887 (1 Kings xiv, 31; xx, 34; 2 Chron. xxii, 4, 7). He persuaded Jehoshaphat to forsake his father’s religion by marrying into the royal family of Judah and working to name his reign by fortifying his kingdom against Israel (2 Chron. xxii, i, 2); and, having thus secured himself against surprise from the quarter which gave most disturbance to him, he proceeded to cleanse the land from the idolatries and licentious monuments by which it was still tainted (1 Kings xxii, 48). Even the high places and groves which former well-disposed kings had suffered to remain were by the zeal of Jehoshaphat in a great measure destroyed (2 Chron. xxvii, 6), although not altogether (2 Chron. xx, 33). In the third year of his reign, he gathered the Levites scattered from town to town, with the book of the Law in their hands, instructing the people, and calling back their wandering affections to the religion of their fathers (2 Chron. xxvii, 7-9). The results of this fidelity to the principles of the theocracy were, that at home he enjoyed peace and substance, and abroad security and honor. His treasur-
ires were filled with the “presents” which the blessing of God upon the people, “in their basket and their store,” enabled them to bring. His renown extended into the neighboring nations, and the Philistines, as well as the adjoining Arabian tribes, paid him rich tributes in silver and gold, and the townsmen of all the towns in good condition, to erect fortresses, to organize a powerful army, and to raise his kingdom to a degree of importance and splendor which it had not enjoyed since the revolt of the ten tribes (2 Chron. xxvii, 10-19).

The weak and impious Ahaz at that time occupied the throne of Israel; and Jehoshaphat, at a time, having nothing to fear from his power, sought, or at least did not repel, an alliance with him. This is al-

ged to have been the grand mistake of his reign, and that it was such is proved by the consequences. Ahaz might be benefited by the connection, but under no cir-
cumstances could it be of service to Jehoshaphat or his kingdom, and it might, as it actually did, involve him in much disgrace and disaster, and bring bloodshed and trouble into his house. Jehoshaphat’s eldest son Jeho-
ran married Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab and Jeze-
bel. It does with priestly and Levitical encouragement that ill-starred union. The closeness of the alliance between the two kings is shown by many circumstances: Eliah’s reluctance when in exile to set foot within the territory of Judah (IIum, Und. Concii, i, § 19, p. 199;) the identity of names given to the children of the two royal families; the admission of names compounded with the name of Jehovah into the family of Jezebel, the zealotous worshipper of Baal; and the acrimony with which Jehoshaphat accompanied Ahaz to the field of battle.

Accordingly, we next find him on a visit to Ahaz in Sam-
ae, being the first time any of the kings of Israel and Judah had met in peace. He here experienced a recep-
tion worthy of his greatness; but Ahaz failed not to take advantage of the occasion, and so worked upon the weak points of his character as to prevail upon him to take arms with him against the Syrians, with whom, hitherto, the kingdom of Judah never had had any war or occasion of quarrel. However, Jehoshaphat was not so far infatuated as to proceed to the war without consulting God, who, according to the principles of the theocratic government, was the final arbiter of war and peace. The false prophets of Ahab poured forth ample promises of success, and one of them, named Zedekiah, resorting to material symbols, made him horns of iron, “for the Lord said, ‘With the hand of iron and the hand of brass will I break thee in pieces.’” Still Jec-
hosaphat was not sated; and the answer to his further inquiries extorted from him a rebuke of the reluctance which Ahab manifested to call Micah “the prophet of the Lord.” The fearless words of this prophet did not make the impression upon the king of Judah which might have been expected; or, probably, he then felt himself too deeply bound in honor to recede. He went to the fatal battle of Ramoth-gilead, and there nearly became the victim of a plan which Ahab had laid for his own safety at the expense of his too-confiding ally. He persuaded Jehoshaphat to come with him against the king of Edom, himself went disguised to the battle. This brought the heat of the contest around him, as the Syrians took him for Ahab; and, if they had not in time discovered their mistake, he would certainly have been slain (1 Kings xxii, 1-38). Ahab was killed, and the battle lost; but Jehoshaphat was saved, and he and his army returned to Jerusalem (2 Chron. xviii, 1-14). B.C. 895. See Ahab.

On his return from this imprudent expedition he was met by the just reproaches of the prophet Jeshu (2 Chron. xix, 1-8). The best atonement he could make for this error was by the continued loyalty he showed to the Law. He resumed his labors in the further extirpation of idolatry, in the instruction of the people, and the improve-
ment of his realm. He now made a tour of his kingdom in person, “from Beerseba to Mount Ephraim,” that he might see the ordinances of God duly established, and witness the due execution of his intentions respecting the instruction of the people in the divine law. This tour enabled him to discern many defects in the local administration of justice, which he then applied him-
sely to remedy (see Selden, De Synedrii, ii, ch. 8, § 4). He appointed magistrates in every city for the deter-
mination of all cases of civil and personal injury, and the pun-
ture of the abuses to which the administration of justice was in those days exposed may be gathered from his excellent charge to them: “Take heed what ye do, for ye judge not for man, but for the Lord, who is with you in the judgment. Wherefore now, take heed to your souls, that ye take not the Lord’s name in vain; and iniquity with the Lord our God, nor respect of persons, nor taking of gifts.” Then he established a supreme council of justice at Jerusalem, composed of priests, Levites, and “the chiefs of the fathers,” to which difficult cases were referred, and appeals brought from the provin-
cial tribunals. This tribunal also was inducted by a weighty but short charge from the king, whose conduct in this and other matters places him at the very head of the monarchs who reigned over Judah as a separate kingdom (2 Chron. xix, 1-41).

The activity of Jehoshaphat’s mind was next turned towards the revival of that maritime commerce which had been established by Solomon. The land of Edom and the ports of the Elanitic Gulf were still under the power of Judah, and in them the king prepared a fleet for the voyage to Ophir. Unhappily, however, he yielded to the wish of the king of Israel that he should accompany him to take part in the enterprise. For this the expedi-
tion was doomed of God, and the vessels were wrecked almost as soon as they quitted port. Instructed by Eli-
zer, the prophet, as to the cause of this disaster, Je-
oshaphat had no scruples, his confidence in him during this time declined the co-operation of the king of Israel, the voy-
age prospered. The trade, however, was not prosecuted.
with any zeal, and was soon abandoned (2 Chron. xx, 53-37; 1 Kings xxii, 48, 49). B.C. 895. See Commerce.

After the death of Ahaziah, king of Israel, Jehoram, his son-in-law, persuaded Jehoshaphat to join him in an expedition against Moab. B.C. ciri. 891. This alliance was, however, on political grounds, more excusable than the two former, as the Moabites, who were under tribute to Israel, might draw into their cause the Edomites, who were tributary to Judah. Besides, Moab could be invaded more safely from the south, round him, the end of the Dead Sea; and the king of Israel could not gain access to them in that quarter but by marching through the territories of Jehoshaphat. The latter not only joined Jehoram with his own army, but required his submission, the king of Edom, to bring his forces into the field. During the seven days, so that the wilderness of Edom the army suffered much from want of water, and by the time the allies came in sight of the army of Moab they were ready to perish from thirst. In this emergency, the pious Jehoshaphat thought, as usual, of consulting God; so hearing that the prophet Elisha was in the camp, the three kings proceeded to his tent. For the sake of Jehoshaphat, and for his sake only, deliverance was promised, and it came during the ensuing night in the shape of an abundant supply of water, which rolled down the exhausted cisterns and pools and hollows. Afterwards Jehoshaphat took his full part in the operations of the campaign till the armies were induced to withdraw in horror by witnessing the dreadful act of Mesha, king of Moab, in offering up his eldest son in sacrifice upon the wall of the town in which he was shut up (2 Kings xxii, 4-37; see Jehoshaphat).

This war kindled another much more dangerous to Jehoshaphat. The Moabites, being highly exasperated at the part he took against them, turned all their wrath upon him. They induced their kindred, the Ammonites and the Arabians, the sons of Lot, to assist them, and even drew over the Edomites and other portions of the neighboring nations to join them against the united forces of the Edomites and the neighbors of Edom. This great enterprise, the allied forces of Judah, and the army of Edom and Moab encamped at Gigedah, near the western border of the Dead Sea. In this extremity Jehoshaphat felt that his days were numbered, and the God with whom he had been associated so long in his career. Jehoshaphat now restitutes the whole of the neighboring nations, and the alliance of all the powerful powers of the earth led to the formation of an alliance of the Edomites and Moabites, which ended in the death of the king. The army of Jehoshaphat, as a result, was compelled to retreat; and the allies, on receiving intelligence of the defeat of their army, were driven to look elsewhere for a means of resistance. The allies, not being able to make an effective resistance, were defeated and the army of Jehoshaphat was left in possession of the country.


JEHOSHEPAPHAT, VALLEY OF (Yehoshaphat, Valley of), a valley of great extent, in the north of Judah, near the Dead Sea. The passage is one of great boldness, amounting to the verbal turns in which Hebrew poetry is so much delighted; and, in particular, there is a play between the names given to the spot—Jehoshaphat, i.e. 'Jehovah's judgment'—and the 'judgment' also there to be pronounced. The Hebrew prophets often refer to the ancient glories of their nation: thus Isaiah speaks of the "day of Midian," and of Jehoshaphat the "day of Midian," and of the triumphs of David and Solomon (in "Mount Perazim" and in "the Valley of Gibeon," and in like manner Joel, in announcing the vengeance of God on the strangers who invaded his country, iii, 14), seems to have glanced back to that triumphant day when king Jehoshaphat—the greatest king the nation had seen since Solomon, and the greatest champion of Jehovah—led out his people to a valley in the wilderness of Tekoa, and there blessed with such a victory over the hordes of his enemies as was without a parallel in the national records (2 Chron. xx. xx. xvi.; see J. E. Gerhardt, Dissert, v. d. Citation Ins Thal Jona.

But, though such a reference to Jehoshaphat is both natural and characteristic, it is not certain that it is intended. The word may be only a reference to a passage which was by this structure, as already mentioned, a favorite place of the prophet. Such was the view of one of the ancient translators, thus Theodotion renders it γήγα ρας νως, and so the Targum of Jonathas:—"the plain of the division of judgment." Michaelis (Bibl. für Urges. lehre, Rev. bibl.) seems to have taken the place of the place of the judgment. It is considered as a prediction of the Maccabean victories. By others, however, the prophet has been supposed to have had the end of the world in view (see Henderson, KelI, etc., ad loc.).

The name "Valley of Jehoshaphat" generally signifies el-Jôs, near Tekoa, for Jôsafoth, also el-Beit el-Shaaf or Faraun, In modern times, is attached to the deep ravine which separates Jerusalem from the Mount of Olives, through which at one time the Kedron forced
its stream. At what period the name was first applied to this spot is not known. There is no trace of it in the Bible or in Josephus. In both the only name used for it is the N. T. C. Kidron. We first encounter its new title in the middle of the 4th century, in the Onomasticon of Eusebius and Jerome (s. v. Colos), and in the commentary of the latter father on Joel. Since that time the name has been recognised and adopted by travellers of all ages and all faiths. It is used by Christians—as Arculf, in 700 (Early Travels, p. 4)—and by Jews, as Benjamin of Tudela, about 1170 (Asher, i, 71; see Roland, Palestine, p. 556). By the Moslems it is still said to be called by the traditional name (Seetzen, ii, 28, 26), though the name generally given to the valley is that of Sittit or Sittit-Margam. Both Moslems and Jews believe that the last judgment is to take place there. To find a grave there is a frequent wish of the latter (Briggs, Heathen and Holy Lands, p. 290), and the former show—as they have shown for certainly two centuries—the place on which Mohammed is to be seated at the last judgment: a stone jutting out from the east wall of the Haram area, near the south corner—one of the pillars which once adorned the churches of Helena or Justinian, and of which multitudes are now imbedded in the rude massery of the more modern walls of Jerusalem. This stone is called et-Tur in Arabic, and is robed by the Moslems (Saucy, Voyage, i, 199). From it will spring the bridge of As-Sirat, the crossing of which is to test the true believers. Those who cannot stand the test will drop off into the abyss of Gehenna, in the depths of the valley (Ali Bey, p. 224, 5; Mejri ed-Din in Robinson's Researches, i, 269). The steep sides of the ravine, wherever a level strip affords the opportunity, are crowded—in places almost paved—by the sepulchres of the Moslems, or the smaller slabs of the Jewish tombs, alike awaiting the assembly of the last judgment. (For a full description of the valley, see Robinson, Biblical Researches, i, 944, 950, 956-958, 996-402; ii, 246.)

So narrow and precipitous a gien is quite unsuited to the Biblical event, but this inconsistency does not appear to have disturbed those who framed or those who hold the tradition. It is, however, implied in the Heb. terms employed in the two cases. That by Joel is emek (מֵעֵק), a word applied to spacious valleys such as those of Edom (Ezek. xvi. 12), Syria (Stanley, ix, xxiv), and Arabia (Appendix § 1). On the other hand, the ravine of the Kidron is invariably designated by nakhal (נהחק), answering to the modern Arabic wady. There is no instance in the O. T. of these two terms being convertible, and this fact alone would warrant the inference that the tradition of the identity of the emek of Jehoshaphat and the nakhal Kidron did not arise until Hebrew had begun to become a dead language. The grounds on which it did arise are probably these:

1. The frequent mention throughout this passage of Joel of Mount Zion, Jerusalem, and the Temple (ii, 92; iii, i, 6, 16, 17, 18) may have led to the belief that the locality of the great judgment would be in the immediate vicinity, and would be assisted by the mention of the Mount of Olives in the somewhat similar passage in Zechariah (xviii, 4, 5).

2. The belief that Christ would reappear in judgment on the Mount of Olives, from which he had ascended. This was at one time a received article of Christian belief—such a pilgrimage would be assisted by the mention of the Mount of Olives in the somewhat similar passage in Zechariah (xviii, 4, 5).

3. There is the alternative that the valley of Jehoshaphat itself is Cumaicus name of the valley of the Kidron, and that, from the name, the connection with Joel's prophecy and the belief in its being the scene of Jehovah's last judgment have followed. This may be so, but then we should expect to find some trace of the existence of the name before the fourth century after Christ, which is not the case. It may have been applied as early as the reign of Josiah (2 Kings xxi. 16), but so interference can fairly be drawn from this.

But whatever originated the tradition, it has held its ground most firmly, as is evinced by several local circumstances. (a) In the valley itself, one of the four remarkable monuments which exist at the foot of Olives is so at a very early date connected with Jehoshaphat. At Arculf's visit (about 700) the name appears to have been borne by that now called "Abalam's tomb," but then the "tower of Jehoshaphat" (Early Travels, p. 4). In the time of Maundrell, the "tomb of Jehoshaphat" is mentioned in the context of the rock behind "Abalam's tomb." A tolerable view of this is given in plate 33 of Munk's Palestine; and a photograph by Salzmann, in a description, in the Texte (p. 31) to the same. The name may, as already observed, really point to Jehoshaphat—"a man of peace," who is described, like the other kings, in the city of David (2 Chron. xxii. 1).

See ABALAM'S TOMB. (b) One of the gateways of the city in the east wall, opening on the valley, bore the same name. This is plain from the Cité de Jérusalem, where it is said to have been called a "postern" close to the golden gate-way (Portz Octo), and to the south of that gate (pars deversa, § 4). It was, therefore, at or near the small walled-up door-way, to which M. de Saucy has restored the name of the Po- terne de Josaphat, and which is but a few feet to the south of the modern gate-way. Hence it may be this "postern" is evidently of later date than the wall in which it occurs, as some of the enormous stones of the wall have been cut through to admit it, and so far, therefore, it is a witness to the date of the tradition being subsequent to the time of Herod, by whom this wall was built. It is probably the "with an arrow leading down by steps to the valley" of which Arculf speaks. Benjamin of Tudela (1163) also mentions the gate of Jehoshaphat, but without any nearer indication of its position than that it led to the valley and the monuments (Asher, i, 71). (c) Lastly, leading to this gate was a street called the street of Jehoshaphat (Cité de Jérusalem, § 7).

If the "king's dale" (or valley of Shaveh) of Gen. xiv, 17, and of 2 Sam. xviii, 18, be the same, and if the commonly received location of them be correct, then we have the valley of Jehoshaphat identified with that of Melchizedek, and its history carries us back to Salem's earliest days. But at what time it became a cemetery we are not informed. See Shaveh.

Cyril, in the 4th century, mentions it in a way which indicates that in his day tradition had altered, or that the valley had become more attached to a wider sweep of country than now, for he speaks of it as some furlongs east of Jerusalem—as bare, and fitted for equestrian exercises (Reland, Palestine, p. 355). Some old travellers say that it was "three miles in length, reaching from the vale of Jehoshaphat to a place without the city which they call Bethel" (Angelus, Hist. saev. Gent. Europaeorum in ivium). Some of the old travellers—such as Felix Fabri, in the 16th century—call it Celc, from the Kolla of Eusebius and the Coelas of Jerome; and they call that part of the Kidron which is connected with it Cramites, or Krizana, a place of judgment (Evag. i, 371). We may add that some old writers extend this valley considerably upwards, placing Gethsemane and the traditional station of the Virgin in it. They seem to have divided the Kidron bed into
two parts: the lower, called the valley of Siloam or Siloam; the upper, the valley of Jehoshaphat, from which the eastern gate of the city in early times was called, not, as now, St. Stephen's, but "the gate of the valley of Jehoshaphat."

The present valley of Jehoshaphat occupies the Kidron hollow and the adjoining acclivities on both sides. Its limits have not been defined, but it is supposed to begin a little above the fountain of the Virgin (Um ed-Deraj), and to extend to the bend of the Kidron, under Scopus. The acclivity to the eastern wall of Jerusalem is—at least towards the top—a Turkish burying-ground; and the white tombs, with the Koran (in stone) at the one end, and a turban at the other, look picturesque as they dot for several hundred yards the upper part of the slope. The other acclivity, ascending the steep between Olivet and the Mount of Corruption, is crowded all over with flat Jewish tombs, each with the Hebrew inscription, and speckled here and there with bushy olive-trees. Thus Moslems and Jews occupy the valley of Jehoshaphat between them, with their dead looking across the Kidron into each other's faces, and laid there in the common belief that it was no ordinary privilege to die in Jerusalem and be buried in such a spot. The valley of the present day presents nothing remarkable. It is rough to the feet and barren to the eye. It is still, moreover, frequently a solitude, with nothing to break the loneliness but perhaps a passing shepherd with a few sheep, or a traveller on his way to Aniata, or some inhabitant of Silwan or Bethany going into the city by the gate of St. Stephen. Tombs, and olives, and rough, verdureless slopes are all that meet the eye on either side. See JERUSALEM.

Jehoshaphah (Heb. יְהוֹשָׁפָּח, Yehohshaphat; Septuag. Ἰωσσαθαί, Josephus Ἰωσσαθαί), the daughter of Jehoram, sister of Ahaziah, and aunt of Joash, kings of Judah. The last of these owed his life to her, and his crown to her husband, the high-priest Jehoiada (2 Kings xi, 2). In the parallel passage (2 Chron. xxiii, 11) the name is written Jehoshareath (יהוֹשָׁחֵר, Yehoshareath; Sept. Ἰωσσαθαί). B.C. 882.

See JEHOSHAH. Her name thus exactly corresponds in meaning to that of the only two other wives of Jewish priests who are known to us, viz. Elisabeth, the wife of Aaron (Exod. vi, 23), and Elisabeth, the wife of Zechariah (Luke i, 7). As she is called (2 Kings xi, 2) "the daughter of Joram, sister of Ahaziah," it has been conjuncted that she was the daughter, not of Athaliah, but of Joram by another wife (comp. Josephus, Ant. ix, 7, 1, ὄργια ὥμοστάρας ἀδελφὰς. She is the only recorded instance of the marriage of a princess of the royal house with a high-priest. On this occasion it was a providential circumstance—"for she was the sister of Ahaziah" (2 Chron. xxiii, 11)—as inducing and probably enabling her to rescue the infant Jehoshaf from the massacre of his brothers. By her he and his nurse were concealed in the palace, and afterwards in the Temple (2 Kings xi, 3, 23; 2 Chron. xxiii, 11), where she was brought up probably with her sons (2 Chron. xxiii, 11), who assisted at his coronation. One of these was Zechariah, who succeeded her husband in his office, and was afterwards murdered (2 Chron. xxiv, 20).—Smith. Needless doubt has been thrown upon her marriage with Jehoiada (Nehman, Hebrew Monatshefte, iii, p. 196), which is not expressly mentioned in Kings, as "a fiction of the chronicler to glorify his greatness." This, however, is certainly assumed in 2 Kings xi, 3, and is accepted by Ewald (Geschichte, iii, 575) as perfectly authentic. See JEROBOAM.

Jehosh'ua (Numb. xiii, 16), or Jehosh'ua'h (1 Chron. vii, 27). See JOSUA.

Jeho'vah (יְהוֹוָה, Yehowah', Sept. usually ב כֹּהָנִים, Author. Vers. usually "the Lord"), the name by which God was pleased to make himself known, under the covenant, to the ancient Hebrews (Exod. vi, 2, 3), although it was doubtless in use among the patriarchs, as it occurs even in the historical creation (Gen. ii, 4). The theory of Schwidt (Semitische Denkm. 1792), that the record is of later origin than the Mosaic age, is based upon the false assumption that the Hebrews had previously been polytheistic. See GENESIS; GOD.

I. Modern Pronunciation of the Name.—Although ever since the time of Galatinus, a writer of the 16th century (De arcanis catholice rerissit, lib. i) —not, as according to others, since Raymund Martin (see Gesenius. Lex. p. 383)—it has been almost universal custom to pronounce the name יְהוָה (in those copies where it is furnished with vowels), Jehovah, yet, at the present day, most scholars agree that this pointing is not that of the original and genuine one, but that these vowels are derived from those of אָדָם, Adoni. For the later Hebrews, even before the time of the Sept. version, either following some old superstition (compare Herod. ii, 86; Cicero, De nat. deor. iii, 56) or deceived by a false interpretation of a certain Mosaic precept (Lev. xxiv, 16), have always regarded this name as too sacred even to be pronounced (Philo, De cts. Mos. iii, 519, 529, ed. Colon.; Joseph. Ant. ii, 12, 4; Talmud, Sanhed. ii, 90; a; Maimonides in Jadh. Chaikura, iv, 10; also in More Nibadh in, i, 61; Theodoret, Quest. 13 in Exod.; Eusebius, Prep. Evangel. ii, 305). Wherever, therefore, this inefltable name is read in the sacred books, they pronounced יְהוָה, "Adoni," Lord, in its stead; and hence, when the Masoretic text came to be supplied with the vowels, the four letters יְהוָה were pointed with the vowels of this word, the initial ו taking, as usual, a simple instead of a compound Sheva. This derivation of the vowels is evident from the peculiar position in the prefix, and from the use of the Dagesh, after it, in both which particulars it exactly imitates the peculiarities of יְהוָה, and likewise from the varied pointing when following יְהוָה, in which case it is written יְהוָה and pronounced פֶּלֶךְ, "Elohim," God, the vowels of which it then borrows, to prevent the repetition of the sound Adoni. That a similar law or notion prevailed even before the Christian era may be inferred from the fact that the Septuag. renders יְהוָה by ב כֹּהָנִים, like יְהוָה;
and even the Samaritans observed the same custom, for they used to pronounce Jehovah by the word יְהוָה, Shíma, i. e. THE NAME (Reland, De Samaritaniis, p. 12; Hunt-ington, Letters, p. 38). (See, on this subject generally, Ha-dr. Reland, Decres excommunication philoi de vera pron. nonnàmis Jehova [Traj. ad Rhen. 1707].)

It seems to Moses neo-Ethiopic, the ancient name of the Hebrew Divinity (More Nechochim, i. 62) gives an obscure account of the traditional and secret method of teaching its true pronunciation to the priests, but avers that it was unknown from its form. Many adduce the statements of Greek writers, as well profane as Church fathers, that the deity of the Hebrews was called Jao, Jao, Jao, Jao, Jao. Theophrastus Theodore alone adding that the Samaritan pronunciation was IABE (Diod. Sic. i. 94; Forpyhry in Eusebius, Prep. Ev. x. 11; Tsattzes, Chilaid. vii, 126; Hesychius often; Clemens Alex. Strom. v, p. 668, Oxon. Orig. in Dan. vol. ii, p. 45; Ireneaus, Hares. ii, 66; Jerome, in Ps. xxi; Theoret. Quest, 15 in Exod.; Epiphanius, Hær. xx). The Gnostics classed Iaoew as the Hebrew divinity, among their sacred emanations (Ireneaus, i. 54; Epiph. Harr. 26), along with several of his appellations (see Mather, Histoire du Gnosticisme, tab. 8-10; Beller-mann, Ueber den Arianschen Glauben der Abessinen, Abschilde, fasc. i, ii, Berlin, 1817, 1818); and that famous oracle of Apollo, quoted by Macrobius (Sat. i, 18), ascribing this name (Iaoew) to the sun, appears to have been of Gnostic origin (Jahizonski, Paedag. Αἰγυπτ. i, 250 sq.).

Perhaps many recent writers have followed the opinion of those who think that the word in question was originally pronounced רְחֵל, Yahveh, corresponding to the Greek Iaoew. But this view, as well as that which maintains the correctness of the common pronunciation רְחֵל (Michaelis, Suppl. p. 524; Meyer, Blätter für höhere Wahrheit, xi, p. 306), is opposed to the fact that verbs of the class (יְהָשָׁנ) from which this word appears to be derived do not admit such a pointing (Cholem) with their second radical. Moreover, the simple letters רְחֵל would naturally be pronounced Jao by a Greek without any special pointing. Those, therefore, appear to have the best reason who prefer the pointing רְחֵל, Yahveh (not רְחֵל, Yahveh; for the first י being a wawpide-handshapes, e. g. in the Hebrew δ, does not take the compound Shewa), as being at once agreeable to the laws of Hebrew vocalization, and a form from which all the Greek modes of writing (including the Samaritan, as cited by Theophrastus) may naturally have sprung (יְהָשָׁנ = יְהָשָׁנ as a "matter lectionis," and יְהָשָׁנ being silent; thus leaving י as the representative of the first vowel). From this, too, the ascopated forms רְחֵל and יְげる may most readily be derived; and it is further corroborated by the etymology. Ewald was the first who used in all his writings, especially in his translations from the O-T. Scriptures, the form יְהָשָׁנ, although in his youth he had taken ground in favor of Jehovah (comp. his Ueber d. Composition der Genese, Brunswick, 1822). Another defender of יְהָשָׁנ was Hengstenberg (Beiträge zur Einlei, ins A. T. Berlin, 1881-38, vol. ii). Strongest in defence of Jehovah is, among prominent German theologians, Höflmann, Bibelstudien (Leipzig, 1859-60), vol. i.

IIII. Proper Signification of the Term.—A clew to the real import of this name appears to be designedly furnished in the passage where it is most distinctively ascribed to the God of the Hebrews, Exod. iii, 14: "And God said unto Moses, I am that I am" (וְיִהוָה יִהוָה וְיִהוָה יִהוָה; and he said, Thus shalt thou say to the children of Israel, The I shall not send thee to you) (where the Sept. and later versions attempt to render the spirit of the Hebrew יִהוָה יִהוָה by אָלֹהִים, the Venetian Greek barbarously ὅ τοῦτο, Vulg. qui sum, A. Vers. "I am"). Here the Almighty makes known his unchangeable character, implied in his eternal self-existence, as the ground of confidence for the oppressed Israelites to trust in his promises of deliverance and care respecting them. The same idea is elsewhere alluded to in the Exod. xx, 15; Is. xxxiii, 6; Mal. iii, 6 (where Jehovah is change not); Hos. xii, 6, "Jehovah is his memento." The same attribute is referred to in the description of the divine Redeemer in the Apocalypse (Rev. i, 4, 8, ὅ νη καὶ ἔν η καὶ ὅ ἄρμος; a phrase used indeclinably, with designed identification with Jehovah, see Stuart, Commentaries, loc. cit., with which has been aptly compared the famous inscription on the Saitic temple of Isis (Εὐρυί ς τό γεγονος καὶ ήν καὶ ἐσθομον, Plutarch, De Isid. et Osir. 9), and various parallel titles of heathen mythology, especially among Eastern nations. Those, however, who compare the Greek and Roman deities, Jupiter, Jove, Osiris, etc., or who seek an Egyptian origin for the name, are entirely in error (see Tholuck's treatise transl. in the Bibl. Repos. 1884, p. 89 sq.; Hengstenberg, Genesimia of the Pentateuch, i, 218; for other Shemitic etymologies, see First, a. v.). Nor are those (as A. M. Whorton, in the Bibliotheca Sacra, Jan. 1857, who appears to have borrowed his idea from the Journ. of Succ. Lit. Jan. 1854, p. 398 sq.; see Tyler, Jehovah the Redeemer, Lond. 1861) entirely correct (see Furtmü. Heb. Wörterb., a. v.) who regard רְחֵל as יְהָשָׁנ, and this as the actual fut. Kal of the verb יְהָשָׁנ יְהָשָׁנ, and so render it directly shall be, i.e. He shall be; for the form, if a verb at all, would be in the Hiphil (see koppe ad Exod. loc.), in Pottii Syii. iv, p. 59; Bohlen, nd Gen., 103; Yatke, Theol. Bibl. p. 671) and would signify he that shall come to be, i.e. the Creator; for the real fut. Kal is יְהָשָׁנ יְהָשָׁנ, Yikh, frequently occurs. It is rather a denominative, i.e. noun or adj., formed by the prepositive 5 prefixed to the verb-root, and pointed like יְהָשָׁנ and other nouns of similar formation (Nordheim's Heb. Gram. p. 512; Lee's Heb. Gram. p. 159). The word will thus signify the Existent, and designate one of the most important attributes of Deity, one that appears to include all other essential ideas.

IV. Application of the Title.—The supreme Deity and national God of the Hebrews is called in the O. T. by his own name Jehovah, and by the appellative Elohim, i. e. God, either promiscuously, or so that one or the other predominate according to the nature of the context or the custom of the writer. Jehovah Elohim, commonly the title of the "Lord God," is predominate, and not, as some would have it, Jehovah of gods, i. e. chief or prince of gods. This is the customary appellation of Jehovah in Gen. ii and iii; Exod. ix, 30, etc. Far more frequent is the compounded form when followed by a genitive, as "Jehovah God of Israel" (Josh. vii, 13; viii, 30); "Jehovah God of thy fathers" (Deut. i, 21; vi, 3); "Jehovah God, thy God" (Deut. i, 31; ii, 7); "Jehovah of hosts," i. e. of the celestial armies. See Host.

It will be evident to the attentive reader that the term Lord, so frequently applied to Christ in the N. T., is analogous to the usage with Jehovah in the O. T. As Christ is called "The Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the ending, which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty;" and also, "of him it is said, Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, to-day, and forever;" he must be Jehovah, the eternally existing and supreme God (Acts ii, 25-27; Hebr. i, 13, 10; 1 Pet. ii, 22; 3: 8; Rev. i, 4, 8). See LOGOS. Jan (גָּם, Yah, Sept. קָנָה, Auth. Vers."Lord," except in Ps. lxviii, 4) is a poetic form abbreviated from Jehovah, or perhaps from the more ancient pronunciation Jaoeh. It is chiefly employed in certain customary formulas or refrains (as a proper title in Ps. lxxxix, 9; xcv, 7, 12; Isa. xxxvii, 11; Exod. xxxiv, 6; Hos. ii, 1; Mal. iii, 6; Isa. xxvi, 4). This, as well as a modification of Jehovah, frequently occurs in proper names. See HAL-LELUJAH.
It should be remembered that the Hebrew name Jehovah is generally rendered, in the English version, by the word Lord (sometimes God), and printed in small capitals, to distinguish it from the rendering of ḫēḇēḇāh and Kūḇañę́r by the same word; it is rendered "Jehovah" only in Exod. vi, 3; Psal. xlviii, 18; Isa. xii, 2; xxvi, 4, and in the compound proper names following.

VI. Literature.—For a full discussion of the questions connected with this sacred name, see, in addition to the above-cited works, Gataker, De Nomo, Dei tetragram., in his Opp. Crit. (Traj. ad Rhein. 1698); Meier, Lectio nomen tetragram. exam. (Viterbo, 1729); Capellius, Or. de nom. Jehovah, in his Critica Sacra p. 690; Crusius, Comment. de nominiis tetragram. signis. (Leipz. 1734); Fischer, ed. (Tub. 1771); Jahn, De Nomo (Wittenb. 1755); Rafael ben-David, יְהוָה יְיָה (Venice, 1669); Reineccius, De nomen (Leizp. 1695—6); Snouhabik, id. (Wittenb. 1621); Stephani, id. (Leizp. 1677); Sulzbach, De Jehovah (Strasburg, 1643); Volkmann, De nominibus diviniis (Wittenb. 1679); Köchler, De pronuntiatione et pronunziatione (Erlangen, 1867); Kurtz, Hist. of the Old Covenant, i, 18 sqq.; ii, 98, 215. See ELOHIM.

Jeho'va-h-i'rah (Hebrew Jehovah ' Yireh', יְהוָה יִרְאֵה), Jehovah will see, i.e. provide; Sept. Κύριος ἀνέρ, Vulg. Dóminus videt, provides the symbolic title conferred upon the altar erected upon the hill where his uplifted hands in prayer had caused Israel to prevail, stated in the text to have been intended as a memento of God's power to exterminate the Amalekites (Exod. xvii, 15). See RPHRHIM. The phraseology in the original is peculiar: "For [the] hand [is] on [the] throne (2 Ch. 7, read 2 Ch., banner of Jah), which the A. V. glosses, "Because the Lord hath sworn," q. d. lifted up his hand. See ŠAH; HAND. The significance of the name is probably contained in the allusion to the staff which Moses held in his hand as a banner during the engagement, and the raising or lowering of which turned the fortune of battle in favor of the Israelites and against their enemies. God is thus recognized in the memorial-altar as the deliverer of his people, who leads them to victory, and is their rallying-point in time of peril. On the figurative use of 'banner,' see Psal. lx, 4; Isa. xi, 10. See BANNER.

Jeho'va-ha'shā'lam (Hebrew Jehovah ' Shā'am, יְהוָה שָׁם), Jehovah gives peace, i.e. prosperity; Sept. Κύριος πάντων, Vulgate Dominus pacem, the appellation given by God to his enemies. God is thus recognized in the memorial-altar as the deliverer of his people, who leads them to victory, and is their rallying-point in time of peril. On the figurative use of 'banner,' see Psal. lx, 4; Isa. xi, 10. See BANNER.

Jeho'va-ha'sham'mah (Hebrew Jehovah ' Sham'mah, יְהוָה שָׁם), Jehovah is there; Sept. Κύριος εἰς τὴν ήλεγχον, Vulg. Dominus est in eis, Author. Ver. "The Lord is there," the symbolic title conferred upon the altar erected upon the mountain where the divine angel appeared to him and wrought the miracles which confirmed his mission; in commemoration of the success thus betokened to him (" Peace be unto thee"); stated to have been extant at a late day in Ophrah (Judg. vi. 24). See CRĪCĪA Sacrīs, ii, 949; Bathshez, De Altari Gēdōmīs, Cyprii, 1746.) See EON.
JEHU 812

1. Son of Obad and father of Azariah, of the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 88). B.C. post. 1012.

2. An Antiochite, one of the Benjamite slingers that joined David's band at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 3). B.C. 1055.

3. The son of Hanani, a prophet (Josephus 'Ippic, Ant. viii, 12, 3) of Judah, but whose ministries were chiefly directed to Israel. His father was probably the seer who suffered for having rebuked Asa (2 Chron. xvi, 7). He must have begun his career as a prophet when very young. He first denounced upon Baasha, king of Israel, and the same solemn warning which had already been executed upon the house of Jeroboam (1 Kings xvi, 1, 7); a sentence which was literally fulfilled (ver. 12). The same prophet, was, many years after, commissioned to reprove Jehoshaphat for his dangerous alliance with the house of Ahab (2 Chron. xix, 2). He appears to have been the public chronicler during the entire reign of Jehoshaphat, and a volume of his records is expressly referred to (2 Chron. xx, 34), B.C. 928-886.

4. The eleventh king of the separate throne of Israel (Josephus 'Ippic, Ant. viii, 13, 7), and founder of its fourth dynasty; he reigned twenty-eight years, B.C. 883-855 (2 Kings ix, x; 2 Chron. xxii, 7-9). His history was told in the lost "Chronicles of the Kings of Israel" (2 Kings x, 34). His father's name was Jehoshaphat (2 Kings ix, 2); his grandfather's (which, as before, he took up to his own name) then, and forever after, was Nimshi. In his youth he had been one of the guards of Ahah. His first appearance in history is when, with a comrade in arms, Bidkar, or Bar-Dakar (Ephraem Syrus, Opp. iv, 540), he rode (either in a separate chariot, Sept., or on the same seat, Josephus behind Ahah, and the making out of the same story) from Damascus to Jezeel, and heard, and laid up in his heart, the warning of Elijah against the murder of Naboth (2 Kings ix, 25). But he had already, as it would seem, been known to Elijah as a youth of promise, and, accordingly, in the vision at Horeb he is mentioned as the future king of Israel, whom Elijah is to anoint as the minister of vengeance on Israel (1 Kings xix, 16, 17). This injunction, for reasons unknown to us, Elijah never fulfilled. It was reserved long afterwards for his successor Elisha. See AHAB.

5. Meanwhile, in the reigns of Ahaziah and Jehoram, had risen to importance. The same activity and vehemence which had fitted him for his earlier distinctions still continued, and he was known far and wide as a charioteer whose rapid driving, as if of a madman (2 Kings ix, 21), could be distinguished even from a distance, and on the next day, when he had held a command in the Israelitish army posted at Ramoth-gilead to hold in check the Syrians, who of late years had made strenuous efforts to extend their frontier to the Jordan, and had possessed themselves of much of the territory of the Isrealites east of that river. The contest was, in fact, still carried on which had begun many years before in the reign of Ahah and Jeoram's father, who had lost his life in battle before this very Ramoth-gilead. Ahaziah, king of Judah, had taken part with Jehoram, king of Israel, in this war; and as the latter had been wounded in a recent action, and had gone to Jezreel to be healed of his wounds, Ahaziah had also gone thither on a visit of sympathy to him (2 Kings vii, 28, 29). B.C. 883. According to Ephraem Syrus (who omits the words "saith the Lord" in 2 Kings ix, 26, and makes "I" refer to Jehu), he had, in a dream, seen the tents, and called forth Jehu, Nabal, and his sons (Ephr. Syr. Opp. iv, 540). In this state of affairs, a council of war was held among the military commanders in camp, when, very unexpectedly, a youth of wild appearance (2 Kings ix, 11), known by his garb to be one of the disciples of the prophets, appeared at the door of the tent, and called forth Jehu, Nabal, and his sons, and bid them that he had a message to deliver to him (2 Kings ix, 1-5). They retired into a secret chamber. The youth uncovered a vial of the sacred oil (Josephus, Ant. ix, 6, 1) which he had brought with him, poured it over Jehu's head, and after announcing to him the message from Elisha, that he was appointed to be king of Israel and destroyer of the house of Ahab, rushed out of the house and fled. (2 Kings ix, 7). As Jehu was of humble origin, and had not been trained to a public profession in which he had found himself placed by the prophetic call. In a moment the enthusiasm of the army took fire. They threw their garments—the large square scapul, similar to a wrapper or plaid,—under his feet, as so to meet a rough carpet of state, placed him on the top of the stairs, as on a throne, blew the royal salute on their trumpets, and thus ordained him king (2 Kings ix, 11-14). Jehu was not a man to lose any advantage through remissness. He immediately cut off all communication between Ramoth-gilead and Jezeel, and then they heard with his ancient comrade Bidkar, whom he made captain of the host in his place, and a band of horsemen. From the tower of Jezeel a watchman saw the cloud of dust raised by the advancing party, and announced his coming (2 Kings ix, 17). The messengers that were sent out to his host, as the news spread, on the news of his arrival, which had guided all his movements. It was not till he had almost reached the city, and was identified by the watchman, that apprehension was felt. But even then it seems as if the two kings in Jezeel anticipated news from the Syrian war rather than a revolution at home. Jehu then went forth himself to meet the king, and was accompanied by the king of Judah. They met in the field of Naboth, so fatal to the house of Abah. The king saluted him with the question, "Is it peace, Jehu?" and received the answer, "What peace, so long as the wrotheds (idiolatries) of thy mother Jezebel and her witchcrafts are so many?" (v.) This completely opened the eyes of Jehoram, who exclaimed to the king of Judah: "There is treachery, O Ahaziah!" and turned to flee. But Jehu felt no infirmity of purpose, and knew that the slightest wavering might be fatal to him. He therefore seized his sword, and, taking full sign at Jehoram, with the bow which, as captain of the host, was always with him, shot him through the heart (2 Kings ix, 24). Jehu caused the body to be thrown back into the field of Naboth, out of which he had passed in his attempt at flight, and grimly remarked to the body, "Bidkar, this is the head of Naboth the Jezreelite, with whom thou rodest together after Ahah his father, the Lord laid this burden upon him." The king of Judah endeavoured to escape, but Jehu's soldiers pursued and inflicted upon him at Beth-gan (A. V. "the garden-house"), probably Engannim, a wound of which he afterwards died at Megiddo. See AHAZIAH. Jehu himself entered the city, whither the news of this transaction had already preceded him. As he passed under the walls of the palace, Jezebel herself, studiously arrayed for effect, appeared at one of the windows, and saluted him with a question such as might have shown a man of weaker nerves, "Had Zimri peace, who slew his master?" But Jehu was unmoved, and, instead of answering her, called out, "Who is on my side—who?" when several eunuchs made their appearance at the window, to whom he cried, "Throw her down!" and immediately this proud eunuch, who had lain upon the bloody bed of the mighty man of Israel, was trodden under foot by the horses. See JEZREEL. Jehu then went in and took possession of the palace (2 Kings ix, 16-37). He was now master of Jezeel, which was, next to Samaria, the chief town of the kingdom; but he could not feel secure while the capital was in the hands of the descendants of those who might be supposed to feel strong attachment to the house of Abah. The force of the blow
which he had struck was, however, felt even in Sama-
ria. When, therefore, he wrote to the persons in au-
thority there the somewhat ironical but designedly in-
timidatingly aggressive note, that one of the princes
in Samaria as king and fight out the matter which lay
between them, they sent a very submissive answer, giv-
ing in their adhesion, and professing their readiness
to obey in all things his commands. A second letter from
Jehu tested this profession in a truly horrid and ex-
ceedingly peremptory manner, requiring all the kings
before him on the morrow, bringing with them the
heads of all the royal princes in Samaria. A fallen
house meets with little pity in the East; and when the
new king left his palace the next morning, he found
seven heads of the golden calves up in two tall steps
in the gate. There, in the sight of these heads, Jehu took occasion
to explain his conduct, declaring that he must be re-
garded as the appointed minister of the divine decrees,
pronounced long since against the house of Ahab by the
prophets, not one of whose words should fail to fall
upon the ground. He then announced his proscriptions by ex-
terminating in Jezerre not only all in whose veins the blood
of the condemned race flowed, but also—by a consider-
able stretch of his commission—those officers, ministers,
and creatures of the late government who, if suffered to
live, would most likely be disturbers of his own reign. He
also concluded that during his absence he would in these
proceedings, that on his way, at “the shearing-
house” (or Beheked), he encountered forty-two sons or
nephews (2 Chron. xx, 8) of the late king of Judah,
and therefore connected by marriage with Ahab, on a
visit of compliment to their relatives, of whose fall,
seemingly by Oriental custom, he expected no more. The
young princes, instead of paying their respects to the
sword at the fatal well, as, in the later history,
of Mizpah, and, in our own days, of Cawnorre (2 Kings
x, 14). (See Kitto’s Daily Bible Illustr. ad loc.) As he
drove on he encountered a strange figure, such as might
have a meaning to the nation of Eliezer, for the name of
Jeho-
adab, the austere Arab sectary; the son of Rechab.
In him his keen eye discovered a ready ally. The austere
virtue and respected character of the Rechabite would,
as he felt, go far to hallow his proceedings in the eyes
of the multitude. He took him into his chariot, and
they concocted their schemes as they entered Samaria.
(2 Kings x, 15, 16). See JEHONADAB. In that capital
Jehu continued the extirpation of the persons more in-
timately connected with the late government. This,
far from being in any way singular, is a common cir-
cumstance in Eastern revolutions. But the great stroke
was, that a new government was connected with that union of intrepid daring and profound secrecy
which marks the whole career of Jehu. His main ob-
ject was to exterminate the ministers and more devoted
adherents of Baal, who had been so much encouraged
by Jezebel. There was even a temple to this idol in
Samaria; and Jehu, never scrupulous about the means
of reaching objects which he believed to be good, laid
a snare by which he hoped to cut off the main body
of Baal’s ministers at one blow. He professed to be a
more zealous servant of Baal than Ahab had been, and
claimed a great festival in his honor, at which none
but his true servants were to be present. The prop-
heists, priests, and officers of Baal assembled from all parts
for this great sacrifice, and sacerdotal vestments were
given to them, that none of Jehovah’s worshippers
might be taken for them. Soldiers were posted so
that none of the former enrolment might escape the
sacrament of this office. One of the chief men of
Athaliah, an officer of Baal, a man named by Ahab (1 Kings xvi, 32; Josephus, Ant. x, 7, 6) was
crowded from end to end. The chief sacrifice was of-
fered, as if in the excess of his zeal, by Jehu himself.
Jehonadab joined in the deception. There was some
apprehension lest worshippers of Jehovah might be
found in the temple; such, it seemed, had been the interfer-
mixture of the two religions. As soon, however, as it
was ascertained that all, and none but the idolaters were
there, the signal was given to eighty trusted guards,
and a sweeping massacre removed at one blow the whole
heathen population of the kingdom of Israel. The in-
nermost sanctuary of the temple (translated in the A. V.
“the city of the house of Baal”) was stormed, the great
store of golden calves being carried off; the high
figures of the inferior divinities sitting round him were
torn from their places and burnt (Ewald, Gesch. iii, 596),
and the site of the sanctuary itself became the public
resort of the inhabitants of the city for the basest uses
(2 Kings x).
Notwithstanding this zeal of Jehu in exterminating the
grosser idolatries which had grown up under his
immediate predecessors, he was not prepared to subvert
the policy which had led Jeroboam and his successors
to maintain the schismatic establishment of the golden
calves in the holy city. In Jehu’s time, however, a crime in him—the worship rendered to the
golden calves being plainly contrary to the law; and he
should have felt that he who had appointed him to the
throne would have maintained him in it, notwithstanding
the apparent dangers which might seem likely to
cause his fall from permitting his name to repair at the great
festivals to the metropolis of the rival kingdom, which
was the centre of the theocratic worship and of sacer-
dotal service. Here Jehu fell short: and this very pol-
icy, apparently so prudent and far-sighted, by which he
hoped to secure the stability and independence of his
position, would eventually so accostume him to his work
as to grant to his dynasty was shortened. For this it was
foretold that his dynasty should extend only to four
generations; and for this the divine aid was withheld from
him in his wars with the Syrians under Izzael on
the eastern frontier. Hence the war was disastrous to
him, and the Syrian king was able to commence the
invasion of a great part of his territories beyond the
Jordan (2 Kings x, 29—33). He died in quiet, and
was buried in Samaria, leaving the throne to his son
Jehoahaz (2 Kings xix, 34—36). B.C. 855. His name is
thought to be the first of the Israelite kings which
appears in the Assyrian monuments. It seems to be found
on the black obelisk discovered at Nimrud (Layard,
Nimrode, i, 396), and now in the British Museum, among
the names of kings who are bringing tribute (in this
case gold and silver, and articles manufactured in gold)
to Shalmaneser I. His name is given as “Yahweh” (or
“Yahhua”), “the son of Khumri’” (Omri). This substi-
tution of the name of Omri for that of his own father
may be accounted for either by the importance which
Omri had assumed as the second founder of the north-
ern kingdom, or by the name of “Beth-Khumri,” only
given to him on his inauguration as “the king over the
Capital of Omri” (Layard, Nineveh and Babylon, p. 643;
There is nothing difficult to understand in the char-
acter of Jehu. He was one of those decisive, terrible,
and ambitious, yet prudent, calculating, and passionate
men whom God from time to time raises up to change
the fate of empires and execute his judgments on the
earth. He boasted of his zeal—“Come and see me for
the Lord”—but at the bottom it was zeal for Jehu.
His zeal was great so long as it led to acts which squared
with his own interests, but it cooled marvellously when
required to take a direction in his judgment less favor-
able to them. Even his zeal in extirpating the idolatry
of Baal is not free from suspicion. The altar of Baal
was that which Ahab had associated with his throne,
and in overturning the latter he could not prudently do
the former. He surrounded the immense site raised
by a “Jeboam” (or Jehu) in the hereditary house which he had extirpated. He must be regarded, like many others in history, as an
instrument for accomplishing great purposes rather than
as great or good in himself. In the long period during
which his destiny—though known to others and per-
haps to himself—lay dormant, he increased in his
rise to power; in the ruthlessness with which he car-
ried out his purposes; in the union of profound silence
and dissimulation with a stern, fanatic, wayward zeal,
he has not been without his likeness in modern times.
The Scripture narrative, although it fixes our attention on the services which he rendered to the cause of religion, made the establishment of a worthless dynasty and a degrading worship, yet, on the whole, leaves the sense that it was a reign barren in great results. His dynasty, indeed, was firmly seated on the throne longer than any other royal house of Israel (2 Kings x), and under Jeroboam II it acquired a high name among the Oriental nations. But Elisha, who had raised him to power, as far as we know, never saw him. In other respects it was a failure; the original sin of Jeroboam's worship continued; and in the prophet Hosea there seems to be a retribution exacted for the bloodshed by which he had murdered the throne: "I will avenge the blood of Jeruzalem upon the house of Jehu" (Hos. i. 4), as in the similar condemnation of Baasha (1 Kings xvi. 2). See a striking poem to this effect on the character of Jehua in the Lyra Apostolica. See ESRA, KINGDOM OF.

5. Son of Josiah, apparently one of the chief Simons who migrated to the valley of Gedæm in quest of pasture during the reign of Hezekiah, and expelled the aboriginal Hagarites (1 Chron, iv, 85). B.C. cit. 711.

Jehu'bah (Heb. Yechevahb, יֵעֵכֶוֹ, a duke; Sept. 'Iud'a, son of Shemariah, one of two persons sent by king Zedekiah to the prophet Jeremiah to request his prophets on behalf of the kingdom; but who joined with his associates on his return in demanding the prophet's death on account of his unfavorable response (Jer. xxxvii, 3). In Jer. xxxviii, 1 his name is written in the contracted form Jucal (יהואל, Yekhal, Sept. Yūd-a-χαλ), and in verse 6 he is styled one of the "princes." B.C. 589.

Jehud (Heb. Ye'ud, יֵעָד), apostorated from Judah, as in Dan. ii. 26, etc.; Sept. Iudget (v. Iewd and 'Aṣōb), a town on the border of Dan, named between Baalah and Bene-barak (Josh. xix. 40). It is the present village el-Yehudiyeh, seven and a half miles south of east from Jaffa (Robinson's Researches, iii, 45; new ed. iii, 140, 141, notes; Schwarze, Palest. p. 141).

Jehudah (HA-LEV) de MODENA. See MODENA.

Jehudah ben-Balaam. See BEN-BALAAM.

Jehudah ben-David. See CHAJDO.

Jehudah ben-Koreish. See BEN-KOREISH.

Jehudah (HA-LEV) ben-Samuel (called in Arabic Abūhamram) a distinguished Spanish Jew, great alike as linguist, philosopher, and poet, one of the greatest lights in Jewish literature, was born in Castile about 1068 according to Grätz, or 1105 according to Rapoport. But little is known of the early history of his life; when a youth of fifteen he was already celebrated as a promising poetical genius. In the vigor of manhood we find Jehudah endeavoring to spread a knowledge of Rabbinical and Arabic literature, both by poetical productions and by discourses whom he gathered about him at Toledo, where he founded a college. About 1141 he is supposed to have completed his Kazari (כזארי), generally called Cuari, the best work ever written in defense of the Jewish religion, and aiming to refute the objections urged against Judaism by Christians. And that aspect of the Jews known to be bitterly opposed to the recognition of the authority of tradition—the Karaites. Many eminent critics, among whom ranks Bartolocci, have long discredited the supposition that it is the production of Jehudah, but of late all seem agreed that he was really the author of the work, which is entitled בִּאֵד אֱלֹהִים וּמַעְרָק יָעַר (The Book of Kazari), after the heroes of it, and it was first published at Fano in 1606, then at Venice in 1547, with an introduction by D. ben Basco. (Cavalcas (Venice, 1594); with a Latin translation and disquisitions by Jo. Buttorff, fil. Basle, 1660); a Spanish translation of it was made by Abendana without the Hebrew text (Amsterdam, 1665). The work has more lately been published with a commentary by Satorow (Berl. 1796); with a commentary, various readings, index, etc., by G.
of God; Sept. 'אֱלֹהֵי יָהֳעַ֫ר יְהֹוָה', 'father' of Zaanah, and one of the sons apparently of Mered by his second wife Hodiah, or Jehudilah (1 Chron. iv. 18). B.C. cir. 1816. See MAZAN.

In the comment of Rabbi Joseph, Jered is interpreted to mean Moses, and each of the names following are taken as titles borne by him. Jeruchiah—'trust in God;'—is so applied because in his days the Israelites trusted in the God of heaven for forty years in the wilderness.

In a remarkable prayer used by the Spanish and Portuguese Jews in the concluding service of the Sabbath, Elijah is invoked as having tided them to peace delivered to him by the hand of Jeruchiah. This is explained to refer to some transaction in the life of Philip II, through whom Elijah is, in the traditions of the Jews, believed to be identical (see Allen, Modern Judaism, p. 229).

Jekuthiel. See Luzatto.

Jekuthiel ben-Isaac Blitz, also called by his father's name, Isaac Blitz, was corrector of the press at the printing establishment of Uri Feves Levi at Amsterdam, and was the first Jew who translated the whole O.T. into German (in Hebrew type). It was published under the title 'Der hebräische Bibel ('The four-authorized translation into German') of Joshua, Judges, 1 and 2 Samuel, and 1 and 2 Kings, by Rabbi Joseph B. Jekuthiel,' and under the title 'Rabbi Joseph b. Isaac of Jekuthiel' on 1 and 2 Chronicles, Joshua, Judges, and Samuel, and 1 and 2 Kings, and 1 and 2 Chronicles, by Rabbi Joseph b. Isaac of Jekuthiel.' The work is a complete text, with the vowels and accents, for the preparation of which he consulted six old Spanish codices, which he denominates 'la, la, la, la, la, and la,' and which Heidenheim explains to mean 'la, la, la, la, la, and la.' The prefixed "n" denoting Spain (comp. 'la, la, la, la, la, and la,' Numb. xxxiii, 28). The results of his critical labors he afterwards embodied in a work entitled 'The Eye of the Reader,' and makes frequent quotations from the writings of many distinguished Jewish commentators of his and the preceding age. An appendix to the work contains a grammatical treatise entitled 'The Laws of the Vowel Points.' Comp. 'Zanab,' and 'Zur Geschichte und Literatur,' Vol. i. 115; Forst, Bibliotheca Judæica, ii. 53; Geiger, Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift f. Jüdische Theologie, v. 418-420; Stein- schneider, Catalogus Libr. Heb. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 1981.

Jemima (Heb. יֶמִיָ֑נָה, 'dove'), from the Arab. 'Hijjaa, Vulg. Díez, both mistaking the derivation as from יְפִיָ֑ה, 'beautiful,' the name of the first of Job's three daughters born after his trial (Job xlii. 14). B.C. cir. 2200. "The Rev. C. Forster (Historical Geography of Arabia), ii. 67," in tracing the posterity of Job in Arabia, thinks that the name of Jemima survives in Jemana, the central province of the Arabian peninsula, which, according to an Arabian tradition (see Bochart, Philog., ii. 26), was called after Jemima, an ancient queen of the Arabians" (Smith).

Jemini. See Benjamin.

Jem’naan (יַמְּנָאָן, Vulg. omits), a place mentioned in the Apocrypha (Judith ii. 20) among those on the borders of Palestine to which the panic of the incursion of Holophernes extended, no doubt JEMMAW or JAMMA (q. v.).


Jenisch, Daniel, a German theologian of some note, was born at Helfingen, in East Prussia, April 2, 1763, and educated at the University of Königsberg. In 1786 he became pastor at the Mary Church, and afterwards at the Nicholas Church. Endowed with great natural abilities, and a very earnest worker, Jenisch soon secured for himself one of the foremost places as a theologian and a philosophical writer. But too close application of his mental powers, and he supposed to have violently ended his life Feb. 9, 1804. His works of interest to us are Ueber Grund u. Wetth d. Entdeckung Kinds in d. Metaphysik, Moral, u. Aesthetik (Berl. 1796, large 8vo):—Südtol Religion dem Menachen jemnaulisch erörtert (ibid. 1797, 8vo). Besides these, he published, after his mind began to be seriously affected, Ueber Gottesserkennt- ung u. Kirchliche Reformen (ibid. 1802, 8vo), rather the work of a sceptical Christian, if we may use the expression, though it contains also many just criticisms on the literary semantics of the Latin Church, for his day, and Kritik des dogmatisch-idealischen u. hyperrc- dischen Religionen u. Moraltheologie (Lpz. 1804, 8vo), which was the last work of Jenisch.

Jenkin, Robert, an English theologian, was born at Minster, Thanet, in 1656. He studied at Canterbury and Cambridge, of which he became fellow. He was successively appointed rector of St. John's College, professor of theology, and chaplain to Dr. Lake, bishop of Chichester. In 1688 he refused to take the oath required of all holding benefices, and retired to private life. He died in 1727. His principal work is The Remains of the English Men of Religion (six editions: the last, 1734, 2 vols. 8vo). He wrote also Experiments of the Authority of General Councils (Lond. 1688, 4to):—Defensio sancti Augustini versus J. Phereomonum (Lond. 1707, 8vo):—Remarks upon four Books just published (on Bacon's History of the Jews, Lake's Paraphrase of St. Paul's Epistle, Le Clerc's Bibliothèque chrétien, etc.). He also translated into English Tilletman's Life of Apollonius of Tyana. See Gorton, General Biograp. Dict. a. v.; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxvi, 650; Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i, 962. (J. N. P.)

Jenkin, William. See JENKYN.

Jenks, Benjamin, an English divine, was born in 1646. Of his early history but little is known. He was at first rector at Harley, then at Kerc, and afterwards chaplain to the earl of Bradford. He died at Harley in 1724. He published Prayers and Offices of Devotion for Families, and for particular Persons upon most Occasions (London, 1697, 8vo; of which the 27th edition was published in 1810 by the Rev. Charles Sim- mond, fellow of King's College, Cambridge, with emendations and amendments in style; there is also an edition by Barnes, 12mo, and an abridgment, 12mo):—Submission to the Righteousness of God (1700, 8vo; 4th ed. 1735, 12mo).—Meditations, with short Prayers annexed (1701, 8vo; 2d ed. 1756, 2 vols. 8vo, with a recommen-
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Preface by Mr. Hervey.—Ouranography, or Heaven Opened (1710, 8vo) — The Poor Man's Companion, a lover Prayer-book for Families on Common Days and other Occasions (London 1713, 8vo), besides a number of sermons on various topics. See Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i. 963.

Jenks, Hervey, a Baptist minister, was born at Beersheba, near Jerusalem, 1755, and was educated at Brown University. After teaching a short time at the academy at that time connected with the university, he entered the ministry, and was successively pastor at West Stockbridge, Mass, and Hudson, N. Y.; then at Hudson alone; next at Beverly, Mass, whence he again removed to New Haven, Conn. and Bennington, Vt. In 1786 he was a young man of great promise, and, though he was only twenty-eight years old when he died, his abilities had already been generally recognized.—Sprague, Annals of the American Pulpit, vi, 587 sq.

Jenks, William, D.D., a Congregational minister of great ability and distinction, was born at Newton, Mass., June 16, 1734, and educated at Amherst College, when only twenty years of age his father removed to Boston. He was educated at Harvard College, where he graduated in 1757. He was first settled in the ministry over the Congregational Church in Bath, Me., where he remained twelve years; he next filled the professorship of Oriental and English literature in Bowdoin College, where he remained three years; and was very active in originating plans to secure religious and social privileges for seamen, till that time a neglected class of men. Some of the more prominent institutions for the benefit of sailors now existing in that city owe their origin to him. He was pastor at the same time of the Green Street church, which he served for twenty-five years. He died Nov. 18, 1866. Dr. Jenks was one of the chief founders of the American Oriental Society, and a prominent member of the Massachusetts Historical Society. He was particularly distinguished in the Oriental, and published a comprehensive Commentary on the Holy Bible (Brattleborough, 1834, 5 vols. roy. 8vo; Supplem. 1 vol. 8vo), which "still stands without a rival for the purpose for which it was intended." He also published an Explanatory Bible Atlas and Scripture Gazetteer (1819, 4to). See Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i. 963; Mead, Aner. Annual Cyclop. 1866, p. 420. (J. H. W.)

Jenkyn, Robert. See JENKYN.

Jenkyv, William, an English Nonconformist divine, was born at Sudbury, Suffolk, in 1612, and educated at St. John's College, Cambridge. He first became lecturer of St. Nicholas Acon, London, and in 1641 minister of Christ Church, Newgate Street, and lecturer of the same Church and St. Simon's Parochial Schools. Refusing to take an oath in 1664, the public thanksgiving appointed by Parliament on occasion of the destruction of the monarchy, he was ejected for nonconformity. Soon after he went to the Tower for participation in Love's plot, but, upon petition, was pardoned, and restored to the ministry. Mr. Peak, who had in the interim become minister of Christ Church, was removed, and Mr. Jenkyn reinstated. Upon this he devoted himself with zeal to his work. On the passage of the Oxford Act he refused to take the oaths, and retired from London to Hertfordshire, where he preached privately. After the Act of Indulgence in 1671, he returned again to London; but when, in 1682, the tempest broke out against the Nonconformists, he fell into the hands of his enemies, and was sent to Newgate under the Convict Act, where he died, from the air and infection of the prison, in 1685. Jenkyn enjoyed the favor and esteem of many of the most prominent worthies for Christian piety and great ability. Richard Baxter pronounced him "a sententious and elegant preacher." He published An Exposition of the Epistle of Jude (London, 1652-54, 4to); another ed., revised by the Rev. James Sherman, with memoir of the author, London, 1679, 8vo, and others. See Allibone, Dictionary of Authors's, i. 963; Nonconformists' Memorial, Calamy, Min. IV. 8-9.

Jennings, David, D.D., an eminent Independent minister, was born at Kibworth, Leicestershire, in 1691. In 1718 he became pastor of a congregation in Old Gravel Lane, Wapping, where he remained for forty-four years. In 1744 he was called to divinity tutor to Cow and Academy, and died Sept. 16, 1762. His principal works are, Jewish Antiquities, with a Dissertation on the Hebrew Language (London, 1766; 10th edition, 1838, 8vo); a work which "has long held a distinguished character for its accuracy and learning," and certainly one of the best works of the kind in the English language.—The Works of John Dennis, 8vo. (London, 1731, 18mo) — A Vindication of the Scripture Doctrine of Original Sin [Anonym.] (London, 1740, 8vo) — An Appeal to Reason and Common Sense (London, 1755, 12mo) — Sermons to the Young (1743, 12mo), etc. See Orton, Life of Doddridge, p. 16; 245; Protestant Dissent. Mag. vol. v; Hoefner, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxvi. 660; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 964.

Jennings, John, an English dissenting minister, brother of David Jennings (see above), became, after preaching for some time, a theological tutor at Kibworth. He was also tutor to Dr. Doddridge. He died in 1733. He wrote Two Discourses on Preaching (London, 1741, 8vo), and was a minister in Maryland, and from 1762 to 1763, at the Jersey, and in Mississippi (see Jackson, in Histoire littéraire), etc. See Wilson, Hist. of Dissenters; Hoefner, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxvi. 660; Allibone, Dictionary of Authors, i, 964.

Jennings, Samuel Kennedy, a Protestant Methodist lay minister of great ability and distinction, was born in Essex County, N. J., June 5, 1771. He was educated at Rutgers (now Queen's) College. After the completion of his collegiate course he studied medicine, and for a time even practiced as a physician. In his youth he was a decided infidel, although he sprang from a family of ministers and zealous Christian workers. In 1794 he was converted, and two years after he entered the lay ministry, and served his Church very ably. In 1805 bishop Asbury ordained him a deacon, and in 1814 bishop M'Kendree made him an elder. In 1817 he took up his residence at Baltimore, after having filled in various places the position of physician and minister, and in this capacity also he made many converts by his Christian kindness and liberality. He was one of the prime movers for the introduction of lay representation in the Conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church, and was one of those who were expelled from the Methodist Episcopal Church, and finally organized the "Methodist Protestant Church." See Lay, xvii. 296. He died Oct. 19, 1854. See Sprague, Annals of the Amer. Pulpit, vii, 279; Stevens, Hist. Meth. Episc. Church. (J. H. W.)

Jenyns, Soame, an English politician, and a writer on theological subjects, born at London in 1704, was educated at St. John's College, Cambridge. He was in his early years a well-known infidel, but extended Biblical studies caused his conversion, and he at once entered the lists in active defence of the Gospel truths. His ablest work, and one which has given rise to the supposition on the part of some that Jenyns published it only with the purpose to injure the Christian cause, now generally rejected on good grounds, is, View of the Internal Evidence of the Christian Religion (1776, 12mo; 10th ed. 1798, 8vo, and often since). Baxter (Ch. History, p. 659) says that the work "brought out the internal evidence to the truth of Christianity arising from its peculiar and explicit character" and "in the ancient efforts by which "infidelity, if not convinced, was silenced." (See, for the pamphlets on the controversy which this work elicited, Chalmers, Biog. Dict. xviii, 520, note 8). He also wrote A Free Inquiry into the Nature and Origin of Evil (1756, 8vo, and often), which was rather a work as a theological treatise, and was very severely criticised by Dr. Johnson (see Boswell's
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Johnson, year 1750). The entire writings of Jephthah are collected in 4 vols. 8vo (Lond. 1790-93), together with his biography by Charles Nelson Cole. Jephunias died Dec. 18, 1787. See Allibone, Dict. of Authors, i. 965; English Cyclopædia, s. v. (J. H. W.)

Jeph'thaē (Heb. xi, 32). See Jephthah.

Jeph'thaē (Heb. Yiphthach, יִפְתַּח, opensen or openen), the name of a man and also of a place. See also Jephthah-EL.

I. (Sept. 108:26 v. r. 168:26 and 168:26, Josephus 168:26, Vulg. Jephta, N. T. 168:26, "Japheth"), the name of an Israelite prince for a period of six years, B.C. 1256-1250. He belonged to the tribe of Manasseh east, and was the son of a person named Gilead by a concubine, or perhaps harlot. After the death of his father he was expelled from his home by the envy of his brothers, who, taunting him with illegitimacy, refused him any share of the heritage, and he withdrew to the land of Tob, beyond the frontier of the Hebrew territories. It is clear that he had before this distinguis\ed himself by his daring character and skill in arms; for no sooner was his withdrawal known than a great number of desperadoes repaired to him, and he became their chief. His position was now very similar to that of David when he withdrew from the court of Saul. To maintain the people who had thus linked their fortunes with his, there was no other resource than that sort of brigandage which is accounted for in the East, so long as it is exercised against public or private enemies, and is not marked by needless cruelty or outrage. So Jephthah confined his aggressions to the borders of the small neighboring nations, who were in some sort regarded as the natural enemies of Israel, even when there was no actual war between them (Judg. xi, 1-31).

The tribes beyond the Jordan having resolved to oppose the Ammonites, to whom the Israelites had fallen under subjection after the death of Jair, in consequence of raping into idolatry, Jephthah seems to have occurred to every one as the most fitting leader. A deputation was accordingly sent to invite him to the war. With little loss of time he came to meet the thrumphant hero "with timbrels and with dances." But he no sooner saw her than he rent his robes, and cried, "Alas! my daughter, thou hast brought me very low.... for I have opened my mouth unto the Lord, and I will not turn back from that which I have vowed." The deputation returned to the Ammonites with a degree of diplomatic consideration and dignity for which we are not prepared. The Ammonites being assembled in force for one of those ravaging incursions by which they had repeatedly desolated the land, he sent to their camp a formal complaint of the invasion, and a demand of the ground of their proceeding. This is highly interesting, because it shows that, even in that age, a cause for which war was judged necessary, no one being supposed to war without provocation; and, in this case, Jephthah demanded what cause the Ammonites alleged to justify their aggressive operations. Their answer was, that the land of the Israelites beyond the Jordan was theirs. It had originally belonged to them, from which it had been taken by the Amorites, who had been dispossessed by the Israelites, and on this ground they claimed the restitution of these lands. Jephthah's reply laid down the just principles upon which he had been for a long period out in the practice of civilized nations, and is maintained by all the great writers on the law of nations. The land belonged to the Israelites by right of conquest from the actual possessors, and they could not be expected to recognise any interest of claim of former possessors, for whom they had not acted, who had rendered them no assistance, and who had themselves displayed hostility against the Israelites. It was not to be expected that they would conquer the country from the powerful kings who had it in possession, for the mere purpose of restoring it to the ancient occupants, whom they had no favorable knowledge, and of whose previous claims they were scarcely cognizant. But the Ammonites reasserted their former views, and on this issue they took the field. Animated by a consciousness of divine aid, Jephthah hastened to meet them, defeated them in several pitched battles, followed them with great slaughter, and utterly broke their dominion over the eastern Israelites (Judg. xi, 4-33). See Pageneat, Jephthas (Lemgo, 1746).

The victory over the Ammonites was followed by a quarrel with the proud and powerful Ephraimites on the west side of the Jordan. This tribe was displeased at having had no share in the glory of the recent victory, and, under the instigation of princes for a period of six years, B.C. 1256-1250. He belonged to the tribe of Manasseh east, and was the son of a person named Gilead by a concubine, or perhaps harlot. After the death of his father he was expelled from his home by the envy of his brothers, who, taunting him with illegitimacy, refused him any share of the heritage, and he withdrew to the land of Tob, beyond the frontier of the Hebrew territories. It is clear that he had before this distinguished himself by his daring character and skill in arms; for no sooner was his withdrawal known than a great number of desperadoes repaired to him, and he became their chief. His position was now very similar to that of David when he withdrew from the court of Saul. To maintain the people who had thus linked their fortunes with his, there was no other resource than that sort of brigandage which is accounted for in the East, so long as it is exercised against public or private enemies, and is not marked by needless cruelty or outrage. So Jephthah confined his aggressions to the borders of the small neighboring nations, who were in some sort regarded as the natural enemies of Israel, even when there was no actual war between them (Judg. xi, 1-31).

The tribes beyond the Jordan having resolved to oppose the Ammonites, to whom the Israelites had fallen under subjection after the death of Jair, in consequence of raping into idolatry, Jephthah seems to have occurred to every one as the most fitting leader. A deputation was accordingly sent to invite him to the war. With little loss of time he came to meet the triumphant hero "with timbrels and with dances." But he no sooner saw her than he rent his robes, and cried, "Alas! my daughter, thou hast brought me very low.... for I have opened my mouth unto the Lord, and I will not turn back from that which I have vowed." She replied, "My father, if thou hast opened thy mouth unto the Lord, do to me according to what that which has proceeded out of thy mouth, forasmuch as the Lord hath taken vengeance for thee of thy enemies, the children of Ammon." But, after a pause, she added, "Let this thing be done for me: let me alone two months, that I may go up and down upon the mountains and bewail my virginity, I and my fellow." Her father, of course, assented, and when the time expired she returned, and, we are told, "he did with her according to his vow." It is then added that it became "a custom in Israel that the daughters of Israel went yearly to lament the daughter of Jephthah the Gileadite three days in the year" (Judg. xi, 34-40).

Volumes have been written on the subject of "Jephthah's rash vow," the question being whether, in doing to his daughter "according to his vow," he really did carry out the threat, or whether she was merely doomed to perpetual celibacy.

That the daughter of Jephthah was really offered up to God in sacrifice—slain by the hand of her father and then burned—is a horrible conclusion; but one which it seems impossible to avoid, in view of the meaning of the text by Jonathan the paraphrast, and Rashi, by Josephus (Ant. v. 7, 10), and by perhaps all the early Christian fathers, as Origen (in Joannis, tom. vi, cap. 86), Chrysostom (Hom. ad pop. Antioch., xiv, 3; Opp. ii, 145), Theodoret (Quaestiones in Jud., xx), Jerome (Ep. ad Jul. 118; Opp. i, 291, etc.), Augustine (Questions in Jud., viii, 49; Opp. iii, 1, 610);
so also in the Talmud (Tosefta to Bechorot, p. 171) and Midrash (R. 1, § 71), in both of which great astonishment is expressed with the dealings of the high-priest. For the first eleven centuries of the Christian era this was the current, perhaps the universal opinion of Jews and Christians. Yet none of them extenuates the act of Jephthah’s daughter as a “great” sin which was pleasing to God. Jewish writers say that he ought to have referred it to the high-priest, but either he failed to do so, or the high-priest culpably omitted to punish the rash act. Origen strictly confines his praise to the heroism of Jephthah’s daughter.

The obligation thus suggested by Joseph. Kimchi. He supposed that, instead of being sacrificed, she was shut up in a house which her father built for the purpose, and that she was there visited by the daughters of Israel four days in each year as long as she lived. This interpretation has been adopted by many eminent men—as by Levin ben Gerson and Beck amongst the Jews, and by Drusius, Grotius, Estius, De Dieu, bishop Hall, Waterland, Dr. Hales, and others. More names of the same period, and of not less authority, might, however, be adduced on the other side. Lightfoot once thought (Euseb. § 16) that Jephthah did not slay his daughter, but, upon more mature reflection, he came to the opposite conclusion (Harmony, etc.; Judges xi, Works i, 51).

1. The advocates for the actual death of the maiden contend that to die unmarried was required by no law, customary or religious, among the parties concerned. Jephthah had a right to impose so odious a condition on another, nor is any such condition implied or expressed in the vow which Jephthah uttered. It is certain that human sacrifice was deemed meritorious and propitiatory by the neighboring nations [see SACRIFICE]; and, considering the manner of life the heathen tribes led, the religious idolatries in which the people had been plunged, and the peculiarly vague notions of the tribes beyond the Jordan, it is highly probable that he contemplated from the first a human sacrifice, as the most costly offering to God known to him (comp. the well-known story of the immolation of Isaac, Gen. xxii, 14 seq.). It is difficult to conceive that he could expect any other creature than a human being to come forth out of the door of his house to meet him on his return. His affliction when his daughter actually came forth is quite compatible with the idea that he had not even exempted her from the sacredness of his promise, and the depth of that affliction is scarcely reconcilable with any other alternative than the actual sacrifice. In that case, the circumstance that she “knew no man” is added as setting in a stronger light the rashness of Jephthah and the heroism of his daughter. If we look at the text, Jephthah vows that whatsoever came forth from the door of his house to meet him “shall surely be the Lord’s, and [Kimchi’s rendering ‘or’ is a rare and harsh one] I will offer it up for a burnt-offering,” which, in fact, was the regular way of making a thing wholly the Lord’s. Afterwards we are told that “he did with her according to his vow,” that is, according to the plain meaning of plain words, offered her for a burnt-offering. (This circumlocutory phrase, and the omission of any direct term expressive of death, are attributed to euphemistic motives.) Then follows the intimation that the daughters of Israel lamented the death of their hero, and that at the time of her death, not the living. The whole story is consistent and intelligible while the sacrifice is understood to have taken place, but becomes perplexed and difficult as soon as we begin to turn aside from this obvious meaning in search of other explanations. The Jewish commentators themselves admit generally that Jephthah really sacrificed his daughter, and even go so far as to allege that the change in the pontifical dynasty from the house of Eliazar to that of Ithamar was caused by the high-priest of the time having suffered this transaction to take place. It is true, human sacrifices were forbidden by the law; but in the rude and unsettled age in which the judges lived, when the Israelites had adopted a vast number of erroneous notions and practices from their heathen neighbors (see 2 Kings iii, 27), many things were done, even by good men, which the law forbade quite as positively as human sacrifice. Such, for instance, was the setting up of the altar by Gideon at his house city of Ophrah (Judg. viii, 27), in direct but undesignated opposition one of the most sacred and important parts of the Mosiacal code (see Kitto’s Daily Bible Illustrations, ad loc.)

2. On the other hand, it has been well replied that the text expressly, and in varied terms, alludes to the vow to lead a life of fasting in burningsacrifice (ver. 37, 38, 39). Such a state was generally considered a calamity by the Israelitish women, probably on account of the early prophecy of the incarnation (Gen. iii, 15). See BARNEKES. But, besides this, the celibacy of Jephthah’s daughter involved the extinction of his whole house as well as dynasty, and removed from him only child, the sole prop and solace of his declining years. For it was her duty, as the Lord’s property, to dwell separately at Shiloh, in constant attendance on the service of the sanctuary (compare Luke iii, 37; 1 Cor. vii, 8), far from her father, the companions of her youth. The belief here entertained that all this was sufficient cause for lamentation. But the idea that she was put to death by her father as a consequence of his vow shocks all the feelings of humanity, could only have horrified her as well as all other inhabitants of the Israel, as an entire violation of the precepts of the Mosaic law, and was impossible from the very nature of its requisitions in several points. For instance, human sacrifices were among the abominations for which the idolatrous nations of Canaan were devoted to destruction (Deut. xviii, 9–14); and the Israelites were expressly forbidden to act in like manner to their sons and daughters by fire (Deut. xii, 29–31). Again, for the redemption of any person devoted to God (Exod. xiii, 11–13), and even for the very case of Jephthah’s singular vow, if understood to refer to his daughter’s immolation, provision was expressly made (Lev. xvii, 2–5), so that he might, with a safe escape, have redeemed her from death by a small payment of money. It must be remembered, too, that by the law he could not offer any victim as a burnt-sacrifice except where the Lord had chosen to place his name (Deut. xvi, 2, 5, 11, 16, compare with Lev. i, 2–18; xvii, 8–9), that is, in the high-priest or as a thank-offering, none but a Levite could kill, and none but a priest could offer any victim; and the statement of the Chaldee paraphrase (ad loc.) that the sacrifice took place through a neglect to consult Phinehas, the high-priest, besides involving an anachronism is utterly at variance with all the known conditions of the case. Moreover, none but a male victim could be presented in sacrifice in any case. It is true that if Jephthah had been an idolater he might have offered his daughter in any of the high-places to a false god; but he was evidently made the deliverer of his people from the yoke of Ammon because he was not an idolater (see Judg. xi, 29–36; comp. Lev. xx, 1–5); and his whole conduct is commended by an inspired apostle (Heb. xi, 22; comp. 1 Sam. xii, 11) as an act of faith in the true God. Such sanction is very different from the express condemnation of the irregular and mischievous proceeding that took place among the Israelites (Judg. viii, 27), for there is nowhere the least intimation that Jephthah’s conduct was other than entirely praiseworthy, although his vow is evidently recorded as a warning against inconceivable oaths (Javis’s Church of the Redeemed, p. 115–117). Indeed, it is very doubtful whether he had the power to sacrifice his daughter, and it is incredible that she should have been the first to claim the fulfillment of such a vow, as well as inconceivable how she should have so readily inferred so unusual an import from the brief terms in which he first intimated to her his fatal pledge (ver. 85, 86); whereas it is altogether likely that (with her prompt consent) he
had the right of doing her to perpetual singleness of life and religious seclusion (compare 1 Cor. vii, 36-38).

See NAZARENE. It is also worthy of note that the term employed to express his promise of devotion in this case is מְדְעָה, Mede'ah, consecration, and not מְאֹד, Me'od, chern, destruction. See VOW; ANATHEMA. Nor can we suppose (with Prof. Bush, ad loc.) that during the two months' respite he obtained better information, in a name conjuring which the immediate word avoided by a ransom-price; for it is stated that he literally fulfilled his vow, whatever it was (ver. 39). The word rendered "lament" in verse 40 is not the common one (גַּשְׁנִי) translated "bewail" in verse 87, 88, but the rare expression (גַּשְׁנִי) rendered "rehearse" in ch. vii, 11, and meaning to celebrate, as implying joy rather than grief.

For a full discussion of the question, see the notes of the Pictorial Bible, and Bush's Notes on Judges, ad loc.; comp. Calmet's Dissertation sur le Voeu de Jephtha, in his Comment. Litteral. tom. ii; Drosse, Volutum Jephtha ex Antiq. Judaica illustr. (Lips. 1767, 1778); Randolf, Erklärung & Gelläubige Jephtha in Eichhorn's Repertoirium, viii, 14, Lightfoot's Harmony, under Judg. xi, 36; Erbrach, commentary on Judges, xi, 36, 39; Browne's Connexion of Sacred and Profane History, i, 479-492; Hales's Analysis of Chronology, ii, 288-292; Gleig's edition of Stockhouse, ii, 97; Clarke's Commentary, ad loc.: Rosenmuller, ad loc.; Hengstenberg's Pentateuch, ii, 128; Markli, in Ohr. Bibl., p. 580; Michaelis, in Zeich, iii, 412; Zingerl, Theol. Abhandl., i, 387; Paulus, Consens. crit., ad loc.; Vatke, Bibl. Theol. p. 275; Capellus, De voto Jeph. (Salurn. 1684); Da thé in Döderlein's Theol. Bibl., iii, 927; Jahn, Einleitung, ii, 198, Eckermann, Theol. Beitr., vi, i, 62; Reland, Antiq. sacr. iii, 10, 6, 369; Vogel in Biedermann's Act. scholar., ii, 229; Georgi, De voto Jepheta (Viteb. 1751); Heumann, Nov. syllogio dissertat., 476; Bernhold, De voto per Jphthach, nuncupato (Alt. 1740); Schudt, Vita Jepht. (Gröningen. 1758), ii, 77; Bruno in Eichhorn's Repertorium, viii, 43; Buddel Hist. V. T. l, 622; Hess, Grec. Josa. u. der Herführer, ii, 156; Nie- mer, Ch. Charact., iii, 496; Ewald, Geschichts, ii, 307; Selden, Jos. nat. et gent. i, 11; Anton, Comparativ, libror. V. T. crit. pt. ii, ii; F. Spanheim, De voto Jepheta, in his Dissert. theolog. hist. p. 135-211; H. Benz, De voto Jepheta, incursato (Lond. 1782); Rathake's Theol. for 1755, p. 414; Seiler, Gemeinmiütts. Beitr. 1779, p. 366; Hasche, Uber Jephtas Velo (Dresden 1779); and in the Dresden Anz. (1787); Pfeiffer, De voto Jepheta, in his Opp. p. 501; Tieroff, id. (Jena, 1657); Münch, id. (Alt. 1740); Bibl. Repos. Jan. 1848, p. 143 sq.; Metz, Quart. Rev. Oct., 1855, p. 558 sq.; Universallreporter, Jan. 1861; Evangelischen Rev. July, 1861; Cassel, in Herzog's Enzykl. a. v.; also the studies by Eichhorn, Darling, Cyclopa. cod. 284.

2. See JIPTAH.

Jephunneh (יִפְתָנְנֶה), a Grecized form (Eccles. xlvii, 7) for the Hebrew name JEHUPHUNE (קָוְעֵבִיָה). The name of two men.

1. (Sept. יִפְתָנְנֶה, also יִפְתָנְנָה and יִפְתָנְנוּה;) The father of Caleb (q.v.), the faithful fellow-exploiter of Canaan with Joshua, in which paternal connection alone his name occurs (Num. xiii, 7; xvi, 6; Deut. i, 36; Josh. xiv. 6, 13; 14, 15; 16, 13; 12; 1 Chron. iv, 15; vi, 21). B.C. 1588.

2. (Sept. יִפְתָנָה;) One of the sons of Jethro or Jothan, of the descendants of Asher (1 Chron. vii, 88). B.C. prob. ante 1017.

Jezre'ah (Heb. יְזְרֵעָה, יְזְרֵעָה), in pause יְזְרֵעָה. Ya'ra'ch, the moon, as often; Sept. יָרָךְ, yarrach, in 1 Chron. i, 20, where, however, some copies have יָרָךְ, Volg. Yar.); the fourth in order of the sons of Joktan, apparently the founder of an Arab tribe, who probably had their settlement near Hazaravand and Hadoram, between which the name occurs (Gen. x, 26), the general location of all the Joktanites being given in verse 80 and extending from Mesha eastward to Mount Shephar. Bo-
1. The fifth in rank of the Gadite braves who joined David's troop in the wilderness (1 Chron. xii. 10). B.C. 1061.
2. The tenth of the same band of adventurers (1 Chron. xii. 18). B.C. 1061.
3. One of the Benjamite bowmen and slingers who repaired to David while at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii. 4). II. Chr. 1058.
4. A chief of the tribe of Manasseh east, apparently about the time of the deportation by the Assyrians (1 Chron. v. 24). B.C. 782.
5. A native of Liddah, the father of Hamnute, wife of Josiah, the mother of Jehoash and Zedekiah (2 Kings xxii. 31; xxiv. 18). B.C. ante 632.
6. Son of Habsuziah, and father of Jaazaniah, which last was one of the Rechabites whom the prophet tested with the offer of wine (Jer. xxxv. 5). B.C. ante 606.
7. The second of the "greater prophets" of the O.T., a son of Hilkiah, a priest of Anathoth, in the tribe of Benjamin (1, i; comp. xxix. 6). The following brief account of the prophet's career, which is fully detailed in his own book, is chiefly from Kittot's Cyclopaeod.

1. Relations of Jeremiah. — Many (among ancient writers, among these, Hosee; among moderns, Eichhorn, Calovius, Maldonatus, Von Bohlen, etc.) have supposed that his father was the high-priest of the same name (2 Kings xxii. 8), who found the book of the law in the eighteenth year of Josiah (Umbreit, Praktischer Commentar über den Jeremia, p. x). This, however, seems improbable, mainly because Jer. xxiii. 1; xxi. 2 (comp. II. Chron. iii. 130; also Keil, Ewald, etc.) first, there is nothing in the writings of Jeremiah to lead us to think that his father was more than an ordinary priest ("Hilkiiah [one of the priests," Jer. i. 1); again, the name Hilkiiah was common among the Jews (see 2 Kings xxiii. 13; 1 Chron. vi. 40; xxvii. 11; Neh. viii. 14; Jer. xxix. 8): and, lastly, his residence at Anathoth is evidence that he belonged to the line of Abiather (1 Kings ii. 26-35), who was deposed from the high-priest's office by Solomon: after which time the office appears to have remained in the line of Zadok.

2. History. — Jeremiah was very young when the word of the Lord first came to him (i. 6). This event took place in the thirteenth year of Josiah (B.C. 628), while the youthful prophet still lived at Anathoth. It would seem that he remained in his native city several years under his father's guidance, and was an assistant of his fellow-townsmen (xi. 21), and even of his own family (xii. 6), as well as to have a wider field for his exertions, he left Anathoth and took up his residence at Jerusalem. The finding of the book of the Law, five years after the commencement of his predictions, must have produced a powerful influence on the mind of Jeremiah, and, king Josiah no doubt found him an important ally in carrying into effect the reformation of religious worship (2 Kings xxiii. 1-25). B.C. 623. During the reign of this monarch, we may readily believe that Jeremiah would be in no way molested in his work; and that from the time of his quitting Anathoth to the eighteenth year of his ministry, he probably uttered his warnings without interruption, though with little success (see ch. xi). Indeed, the reformation itself was nothing more than the forcible repression of idolatrous and heathen rites, and the remnant of the remnant of the external service of God, by the command of the king. No sooner, therefore, was the influence of the court on behalf of the true religion withdrawn, than it was evident that no real improvement had taken place in the minds of the people. Jeremiah, who hitherto was at least permitted, if not even encouraged, to propagate the gospel, soon found himself the object of attack, as he must doubtless have long been the object of dislike to those whose interests were identified with the corruptions of religion. The death of this prince was bewailed by the prophet as the precursor of the divine judgments for the national sins (2 Chron. xxxvi. 22). B.C. 609. See LAMENTATIONS.

We hear nothing of the prophet during the three months which constituted the short reign of Jehoahaz; but "in the beginning of the reign of Jehoiakim" (B.C. 607) the prophet was interrupted in his ministry by "the priests and the prophets," who, with the populace, brought him before the civil authorities, urging that capital punishment should be inflicted on him for his threatening the destruction of the city unless they amende their ways (ch. xxvi). The princes seem to have been in some degree aware of the results which the general corruption was bringing on the state, and if they did not themselves yield to the exhortations of the prophet, they acknowledged that he spoke in the name of the Lord, and were quite as averse from any announcement of his authority as to put his messenger to death. It appears, however, that it was rather owing to the personal influence of one or two, especially Ahikam, than to any general feeling favorable to Jeremiah, that his life was preserved; and it would seem that he was then either placed under restraint, or else was in so much danger from the animosity of his adversaries as to make it prudent for him not to appear in public. In the fourth year of Jehoiakim (B.C. 605) he was commanded to write the predictions which had been given him during that year, and to read them publicly on the fast-day, the cause, probably, which we have intimated above, he was, as he says, "shut up," and could not himself go into the house of the Lord (xxxvi. 5). He therefore deputed Baruch to write the predictions after him, and to read them publicly on the fast-day. These threatenings being read, the prince, as the word had been intimated before the princes to give an account of the manner in which the roll containing them had come into his possession. The princes, who, without strength of principle to oppose the wickedness of the king, had sufficient respect for religion, as well as sagacity enough to discern the importance of the predictions, and, in order to protect the prophet, advised both Baruch and Jeremiah to conceal themselves, while they endeavored to influence the mind of the king by reading the roll to him. The result showed that their precautions were not needless. In his bold self-will and recklessness during the war, he was refused to listen to any advice, even though coming with the professed sanction of the Most High. Having read three or four leaves, "he cut the roll with the penknife and cast it into the fire that was on the hearth, until all the roll was consumed," and gave immediate orders for the execution of those who preserved the roll, who, however, were both preserved from the vindictive monarch. At the command of God the prophet procured another roll, in which he wrote all that was in the roll destroyed by the king, and added besides unto them many like words (xxxvi. 32). See Baruch.

Near the close of the reign of Jehoiakim (B.C. 609), and during the short reign of his successor Jehoachin or Jeconiah (B.C. 598), we find him still uttering his voice of warning (see ch. xiii. 18; comp. 2 Kings xxiv. 12, and Jer. xxvi. 24-30), though without effect; and, after witnessing the downfall of the monarchs which he had himself predicted, he sent a letter of condolence and hope to those who shared the captivity of the royal family (ch. xiii-xxxxi). It was not till the latter part of the reign of Zedekiah that he was put in confinement, as we find that "they had not put him into prison" when the army of Nebuchadnezzar besieged Jerusalem (xxvii. 4, 5) (B.C. 589). On the investment of the city, the prophet had sent a message to the king declaring what would be the fatal issue, but this had so little effect that the slaves who had been liberated were again reduced to bondage by their (xxvii); however, soon after, they were incarcerated in the court of the prison adjoining the palace, where he predicted the certain return from the impending captivity (xxxiii. 38). The Chaldeans drew off their army for a time on the report of help coming from Egypt to the besieged city, and now, feeling the danger to be imminent, and yet a ray of hope brightening their prospects, the king exalted Jeremiah to pray to the
Lord for them. The hopes of the king were not re-
sponded to in the message which Jeremiah received
from God. He was assured that the Egyptian army
would return to their own land, that the Chaldæans
would come in; and as the Chaldeans burned the city
and burnt it with fire (xxxvii. 7, 8). The princes, ap-
parently irritated by a message so contrary to their
wishes, made the departure of Jeremiah from the city
(for he appears to have been at this time released from
confinement), during the short respite, the pretext for
accusing him of deserting to the Chaldeans, and he was
forthwith cast into prison, where he might have perished
but for the humanity of one of the royal eunuchs
(xxxxvii. 12—xxxviii. 13). The king seems to have
been throughout inclined to favor the prophet, and
sought to know from him the word of the Lord; but he
was wholly under the influence of the princes and dared
not communicate with him except in secret (xxxxviii. 14—28), much less could he follow advice so ominous
to their views as that which the prophet gave. Jer-
emiah, therefore, more from the hostility of the princes
than from the inclination of the king, was cast into prison,
when the city was taken, B.C. 588. Nebuchadnezzar
formed a more just estimate of his character and of the
value of his counsels, and gave a special charge to his
captain, Nebuzar-adan, not only to provide for him,
but to follow his advice (xxxix. 12). He was accord-
ingly permitted to remain in prison and to choose freely
whether he would either go to Babylon, where doubtless he would have been held in honor in the royal court, or to remain with
his own people (B.C. 587). With characteristic patriot-
ism he went to Mizpah with Gedaliah, whom the Bab-
ylonian monarch had appointed governor of Judæa, and,
after his murder, sought to persuade Johanan, who was
then the recognised leader of the people, to remain in
the land, assuring him and the people, by a message
from God in answer to their inquiries, that, if they did
so, the Lord would build them up, but if they went
to Egypt, the kings of Egypt would make them escape
come upon them there (ch. xili). The people refused to
attend to the divine message, and, under the com-
mand of Johanan, went into Egypt, taking Jeremiah
and Baruch along with them (xili. 6). In Egypt the
prophet still sought to turn the people to the Lord, but
they caught his flight and came upon him there (ch. xlvii.),
his writings give us no subsequent informa-
tion respecting his personal history. Ancient traditions
assert that he spent the remainder of his life in Egypt.
According to the pseudo-Epiphanius, he was stoned by
the people at Tabnôn (iv Thronov), the same as Tah-
pashu, where there were settled a tribe of Israelites.
(See Lamentations, iii. 19, 20). The name is also
found in the legend of the prophet of the same name
who according to the traditions was a native of Jerusalem.
His whole history convinces us that he was by nature
mild and retiring (Ewald, Propheten des Alt. Bundes, p. 2),
highly susceptible and sensitive, especially to sorrow-
ful emotions, and rather inclined, as we should imagine,
to shrink from danger than to brave it. Yet, with this
nature, he stood unimpeachable and naturally of the
least probable to become a leader of the people. He
being a "man of strife," he never in the least degree
shrinks from publicity; nor is he at all intimidated by
reproach or insult, or even by actual punishment and
threatened death, when he has the message of God to
deliver.

The style of Jeremiah corresponds with this view of
the character of his mind: though not deficient in pow-
er, it is peculiarly marked by pathos. He delights in
the expression of the tender emotions, and employs all
the resources of his imagination to excite corresponding
feelings in his readers. He has an irresistible sympa-
thly with the miserable, which finds utterance in the
touching descriptions of their condition.

The prophecies of Jeremiah and the peculiarities
which belong to the later Hebrew, and by the introduc-
tion of Aramaic forms (Eichhorn, Einleitung, i, 122;
Gesenius, Geschichte der Heb. Sprache, p. 35). It was,
we imagine, on this account that Jerome complained of
a certain rusticity in Jeremiah's style. Lowth, how-
ever, says, "its overabundant richness is contrary to
Jeremiah as nearly equal in sublimity in many parts to

2. The canon of the writings of Jeremiah in gen-
eral are established both by the testimony of ancient
writers and the quotations and references which occur
in the New Testament. Thus the son of Siraeh refers
to him as a prophet consecrated from the womb, and
quotes from Jer. i. 10 the commission with which he
was intrusted (Eccles. xlii, 7). In 2 Macc. ii. 1—8, there
is a tradition respecting his hiding the tabernacle and
the ark in a rock which he is called "Jeremiah the
prophet." Philo speaks of him under similar titles,
as προφήτης, μυστής, ἱεροφάντης, and calls a passage
which he quotes from Jer. iii. 4 an oracle—χρησιμος
(Eichhorn, Einleitung, i, 50). Josephus refers to him
by name as the prophet who predicted the evils which
were coming upon the city. For the rest, he appears as
the author of Lamentations (μελος Σαμαριτων) which are
still existing (Ant. x, 5, 1). His writings are included
in the list of canonical books given by Melito, Origen
(whose words are remarkable: ἡμιαμας αὐτόν Ἰακωβ
και τῷ ἐπίσημῳ ἐν Ἰερουσαλημ, Jerome), and the Talmud (Eich-
horn, Einleitung, i, 194). In the New Testament Jer-
emiah is referred to by name in Matt. ii. 17, where a
passage is quoted from Jer. xxxii, 15, and in Matt. xvi, 14;
in Heb. viii, 8—12, a passage is quoted from Jer. xxxi,
31—34. There is one other place in which the name of Jeremiah appears in Matt. 12, 40. The point of
considerable difficulty, because the passage there quoted
is not found in the extant writings of the prophet (see
Kühnel, Com. ad loc.). Jerome affirms that he found
the exact passage in a Hebrew apocryphal book (Fab-
ricius, Codex Paradigrapbus, i, 1103), but there is no
proof that he had it exists before the time of Christ.
It is probable that the passage intended by
Matthew is Zech. xi, 12, 13, which in part corresponds
with the quotation he gives, and that the name is a
gloss which has found its way into the text (see Oes-
hausen, Commentar über d. T. Test. ii, 489).

3. The prophecies of Jeremiah are divided
into the books has of late been disputed by German critics.
Movers, whose views have been adopted by De Wette and Hitzig, at
tributes x, 1—16, and ch. xxxi, xxxii, and xxxiii to
the author of the concluding portion of the book of Isaiah.
His fundamental argument against the last-named
portion is, that the prophet Zechariah (xiii. 7, 8) quotes
from Jer. xxxi, 7, 8, and in verse 9 speaks of the au-
thor as one who lived in the day that the foundation
of the house of the Lord was laid. But there
is nothing in ver. 7 and 8 of Zechariah to prove that
it is intended to quote Jeremiah. The difficulty is,
much less from this portion of Jeremiah. Hence
Hitzig (Jeremia, p. 298) gives up the external evidence
on which Movers had relied. The internal evidence
arising from the examination of particular words and
phrases is so slight, especially when the authenticity
of the language and language of the Book of Isaiah is
considered, that it is not enough against the
Ewald agrees that the chapters in question, as well as
the other passage mentioned (x, 1—16), are the work of
Jeremiah. It seems, however, not improbable that
the Chaldee of verse 11 is a gloss which has crept into the
text, both because it is (apparently without reason)
in another place without any such interpunction,
and the progress of thought. The predictions against Babylon
in ch. i and ii are objected to by Movers, De Wette, and
others on the ground that they contain many interpola-
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tions. Ewald attributes them to some unknown protagonist, who imitated the style of Jeremiah. Their authenticity is maintained by Hitzig (p. 891) and by Umbreit (p. 290-293), to whom we must refer for an answer to the objections which were made against them. The last chapter is generally regarded as an appendix added by some later author. It is almost verbally the same as the account in 2 Kings xxiv, 18; xxv, 30, and it carries the history down to a later period, probably, than that of the death of Jeremiah. That it is not his work seems to be indicated by the use of the verse ch. ii. (See generally Haver- nick’s Einleitung, i, 232, etc.)

4. Much difficulty has arisen with respect to the writings of Jeremiah from the apparent disorder in which they stand in their present copies, and from the many disagreements between the Hebrew text and that found in the Septuagint version, and many conjectures have been hazarded respecting the occasion of this disorder. The following are the principal diversities between the two texts:

(a) The chapters containing prophecies against foreign nations are placed in a different part of the book, and the prophecies themselves are arranged in a different order, as in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hebrew</th>
<th>Septuagint</th>
<th>Chronological</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All nations, xxv, 14-38</td>
<td>Elam, xxv, end (xlix, 34-39)</td>
<td>Egypt, xxvi, 1-12. B.C. 607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt, xxv, 14-38</td>
<td>Babylon, xxvii, entire (1, 4-60)</td>
<td>Surroudings, p. 607</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philistia, xxvii, 1-7</td>
<td>xxvii, entire (1, 6-40)</td>
<td>Egyptian narrations, xxv.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moab, xlvii, 1-47</td>
<td>Pharisina, xxvii, 7-17</td>
<td>Elam, xlii, 3-40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ammon, xlv, 1-4</td>
<td>Edom, xxviii, end (xlii, 7-25)</td>
<td>Babylon, xlii. 1, 9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edom, xlv, 1-25</td>
<td>Ammon, xxx, begin, (xlii, 1-5)</td>
<td>Babylon, xlii. 2, 9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Damascus, xxvii, 23-37</td>
<td>Kedar, xxx, middle (xlii, 9-30)</td>
<td>Babylon, xlii. 3, 9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>läch, xii, 37-41</td>
<td>Damascus, xxvii, end (xlii, 23-37)</td>
<td>Babylon, xlii. 4, 9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elam, xxviii, 34-38</td>
<td>Maob, Elam, xxviii, 44-45</td>
<td>Babylon, xlii. 5, 9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Babylon, xlii, 1-46</td>
<td>All nations, xxix, entire (15-38)</td>
<td>Babylon, xlii. 6, 9-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>li, 4-4</td>
<td>The other chapters (xliii-lii) follow in the same order as the Heb. (xliii-lxv).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(b) Various passages which exist in the Hebrew are not found in the Greek copies (e.g. xlvii, 19-22; xxxiii, 14-26; xlix, 4-14; xlvii, 45-47). Besides these discrepancies, there are numerous omissions and frequent variations of single words and phrases (Movers, De utriusque Vaticiniumarem Jeremiæ recensionem indole et origine, p. 8-32). To explain these diversities, recourse has been had to the hypothesis of a double recension, a hypothesis which, with various modifications, is held by most modern critics (Movers, ut supra; De Wette, Lehrbuch der Hist.-Crit. Einl., in d. Alt. Test. p. 303; Edel, Propheten des Alt. Bund. ii, 23; Keil, Einl., p. 100, etc.). These differences are also found in the fragments of the Septuagint, as compared with the other copies (Hengstenberg’s Christologie, iii, 495-619).

5. The following are the chief exegetical works upon the whole of Jeremiah’s prophecies, to a few of the most important of which we prefix an asterisk [*]: Origien, Homiliae (in Opp. iii, 125); also Selecta (ibid. iii, 287); Ephiæus Sylaeus, Explanatio (Sylaeus et Lat. in Opp. v, 30); Jerome, In Jer. (In Opp. iv, 833); I. G. I, 24, Proprietatio (Greek, in Opp. ii, 8); Rabanus Maurus, Commentarius (in Opp.); Rufus Tucitensis, In Hierem. (in Opp. i, 468); Thomas Aquinas, Commentarius (in Opp. ii); Melanchthon, Argumentum (in Opp. ii); Arama, בָּשָׁמ, etc. (incl. Is. i, 1668, 4to; also in Frankforter’s Rabb. Bible); Zuingle, Complamentarii (Tiguri, 1581, fol.; also in Opp. iii); Ecolampadius, Commentarius [incl. Lam.]. (Argenti. 1559, 4to; Buggenhen, Adnotationes (Viteb. 1546, 4to); De Castro, Commentacres [incl. Lam. and Baruch] (Par. 1559, Mogunt. 1616, 4to); Zichemius, Expositions (Col. 1559, 8vo); Pintus, Commentarius [incl. Is. and Lam.] (Lugduni 1656, 1659; Salaman. 1581, fol.); Calvin, Probationes (Genev. 1569, 1576, 1590, 4to; also in French, ib. 1665, 4to; trans. in English by Owen, Edinburgh, 1858, 4to); Congazzi, Conciences (Lips. 1666, 8vo); Schneck, Auslegung (Lpz. 1656, 4to); Bullinger, Conciences (Tigurni, 1575, folio); Taillefer, Commentarius (Par. 1684, 4to; Heilbrunner, Questions (Lauing. 1684, 4to); Capella, Commentarius (Tarracon. 1666, 4to); Figniern, Prophéties (Genev. 1568, 1569); Calvin, Commentarium (in Opp.); Manessens, Commentarius [incl. Lam.]. (Gen. 1606, 4to); Polan, Commentarius [incl. Lam.]. (Basile. 1606, 8vo); Sanctius, Commentarius [incl. Lam.] (Lugduni 1618, 4to); A. Lapide, In Jerem. etc. (Antw. 1621, 4to); Ghisler, Commentarium (Lugduni 1626, 4to); Hazemann, Considerationes (Olysepi 1638, 4to); Halmerey, Commentarius [incl. Lam.]. (Rudolphop. 1663, Lips. 1695, 4to); Forster, Commentarius (Vitemb. 1672, 1699, 4to);

The principal predictions relating to the Messiah are found in chapter xxviii, 1-6; xcvii, 34; xxxii, 14-26 (Hengstenberg’s Christologie, iii, 495-619).
Alting, Commentarius (Amst. 1688, folio; also in Opp. i, 649); *Seb. Schmidt, Commentarius (Argent. 1685, Fr. ad M. 1637, 1705, 2 vols. 4to); De Sacy, Exposition (in Paris, 1793, 1799, 4to); \( \text{Fronth.} \) (Franc. 1701, 4to); *Lottw. Commentarius [incl. Lam.] (Lond. 1718, 4to; also in the *Commentary of Patrick,* etc.); Petersen, Zeugnisse (Franc. 1719, 4to); Rapel, Predigten (Lunenburg, 1720, 1755, 2 vols. 4to); Ithig, Predigten (Dresden, 1722, 4to); Michaelis, Observationes [on parts] in Cassiodor. (Gottingen, 1743, 4to); also in Pott, et cet. Comment. ii; Spohn, Notes (Lips. 1794-1824, 2 vols. 8vo); Volborth, Anmerkungen (Celle, 1795, 2 vols. 8vo); *Blayney, Notes [incl. Lam.] (Oxf. 1784, 4to; 3d ed. Lond. 1856, 8vo); Schruer, Observationes [on parts] in Cassiodor. (Lips. 1794-7, 2 vols. 8vo); *Von d. Gersdorff, Miller, Schofia [including Lam.] (Lips. 1802-5, 2 vols. 8vo); Movers, Recensiones Jeremiæ (Hamb. 1827, 8vo); Knobel, De Jeremia, Chaldaizantze (Vratislav, 1831, 4to); Kükper, Jeremia interpres (Berlin, 1887, 8vo); *Hitzig, Erklärung (Leipzig, 1841, 4vo); *Umbreit, Commentarius (Hann. 1849, 1850, 4to); *Kuinoel,Commentarius [incl. Lam.] (London, 1851, 12mo); Neumann, Auslegung [including Lam.] (Lips. 1856, 8vo); Graf, Erklärung (Lips. 1862, 8vo, 2 vols. 8vo); Cowles, Notes (N. York, 1869, 12mo). See Proph. Jeremia, Epistle of, one of the apocryphal works, purporting to proceed from the pen of the prophet Jeremiah (q. v.).

1. Title and Position.—This apocryphal piece, which derives its title, επιστολὴ ιερουμένη (Sept. Vulg., Syriac, etc.), from purporting to be an epistle sent by the prophet Jeremiah to the people of Babylon, has different positions in the different MSS. It is placed after the Lamentations in Origin's Hexaplas, according to the Syriac Hexapla codex in the Ambrosian Library at Milan, in the Cod. Alex., the Arabic versions, etc.; in some editions of the Sept., in the Latin Vulgate, which was followed by the Zurich Bible, and by the A. Vens. ("Epistle of Jeremy"), it constitutes the sixth chapter of the apocryphal book of Baruch, while Theodoret, Hilary of Poitiers, and several MSS. of the Sept. entirely omit it. It is, however, an independent production, and has nothing to do with Baruch. See Baruch, Book of.

2. Design and Contents.—The design of this epistle is to admonish the Jews who were going into captivity with the king to beware of the idolatry which they would see in Babylon. It tells the people of God not to become idolaters like the strangers, but to serve their own God and not to partake of their idolatry (verse 1-7), as it exposes in a rhetorical declaration the folly of idolatry (verse 8-72), concluding every group of verses, as it contains a fresh proof of its folly, with the reiterated remarks, "Seeing that they are no gods, fear them not" (verse 49, 59, 64), "How can a man think that they are gods?" (verse 40, 44, 56, 64, 69), "How can a man not see that they are not gods?" (verse 49, 63).

3. Author, Date, Original Language, Comonicity, etc.—The inscription claims the authorship of this epistle for Jeremiah, who, it is said, wrote it just as the Jews were going to Babylon, which is generally reckoned to be the first year of Nebuchadnezzar the Great, or B.C. 606. This is the general opinion of the Roman Church, which, as a matter of course, regards it as canonical. But modern critics, both Jewish and Christian, who deny the power to any Church to override internal evidence, and defy the laws of criticism, have shown satisfactorily that its original language is Greek, and that it was written by Herodotus, in the time of Thutmose III and xxix. This is corroborated by the fact that this epistle does not exist in the Hebrew, was never included in the Jewish canon, is designated by Jerome, who knew more than any other what the Jewish canon contained, as ἔκθεσις τοῦ Ἰεροῦ (Praem. Comment, in Hierom.), was marked off from the 4 Apocrypha by the editors of the Vulgate, and was removed from the note of Cod. Chalismus (Βαρούπος ὁ αἷμα διεσπαρακαταρά τούς ἄνθρωπος), and was passed over by Theodoret, though he explained the book of Baruch. The date of this epistle cannot be definitely settled. It is generally supposed that 2 Macc. ii, 2 alludes to this epistle, and that it must, therefore, be older than this book of Maccabees. Herzfeld (Geschichte d. Israel vor der Zerstörung des ersten Tempels, Brunswick, 1847, p. 316) infers from it the very reverse, namely, that this epistle was written after the passage in 2 Macc., while Frischauf and Davidson adduce several other points to the appropriateness of the supposed reference. It is most probable that the writer lived towards the end of the Maccabean period.


5. A priest who accompanied Zerubbabel from Babylon to Jerusalem (Neh. xii, 1). B.C. 536.

9. One of those who followed the princes in the circuit of the newly-repaired walls with the sound of trumpets (verse 94); apparently the same with one of the priests who subscribed the sacred covenant along with the priests. See Jer. xcv. 446-civ. 410. He was possibly identical with No. 8.

Jeremiah II, patriarch of Constantinople, was born in 1536. He was elected patriarch May 5, 1572; in 1579 he was driven from his see, but after the death of Metrophanes (1580) he regained his position. Shortly after his consecration, but before he was invested with the see, he was taken into charge of high treason. Liberated through the intervention of the ambassadors of France and Venice, he was again exiled to Rhodes in 1585. Finally, in 1587, he was again reinstated in the patriarchate by paying 500 ducats yearly to the party who had held it during his exile. The Church funds had been so reduced in consequence of all these struggles that there was no money to meet the expenses for worship. Under these circumstances, Jeremiah was obliged to seek help from the exar, in return for which he was obliged to create the metropolitan of Moscow a patriarch. This was accordingly done; but Jeremiah had to bow the knee on his return to Moscow, a number of bishops, who had accompanied him on his journey, and who had vehemently opposed his course, left him, and joined the Church of Rome. Some writers say that Jeremiah was "wrongly deposed" by the Council of Florence, which he thought to be the Latin churches. He was the patriarch with whom the Tingham theologians entered into a correspondence in 1573, with the intention to bring over the Greek Church to the Reformers, and which resulted, as is well known, in the rejection of Luther's doctrines by the Greek Church. See Chr. F. Schneeberger, Lehrbuch, edited by A. Kellermann (Berlin, 1856); Acta Thologorum Wirtembergensium et Patriarchiae Constantinopolitanis D. Hieremiae (Würtemberg, 1854); Acta
JEREMIAH


Jeremiah, archbishop of Sons, flourished in the latter half of the 8th and the early part of the 9th century. But little is known of his personal history. He was the successor of Magnus; he had a canonical office, and is said to have died in 827. See Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Générale, xxv, 667.

Jeremia'is (Ieremiais), a Grecized form of the name of two men.

1. Jeremiah (q. v.) the prophet (Ecclus. xiii, 6; 2 Macc. xv, 14; Matt. xvi, 14).
2. (1 Esdr. ix, 54.) See JEREMIAL.

Jer'emoth (Hebr. Yiremuth, יִרֵמְוֹת, or Yorem'oth, יִרֵמְוֹת, heightis), the name of several men. See above.

J. (Sept. Iermuth.) The last named of the three sons of Mushi, grandson of Levi (1 Chron. xxiii, 23); called Jeremiah in 1 Chron. xxxiv, 30. B.C. post 1856.
3. (Sept. Iermuth.) A Levite, chief of the fifteenth division of Temple musicians as arranged by David (1 Chron. xxxiv, 22); probably the same called Jeremiah in ver. 4. B.C. 1014.
4. (Sept. Iermuth v. r. Iermuth.) One of the "sons of Jehia, a Benjamite (1 Chron. vii, 14). B.C. post 1856. Probably the same with Jeroham in ver. 27.
5. (Sept. Iermuth v. r. Iermuth, Vulg. Jeremuth.) An Israelite, one of the "sons" ( inhabitants) of Elam, who divorced his Gentle woman after the captivity (Exx. z, 26). B.C. 459.
6. (Iermuth v. r. Iermuth, Vulg. Jeremuth.) Another Israelite, one of the "sons" (inhabitants) of Zattu, who likewise divorced his Gentle woman after the captivity (Exx. z, 27). B.C. 459.
7. (Exx. z, 29, and Ramoth.) See RAMOTH.

Jer'emy, a familiar form (1 Esdr. i, 28, 52, 47, 57; ii, 1; 2 Esdr. ii, 18; Baruch vi, title; 2 Macc. ii, 1, 5, 7; Matt. xvi, 17; xxv, 9) of the name of the prophet JEREMIAH (q. v.).

JEREMIAH, EPISODE OP. See JEREMIAH, EPISODE OF.


Jer'ibai (Hebr. Yirbay, יִרְבַּי, contentuous; Sept. Yeribai v. r. Yeribai, a son of Elinaam, and (together with his brother Shevahish) one of David's famous bodyguard (1 Chron. xii, 46). B.C. 1046.

Jer'icho (Hebr. Yericho, יֵרִיחֹה, place of fragrance, prob. from balms Alps growing there; Josh. ii, 1, 2, 3; iii, 16; iv, 18, 19; v, 10, 13; vi, 1, 25, 26; vii, 2; viii, 2; ix, 3; x, 28, 30; xii, 9; xiii, 22; xvi, 1, 7; xvii, 12; xxii, 8; xxiv, 11; 2 Kings ii, 14, 15, 18; also written Yericho, יֶרֶיחֹה, Numm. xxii, 1, 3, 63; xxxii, 12; xxxiii, 48; 50, xxxv, 15; xxvi, 1; xxvi, 13; Deut. xxxii, 49; xxxiv, 1, 3, 2 Sam. x, 5; 2 Kings xxix, 5; 1 Chron. vi, 78; xix, 5; 2 Chron. xxviii, 10; Ezra ii, 34; Neh. iii, 2; vii, 36; Jer. xxxix, 5; lii, 8; once Jericho, יֵרִיחוֹ, 1 Kings xvi, 34; Sept. and N. T. Ιεριχω, Iericho, Jerosch.; LXX. Jericho; Justin. Hierichus), a city situated in a plain traversed by the Jordan, and exactly over against where that river was crossed by the Israelites under Joshua (Josh. iii, 16). It is first mentioned in connection with the story of their approach to the land eastward of the Jordan, and they abandoned their houses in fear. Had the city existed in the time of Abraham and Lot, it would scarcely have escaped notice when the latter looked down on the plain of Jordan from the heights of Bethel (Gen. xiii.). From the manner in which it is referred to, and the frequency with which it is mentioned, it became an important city in the Jordan valley at the time of the Exodus (Num. xxxiv, 15; xxxv, 12; xxxvi, 1, etc.). Such was either its vicinity or the extent of its territory that Gilgal, which formed their primary encampment, was in the same dishonest, in its east border, xix, 19). That it had a king is a very secondary consideration, for almost every small town had one (xiii, 9-24); in fact, monarchy was the only form of government known to those primitive times—the government of the people of God presenting a marked exception to prevailing usage. But Jericho was further in by walls, and those walls were so considerable that at least one person (Rahab) had a house upon them (i, 15), and its gates were shut, as throughout the East still, "when it was dark" (v, 5). Again, the spoil that was found in it betokened its affluence—Ai, Makkedah, Libnah, Lachish, Egion, Hebron, Debir, and even Hazor, evidently a city of no great worth mentioning in comparison—beads, sheep, oxen, and asses, we hear of vessels of brass and iron. These possibly may have been the first-fruit of those brass foundries "in the plain of Jordan" of which Solomon afterwards so largely availed himself (2 Chron. iv, 17). Silver and gold were found in so small abundance that one man (Achan) could appropriate stealthily 200 shekels (100 oz. approx.; see Lewis, Heb. Rep. vi, 57) of the former, and "a wedge of gold of 50 shekels (25 oz.) weight;" a goodly Babyloni, garment, parceled in the same dishonest, may be ascribed as evidence of a then existing commerce between Jericho and the far East (Josh. vi, 24; vii, 21). In fact, its situation alone—in so noble a plain, and contiguous to so prolific a river—would bespeak its importance in a country where these natural advantages have always been so highly prized, and in which people when they settled down to live and became agriculturists so much more upon the indigenous resources of nature than they are compelled to do now. Jericho was the city to which the two spies were sent by Joshua from Shittim: they were lodged in the house of Rahab the harlot upon the wall, and departed, having first promised to save her and all that were found in her house from destruction (Josh. ii, 1-21). Text account which the spies received from their hostess tended much to encourage the subsequent operations of the Israelites, as it showed that the inhabitants of the country were greatly alarmed at their advance, and the signal miracles which had marked their course from the Nile to the Jordan. The same manner in which Jericho itself was taken (see Hacks, De ruina murorum Hierichantorum, Jena, 1690) must have strengthened this impression in the country, and, appears, indeed, to have been designed for that effect. The town was utterly destroyed by the Israelites who pronounced an anathema upon it as long as the heavens were above and the earth below, and, as they did before it, it was not only not rebuilt, but the walls were apparently torn down; and all the inhabitants were put to the sword, except Rahab and her family (Josh. vii). Her house was recognised by the scarlet line bound in the window from which the spies were let down, and she and her relatives were taken out of it, and "lodge thither without it," but it is nowhere said or implied that her house escaped the general conflagration. That she "dwelt in Israel" for the future; that she married Solomon, son of Nasa-
Jericho was the site of a distant 150 years' war, and was six miles from it.

The Jericho of the days of Josephus was distant 150 or 160 miles from Jerusalem, and was six miles from it.

It lay in a plain overhung by a barren mountain, whose roots ran northward towards Scythopolis, and southward in the direction of Sodom and the Dead Sea. These formed the western boundaries of the plain. Eastward, its barriers were the mountains of Moab, which ran parallel to the former. In the midst of the plain—the great plain, as it was called—flowed the Jordan, and at the top and bottom of it were two lakes: Tiberias, proverbial for its sweetness, and Asphalitis for its bitterness. Away from the Jordan, it was parched and unhealthy during summer; but during winter, even in the hottest part of Jerusalem, it was cool enough to wear linen garments.

Hard by Jericho, bursting forth close to the site of the old city which Josephus took on his entrance into Canaan, was a most exuberant fountain, whose waters, before noted for their contrary properties, had received (proceeds Josephus) through Eliahu's prayers, a powerful salubrity and efficacy. Within its range—seventy stadia (Strabo says 100)—by twenty—the fertility of the soil was unexampled. Palms of various names and properties—some that produced honey scarcely inferior to that of the neighborhood; ephalbamium, the choicest of indigenous fruits; cyprus (Aramaic: "ez-bema"—"zukumm") thro' there beautifully, and thickly dotted about the pleasure-gounds (War, iv, 8, 3). These and other aromatic shubs were here of peculiar fame.

Grace (Justin. xxxvi, 8; Josephus, Ant. iv, 6, 1; xiv, 4, 1; xv, 4, 2; War, i, 6, 6; i, 18, 5). Wisdom herself did not disdain comparison with "the rose-plants of Jericho" (Ism. iv, 7, 12). The faithfulness of the O.T. given by Paul (Josh. vi, 25; 1 Chron. ii, 10; Matt. i, 5; Heb. xi, 31)—all these facts surely indicate that she did not continue to inhabit the accursed site; and, if so, and in the absence of all direct evidence from Scripture, how could it ever have been inferred that her honor was "erased"? (See Hoffmann, Rassale Ereignisse, Berl. 1861.) See Rahab.

Such as it had been left by Joshua, such it was bestowed by him upon the tribe of Benjamin (Josh. xvii, 21); it lay also on the border of Ephraim [Josh. xvi, 7], and from this time a long interval elapsed before Jericho appeared again in the scene. It is only incidentally mentioned in the life of David in connection with his embassy to the Ammonite king (2 Sam. v, 9). The solemn manner in which its second foundation under Hiel the Bethelite is recorded—upon whom the curse of Joshua is said to have descended in full force (1 Kings xvi, 8)—would seem to imply that up to that time its site had been uninhabited. It is true, mention is made of a "city of palm-trees" (Judg. i, 16, and iii, 13) in existence apparently at the time when spoken of, and Jericho is twice—once before its first overthrow, and twice after its second foundation—designated by that name (see Deut. xxxiv, 3, and 2 Chron. xxviii, 15); but these designations must be understood to apply only to the site, in whatever condition at the time. (On the presence of these trees, see below.) However, once actually rebuilt, Jericho rose again slowly in importance. In the days of the kings, it was the place of retirement from the world, and Elijah "healed the spring of the waters;" and over and against it, beyond Jordan, Elijah "went up by a whirlwind into heaven" (2 Kings ii, 1, 2). In its plains Zebediah fell into the hands of the Chaldeans (2 Kings xxv, 5; Jer. xxxix, 5). By no means a great town, in respect of numbers, it was, by the mind of the Lord, to be a type of the "new Jericho," 
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Jericho, who stripped him naked and left him severely wounded.

Posterior to the Gospels, Vespasian found it one of the
arches of Judea (War, iii, 3, 5), but deserted by its
inhabitants, in a general massacre when he encamped there
(War, iv, 8, 2, 7). He left a garrison consisting
necessarily the 10th legion, which is only stated to have
marched through Jericho) which was still there when
Titus advanced upon Jerusalem. Is it asked how Jeri-
cho was destroyed? Evidently by Vespasian; for Jos-
eph, under an understanding that is Dr. Rhon-
son's (Bibl. Res. i, 566, 2d. ed.) thinks. The city pillaged
and burnt in Josephus (War iv, 9, 1) was clearly Jeri-
cho, with its adjacent villages, and not Gerasa, as may
be seen at once by comparing the language there with
that of 8, 2, and the agent was Vespasian. Eusebius and
Jerome (Onomast. s. v.) say that Jericho was destroyed
when Jerusalem was besieged by the Romans. They
further add that it was afterwards rebuilt—they do not
say by whom—and still existed in their day; nor had the
ruins of the two preceding cities been obliterated. Could
Hadrian possibly have planted a colony there when he
passed through, and called it Elia (Dio Cass. Hist. lixiv, c. 11, ed. Sturz; more at large Chron. Paschali, p. 254, ed. Du Fresne). The discovery which Origens
made there of a version of the O. T. (the 5th in his Hexa-
pha), together with sundry MSS, Greek and Hebrew,
suggests that it could not have been wholly without in-
habitation (Suidas, s. v. Hexapla). It is possible that
Menur. of circa med.); or again, as is perhaps more
probable, did a Christian settlement arise there under Con-
santine, when baptisms in the Jordan began to be the
rage? That Jericho became an episcopal see about that
time under Jerome appears from more than one ancient
Notitia (Geograph. s. a. Carola Paulo, p. 906, and the Par-
ergon appended to it; comp. William of Tyre, Hist. lib.
xxiii, ad f.). Its bishops subscribed to various councils
in the 4th, 5th, and 6th centuries (Bibl. et Le Quien's
Oriens Christiani. iii, 651). Justianus, we are told, re-
stated and added to it, and the
meditate neighborhood of the fountain of Elisha; and that
of the second (the city of the New Test. and of Josephus)
at the opening of the wady Kelt (Cherith), half an hour
from the fountain. The ancient, and, indeed, the only
practicable road from Jerusalem zigzags down the rug-
ged and bare mountains, through a narrow defile; after
five years afterwards we find Micosensis, wife of king Fulco,
assigning them to the convent of Bethany, which she had
founded A.D. 1137.

The site of ancient (the first) Jericho is with reason
placed by Dr. Robinson (Bibl. ii, 528, 568) in the im-
mediate neighborhood of the fountain of El-Dhah, and
that of the second (the city of the New Test. and of Josephus)
at the opening of the wady Kelt (Cherith), half an hour
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five years afterwards we find Micosensis, wife of king Fulco,
assigning them to the convent of Bethany, which she had
founded A.D. 1137.

The site of ancient (the first) Jericho is with reason
present day. Jericho, a mile north of the present road, is an
immense reservoir, now dry, and round it are extensive ruins,
consisting of mounds of rubbish and ancient founda-
tions. Rising northward, similar remains were seen on
both sides of wady el-Kelt. Half a mile farther north we
enter cultivated ground, interspersed with clumps of
thorny nubk ("lote-tree") and other shrubs; another half
mile brings us to Ain es-Sultan, a large fountain burst-
ing forth from the foot of a mound. The water, though
cold, is warm, is sweet, and is extensively used for the
surrounding plain. The whole plain immediately around
the fountain is strewn with ancient ruins and heaps of
rubbish.

The village traditionally identified with Jericho now
bears the name of Rihah (in Arabic er-Rihah) and is situ-
ated about the middle of the plain, six miles west from
the Jordan, in N. lat. 34° 57', and E. long. 35° 38'. Dr.
Olin describes the present village as "the meanest and
foulest of Palestine." It may perhaps contain forty
dwellings, with some two hundred inhabitants.

The houses consist of rough walls of old building-stones,
roofed with straw and brushwood. Each has in front of
it an inclosure for cattle, fenced with branches of the
thorny nubk; and a stronger fence of the same materi-
al surrounds the whole village, forming a rude barrier
against the raids of the Bedawins. Not far from the vil-
lage is a little square castle or tower, evidently of Sera-
monic origin, but now dignified by the title of "the house
of Zaccheus." This village, though it bears the name of
Jericho, is about a mile and a half distant both from the
Jericho of the prophets and that of the evangelists.

Very probably it may occupy the site of Gilgal (q.v.).
The ruinous state of the present village is evidence how fast
it is sinking to a comparatively recent event. [Page 151]

Very probably it may occupy the site of Gilgal (q.v.).
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been attacked by the Arabs in crossing the Jordan, sent a detachment of his army and razed Jericho to the ground.

The soil of the plain is unsurpassed in fertility; there is abundance of water for irrigation, and many of the old aqueducts are almost perfect; yet nearly the whole plain is wasted and desolate. The grove supplied by the fountain is in the distance. The few fields of wheat and Indian corn, and the few orchards of figs, are enough to show what the place might become under proper cultivation. But the people are now few in number, indolent, and licentious. The palms which gave the ancient city a distinction are gone; even that "single solitary palm" which Dr. Robinson saw exists no more. The climate of Jericho is exceedingly hot and unhealthy. This is accounted for by the depression of the plain, which is about 1200 feet below the level of the sea. The reflection of the sun's rays from the bare white cliffs and mountain ranges which shut in the plain, and the insoucian exhalations from the lake, and from the numerous salt springs around it, are enough to poison the atmosphere.


Jer'el (Heb. Yeriel, יריעלי, 'fearer of God, or I. q. Jeruel; Sept. Ιερελ), one of the sons of Tola, the son of Issacah, mentioned as a valiant chief of his tribe, which were enrolled in the time of David (1 Chron. vii, 2). B.C. post 1856.

Jer'i-jah (1 Chron. xxvi, 31). See JERIAH.

Jer'moth (Heb. Yerimoth, יֶרֶמוֹת, heights, i. q. Jeremoth), the name of several men. See also Jerumoth.

1. (Sept. Ιερουμια). One of the five sons of Bela, son of Benjamin, a valiant chief of his tribe (1 Chron. vii, 7). B.C. post 1856.

2. (Sept. ΙερουμιαΣ). The last named of the three sons of Mushi, grandson of Levi (1 Chron. xxvi, 30); elsewhere (1 Chron. xxiiii, 23) called Jeremoth (q. v.).

3. (Sept. ΙερουμιαΣ v. r. Αρμου). One of the famous Benjaminite archers and slingers that joined David's band at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 5). B.C. 1055.

4. (Sept. ΙερουμιαΣ v. r. Αρμου). One of the forty elite soldiers, and appointed a Levitical musician under his father in the arrangement of the sacred services by David (1 Chron. xxv, 4); probably the same elsewhere (ver. 22) called Jeremoth.


6. (Sept. ΙερουμιαΣ v. r. Αρμου). A son of David, whose daughter Mahalah was Rehoboam's first wife (2 Chron. xi, 15). B.C. ante 975. He appears to have been different from any of David's sons elsewhere enumerated (2 Sam. iii, 2-5; 1 Chron. xiv, 4-7), having, perhaps, been born of a concubine (compare 2 Sam. xvi, 21). See David. "This, in fact, is the Jewish tradition respecting his maternity (Jerome, Questiones, ad loc.). It is, however, somewhat questionable whether Rehoboam would have married the grandchild of a concubine to David. The passage 2 Chron. xi, 18 is not quite certain, since the word 'daughter' is a corruption of the Keri: the original text had 'sone', i.e. 'son'.

7. (Sept. ΙερουμιαΣ). A Levite, one of the overseers of the Temple offerings in the time of Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxxi, 15). B.C. 726.

Jē'rioth (Heb. Yeriith, יֶרִית, timely, otherwise caietatae; Ιεριωθ, a person apparently named as the father of the last two wives of Eleazar, son of Izcarah, several children being mentioned as the fruit of the marriage with one or the other (1 Chron. ii, 18). B.C. post 1856. The Vulgate renders this as the son of Caleb by the first-mentioned wife, and father of the sons named; but contrary to the Heb. text, which is closely followed by the Sept. There is probably some corruption; possibly the name in question is an interpolation: compare ver. 19; or perhaps we should render the connective by thus, thus making Jerioth but another name for Azubah.

Jer'ment, Gi'robo, D.D., a minister of the Secession Church of Scotland, was born in 1759 at Peebles, Scotland, where his father was at the time pastor of a church of that branch of the Secession Church denominated before their union in 1819 as Anti-burgher. On the conclusion of his collegiate course he entered the divinity hall of his denomination, situated at Alloa, and while a student there, took a high standing in his class. After preaching a short time in Scotland he went to London, to become the colleague of Mr. Wilson, at the Secession Church in Bow Lane, Cheapside, and was ordained in the last week of Sept. 1782. In the English metropolis Jerment was well received, and he labored there for the space of thirty-five years, his preaching attracting large and respectable congregations from the Scottish residents of London. He died May 23, 1819. "His character stood very high in the estimate of all who knew him, whether as a man of sense, judgment, prudence, and exalted piety. He was one of the first directors of the London Missionary Society, and greatly encouraged the enterprise. The writings of Jerment intruded into the press are mainly public lectures and sermons (London, 1781-1813). Among these his Early Piety, illustrated and recommended in several Discourses; and Religion, a Monitor to the Middle-aged and the Glory of old Men, deserve to occupy a conspicuous place. See Morison, Fathers and Founders of Lond. Miss. Soc'y, p. 506 sq. (J. H. W.)

Jērō-bo'am (Heb. Yero'am, יֶרוֹאָם, "increase of the people; Sept. Ιερουαμ, Iosephus Ιερουομος, the name of two of the kings of the separate kingdom of Israel.

1. The son of Nebat (by which title he is usually distinguished in the record of his infancy) by a woman named Zeruah, of the tribe of Ephraim (1 Kings xi, 26). He was the founder of the schismatical northern kingdom, and father of the ten tribes, over which he reigned twenty-two (or current) years. B.C. 973-951. According to the Hebrew genealogy, he first appears in the sacred history his mother was a widow, and he had already been noticed by Solomon as a clever and active young man, and appointed one of the superintendents of the works which that monarch carried on at Jerusalem. He now incurred the charge of the services required of the leading tribe of Ephraim (1 Kings xi, 26-28; comp. Josephus, Ant. viii. 7, 7). B.C. 1010-998. This appointment, the reward of his merits, might have satisfied his ambition had not the declaration of the prophet Ahijah given him higher hopes. When informed that, by the divine appointment, he was to become king over the ten tribes about to be rent from the house of David, he was not content to wait patiently for the death of Solomon, but began to form plots and conspiracies, the discovery of which constrained him to flee to Egypt to escape condign punishment. B.C. cir. 990. The king of that country was but too ready to encourage one whose success must necessarily weaken the kingdom which had become great and formidable under David and Solomon, and which had already pushed its frontier to the Red Sea (1 Kings xi, 29, 40).

When Solomon died, the ten tribes sent to call Jeroboam from Egypt; and he appears to have headed the delegation that came before the son of Solomon with a demand of new securities for the rights which the measures of the late king had compromised. It may be supposed that the answer of Rehoboam that the demand was urged by a body of men headed by one whose pretensions were so well known and so odious to
Jeroboam

the house of David. It cannot be denied that, in making their applications thus offensively, they struck the first blow, although it is possible that they, in the first instance, intended to use the presence of Jeroboam for no other purpose than to frighten the king into compliance. The imprudent answer of Rehoboam rendered a revolution inevitable. (2 Kings xii, 24.)

2. The son and successor of Jeoahash, and the fourteenth king of Israel, for a period of forty-one years. B.C. 823-782 (2 Kings xiv, 23). He followed the example of the first Jeroboam in keeping up the idolatry of the golden calves (2 Kings xiv, 24). Nevertheless, the Lord had pity upon Israel (2 Kings xiv, 26), the time of its ruin had not yet come, and this reign was long and flourishing, being contemporary with those of Amanaziah (2 Kings xvi, 3), Uzziah, Ahaz, Jotham, and Hezekiah of Judah. Jeroboam brought to a successful issue the wars which his father had undertaken, and was always victorious over the Syrians (comp. 2 Kings xiii, 4; xiv, 26, 27). He even took their chief cities of Damascus (2 Kings xiv, 28; Amos i, 3-5) and Hamath, which had been formerly beyond the Leontes, and reéstablished the kingdom of Israel to its former limits. He also restored to the realm of Israel the ancient eastern limits from Lebanon to the Dead Sea (2 Kings xiv, 25; Amos vi, 14). Ammon and Moab were reconquered (Amos ii, 13; ii, 1-8); the Transjordanic tribes were restored to their territory (2 Kings xiii, 5; 1 Chron, v, 17-22). But this merely an outward restoration. The same year that Bethel was kept up in royal state (Amos vii, 13), while drunkenness, licentiousness, and oppression prevailed in the country (Amos ii, 6-8; iv, 1; vi, 6; Hos. iv, 12-14; 1, 2), and idolatry was united with the worship of Jehovah (Hos. iv, 18; xiii, 6). During this reign lived the prophets Hosea (Hos. i; ix), Joel iii, 16 with Amos i, 12), Amos (Amos i, 1), and Jonah (2 Kings xiv, 25). In Amos vii, 11, Amaziah, the high-priest of Bethel, in reporting what he called the conspiracy of Amos against Jeroboam, represents the prophet as declaring that Jeroboam should die by the sword; and the former regard this as a prophecy that had not received its fulfilment, as there is no evidence that his death was other than natural, for he was buried with his ancestors in state (2 Kings xiv, 29), although the interregnum of eleven years which intervened before the accession of his son Zechariah (2 Kings xiv, 28, comp. with xv, 8) argues some political disorder at the time of his death (see the Studien und Kritiken, 1847, iii, 648). But the probability rather is that the high-priest, who displayed the true spirit of a persecutor, gave an unduly specific and offensive turn to the words of Amos, in order to undermine Jeroboam the more against him. The only passages of Scripture where his name occurs are 2 Kings xiii, 13; xiv, 16, 23, 27, 28, 29; xv, 1, 8; 1 Chron, v, 17; Hos. i, 1; Amos i, 1; vi, 9, 10, 11; in all others the former Jeroboam is intended. See Israel, Kingdom of.

Jeroham (Heb. Yeroham, יֶרֹחָם, cherished), the name of several men.

1. (Sept. Æremôth, Ἰερομάθης, Ἰερομαθῆς.) The son of Elihu (Eliab, Eleab), and father of Ekanah, Samuel’s father (1 Sam. i, 1; 1 Chron. vi, 27, 34). B.C. ante 1142.

2. (Sept. Æromus, Ἰερομᾶς, Ἰερομᾶς.) An inhabitant of Gedor, and father of Joelah and Zebariah, two of the Benjamite archers who joined David’s band at Ziklag (1 Chron. xiii, 7). B.C. ante 1055.

3. (Sept. Æromus v. Ἰερωμᾶς.) The father of Azareel, which latter was “captain” of the tribe of Dan under David and Solomon (1 Chron. xxvii, 22). B.C. ante 1017.
4. (Sept. Ἰωάνν.) Father of Azariah, which latter is the first mentioned of the two of that name among the "captains of hundreds" with whom Jehoiada planned the restoration of prince Jehoash to the throne (2 Chron. xxiii., 1). B.C. ante 576.

5. (Sept. Ἰωάννα v. r. Ἰωάννα). The father of several Benjamite chiefs resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. vii, 27). B.C. apparently ante 588. See No. 6; also Jeremiah, 4.

6. (Sept. Ἰωάννα v. r. Ἰωάννα). The father of Nehemiah, which latter was one of the Benjamite chiefs resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. ix, 8). B.C. apparently ante 548.

Possibly identical with the preceding.

7. (Sept. Ἰσαὰκ v. r. Ἰσαὰκ). The son of Pahur, and father of Adahiah, which last was one of the chief priests resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. ix, 12). B.C. apparently ante 546.

8. (Sept. Ἰσαὰκ). The son of Pelahiah, and father of Adahiah, which last was one of the chief priests resident at Jerusalem after the Exile (Neh. vi, 12). B.C. ante 440. Perhaps, however, this Jeroham was so noted with the No. 7.

Jerome (fully Latinized Sophronius Eusebius Hieronymus), generally known as Saint Jerome, one of the most learned and able among the fathers of the Western Church, was born at Stridon, a town on the confines of Dalmatia and Pannonia (but whose site is now unknown, as the place was destroyed by the Goths in A.D. 577), at some period between 351 and 345—according to Eusebius probably occurred. His parents were both Christians. His early education was supervised by his father, after which he studied Greek and Latin rhetoric and philosophy under Ælius Donatus at Rome. While a resident in this Christian city he was admitted to the rite of baptism, and decided to devote his life, in rigid asceticism, to the service of his Master. It seems uncertain whether a visit which he made to Gaul was undertaken before or after this important event. At any rate, about 370 we find him at Treves and at Aquileia, busy in transcribing the commentaries of Hilary on the Psalms, and a work on the synods by the same author; and in composing his first theological essay, De mulieribus septem persecutus, the letter to Innocentius. In 373 he set out on a journey to the East, in company with his friends Innocentius, Evagrius, and Hiliodores, and finally settled for a time at Antioch. During his residence at this place he was seized with a severe fever, and in a dream which he had in this sickness he fancied himself called before the judgment bar of God, and as a heathen Ciceronian (he had hitherto given much of his time to the study of the classical writers) so severely reprimanded and scourged that he was afterwards interred for a long time in sympathy with his youth, and he himself was led to take the solemn vow hereafter to forsake the study and reading of worldly books, a pledge which, however, he did not adhere to in after life. A marked religious fervor thenceforth animated Jerome; a devotion to monastic habits became the ruling principle, we might say the ruling passion of his life; he retired to the desert of Chalcis in 374, and there spent four years in penitential exercises and in study, paying particular attention to the acquirement of the Hebrew tongue. But his active and restless spirit soon brought him again upon the public stage, and involved him in all the doctrinal and ecclesiastical controversies of those controversial times. See MELETIUS. In 379 he was ordained a presbyter by bishop Paulinus in Antioch, without receiving charge of a congregation, as he preferred the itinerant life of a wandering student; and to a fixed office he set no journeyed to Constantinople, where, although past a student's age, he was not ashamed to take his seat at the feet of the celebrated Gregory Nazianzen, and to listen to the anti-Arian sermons of this learned father of the Church. Indeed, the pupil and instructor soon became one; and there emerged from his study a knowledge of the Greek language and literature, to which much of his time and attention was here devoted, several transla-
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acknowledged by him as a truth. Where he judged himself to be in the right, he manifested the energy worthy of a Roman, even though the world was against him. Thus he hesitated not to encounter the opposition of all Rome when once he believed it to be his duty to come forward as a promoter of monasticism in a country where it was a little loved, and where this rigidly ascetic tendency came into collision with the propensities and interests of many, and where "he could not fail, even on this score, to incur the hatred of numbers, both of the clergy and laity" (Neander, ii, 688). Still, to his praise be it said, that however greatly we regret his attitude of regard for, or disapprobation of, monachism, which, at this early period of the life of the Christian Church, may be pardoned on the ground that such great personal sacrifices and privations were the only proofs which the young convert could bring to evince his earnestness and zeal for the cause of his Master, yet "no one has denounced, no one has branded more energetically than he the false monks, the false penitents, the false widows and virgins. He points out with a bold hand all the faults and dangers of the institution," so far, of course, as an advocate of monasticism could have ventured to do it at all (Ibid. 

Moms of the Church, 405 sq. Lea, Catholic, p. 72 sq. Jerome, in short, was in the service of the popular opinion, and yet never yielded to the opinion of the day. In the opinion of Neander, Jerome's "better qualities were obscured by the great defects of his character, by his manly passion, his easily offended nature, his spirit of controversy and of rule, his pride, so often concealed under the garb of humility." Much milder is the judgment of Dr. Schaff, who pronounces Jerome "indeed an accomplished and most serviceable scholar, and a zealous enthusiast for all which his age counted holy and respected," and that he reflected with pride the failings also of his age and of the monastic system," adding in a foot-note that "among later Protestant historians opinion has become somewhat more favorable," though he again modifies this statement by saying that this has reference "rather to his learning than to his moral character.

The Vulgate.—Jerome gave also great offence to his contemporaries by his attempt to correct the Latin version of the Bible, the "become greatly distorted by the blending together of different translations, the mixing up with each other of the different Gospels, and the ignorance and prevalence of transcriptions." This he succeeded in accomplishing, and it is regarded by all Biblical scholars as "by far the most important and valuable" work of Jerome, in itself constituting "an immortal service" to the Christian Church. "Above all his contemporaries, and even all his successors down to the 16th century, Jerome, by his linguistic knowledge, his Oriental travel, and his entire culture, was best fitted, and, in fact, the only man to undertake and successfully execute so gigantic a task—a task which just then, with the approaching separation of East and West, and the decay of the knowledge of the original language of the Bible in Latin Christendom, was of the highest necessity. Here, as so often in history, we plainly discern the hand of divine Providence" (Schaff). He had been urged to undertake this work by bishop Damasus, and it was commenced, as already noted, while Jerome was yet a resident at Rome, and had, in fact, been commenced while the Gospels and the Psalms. In his retreat at Bethlehem he extended this work to the whole Bible, supported in his task, it is generally believed, by the Hexapla of Origen, which he is supposed to have obtained from the library at Cesarea. Even this was a bold undertaking, by which he must expose himself to being loaded with reproaches on the part of those who, in their ignorance, which they identified with a pious simplicity, were wont to condemn every deviation from the traditional text, however necessary or salutary it might be. They were very ready to see, in any change of the only text which was known to them, a falsification, without in-
quiring any further into the reason of the alteration. Yet here he had in his favor the authority of a Roman bishop, as well as the fact that in this case it was impossible to oppose to him a translation established and transmitted by ecclesiastical authority, or a divine inspiration. The hitherto received Vulgate had given far greater offence by another useful undertaking, viz. a new version of the Old Testament, not according to the Alexandrian translation, which before this had alone been accepted, but according to the Hebrew. This appeared to many, even of those who did not regard their opinions as of equal importance, to be a great piece of impiety—to pretend to understand the Old Testament better than the seventy inspired interpreters—better than the apostles who had followed this translation, and who would have given another translation if they had considered it to be necessary—to allow one's self to be so misled by Jews as for their accommodation to falsify the writings of the Old Testament! (Neander, Church History, ii, 684 sq.) But with the opposition there came also friends, and among his supporters he counted even Augustine, until gradually it was introduced in all the churches of the West. Of this great work, as a whole, Dr. Schaff (Church History, iii, 376 sq.) says: "Of the Vulgate the first place among the Bible versions of the ancient Church. It exerted the same influence upon Latin Christendom as the Septuagint upon Greek, and it is directly or indirectly the mother of most of the existing European Bibles. It became immediately from the original languages, though with the use of all accessible helps, and is as much superior to the Italics as Luther's Bible is to the older German versions. From the present stage of Biblical philology and exegesis the Vulgate can be charged, indeed, with innumerable faults, the uncritical in the expositions, and the arbitrary in the style; but, notwithstanding these, it deserves, as a whole, the highest praise for the boldness with which it went back from the half-defiled Septuagint directly to the original Hebrew; for its union of idiom and freedom; and for the dignity, clearness, and gracefulness of its style. Accordingly after the extinction of the knowledge of Greek, it very naturally became the official Bible of Western Christendom, and so continued to be till the genius of the Reformation in Germany, Switzerland, Holland, and England, returning to the original text, and still further penetrating the spirit of the Semitic tongue, with the continual help of the Vulgate, produced a number of popular Bibles, which were the same to the evangelical laity that the Vulgate had been for many centuries to the Catholic clergy. This high place the Vulgate has also to this day in the Roman Church, where it is unwarrantably and perniciously placed on an equality with the original." See Vulgate.

Jerome's other Writings.—As the result of his critical labors on the Holy Scriptures, we have also commentaries on Genesis, the major and minor prophets, Ecclesiastes, Job, on some of the Psalms, the Gospel of Matthew, and the epistles to the Galatians, Ephesians, Titus, and Philemon, besides translations of different parts of the Old and New Testaments. All these productions, Dr. Schaff pronounces "the most instructive we have from the Latin Church of that day, not excepting even the best of Augustine, which otherwise greatly surpass them in theological depth and spiritual unction." Alban Butler thus speaks of Jerome's exegetical labors: "Nothing has rendered St. Jerome so famous as his critical labors on the holy Scriptures. For this the Church so loudly acceded. He has not been raised by God through a special providence, and particularly assisted from above, and she styles him the greatest of all her doctors in expounding the divine oracles. To works of an exegetical character in a wider sense belong also his Liber de interpretatione nominum Hebraicorum, or De nominibus Hebr. (Opera, iii, 1-199), the book On the Interpretation of the Hebrew Names, an etymological lexicon of the proper Names of the Old and New Testa-
ments, useful for its time, but in many respects defective, and now worthless; and Liber de sive nonnamis locorum Hebraicorum, usually cited under the title Ensebiis Onomasticon (urubium et locorum S. Scripturae) (Opera, iii, 121-290), a free translation of the Onomasticon of Theodotion, a sort of Biblical topology in alphabetical order, still considered valuable to antiquarian scholarship.

Yet the busy life which Jerome led, and the controversies which he waged in behalf of rigid orthodoxy in Christian belief, prove that, so far from confusing himself to his ultimate destruction, he was a great piece of acumen, a great piece of industry upon each subject—biography, history, and the vast field of theology, and in all he wielded the pen of a scholar, in a (Latin) style acknowledged by all to be both pure and terse. "The phraseology of Jerome," says Prof. W. Ramsay (Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Bibl. s. v.), "is exceedingly pure, bearing ample testimony to the diligence with which he must have studied the choicest models. No one can read the Vulgate without being struck by the contrast which it presents in the classic simplicity of its language to the degenerate affectation of Apuleius, and the barbarous obscurity of the Greek Fathers. It is, indeed, the model of all later style." We lack the space to go into further details on his varied productions, and are obliged to refer for a more detailed statement to Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Bibl. (Lond. 1852, royal. 8vo), ii, 461 sq., and Hofer, Lexicon Theol. Vatic. (Vatican City 1842). In short, "Jerome excelled" (says Dr. Eadie, in Appleton's Cyclop. s. v.) "all his contemporaries in erudition. He wanted the glowing fancy of Chrysostom, and the serene temper and symmetrical intellect of Augustine, but he was beyond them both in critical skill and taste. His faults lie upon the surface; he was inaccurately disposed, in an opposite manner to the Greek Fathers, who so respected every opposition, and magnified tridles, that, in his towering passion, he heaped upon opponents opprobrious epithets and coarse invective. Hauteur, cagryness, and acerbity appear also in his letters and expositions. His mode of life must have greatly aggravated these touchiness and instability. It made him a fit instrument of the mollifying influence of society and friendship. His heart was estranged from human sympathies; and, save when lighted up by the ardors of his indignant passion, it was, like his own cell, cold, gloomy, and uninvisiting. The works of Jerome will always maintain for him the place he holds in the museum of Christian antiquities, brought to him by the continual help of the Vulgate, produced a number of popular Bibles, which were the same to the evangelical laity that is baseless, fanciful, and one-sided, but very much that is useful and instructive in exegesis and theology." A still greater, and to us nearer authority, Dr. Schaff (Church History, iii, 987 sq.), thus sums up the position and work of this great man: "Jerome was more than a doctor in theology and Christology, semi-Velician in anthropology, Romanizing in the doctrine of the Church and tradition, anti-chiastic in eschatology, legalistic and ascetic in ethics, a violent fighter of all heresies, a fastidious of all monkish extravagances, Jerome was revered throughout the Catholic middle age as the patron saint of Christian and ecclesiastical learning, and, next to Augustine, as maximus doctor ecclesiae: but by his enthusiastic love for the holy Scriptures, his recourse to the original languages, his classic translation of the Bible, and his manifold exegetical merits, he established a position in the Church that is unassailable; and as a scholar and an author still takes the first rank, and as an influential theologian the second (after Augustine), among the Latin fathers."

Of the various editions of Jerome's works a detailed account is given in the Dictionary of the Bibliotheca Patrum Latinorum, i, 6, 3, § 3. Parts of the first edition were early published, one of its earliest writings collectively was given to the public in 1516. It was reprinted by Erasmus, with the assistance of Erasmianus (Basel, 9 vols. fol.,reprinted in 1558 and 1561, and also in Lyons, 1580, in 8 vols. fol.). Another critical edition was prepared by Marianus Victorinus (Rome, 1566-72).
him (Wickliffe), and, finding his doctrines had made considerable progress in Bohemia, and that Huss was at the head of that party which had espoused them, he attached himself to that leader” (Gilpin, Lives, p. 294; compare, however, Giusti, Life of Huss, i. 69).” May 29, 1408, the University of Prague, at the instigation of the archiepiscopal officials and the cathedral chapter of Prague, publicly condemned the writings of John Wickliffe as heretical, in spite of a strong opposition, headed by John Huss, Jerome, and Master Nicholas of Letecký (q. v.). For some time past they had been growing a discontent between the native and foreign element represented at the university. When that institution of learning was founded, Prague was the residence of the German emperor, but that city was also the capital of Bohemia, a country which “seemed fitted by location and even nature to become one of the forerunners of the new states of Europe,” and the people, aware of their great natural resources, were unwilling to submit to the policy of the rulers to make their country a province of Germany. A strong feeling of nationality, such as is again witnessed in our day, developed itself in every Slavic heart, and gradually Bohemian literature, a nation’s strength, which had before succumbed to the German, began to revive, and with it there came a longing desire to force from the Germans the control of the university, in which the native Bohemians saw themselves slighted. The German brothers were not only outvoted by the Bohemians, but also by the Bohemian radicals, Wickliffe a Realist; no wonder, then, that his writings were condemned, even though the Bohemians were in favor of the Englishman (see Reichel, Sitze von der Mitten, Aeg, p. 602 sq.; Studien und Kritiken, 1871, i, 297 sq.). Here, then, came an opportunity for John Huss and his followers. The clergy, returning from Italy, in large numbers, to found a university at Leipzig. They also circulated the most injurious reports respecting the Hussites (as we will hereafter call the adherents of Huss and Jerome for convenience sake). In the mean time, he continued his battle with the orthodox. The archbishop of Prague, Zybneck, had issued (in 1406) a decree “that henceforth no one, under severe penalty, should hold, teach, or, for purposes of academic debate, argue in favor of Wickliffe’s doctrines.” This same Zybneck was the legate of Gregory XII. To this last pope the king of Bohemia adjoined at this time, but in 1409, when the Council of Pisa denounced the rival popes, Gregory XII and Benedict XIII, and declared Alexander V the legitimate incumbent of the papal chair, Huss inclined to favor the action of the Council of Pisa, and won also the king over to his side, through the influence of Jerome, who seems to have been a favorite at court. This brought about an open rupture with Zybneck, who had hitherto hesitated openly to attack Huss and Jerome. Now there was no longer any need for delaying the decisive conflict. “He issued an ordinance forbidding all teachers of the university who had joined the party of the cardinal (the Council of Pisa) against the schismatic popes, and had thus abandoned the cause of Gregory, to discharge any priestly duties within his diocese.” The Bohemians refused to obey the mandate; the archbishop then pronounced the king and his teachers to be accessory to the crime of preaching, and commanded them to enforce obedience to his decrees; neither was his master, Gregory XII, able to do it. Determined to conquer, the archbishop now suddenly espoused the cause
of the stronger rival in the papacy, and appealed to Alex- 
exander V for his decision in the conflict with the Boh-
emians. A papal bull was secured condemning the 
articles of Wickliffe, forbidding preaching in private 
chapel bull granting the excommunication of the leader 
commission to enforce the measures adopted by him for 
the extirpation of the spreading heresy. In addition to 
a renewal of his former decrees, the archbishop now 
condemned not only the writings of Wickliffe, but also 
the books of Hus and Jerome, as well as those of their 
descendants Milic and Janow, and caused them to be 
publicly burned. "The deed was done. The books 
were burned. The ban of the Church rested on those 
who had dared to object. Doubtless the archbishop 
feared that he had secured a triumph. He had executed 
his papal sentence, and proved himself an able instru-
ment of the Church party who had instigated him to 
the bold deed. But it provoked more than it overawed. 
The king, the court, and a large proportion of the citi-
zens of Prague were enraged and embittered by it. A 
cry of indignation ran throughout Bohemia" (Gillett, 
Huss, i, 157). 

As usual, and as is too 
apt to be the case, excesses were committed by maraud-
ers, and the crime charged to the reformers. The king 
and the people siding with the Hussites, it remained for 
the papal party to adopt severer measures; these were 
soon found in the proclamation of an interdict on the 
city, and in the excommunication of the leaders. 
Huss left the city to avoid an open conflict between his 
countrymen, and Jerome also soon quitted the place, 
and went to Ofen (1410). But Zytebeck was unwilling to see 
his opponent abroad proclaiming everywhere the doc-
tines of Wickliffe, and denouncing even popery. Je-
rome dared to sustain the excommunication at any 
question of these: Whether the pope possessed more power than another 
priest, and whether the bread in the Eucharist or the 
body of Christ possessed more virtue in the mass of 
the Roman pontiff than in that of any other officiating ec-
clesiastic. Not many days after, while in open squa-
ranged by several of his friends and adherents, he 
exposed two sketches, in one of which Christ's disciples, 
on one side, following, with naked feet, their Master 
mounted on an ass; while on the other the pope and 
the cardinals were represented in great state on superb 
horses, and preceded, as usual, with falcons and 
rumbling carriages. Zytebeck caused the arrest of Jerome by the archbishop of 
Graz, who, recognising the superior abilities and 
great influence of Jerome, dismissed him five days after. 

More vehement and serious became Jerome's opposition 
to the papal party in 1412, after the publication of the 
papal bull granting the excommunication of Hus (q.v.) to all who should engage in "holy warfare" against king Ladis-
laus (q.v.). Huss, who had returned to Prague, and who now was 
excommunicated, simply preached with all his power against this bull, but Je-
rome, urged on by his impulsive nature, was carried 
far beyond the limits of prudence and of decency. He 
caused (if he did not head the movement he undoubt-
edly inspired it) the bull to be carried about the streets 
by two ladies, heading a long procession of stu-
dents, and, after displaying it in this manner for some 
time, it was publicly burned, with some fulsome briefs, 
at the gates of the new town. "That similar scenes 
not infrequently occurred is most probable. Among 
the charges brought against Jerome at the Council of 
Constance are some which imply that his conduct in 
this respect had been far from unquestionable. Some 
of these, however, but the evidence is too strong if not 
decisive, in regard to his course on the reception of the 
papal bulls for the Crusade. On another occasion he is 
said to have thrown a priest into the Moldau, who, but 
for timely aid, would have been drowned. But such 
violence was bitterly provoked. The burning of the 
books by Slynco (Zytebeck), the execution of the men 
for asserting the falsehood of the indulgences, the ex-
communication of Huss, to say nothing of the course 
pursued by his assailants, had excited a strong feeling 
against the patrons of papal fraud and ecclesiastical cor-
ruption. We are only surprised that the deep resent-
ment felt was confined in its expression within such 
limits" (Gillett, i, 257). Both he and Huss were obliged 
to fee in order to evade the sentence of their peers for a defense of his 
course. When the tiding of the imprisonment of his 
friend reached Jerome he determined to go to Constance 
himself. He went there at first incognito and secretly 
(April 4, 1415), but, fearing danger for himself without 
the possibility of affording relief to his friend, he left 
for a journey four miles distant, and there demanded of 
the emperor a safe-conduct to Constance, that he might 
publicly answer before any one to every charge of heresy 
that might be brought against him. Not being able 
to obtain such a safe-conduct, he caused to be affixed 
the next day, on the gates of the emperor's palace, on 
the doors of the priory chapel. A citation was sent to him, 
which, it was said, had been posted up in Constance in 
reply to his declarations to the council. He denied to 
have seen them before he left the vicinity of Constance, 
where he had waited sufficiently long to be reached by 
any reply made within a reasonable time of time, and 
added: "I am not afraid that the emperor will reach him 
even on the confines of Bohemia. But this declaration rather aggravates, if anything, the members of the council, so eager to find a plea to con-
demn the prisoner. Many members of this council 
came from the universities of Paris, Heidelberg, and 
Cologne, and recollecting him, they desired in triumph 
over the man who had always far outranged them.

"Accordingly one after another addressed him, and 
re-
minded him of the propositions which he had set forth. 
The first among these was the learned chancellor Ger-
on, but the evidence is too strong if not entirely over- 
coming the other, and declared that he, as a university 
master, had maintained such philosophical doctrines as 
he had no concern with faith. In reference to all that had een objected to him by different parties, he held him-
self ready to recant as soon as he was taught anything 
better. Amid the noise of three men crying, 'Jer-
ome must be burnt,' he answered with composure, 
'Well, if you wish my death, let it come, in God's 
name!' Wise counsel, however, prevailed at the mo-
ment, and Jerome was remitted to prison, where he was bound to a stake, with his hands, feet, and neck so that he could scarcely move his head. Thus he lay two days, with nothing to eat but bread and water. Then for the first time he obtained, through the mediation of his friends, a short interval of liberty, lasting only a few days, and during which he was followed by his keepers, other means of subsistence. This severe imprisonment threw him into a violent fit of sickness. He demanded a confessio, which was at first refused, and then granted with difficulty. After he had spent several months in this severe confinement, he heard of the imprisonment of his friend, whose death in prison the imprisonment of Jerome produced the greatest exasperation of feeling among the knights in Bohemia and Moravia. On the 2d of September they put forth a letter to the council, in which they expressed their indignation and declared that they had known Huss but as a pious man, zealous for the doctrines of the Gospel; and that he had fallen a victim only to his enemies and the enemies of his country. They entered a bitter complaint against the captivity of the innocent Jerome, who had made himself famous by his brilliant gifts; perhaps he, too, had been taken on the! For the trial, and it was included in the heretical composition. They declared themselves resolved to contend, even to the shedding of their blood, in defence of the law of Christ and of the faithful servants' (Neander, Ch. Hist. v, 375). This decided stand of Jerome's friends forced the council to milder terms, and they determined, if necessary, to secure the martyrdom of the Hussite prelate, a point which the effect of Jerome's close confinement, and the sufferings that he had endured for the past six months, made them believe might be carried without much difficulty. They mainly pressed him to recant his opinion on the doctrine of transubstantiation; and on the third examination, Sept. 11, 1416, Jerome, by this time worn out both in body and mind, made a public and unqualified recantation of the Hussite statement of the eucharistic theory. Here the irreparable conduct of the Romanists might well have rested, and Jerome might have been permitted to return to his native land. But there were men in the council who well understood that Jerome had been induced to recant only because he saw no other door to lead from the prison, and that, his liberty once regained, he would return to his friends, to preach anew the truth as he had heard it from the lips of Huss, and to die as was done by the friends of Wickliffe. Indeed, they had reasons to fear that if he ever escaped with his life, it would be given to the cause in which Huss had just fallen. On the other hand, there were men of honor in the council—men who, though they had narrowed themselves down until they could see Christ only in the typical sense, who were more willing to forego the hope of deliverance for the time being, than to give up a moral position to the papal chair, yet would not make pledges only to break them as soon as they found it to their interest to do so. One of these was the cardinal of Cambrai, who insisted that Jerome ought now to be liberat-ed, as he had promised him before his recantation. The counsel of the more cunning, however, prevailed, and Jerome was detained to answer other and more serious accusations. Tired of the crooked ways of these so-called defenders of the Christian faith, Jerome finally declared to be any longer subjected to private examinations. The council charged that publically and all year long he ready to answer the calumnies of his accusers. May 23, 1416, he finally succeeded in obtaining a public hearing. On this day, and on the 26th, he spent from six in the morning until one in the afternoon in replying to the different accusations made against him, and closed, to the satisfaction of all the council, by his only answer, namely, claiming his former cowardly recantation. "Of all the sins," he exclaimed now, with great feeling, "that I have committed since my youth, none weigh so heavily on my mind and cause me such poignant remorse as that which I committed in this fatal place when I accepted the purest sentences of the John Huss, my master and friend." If his defence had been delivered with such presence of mind, with so much eloquence and wit as to excite universal admiration and to incline his judges to mercy, the closing declaration against his former recantation certainly sealed his own death-warrant, and left not the least hope for escape from martyrdom. Yet there was a thrill among his enemies, a spark of hope. He was so excited so deep a sympathy that they would not declare against him; there were also some who dared not, by this new martyrdom, provoke still further the angry feelings of the Bohemians. He was granted a respite of forty days for reflection, and an opportunity was afforded to the council of Prague still to use the heretic to influence him possibly to recant of this decided opposition to the Church. But Jerome remained steadfast this time. If he had seen a period when, like Cranmer, his faith faltered, it had passed, and he was now ready to die rather than give up his faith, and felt as a Hussite. May 30 had been appointed to pass final judgment. He still refusing to recant, the council pronounced against him, and he was handed over for execution to the secular authorities. The whole trial and his last hours are vividly pictured by a Roman Catholic, Poggio, an ecclesiastic of the Franciscan order, who is freely cited by Neander (Ch. Hist. v, 375 sq.), and is given in full by Gilpin (Lives, p. 255 sq.). Of his last hours Pog-gio relates as follows: "With cheerful looks he went readily and willingly to his death; he feared neither death nor the fire and its torture. No stoic ever suffered death with a more quiet face and composed manner; and his courage seemed to demand it. Jerome endured the torments of the fire with more tranquility than Socrates displayed in drinking his cup of hemlock." Jerome was burned like his friend and master Huss, and his ashes likewise thrown into the Rhine. "Historian, [Roman] Catholic Church, History, vol. iii, p. 473., and Protestant alike, vie with each other in paying homage to the heroic courage and apostolic resignation with which Jerome met his doom. Posthuma has confirmed their verdict, and reveres him as a martyr to the truth, who, unweared in life and noble in death, has acquired an immortality from his death. Indeed, we question whether Jerome and Huss sufficient credit is given for their share in the Reform-ation of the 16th century. We fear that it is through neglect alone that to Huss and Jerome is denied a place by the side of Luther and Calvin, to which, as Giselin (in the Franciscan order) rightly says, they are justly entitled. "It is true, indeed, that the great reform movement, of which Huss was the leader, was, to human view, after a most desperate and prolonged struggle, crushed out; not, however, without leaving behind it most important results." See Gillet, "Huss and John Huss," vol. i, pp. 158 and 182; Neander, Church History, vol. v (see Index); Tischer, Leben d. Hieronymus, v. Prag. (Lpz. 1835); Helfert, Huss u. Hieron. (Prag. 1835, p. 151 sq., 208 sq.; perhaps the most important, though rather partial); Zvezenska, Gesetz der euckar, Kirche in Böhmen (Bielef, 1806), vol. i; Bühringer, Die Kirche Christi, ii, 4, 608 sq.; Krammel, Gesetz der böhm. Reformation (Gotha, 1867, 8vo); Palacky, Gesetz. v. Böhm. vol. iii and iv. See HUSS: J. H. W.)

Jerome. See HIERONYMUS.

Jerubb’aël (Heb. Jerubbe’aël, contempler with Bala; comp. Ishbaal; Sept. Ἰούσσαλος), a surname of Gideon (q. v.), the judge of Israel, given him in consequence of his overthrow of the idolatrous image of Baal (J. viii. 38, vi. 15, 16, 24, 29, 35; Sam. xii, 11). "The name Jerubbael appears in the Greekized form of Hieronobol (Ἱερονοβολός) in a fragment of Philo-Biblical preserved by Eusebius (Proc. Euseu. i, 9); but the identity of name does not authorize us to conclude that it is Gideon who is there referred. In the Pamilyene inscriptions, Ἱερονοβολός appears as the name of a deity (Gesemiens, Monum. Phœnic. p. 229; Movers, Phœniciar., i, 454). Josephus omits all reference to the incident (Ant. v, 6, 6). See JERUBBESHEETH.

Jerubb’beseth (Heb. Jerubbe’seth, Ἱεροφασάθε, contri-
Jeruel

Jeruel (Heb. יֶרֶעֶל, יֶרֶעֶל, founded by God, otherwise fear of God; compare Jeshuel; Sept. Ἰερουσηλήτης) is a name (probably to avoid mentioning the name of a false god, Exod. xxi, 18) of Gideon (q.v.), the Israelitish judge, acquired on account of his conflict with the idolatry of Baal (2 Sam. xi, 21). See JERUSALEM.

Jeru' al (Heb. יֶרֶעֶל, יֶרֶעֶל, founded by God, otherwise fear of God; compare Jeshuel; Sept. Ἰερουσηλήτης), a desert (דֶּרֶשָׁה, i.e. open common) mentioned in the prediction by Jabeziah of Jehoshaphat's victory over the Moabites and Ammonites, where it is described as being situated on the ascent from the valley of the Dead Sea towards Jerusalem, at the foot of the valley leading towards the cliff Ziz (1 Chron. xx, 10). The "desert" was probably so called as adjoining some town or village of the same name. From the context it appears it has lain beyond the wilderness of Tekoa (ver. 20), in the direction of Engedi (ver. 2), near a certain watch-tower overlooking the pass (ver. 24). It appears to correspond to the tract el-Hussaoua, sloping from Tekoa to the precipice of Ain-Jidy, described by Dr. Robinson as fertile in the north-western part (Researches, ii, 212), but sterile as it approaches the Ghor (p. 248), and forming part of the Desert of Judaea.

The invading tribes, having marched round the south of the Dead Sea, had encamped at Engedi. The road thence to Jerusalem ascended by a steep and terrible path (Walcott, Bib. Sac. i, 69), and thence leads northward, passing below Tekoa (Robinson, Bib. Res. i, 501, 508). The valley ("brook," ver. 16), at the end of which the enemy were to be found, was probably the wady Jehar, which, with its continuation wady el-Qhar, traverses the southern part of this plateau (Robinson's Res. ii, 185); and its upper end appears to have been the same through which the triumphant host passed on their return, and named it Berachah (q.v.), i.e. blessing, in commemoration of the victory (ver. 25).

Jesu'alem (Heb. יְשׁוּעַלֵה, יְשׁוּעַלֵה, fully [in 1 Chron. iii, 5; 2 Chron. xxiv, 1; 2 Sam. i, 6; Jer. xxvi, 18] יְשׁוּעַלֵה, יְשׁוּעַלֵה, with [final] י directive, לֶבֶנֶת, 1 Kings x, 2; fully יְשׁוּעַלֵה, 2 Chron. xxxii, 9]; Chal. יְשׁוּעַלָה or יְשׁוּעַלָה; Yerushalem; Syr. Vriahlem; Gr. Ιερουσαλημ or [r] Ἱερουσαλημ [I. e. Jerusalem], poetically also Σαλαμ (Σαλαμ, Shalam), and once Aniel (q.v.); original Jealous (q.v.; ver. 2); in sacred themes the "City of God," or "Jerusalem City" (Neh. xi, 1; Matt. iv, 5), as in the modern Arabic name el-Khamayeyn, the Holy City (comp. i-xii, 28), the "city of Judah." The Hebrew name is a dual form (see Gesenius, Lehrg. p. 553 sqq.; Ewald, Krit. Gramm. p. 301), and is of disputed etymology (see Gesenius, Thes. Heb. p. 628; Rosenmuller, Althebr. ii, ii, 292; Ewald, Jer. Gesch. ii, 354), but probably signifies possession of peace (q. d. לֵבֶנֶת יְשׁוּעַלֵה rather than לֵבֶנֶת יְשׁוּעַלָה, i.e. foundation of peace, as preferred by Gesenius and First.), the dual referring to the two chief mountains (Zion and Moriah) on which it was built, or two main parts (the Upper and the Lower City, i.e. Zion and Acora). It has been known under the above titles in all ages as the Jewish capital of Palestine.

I. History.—This is so largely made up of the history of Palestine itself in different ages, and of its successive rulers, that for minute details we refer to these (especially Judah); here we present only a general survey, to which references to sources of more detailed information will be added.

1. This city was mentioned very early in Scripture, being usually supposed to be the Salem of which Melchizedek was king (Gen. xiv, 18). B.C. cir. 2000. Such was the name of the Jews themselves; for Josephus, who called Melchizedek king of Salem (Σαλομ) observes that this name was afterwards changed into Hierosolyma (Ant. i, 10, 8). All the fathers of the Church, Jerome excepted, agree with Josephus, and understand Jerusalem and Salem to indicate the same place. The Psalmist also says (lxvi, 2), "In Salem is his tabernacle, and his dwelling-place in Zion." See JERUSALEM.

The mountain of the land of Moriah, which Abraham (Gen. xxii, 2) descended on the third day to offer Isaac (B. C. cir. 2047), is said by Josephus (Ant. i, 13, 2) the mountain on which Solomon afterwards built the Temple (2 Chron. iii, 1). See Moriah.

The position of the identity of Jerusalem with "Ca-dysia, a large city of Syria," which is almost as large as Samaris, which is mentioned by Herodotus (ii, 159; iii, 5) as having been taken by Pharaon-Necho, need not be investigated in this place. It is interesting, and, if decided in the affirmative, so far important as confirming the Scripture narrative, but does not in any way add to our knowledge of the history of the city. The reader will find it fully examined in Rawlinson's Herodotus, ii, 246; Blakesley's Herodotus—Excursus on Bk. iii, ch. v (both on identification); and in Kenrick's Egypt, i, 406, and Dict. of Ge. and Rom. Geogr. ii, 17 (both for it).

Not less nebulous than far more certain in the historical traditions they are, and not more individual speculations—of Tacitus (Hist. v, 2) and Plutarch (It. d. Claud. ch. xxxii) of the foundation of the city by a certain Hierosolymus, a son of the Typhon (see Winer's note, 545). All the certain information on which to rely one must gather from the books of the Jewish historians alone.

2. The name Jerusalem first occurs in Josh. x, 1, where Azmonidek (q.v.), king of Jerusalem, is mentioned as having entered into an alliance with other kings against Joshua, by whom they were all overcome (comp. Josh. xii, 10). B. C. 1618. See JOSHUA.

In drawing the northern border of Judah, we find Jerusalem again mentioned (Josh. xv, 8; compare Josh. xvi, 16). This border ran through the valley of Benjamin, viz. the country on the south of it, as Bethel, which belonged to Joseph, as the mountain of Zion, forming the northern wall of the valley, and occupied by the Jebusites, appertaining to Benjamin. Among the cities of Benjamin, therefore, is also mentioned (Josh. xxvii, 26) "Jebus, which is Jerusalem" (comp. Judg. xix, 10; 1 Chron. vi, 4). At a later date, however, owing to the conquest of the David, the line runs on the north-er side of Zion, leaving the city equally divided between the two tribes. See TIRIHE. There is a rabbinical tradition that part of the Temple was in the lot of Judah, and part of it in that of Benjamin (Lightfoot, 1636, Lond. 1894). See TEMPLE.

After the division of Joshua, when there remained for the children of Israel much to conquer in Canaan, the Lord directed Judah to fight against the Canaanites; and they took Jerusalem, smote it with the edge of the sword, and set it on fire (Judg. i, 1-8). B. C. cir. 1590. After that, the Judahites and the Benjamites dwelt with the Jebusites at Jerusalem; for it is recorded (Josh. xv, 63) that the children of Judah could not drive out the Jebusites inhabiting Jerusalem; and we are farther informed (Judg. i, 21) that the children of Benjamin did not expel them from Jerusalem (comp. Judg. xix, 10). The Jebusites were removed by Josiah, not only from the lower city, but kept possession of the mountain of Zion, which David conquered at a later period. This is the explanation of Josephus (Ant. v, 2, 3). See JERUSALEM. Jerusalem is not again mentioned till the time of Saul, when it is stated (1 Sam. xvi, 54) that Danit, the son of Sodiel and beth of Jerusalem, B. C. cir. 1068. When David, who had previously reigned over Judah alone in Hebron, was called to rule over all Israel, he led his forces against the Jebusites, and conquered the castle of Zion which Josit first scaled (1 Sam. vii, 5-9; 1 Chron. ii, 4-8). Then he fixed his standard on the temple, and the city was "called Jerusalem," B. C. cir. 1044. He strengthened its fortifications [see MILLO], but does not appear to have enlarged it.
3. The reasons which led David to fix upon Jerusalem as the metropolis of his kingdom are noticed elsewhere [see David], being, chiefly, that it was in his own tribe of Judah, in which his influence was the strongest, while it was the nearest to the other tribes of any site he could have chosen in Judah. The peculiar strength also of the place, and its situation on three sides by natural trenches of valleys, could not be without weight. Its great strength, according to the military notions of that age, is shown by the length of time the Jebusites were able to keep possession of it against the force of all Israel. David was doubtless the best judge of his own interests in this matter. The interests of Jerusalem could not come into play, and if he had only considered the best situation for a metropolis of the whole kingdom, it is doubtful whether a more central situation with respect to all the tribes would not have been far preferable, especially as the law required all the adult males of Israel to reassemble there every year to the divine presence. Indeed, the burdensome character of this obligation to the more distant tribes seems to have been one of the excuses for the revolt of the ten tribes, as it certainly was for the establishment of schismatic altars in Dan and Bethel (1 Kings xii, 28). Many travelers have suggested that Samaria, which afterwards became the metropolis of the separated kingdom, was far preferable to Jerusalem for the site of a capital city; and its central situation would also have been in its favor as a metropolis for all the tribes. But as the choice of David was so firmly confirmed by the divine government, which made Mount Moriah the site of the Temple, we are bound to consider the choice as having been providentially ordered with reference to the contingencies that afterwards arose, by which Jerusalem was made the capital of the separate kingdom of Judah, for which it was well adapted. See JERUSALEM.

The promise made to David received its accomplishment when Solomon built his Temple upon Mount Moriah, B.C. 1010. He also added towers to the walls, and otherwise greatly adorned the city. By him and his father Jerusalem had been made the imperial residence of the king of all Israel; and the place, often called "the house of Jehovah," constituted at the same time the residence of the King of kings, the supreme head of the theocratical state, whose viceroygers the human kings were taught to regard themselves. It now began, for that was the true centre of the Levites, to a particular tribe: it was the centre of all civil anarchy, the very place of which Moses spoke, Deut. xii, 5: "The place which the Lord your God shall choose out of all your tribes to put his name there, even unto his habitation shall ye seek, and thither thou shalt come" (comp. Luke viii, 14; xiv, 20; xvi, 11-16; Ps. cxxvii). See SOLOMON.

Jerusalem was not, indeed, politically important: it was not the capital of a powerful empire directing the affairs of other states, but it stood high in the bright prospects foretold by David when declaring his faith in the coming of a Messiah (Ps. ii, 6; 12; lxiii, 8; 12, 16-26; Ec. ii, 2).

In all these passages the name Zion is used, which, although properly applied to the southernmost part of the city of Jerusalem, is often in Scripture put poetically for Jerusalem generally, and sometimes for Mount Moriah and its Temple. See ZION.

The importance and splendor of Jerusalem were considerably lessened after the death of Solomon, under his son Rehoboam whose ten years' tenor, through the prophet Nathan (2 Sam. vii, 10), "I will appoint a place for my people Israel, and will plant them, that they may dwell in a place of their own and move no more," B.C. 943. From this it would seem that even David had, then at least, no assurance that Jerusalem would be the place. It had so often been spoken of as that which God would choose for the central seat of the theocratical monarchy, and which it became after Solomon's Temple had been built. See TEMPLE.

After this time the history of Jerusalem is continued in the history of Judah, for which the second book of the Kings and of the Chronicles are the principal sources of information. After the time of Solomon, the kingdom of Judah was almost absolutely ruled by good kings, "who did that which was right in the sight of the Lord," and by such as were idolatrous and evil-disposed; and the reign of the same kind often varied, and was by turns good or evil. The condition of the kingdom, as of the nation in general, was very much affected by these mutations. Under good kings the city flourished, and under bad kings it suffered greatly. Under Rehoboam (q. v.) it was conquered by Shishak (q. v.), king of Egypt, who pillaged the treasures of the Temple (2 Chron. xii, 9); B.C. 970. Under Jeroboam (q. v.) it became the capital of the kingdom of Israel, who broke down four hundred cubits of the wall of the city, and took all the gold and silver, and all the vessels that were found in the Temple (2 Kings xiv, 13, 14); B.C. 880. Uzziah (q. v.), son of Amaziah, who at first reigned well, built towers in Jerusalem at the corners of the walls, and brought water by a subterraneous aqueduct to the west side of the city (2 Chron. xxvi, 9, B.C. 713). But in the latter part of the same year he performed his most eminent service for the city: he built two more towers by the side of the wall, and fortified them (2 Chron. xxvi, 9, B.C. 713). His son, Jotham (q. v.), built the high gate of the Temple, and reared up many other structures (2 Chron. xxvii, 3, 4), B.C. 755. Hezekiah (q. v.) added to the honors of his reign that of an improver of Jerusalem (2 Chron. xxxii, 8, B.C. 725). At a later date, however, he depopulated the Temple in some degree in order to pay the levy imposed by the king of Assyria (2 Kings xviii, 15, 16); B.C. 713. But in the latter part of the same year he performed his most eminent service for the city: he built two more towers by the side of the wall, and bringing its waters by a subterraneous aqueduct to the west side of the city (2 Chron. xxxii, 30). This work is inferred, from 2 Kings xx, to have been of great importance to Jerusalem, as it cut off a supply of water from any besieging enemy, and bestowed it upon the inhabitants of the city. The immediate occasion was the threatened invasion by the Assyrians. See SASSANIAN.

Hezekiah's son, Manasseh (q. v.), was punished by a capture of the city in consequence of his idolatrous desecration of the Temple (2 Chron. xxxiii, 11), B.C. 690; but in his later and best years he built a strong and very high wall on the east side of Jerusalem (2 Chron. xxxiii, 14). The works in the city connected with the names of the succeeding kings of Judah were, so far as recorded, confined to the defilement of the house of the Lord by bad kings, and its purgation by good kings, the most important of the latter being the repairing of the walls and the rebuilding of the Temple by Nehemiah (2 Kings xxii, 20-22; ii Kings xxv, 23), B.C. 660, and again (2 Kings xxiv, 13), B.C. 627. Finally, after a siege of three years, Jerusalem was taken by Nebuchadnezzar, who razed its walls, and destroyed its Temple and palaces with fire (2 Kings xxiv; 2 Chron. xxxvi; Jer. xxxix, B.C. 588. Thus was Jerusalem smitten with the calamity which Moses had prophesied would befall it if the people would not keep the com-
Ancient Assyrian delineation of a hostile city resembling Jerusalem in situation.

“the people shouted for joy, but many of the Levites who had seen the Temple in Jerusalem wept with a loud voice” (Ezra iii, 2, 12). When the Samaritans expressed a wish to share in the pious labor, Zerubbabel declined the offer, and in revenge the Samaritans sent a deputation to King Artaxerxes of Persia, carrying a presentment in which Jerusalem was described as a rebellious city of old time, which, if rebuilt, and its walls set up again, would not pay toll, tribute, and custom, and would thus endanger the deputation succeeded, and the public revenue. The deputation succeeded, and Artaxerxes ordered that the building of the Temple should cease. The interruption thus caused lasted to the second year of the reign of Darius (Ezra iv, 24), when Zerubbabel and Joshua, supported by the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, again resumed the work, and would not cease though cautioned by the governor of Judea, B.C. 529. On the matter coming before Darius Hyasaspis, and the Jews reminding him of the permission given by Cyrus, he decided in their favor, and also ordered that the expenses of the work should be defrayed out of the public revenue (Ezra vi, 8). In the sixth year of the reign of Darius the Temple was finished, when they kept the dedicatory festival with great joy, and next celebrated the Passover (Ezra vi, 15, 16, 19), B.C. 516. Afterwards, in the seventh year of the second Artaxerxes (Longimanus), Ezra, a descendant of Aaron, came up to Jerusalem, accompanied by a large number of Jews who had remained in Babylon, B.C. 459. He was highly patronized by the king, who not only made him a large present in gold and silver, but published a decree enjoining all treasurers of Judea speedily to do whatever Ezra should require of them; allowing him to collect money throughout the whole province of Babylon for the wants of the Temple at Jerusalem, and also giving him full power to appoint magistrates in his country to judge the people (Ezra vii, viii). At a later period, in the twentieth year of King Artaxerxes, Nehemiah, who was his cup-bearer, obtained permission to proceed to Jerusalem, and to complete the rebuilding of the city and its wall, which he happily accomplished, in spite of all the opposition which he received from the enemies of Israel (Neh. i, ii, iv, vi), B.C. 446. The city was then capacious and large, but the people in it were few, and many houses still lay in ruins (Neh. vii, 4). At Jerusalem dwelt the rulers of the people and “certain of the children of Judah and of the children of Benjamin;” but it was now determined that the rest of the people should cast lots to bring one of ten to the capital (Neh. xi, 1-4), B.C. cir. 440. On Nehemiah’s return, after several years’ absence to court, all strangers, Samaritans, Ammonites, Moabites, etc., were removed, to keep the chosen people from pollution; ministers were appointed to the Temple, and the service was performed according to the law of Moses (Ezra x; Neh. viii, xii, xiii), B.C. cir. 410. Of the Jerusalem thus by such great and long-continued exertions, very splendid prophecies were uttered by those prophets who flourished after the exile; the general purport of which was to describe the Temple and city as destined to be glorified far beyond the former, by the advent of the long and eagerly-expected Messiah, “the desire of all nations” (Zech. ix, 9; xii, 10, 11; xiii, 3; Hagg. ii, 6, 7; Mal. iii, 11). See Ezra; Nehemiah.

5. For the subsequent history of Jerusalem (which is closely connected with that of Palestine in general), down to its destruction by the Romans, we must draw chiefly upon Josephus and the books of the Maccabees.
It is said by Josephus (Ant. xi, 8) that when the dominion of this part of the world passed from the Persians to the Greeks, Alexander the Great advanced against Jerusalem to punish it for the fidelity to the Persians which it had manifested while he was engaged in the siege of Tyre. His hostile purposes, however, were soon abated, and he was disarmed of his presumptuous design by the appearance of a train of priests in sacred vestments. Alexander recognised in him the figure which in a dream had encouraged him to undertake the conquest of Asia. He therefore treated him with respect and reverence, spared the city against which his wrath had been kindled, and magnificently bestowed upon him the great priest and important privileges. The historian adds that the high-priest failed not to apprise the conqueror of those prophecies in Daniel by which his successors had been predict ed. The whole of this story is, however, liable to suspicion, from the absence of any notice of the circumstances in the histories of this campaign which we possess.

See Alexander the Great.

After the death of Alexander at Babylon (B.C. 324), Ptolemy surprised Jerusalem on the Sabbath day, when the Jews would not fight, plundered the city, and carried away a great number of the inhabitants, where, however, from the estimation in which the Jews of this period were held as citizens, important privileges were bestowed upon them (Joseph. Ant. xii, 1). In the contests which afterwards followed for the possession of Syria (including Palestine), Jerusalem does not appear to have been wanted by Ptolemy, and was not disputed when Ptolemy gave up Samaria, Acco, Joppa, and Gaza to P tage. The contest was ended by the treaty in B.C. 302, which annexed the whole of Palestine, together with Arabia Petraea and Osroene to Egypt. Under easy subjection to the Ptolemies, the Jews remained in much tranquillity for more than a hundred years, in which the principal incident, as regards Jerusalem itself, was the visit which was paid to it, in B.C. 245, by Ptolemy Euergetes, on his return from his victories in the East. He offered many sacrifices, and made magnificent presents to the Temple. In the wars between Antiochus the Great and the King of Egypt, (from B.C. 221 to 197,) Judea could not fail to suffer severely; but we are not acquainted with any incident in which Jerusalem was principally concerned till the alleged visit of Ptolemy Philopator in B.C. 211. He offered sacrifices, and gave a great sum to the Temple, but, venturing to enter the sanctuary in spite of the remonstrances of the high priest, he was seized with a supernatural dread, and fled in terror from the place. It is said that on his return to Egypt he vented his rage on the Jews of Alexandria in a very barbarous manner. See Alexandria. But the whole story of this visit and its result rests upon the sole authority of the third book of Maccabees (chap. i. and ii.), and is therefore not entitled to implicit credit. Towards the end of this war the Jews seemed to favor the cause of Antiochus; and after he had subdued the neighboring country, they voluntarily tendered their submission, and rendered their assistance in expelling the Egyptian garrison from Mount Zion. For this conduct they were rewarded by many important privileges by Antiochus. He issued decrees directing, among other things, that the outworks of the Temple should be completed, and that all the materials for needful repairs should be exempted from taxes. The temple was also to be respected. No foreigner was to pass the sacred walls, and the city itself was to be protected from pollution; it being strictly forbidden that the flesh or skins of any beasts which the Jews accounted unclean should be brought into the city (Joseph. Ant. xii, 3, 3). These were very liberal concessions to what the king himself must have regarded as the prejudices of the Jewish people.

Under their new masters the Jews enjoyed for a time nearly as much tranquillity as under the generally benign and liberal government of the Ptolemies. But in B.C. 176, Seleucus Philopator, hearing that great treas ures were hoarded up in the Temple, and being distressed for money to carry on his wars, sent his treasurer, Heliodorus, to bring away these treasure. This personage is reported to have been so frightened and stricken by an apparition that he relinquished the attempt, and Seleucus left the Jews in the undisturbed possession of their holy places. (Joseph. Ant. xii, 3, 3.) His brother and successor, Antiochus Epiphanes, however, was of another mind. He took up the design of reducing them to a conformity of manners and religion with other nations; or, in other words, of abolishing those distinctive features which made the Jews a people. This project was carried on with all possible vigour and in various ways. The design was odious to the great body of the people, although there were many among the higher classes who regarded it with favor. Of this way of thinking was Menelaus, whom Antiochus had made high-priest, and who was expelled by the orthodox Jews with ignominy, in B.C. 169, when they heard the joyful news that Antiochus had been slain in Egypt. The rumor proved untrue, and Antiochus, on his return, punished them by plundering and profaning the Temple. Wero evils befell them two years after; for Antiochus, out of honor at being overthrown by the king of Egypt, signed an alliance with Egypt, sent his chief collector of tribute, Apollonius, with a detachment of 22,000 men, to vent his rage on Jerusalem. This person plundered the city and razed its walls, with the stones of which he built a citadel that commanded the Temple Mount. A statute of general amnesty was declared by Judas Maccabeus, the king of the Jews, the observances of the Jewish law were abolished, and a persecution was commenced against all who adhered to these observances, and refused to sacrifice to idols. Jerusalem was deserted by priests and people, and the daily sacrifice at the altar was entirely discontinued (1 Mac. iv, 40; 2 Mac. ii, 41; Joseph. Ant. xii, 5, 4). See Antiochus Epiphanes.

This led to the celebrated revolt of the Maccabees, who, after an arduous and sanguinary struggle, obtained possession of Jerusalem (B.C. 168), and repaired and purified the Temple, which was then dilapidated and deserted. New utensils were supplied for the sacred services: the old altar, which had been polluted by heathen abominations, was taken away, and a new one erected. The sacrifices were then recommenced, exactly three years after the Temple had been dedicated to Jupiter Olympus. The castle, however, remained in the hands of the Ptolemies, and long continued to be the residence of the Jews, although Judas Maccabeus surrounded the Temple with a high and strong wall, furnished with towers, in which soldiers were stationed to protect the worshippers from the Syrian garrison (1 Mac. i, 56, 57; Joseph. Ant. xii, 5). Eventually the annoyance grew so intolerable that Judas laid siege to the castle. This attempt brought a powerful army into the country under the command of the regent Lysias, who, however, being constrained to turn his arms elsewhere, made peace with the Jews; but when he was admitted into the city, and observed the strength of the place, he threw down the walls in violation of the treaty (1 Mac. i, 48-65). In the ensuing war with the Syracilians, the general of Demetrius Soter, in which Judas was slain, the Syrians strengthened their citadel, and placed in it the sons of the principal Jewish families as hostages (1 Mac. x, 17; 2 Mac. iv, 26, 27). After the death of the latter (B.C. 159) the temporizing high-priest Akinmus directed the wall which separated the court of Israel from that of the Gentiles to be cast down, to afford the latter free access to the Temple; but he was seized with pain by the report of what had been done, and died in great agony (1 Mac. ix, 51-57). When a few years later, Demetrius and Alexander Balas sought to outbid each other for the support of Jonathan, the hostages in the castle were released; and subsequently all the Syrian garrisons in Judaea were evacuated, excepting those of Jerusalem and Bethhoron, which were chiefly occupied by apostate Jews, who were afraid to leave their places of
The destruction of Jerusalem by the Romans did not cause the site to be utterly forsaken. Titus (q.v.) left there in garrison the whole of the tenth legion, besides several squadrons of cavalry and cohorts of foot. For these troops, and for those who ministered to their wants, there must have been dwellings; and there is no reason to suppose that such Jews or Christians as appeared to have taken no part in the war were forbidden or unable to make their abodes among the ruins, and so build up so far as their necessities might require. But nothing like a restoration of the city could have arisen from this, as it was not likely that any but poor people, who found an interest in supplying the wants of the garrison, or were likely to be rewarded by the success of the city under such circumstances. However, we learn from Jerome that for fifty years after its destruction, until the time of Hadrian, there still existed remnants of the city. But during all this period there is no mention of it in history.

Up to A.D. 191 the Jews remained tolerably quiet, although apparently awaiting any favourable opportunity of shaking off the Roman yoke. The then emperor, Hadrian (q.v.), seems to have been aware of this state of feeling, and, among other measures of precaution, ordered Jerusalem to be rebuilt as a fortified place where-with to keep in check the whole Jewish population. The works had been made so strong that it was impossible to endure the idea that their holy city should be occupied by foreigners, and that strange gods should be set up within it, broke out into open rebellion under the notorious Barchochebas (q.v.), who claimed to be the Messiah. His success was at first very great, but he was crushed before the tremendous power of the Romans, so soon as it could be brought to bear upon him; and a war scarcely inferior in horror to that under Ves pasian and Titus was, like it, brought to a close by the capture of Jerusalem, of which the Jews had obtained possession. This was in A.D. 155, from which period Jerusalem remained in Roman hands.

The Romans then finished the city according to their first intention. It was made a Roman colony, inhabited wholly by foreigners, the Jews being forbidden to approach it on pain of death: a temple to Jupiter Capitolinus was erected on Mount Moriah, and the old name of Jerusalem was sung to be supplanted by that of Aelia Capitolina, conferred upon it in honor of the emperor El Cias Hadrianus and Jupiter Capitolinus. By this name was the city known till the time of Constantine, when that of Jerusalem again became current, still its civic designation, and remained such so late as A.D. 386, when it was described in the acts of a synod held there. This name even passed to the Mohammedans, by whom it was long retained; and it was not till after they recovered the city from the Crusaders that it became generally known among them by the name of El-Khuds—"the holy"—which it still bears.

7. From the rebuilding by Hadrian the history of Jeru salem is almost a blank till the time of Constantine, when its history, as a place of extreme solicitude and interest to the Christian Church, properly begins. Pilgrimages to the Holy City now became common and popular. Such a pilgrimage was undertaken in A.D. 326 by the emperor's mother Helena, then in the eightieth year of her age, who built churches on the alleged site of the nativity at Bethlehem, and of the resurrection on the Mount of Olives. This example may probably have excited in her son the desire to visit in person the holy sepulchre, and to the erection of a church thereon. He removed the temple of Venus, with which, in studied insult, the site had been encumbered. The holy sepulchre was then purified, and a magnificent church was, by his order, built over and around the sacred spot. Moreover, the ceremonial of the Holy Year was conducted with great solemnity in A.D. 335. There is no doubt that the spot thus singled out is the same that has ever since been regarded as the place in which Christ was entombed; but the correctness of the identification
then made has of late years been much disputed, on
grounds which have been examined in the article Goz-
gothis. The very cross on which our Lord suffered
was also, in the course of these explorations, believed to
have been discovered, under the circumstances which
have elsewhere been described. See CROSS.

By Constantine the edict excluding the Jews from
the city of their fathers' sepulchres was so far repealed
that they were allowed to enter it once a year to walk
over the desolation of "the holy and beautiful house" in
which their fathers worshipped God. When the nephe-
lew of Constantine, the emperor Julian (q. v.), abandoned
Christianity for the old Paganism, he endeavored, as a
matter of policy, to conciliate the Jews. He allowed
them free access to the city, and permitted them to re-
build their Temple. They accordingly began to lay the
foundations in A.D. 362; but the speedy death of the
emperor probably occasioned that abandonment of the
attempt which contemporary writers ascribe to super-
natural hinderances. The edicts seem then to have
been renewed which excluded the Jews from the city,
except on the anniversary of its capture, when they
were allowed to enter the city and weep over it. Their
appointed wailing-place remains, and their practice of
wailing there continues to the present day. From St.

The Jews "Wailing-Place," in the western wall of the
Haram enclosure.

James, the first bishop, to Jude II, who died A.D. 136,
there had been a series of fifteen bishops of Jewish de-
scent; and from Marcus, who succeeded Simeon, to Ma-
carius, who presided over the Church of Jerusalem un-
der Constantine, there was a series of twenty-three bish-
ops of Gentile descent, but, beyond a bare list of their
names, little is known of the Church or of the city of
Jerusalem during the whole of this latter period.

In the conversion of Constanti-
tine, the roads to Zion were thronged with pilgrims
from all parts of Christendom, and the land abounded in
monasteries, occupied by persons who wished to lead a
religious life amid the scenes which had been sanctified
by the Saviour's presence. After much struggle of con-
Anarchate of Jerusalem. In the theological contro-
tversies which followed the decision of that council with
regard to the two natures of Christ, Jerusalem bore its
share with the other Oriental churches, and two of its bish-
ops were deposed by Monophysite fanatics. The Synod
of Jerusalem in A.D. 536 confirmed the decree of the
Synod of Constantinople against the Monophysites. See
JERUSALEM, COUNCILS OF. In the same century it found
a second Constantine in Justinian, who ascended the
throne A.D. 527. He repaired and enriched the former
structures, and built upon Mount Moriah a magnificent
church to the Virgin, as a memorial of the persecu-
tion of Jesus in the Temple. He also founded ten or eleven
convents for monks and nuns, and established a hospital for pilgrims in each of those cities.

In the following century, the Persians, who had long
harassed the empire of the East, penetrated into Syria,
and in A.D. 614, under Chosroes II, after defeating the
forces of the emperor Heraclius, took Jerusalem by storm.
Many thousands of the inhabitants were slain, and
much of the city, including the finest churches—
that of the Holy Sepulchre among them—was destroy-
ed. When the conquerors withdrew they took away
the principal inhabitants, the patriarch, and the true
cross; but when, the year after, peace was concluded,
these were restored, and the emperor Heraclius entered
Jerusalem in solemn state, bearing the cross upon his
shoulders.

The damage occasioned by the Persians was speedily
repaired. But Arabia soon furnished a more formida-
able enemy in the khilif Omar, whose troops appeared
before Syria. The battle of the Yarmuk (A.D. 636, Arafa,
and Edessa) was a decisive blow to the existence of the
Moslems having already been brought under the Moslem yoke.
After a long siege the asture khilif himself came to
the camp, and the city was at length surrendered to him
in A.D. 637. The conqueror of mighty kings entered the
holy city clad in the armor of cameo, and conducted himself with much discretion and generous for-
bearance. By his orders the magnificent mosque which
still bears his name was built upon Mount Moriah, upon
the site of the Jewish Temple.

6. Jerusalem remained in possession of the Arabs, and
was long visited by Christian pilgrims from Europe till
the year 1000, when a general belief that the second coming of the Saviour was near at hand
drew pilgrims in unwonted crowds to the Holy Land,
and created an impulse for pilgrimages thither which
ceased not to act after the first exciting cause had been
forgotten. The Moslem government, in order to derive
some profit from this enthusiasm, imposed the tribute
of a piece of gold as the price of entrance into the holy
city. The sight, by such large numbers, of the holy
place in the hands of infidels, the exaction of tribute,
and the insults to which the pilgrims, often of the high-
est rank, were exposed from the Moslem rabble, excited
an extraordinary ferment in Europe, and led to those
remarkable expeditions for recovering the Holy Sepul-
chre from the Mohammedans which, under the name of
the Crusades, will always fill a most important and cur-
ious chapter in the history of the world. (See Gib-
bon's "History of the Decline and Fall of the Roman
Empire." See CRUSADES.

The dominion over Palestine had passed in A.D. 690
from the khilifs of Bagdad to the Fatimite khilifs of
Egypt, and these in their turn were displaced in A.D.
1079 by the Turkomans, who had usurped the powers of
the Eastern khilifs. The severities exercised by these
more fierce and uncivilized Moslems upon both the na-
tive Christians and the European pilgrims supplied the
immediate impulse to the first Eastern expedition. But
by the time the Crusaders, under Godfrey of Bouillon,
appeared before Jerusalem, on the 17th of June, 1099,
the Egyptian khilifs had recovered possession of Palae-
tine, and driven the Turkomans beyond the Euphrates.
After a siege of forty days, the holy city was taken
by storm on the 15th day of July, and a dreadful mas-
acre of the Moslem inhabitants followed with in-
discrimination of age or sex. As soon as order was restored,
and the city cleared of the dead, a regular government
was established by the election of Godfrey as king of
Jerusalem. One of the first cares of the new monarch
was to dedicate anew to the Lord the place where his
presence had once abode, and the Mosque of Omar be-
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more sounded over the city. From that time to the present day the holy city has remained, with slight interruption, in the hands of the Moslems. On the threatened siege by Richard of England in 1192, Saladin took great pains in strengthening its defences. New walls and bulwarks were erected, and deep trenches cut, and in six months the town was stronger than it ever had been, and the works had the firmness and solidity of a rock. But in A.D. 1219, the sultan Mulek el-Maoudin of Damascus, who then had possession of Jerusalem, ordered all the walls and towers to be demolished, except the citadel and the inclosure of the mosque, lest the Franks should again become masters of the city and find a place of strength. In this desperate state Jerusalem continued till it was delivered over to the Christians in consequence of a treaty with the emperor Frederick II, in A.D. 1229, with the understanding that the walls should not be rebuilt. Yet ten years later (A.D. 1239) the barons and knights of Jerusalem began to build the walls anew, and to erect a strong fortress on the west of the city. But the works were interrupted by the emir David of Kerak, who seized the city, strangulated the Christian inhabitants, and cast down the newly erected walls and fortress. Four years after, however (A.D. 1240), Jerusalem was again made over to the Christians without any restriction, and the works appear to have been restored and completed; for they are mentioned as existing when the city was stormed by the wild Kharianian hordes in the following year, shortly after which the city reverted for the last time into the hands of its Mohammedan masters, who have substantially kept it to the present day, although in 1277 Jerusalem was nominally annexed to the kingdom of Sicily.

9. From this time Jerusalem appears to have sunk very much in political and military importance, and it is scarcely named in the history of the Mameluke sultans who reigned over Egypt and the greater part of Syria in the 14th and 15th centuries. At length, with the rest of Syria and Egypt, it passed under the sway of the Turkish sultan Selim I in 1517, who paid a hasty visit to the holy city from Damascus after his return from Egypt. From that time Jerusalem has formed a part of the Ottoman Empire, and during this period has been subject to few vicissitudes; its history is accordingly barren of incident. The present walls of the city were erected by Suleiman the Magnificent, the successor of Selim, in A.D. 1542, as is attested by an inscription over the Jaffa gate. As lately as A.D. 1609, the Church of the Holy Sepulchre was partially consumed by fire; but the damage was repaired with great labor and expense by September, 1810, and the traveller now finds in this imposing fabric no traces of that calamity.

In A.D. 1892 Jerusalem became subject to Mohammed Ali, the pasha of Egypt, the holy city opening its gates to him without a siege. During the great insurrection in the districts of Jerusalem and Galilee in 1834, the insurgents seized upon Jerusalem, and held possession of it for a time; but by the vigorous operations of the government order was soon restored, and the city reverted quietly to its allegiance on the approach of Ibrahim Pasha with his troops. In 1841 Mohammed Ali was deprived of all his Syrian possessions by European interference, and Jerusalem was again subjected to the Turkish government, under which it now remains.

In the same year took place the establishment of a Protestant bishopric at Jerusalem by the English and Prussian governments, and the erection upon Mount Zion of a church calculated to hold 500 persons, for the celebration of divine worship according to the ritual of the English Church. See JERUSALEM, SAX (below).

In 1890 a dispute about the guardianship of the holy places between the monks of the Greek and Latin churches, in which Nicholas, emperor of Russia, sided with the Greeks, and Louis Napoleon, emperor of the French, with the Latins, led to a decision of the question.
by the Porte, which was unsatisfactory to Russia, and which resulted in a war of considerable magnitude, known as "the Crimean War," between that country on the one side, and the allied forces of England and France on the other. This war has led to greater liberties of all classes of citizens in the enjoyment of their religious faith, and to a partial adjustment of the rival claims of the Greek and Latin monks to certain portions of the holy places; it has also resulted in much more freedom towards Frank travellers in visiting the city, so that even ladies have been allowed to enter the mosque in cloisters; but it has caused no material alteration in the city or in its political relations.

For details, see Vitius, Hist. Hierosolyma, in his Miscell. Suec. ii, 187 sq.; Spalding, Gesch. d. Christl. Königreicb's Jerusalem (Berlin, 1805); Devlin, Elias Capitolinae Orig. et Historia (Lips. 1748); Wagner, Uber d. Phänomene vor d. Zerstörung Jer. (Halle, 1788); H. Bessarion, Storia della Basilica di P. Croce in Gerusalemme (Rome, 1760); C. Cellarius, De Alia Capitolina, etc., in his Programmata, p. 441 sq.; Fouquet, Histoire de Jérusalem (Brux. 1812); F. Münster's treatise on the Jewish War under Hadrian, transl. in the Biblioth. Sacra for 1843, p. 388 sq.; Haenner's Palaestina; Robinson's Bib. Hist. in Palestine; and especially Williams, Holy City, vol. i.

II. Ancient Topography.—This has been a subject of no little dispute among antiquarian geomorphers. We prefer here briefly to state our own independent conclusions, with the authority on which each point rests, and we shall therefore but incidentally notice the controversies, which will be found discussed under the several heads elsewhere in this Cyclopedia.

1. Natural Features.—These, of course, are mostly the same in all ages, as the surface of the region where Jerusalem is situated is generally limestone rock. Yet the wear of the elements has no doubt caused some
minor changes, and the demolition of large buildings successively has affected very considerable differences of level by the accumulation of rubbish in the hollows, and even on some of the hills; while in some cases high spots were ancient platforms partially filled in and artificial platforms and terraces formed, and in others deep trenches or massive structures have left their traces to this day.

(A.) Hills.—(1) Mount Zion, frequently mentioned in the Old Testament, only once in the New (Rev. xiv, 1), called the "City of the Great King" (War., v, 4, 1), was divided by a valley (Tyropoion) from another hill opposite (Acre), than which it was "higher, and in length more direct" (ibid.). It is almost universally assigned, in modern times, as the south-western hill of the city. See Zion.

(2) Mount Moriah, mentioned in 2 Chron. iii, 1, as the site of the Temple, is unmistakable in all ages. Originally, according to Josephus (War., v, 5, 1), the summit was small, and the platform was enlarged by Solomon, who built up a high stone terrace wall on three sides (east, south, and west), leaving a tremendous precipice at the (south-eastern) corner (Ant., xv, 11, 3 and 5). Some of the lower courses of these stones are still standing. See Moriah.

(3) The hill Acre is so called by Josephus, who says it "sustained the Lower City, and was of the shape of a moon when she is lorned," or a crescent (War., v, 4, 1). It was separated from another hill (Betsitha) by a broad valley, which the Asmonæans partly filled up with earth taken from the top of Acre, so that it might be made lower than the Temple (ibid.). Concerning the position of this hill there is much dispute, which can only be settled by the location of the valleys on either side of it (see Cassiari, in the Stud. et Crit. ii, 1864). See ACRE.

(4) The hill Betsitha, interpreted by Josephus as meaning "New City," placed by him opposite Acre, and stated to be originally lower than it, is said by him also to lie over against the tower Antonia, from which it was separated by a deep fosse (War., v, 4, 1 and 2). See Betsitha.

(5) Ophel is referred to by Nehemiah (iii, 26, 27), as well as by Josephus (War., v, 4, 2), in such connection with the walls as to show that none other can be intended than the ridge of ground sloping to a point southward from the Temple area. See OPHEL.

(6) Calvary, or more properly Golgotha, was a small eminence, mentioned by the evangelists as the place of the crucifixion. Modern tradition assigns it to the site of the Church of the Holy Sepulchre, but this is greatly contested by Josephus (ibid.) and even by the question turns chiefly upon the course of the second wall, outside of which the crucifixion undoubtedly took place (John xix, 17). See CALVARVY.

(7) The Mount of Olives is so often referred to by Josephus, as well as in the Bible, that it can be taken for no other than that which now passes under the same name. See OLIVER.

(8) Scopus is the name assigned by Josephus to an elevated plain about seven furlongs distant from the city wall in a northerly direction (War., ii, 19, 4; v, 2, 8), an interval that was leveled by Titus on his approach from Samaria (ibid., iii, 2). By this can this is foreshadowed perhaps the rocky prominences on the southern, or those on the northern edge of that part of the valley of Jehoshaphat which sweeps around the city on the north, for the former are too near, and the latter intercepted by the valley; but rather the gentle slope on the north-west of the city.

Besides these, there is mentioned in Jer. xxxi, 39, "the hill Garbeh," apparently somewhere on the north-west of the city, and Goath, possibly an eminence on the west. "Mount Gilon," so confidently laid down on certain maps of the ancient city, is a modern invention.

(B.) Valleys.—(1) The principal of these was the one termed by Josephus that of the Tyropoion, or Cheese-makers, running between Zion and Acre, down as far as Siloam (War., v, 4, 1). The southern part of this is still clearly to be traced, although much choked up by the accumulated rubbish of ages; but to the northern part there is considerable discrepancy. Some (as Dr. Robinson) make it bend around the northern brow of Zion, and so end in the shallow depression between that hill and the eminence of the Holy Sepulchre; while others (Williams, with whose views in the main I coincide) carry it directly north, through the depression along the western side of the mosque area, and eastward of the church, in the direction of the Damascus Gate. See Tyropoion.

(2) The only other considerable valley within the city was that above referred to as lying between Acre and Betsitha. The language of Josephus, in the passage where he mentions this valley (War., v, 4, 1), has been understood by some as only applicable to the upper portion of that which is above regarded as the Tyropoion, because he calls it "a broad valley," which is the broadest in that vicinity. But the Jewish historian only says that the hills Acre and Betsitha were "formerly divided by a broad valley; but in those times when the Asmonæans reigned, they filled up that valley with earth, and had a mind to join the city to the Temple: they then took off a part of the height of Acre, and reduced it to a less elevation than it was before, that the Temple might be superior to it." From this it is clear that in the times of Josephus this valley was not so distinct as formerly, so that we must not look for it in the plain and apparently unchanged depression west of the Temple, but rather in the chinked and obscure one running northward from the middle of the northern side of the present mosque enclosure. The union of the city and Temple across this valley is also more explicable on this ground, because it not only implies a nearly level passage effected between the Temple area and that part of the city west of it, but it also intimates that there had previously been no special passage-way there—whereas on the west the Temple was connected with Zion by a bridge or causeway, besides at least two other easy avenues to the parts of the city in that direction.

(3) The longest and deepest of the valleys outside the walls was the Valley of Jehoshaphat, which ran along the entire eastern and north-eastern side, forming the bed of the brook Kidron. Respecting the identity of this, the modern name leaves no room for dispute. See JEHOSHAPHAT VALLEY OF.

(4) On the south side was the Valley ben-Hinnom.
of the same as that called by Josephus "the fountain in the king's garden" (Ant. vii, 14, 4). Its water is peculiar, but no underground connection has been traced with any other of the fountains. See En-rogel.

(2.) Siloam or Shiloah is mentioned in the Old and New Testaments also as Shiloah, and the latter indicates its site at the mouth of the Valley of Tyropoeon (War, v, 4, 1). It is identical with the modern fount of Selwan. See Siloam.

(3.) The only remaining one of the three natural springs about Jerusalem is that now known as the Fountain of St. Mary (now ed-Der'a), said to be the source of the Pool of Siloam. It is intermittent, the overflow apparently of the Temple supply; and it is connected by a passage through the rock with the Pool of Siloam (Robinson, Researches, i, 502 sq.). It is apparently the same with the "king's pool" (Neh. ii, 14; comp. iii, 16) and "Solomon's Pool" (Josephus, War, v, 4, 2). This we are inclined (with Lightfoot and Robinson) to identify with the "Pool of Bethesda" in John v, 2. See Bethesda.

There are several other wells adjoining the Temple area which have the peculiar taste of Siloam, but whether they proceed from a living spring under Moriah, or are conducted thither by the aqueduct from Bethlehem, or come from some distant source, future explorations can alone determine. Some such well has, however, lately been discovered, but how far it supplies these various springs has not yet been fully determined (Jour. Sac. Lit. April, 1864). See Solomon's Pool.

(E.) Reservoirs, Tanks, etc.—(1) The Upper Pool of Gihon, mentioned in Isa. vii, 3; 2 Chron. xxix, 30, etc., can be no other than that now found in the northern part of the valley of the west of the city. This is probably what is called the "Dragon Well" by the Nehemiah (ii, 13), lying in that direction. Josephus also incidentally mentions a "Serpent's Pool" as lying on the northwestern side of the city (War, v, 3, 2), which the similarity of name and position seems to identify with this.

See Gihon.

(2.) The Lower Pool (of Gihon), referred to in Isa. xxii, 9, is also probably that situated in the southern part of the same valley. See Pool.

(3.) There still exists on the western side of the city another pool, which is frequently termed the Pool of Hezekiah, and the supposition that it is the one intended to hold the water which that king is said (2 Kings xx, 20; 2 Chron. xxix, 30) to have brought down to the city by a conduit from the upper pool. It is to this day so connected by an aqueduct, which renders the identification probable. But it does not follow (as some argue) that this pool was within the second wall in the time of Christ, if, indeed, it ever lay strictly within the city; the statements above referred to only show that it was designed as a reservoir for supplying the inhabitants, especially on Mount Zion, within the bounds of which it could never have been embraced. This pool is perhaps also the same as one mentioned by Josephus, under the title of A mygdalon, as opposite the third of the towers of the wall, then standing on the north-eastern corner towards the Dead Sea. The brook Kedron was the principal of these, and is mentioned in both the Old and New Testaments (2 Sam. xv, 22; John xviii, 1), and by Josephus (War, v, 2, 9), as lying between the city and the Mount of Olives. See Kedron.

(F.) The First or Old Wall.—Josephus's account of this is as follows: "Beginning on the north from the tower Hippicus (so called), and extending to the Xyurus (so called), thence touching the council- [house], it joined the western cloister of the Temple; but in the other direction, on the west, beginning from the same tower, and extending through the place Bethus (so called) to the house of the water communication above the fountain Siloam, and thence again leaning on the east to the Pool of Solomon, and reaching as far as a certain place which they call Ophla, it joined the eastward cloister of the Temple." It was defended by sixty towers (ibid. § 3), probably at equal distances, and of the same average dimensions (but probably somewhat smaller than those of the outer wall), exclusive of the three towers specially described.

(1.) The north side it began at the Tower of Hippicus. This has been with great probability identified
with the site of the present citadel or Castle of David, at the north-western corner of Zion. This tower is
stated by Josephus to have been 25 cubits (about 45 feet square), and solid to the height of 30 cubits (War, v, 4,3). At the north-western corner of the modern citadel is a tower 45 feet square, cut on three sides to a great height out of the solid rock, which (with Mr. Williams) we think can be no other than Hippicus. This is probably the tower at the Valley Gate mentioned in 2 Chron. xxvi, 9. See Hillerius c.
(2.) Not far from Hippicus, on the same wall, Josephus places the Tower of Phasaelus, with a solid base of 40 cubits (about 73 feet) square as well as high (ibid.). To this the tower on the north-eastern corner of the modern citadel so nearly corresponds (its length being 70 feet, and its breadth now shortened to 56 feet, the rest having probably been masonry), that they cannot well be regarded as other than identical.
(3.) Not far from this again, Josephus locates the Tower of Mariamne, 20 cubits (about 36 feet) square and high (ibid.). This we incline (with Mr. Williams) to place about the same distance east of Phasaelus.
(4.) The Gate Germath (i.e. "garden"), distinctly stated by Josephus as belonging to the first wall (War, v, 4, 2), apparently not far east of Mariamne. The arch now known by this name, near the south end of the bazaars, evidently is comparatively recent. See Gennath.

Modern "Gate of Germath," explored by Lieutenant Warren in his excavations at Jerusalem. (From Tracing of Feb. 1, 1857, of the "Palestine Exploration Fund.")

(5.) There is another "oboeure gate" referred to by Josephus, as lying near Hippicus, through which the Jews made a sally upon the Romans (War, v, 6; vi, 5). This could not have been on the north side, owing to the precipice. It must be the same as that through which he says elsewhere (ibid. vii, 5) water was brought to the tower Hippicus, evidently from the Upper and Lower Pools, or from Siloam. It can therefore only be located just south of Hippicus. It appears to be identical with that mentioned in the Old Testament as the 17th gate of Zion (Neh, iii, 13 or compare 2 Chron. xxvi, 9; xxvii, 14).

(6.) On the southern side of this wall we next come (omitting "Betho" for the present) to Josephus's "Gate of the Essentials." This we should naturally expect to find opposite the modern Zion Gate; but as the ancient citadel is in more of this hill than the modern (for the Tomb of David is now outside), we must look for it along the brow of Zion at the south-west corner. Here, accordingly, the Dung-gate is mentioned in Neh. ii, 13, and iii, 13, as lying next to the Valley-gate; and in this latter passage it is placed at 1900 cubits (1820 feet) from it—the accordance of the modern distance with which may be considered as a strong verification of the correctness of the position of both these gates. The Dung-gate is also referred to in Neh. xii, 31, as the first (after the Valley-gate, out of which the company appear to have emerged) toward the right (i.e. south) from the north-west corner of the city (i.e. facing the wall on the outside).

From this point, the escarpments still found in the rock indicate the line of the wall as passing along the southern brow of Zion, as Josephus evidently means. Beyond this, he says it passed above the fountain Siloam, as indeed the turn in the edge of Zion here requires.

(7.) At this south-east corner of Zion probably stood the Pottery-gate, mentioned (Jer. xix, 2, where it is mistranslated "east-gate") as leading into the Valley of Hinnom; and it apparently derived its name from the "Potter's Field," lying opposite. See Potter's Field.

Beyond this, it becomes more difficult to trace the line indicated by Josephus. His language plainly implies that in skirting the southern brow of Zion it curved sufficiently to exclude the Pool of Siloam, although it has been strongly contended by some that this fountain must have been within the city.

(8.) At the mouth of the Tyropeon we should naturally look for a gate, and accordingly we find mention of a Fountain-gate along the Valley of Hinnom beyond the Dung-gate (Neh. ii, 14; xii, 37), and adjoining the Pool of Siloam (Neh. iii, 10), which seems to fix its position with great certainty. The next bend beyond Siloam would naturally be at the termination of the ridge coming down from the Temple. From this point, according to Josephus, it curved so as to face the east, and extended to the Fountain of the Virgin (Solomon's Pool), thus passing along the verge of Ophel. If this fountain really be the Pool of Bethesda, we must locate it near the city.

(9.) The Sheep-gate, which, on the whole, we are inclined to fix in this vicinity (Neh. xii, 39; iii, 1, 32; John v, 2).

The line of the wall, after this, according to Josephus, ran more definitely upon the edge of Ophel (thus implying a slight bend to the east), and continued along it till it reached the Temple. We are not compelled, by his language, to carry it out to the extreme south-eastern corner of the Temple area, because of the deep precipice which lay there (Am. xv, 11, 4). Just so, the modern wall comes up nearly in the middle of the south side of this area. The ancient point of intersection has been discovered by the recent excavations of the English engineers. (See the sketch of Ophel above.)

From this account of the first wall, we should naturally conclude that Josephus's Upper City included the Tyropeon as well as Ophel; but from other passages it is certain that the Zion wall had a separate wall on its eastern brow, and that Josephus here only means to speak of the outer wall around the west, south, and east. Thus he states (War, vi, 7, 2) that, after the destruction of the Temple, the Romans, having seized and burned the whole Lower City as far as Siloam, were still compelled to make special efforts to dislodge the Jews from the Upper City; and from his account of the banks raised for this purpose between the Xystus and the bridge (ibid. 8, 1), it is even clear that this wall extended around the north-eastern brow of Zion quite to the north part of the Tyropeon, leaving a gateway between the Upper City and the Temple. He also speaks (ibid. 6, 2) of the bridge as parting the tyrants in the Upper City from Titus in the western cloister of the Temple. This part of the Tyropeon was therefore inclosed by barriers on all its four sides, namely, by the wall on the west and north, by the Temple on the east, and by the Tyropeon on the south. The same conclusion of a branch from the outer wall, running up the western side of the Tyropeon, results from a careful inspection of the account of the repairs in Neh. iii. The historian there states that adjoining ("after him") the part repaired around the Fountain-gate at Siloah (verse 15) lay a portion extending opposite the "sepulchres of David" (verse 16). By these can only be meant the tomb of David, still extant on the crown of Zion, to which Peter alludes (Acts
ii, 29) as existing in his day within the city. But we cannot suppose Nehemiah to be here returning along the wall in a westerly direction, and describing repairs which he had just attributed to others (verses 14 and 15); nor can he be speaking of the wall eastward of Siloam, which would in no sense be opposite David's tomb, but actually intercepted from it by the termination of Ophel: the only conclusion therefore is, that he is now proceeding along this branch wall northward, lying opposite the east end of the pool that was made," mentioned as situated here (verse 16), cannot therefore be meant either Siloam, or the Lower Pool, or even the Virgin's Fountain, but some tank in the valley, since filled up, probably the same with the "ditch made between the two walls for the water of the old pool" (Isa. xxv. 3), which might easily be connected (from either of the pools of Gilbon) to this spot, along the line of the present aqueduct from Bethlehem. Moreover, it was evidently along this branch wall ("the going up of the wall") that one party of the priests in Neh. xii, 37 ascended to meet the other. This double line of wall is also alluded to by this passage, but likewise by the escape of Zedekiah "by the way of the [Fountain-] Gate between the two walls, which is by the king's garden" (i.e. around Siloam), in the direction of the plain leading to Jericho (2 Kings xxxv. 4, 5; Jer. xxix. 4; ii. 7). From 2 Chron. xxvii. 3, and xxviii. 14, we know that Ophel was fortified by a separate wall. We will now endeavor to trace this branch wall around to the Temple and to the gate Gennath as definitely as the intricate account in Nehemiah, together with other scattered notices, will allow.

We may take it for granted that this part of the wall would leave the other at the south-eastern corner of Zion, near the Pottery-gate, where the hill is steep, and keep along the declivity throughout its whole extent, for the sake of more perfect defence. There were stairs in this wall just above the wall that continued to the Fountain-gate (Neh. xii. 37; ii. 14), which might easily be completed at least a small gate there, as they led into the Upper City. They would naturally be placed within the outer wall for the sake of security, and at the eastern side of this corner of Zion, where the rock is still precipitous (although the stairs have disappeared), so that they afford a line of real communication to the wall in this passage.

(10.) Above the Sepulchre of David, and beyond "the pool that was made," Nehemiah (chap. iii, 16) places "the house of the mighty," apparently a Giants' Tower, to defend the wall. Immediately north of this we may conjecture occurring opposite the modern Zion-gate, and over against the ancient Sheep-gate, although the steepness of the hill would prevent its general use.

Farrar north is apparently mentioned (Neh. iii, 19) another minor entrance, "the going up to the armory at the turning of the wall," meaning probably the bend in the brow of Zion opposite the south-western corner of the Temple, near where the bridge connected them. Farrar on, another "turning of the wall, even unto the corner," is mentioned (Neh. iii, 24), but in what direction, and how far off, cannot be determined with any degree of certainty. It may mean the junction with the wall of the bridge.

From this point it becomes impossible to trace the order pursued by Nehemiah in the rest of the third chapter, as he does not describe the wall from point to point, but mostly refers to certain objects opposite which they lay, as if he was speaking of the ground ("after him"). All that can be definitely gathered as to the consequent course of the wall is that, by various turns on different sides, its respective parts faced certain fixed points, especially the "tower lying out" (verses 25, 26, 27); that it terminated opposite the gate-gate verse 26; the "Horse-gate," verse 28; and the gate "Miphkalah," verse 31; that it joined Ophel (verse 27); and that it completed the circuit of walls in this direction (verse 32). It needs but a glance to see that all this strikingly agrees, in general, with the afore-mentioned inclosure in the valley of the Tyropoeon just above the bridge, which certainly embraced all the objects referred to by Nehemiah, as we shall see; and this fact of the quadrilateral form of these portions of the wall will best account for the apparent confusion of this part of his statement (as our total ignorance of many of the elements of elucidation makes it now seem), as well as his repeated use of the peculiar mode of description, "over against the house of David," etc. (as the presumed line, which the nature of the ground seems to require, and identify the points as they occur, trusting to the naturalness with which they may fall in with our scheme for its vindication.

After leaving the bend at the junction with the bridge, we should therefore indicate the course of the wall as follows: the natural declivity on the north-east edge of Zion in a gentle curve, till it joined the northern line of the old wall, about half way between the gate Gennath and the Temple. Indeed, the language of Nehemiah (xii, 37) implies that "the going up of the [branch] wall" extended "above the house of David" (i.e. the "king's house"), and thence bent "even unto the Water-gate eastwardly." (11.) On this part of the wall, at its junction with the bridge, we think we must place the Horse-gate (2 Kings xi, 15; 2 Chron. xxvi., 15; Neh. iii, 28; Jer. xxxi, 38-40) probably the same as the Sheep-gate (chap. iii, 28, 31, 32), an identity which the name favors—being literally Gate of reviewing, perhaps from the census being taken at this place of concourse, or (with the Vulgate) Gate of judgment, from its proximity to the prison.

(12.) The Second or Middle Wall.—Josephus' statement of the course of this wall is in these words: "But the second [wall] had (first) its beginning from the gate which they called Gennath, belonging to the first wall, and then, encircling the northern slope only, went up (on returned) as far as Antonia (War, iv, 2, 4). It had fourteen gates (of which) three were gate-gates, probably the same size as those of the outer wall. If we have correctly identified Acra, it must be this hill that Josephus calls "the northern slope;" and the direction of this will require that the wall, after leaving Gennath, should skirt the lowest edge of Golgotha in nearly a straight line, till it reached the upper end of the Tyropoeon, opposite the western edge of Acra. This direct course agrees with the absence of any special remark in Josephus respecting its line between these two points. Neither is there mention of any gate or tower along it, near Gennath nor to the west of Golgotha; so that (1.) The first point of note in this direction is the Tower of Furnaces, which may be located on the north-eastern slope of the elevation assumed to be that of Golgotha (Neh. iii, 8, 11, 13; xii, 38; comp. 2 Chron. xxvi., 9); and (2.) on the western bank of this entrance of the Tyropoeon should be situated the Corner-gate (compare Jer. xxxi, 38).

From this point the wall would run directly across the broad beginning of the Tyropoeon, to meet the north-western brow of Acra, which Josephus intimates it only served to guide. The water-gate, then, should be the Broad Wall, referred to in Neh. iii, 8; xii, 38, as lying here. A stronger wall would be needed here, as there was no natural breastwork of rock, and it was on this side that invaders always approached the city. Ac-
The eastern wall of the Temple area, which evidently served for that of the city, and connects Josephus's first and second walls on this part, we reserve for consideration under the head Temple.

(II.) The Third or Outer Wall. — This was not yet built in the days of Christ, having been begun by Herod Agrippa I about A.D. 43. Josephus's account of its course is in the following words (War, v, 4, 2): "The starting-point of the third [wall], however, was the tower Hippicus, whence stretching as far as the northern slope to the tower Psephinus, thence reaching opposite the Temple in identifying it with the foundations through the royal vaults, it bent in the first place with a corner tower to the (so-styled) Fuller's monument, and then joining the old circuit [i.e. the former wall], ended at the (so-called) valley Kedron." It inclosed that part of the New City, and was (in parts at least) ten cubits thick and twelve-five high (ibid.). It was defended by ninety towers twenty cubits square and high, two hundred cubits apart (ibid. 3).

(1.) The first mark, then, after leaving Hippicus, was the Tower Psephinus, described (ibid.) as being an octagon, seventy cubits high, at the north-west corner of the city, opposite Hippicus. It was situated quite off the direct road by which Titus approached the city from the north (ibid. ii, 2), and lay at a bend in the northern wall at its western limit (ibid. iii, 5). All these particulars agree with the descriptions of some ancient structure still clearly traceable on the north-western side of the modern city, opposite the Upper Pool. Indeed, the ruins scattered along the whole distance between this point and the present Jaffa-gate suffice to indicate the course of this part of the third wall along the rocky ridge of the Valley of Gibon. We therefore locate Psephinus opposite the southernmost two of four square foundations (apparently the towers at intervals) which we find marked on Mr. Williams's Plan, and indicating a salient point in the wall here, which is traceable on either side by a line of old foundations. These we take to be remnants of the part of this outer wall which Josephus says was begun with enormous stones, but was finished in an inferior manner on account of the emperor's jealousy (War, ut sup.). Although no gate is referred to along this part of the wall, yet there probably was not so far below Psephinus, where the path comes down at the north-west corner of the present city wall.

(2.) Between the tower Psephinus and the gate leading to the north-west were the Women's Towers, where a sallying party came near intercepting Titus (Joseph. War, v, 2; compare 3, 5). They appear to have issued from the gate and followed him to the towers.

(3.) Not very far beyond this, therefore, was the gate through which the above party emerged. This could have been no other than one along the present public road in this direction, a continuation of that leading through the Ephraim-gate up the head of the Tyropo-

neciation with Antonia, through which he might pour soldiers into the heart of the Temple area as need required (Josephus, Ant. xv, 11, 7).

This will make out the circuit of the general tower of Antonia, the proper castle standing on the south-west corner, and thence extending a wing to reach the tower on the north-west corner; and the two towers on the east side being on the same basis as the base of the towers. It had gates doublets on all sides, but, besides that on the south (which will be considered under the Temple), there is distinct evidence of none except (9.) The Golden-gate, so called in modern times. It is a double-thebrian called Bezetha, or the New Haran, now closed up, but evidently a work of antiquity, from its Roman style of architecture, which would naturally refer it to this time of Herod's enlargement of Antonia. Its position, as we shall see, is such as to make it a convenient entrance to this insculre. See Fenced City.

From this point the wall probably ran in a circular north-east course along the northern declivity of Acre, about where the modern wall does, until it reached, (4.) The Old-gate, which appears to have stood at the north-east corner of Acre (Neh. iii, 3, 4, 8; xii, 39); apparently the same as the First-gate (Zech. xiv, 10).

(5.) The Tower Antonia, at which we thus arrive, was situated (according to Josephus, War, v, 5, 8) at the corner of the Temple court where the northern and western cloisters met. This shows that it did not cover the whole of the platform north of the Temple, but only the courts and sacred spaces occupying this entire area, with a tower at each of the four corners (ibid.). Of these latter the proper Antonia seems to have been one, and they were all doubtless connected by porticoes and passages. They were all on a precipitous rock, fifty cubits high, the proper tower Antonia being forty cubits above this, the south-eastern tower seventy, and the others fifty cubits (ibid.). It was originally built by the Asmonean princes for the safe keeping of the high-priest's vestments, and called by them Bairus (ibid. Ant. xv, 11, 4). It was "the castle" into which Paul was taken from the mob (Acts xxvi, 34, 37). See Antonia.

(6.) That one of these four towers which occupied the north-east corner of the court of Antonia we are inclined to identify with the ancient Tower of Hinnom, between the tower of Meah and the Fish-gate (Neh. iii, 1, 3; xii, 39), and at the most north-eastern point of the city (ibid. xxxii, 14; compare with Zeph. i, 10).

(7.) The south-east one of these towers, again, we take to be the ancient Tower of Meah, referred to in the above passages of Nehemiah.

Pierotti has found a subterranean passage extending from the Golden-gate in a north-westerly direction (Jerusalem Explorated), but this could not trace it completely; only in two unconnected fragments, one 130 feet long, and another 150 feet. This may be the secret passage (κουντρι εκοπηκ) which Herod excavated from Antonia to the east gate, where he raised a tower, from which he might watch any seditious movement of the people; thus establishing a private comm
failed to be one at the notch opposite the north-east corner of the present city. Below this spot the ancient and modern walls would coincide in position.

3. As to the internal subdivisions of the city, few data remain beyond the arrangement necessarily resulting from the position of the hills and the course of the walls. Little is positively known respecting the streets of ancient Jerusalem. Josephus says (War, v, 4, 1) that the corresponding rows of houses on Zion and Acra terminated at the Tyropoeon, which implies that there were streets running across it; but we must not think here of wide thoroughfares like those of our cities, but of covered alleys, which constitute the streets of Oriental cities, and this is the general character of those of modern Jerusalem. The same remark will apply to the narrow streets leading obliquely to the [second] wall on the inside, several times referred to in the account of the capture of the city (War, v, 8, 1). The principal thoroughfares must be gathered from the position of the gates and the nature of the ground, with what few hints are supplied in ancient authors. In determining their position, the course of the modern roads or paths around the city is of great assistance, as even a mule-track in the East is remarkably permanent.

We must not, however, in this connection, fail to notice the famous bridge mentioned by Josephus (Ant. xiv, 4, 2; War, i, 7, 2; ii, 16, 3; vi, 6, 2; vi, 8, 1) as having remotely connected the hill Zion with the Temple near its south-west angle. Dr. Robinson (who was in Palestine in 1838, and published his book in 1841) claims to have discovered this (Researches, i, 425 sq.) in the

Remains of Arch of Bridge at the south-west angle of the Temple Area.

Three ranges of immense stones still jutting out from the Haram wall at this point; whereas Dr. Ginn (who visited Palestine in 1840, and published in 1843) asserts that this relic had hitherto been unmentioned by any traveller, although well known to the citizens of Jerusalem (Travels, ii, 26). The controversy which arose on the subject was closed by a letter from Rev. H. A. Homes, of Constantinople, stating that the existence and probable character of the remains in question were suggested in his presence to Dr. Robinson by the missionaries then resident at Jerusalem. The excavations of the English engineers on the spot have demonstrated the truth of the identification thus proposed. See TEMPLE.

Dubious Jerusalem, anciently, like all other cities, had definite quarters or districts where particular classes of citizens especially resided, but there was not the same difference in religion which constituted such marked divisions within the bounds of the modern city. It is clear, however, as well from the great antiquity of the Upper City, as from its being occupied in part by palaces, that it was the special abode of the nobility of
Recovery of the Pier of the ancient Arch across the Tyropeon at the south-west corner of the Temple. (From Lieutenant Warren's Sketch, August 22, 1838, in Tracings of the "Palestine Exploration Fund.")

buildings and objects of note connected with the ancient city. The topography of the Temple will be considered in detail under that article.

(a) Within the Upper City—Zion.—(1.) Herod's Palace. This, Josephus states (War, v, 4, 4), "adjointed the towers Hippicus, etc., on the north side of the old wall, being "elevated wall about to the height of 30 cubits, with towers at equal distances." Its precise dimensions in all are not given, but it must have covered a large area with its "innumerable rooms," its "many porticoes" and "courts," with "several groves of trees, and long walks through them, with deep canals and cisterns."

Similar descriptions are also given in Ant. xxv, 9, 3; War, ii, 1, 1. We do not regard it, however, as identical with the "dining-hall" built by Herod Agrippa at Zion (Ant. xxv, 8, 11), for that was only a wing to the former palace of the Asmonaeans (apparently a reconstruction of the ancient "king's house"), and lay nearer the Temple (War, ii, 16, 3)—the adjoining "portico" or "gallery" mentioned in these passages being probably a covered portion of the western portion of the ground apartments of this building appears to have been the procurator's praetorium, mentioned in the account of Christ's trial before Pilate (John xviii, 32, 33; xxix, 9; Mark xv, 16), as Josephus informs us (War, ii, 14, 8) that the Roman governors took up their quarters in the palace, and set up their tribunal in the room on the western side of the interior of the building.

(2) There is no reason to suppose that David's Tomb occupied any other position than that now shown in his burial-place on Mount Zion. It was within the precincts of the old city (1 Kings ii, 10); Nehemiah mentions it as surviving the first overthrow of the city (Neh. iii, 16); Peter refers to it as extant at Jerusalem in his time (Acts ii, 39); and Josephus alludes to it as a costly and noble vault of sepulture (Ant. xiii, 8, 4; xvi, 7, 1). The present evidence, however, is less conclusive as to the position of the ancient monument, now buried by the accumulated rubbish of ages.

(3) The Armory referred to in Neh. iii, 19, has already been located at the bend of the branch wall from a north-east to a north-west direction, a little below the bridge. Its site was probably represented in our Saviour's time by an improved building for some similar public purpose.

(4) The King's House, so often mentioned in the Old Testament, has also been sufficiently noticed above, and its probable identity with Herod Agrippa's "dining-hall" pointed out.

(b) Within the Lower City—Agra and Ophel.—(1.) Josephus informs us (War, vi, 6, 3) that "Queen Helen's Palace was in the middle of Agra," apparently upon the summit of that hill, near the modern site of the chancery office of the Temple. It is also mentioned as the (north-east) limit of Simon's occupancy in the Lower City (War, v, 6, 1).

(2) There were double arches Bazaars in ancient as in modern Jerusalem, but of these we have no account except in two or three instances. Josephus mentions "a place where were the merchants of wool, the bakers, and the market for cloth," just inside the second wall, not far from its junction with the first (War, v, 8, 1). It would also seem from Neh. viii, 1, 16, that there was some such place of general resort at the head of the Tyropeon. A "baker's street" or row of shops is referred to in Jer. xxxvii, 21, but its position is not indicated, although it appears to have been in some central part of the city. See also Makhtesh. Perhaps bazaars were stretched along the low tract between the Euphrates and the northern brow of Zion.

(3) The Tyropeon is frequently mentioned by Josephus as a place of popular assemblage between Zion and the Temple, and between the bridge and the old wall (War, v, 4, 2; vi, 3, 2; 6, 2; 8, 1). We have therefore thought that it would scarcely be included within the Upper

Double-vaulted Passage below the Mosque el-Aksa. (From Lieutenant Warren's Sketch, Dec. 31, 1857, in Tracings of the "Palestine Exploration Fund.")
City, the abode of the aristocracy, where, moreover, it would not be so generally accessible.

(4.) The Prison, so often referred to in the Old Testament (Neh. iii, 24, 25; Jer. xxxiii, 2; xxxviii, 6), must have been situated in the north-west corner of the enclosure which we have designated as "Millo," near the "Prison-gate" (Neh. xii, 39), and Peter's "iron gate" (Acts xii, 10). See Prison.

(5.) On the ridge of Ophel, not far from the "Fountain of the Virgin," appears to have stood the Palace of Mowaboth, otherwise styled that of Gropel (Josephus, War, v, 6, 1; 4, 2; iv. 9, 11, v. 7, 1).

(6.) Josephus states (Ant. xv, 8, 1) that Herod "built a theatre at Jerusalem, as also a very great amphitheatre in the plain;" but this notice is too indefinite to enable us to fix the site of these buildings. He also speaks elsewhere (Ant. xvii, 10, 2) of a hippodrome somewhere near the Temple, but whether it was the same as the amphitheatre is impossible to determine; the purposes of the two edifices, however, would appear to have been different.

(c.) Within the New City—Bezetha.—(1.) The Monuments of king Alexander, referred to by Josephus (War, v, 7, 3) were on the south-west edge of the proper hill Bezetha, nearly opposite the Fish-gate, as the circumstances there narrated seem to require. This will also agree with the subsequent erection of the second engine by the Romans (evidently by the same party of besiegers operating on this quarter, "a great way off" from the other), which was reared at 20 cubits' distance from the pool Struthius (ibid. xi, 4), being just south of this monument.

(2.) The Sepulchre of Christ was not far from the place of the Crucifixion (John xix, 42); if, therefore, the modern church occupies the true Calvary, we see no good reason to dispute the identity of the site of the tomb still shown in the middle of the west rotunda of that building. See Golgotha.

(3.) The Camp of the Assyrians was on the north-west side of the city (Isa. xxvi, 2; 2 Kings xviii, 17), identical with the site of Titus' second camp within the outer wall, but sufficiently outside the second wall to be beyond the reach of damage from it (Josephus, War, v, 7, 3; 12, 2), so that we can well refer it only to the western part of the general swell which terminates in the knoll of Calvary.

(4.) The Monument of the high-priest John is to be located near the bottom of the north edge of Zion, a little east of the tower Mariamne (Josephus, War, v, 11, 4; 6, 2; 9, 2, 7, 3).

(d.) In the Environs of the city.—(1.) Herod's Monuments we incline to locate on the brow of the ridge south of the "upper pool of Gihon" (see Josephus, War, v, 3, 12, 2).

(2.) The Village of the Erebithoi is mentioned by Josephus (ibid.) as lying along this line of blockade south of Herod's Monuments, and therefore probably on the western edge of Gihon, near the modern hamlet of Abu-Wâr'in.

(3.) The Fuller's Field we take to be the broad Valley of Gihon, especially between the two pools of that name; for not only its designation, but all the notices respecting it (Isa. vii, 3; xxxvi, 2; 2 Kings xviii, 17), indicate its proximity to these waters. See Fuller's Field.

(4.) Pompey's Camp is placed by Josephus (War, v, 12, 2) on a mountain, which can be no other than a lower spur of the modern "Hill of Evil Compliments." This must have been that general's preliminary camp, for, when he captured the city, "he pitched his camp within [his own line of circumvallation, the outer wall being unburnt], on the north side of the Temple" (Ant. xiv, 4, 2).

(5.) There is no good ground to dispute the traditional site of Acedamia or the Potter's Field (Matt. xxvii, 7, 8), in the face of the south brow of the Valley of Hinnom. See Acedamia.

(6.) The Monument of Ananias [i.e. Annas or Caiphas], the high-priest, mentioned by Josephus (War, v, 12, 2), must have been just above the site of Acedamia.

(7.) The King's Garden (Neh. iii, 15) could have been no other than the well-watered plot of ground around the well of En-Rogel, where were also the king's stables (Zechar. xiv, 10).

(8.) The rock Peristeron (literally "pigeon-holes"), referred to by him in the same connection, has been so inaptly identified with the perforated face of the Valley of Jehoshaphat at the foot of the Mount of Olives, where modern tradition assigns the graves of Jehoshaphat, Ab-salom, James, and Zacharias.

(9.) The second of these ruins from the north is probably the veritable Pillar of Abalam, referred to in the Scriptures (2 Sam. xviii, 18), and by Josephus as if extant in his day ("a marble pillar in the king's dale [the Valley of Jehoshaphat, which led to 'the king's gardens'], two furlongs distant from Jerusalem" [Ant. vii, 10, 3]. See ABALAM'S TOMB.

(10.) The last and most interesting spot in this survey is the garden of Gethsemane, which tradition has so consistently located that nearly every traveller has acknowledged its general identity. Respecting its site, however, we know very little; but we are unable to perceive the propriety of supposing a village of the same name to have been located near it. See GETHSEMANI.

(11.) Finally, we may briefly recapitulate the different points in the Romans' wall of circumvallation, during the siege by Titus, as given by Josephus (War, v, 12, 2), at the same time indicating their identity as above determined: "Titus began the wall from the camp of the Assyrians, where his own camp was pitched [i.e., near the north-west angle of the modern city wall], and drew it [in a north-east curve] down to the lower parts of the New City [following the general direction of the present north wall]; thence it went [southeast] along [the eastern bank of] the Valley of Kedron to the Mount of Olives; it then bent [directly] towards the south, and encompassed the western slope of that mountain as far as the rock Peristeron [the tomb of Jehoshaphat, etc.], and [of] that other hill [the Mount of Olives] which lies next it [on the southern], and which is over [i.e. east of] the Valley of Jehoshaphat, which reaches to Siloam; whence it bent again to the west, and went down [the hill] to the Valley of the Fountain [the wady En-Nar], beyond which it went up again at the monument of Ananias the high-priest [above Acedamia].
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and compassing that mountain where Pompey had formerly pitched his camp [the extremity of the Hill of Evil Counsel], it returned to [i. e. towards] the north side of the city, and was carried [along the south-western bank of Gihon Valley] as far as a certain village called the house of the Erehbiti [at Abu-Warî] after which the road led [westwards]. [This village, which is called Herod's monument [south of Upper Gihon], and there on the east] was joined to Titus's own camp, where it began. Now the length of this wall was forty furlongs less one. Along the line thus indicated it would be precisely this length; it would make no sharp turns or deviations, but run straight, and the numerous commanding eminences, following the walls at a convenient distance so as to be out of the reach of missiles.

For a further discussion of the various points connected with the ancient topography of Jerusalem, see Villalpandi, Apparatus urbis Hierosolym. in pt. 3 of Præsid. and Villal. Explanat. in Ezech. (Rome, 1604); Lamy, De Tobi, fied. sanct. cie. etc., vii (Paris, 1720), bk. iv, p. 552-567; Ireland, Palest. cit., p. 832 sq.; Offenhaus, Descript. vet. Hierosolym. (Davenort. 1714); Faber, Archœologia, i, 273 sq.; Hamesveld, i, 2 sq.; Rosenmüller, Aethr. ii, 202 sq.; Robinson, Researches, 4, 408-516; Williams, Holy City, ii, 185 sq.; cf. Wood, Bible, i, 184 sq.; i, 413 sq., 605 sq.; 184, p. 92 sq.; Reiner, Jerusalem Virtutissimæ Descripta (Francois, 1653); Olshausen, Zur Topographie d. alt. Jerusalem (Kiel, 1883); Adrichomius, Hierosolymæ necit Christi tempore floruit (Coloniæ, 1788). C damping (Beat. Patr. Hierosolym. 1624), Hiéronymi Hierosol. et Descriptio Terræ Sanctæ, Umbriæ Sanctæ Hierosolymæ (Venetiæ, 1728) [this work is in Greek]; D'Anville, Dessert, sur l'entendue de l'Ancienne Jerusalem (Paris, 1747); Thrupp, Ancient Jerusalem (London, 1855); Strong's Harmony and Expos. of the Gospels, Append. ii; Seppe, Jerusalem (Münich, 1869); Barclay, City of the Great King (Phila, 1858); Ferguson, Ancient Topography of Jerusalem [altogether astray] (Lond. 1847); Lewin, Jerusalem (London, 1861); Pierotti, Jerusalem Explored (London, 1864); Unruh, Das alte Jerusalem (Leauge, 1861); Scholz, De Hierosolymo sitù (Bonn, 1850).

III. Modern City—L. Situation.—The following alá sketch of the general position of Jerusalem is extracted from Dr. Robinson's Researches (i, 380-384): "Jerusalem lies near the summit of a broad mountain-ridge, extending without interruption from the plain of Esdraelon to a line drawn between the south end of the Dead Sea and the south-east corner of the Mediterranean; or, more properly, perhaps, it may be regarded as extending as far south as Jebel Anfi, in the Desert, where it sinks down at once to the level of the great western plateau. This tract, which is everywhere not less than from 20 to 25 geographical miles in breadth, is, in fact, high, uneven table-land. It everywhere forms the precipitous western wall of the great valley of the Jordan and the Dead Sea, while towards the west it sinks down by an offset into a range of lower hills, which lie between it and the great plain along the coast of the Mediterranean. The surface of this upper region is everywhere rocky, uneven, and mountainous; and is, moreover, cut up by deep valleys which run east or west on either side towards the Jordan or the Mediterranean. The line of division, or water-shed, between the waters of these valleys—a term which here applies almost exclusively to the rivers—is the ancient rainy season; it follows for the most part the height of land along the ridge, yet not so that the heads of the valleys, which run off in different directions, often interlap for a considerable distance. Thus, for example, a valley which descends to the Jordan often has its head a mile or two westward of the commencement of other valleys which run to the western sea.

"From the great plain of Esdraelon onwards towards the south, the mountainous country rises gradually, forming the tract already known as the mountains of Ephraim and Judah, until, in the vicinity of Hebron, it attains an elevation of nearly 9000 Paris feet above the level of the Mediterranean Sea. Further north, on a line drawn from the north end of the Dead Sea towards the true west, the ridge has an elevation of only about 2500 Paris feet, and here, close upon the water-shed, lies the city of Jerusalem. Its mean geographical position is in lat. 31° 49' 43" N., and long. 35° 38' E. from Greenwich foot of Buddha, which is called (from the Much- built form, it is a great deal higher than it appears, and the elevation is more gradual than a rough glance would lead us to suppose.

"Six or seven miles north and north-west of the city is spread out the open plain or basin round about el-Jib (Gibeon), extending also towards el-Birch (Beeroth), the waters of which flow off at its south-east part through the deep valley here called by the Arabs wady el-Maaleh, but no other than the mud-floods. The tellers in the ancient times have usually given the name of the 'Valley of Turpentine,' or of the Terebinth, on the mistaken supposition that it is the ancient Valley of Elah. This great valley passes along in a south-west direction an hour or more west of Jerusalem, and finally opens out from the mountains into the western plain, at the distance of six or eight hours south-west from the city, under the name of wady es-Sirâr. The traveller, on his way from Ramleh to Jerusalem, descends into and crosses this deep valley at the village of Kulunieh, on its western side, an hour and a half from the latter city. On again reaching the summit on the high road, and on the south-eastern side, there is an open tract sloping gradually downward towards the east, and sees before him, at the distance of about two miles, the walls and domes of the holy city, and beyond them the higher ridge or summit of the Mount of Olives. The traveller now descends gradually towards the city along the slope of the ridge, at the distance of six or eight hours, and arrives at the distance of about one mile west of the summit of the Mount of Olives. Beyond that mountain the slope is somewhat more open, and again east nearly at right angles, and unites with the other, which then continues its course to the Dead Sea. Upon the broad and elevated promontory within the fork of the two valleys lies the holy city. All around are higher hills; on the east, the Mount of Olives; on the south, the Hill of Ezel; or Gethsemane, rising directly from the Vale of Hinnom; on the west the ground rises gently, as above described, to the borders of the great wady; while on the north, a bend of the ridge, connected with the Mount of Olives, bounds the prospect at the distance of more than a mile. Towards the south-west the view is somewhat more open, for here lies the plain of Rephaim, commencing just at the southern brink of the Valley of Hinnom, and stretching off south-west, where it runs to the western sea. In the north-west, too, the eye reaches up along the upper part of the Valley of Jehoshaphat, and from many points can discern the Mosque of Nych Samwil, situated on a lofty ridge beyond the great wady, at the distance of two hours.

"The surface of the elevated promontory itself, on which the city stands, slopes somewhat steeply towards the east, terminating the brink of the Valley of Jehoshaphat. From the northern part, near the plain of Damascus-gate, a depression or shallow wady runs in a southern direction, and is joined by another depression or shallow wady (still easy to be traced) coming down from near the Jaffa-gate. It then continues obliquely downwards to the slope, but with a deeper depression, in a direction, quite to the Pool of Siloam and the Valley of Jehoshaphat. This is the ancient Tyropoön. West of its lower part Zion rises loyally, lying mostly without the modern city; while on the east of the Tyropoön lie Bezetha, Moriah, and Ophel, the last a long and comparatively narrow ridge, also outside of the modern city, and terminating in a rocky point over the Pool of Siloam. These last three hills may strictly be taken as only parts of one and the same ridge. The breadth of the whole site of Jerusalem, from the brow of the Valley of Hinnom, near the Jaffa-gate, to the brink of the Valley of Jehoshaphat, is about 1020 yards, or nearly half a
geographical mile, of which distance 318 yards are occupied by the area of the great mosque el-Haram ash-Sherif. North of the Jaffa-gate the city wall sweeps round more to the west, and increases the breadth of the citadel.

"The country around Jerusalem is all of limestone formation, and not particularly fertile. The rocks everywhere come out above the surface, which in many parts is also thickly strewed with loose stones, and the aspect of the whole region is barren and dreary; yet the old proverb, 'God has scattered the chaff, and the unfruitful branches are seen in the valleys and level places, but they are less productive than in the region of Hebron and Nablus. Neither vineyards nor fig-trees flourish on the high ground around the city, though the latter are found in the gardens below Siloam, and very frequently in the vicinity of Bethlehem."

"The elevation of Jerusalem is a subject of constant reference and exultation by the Jewish writers. Their fervid poetry abounds with allusions to its height, to the ascent thither of the tribes from all parts of the country. It was the habitation of Jehovah, from which 'he looked upon the world' (Ps. xxxiii, 14): its kings 'were higher than the kings of the earth' (Ps. lxxxix, 27). In the later Jewish literature of narrative and description this poetry is reduced to prose, and in the most exagerrated form. Jerusalem was watered as if by a clear, springing fountain by the secret and subterraneous channels from springs to the west of the town, and communicating by other subterraneous passages with the Pool of Siloam and the Fountain of the Virgin in the east of the town, whether they were within or without the walls of the town."

The existing streams of a perennial source of water below the Temple has always been admitted. Tacitus knew of it (Hist. v, 12); and Aristeas, in describing the ancient Temple, informs us that "the supply of water was unfailing, inasmuch as there was an abundant natural fountain flowing in the interior, and reserves of subterraneous construction under ground, extending five stadia round the Temple, with pipes and conduits unknown to all except those to whom the service was intrusted, by which the water was brought to various parts of the Temple and again conducted off." The Moslems also write that the existing springing fountain was a reservoir or cistern; but a reserve has always been kept up as to the means by which it is supplied. This reserve seems to have been maintained by the successive occupants of Jerusalem as a point of civic honor; and this fact alone intimates that there was danger to the town in its becoming known to the enemy. This danger came from without the city by secret channels, which it was of importance not to disclose. Yet we are plainly told in the Bible that Hezekiah "stopped the upper water-course of Gihon, and brought it down to the west side of the city of David" (1 Kings i, 35, 36); from 2 Chron. xxxvi, 28 it seems that all the neighboring fountains were thus "stopped" or covered, and the brook which they had formed diverted by subterraneous channels into the town, for the express purpose of preventing besiegers from finding the "much water" which previously existed outside the walls (comp. also Ecclus. xlviii, 12). Isaiah (xxii, 12) alludes to this secret fountain under the Temple when he speaks of waters issuing from the threshold of the Temple towards the east, and flowing down towards the desert as an abundant and beautiful stream. This figure may be drawn from the waters of the inner source under the Temple, being at the time of overflow dis charged by the outlets at Siloam into the Kidron, which takes the eastward course thus described.

There are certainly wells, or rather shafts, in and near the Temple area, which are said to derive their waters through a passage of masonry four or five feet high, from a chamber or reservoir cut in the solid rock under the grand mosque, in which the water is said to rise from the rock into a basin at the bottom. The existence of this reservoir and source of water is affirmed by the citizens, and coincides with the previous intimations, but it must for the time being at any rate be in shadow. It is one of the obscurities in which the matter is involved. Even Dr. Barclay, who gave great attention to this subject, was unable fully to clear it up (City of the Great King, p. 293).

The pools and tanks of ancient Jerusalem were very abundant, and each house being provided with what we may call a bottle-necked cistern for rain-water, drought within the city was rare; and history shows us that it was the besiegers, not the besieged, that generally suffered from want of water (Gul. Tyr. bk. viii, p. 7; see Waha, Anbora Gesofeli, p. 421). Though occasionally this water was cut off, its absence in neither ancient nor modern times could the neighborhood of Jerusalem be called "waterless," as Strabo
describes it (Geogr. xvi, 2, 56). In summer the fields and hills around are verdureless and gray, scorched with months of drought, yet within a radius of seven miles there are some thirty or forty natural springs (Barclay's City, p. 295). This natural provision for a supply of water in Jerusalem in ancient times was perhaps the most complete and extensive ever undertaken for a city. Till lately this was not fully credited; but Barclay's, and, more recently, Whitby's and Pleniotty's subterranean excavations have proved it. The aqueduct of the Middle Ages (twenty-two miles and a quarter) pours the waters of the three immense pools into the enormous Temple wells, cut out like caverns in the rock; and the pools, which surround the city in all directions, supply to a great extent the want of a river or a lake (Trallis's Josephus, vol. i; Append. p. 57, 60). For a description of these, see Thomson, Land and Book, ii, 523 sq.

The ordinary means taken by the inhabitants to secure a supply of water have been described under the article Cisterns; for interesting details, see Raumer's Illustration, p. 329-333; Robinson's Researches, i, 479-518; Olin's Travels, ii, 168-181; and Williams's Holy City, ii, 453-502.

3. We present in this connection some additional remarks on the fortifications of the city. Dr. Robinson thinks that the wall of the new city, the Еліа of Hadri-ean, nearly coincided with that of the old; thus Jerusalem and the portion of Mount Zion which now lies outside would seem then also to have been excluded; for Eusebius and Cyril, in the 4th century, speak of the denunciation of the prophet being fulfilled, which describes Zion as "a ploughed field" (Mic. iii, 2).

In the Middle Ages there appear to have been two gates on each side of the city, making eight in all; a number not greatly short of that assigned in the above estimate to the ancient Jerusalem, and probably occupying nearly the places of the most important of the ancient ones.

On the west side were two gates, of which the principal was the Porta David, gate of David, often mentioned by the writers on the Crusades. It was called by the Arabs Bab el-Mubarak, and corresponds to the present Jaffa-gate, or Bab el-Khalil. The other was the gate of the Fleeing Field (Porta Fugitorum), called by Lewis pavonia. This seems to be the same as which others call Porta Judiciaria, and which is described as being in the wall over against the church of the Holy Sepulchre, leading to Silo (Nebiy Samwil) and Gibea. This seems to be that which the Arabian writers call Ser, where there is no trace of it in the present wall. On the north there were also two gates, and all the Middle-Age writers speak of the principal of them as the gate of St. Stephen, from the notion that the death of the protomartyr took place near it. This was also called the gate of Ephraim, in reference to its probable ancient name. Arabic writers call it Bab 'Amud el-Gharob, of which the present name, Bab el-'Amud, is only a contraction. The present gate of St. Stephen is on the east of the city, and the scene of the martyrdom is now placed near it; but there is no account of the change. Further east was the gate of Benjamin (Porta Benjaminis), corresponding apparently to what is now called the gate of Herod.

On the east there seem to have been at least two gates. The northernmost is described by Adamnanus as a small portal leading down to the Valley of Jehoshaphat. It was called the gate of Jehoshaphat from the valley by which it led. It seems to be represented by the present gate of St. Stephen. The Arabic writers call it Bab el-'Ubayd, gate of the Tribes, being another form of the modern Arabic name Bab re-Subat. The present gate of St. Stephen has four lions sculptured over it on the outside, which, as well as the architecture before it, is learned. Robinson suggests that the original "small portal" was rebuilt on a larger scale by the Franks when they built up the walls of the city, either in A.D. 1178 or 1229. The other gate is the famous Golden Gate (Porta aurea) in the eastern wall of the Temple area. It is now called by the Arabs Bab el-Dokhairiyeh, but formerly Bab er-Rameh, "Gate of Mercy." The name Golden Gate appears to have come from a supposed connection with one of the ancient gates of the Temple, which are said to have been covered with gold; but this name cannot be traced back beyond the historians of the Crusades. This gate is, from its architecture, obviously of Roman origin, and is conjectured to have belonged to the incesur of the temple of Jupiter which was built by Hadrian upon Mount Moriah. The exterior is now walled up, but, being double, the interior forms within the area a recess, which is used for prayer by the Moslem worshipper. Different reasons are given for the closing of this gate. It was probably because it was found inconvenient that a gate to the mosque should be open in the exterior wall. Although not walled up, it was kept closed even when the Crusaders were in possession of the city, and only opened once a year, on Palm Sunday, in celebration of our Lord's supposed triumphal entry through it to the Temple.

Of all the towers with which the city was anciently adorned and defended, the most important is that of Hippicus, which, as we have already seen, assumed as the starting-point in his description of all the walls of the city. Herod gave it the name of a friend who was slain in battle. It was a quadrangular structure, twenty-five cubits on each side, and built up entirely solid to the height of thirty cubits. Above this solid part was a cistern twenty cubits; and then, for twenty-five cubits more, were chambers of various kinds, with a breastwork of two cubits, and battlements of three cubits upon the top. The altitude of the whole tower was consequently eighty cubits. The stones of which it was built were very large, twenty cubits long by ten broad and five high, and (probably in the upper part) were of white marble. Dr. Robinson has shown that this tower should be sought at the north-west corner of the upper city, or Mount Zion. This part, a little to the south of the Jaffa-gate, is now occupied by the citadel. It is an irregular assemblage of square towers, surrounded on the inner side towards the city by a low wall, and having on the outer west side a deep fosse. The towers which rise from the brink of the fosse are protected on that side by a low sloping bulwark or buttress, which rises from the bottom of the trench at an angle of forty-five degrees. This part bears evident marks of antiquity, and Dr. Robinson is inclined to ascribe these massive outworks to the time of the rebuilding and fortifying of the city by Hadrian. This fortress is described by the Middle-Age historians as the tower or citadel of David. Within it, as the traveller enters the city by the Jaffa-gate, the northeaster tower attracts his notice as being evident marks of higher antiquity than any of the others.
upper part is, indeed, modern, but the lower part is built of larger stones, bevelled at the edges, and apparently still occupying their original places. This tower has been singled out by the Franks, and bears among them the name of the tower of David, while they sometimes give to the whole fortress the name of the castle of David. Taking all the circumstances into account, Dr. Robinson thinks that the antique lower portion of this tower is in all probability a remnant of the tower of Hippicus, which, as Josephus states, was left standing by Titus when he destroyed the city. This discovery, however, is not new, the identity having been advocated by Raumer and others before Dr. Robinson travelled. This view has been somewhat modified by Mr. Williams, who shows that the north-western angle of the present citadel exactly corresponds in size and position to the description of Josephus, while other portions of the same general structure have been rebuilt upon the old foundations of the adjoining towers of Mariamne and Phasaelus (Holy City, ii, 14-16).

The present Damascus-gate in particular, from its massive style and other circumstances, seems to have occupied a prominent point along the ancient "second wall" of the city. Connected with its structures are the immense underground quarries, on which, as well as out of which, the city may be said to be built. From them have been hewn, in past ages, the massive limestone blocks which appear in the walls and elsewhere. In these dark chambers one may, with the help of torches, wander for hours, scrambling over mounds of rubbish; now climbing into one chamber, now descending to another, noting the various cuttings, grooves, cleavages and hammer-marks; and wondering at the different shapes—bars here, slices there, boulders there, thrown up together in utter confusion. Only in one corner do we find a few drippings of water and a tiny spring; for these singular excavations, like the great barrack at Khureitun (beyond Bethlehem, probably Adullam), are entirely free from damp; and though the only bit of intercourse with the upper air is by the small twenty-inch hole at the Damascus-gate, through which the entreprenising traveller wriggles into them, like a worm, yet the air is fresh and somewhat warm (Stewart’s Tent and Khan, p. 263-266).

These are no doubt the subterranean retreats referred to by Josephus as occupied by the despairing Jews in the last days of Jerusalem (War, vi, 7, 3; vi, 8, 4); and to which Tasso alludes when relating the wizard’s promise to conduct the “Soldan” through Godfrey’s leaguer into the heart of the city (Ierus. Liber, x, 29). The native name for the quarries is Maghåret el-Kotton, the Cotton Cave. For a full description of these caverns, see Barclay, City of the Great King, p. 460 sq.; Thomson, Land and Book, ii, 491 seq.; and the report of the Ordnance Survey (1865, p. 63).

The following description of the present city is chiefly abridged from the excellent account of Dr. Olmstead (Present, vol. ii, chap. iv). The general view of the city from the Mt. of Olives is mentioned more or less by all travellers as that from which they derive their most distinct and abiding impression of Jerusalem.

The summit of the Mt. of Olives is about half a mile east from the city, which it completely overlooks, every considerable edifice and almost every house being visible. The city, seen from this point, appears to be a regular inclined plain, sloping gently and uniformly from west to east, or towards the observer, and indented by a slight depression or shallow vale, running nearly through the centre in the same direction. The south-east corner of the quadrangle—for that may be assumed as the figure formed by the rocks—that which is nearest to the observer, is occupied by the mosque of Omar and its extensive and beautiful grounds. This is Mount Moriah, the site of Solomon’s Temple; and the ground embraced in this inclosure occupies about an eighth of the whole modern city. It is covered with greensward, and planted sparingly with olive, cypress, and other trees, and it is certainly the most lovely feature of the town, whether we have reference to the splendid structures or the beautiful lawn spread out around them.

The south-west quarter, embracing that part of Mount Zion...
which is within the modern town, is to a great extent occupied by the Armenian convent, an enormous edifice, which is the only conspicuous object in this neighborhood. The north-west is largely occupied by the Latin convent, another very extensive establishment. About midway between these two convents is the castle or citadel, close to the Bethlehem-gate, already mentioned. The north-east quarter of Jerusalem is but partially built up, and it has more the aspect of a rambling agricultural village than that of a crowded city. The vacant spots here are green with gardens and olive-trees. There is another large vacant tract along the southern wall, and west of the Haram, also covered with verdure. Near the centre of the city also appear two or three green spots, which are small gardens. The Church of the Holy Sepulchre is the only conspicuous edifice in this vicinity, and its domes are striking objects. There are no buildings which, either from their size or beauty, are likely to engage the attention. Eight or ten minarets mark the position of so many mosques in different parts of the town, but they are only noticed because of their elevation above the surrounding edifices. Upon the same principle the eye rests for a moment upon a great number of low domes, which form the roofs of the principal dwellings, and relieve the heavy uniformity of the flat plastered roofs which cover the greater mass of more humble habitations. Many rainous piles and a thousand disgusting objects are concealed or disguised by the distance. Many inequalities of surface, which exist to so great an extent that there is not a level street of any length in Jerusalem, are also unperceived.

From the same commanding point of view a few olive and fig trees are seen in the lower part of the Valley of Jehoshaphat, and scattered over the side of Olivet from its base to the summit. They are sprinkled yet
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more sparsely on the southern side of the city on Mount Zion and Ophel. North of Jerusalem the olive plantations appear more numerous as well as thriving, and thus offer a grateful contrast to the sunburnt fields and bare rocks which predominate in this landscape. The rugged country in the back of the desert is well watered by wadis, or watercourses, that carry torrents of water in winter, and often flow dry in summer.

The streets of Jerusalem are, for the most part, narrow, winding, and crooked, and are paved with stone, cobbled, or with cobblestones. The houses are of various sizes and shapes, and are generally built of stone, with flat roofs. The walls are high, and often reach to the roof, and are made of clay and brick. The doors are usually large, and are often ornamented with carved wooden panels.

The greatest feature of the city is the Temple, which is situated in the center of the old city. The Temple was the center of the religious life of the Jews, and was also the center of the political and social life of the city. The Temple was destroyed by the Romans in 70 AD, and has not been rebuilt since that time.

The walls of Jerusalem are high and thick, and are made of stone. The walls are a reminder of the history of the city, and of the many battles that have taken place within its walls. The walls have been repaired and strengthened many times over the centuries, and are now in good repair.

The city of Jerusalem is a center of pilgrimage, and is visited by thousands of pilgrims each year. The pilgrims come from all over the world, and are of all faiths and backgrounds. The pilgrims come to Jerusalem to visit the Temple, and to visit the places associated with the life of Jesus.

The city of Jerusalem is also a center of education, and is home to many universities and colleges. The universities and colleges are a reminder of the intellectual and cultural life of the city, and of the many scholars and researchers who have contributed to the study of Judaism and the Bible.

The city of Jerusalem is also a center of commerce, and is home to many businesses and industries. The businesses and industries are a reminder of the economic life of the city, and of the many people who work and live in Jerusalem.
The population of Jerusalem has been variously estimated by different travellers, some making it as high as 30,000, others as low as 12,000. An average of these estimates would make it somewhere between 12,000 and 15,000; but the Egyptian system of taxation and of military conscription in Syria has lately furnished more accurate data than had previously been obtainable, and on these Dr. Robinson estimates the population at not more than 11,500, distributed thus:

Mohammedans .......... 4,500
Jews .................. 5,000
Christians .......... 2,000
Others ................ 1,000

11,000

If to this be added something for possible omissions, and the inmates of the convents, the standing population, exclusive of the garrison, would not exceed 11,500. Dr. Barclay is very minute in regard to the Christian sects, and his details show that Robinson greatly underestimated them when he gave their number as 3500. Barclay shows them to be in all 4518 (p. 588). The latest estimate of the population is that of Pierotti, who gives the entire sum as 20,820, subdivided as follows: Christian sects, 6068; Moslems (Arabs and Turks), 7556; Jews, 7796.

The language most generally spoken among all classes of the inhabitants is the Arabic. Schools are rare, and consequently facility in reading is not often met with. The general condition of the inhabitants has already been indicated.

The fortified circuit of the town holds the rank of pasha, but is responsible to the pasha of Beirutt. The government is somewhat milder than before the period of the Egyptian domination; but it is said that the Jewish and Christian inhabitants at least have ample cause to regret the change of masters, and the屯金aries lament that change without reserve (Am. Bib. Repons, for 1843). Yet the Moslems reverence the same spots which the Jews and Christians account holy; the holy sepulchre only excepted; and this exception arises from their disbelief that Christ was crucified, or buried, or rose again. Formerly there were in Palestine monks of the Benedictine and Augustine orders, and of those of St. Basil and St. Anthony; but since 1804 there have been none but Franciscans, who have charge of the Latin convent and the holy places. They resided on Mount Zion till A.D. 1561, when the Turks allowed them the monastery of St. Peter, which they now occupy. They have formerly a handsome revenue out of all Roman Catholic countries, but these sources have fallen off since the French Revolution, and the establishment is said to be poor and deeply in debt. The expenses arise from the duty imposed upon the convent of entertaining pilgrims, and the cost of maintaining the twenty convents belonging to the establishment of the Terra Santa is estimated at 40,000 Spanish dollars a year. Formerly it was much higher, in consequence of the heavy exactions of the Turkish government. Burckhardt says that he shrewdly paid annually £12,000 to the pasha of Damascus. But the Egyptian government relieved them from these heavy charges, and imposed instead a regular tax on the property possessed. For the buildings and lands in and around Jerusalem the annual tax was fixed at 7000 litteras, or 350 Spanish dollars. It is probable that the restored Turkish government has not yet, in this respect, recurred to its old oppressions. The convent contains fifty monks, half Italians and half Spaniards. In it resides the intendant or the principal of all the convents, with the rank of abbot, and the title of guardian of Mount Zion and custos of the Holy Sepulchre. He is always a Scotchman, and has charge of all the spiritual affairs of the Roman Catholics in the Holy Land. There is also a president or vicar, who takes the place of the guardian in case of absence or death: he was formerly a Frenchman, but is now either an Italian or Spaniard. The procurator, who manages their temporal affairs, is always a Spaniard. A council, called Discretorium, composed of these officials and three other monks, has the general management of all the spiritual and temporal matters. Much of the attention of the order is occupied, and much of its expense incurred, in entertaining pilgrims and in the distribution of alms. The native Roman Catholics live around the convent, on which they are wholly dependent. They are native Arabs, and are said to be descended from converts in the times of the Crusades.

There is a Greek patriarch of Jerusalem, but he usually resides at Constantinople, and is represented in the holy city by one or more vicars, who are bishops residing in the great convent near the church of the Holy Sepulchre. At present the vicars are the bishops of Lydda, Nazareth, and Kerek (Paxtra), assisted by the other bishops resident in the convent. In addition to thirteen monasteries in Jerusalem, they possess the convent of the Holy Cross, near Jerusalem; that of St. Helena, between Jerusalem and Bethlehem; and that of St. John, between Jerusalem and the Dead Sea. All the monks of the convents are converts. The Christians of the Greek rite who are not monks are all native Arabs, with their native priests, who are allowed to perform the Church services in their mother tongue—the Arab.

The Armenians in Jerusalem have a patriarch, with three convents and 100 monks. They have also convents at Bethlehem, Ramliah, and Jaffa. Few of the Armenians are natives: they are mostly merchants, and among the wealthiest inhabitants of the place, and their condition is generally good. A convent of Latin clergy and a convent of Greek clergy are near the city of Jaffa, and a convent of the Abyssinians, and one belonging to the Jacobite Syrians.

The estimate of the number of the Jews in Jerusalem at 3000 is given by Dr. Robinson on the authority of Mr. Nicolayson, the resident missionary to the Jews. Yet in the following year (1839) a Scotch deputation set them down at six; a number on the same authority. (See Dr. Barclay's estimate above.) They inhabit a distinct quarter of the town, between Mount Zion and Mount Moriah. This is the worst and dirtiest part of the holy city, and that in which the plague never fails to make its first appearance. Few of the Jews are wealthy or aquapants, and a large number of them now choose to die in the city of their fathers' sepulchres. The greater proportion of them are from different parts of the Levant, and appear to be mostly of Spanish and Polish origin. Few are from Germany, or understand the German language. They are, for the most part, wealthy or in possession of land. Their subsistence upon the contributions of their brethren is different countries. These contributions vary considerably in amount in different years, and often occasion much dissatisfaction in their distribution (see the Narrative of the Scotch deputation, p. 148). An effort, however, is now making in Europe for the preservation of Jewish agriculture in Palestine, and a society formed for that purpose, under whose auspices several Jewish families have emigrated to their sacred fatherland, and are engaged in the culture of the produce of which the soil is so fertile. Prominent among these philanthropic exertions are those of Sir Moses Montefiore, of London, who has established a farm in the vicinity of Jerusalem for the benefit of his Jewish brethren (Benjamin, Eight Years in Asia and Africa, p. 94). Under the reforms and religious toleration in Turkey, as already observed, the Jews have a fair chance of improving their condition. The condition of the Jewish and Christian inhabitants of Jerusalem may be expected. It should also be added that European enterprise has projected a railway from Jaffa to Jerusalem as one of the fruits of the alliance during the late war, and on its completion an additional impulse will doubtless be given to this ancient metropolis by the facilities of travel and transportation thus afforded.
6. The most recent and complete works on modern Jerusalem are Dr. Titus Tobler's Zwei Bücher Topographie von Jerusalem und seine Umgebungen (Berlin, 1853, et seq.), which contains (vol. i, p. xi-e) a nearly full list of all works by travellers and others on the subject, with brief critical notices of each work. The most recent work is that of Max C. von der Hagen, Gotha, 1859, and greatly enlarged in his Bibliographie Geographique Palestine, Lpz. 1867.), and Prof. Joseph's Jerusalem und das Heilige Land (München, 1864, 2 vols.), which almost exhaustively treat the sacred topography from the Roman Catholic point of view. The city itself is described by those who have visited the Holy Land; see especially Bartlett's Walks about Jerusalem (London, 1842). The map of van De Velde (Gotha, 1838), with a memoir by Tobler, has remained the most exact one of the present city till the publication of the English Ordance Survey (London, 1864–5, 1866; N. Y., 1871), which contains minute details. The most perfect pictorial representation is the Panorama of Jerusalem, taken from the Mount of Olives, in three large aquatint engravings, with a key, published in Germany (Munich, 1850). Many new and interesting details have been furnished by scientific investigation, especially by the explorations of the engineers lately employed under the auspices of the "Palaeontological Exploration Fund" of England, the results of which are detailed in their successive Quarterly Statements, and popularly summed up in their volume entitled Jerusalem Rock and City, 1878. The Christian Church. Much depends, in determining the number of councils held, on the significance of the name. See the article Council. We have room here only for the principal councils held at Jerusalem. They are, I. The first, held to confirm the regulations of the apostles, which is believed to have been held during the year 47, under James the Less, bishop of Jerusalem, in consequence of the dispute in the Church of Antioch on the propriety of dispensing with circumcision (probably provoked by Judaizers). By the decisions of this council, the faithful were commanded to abstain (1) from meats which had been offered to idols (so as not even to appear to countenance the worship of the heathen), (2) from blood and3
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The apostle, from the summit of a high mountain, beheld, in a pictorial symbol or scenic representation, a city resplendent with celestial brightness, which seemed to descend from the heavens to the earth. It was built upon terraces, one rising above another, each elevated, or the building supporting or encircling it; and thus, although each wall was only 144 cubits = 252 feet high, the height of the whole city was equal to its diameter. This was stated to be a square of about 400 miles; or 12,000 stadia = about 1500 miles in circumference—of course a mystical number, denoting that the city was capable of holding almost countless myriads of inhabitants. In its general form, the symbolic city presents a striking resemblance to that of the new city in Ezek. xl-xlviii. The pictorial symbol must be regarded as the representation not of a place or thing, but of the Church as a society.

Jerusalem and Zion are often used for the inhabitants and faithful worshippers, so the new Jerusalem is emblematical of the Church of God, part on earth and part in heaven. To suppose the invisible world to be exclusively referable to the new city would deprive the contrast between the Law and the Gospel economy, Sinai and Zion, of its appositeness and force. Moreover, the distinction between the general assembly of the enrolled citizens, and the spirits of the just made perfect (Heb. xii, 22-24), can be explained only by interpreting the former of the material church, and the latter of the Church triumphant in heaven. Thus we see why the New Jerusalem was bethel, like Jacob's ladder, extending from earth to heaven. See Zion.

NEW JERUSALEM, NEW, CHURCH. See NEW JERUSALEM CHURCH.

JERUSALEM, PATRIARCHATE OF. See PATRIARCHATE OF JERUSALEM.

JERUSALEM, THE NEW SEE OF ST. JAMES IX. The city, sacred alike to the Jew, the Gentile, and the Turk, new life was infused, but of the Church as a society, until the opening of the present era; and, strange to say, the desolate condition of the Jews first caused the appointment of two missionaries to Palestine. These were sent in 1818 by the North American Missionary Society, of Boston. In Europe, no action was taken until 1832: in this year the London Missionary Society took up the work and entered the field. In 1840, at last, the expedition of the great European Powers to the East gave rise to the hope that, though Protestantism might not immediately secure a strong foothold, the power of the Mohammedans at least would be broken, and an opening be made, if not for the reception of the influences of the Christian dispensation, at least for the sacred land. The great ambition of king Frederick William IV. of Prussia was to establish a Protestant bishopric in the holy city: and when, at the ratification (July 15, 1840) of the treaty between the Christian and Musulman Powers, he failed to obtain the desired support for the mission, he sent a special embassy to the queen of England, the archbishop of Canterbury, and the bishop of London (recognising in them the spiritual heads of the English Church, and proposed a plan for the two great Protestant nations of Prussia and England—to establish and support in common a Protestant bishopric in Jerusalem, which should be equally shared in (i.e. alternately) by both the German Evangelical and the Anglican churches. "It was anticipated," says Dr. Hagenbach (Church Hist, 18th and 19th cent.), "that by this the Protestantism would be more firmly established, and an important centre formed for missionary labors. While Prussia had formed itself with England in the attainment of great ecclesiastical ends, it now seemed that England, by the position which Providence had given her, was adaptation of this plan; and the influence which she had gained as a European Power in the East and in Jerusalem, encouraged the hope without, while it was inwardly strengthened by the fixed forms of her ecclesiastical character, and by the halo of her episcopal dignity." Of course, people differed in their opinion concerning the proposal. There were many eminent German theologians who deprecated the wisdom of affiliating to the Established Church, which was described as one of exterior formalism, etc.; while, amongst the English, many hesitated to cast in their lot with German rationalistic divines. But the plan was, after all, adopted by the higher clergy of England, as well as by the German bishops on the Established Church. But, Prussia also stipulated that the bishopric should be formed at the Church of St. James, in Jerusalem, and must be occupied by a German, should receive his appropriate consecration at the hands of the Primate of the Anglican Church in London, and subscribe to the 39 articles of the establishment. The plea which the English clergy made on its adoption was that it gave rise to the hope of bringing about by this means a reconciliation between the two denominations: the archbishop even expressed himself that this union would contribute to "a unity of discipline as well as of doctrine between our own Church and the less perfectly constituted of the Protestant churches of Europe." But the establishment of the bishopric was fixed at £30,000 sterling, to insure the bishop a yearly income of £1200. The bishop was to be appointed by the Queen in Council, subject to the King, the Senate of the empire, and the Primate of England, however, having the right to vote in the nomination of the latter. The protection to be afforded to the German Evangelists is provided for by the ordinances of 1814-2, containing the following specifications: 1st. The bishop will take the German congregation under his protection, and afford them all the protection in his power. 2d. He will be assisted by competent German ministers, ordained according to the ritual of the Church of England, and required to yield him obedience. 3d. The liturgy is to be taken from the received Rituals of the Western Church, carefully revised by the primate. 4th. The rite of confirmation is to be administered according to the form of the English Church. In the mean while, an act of Parliament, under date Oct 5, 1841, decided that persons could be consecrated bishops of the Church of England in foreign countries without, on the occasion of the sacrament, to be present; it was also provided that such would also take the oath of allegiance to the archbishop, in order that they, and such deacons and ministers as they might ordain, may have the right to fulfil the same functions in England and Ireland. In consequence, Dr. Macaulay of Ireland, having declined the episcopal consecration to him, has been appointed missionary bishop of Hebrew and Rabbinical literature at Christ's College, London, a converted Jew, and formerly a Prussian subject (having been born in Polish Prussia in 1799), was made first incumbent of the new bishopric. He died Nov. 23, 1845, near Cairo. His successor was Samuel Gobat of Cremona, canon of Bern, a student of the Basel Mission House, nominated by Prussia, and experienced for missionary labors by his residence in Abyssinia. Since then, the news from Jerusalem has been gradually behind. Jan. 21, 1849, a newly-created Evangelical church called Christ Church, situated on Mount Zion, was consecrated. The Gospel is preached there in Hebrew, English, German, French, Spanish, and Arabic. Belonging to it are a burial-ground; a school attended by the children of Jews, Mohammedans, and different Christian denominations; a hospital for the Jews, in which they are treated gratuitously; and a Sunday School, and aospital for proserlyes, etc., which is attended by the poor; a house of industry for prosterlyes, and an industrial school for Jewish females. The number of Jewish converts averages from seven to nine annually. In consequence of the firm granting to Prussian the right, these are possessed by other churches, they have established small schools in Bethel, Jaffa, Nablus, and Nazareth.
JERUSALEM

For accurate accounts, see Herzog, Real-Encyklop., vi, 505 sq.; Alisek, Dua evengliche Bischoff in Jerusalem (Berlin, 1842). (J. H. W.)

Jerusalem, Johann Friedrich Wilhelm, a German theologian—one of the best apologistic and practical theologians of the last century, was born at Osnabrück Nov. 22, 1709, and was educated at the Universities of Leipzig and Wittenberg; at the latter he took his master's degree. Declining to enter the ministry, for which he had prepared himself, and too young to enter the ranks of academical instructors, he went to the Low Countries, and studied at Leyden, where he enjoyed the counsels of such men as Albert Schultens, Peter Burman, etc. For he sought and secured the leading minds of the different Christian denominations of Holland, and learned to appreciate men out of the pale of his own band. After his return to his native place, still only twenty-four years old, he received the most flattering offers, one of which was a position at the newly-created University of Göttingen, which he declined to accept. Fearing that he might not be thoroughly prepared, he again set out on a journey, this time to spend a year of further preparatory study in England, more especially at London. He there became acquainted with the master theologians of that age and country. Thomas Sherlock, Daniel Waterland, Samuel Clarke freely admitted the young scholar to their studies, and so interested became he in English theology that he remained there three years and declined to go to Göttingen. In 1740 he returned to Germany, and was appointed tutor and preacher of Prince Charles William Ferdinand of Brunswic. In 1743 he was appointed professor of the monasteries of St. Crucis and St. Egidi; in 1749 he was made abbot of Marienthall, and in 1752 abbot of the convent of Riddagshausen, a theological training-school of the Brunswick ministry, with which he remained associated for six scores of years, and in which he laboriously earned to promote especially the religious spirit of the young preachers. Indeed, so well were his labors performed, that a late biographer of Jerusalem is found to say that in no small measure the religious spirit of Brunswick of our day is due to the work which he performed at this University. In 1771 he became vice-president of the consistory of Wolfenbüttel. In the latter part of his life he was severely afflicted by the suicide of his son (1775), who had gone to Wetzlar to practice law. Jerusalem died Sept. 2, 1789. His most important work, Betrachtungen, u. d. verkehrten Wahrheiten der Religion, written for the instruction of the hereditary prince of Brunswick (Brunsw. 1768–79, 1785, 1790, 2 vols.), has been translated into most European languages. Of his other works, we notice two collections of sermons (Brunsw. 1745–53, 1788–69); for a full list, see Doring's D. deutschen Kunsstlerdn d. 19 u. 19 Jahrhunderts; Jerusalem, Denkbiographie (Braun. 1781),—Hertzog, Real-Encyklop., s. v.; Görlich, Geschichte des Theol. (Adelung's Aulenda, s. v.); Dornerr, Geschichte der Protest. Theol. bk. ii, div. iii, § 1; Tholuck, Gesch. des Ratomismus, pt. 1; Hurst's Hagenbach, Ch. Hist. 18th and 19th Cent. (see Index); Zeitschr. f. d. Theol. 1865, p. 530 sqq. (J. H. W.).

Jeshur'nah (many Jeshurun) (a, Neh. xi, 7, b, Chron. iii, 21). See JESHURUN.

Jeshurun (many Jeshurun) (Hebrew Yeshurun), יְשׁוּרֻן, deliverance of Jehovah; 1 Chron. iii, 21; Ezra viii, 7, 19; Neh. xi, 7; else in the paraphrase form יְשָׁרִי (Yeshari), יְשָׁרִי, the name of several men.


Jeshua (Sept. 'Issur v. r. 'Issur; Vulg. Isiur, Author. Vers. "Jesiah.") One of the sons of Jeduthun, appointed under him among the sacred harpers (1 Chron. xxv, 3), at the head of the eighth division of Levitical musicians (vers. 15). B.C. 1014.


Jeshua (Sept. 'Issur v. r. 'Issur, Vulg. Isiur, Author. Vers. "Jesiah.") A Levite of the family of Merari, who accompanied Hashabiah to the river Ahava, on the way from Babylon to Ecbatana (Ezra vii, 19).

Jeshua'nah (many Jeshua'nah) (Heb. Yehezakhan, יְהֶזְקָן, old q. d. פְּלַעַוְלַשׁ; Sept. Isauron v. r. 'Aron), a city of the kingdom of Israel, taken with its suburb from Jeroboam by Abijah, and mentioned as situated near Bethel and Ephraim (2 Chron. xii, 19). It appears to be the "village Iseras" (Iseroa), mentioned by Josephus as the scene of Herod's encounter with Pampus, the general of Antigonus (in Samaria, Ant. xiv, 15, 12, compare 'Issura, Ant. xvi, 11, 3). It is not mentioned by Jerome in the Onomasticon, unless we accept the conjecture of Reland (Pol. rest. p. 861), that "Jethubah, urbis antiqua Judææ" is at once a corruption and a translation of the name Jeshana. According to Schwarz (Polemest. p. 160), it is the modern village el-Sa-mom, two miles west of Bethel; but no such name appears on Zimmermann's map, unless it be Ain Sinua, a village surrounded by vineyards and fruit-trees, with vegetable gardens watered from a well, situated at a fork of the valley about a mile N.E. of Jafna (Robinson's Researches, ii, 86).

Jeshur'e'ah (some Jeshure'ah) (Heb. Yehezak'ah, יְהֶזְקָא, upright towards God; some copies read יְשָׁרִי, Yeure'ah; Septuag. 'Ispadai v. r. 'Isopai, Vulg. Isurela), the head of the seventh division of Levitical musicians (1 Chron. xxvi, 14); elsewhere called by the equivalent name Asarelah (ver. 2). B.C. 1014.

Jeshub'e'ab (Heb. Yehezk'ab, יְהֶזְקָב, seat of his father; Sept. 'Ispadai v. r. 'Isopai, Vulg. Ishbubah), the head of the fourteenth division of priests as arranged by David (1 Chron. xxvii, 13). B.C. 1014.

Jeshur'ah (Heb. Yehez'ah, יְהֶזְזַע, upright) (Sept. 'Ispadai v. r. 'Isopai), the first named of the three sons of Caleb (son of Hezron) by his first wife Azubah (1 Chron. ii, 21).

Jeshur'ah (Bah. Yehez'ah, יְהֶזְזַע, upright) (Sept. 'Ispadai v. r. 'Isopai), the first named of the three sons of Caleb (son of Hezron) by his first wife Azubah (1 Chron. ii, 21).

Jeshua (Heb. Yehez'ah, יְהֶזְזַע, jakoh a ..... Jeshua (Heb. Yehez'ah, יְהֶזְזַע, jakoh a .......
JESUS

Jeshua (1 Chron. xxiv, 11). See JESUS.

Jeshurun (Heb. Jeshuru'nu, יְשָׁוְרֻן), a poetical appellation of the people of Israel, used in the precepts and promises, occurring four times (Deut. xxxii, 15, Sept. 'Iseod, Vulg. dictetus; Deut. xxxix, 5, 26, and Isa. xxiv, 2 [A. Vers. in this latter passage "Jesurun"]; Sept. Ἰσσαρύμνος, Vulg. rectiusam). The term is according to Mercier in Pagnin, Thes. i. p. 1165; Mich. in Ecclus. 32, 15, and others a diminutive (after the name of Zebedee, Zebedus, Zebeduthus, etc.) from יהושע, i. e. (compare יִשְׂרֵאלִי and ḫḇ, q. d. rectus, a "rightful", i.e. the dear upright people). Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion have in Isaiah ἴσως, elsewhere ἱσιών. Kimchi says, "Israel is so called as being just among the nations"; so also Aben-Ezra and Saadia (in the Pesh.) interpret. Others, as Grotius, understand the word as a diminutive from "Israel" itself, and so apparently the Chalde, Syriac, and Saadia (in Isaiah), but against the analogy of derivation. Igen (De indre Israël, p. 25, and in Paulus, Memorabil. vi, p. 157) gives a far-fetched derivation from the Arabic, and other fanciful explanations may be seen in Jo. Oliupis's Dias, de 1793 (presumably Theod. Haseo, Bremere, 1780). The passages where it is employed seem to express the idea that in the character of the people, in comparison with the rest of the nations, they were just and upright. Thus, in the year 879, the prophet Haggai's utterances are addressed to Jeshua (Hagg. i, 1; ii, 2), and his name occurs in two of the symbolic prophecies of Zechariah (i, 10; vi, 11-15). In the first of these passages, Jeshua, as pontiff, represents the Jewish people covered at first with the garb of slaves, and afterwards with the new and glorious vestures of deliverance. In the second he wears for a moment the crown of silver and gold, as symbols of the sacerdotal and regal crowns of Israel, which were to be united on the head of the Messiah.—Kitto. See Hagg. Haggai. He is probably the person whom Josephus (Ant. vi, 11) has alluded to in Ezra ii, 36; Neh. vii, 39. See JERUSALEM.

Jeshua (Josh. i, 12), the name of one of the Levites appointed by Ezra to take charge of the offerings for the sacred services (Ezra viii, 38). B.C. ante 450.

Jeshua (Heb. 'Isa'yu, יִשְׁעַי), perhaps first, otherwise living: once 'Isa'yu, either by prothesis, or wordy, 1 Chron. ii, 13; Sept. and N. T. (Isaiah; Josephus 'Isaiou, Anti. vi, 1), a son (or descendant) of Obed, the son of Boaz and Ruth (Ruth iv, 17, 22; Matt. i. 5; Luke iii, 32; 1 Chron. ii, 12). He was the father of eight sons (1 Chron. vii, 12), the youngest of whom, David, is reflected all the distinction which belongs to the name, although the latter, as being of humble birth, was often reproached by his enemies with his youthfulness (1 Sam. xx, 27, 30, 31; xxii, 7, 8, xv. 10; 2 Sam. xx, 1, 11; 1 Kings ii, 16; 2 Chron. xx. 1). See JESUS (1 Chron. xxi, 1-9). Jeshua (Ishua, Jeshua), a city of Judah inhabited after the captivity, mentioned in connection with Jehovah, Moladah, and other towns in the lowlands of Judah (Neh. xi, 29). According to Schwarz (Paulist, p. 116), it is the village Yeshua near Khulda, five English miles east of Ekron; doubtless the village Yeshua [locally pronounced Esh-va] seen by Dr. Robinson (new edit. of Researches, iii, 135). A similar town is on Van de Velde's Map on wady Thurb, between Zorah and Chesalon.
that he must have been aware of the high destinies which awaited his son, but it is doubtful if he ever lived to see them realized (see 1 Sam. xvii, 12). The last historical mention of Jesse is in relation to the asylum which David procured for him with the king of Moab (1 Sam. xxiii, 3). B.C. cir. 1068–1061. See David.

According to an ancient Jewish tradition, recorded in the Talmud, the Messianic expecation was to be found among the sons or descendants of the vassals of the sanctuary; but as there is no contradiction, so there is no corroboration of this in the Bible, and it is possible that it was suggested by the occurrence of the word orégin, 'weavers', in connection with a member of his family. See JÁAHE-ORÉGIN. Who were the Jesseans we are not told. The family contained, in addition to the sons, two female members—Zeruiah and Abigail; but it is uncertain whether these were Jesse's daughters, for, though they are called the sisters of his sons (1 Chron. ii, 18), yet Abigail is said to have been the daughter of Nahash (2 Sam. xxi, 18). Of this, two explanations have been proposed. (1) The Jewish: that Nahash was another name for Jesse (Jerome, Quast. Hebr. on 2 Sam. xvii, 25, and the Targum on Ruth iv, 22). (2) Prof. Stanley's: that Jesse's wife had formerly been wife or concubine to Nahash, possibly the king of the Ammonites (Jewish Church, ii, 39, 51). See NAHAŞ.

Jesse, TREE OF, in ecclesiastical architecture, is a representation of the genealogy of Christ on scrolls of foliage so arranged as to represent a tree, and was quite a common subject for sculpture, painting, and embroidery. In ancient churches, the candlesticks often took this form, and was therefore called a Jesse. See Parker, Gloss. Archit. s. v.; Walcott, Sacred Archaeology, p. 338.

Jesu'zù (Ierosoví v. Tépoví and Tri'poví, 1 Esdr. y 26, or Iesu'zù (Iepoví, 1 Esdr. viii, 63), corrupt forms (see Ezra ii, 40; viii, 33) of the name of JESÚA (q. v.). JESÚS is likewise used in modern poetry for the name of Jesus, our Saviour, especially as a vocative or genitive.

Jesusites, a monastic order, so called because its members frequently pronounced the name of Jesus. The founders were John of Colombi, gondaloniere, and Francis Mino Vincentini of Sienna. This institution was confirmed by Urban V in the year 1368, and continued till the seventeenth century, when it was suppressed by Clement IX. The persons belonging to it professed poverty, and adhered to the institute of Augustine. They were not, however, admitted to holy orders, but professed to assist the poor with their prayers and other offices, and prepared medicines for them, which they distributed freely; we find them castrated, and sometimes called Apostolic Clerks. They were also known as the Congregation of Saint Hieronymus, their patron. Having become largely interested in the distillery of brandies, etc., they were by the people called Padri dell' acqua vitae. A female order of the same name, and a branch of the male order, was founded by Catharina Colombina. They still continue to exist in Italy as a branch organization of the Augustinian order. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. s. v.; Farrar, Ecclesiast. Dict., p. 340; Helvétius, Geschichte d. Kluster und Bistümerordien, iii, 484 sq.

Jesú; Jesü'le (Numb. xxvi, 44). See ISHUI, i.

Jesuits, or the Society of Jesus (Societas Jesu), the most celebrated among the monastic institutions of the Roman Catholic Church.

I. Foundation of the Order.—It was founded by the Spanish nobleman Don Ignacio (Ignatius) of Loyola (q. v.). Thrift for glory caused him at an early age to enter the army. Having been wounded, May 20, 1521, during the siege of Pamplona by the French, he turned to the spiritual life during the slow progress of his recovery from his former favorite reading of knight's novels to the study of the life of Jesus and the saints. His heated imagination suggested to him an arena in which even greater distinction could be won than in a military life, and he resolved henceforth to devote his life to the service of God and of the Church. Having recovered, he first went to the Benedictine abbey of Montserrat, where, after a general confession, he took the vow of chastity, hung up his sword and dagger on the altar, and then proceeded to Manresa, where, after a short stay in the hospital, he hid himself in a rocky cavern near the town, in order to devote himself wholly to prayer and meditation. He has left to posterity a description of his first draft of the "Spiritual Exercises" (Exercitii Spiritualitatis), a work in which 1548 a brief of pope Paul III warmly commended to all the faithful, and to which the thorough warrior-like discipline that characterizes the order of the Jesuits, and the ultra papal system of which they have been the pioneers, is largely due. As Ignatius himself subsequently states, the idea of a new religious order which was to take a front rank under the banner of Christ in the combat against the prince of darkness likewise originated with him at this time. During a brief pilgrimage which Ignatius made in 1528 to Palestine, he became aware that he utterly lacked the necessary literary qualification for carrying out the plans which he had conceived. Accordingly, when he had returned to Spain, he entered a grammar-school at Barcelona, and subsequently visited the universities of Alcalá and Salamanca, and lastly studied at Valencia. In 1538 he acquired the title of doctor of philosophy. In Paris Ignatius gradually gathered around himself the first members of the order he intended to found. His first associates were Lefévre (Petrus Faber), from Savoy, Francis of Xavier, from Navarre, and, from the Spanish Dominicans, Salmeron, Nicolaus Bobacilla, and Simon Rodriguez. They were for the first time called together by Ignatius in July, 1538, and soon after, on August 15, the festival of the Assumption of Mary, they took the vows of poverty, chastity, and of making a pilgrimage to Jerusalem, in order to lay the foundations for the later colonization of the intifide. In case they should be unable to carry out this project within one year after their arrival in Venice, they would go to Rome and place themselves at the disposal of the pope. On Jan. 6, 1537, Ignatius was joined in Venice by all of his disciples and some more Frenchmen—Le Jay, Codure, and Brouet. All took, two months later, holy orders, but their plan to go to Jerusalem they could not execute, as the republic of Venice was at war with sultan Soliman II. They consequently went to Rome to await the orders of the pope. Paul III received them kindly, gave them the necessary letters, and for the next two years Ignatius presided over the general chapter in Rome, and prepared the constitutions and for the pontifical intifide. In March, 1538, the other associates also arrived in Rome, and it was now formally resolved to establish a new religious order. Ignatius was elected to submit their plan to the pope, and to obtain his sanction. This was given on Sept. 27, 1540, in the bull Regimini Militantis ecclesie, which, however, restricted the number of profesi to forty. Three years later (March 14, 1548), another bull, Injunctum Nobis, removed this restriction. Sceptantically Ignatius accepted the dignity of the first general of the order, to which he had been unanimously elected. He entered upon his office on April 17, 1541; and soon after, in accordance with the request of Paul III, the draft of the constitution of the new order was made by him (not, as is often maintained, by Lainez; see Jerome, Constit. p. 191). Being before finally sanctioned, the constitution was to undergo several revisions; but before these were made, Ignatius died, July 31, 1556.

II. Constitution and Form of Government.—The laws regulating the order are contained in the so-called insitutum (official edition, Prague, 1575, 2 vols.; new edit. Avignon, 1827–38). The work opens with a collection of all the bulls and decrees of the apostolic see concerning the new society. This is followed by a list of the privileges which have been granted to the order, and by the General Examination, which serves as an introduction to the constitutions, and is laid before every ap-
JESUITS

866

JESUITS

plicant for admission. The most important portion of the code, the constitutions, consists of ten chapters, to each of which are added explanations (Declarations), which, according to the intentions of the founder, are to be equally valid as the constitutions. Next follow the decrees and canons of the general congregations; the provincial constitutions (Rationum Studiorum) of 1615, however, in 1832 were considerably changed by the general Joseph Rootham, the decrees of the generals (Ordinationes Generalium), as they were revised by the eighth General Congregation in 1615; and, in conclusion, by three sacret writings—the Industria ad curandum anima minorum collegiis et societati Aquaviva, a spiritual Rule of Exercices of Ignatius, and the Directorium, an official instruction for the right use of these exercises. At the head of the order is a general (Præpositus Generalis), who is elected for life, must reside at Rome, and is only subject to the pope. His power is unlimited, as the Council of Assistants has only a deliberative vote. He is, however, bound to the constitutions, which he can neither change nor set aside. The constitution provides for the deposition of a general in particular cases by the General Congregation, but the case has not yet occurred. For the administration of the provinces into which the order has been divided the generals appoint the provincials for the term of three years. Several provinces are united into an assistentium, which is represented in the council of the general by an assistant. There were in 1871 five assistants for Italy, France, Spain, England, and Germany. The assistants are appointed by the General Congregation, but in case of the death of an assistant the general can substitute another, with the consent of the majority of the provincials. Subordinate to the prelats are the prepositi, who govern the houses of the professed, and the rector, who governs the collegium and the novices. They are likewise assisted by assistants appointed by the general. At the head of the minor establishments (residuium) are "superiors." Each of these officers has by his side a consultor to advise, and a monitor to watch and admonish. As in every religious order, the members are divided into priests and lay brothers (Coadjutores temporales). The latter take the simple vows after a two-years' novitiate, and the solemn vows after having been in the order for at least ten years. Those candidates who, on entering the order, leave their future employment entirely to the disposition of their superiors, are called Indiciertres; but, according to the decrees of the General Congregation, their final destination must be assigned to them at least within two years. The candidates for the priesthood are, during the first two years, Novitii scholastici; then, after binding themselves to the order by taking simple vows, they become Scholastici approachi, devote themselves for several years to classical and philosophical studies, and are for some time employed as teachers or educators in the colleges, before they begin the study of theology, which lasts for four years. After the completion of the theological course they are ordained priests, and now enter into a third novitiate, the sole object of which is to increase their zeal. At the end of this novitiate the candidate is admitted to the solemn profession of the vows, and enrolled either in the class of the professed or that of the spiritual concluders. Only the former class, the professed, who take the fourth vow of perfect observance, the novitiate, and the full rights of members of the society. The professed of a province every third year meet in a provincial congregation, and out of their midst choose a procurator, who has to make a report on the affairs and condition of the province to the general. On the death of a general the Provincial Congregation elects two disputers, who, together with the provincials, constitute the General Congregation, which elects the new general. In this General Congregation the supreme legislative power is vested; it can be called together on extraordinary occasions by the general, and, in case the latter neglects his duty, by the assistants. Thus the order bears the aspect of military aristocracy, and never, during the whole history of the Church of Rome, have the popes had in their service a body of men so thoroughly disciplined. "Before any one could become a member, he was severely and appropriately tested in the novitiate. Of the actual members, only a few choice spirits reached the perfect dignity of the professed, from whom alone were called to fill the superior offices in the provincials, constituting a well-organized train of authorities up to the general. Every individual was powerful in his appropriate sphere, but in every act he was closely watched and guarded lest he should transgress the rules. He was given an essential part in his perfect nature. To submit in the latter part of his novitiate, and strengthened by every spiritual means, that a single arbitrary but inflexible will controlled every movement of the order in all parts of the world. Although every individual possessed no more will of his own than the particular members of the human body, he expected to be placed in precisely that position in which his talents would be best developed for the common benefit; in exercises of monastic devotion, in literary and scientific pursuits, in the secular life of courts, or in strange adventures and eminent offices among savage nations." (Haen, Chrest. Hist., v. 3, p. 63.)

III. History from 1540 to 1750.—On the death of Ignatius the General Congregation could not meet immediately, as the Spaniards, who were at war with the pope, blocked up the roads to Rome. On June 19, 1557, Jacob Lainez, the most gifted member of the order, was elected; the second general of the society. But the constitutions were once more revised, and unanimously adopted; but the pope (Paul IV.) disliked several of its provisions, and in particular wished to have the general elected for a term of only three years, and an observance of the canonical hours. So he submitted in the latter points, but when the aged pope soon after died they returned to their original practice. The society spread rapidly, and numbered at the death of Lainez (Jan. 19, 1565) eighteen provinces and 130 houses. During the administration of the two following generals, the Spanish Francis Borga (1565–72) and the Belgian Merian (1572–80), the order was greatly favored by the popes, and new provinces were organized in Peru, Mexico, and Poland. The fourth General Congregation, on Feb. 19, 1581, elected, as general the Neapolitan Claudio Aquaviva (1581–1610), a man of rare administrative genius, who succeeded in maintaining the unity and the only internal commutation of importance through which it has passed, and who, next to its founder, has done more than any other general in moulding its character. The leading Spanish Jesuits, mortified at seeing the general who had been their idol begin to regard as a domain of their nationality, pass into the hands of Italian, meditated an entire decentralization of the order and the hegemony of the Spaniards at the expense of the unity and the monarchical principle. The plan met with the approval of Philip II; but the energy of the pope Sixtus V., who took sides with Aquaviva, foiled it. Under Clement VIII the Spaniards renewed their scheme, and the commotion produced by them became so great that in 1578 the fifth General Congregation (the first extraordinary one) was convoked. The Spaniards hoped that Aquaviva would be removed, but again their designs were defeated by the administration of the general sustained. The administrative crisis was followed by violent doctrinal controversies. The book of the Portuguese Jesuit Molina involved the order in a quarrel with the Dominican, and a work (published in 1599) in which the Spanish Jesuit Martin juridic question was raised a second of indemnities against the society throughout Europe, although Aquaviva, in 1614, strictly forbade all members of the order to advance this doctrine. During the administration of Aquaviva (about 1660) the order numbered 27 provinces, 21 houses of professed, 267 colleges, 38 novitiates, 90 residences, and 10,581 members. During the admin-
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ization of the Roman Mutius Vitelleschi (1615–45) the order celebrated its first centenary (1640). The eighth General Congregation, on Jan. 7, 1645, elected as general the Neapolitan Vincenzo Caraffa. On January 1 of this year pope Innocent X issued a brief, according to which a General Congregation was to be held every ninth year, and the administration of the superiors was left to the Jesuits. The large measure was repealed by Alexander VII (Jan, 1, 1668); the former did not take effect until 1661, as the short administration of the generals Vincenzo Caraffa († June 8, 1649), Francis Piccolomini († June 17, 1651), and Alois Gottfried had practically sufficed. At the first session of the General Congregation for the first time elected as a general a German, Guiswin Nickel, of Julich, to whom, on account of his retired age, the eleventh Congregation, on June 7, 1661, gave Paul Ottilas as coadjutor, with the right of succession. Oliva was general for more than seventeen years, and was succeeded by the Belgian Noyelle (1682–86) and the Spaniard Thyrus Gonzalez (1687–1705). Pope Innocent XI was unfavorable to the order, and in 1684 the Congregation of the Propaganda forbade it to receive any more novices; but in 1686 this decree was cancelled by Innocent himself. Gonzalez caused considerable trouble by advocating a rigid doctrine of Probabilism, which had been generally taught by the theologians of the society. He was succeeded by the generals Tamburini (1706–30), Retz (1730–50), Visconti (1751–55), Centurione (1755–57), Ricci (1758– 79); under the latter the order was suppressed (1773). The Jesuits had really to fight against the growing strength of Pettrich, rapidly increased in strength. It numbered in 1720 5 assistants, 37 provinces, 24 houses of professed, 612 colleges, 59 novitiates, 340 residences, 175 seminaries, 200 missions, and 19,998 members, among whom were 9957 priests. In 1762 the order had increased to 138 provinces, 629 college, 61 novitiates, 178 seminaries, 336 residences, 223 missions, and 22,787 members, among whom were 11,010 priests.

Soon after the establishment of the order, the pope, the bishops, and those monarchs who were opposed to the Reformation recognized the Jesuits as the most efficient organization for saving the old Church. Thus the spread of the order was rapid. At the Council of Trent the Spanish ambassadors declared that their king, Philip II, knew only two ways to stay the advance of the Reformation, the education of good preachers, and the Jesuits. Cells were consequently founded in various countries for members of the order, but, as they not only opposed Protestantism, but defended the most exclusive claims of the popes with regard to secular governments, they soon encountered a violent resistance on the part of those governments which refused a submission to the dictates of the papacy. In many cases the bishops sided against them, as the Jesuits were found to be always ready to extend the papal at the cost of the episcopal authority. This was especially the case in the republic of Venice, where the patriarch Trevisani showed himself their decided opponent. Subsequently, when they defended the interest which Paul V had pronounced against Venice, they were expelled (1606), and not until 1656 did pope Alexander VII succeed in obtaining from the republic a reluctant consent to their return. At the beginning of the 18th century the Piedmontese viceroy in Sicily, Maffei, expelled them from that island, because they were again the most eager among the clergy to enforce a papal interdict, nowhere did the order render to the Church of Rome so great services as in Germany and the northern countries of Europe, where Protestantism had become predominant. While taking part in all the efforts against the spread of Protestantism, the Jesuits undertook a particular zeal for the establishment of educational institutions, and for gaining the confidence of the princes. In both respects they met with considerable success. Their colleges at Ingolstadt, Munich, Vienna, Prague, Cologne, Trevies, Mentz, Augsburg, Ellwangen, and other places became highly prosperous, and attracted a large number of pupils, especially from the aristocratic families, most of whom remained throughout life warm supporters of all the schemes of the order. Under emperor Rudolph II the Jesuits established themselves in all parts of Germany. At most of the courts Jesuits were confessors of the reigning princes, and invariably used their influence to press for the latest measures against Protestantism. At the instigation of the Jesuits a counter-reformation was forcibly carried through in a number of provinces in which Protestantism, before their arrival, appeared to be sure of success. Thus, in particular, Austria, Bavaria, and Poland were either gained back by them or preserved for the Church of Rome, and from 1648 to 1748 they are said to have persuaded no less than forty-five princes of the empire to join the Roman Catholic Church. As advisors of the princes, they became to so high a degree involved in political affairs that frequently even the generals of the order and the pope deemed it necessary to recommend to them a greater caution. They were called into Hungary by the archbishop of Gran as early as 1561, but there, as well as in Transylvania, the vicissitudes of the religious wars for a long time prevented them from gaining a firm footing. When, however, the policy of the Austrian government finally succeeded in breaking the strength of the Protestant party, the Jesuits became all-powerful. In 1767 they had in these two countries 18 colleges, 20 residences, 11 missionary stations, and 560 members. In Poland, Petrus Canisius appeared in 1556, and in 1727 the Jesuits were granted the right of establishing colleges. Six years later the favor of king Stephen Bathori empowered the Jesuits to found a number of colleges, and to secure the education of the nearly whole aristocracy. John Casimir, the brother of Vladislaw IV, even entered the order on Sept. 25, 1645, and, although never ordained priest, was made cardinal in 1647; yet, after the death of his brother, he became king of Poland (1648–68). The Jesuit Posevins was in 1681 sent as ambassador of Gregory XIII to Ivan IV of Russia, and subsequently the Jesuit Vota made a fruitless attempt to unite the Greek with the Roman Catholic Church. Peter the Great, in 1714, expelled the few Jesuits who at that time were laboring in his dominions. In Sweden, in 1578, the Jesuits induced the king, John III, to make a cecret a profession of the Roman Catholic faith; and queen Christina, the daughter of Gustavus Adolphus, was likewise prevailed on in 1650 by the Jesuits, Cavedo and Cassati, to join the Church of Rome; but, with regard to the people at large, the efforts of the Jesuits were entirely fruitless. To England, Salmeron and Brouet were sent by Ignatius. They were unable to prevent the separation of the English Church from Rome, but they confirmed James V of Scotland in the Roman Catholic faith, encouraged the people of Ireland in their opposition to the English king and the Anglican reformation, and, having returned to the Continent, established several colleges for the education of Roman Catholic priests for England. Elizabeth expelled all the Jesuits from her dominions. In 1660, the Jesuit Cavedo was permitted to return to England, and brought about a reconciliation against Charles II and the state, in consequence of which six members of the order were put to death. The first Jesuits who were brought to the Netherlands were some Spanish members of the order, who, during the war between France and Charles V, were ordered to leave France, but were given a better welcome in the Netherlands than in the other countries, and the magistrates in the cities, on whose consent the authorization to establish colleges was made contingent, generally opposed them; but they overcame the opposition, and in the southern provinces (Belgium) soon became more
numerous and influential than in most of the other European countries. They attracted great attention by their attacks upon Bajus and the Jansenists, both of whom were condemned at Rome at their instigation. In the northern provinces (Holland) stringent laws were repeatedly passed against them, and they were charged with being moral philosophers. The bishop of William of Orange, as well as with the attempt against the life of Maurice of Nassau, but both charges were indignantly denied by the order.

In France, where the Jesuits established a novitiate at Paris as early as 1540, they encountered from the beginning the most determined opposition of the University and the French bishops. But it was only in 1550 that the cardinal of Lorraine obtained for them a favorable patent from Henry II, but the Parliament refused to record it. In 1561 Lainez received from the Synod of Poissy the concession that the Jesuits should be permitted to establish themselves at Paris under the name of "Fathers of the College of Clermont." This college, which was sanctioned by Charles IX in 1565, and by Henry III in 1580, attained a high degree of prosperity, and in the middle of the 17th century numbered upwards of 2000 pupils. In the last part of the 17th century, the Jesuits gained a greater influence than in the north, and were generally regarded as the leaders in the violent struggle of the Catholic party for the arrest and suppression of Calvinism. They were closely allied with the Ligue, but general Aquaviva disapproved the openness of this alliance, and reconciled father Sommieri, who was instrumental in bringing about the alliance, to Italy and Belgium. The Jesuit Toletus brought about the reconciliation between the Ligue and Henry IV, who remained a warm protector of the order. Nevertheless, the Jesuits were charged with the attempts made upon the life of Henry II by Chatel (1548) and by the Jesuits who had before been charged with complicity in the plot of Clement (1589) against Henry III. The Parliament of Paris instituted, accordingly, proceedings against the Jesuit Guignard, who had been the instructor of Chatel, sentenced him to death, deprived the Jesuits of their goods, and expelled them from France. Henry IV was, however, prevailed upon to recall them, continued to be their protector, and again chose a Jesuit as his confessor. The same office was filled by members of the order during nearly the whole reign of Louis XIII, Louis XIV, and Louis XV, and through the royal council and the parlements, and before did not exercise a very conspicuous influence upon the policy of the kings both at home and abroad. The connivance of these confessors with the scandalous lives of the kings did more than anything else to undermine the respect for the Roman Catholic Church, and for religion in general, among the educated classes. To Rome, however, they rendered invaluable services by heading the opposition against Louis XIV and the bishops when the latter jointly tried to enforce throughout the Catholic Church of France submission to the four Gallican articles, and after effecting a full reconciliation between Rome and Louis, by securing the aid of the secular arm for arresting the progress and averting a victory of Jansenism, which had obtained full control of the best intellects in the Church of France. In Spain, which had been the cradle of the order, its success was remarkably rapid. As early as 1556 the provinces of Aragon and Andalusia had been organized. They were, however, opposed by the learned Melchor Camus; in Saragossa they were expelled by the archbishop, and the Inquisition repeatedly drove them before their tribunal as suspected of heresy. But the royal favor of the Duke of Alba, Philip II, III, and IV kept their influence unimpaired. In Portugal, Francis Xavier and Simon Rodriguez visited Lisbon on their way to India. They were well received by the king, and Rodriguez was induced to remain, and became the founder of a province, which soon belonged to the most prosperous of the order.

IV. Suppression of the Order (1750-78).—In the middle of the 18th century the order was at the zenith of its power. As confessors of most of the reigning princes and a large number of the first aristocratic families, and as the instructors and educators of the children, they wielded a controlling influence on the destinies of most of the Catholic countries of Europe. As such, they amassed great wealth, which they tried to increase by bold commercial speculations. Both influence and wealth they used with untiring energy, and with a consistency of which the history of the world hardly knows a parallel, for the development of their ultra papal system. In protest against it they were expelled from all their countries and every form of belief opposed to the Church of Rome, and within the Church blind and immediate submission to the doctrinal decision of the infallible pope; in point of ecclesiastical polity, the weakening of the episcopal benefit of the papal authority, the defence of the most exorbitant claims of the pope with regard to secular government, and a controlling influence upon the popes by the order—these were the prominent features of the Jesuit system. As the Jesuits were anxious to crush out everything opposed to the Roman Catholic Church, they undertook a struggle in which these elements should, in self-defence, combine for planning the destruction of so formidable an antagonist. As the Jesuits had attained their influential position chiefly through the favor of the princes, the same method was adopted for crushing them. The first great victory was won by the king of Portugal. The Jesuits therein Calvhalo, better known under the title (which he received in 1770) of marquis of Pombal, probably the greatest statesman which Portugal has ever had, was fully convinced that commerce and industry, and all the material interests of the country, could be successfully developed only when the Jesuits were withdrawn from the depressing connection with the hierarchy and the nobility, and that the first step towards effecting such a revolution was the removal of the Jesuits. Opportunities for disposing the king against the order soon offered. In Paraguay, a portion of which had in 1768 been ceded by Spain to Portugal, an insurrection of the natives broke out against the new rule. The Jesuits, according to their own accounts, had established in Paraguay a theocratic form of government, which gave them the most absolute power over the minds of the natives. They were therefore opposed to the ecclesiastics of a portion of this territory to Portugal, and spared no efforts to prevent them. When, therefore, the natives rose generally in insurrection, it was the general opinion that an insurrection in a country like Paraguay was impossible without at least the connivance of the Jesuits. They were therefore dismissed from the country, and the Jesuits were withdrawn from them all priestly functions. An attempt to assassinate the king (Sept. 3, 1768) supplied an occasion for impeaching them of high treason, as the slate from Portugal and converted him into Portugal, and the pope employed his accomplices. The two accused denied the guilt, and the writers of the order generally represent the whole affair as arranged by Pombal in order to give him a new pretext for criminal proceedings against the order. On Sept. 3, 1769, a royal decree forever excluded the Jesuits from Portugal, and the order (Castile, Aragon, and Andalusia) was dissolved. Most of the Jesuits were, on board of government ships, sent to Italy; and one of their prominent members, Malagrida, was in 1761 burned at the stake. The pope, in vain, had interceded for them; the nuncio had to leave the country in 1780, and all connection with Rome was broken off.
In France the numerous enemies of the order found a welcome opportunity for arousing public opinion against it in the commercial speculations of the Jesuit Lavalle, the superior of the mission of Martinique. When, in the war between France and England, his ships were captured, his creditors applied for payment to father De Sacy, whom the Jesuits had driven to seek refuge in Paris. He satisfied them, and instructed Lavalle to abstain from speculations in future. When Lavalle disregarded these instructions, and when, consequently, new losses occurred, amounting to 2,400,000 livres, Sacy refused to hold himself responsible. The creditors applied to the Parlement with the result that Lavalle was publicly denounced and identified as a Jesuit. The Parlement demanded a copy of the constitution of the order for examination. On April 18, 1761, a decree of Parliament suppressed the congregations of the Jesuits; on May 8 the whole order was declared to be responsible for the debt of Lavalle; and on August 6 the constitution of the order was declared to be an encroachment upon Church and State, twenty-four works of Jesuit authors were burned as heretical and dangerous to good morals, and the order was excluded from educational institutions. A protest from the king (August 10) was disregarded. On September 29, 1761, the Parlement for one year, was as unsuccessful as the intercession of the majority of the French bishops and of pope Clement XIII. Other Parliaments of France followed the example given by the Paris Parliament: on April 1, 1763, eighty colleges of the order were closed; and on August 30, 1763, the Holy Office, in a letter addressed to the parlements of France, declared the constitution of the Jesuits to be godless, sacrilegious, and injurious to Church and State, and the vows of the order to be void and null. In the beginning of 1764 all the members were ordered to forswear their vows, and to declare that their constitution was punishable, abominable, and in accordance with the laws of the land, among them father Cerutti, who two years before had written the best apology of the order. On Nov. 26, 1764, Choiseul obtained the sanction of the king for a decree which banished the Jesuits from France as dangerous to the state. Clement XIII, the steadfast friend of the order, replied to the royal decree on Jan. 8, 1766, by the bull Apostolicam, in which he again approved the order and its constitution.

In Spain, Aranda, the minister of Charles III, was as successful as Pombal in Portugal and Choiseul in France. During the months from Sept. 2 to Sept. 5, 1766, all the Jesuits of the kingdom, about 6000 in number, were seized and transported to the papal territory. When the pope refused to receive them, they were landed in Corsica, where they remained a few months, until, in 1769, that island was annexed to France. They were then again expelled, and this time found refuge in the papal territory. In Naples from 3000 to 4000 Jesuits were seized in the night from Nov. 3 to 4, 1767, by order of the regent Tanucci, the guardian of the minor Ferdinand IV, and likewise transported to the States of the Church. The government of Parma seized the Jesuits on Feb. 7, 1768, because the pope, claiming to be the feudal sovereign of Parma, had issued a bull declaring an order of the Parmaese government (the Pragmatic Sanction of Jan. 16, 1768) null and void, and excommunicating its authors. All the Bourbon courts took sides in this question with Parma, forbade the publication of the order, and were allowed to live together in their former colleges as societies of secular priests. In France the brief was not officially promulgated, and the Jesuits, otherwise so ultra papal in their views of the validity of papal briefs, now inferred from this circumstance that the order had not been abolished in France at all. In Prussia Frederick II forbade the promulgation of the brief, and in 1775 obtained permission from Pius VI to leave the Jesuits undisturbed. Soon, however, to please the Bourbon courts, the Prussian Jesuits were requested to lay aside the dress of the order, and Frederick William II abolished all their houses. In Russia Catherine II also forbade the promulgation of the brief, and ordered the Jesuits to continue their organization. The Jesuits reasoned that, since the brief in Rome itself had not been published in due form, they had a right to comply with the imperial request until the brief should be officially promulgated. This was the step taken by the Russian bishop as unauthorized; orally, however, as the Jesuits maintain, he repeatedly confirmed what officially he had disowned. Thus the Jesuits attempt to clear themselves from the charge of having disobeyed the pope, by charging the latter with deliberate duplicity. The Russian Jesuits were placed.
under the vice-generals Czerniewicz (1782-85), Lienkiewicz (1785-98), and Careu (1790-1802). The brief of Clement XIV was in 1801 repealed by Pius VII, so far as Russia was concerned, and the next superior of the Russian Jesuits, Gabriel Gruber (1802-5), assumed the title of a general for Russia, and since July 31, 1804, also for Naples. The successor of Gruber, Brzozowski (1805-20), lived to see the restoration of the order by the pope. Soon after (1815) the persecution of the order began in Russia; Dec. 20, 1815, they were expelled from St. Petersburg, in 1820 from all Russia. In other countries of Europe the ex-Jesuits had formed societies which served as substitutes of the abolished order. In Belgium the ex-Jesuits De Broglie and Tournelley established in 1794 the Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, which, after its expulsion from Belgium, established its centre in Austria. In accordance with the wish of the pope, and through the mediation of archbishop Migazzi, of Vienna, this society, under the successor of Tournelley (+1797), father Varin, united, on April 8, 1799, with the Baccarantic (q.v.), or Fathers of the Faith of Jesus. Under this name Baccaranti (or Baccarantic), a layman of Trent, had, in union with several others, established in 1798 a society in Italy, which, after the union with the Society of the Sacred Heart of Jesus, made considerable progress in Italy, France, Germany, and England. Most of the members hoped gradually to smooth the way for a reunion with the Jesuits in Russia; but as Baccaranti, who in the mean while had been elected as a priest, did not appear to be in sincere sympathy with this project, he was abandoned by many members and by whole houses. In 1807 he was even arrested by order of Pius VII, but the French liberated him in 1809, since which year he entirely disappeared. The last house of the society, that of St. Sylvester, in Rome, joined the restored Jesuits in 1814.

V. History of the Order from its Restoration in 1814 to 1871. Soon after its return from the French captivity, Pius VII promulgated (Aug. 7, 1814) the bull Abdicantia sibi, by which he restored the order of the Jesuits for the whole earth. Father Panizzone, in the name of the general of the order, Brozowski, who resided in Russia, received back from the pope the church Al Gesu, in Rome. When Brozowski died, the order had to pass through a severe trial. The vicar-general of the order, in union with the priest Pietroboni, tried to curtail the electoral freedom of the General Congregation, and his plans were supported by cardinal Della Genga; but the other members invoked the intervention of the pope, and, of freedom of election having been secured, elected as general father Fortis, of Veronza (1820-29), who was succeeded by father Roothman, of Amsterdam (1829-53), and father Baxx, a Belgian (elected July 2, 1853). Within a few years after the restoration the order had again established itself in all parts of Italy. Ferdinand III, in 1815, called them to Modena; and the ex-king of Sardinia, Emanuel IV, entered the order in 1815; he died in 1819. The fear which the election of cardinal Della Genga as pope in 1823 caused to the order proved to be unfounded, for the new pope (Leo XII) was henceforth the warm patron of the Jesuits, and restored to them the Roman college (1824). They were expelled from Naples and Fiume in consequence of the revolutionary movements in 1820 and 1821, but were soon restored. In 1836 they were admitted to the Lombardo-Venetian kingdom, and in Venzone cardinal Odoracchi in 1838 entered the novitiate, but died in 1841. General Bozhan witnessed the expulsion of the Jesuits from all Italy, and from Rome, 1848, but he lived to see their restoration in Naples and Rome in 1850. The war of 1859 again destroyed the provinces of Naples and Sicily; in 1866 also Venice. In Spain, Ferdinand VII, by decree of May 15, 1815, declared the charges which former Spanish governments had made against the Jesuits false. The revolution of 1820 drove them from their houses, and on Nov. 17, 1829, twenty-five of them were killed; but when the insurrection was in 1824 subdued by the French, the Jesuits returned. In the civil war of 1834 they were again expelled; in Madrid a fearful riot was excited against them by the report that they had poisoned the wells, and fourteen were massacred. The Jesuits were again established in the Spanish dominions by a decree of the Cortes. Since 1848 they began slowly to return, but the law, which had not been repealed, was again enforced against them by the revolution of 1868. Only in Cuba they remained undisturbed. To Portugal the Jesuits were restored in 1827. In 1832 they received the college of Coimbra, where they numbered the great-grandson of Pombal among their pupils. After the overthrow of Dom Miguel, the laws of Pombal were again enforced against them by Dom Pedro, and ever since they have been excluded from Portugal. In France a number of interrupted attempts, immediately after the restoration of the order, to desire to place the boys' seminaries under their charge, and Talleyrand declared himself in favor of their legal restoration, but the king did not consent. Nevertheless, the number and the influence of the Jesuits increased. In 1829 the number of pupils in the Jesuit colleges in France amounted to 20,000. The revolution of July, 1830, dissolved all the houses of the order, and drove all the members out of France; but gradually many returned, and Ravignan, in Paris, gained the reputation of being one of the first pulpit orators of his country. On motion of Thiers, the Chamber of Deputies, in 1848, requested the government to abolish the order in France; but the government preferred to send a special ambassador (Rossi) to Rome in order to obtain the suppression of the Jesuits from the pope. Gregory XVI declined to make any direct concessions, but the general of the order, on request of the government, in France in order to evade the storm rising against the order. The revolution of 1848, the government of Louis Napoleon, and the revolution of 1870, left them undisturbed, and they were allowed to erect a considerable number of colleges in the four provinces into which the Frankish empire is divided. In England the bill for the abolition of the order, to live in common. In 1790 they received from Thomas Weld the castle of Stonyhurst, which soon became one of the most popular educational institutions of the English Roman Catholics. In 1860 they were allowed to join the Russian branch of the order. In Belgium the fathers of the Faith joined in 1814 the restored order. The Dutch government expelled the Jesuits, but they returned after the Belgian revolution of 1830, and soon became very numerous. The Jesuits in who in 1820 had been expelled from Russia were re-admitted in 1846. Others were called to Hungary by the archbishop of Cobaza, and father Landes made his appearance in Vienna. As they secured the special patronage of the emperor and the imperial family, they gained a great influence, and were, as in all other countries, the bulwarks of the most dangerous enemies of religious and civil liberty. They were therefore expelled by the revolution of 1848, but returned again when the revolutionary movement was subdued, and received from the Austrian government in 1857 the theological faculty of the University of Innsbruck. To Switzerland eight Fathers of the Faith were in 1805 called from Rome by the govern-
ment of Valais. They soon broke off the connection with Baccanari, and in 1810 were incorporated with the society in Russia. After the restoration of the order, they soon established colleges in other Catholic cantons, particularly in Freiburg, Lucerne, and Schwyz. When the government of the canton of Lucerne, on Oct. 24, 1844, resolved to place the episcopal seminary of the city of Lucerne under the charge of the Jesuits, two volunteer expeditions (Dec. 1444, and March, 1445) were undertaken for the purpose of overthrowing the government of Lucerne, but without success. As most of the Protestant cantons demanded the expulsion of the Jesuits from the whole of Switzerland, those cantons which either had called Jesuits to cantonal institutions or which patronized them (namely, Lucerne, Uri, Schwyz, Unterwalden, Zug, Freiburg, and Valais) strengthened a separate alliance (the "Sonderbund"), which had already been formed in 1843, and appointed a council of war for the emergency of a civil conflict. In September, 1847, the Federal Diet decreed the dissolution of the Sonderbund and the expulsion of the Jesuits, and when the seven cantons refused submission, the Sonderbund war broke out, which, in November, 1847, ended in the defeat of the Sonderbund and the expulsion of the Jesuits. The revised federal constitution of Switzerland forbids the establishment of any Jesuit settlement. From the German States, with the exception of Austria, the Jesuits remained excluded until the revolution of 1848. In 1848 pope Gregory XVI. issued the bull "Piacere," which secured the principle of religious liberty, and gained for them admission to all the states, in particular to Prussia, where they established in rapid succession houses in Munster, Paderborn, Aix-la-Chapelle, Cologne, Bonn, Coblenz, Treves, and other cities. They gained a considerable influence on the Catholic population in particular by holding numerous missions in all parts of Germany.

The membership of the order, during the period from 1841 to 1866, increased from 8566 to 8155. At the beginning of 1867 the numerical strength of the order was as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>American's District</th>
<th>Province</th>
<th>Members</th>
<th>Priests</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Italy............</td>
<td>1. Rome</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Naples (scattered)</td>
<td>255</td>
<td>194</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Sicily (scattered)</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>141</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Turin (scattered)</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>173</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Austria.........</td>
<td>448</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Austria (scattered)</td>
<td>609</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Galicia.........</td>
<td>606</td>
<td>290</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Germany.........</td>
<td>636</td>
<td>255</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Prussia.........</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>100</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Paris...........</td>
<td>560</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Toulouse........</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>710</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Spain...........</td>
<td>1. Aragon (scattered)</td>
<td>492</td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Aragon (scattered)</td>
<td>278</td>
<td>184</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mexico (scattered)</td>
<td>703</td>
<td>180</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Scotland.......</td>
<td>167</td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Ireland........</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Maryland........</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total, 21 provinces, 8331 members (3063 priests, 2392 scholastics, and 2436 brothers).

VI. The Labors of the Order in the Missionary Field.

-From the beginning of the order, the extension of the Church of Rome in pagan countries constituted one of the chief aims of the Jesuits, whose zeal in this field was all the greater, as they hoped that here the losses inflicted upon the Church by Protestantism would be more than balanced by new gains. The energy which they have displayed as foreign missionaries is recognized on all sides; the spirit of mission and charity of so many of their members, which is illustrated by the martyrdom of about 800 of the order, has also met with deserved recognition even among Protestants. On the other hand, within their own Church, charges were brought against many Jesuits from missions, as they received candidates for baptism too easily, and without having sufficient proofs of their real conversion, and that they were too accommodating to pagan views and customs. These charges led to long controversies between the Jesuits and other monastic orders, and to several decisions of the popes against them. In India, the first missionary ground occupied by the Jesuits, at St. Xavier and St. Ignatius, Canton Salsette, on Oct. 26, 1600, was established, and a large number of natives to join the Church of Rome. In Travancore forty churches had to be built for the converts, and Francis Xavier is reported to have baptized 10,000 pagans within one month. As it was soon discovered that the chief obstacle to the mission was the rigid practice of the Jesuits, the king of Portugal and some members of the order adopt the mode of life of the Brahmins, and others of that of castes. Accordingly, the Jesuits Fernandez, De Nobili, and others began to practice the painful penances of the Brahmins, endeavored even to outdo them in the rigor of these penances, and thus, making the people believe that they were Brahmins, or Indians of other castes, they made in some districts considerable progress. The Catholic congregations in Madura, Carnate, Mogar, and Ceylon are said to have numbered a native population of upwards of 150,000. In India it was also visited by Francis Xavier, who arrived there with two other missionaries in 1649. They gained the favor of several Daimios, and, with their efficient aid, made considerable progress. In 1575 the number of Roman Catholics was estimated at 40,000; in 1582 three Christian Daimios sent ambassadors to the pope Gregory XIII. In 1613 three Christian kings were received at Nagasaki, Miaco, and Fukato, colleges at Nagasaki and Arima, and residences at Otsaca and seven other places. During the persecution which broke out in the 17th century and extirpated Christianity, more than a hundred members of the order perished, together with more than a million of their native countrymen. The first Catholic missionaries in China were the Jesuits Roger and Ricci. The latter and several of his successors, in particular father Adam Schall, gained considerable influence upon the emperors by means of their knowledge of astronomy and other sciences, and the number of those who admitted to the Church was estimated as early as 1668 at 300,000. They showed, however, so great an accommodation with regard to the pagan customs that they were denounced in Rome by other missionaries, and several popes, in particular Benedict XIV. They were allowed to practice in China the first Jesuits arrived in 1614, in Tunkin in 1627. In both countries they succeeded, in spite of cruel persecutions, in establishing a number of congregations which survived the downfall of the order. They met with an equal success in the Philippine islands, and in the Mariana Islands, where their labors on the island of Luzon were a failure. Their labors in Abyssinia, Moroco, and other parts of Africa, likewise, did not produce any lasting results. Congo and Angola were nominally converted to Christianity by Jesuit and other missionaries, but even Roman Catholic writers must admit that the religion of the masses of the population differed but little from paganism, into which they were easily relapsed as soon as they found themselves without European missionaries. In 1549, Ignatius Loyola, at the request of king John III of Portugal, sent Emanuel de Nobrega and four other Jesuits to Brazil, where they gathered many masses in villages, and civilized them. Among the many Jesuits who followed these pioneer missionaries, Joseph de Anchieta († 1597) and the celebrated pulpit orator Anthony Vicira (about the middle of the 17th century) are the most noted. Among the Jesuits who labored in the Amazons of Brazil was Peter Claver, who is said to have baptized more than 500,000 negroes, and is called the apostle of the negroes. In 1656 they were called by the bishop of Tucuman to Paraguay, which soon became the most prosperous of all their missions. The Christian tribes who were gathered into the missions, and who were removed from their old homes, were those of the Guarani tribe, and in 1736 the tribe of the Guarani alone numbered in thirty-two towns from 80,000 to 40,000
families. When, in 1578, the Spaniards ceded seven reductions to Portugal, and 30,000 Indians were ordered to leave their villages, an insurrection broke out, which led to the expulsion of the Jesuits by the Spanish governor. 

The Jesuits, together with the other monastic orders in the missionary work. They directed their attention chiefly to the unsubdued tribes, and in 1682 numbered 500 missionaries in 70 missionary stations. The Jesuit Salviatelli and his companion Pacolo in 1607 gained firm footing in California, where they established the first Jesuit mission in that country. In 1619, California, which was first discovered by the Jesuit Kith, they encountered more than usual obstacles, but gradually the number of their stations rose to fourteen. In Florida they met with hardly any success. In New France, where the Jesuits set up their first mission in 1620, Father Brebeuf became the first apostle of the Hurons. The Abenakis were fully Christianized in 1629; subsequently nearly the whole tribe of the Illinois, on the Mississippi, was baptized. In Eastern Europe and in Asia Minor the Jesuits succeeded in inducing a number of Greeks and Turks to recognize the supremacy of the pope. After the restoration of the order the Jesuits resumed their missionary labors with great zeal.

VII. The Work at Home.—While abroad the order was endeavoring to extend the territory of the Church, their task at home was to check the further progress of Protestantism, and to secure the maintenance of the Church of Rome, and to become within the Church the most powerful organization. They regarded the pulpit as one of the best means to establish an influence over the mass of the Catholic people, and many members gained considerable reputation as pulpit orators. Bourdaloue, Retzmann, and Felix of the French, Scurti in Italy, Torio in Spain, Viceria in Portugal, were regarded as among the best pulpit orators in those countries; but, on the whole, the effect of their preaching was more sensational than lasting. In order to train the youth in the principles of the Church, the congregation of the oratory was enjoined upon the members to cultivate with particular zeal catechetics. A large number of catechisms were accordingly compiled by Jesuit authors, among which those of Casinus and cardinal Bellarmine gained the greatest reputation and the widest circulation. In modern times the gradual introduction of the catechism of the Jesuit Deharbe by the ultramontane bishops is believed to have been one of the chief instruments in the revival of ultramontane principles among the German people. As confessors, the Jesuits were famous for their indulgent and lax conduct not only towards licentious princes, but towards all who held opinions in their opinion might be expected to benefit the order. In their works on moral theology they developed a comparatively new branch, casuistry; and many of their writers developed on the theory of Probabilism (q. v.) ideas which a large portion of the Church indignantly repudiated as dangerous innovations, and which, in some instances, even the popes deemed it necessary to censure. In order to effect among their adherents strict an organization as the order itself possessed, so-called "congregations" were formed among their students, and among all classes of society, with the object of uniting the members of the order absolutely to its own members. Wherever there were or are houses of Jesuits, there is a Jesuitic party among the laity which pursues the same aims as the order. Thus the Jesuits have become a power wherever they have established themselves, while, on the other hand, the fanaticism connected with the remnants has always and naturally produced against them a spirit of bitterness and hatred which has never manifested itself to the same degree against any other institution of the Roman Catholic Church. The importance of schools for gaining an influence upon society was appreciated by the Jesuits more highly than had ever before been the case in the Roman Catholic Church. The most famous of their educational institutions was the Roman College (Collegium Romanum). Paul IV conferred upon it in 1556 the rank and privileges of a university; Gregory XIII, in 1581, a princely donation. In 1584 it numbered 2107 pupils. Eight of its pupils (Urban VIII, Innocent X, Clement IX, Clement X, Innocent XII, Clement XII, Clement XIII, Clement XII) succeeded the papal throne; several others (Aloysius Gonzaga, Camillus of Lellis, Leonardo of Porto Maurizio) were enrolled among the canonized saints. In 1710 the Jesuits conferred the academic degrees at 24 universities and 615 colleges, and 157 boarding-schools were under their management. All these establishments formed the backbone of the Jesuitical order. The Jesuits displayed the same zeal in establishing schools and colleges, and have revived their reputation of strict disciplinarians, who know how to curb the impetuosity and passions of youth; but neither in the former nor in the present day have they been able to raise one of their schools to that degree of eminence which, as in the case of some of the German universities, must be admitted by friend and foe. The number of writers which the order has produced is immense. As early as 1608 Ribadeneyra published a catalogue of the writings of the order containing 166 pages. Alegambe (1643) and Southwell (1675) extended it into a large volume in folio. More recently the Belgian Jesuits Augustine and Aloys de Backer began a bibliographical of the order, which, though not yet completed, numbered in 1670 seven volumes (quarto). A new edition of a work of the previous edition, of the order, in folio, is in the course of preparation. The following writers of the order belong among those who are best known: Bellarmine, Less, Molina, Petavino, Suarez, Tole. Vasquez, Maldonat, Salmeron, Cornelius a Lapide. Hardouin, Labbe, Sirmond, the Bolandista, Mariana. Petramont, Ximenes, Ferer, Abbot, (editor of the Quo recently the order has also attempted to establish its own organs in the province of periodical literature. Publications of this kind are the monthly Civita Cattolica of Rome, which is generally regarded as the most daring exponent of the most advanced ultramontane school; Etudes historiques de France, The Month in England, and the Stimmung von Maria Leach (a monthly published by the Jesuits of Maria Leach since August, 1871) in Germany.

VIII. Some Errors concerning the Jesuits. As the Jesuits, by their systematic fanaticism, provoked such violent opposition on the part of all opponents of ultramontane Catholicism, it is not to be wondered at that occasionally groundless charges were brought against them, and that some of these were readily believed. Among the erroneous charges which at one time have been general, and which have had to be acquiesced in by the Jesuits now acquit them, are the following: 1. That they are responsible for the sentiments contained in the famous volume Monita Secreta (q. v.). This work was not written by a Jesuit, but is a satire, the author of which was, however, as familiar with the movements of the Jesuits as with their history (see Gieseler, Kirche engesch. ii. 2, 656 sq.). 2. That the superior of the order has the power to order a member to commit a sin. It is now generally admitted that the passage of the constitution on which the charge is based (innum est ut... nisi superius eam suaviter superius superius superius) is misunderstood. 3. That the order holds to the maxim that "the end justifies the means." Although many works of Jesuits (in particular those on System) were well calculated to upset such an opinion, in the hands of the reader, the order has never expressly taught it.

IX. Literature. — The number of works on the Jesuits is legion. The titles of most may be found in Carvaxo. Bibliographie hist. de la Comp. de Jesus (Paris, 1864). The most important work, in favor of the Jesuits is Corns. de Jesus, Let. de Comp. de Jesus (1864, 6 vols.). The best that has been written on the subject are the chapters concerning the Jesuits in Banke's work on the Roman popes. (A. J. S.)
JESURUN (Isa. xlv. 2). See JESURUHN.

Jesu'nu (Ἰησοῦν, Gen., Dat., and Voc. -ου, Acc. -ουν; from the Heb. ⲏⲥⲥⲟⲥ, “Yeshu’u,” “Jeshua” or “Joshua,” Syr. Yešu,’), the name of several persons (besides our Saviour) in the New Testament, the Apocalypse, and Josephus. For a discussion of the full import and application of the name, see JESUS CHRIST.

1. JOSCHA (q.v.) the son of Nun (2 Esdr. vii. 37; Escl. xlvii. 1; 1 Macc. ii. 55; Acts vii. 45; Heb. iv. 8); so also Josephus, Anti. xi. 3, 10 sqq.

2. JOSCHA (q.v.) the priest, the son of Jehozadak (1 Esdr. v. 8, 24, 48, 56, 68, 70; vi; 2, ix; 19; Escl. xlix. 12; so also Josephus, Anti. xi. 3, 10 sqq.).

3. JOSCHA (q.v.) the Levite (1 Esdr. vi. 58; iv. 45).

4. JESUS, THE SON OF SIRACH (Ἰησοῦς τὸν Ὑσαίαν; Vulgate Jesus filius Sirach), is described in the text of Ecclesiasticus (I, 37) as the author of that book, which in the Sept., and generally in the Eastern Church, is called by his name—the Wisdom of Jesus, the Son of Sirach, or simply the Wisdom of Sirach, but in the Western churches, after the Vulgate, the Book of Ecclesiasticus. The same passage speaks of him as a native of Jerusalem, and the internal character of the book confirms its Palestinian origin. The name Jesus was of frequent occurrence (see above), and was often represented by the Greek Jesus (see Josephus, Anti. xii. 5, 1). In the apocryphal list of the seventy-two commissioners sent by Eleazar (Arist. in cont. phil., Hist. ap. Hody, De Test. p. vii.), but there is not the slightest ground for connecting the author of Ecclesiasticus with either of the persons there mentioned. The various conjectures which have been made as to the position of the son of Sirach from the contents of his book—so, for instance, that he was a priest (from vii. 29 sq.; xiv. 1; xlix. 1), or a physician (from xxxix. 1 sq.)—are equally unfounded. The evidences of a date B.C. cir. 310-270, are as follows: 1. In ch. xlvii. 1-21, the praises of the ancient worthies are extolled down to the time of Simon, who is doubtless Simon I, or “the Just” (B.C. 570-300). 2. The Talmud most distinctly describes the work of Ben-Sira as the oldest of the apocryphal books (comp. Tosef. Tikkun, ii. 10). 3. It had a general currency, and was quoted as least as early as the 2d century B.C. (comp. Ant. ii. 5, 1; Jerusalem Nazir, v. 8), which shows that it must have existed a considerable period before the time of our Lord, and must have been known among the circles of the rabbis, as it is cited and condemned by the Talmud. In the description of these great men, and throughout the whole of the book, there is not the slightest trace of those Haggadic legends about the national worthies which were so rife and numerous in the second century before Christ. On the other hand, the mention of the “88th year of king Euergetes” (translator’s prologue) argues a later date. See ECCLESIASTICUS.

Among the later Jews the “Son of Sirach” was celebrated under the name of Ben-Sira as a writer of proverbs, and some of those which have been preserved offer a close resemblance to passages in Ecclesiasticus; but in the course of time a later compilation was substituted for the original work of Ben-Sira (Zunz).

According to the first prologue to the book of Ecclesiasticus, taken from the Synopsis of the Pseude-athanassius (iv. 577, ed. Migne), the translator of the book looks upon the same name as the author of it. If this conjecture were true, a genealogy of the following form would result: 1. Sirach. 2. Jesus, son (father of Sirach (author of the book). 3. Sirach. 4. Jesus, son of Sirach (translator of the book). It is, however, most likely that the last chapter, “The prayer of Jesus, the Son of Sirach,” is the genuine introduction of the book, as it was the only source of information which we possess upon the subject. Like all his co-religionists, he was trained from his early life to fear and love the God of his fathers. He travelled much both by land and sea when he grew up, and was in frequent perils (Eccles. xxxiv. 11, 12). Being a diligent student, and having acquired much practical knowledge from his travels, he was intrusted with some office at court, and his enemies, who were jealous of him, maligned him before the king, which nearly cost him his life (II, 6, 7). To us, however, his religious life and sentiments are of the utmost importance, inasmuch as they describe the opinions of the Jews during the period immediately before the Old and New Test. Though deeply penetrated with the fear of God, which he declared was the only glory of man, rich, noble, or poor (x, 22-24), still the whole of Ben-Sira’s tenets may be described as limited, and are as follows: Resignation to the dealings of Providence (xi. 21-25); to seek truth at the cost of life (iv. 28); not to use much babbling in prayer (vii. 14); absolute obedience to parents, which in the sight of God atones for sins (iii. 1-16; vii. 27, 28); humility (iii. 17-19; x, 7, 18, 28); kindness to domestics (iv. 30; vii. 20, 21; xxxiii. 30, 31); to relieve the poor (iv. 9); to act as a father to the fatherless, and a husband to the widow (iv. 10); to visit the sick (vii. 35); to weep with them that weep (vii. 34); not to rejoice over the death of even the greatest enemy (vii. 7), and to forgive sins as we would be forgiven (xxviii. 2, 8). He has nothing in the whole of his book about the immortality of the soul, a future judgment, the existence of spirits, or the expectation of a Messiah. See SIRAC.UL.

5. See BARAHAN.

6. (Col. iv. 11). See JUSTUS.

JESUS is also the name of several persons mentioned by Josephus, especially in the pontifical times. See HUCUL-PUST.

1. A high-priest displaced by Antiochus Epiphanes to make room for Onias (Anti. xii. 5, 1; xvi. 3, 1).

2. The son of Phabat, deprived by Herod of the high-priesthood in order to make way for his own father-in-law Simon (Anti. xvi. 3, 1).

3. Son of Sie, successor of Eleazar (Anti. xvii. 13, 1).

4. Son of Damasus, made high-priest by Agrippa in place of Ananus (Anti. xx. 9, 1).

5. Son of Gamaliel, and successor of the preceding in the high-priesthood (Anti. xx. 9, 4; compare War, iv. 4, 8).

6. Son of Ananus, a plebeian, and the utterer of the remarkable doom against Jerusalem, which was fulfilled during the last siege simultaneously with his own death (War, vi. 5, 8).

7. A priest of the Buthathus, who surrendered to Titus the sacred utensils of the Temple (War, vi. 8, 8).

8. Son of Sepphas, one of the chief priests and governor of Tiberias (War, ii. 20, 4).

9. Son of Saphat, a ringleader of the Sicarii during the last war with the Romans (War, iii. 9, 7).

Jesus Christ (Ἰησοῦς Χριστός; Ἰσχαοὺς ὁ Χριστός; sometimes by Paul in the reverse order “Christ Jesus”), the ordinary designation of the incarnate Son of God and Saviour of mankind. This double designation is not, like Simon Peter, John Mark, James Barnabas, composed of a name and a surname, but, like John the Baptist, Simon Magnus, Bar-Jesus Elymas, of a proper name and an official title. Jesus was our Lord’s proper name, just as Peter, James, and John were the proper names of three of his disciples. To distinguish our Lord from others bearing the name, he was termed Jesus of Nazareth (John xviii. 7, etc.; strictly Jesus the Nazarene, Ἰησοῦς ὁ Ναζαρηνός), and Jesus the son of Joseph (John xxi. 8, etc.).

1. Import of the name.—There can be no doubt that Jesus is the Greek form of a Hebrew name, which had been borne by two illustrious individuals in former periods of the Jewish history—the successor of Moses and Aaron in the perpetuation of the Law (Deut. xxiv. 18), and the high-priest who, along with Zerubbabel (Zech. iii. 1), took so active a part in the re-establish-
ment of the civil and religious polity of the Jews on their return from the Babylonian captivity. Its original and full form is Jehohua (Num. xiii, 16). By contraction it became Joshua, or Josua; and when transferred into Greek, by taking the termination characteristic of that language, it assumed the form Jesus. It is thus twice that the names of the illustrious individuals referred to are uniformly written in the Sept., and the first of them is twice mentioned in the New Testament by (Acta vii, 45; Heb. iv, 8).

The original name of Joshua was Jehosha (יהושע), as appears in Numb. xxiii, 16, which was changed later into Moses into Jehoshua (יהושע), Jehovah is his salvation), as appears in Numb. xiii, 16; 1 Chron. vii, 27, being elsewhere Anglicized of this "name, Joshua (יהושע, id.), whence the Greek name Ιησοῦς, by which this is always represented in the Sept. This last Heb. form differs little from the abstract noun from the same root, γεωργ, yeosuch, deliverance, and seems to have been understood as equivalent in import (see Matt. i, 22; comp. Eccle. xiii, 10).

The "name of Jesus" (Phil. ii, 10) is not the name Je-sus, but "the name above every name" (ver. 9); i.e. the supreme dignity and authority with which the Father has invested Jesus Christ as the reward of his disinterested exertions in the cause of the divine glory and humanity, and the bowing by ro y wewy, bowing (of him who is named Joshua) is obviously not an external mark of homage when the name Jesus is pronounced, but the inward sense of awe and submission to him who is raised to a station so exalted.

The ascription of this name on our Lord was not the result of accident, or of the ordinary course of things, but was the effect of a direct divine order (Luke iii, i; ii, 21), as indicative of his saving function (Matt. i, 21). Like the other name Immmanual (q. v.), it does not necessarily import the divine character of the wearer. This, however, clearly results from the attributes given in the same connection, and is plainly taught in numerous passages (see especially Rom. i, 4, 8; ix, 5).

For the import and application of the name Christ, see MESSIAH.

For a full discussion of the name Jesus, including many fanciful etymologies and explanations, with other refutation, see Gesenius, Thes. Heb. ii, 582; Simon, Onom. i, 7, p. 519 sq.; Fritzsche, De nomine Jesus (Freiburg, 1705); Clodius, De nom. Chr. et Maria Avrabicea (Lips. 1724); Hottinger, Hist. Orient. p. 153, 157; Seelen, Melch. exeg. i, 413; Thiess, Kr. Comment. ii, 355; A. Pfeiffer, Jesu in his treatise De nomen J. Domini, p. 177 sqq.; Baumgarten, Hetiecht. d. Namen Jesu (Halle, 1736); Chysander, De vera forma atque emphasi nominis Jesu (Rintel. 1751); Osander, Harmony Evangelica (Basil. 1651), lib. i, c. 6; Chemnitz, De nomine Jesu, in the Theol. Philol. (Amst. 1702), vol. ii, p. 63; Canini, Disquis. in loc. nigr. N. T., in the Ort. Soc. ii, ix; Gass, De utroque J. C. nominis, De fili et nominis (Vratisl. 1840); and other monographs cited in Volbe- ding's Index, p. 6, 7; and in Hase's Leben Jesu, p. 61.

II. Personal Circumstances of our Lord.—These, of course, largely affected his history, notwithstanding his divinity.—General View.—The following is a naked statement of the facts of his career as they may be gathered from the evangelical narratives, supposing them to be entitled simply to the credit due to profane history. (For literature, see Volbeding, p. 56; Hase, p. 6.) The founder of the Christian religion was born (B.C. 6) at Bethlehem, near Jerusalem, under the reign of the emperor Augustus, of Mary, at the time betrothed to the carpenter (see) Joseph, and descended from the royal house of David (Matt. i, 1 sq.; Luke ii, 25 sq.; comp. John vii, 42). Soon after his birth he was compelled by the murderous designs of Herod the Great by a hasty flight into the adjacent parts of Egypt (Matt. ii, 13 sq.; according to the tradition at Matarae, see Evangel. infant. Arab. c. 24; apparently a place near old Heliopolis, where is still shown a very old mulberry-tree under which Mary is said to have rested with the babe, see Prosp. Alpin. Retr. Ep. l. p. 24; Matt. ii, 13 sq.; Luke ii, 14 sq.; 141 sq.; comp. generally Hartmann, Erdbeckw. d. Afric. coi, i, 878 sqq.). See EGYPT: HEBRON. But immediately after the death of this king his parents returned to their own country, and settled again (Luke i, 25) in Nazareth (q. v.), in Lower Galilee (Matt. ii, 23; comp. Luke iii, 21 sq.; iv, 15 sq.; viii, 40 sqq.; etc.), where he seems so rapidly matured (Luke ii, 40, 52), that in his twelfth year the boy evinced at the metropolis tracts of an uncommon religious intelligence, which excited astonishment in all the spectators (Luke ii, 41 sq.). With this event the history of his youth concludes in the canonical gospels, and we next find him, about the thirty-eighth year of his age (A.D. 25), in the neighborhood of the Dead Sea, at the Jordan, where he submitted himself to be consecrated for the introduction of the new dispensation (βαπτισμός τοῦ Θεοῦ) by the symbol of water baptism at the hands of John the Baptist (Matt. iii, 13 sq.; iv, 1 sq.; 17 sq.; Luke iii, 21 sq.; iv, 1 sq.). He now began, after a forty-days' fast (comp. 1 Kings xix, 8) spent in the wilderness of Judea (Matt. iv, 1-11: Mark i, 12 sq.; Luke iv, 1-13) in quiet meditation upon his mission, to publish openly in person this "kingdom of God," by earnestly summoning his countrymen to repentance, and by urging them to keep the teachings and traditions of the old dispensations and conduct, through a new birth from the Holy Spirit (John iii, 3 sq.). He repeatedly announced himself as the mediator of this dispensation, and in pursuance of this character, in correction of the sensual expectations of the people with reference to the long-looked-for Redeemer (comp. Luke iv, 21), he chose from among his early associates and Galilean countrymen a small number of faithful disciples (Matt. x), and with them travelled, especially at the time of the Paschal festival and during the summer months, in various districts through Palestine, subclassing every opportunity to impress pure and fruitful religious sentiments upon the populace or his immediate disciples, and to enlighten them concerning his own dignity as God's legitimate descendent (Δεῖ γὰρ αὐτῷ ὁ χειρὶς τῆς δικαιοσύνης), who should abolish the sacrificial service, and teach a worship of God, as the common Father of all men, and in truth (Matt. x). With these, and their expositions of doctrine, which all breathe the noblest practical spirit, and were so carefully adapted to the capacity and apprehension of the hearers that in respect to clearness, simplicity, and dignified force they are still a pattern of true instruction, he coupled, in the spirit of the second advent, the spirit of the Kingdom, which was expected from the Messiah, wonderful deeds, especially charitable cures of certain diseases at that time very prevalent and regarded as incurable, but to these he himself appears to have attributed a subordina. value. By this means he gathered about him a considerable company of true adherents and faithful disciples, chiefly from the middle class of the people (John vii, 49; and even from the despis able publicans, Matt. ix, 9 sq.; Luke v, 27 sq.); for the eminent and learned were repelled by the severe reproofs which he uttered against their corrupt maxims (Matt. xii, 38 sq.), their sectarian animosities (Luke xi, 23 sq.; xii, 9 sq.) and his independence and freedom from prejudice, as being subversive of all true religion (John vii, 53; ix, 16), as well as by the slight regard which (in comparison with their statutes) he paid to the Sabbath law (Mark xvi, 16); and as he in no respect conformed to their interpretations of the Mosaic law, from animosity, they made repeated attempts to seize his person (Mark xi, 18; John vii, 30, 44). At last he succeeded, by the assistance of the traitor Judas, in taking him prisoner in the very capital, where he had just paraded the official sign of the messianic kingdom (the Passover), upon which he engrafted the inimitable rite of a new covenant; and thus, without exciting any
surprise on his part, in surrendering him into the hands of the Roman authorities as a popular insurrectionist. He was sentenced to death by crucifixion, as he had often declared to his disciples would be his fate, and suffered himself, with calm resignation, to be led to the place of execution, and was nailed to the cross without any traditional names, see Thilo, Apocryphi, i. 560 sq.; comp. Evangel. infant. Arab. c. 23; but he arose alive on the third day from the grave which a grateful disciple had prepared for him, and after tarrying forty days in the midst of his disciples, during which he confidently instructed and presented himself as a man of marked grace, and conversed with them in the把握 their material from earlier traditions, doubtless from those collections and companions of Jesus; but they were all first written down a long time after the occurrences: hence it has often been asserted that the historical matter was even at that time no longer extant in an entirely pure state (since the more subjective and the subtilest, both in views and opinions, are readily interchanged in an unscientically formed style); but that after Jesus had been so gloriously proved to be the Messiah, the incidents were improved into prodigies, especially through a consideration of the Old-Testament prophecies (Kaiser, Bibl. Theol. c. 199 sq.; see also the single references; both in view and opinion, could only be shown in the composition and connection of single transactions; the facts themselves in the respective accounts agree too well in time and circumstances, and the narrators confine themselves too evidently to such a position by the writers of memoirs, to allow the supposition of a (condensed) transformation of the events or any such developments from Old-Testament prophecy; moreover, if truth and pious poetry had already become mingled in the verbal traditionary reports, the eye-witnesses Matthew and John would have known well, in a fresh narration, how to distinguish between every of these elements identified to accounts which they had themselves passed through, for memory and imagination were generally more lively and vigorous among the ancients than with us) (Br. ibh. Rationem, p. 248 sq.; compare Heydenreich, Ueb. Unzulässigkeit d. myth. Anwendung d. Histor. im N. T. und d. Christentum. Herborn, 1851-5; see Hase, p. 5). Sooner would we suppose that the fertile-minded John, who wrote latest, has set before us, not the pure historical Christ, but one apprehended by faith and confused with his own spiritual conceptions (Br. Über Rational. p. 382). But while it is altogether plausible theoretically, it means not the individuality and spiritual sympathy with Jesus, apprehended and reflected the depth and spirituality: of his Master more truly than the synoptical evangelists, who depict rather the exterior phenomena of his character, at the same time there is actually nothing containing an identification between these two insecurely, in substance or form, that is incompatible with the Christ of the first three evangelists (see Heydenreich, in his Zeitarch. p. 3; yet these latter represent Jesus as speaking comparatively seldom, and that in more general terms, of his exaltation, digne, and relation with the Father, whereas that Christ would have explained himself much more definitely and fully upon a point that could not have remained undiscussed, is of itself probable (see Hase, p. 10). Hence also, although we cannot believe that in such representations we are to understand the identical words of Christ to be given (for while the retention of all these extended discourses in the memory is improbable, on the other hand a writing of them down is repugnant to the Jewish custom), yet the actual sentiments of Jesus are certainly thus reported. (See further, Bauer, Bibl. Theol. N. T. ii. 278 sq.; B. Crusius, Bibl. Theol. p. 81; Fleck, Orientation Evangel. Lpz. 1812; and Harnack, Uber den Geist und die Form der evang. Gesch. Lpz. 1865; Eichhorn, Einleitung, i. 689 sq.; on the mythicism of the evangelists, see Gabler, Newest. theolog. Journ. vii. 396; Bertholdt, Theol. Journ. v. 253 sq.)

In the Church fathers, we find very little that appears to have been derived from these speeches; but the apocryphal gospels breathe a spirit entirely foreign to historical truth, and are filled with accounts of petty miracles (Tholuck, Glaubwürdigkeit, p. 406 sq.; Ammon, Lek. Maria, i. 90 sq.; compare Schmidt, Einleitung ins N. T. ii. 294 sq., and Scholz, J. Krit. u. Exegese, ii. 481 sq.).

The passage of Josephus (Ant. xviii, 3, 3; see Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. § 24), which Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. i. 11; Demonstrat. Exe. iii. 7) was the first among Christian writers to make use of, has been shown (see Hase, p. 12), although some have ingeniously striven to defend it (see, among the latest, Bretschneider, in his Diss. ophel. theolog. Jud. n° 65; Josephus, De floribus Galilaeae; Harnack, Ueber den Jos. Zeugniss von Christo. Leipzig, 1823; Schödel, Fl. Joseph. de e. Chr. testatore, Lips. 1840), to be partly, but not entirely spurious (see Eckstadt, Floriani de Jesu Christo testimoniis noveiturque super nuper austerius defensis, Jesu, n. 18; also his De Prop. Phil. contra Iren. 1. 28; 1841; in the Heidelberger Johrb. 1818, i. 269 sq.; Thiele, in the N. kritische. Journ. d. theolog. Lit. ii. 97 sq.; Heimich, Ench. i zu Euseb. H. E. iii, 381 sq.; compare Suppl. notarius ad Eusebium, p. 78 sq.; Ammon, Lek. Maria, i. 129 sq.). See Josephus. (See Volbeding, p. 5.) The Koran (q. v.) contains only negligible fables concerning Jesus (Hotttinger, Histor. Or. 105 sq.; Schmidt, in his Bibl. J. Krit. u. Exegese, i. 110 sq.; D'Herbelot, Biblioth. Orientale, ii. 849 sq.; compare Augusthi, Christologica Ko. roniana Jeno, 1799), and the Jewish History of Jesus (2 Thess. ii. 9-13; edit. Hultzdri, Lugd. Bat. 1703), and in Wagnitz, Tela ign. Sattm. Altdorf, 1681) betrays itself as an abortive fabrication of Jewish calumny, destitute of any historical value (see Ammon, Bibl. Theol. iii. 269), while the allusions to Jesus in the Talmud and the Rab- bis have only a polemical aim (see Meefuller, Jesus in Talmude, Altdorf, 1699, i. 4; Werner, Jesus in Talmude, Stade, 1701; comp. Buxenus, De notatis J. C. ii. 4). (See Volbeding, p. 5.) The genuine "Acta Pilati," Eusebius, Chron. Arm. ii. 267; compare Herke, Opusc. p. 199 sq. are no longer extant (see Pilate); what we now possess under this title is a later fabrication (see Ammon, i. 102 sq.). In the Greek and Roman prose writers, Jesus is only incidentally named (Taci- tuus, Annal. xv, 44, 5; Pliny, Epist. x, 97; Lampriid. 12, Alex. Svet. c. 29, 48; Porphyry, De philosoph. ex orac. in Euseb. Demonstr. Evang. iii. 7; Liban. in Socr. Hist. Exe. iii. 29; Lucas, Mors pereg. c. 11, 13). On Suidas, s. v. Inpafio, see Walter, Codex in Svto Mendaciz de Jesus in Lips. 1724). Whether by Chrysostom in Suentios (Cloud. p. 25) is to be understood Christ, is doubted by some (comp. Ernesti and Wolf, ad loc.; see Claudeius), but the unusual name Christiau might easily undergo this change (see also Philostr. Soph. ii. 11) in popular reference, as generally Eckhard, Non-Christianism, of Christo testimoniis, Quo in theo. Sacris Jeno Christi ex scirip. proton, eruta, Jena, 1768; Meinardus, e. Vertheid. u. Eropt. d. Geschicht d. Jesus u. d. Apostol. u. prieuch. u. rom. Professare. Hannov. 1805; Frommuller, in the Studien d. wirt. Gesch. in. 1. 1. On the Jesus of the book of Sirach, xii. 53, 25, see Secden, De Jesu in Jesu Spiritualis, frustra prae. Laude. 1724; also in his Medit. egez. i. 207 sq.)

3. The scientific treatment of the life of Jesus belongs to the modern period of theological criticism. Among earlier contributions of a critico-chronological character is that of Offerhaus (De vita J. C. privata et publica, in his Sprche. hist. chronol. Groningen, 1839). Greling
(Halle, 1813) first undertook the adjustment, in a lively narrative, of the recent (rationalistic) exposition that has resulted, to the actual career of Christ. An independent but, on the whole, unsatisfactory treatise is that of Philipp Jakob Hufeland, in his "Einleitung in die Künstler, in die Welt durch Janum u. die Apostel, Göttingen, 1818." Kaiser has attempted an analysis (Bibl. Theol. i, 280 sqq.). Still more severe in his method of criticism is Paulus (Das Leben Jesu als Grundlage einer reinen Gesch. d. Urschristent. Heidelberg, 1839), and bold to a point in which, he arranges the theological ideas of D. D. Strauss (Leben J. krit. bearbeitet, Tübingen, 1835, and since). The latter, as well as many other, the evangelical histories (with the exception of a few plain transactions) to a mythological composition springing out of the Old-Test. prophecies and the expectations of the Messiah in the community, and, in his criticism upon single points generally, as upon the shoulders of the preceding writers. In opposition to him, numerous men of learning and courage rose up to defend the "historical Christ," some of them insisting upon the strictly supernatural interpretation (Lange; Harl. Nachr. 1838; Krumm, Vorles. über das Leben Jesu, Hanb, 1839), while others concede or pass over single points in the history (Neander, Leben J. Chr. Hamburg, 1837). Into this controversy, which grew highly personal, a philosophic writer (Weisse, Evangel. Geschichte K. Janum und die Bearbeitung, Leipzig, 1840) became involved, and attempted, by an ingenious but decidedly presumptuous criticism, to distinguish the historical and the unhistorical element in the evangelical account. At the same time, Thiele (Zur Biographie Jesu, Leipzig, 1837) gave a careful and conclusive summary of the materials of the discussion but, having published (1840) the 4th ed. of his Leben Jesu, Leipzig, 1840) a masterly review, showing the gradual rejection of the extravagances of criticism since 1829. The substance of the life of Jesus has thus now become established in general belief as a historical fact (Bauer (Krit. des evang. Gesch. d. Synoptiker, Leipzig, 1841), after an analysis of the gospels as literary productions, calls the original narrative concerning Jesus "a pure creation of the Christian consciousness," and he pronounces the evangelical history generally to be "solved." Thenius has met him with a proof of the evangelistic, "Grundzüge der christlichen Alterthums- geschichten," in a few but striking remarks (Das Evang. ohne die Evangelien, Leipzig, 1843), and a. Ehrard (Wiss. Krift. d. evang. Gesch. Frankf. 1842) has fully refuted him in a learned but not unpunished work (see also Weisse, in the Jena Lit.-Zeit. 1843. No. 7-9, 19-30). But this heart- lessness in the way of critic has inspired the latest of Bauer—which, indeed, often degenerates into the ridiculous—appears to have had no impression upon the literary world, and may therefore be dismissed without further consideration (comp. generally Grimm, Grundbegriff d. evang. Gesch. in Beszug auf Strauss und Bauer, Jena, 1845). Lately, Von Ammon (Gesch. d. Leb. Jesu, Leipzig, 1842) undertook, in his style of combination, carefully steering between the extremes, a narrative of the life of Jesus full of striking observations. Whatever else has been done in this department (Görner, Geschichte des Urschristentums, 1839; Salvador, Leben Christ et al doctrine, Par. 1838) belongs rather to the rank of Christianity than to the data of the life of Jesus. In Catholic literature little has appeared on this subject (Kuhn, Leben Jesu wissensc. bearbeit., Mainz, 1838; of a more general character are the works of Francke, Leipzig, 1838, and 1841). On the basis of subjective views upon the treatment of the Gospel history, there are the monographs cited in Volbeding, p. 6. See literature below, and compare the art. CHRONOLOGY.

4. Chronological Data.—The year of Christ's birth (for the general condition of the age, see Knapp, De statu temp. nat. Christo, Hal. 1747; and the Church histories of Gieseler, Neander, etc.; on a special point, see Masson, Juri. temp. Christo nascent. reservatum, Rotterdam, 1700) cannot, as all investigations on this point have proved (Fabricius Bibl. antiquar. p. 187 sqq., 342 sqq.; Thiem, Krift. Comment. ii, 389 sqq.; comp. especially S. van Tiele, In anno, mensae et diei saec. Chr. Lugd. Bat. 1700, pref. G. J. Walch, Jena, 1740; B. Michaelis, Uebcr das Geburt- jahr Christi, Berlin, 1747; Steiger, Die Geburtsjahre: 28. Künstl. Künsflth, in die Welt durch Janum u. die Apostel, Göttingen, 1818). Kaiser has attempted an analysis (Bibl. Theol. i, 280 sqq.). Still more severe in his method of criticism is Paulus (Das Leben Jesu als Grundlage einer reinen Gesch. d. Urschristent. Heidelberg, 1839), and bold to a point in which, he arranges the theological ideas of D. D. Strauss (Leben J. krit. bearbeitet, Tübingen, 1835, and since). The latter, as well as many other, the evangelical histories (with the exception of a few plain transactions) to a mythological composition springing out of the Old-Test. prophecies and the expectations of the Messiah in the community, and, in his criticism upon single points generally, as upon the shoulders of the preceding writers. In opposition to him, numerous men of learning and courage rose up to defend the "historical Christ," some of them insisting upon the strictly supernatural interpretation (Lange; Harl. Nachr. 1838; Krumm, Vorles. über das Leben Jesu, Hanb, 1839), while others concede or pass over single points in the history (Neander, Leben J. Chr. Hamburg, 1837). Into this controversy, which grew highly personal, a philosophic writer (Weisse, Evangel. Geschichte der Vereinigung, K. und die Bearbeitung, Leipzig, 1840) became involved, and attempted, by an ingenious but decidedly presumptuous criticism, to distinguish the historical and the unhistorical element in the evangelical account. At the same time, Thiele (Zur Biographie Jesu, Leipzig, 1837) gave a careful and conclusive summary of the materials of the discussion but, having published (1840) the 4th ed. of his Leben Jesu, Leipzig, 1840) a masterly review, showing the gradual rejection of the extravagances of criticism since 1829. The substance of the life of Jesus has thus now become established in general belief as a historical fact (Bauer (Kritik des evang. Gesch. d. Synoptiker, Leipzig, 1841), after an analysis of the gospels as literary productions, calls the original narrative concerning Jesus "a pure creation of the Christian consciousness," and he pronounces the evangelical history generally to be "solved." Thenius has met him with a proof of the evangelistic, "Grundzüge der christlichen Alterthums- geschichten," in a few but striking remarks (Das Evang. ohne die Evangelien, Leipzig, 1843), and a. Ehrard (Wiss. Krift. d. evang. Gesch. Frankf. 1842) has fully refuted him in a learned but not unpunished work (see also Weisse, in the Jena Lit.-Zeit. 1843. No. 7-9, 19-30). But this heartlessness in the way of critic has inspired the latest of Bauer—which, indeed, often degenerates into the ridiculous—appears to have had no impression upon the literary world, and may therefore be dismissed without further consideration (comp. generally Grimm, Grundbegriffe des evang. Gesch. in besugs auf Strauss und Bauer, Jena, 1845). Lately, Von Ammon (Gesch. d. Leb. Jesu, Leipzig, 1842) undertook, in his style of combination, carefully steering between the extremes, a narrative of the life of Jesus full of striking observations. Whatever else has been done in this department (Görner, Geschichte des Urschristentums, 1839; Salvador, Leben Christ et al doctrine, Par. 1838) belongs rather to the rank of Christianity than to the data of the life of Jesus. In Catholic literature little has appeared on this subject (Kuhn, Leben Jesu wissensc. bearbeit., Mainz, 1838; of a more general character are the works of Francke, Leipzig, 1838, and 1841). On the basis of subjective views upon the treatment of the Gospel history, there are the monographs cited in Volbeding, p. 6. See literature below, and compare the art. CHRONOLOGY.

4. Chronological Data.—The year of Christ's birth (for the general condition of the age, see Knapp, De statu temp. nat. Christo, Hal. 1747; and the Church histories of Gieseler, Neander, etc.; on a special point, see Masson, Juri. temp. Christo nascent. reservatum, Rotterdam, 1700) cannot, as all investigations on this point have proved
was born in the year 41 (42) of the reign of Augustus, i.e. 751 of Rome, or B.C. 3 (Ideler, Chronolog. chron., 880). As Luke's date cannot be precise, the exact year of his birth cannot be definitely fixed ("about," say). We may presume that Christ was rather over than under thirty years of age; and this conjecture would depend upon the determination of the number of Passovers which Jesus celebrated during his ministry; but this itself is quite a difficult question (see under No. 5, below). It is now generally conceded that he could not well have passed less than three Passah under these circumstances, and at the least not more than one hour before the beginning of each of Christ's three years, and a fourth at the close of the last; thus we ascertain as the term the 5th of the Passah of the year A.D. 28, and as the probable term a quod the year A.D. 32; or, on the supposition (as above) that the joint reign of Titus and Vespasian is meant, we must take every third year (A.D. 25, 28, 31). This result would be rendered more definite and certain if we could ascertain whether in the last of these series of years (A.D. 29 or 32) the Jewish Passover fell on a Friday (Thursday evening and the ensuing day), as this was the week-day on which the death of Christ is generally held to have taken place. There have been various calculations by means of lunar tables (Linbanna, in the Akademie der Wiss. vol. vii; Wurm, in Bengal's Archiv., i, 1, 292 sq.; Anger, De temporum in Act. i.资st. 498; Heilprin, in ... Nicolaus, 1844, p. 504), to determine during which of the years of this period the Paschal day must have occurred on Friday (see Strong's Harm., and Expos. App. p. 8 sq.) but the inexactness of the Jewish calendar makes every such computation uncertain (Wurm, ut sup. p. 294 sq.). Yet it is worthy of notice that the two most recent investigations of Wurm and Anger both make the year A.D. 51 or 74 of Rome, to be such a calendar year as we require. (Wieseler, Chronol. Synops. p. 479.), on the other hand, protests against the foregoing computations, and insists that in A.D. 60 alone the Paschal day may fall on a Friday. Accordingly, the calculations, A.D. 29 and 33 are the only years of this period in which the Paschal day fell on Thursday (see Brown, Ordo Sacramentorum, p. 55), while so great discrepancy prevails between other computations (see Townsend's Chron. p. 7 sq. *150) that little reliance can be placed upon this argument (see Strong's Harm. and Expos. App. p. 8 sq.) See Passover. The opinion of some of the ancient writers (Irenaeus, ii, 22, 5, that Jesus died at 40 or 50 years of age (compare John viii, 57), is altogether improbable (see Fisians, De erro. p. 382 sq.). More Irenaeus in the 25th and 36th chapters of his Against Heresies. The most of the Church fathers (Tertull. Act. Jud., 8; Lactanc. Institutiv. iv, 10; Augustine, C. der. xvii, 84; Clem. Alex. Strom. i, 147, etc.) assign but a single year as the duration of Christ's ministry, and place his death in the conjuncture of the two Gemini (VIII Cal. April. Coss. C. Rubello Gemino et C. Rubio Gemino, i. c. 782 of Rome, A.D. 29, the 15th year of Tiberius, which Ideler (Chronology, 418 sq.) has lately (so also Brown, Ordo Sacramentorum, p. 39 sq.) attempted to reconcile with Luke iii, 1 (but see Seyfarth, Chronol. Sacra, p. 115 sq.; Eusebius, in his Chron. Armenii, p. 294, places the death of Jesus in the 15th year of Tiberius, which Jerome, in his Latin translation, calls the 18th; on the above reckoning of the fathers, see Petavius, Ani. med. etc., p. 144 sq.; Thilo, Cod. Apoc. i, 497 sq.) On the observation of the sun at the crucifixion (Matt. xxvii, 46; Mark xvi, 9; Luke xxi, 37; Luke xvi, 28, 31, 35, 36; Erculis, On the chronology of the Saviour of the life of Jesus, is generally Hottinger, Pentas dissertation, bibl.-chronol. p. 218 sq.; Voss, De anno Christi diessertat. Amt. 1648; Lupi, De nostis chronolog. anni mortis et nativ. J. C. dissertat. Rom. 1744; Horix, Observat. hist. chron. de anno Christ. Nat. August. Mogunt. 1785; compare Volbeding, p. 20; Hase, p. 52). See CHRONOLOGY.

5. The two family registers of Jesus (Matt. i and Luke iii) of which the first is descending and the latter ascending, vary considerably from each other; inasmuch as not only entirely different names of ancestors are given
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en from Joseph upwards to Zerubbabel and Salathiel (Matt. i, 15 sq.; Luke iii, 37), but also Matthew carries back Joseph's lineage to David's son Solomon (ver. 6 sq.), while Luke refers it to another son Nathan (ver. 31). Moreover, Matthew only goes back as far as Abraham (as he wrote for Jewish readers), but Luke (in agreement with the general scope of his gospel) as far as Isaac, and so the disagreement suggests engaged the attention of the Church fathers (see Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. i, 7), and later interpreters have adopted various hypotheses for the reconciliation of the two evangelists (see especially Surenhus, Βιβλος κατά γένεσιν, p. 320 sq.; Rus, Harmon. evang. i, 60 sq.; Thiess, Krit. Comment. zum Neuen Testament, Proleg. i, 101 sq.). There are properly only two general representations possible. For the history of Christ's parents, see Joseph; Mary.

(a) Matthew traces the lineage through Joseph, Luke gives the maternal descent (comp. also Neander, p. 211), so that the person called Eli in Luke iii, 36, appears to have been the father of Mary (see especially Helvius, in Crenet Exercit. philol. hist. iii, p. 382 sq.; Spanheim, Dubia evang. i, 18 sq.; Bengel, Heumann, Paulus, Kuhn, in their Commentaries; Wieseler, in the Studien u. Kritik, 1845, p. 561 sq.; on the contrary, Bleek, Deuter. 15, 101 sq.). But in the first place, it is clear that Luke would hardly have written so expressively the "son of Eli" ("τοῦ Ἱακώβ"), since we must understand all the following genitives to refer to the actual fathers and not to the fathers-in-law (the appeal to Ruth i, 11 sq., for the purpose of showing that a daughter-in-law could be a mother among the Hebrews, is unus ordine valdium for the distinction in question); although, in the second place, we need not understand the Salathiel and Zerubbabel named in one genealogy to have been both different persons from those mentioned in the other (Paulus, Comment. i, 243 sq.; Robinson, Gr. Harmony, p. 119, which is a very questionable exposition) but (see especially Hug, Einleitung, ii, 266; Methodist Quarterly Review, Oct. 1852, p. 602 sq.). Aside from the fact that Luke does not even mention the mother of Jesus (but only Matt. i, 16), and from the further fact that the Jews were not at all accustomed to record the genealogies of women (Baba Bathra, f. 110, "The father's family, not the mother's, is accounted the true lineage;" compare Wetstein, i, 281), we might make an exception in the case of the Messiah, who was to be descended from a virgin (compare also Paulus, Leben J. in, 90). A still different view (Voss, ut sup., comp., in the Theol. Quartalschr. 1836, p. 493 sq., 539 sq.) merely that, Eli, although the father of Mary, is here introduced as being the grandfather of Joseph (according to the supposition that Mary was an heiress, Numb. xxvii, 8), proceeds upon an entirely untenable interpretation (see Paulus, Comment. i, 248, 261). Notwithstanding the foregoing objection to the view under consideration, it meets, perhaps better than any other, the difficulties of the subject. See Genealogy.

(b) Some assume that the proper father of Joseph was Eli: he, as a brother of the names up to Salathiel necessitates (as the nearest relative, (half-brother?, had married Mary, the wife of the deceased childless Jacob, and according to the Levirate law (q. v.) Joseph would appear as the son of Jacob, and would, in fact, have two fathers (so Ammonius); or conventional that Jacob was the father of Joseph, and Eli his childless deceased uncle (comp. Julius Afric. in Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. i, 7; Calixtus, Clericus). This hypothesis, which still conflicts with the Levirate rule that only the deceased is called father of the posthumous son (Deut. xxv, 6), Hug (Einleitung, ii, 380 sq.), has been so modified as to place the Levirate marriage as far back as Salathiel, by which the mention of Salathiel and Zerubbabel in both lists would be explained; and Hug also introduces such a marriage between the parents of Joseph, and still another among more distant relatives. This is ingenious, but too complicated (see generally Paulus, ut sup. p. 209). If a de

recognition of Jesus could have been laid down from David there remains no reason why, when the external extraction of the Messiah straight from David was so important, the very evangelist who wrote immediately for Jewish readers should have traced the indirect lineage. But if so many as three Levirate marriages had occurred together (as Hug thinks), we should suppose that none of the fathers-in-law were involved, and even in the case, would have given his readers some hint, or at least not have written (ver. 10) "begat" (γεννήσαι) in a manner quite calculated to mislead. Moreover, this hypothesis of Hug rests upon an interpretation of 1 Chron. iii, 18 sq., which that scholar himself could only have chosen (comp. his comment on this verse, § 4). There are properly only two general representations possible. For the history of Christ's parents, see Joseph; Mary.

(c) If both the foregoing explanations be rejected, there remains no other course than to renounce the attempt to reconcile the two family lines of Jesus, and frankly acknowledge a discrepancy between the evangelists, as some have done (Stroth, in Eichhorn's Repert. lx, 181 sq.; Ammon, Bibl. theol. ii, 256; Thiess, Krit. Comment. ii, 271 sq.; Fritzschke, ad Matt. p. 35; Strauss, i, 105 sq.; De Wette, B. Crustius, Alford, on Luke iii). In the decayed family of Joseph it might not have been possible, especially after so much misfortune as befell them, any father could have been desisted from, and every arrangement for the construction of a family register back to David. Were the account of Julius Africanus (in Eusebius, i, 7; compare Schöttgen, Itror, Heb. p. 885), that king Herod had caused the family records of the Jews to be burned, correct, the want of such information can only be explained by the conclusion that the genealogy of Joseph included in the genealogy of Jesus (as Wieseler, in the Stud. u. Kritik, 1845, p. 369). In that case, after the need of such registers had arisen, persons would naturally have set themselves to compiling them from traditional recollections, and the variations of these may readily have resulted in a double lineage. But even this supposition is by no means inconsistent with the hypothesis that Jesus was descended from David, which hypothesis would present the descent of Joseph and not of Mary, since it was unusual to exhibit the maternal lineage, and the Jews would not have regarded such an extraction from David as the genuine one. There are, at all events, two positions possible: either the supernatural generati on of Jesus by the Holy Spirit was admitted, or Jesus was considered a son of Joseph (Luke iii, 33). In the latter case a family record of Joseph entirely sufficed for the application of the O.T. oracles to Jesus; in the former case it has been conceived that such a register would be necessary. Thus, also Schlieren, in the Genealogia Jesus from David (Nom. iii, 8) would have thrown his divine origin into the background. This has been alleged as the reason why John gives no genealogy at all, and generally says nothing of the extraction of Jesus from the family of David (see Von Ammon. Leh. Juxta, i, 173 sq.). The force of these arguments, however, is greatly lessened by the consideration that the early Christians, in meeting the Jews, would be very anxious, if possible, to prove Christ's positive descent from David through both his reputed and his real parent; the more so, as the former was supposed to be only nominally such, but the latter the actual lineage to be made out on the mother's side. (See generally Baumgarten, De genealogia Chr. Hal. 1749; Dürs, Genealogia Jesu, Gott. 1778; Büsching's Harmon. d. Evang. p. 166 sq., 204 sq.) See Genealogy of Christ.

Dionysius also assumes the proper father of Joseph to be Eli, as a brother of the names up to Salathiel necessitates (as the nearest relative, (half-brother?), had married Mary, the wife of the deceased childless Jacob, and according to the Levirate law (q. v.) Joseph would appear as the son of Jacob, and would, in fact, have two fathers (so Ammonius); or conventional that Jacob was the father of Joseph, and Eli his childless deceased uncle (comp. Julius Afric. in Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. i, 7; Calixtus, Clericus). This hypothesis, which still conflicts with the Levirate rule that only the deceased is called father of the posthumous son (Deut. xxv, 6), Hug (Einleitung, ii, 380 sq.), has been so modified as to place the Levirate marriage as far back as Salathiel, by which the mention of Salathiel and Zerubbabel in both lists would be explained; and Hug also introduces such a marriage between the parents of Joseph, and still another among more distant relatives. This is ingenious, but too complicated (see generally Paulus, ut sup. p. 209). If a de
in the Christian tradition, and so surpasses the range of the profane concerns, that we can hardly reject the idea that it must have operated to enhance the estimate of Christ's dignity.

It has been suggested as possible (Paulus, Leben Jesu, 1, 97 sq.) that the hope had already formed itself in the soul of Mary that she would become the mother of the Messiah (which, however, is contradicted by her evident surprise at the announcement, Luke i, 29, 34), and that this had drawn nourishment from a vision in a dream, as the angelic announcement (Luke i, 26 sq.) has been (but with the greatest violence) interpreted (see, however, Van Oosterzee, De Jesu et Virginis nato, Utr. 1840). See CONCEPTION.

Bethlehem, too (Wagner, De loco nat. J. Chr. Colom. Brandeb. 1673), as the place of Christ's birth, has been deemed to belong to the mythical dress of the narrative (comp. Mic. v, 1; see Thiers, Kir. Comment. ii, 414), and it has therefore been inferred that Jesus was not only begotten in Nazareth, but also born there (Kaiser, Bibl. Theol. i, 290)—which, nevertheless, no one dares to maintain. According to the following documents,

"John, who stands in so near a relation to Jesus, and must have known the family affairs, relates nothing at all of this wonderful birth, although it was very apposite to his design." But this evangelist shows the high dignity of Jesus only from his discourse, the other facts from public evidences and a few astonishing miracles; moreover, his prologue (i, 1-18) declares dogmatically pretty much the same thing as the synoptic gospels do historically in this respect. (Compare also the departures of Mary, John ii, 8 sq.; see Neander, p. 16 sq.)

"Neither Jesus nor an apostle ever appears in any discourse to this circumstance. Paul always says simply that Jesus was born 'of the seed of David' (Rom. i, 3; 2 Tim. ii, 8; once (Gal. iv, 4), more definitely, 'of a woman' (i.e. γυναῖκα, not παρθένον)."

It must be admitted, however, that an appeal to a fact which only one individual could positively know, speaks experience would be very ineffective; and an apostle would be very likely to subject himself to the charge of irrelevancy if he resorted to such an appeal (comp. Nietzsche, Pred. ad usit. placit., N. T. scriptorum rom. "Illustrum de primitivis vitis J. C. Halle, 1790"). But this would lend latitude to improper enmities, and make the word γέννησις (Gal. iv, 5) as that of the other theologians upon μητέρα (Isa. vii, 14).

(c) "Mary calls Joseph, without qualification, the father of Jesus (Luke ii, 48), and also among the Jews was generally called Joseph's son (Matt. xiii, 55; Mark vi, 3; Luke iii, 28; iv, 19; John i, 46; vi, 42)." This last argument is wholly destitute of force; but Mary might naturally, in common parlance, call Joseph Jesus' father, just as, in modern phrase, a foster-father is generally styled father when definiteness of expression is not requisite. (d) "The brothers of Jesus did not believe in him as the Messiah (John vii, 5), which would be inexplicable if the Deity had not been united with the Messiah from his very birth." Yet these brothers had not themselves personally known the fact; and it is, moreover, not uncommon that one son in a family who is a general favorite excites the ill-will of the others to such a degree that they even deny his evident superiority, or that brothers fail to appreciate and esteem a mentally distinguished brother.

(e) "History shows in a multitude of examples that the birth of illustrious men has been embellished with fables (Wetstein, N. T. i, p. 236); especially is the notion of a birth without connection with a man (μητέρα, γεννησθαι, etc.) (Gregorovius, Gesch. der Alph. Tibet, Rom. 1762, p. 55 sqq., 369 sqq.), and among the Indians and Chinese it is even applied to the foundlings of religion (Paul a. Bartholom. System. Brahman. p. 158; Du Halde, Rechbr. d. Chines. Reicht. iii, 26)."

In case it is meant by this that a wonderful generation of a new principle of the Jewish monotheism, it could not be made probable (Weisse, Leben Jesu, i, 176 sq.) that this account of the birth of Jesus is a heathen production (see, on the contrary, Neander, p. 12 sqq.). On the other hand, however, this statement stands so isolated...
JESUS CHRIST 880

JESUS CHRIST

56), partly that it is not certain that Mary, after her first conjunction by the Holy Spirit, ever bore the other children of her husband by her wife (see Origen, in Matt. iii, 468, ed. de la Rue; comp. Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. ii, 1). The latter argument is of no force (see Schaaff, p. 29); on the formers, see below. But the term "brethren" (ἀδελφοί), since it does of itself indicate blood relatives, cannot be used where there is not immediate connection in blood with the mother. And if it denotes proper brothers, as also Bloom and Wieseler suppose, the question still remains whether these had both parents the same with Jesus (i.e. uere his full sisters), or were the sons of Joseph by a former marriage (half-brothers of Jesus by Theophil, or a first cousin indicated by the opinion [see Josephus], which is based upon an old (Ebo nician) tradition (see Fabricius, Pseudopigraph. i, 291; Thilo, Cod. Apocr. i, 109, 208, 362 sq.), is held as probable by Grotius (ad loc. i, 1), Vorstius (De Heb. Nor. Text. ed. Fischer, p. 71 sq.), Paulinus (Comment, i, 618), Berchtold (Eselet, v, 656 sq.), and others; the former by Herder (Briefe zweier Brüder J. p. 7 sq.), Pott (Proleg. in Kp. Jac. p. 90), Ammon (Bibl. Theol. ii, 259), Eichhorn (Einl. ins N. T. iii, 570 sq.), Kuinol (ad Matt xii, 46), Clement (ut sup.), Bengel (in his N. Acharieii, 9 sq.), Steir (An deute, i, 404 sq.), Friedlein (ad Matt 481), Neander (Leon. Jud. p. 39 sq.), Wieseler and Schaaff (ut sup.), and others. An intimation that favors this last view is contained in the expression "first-born" (Matt. i, 25; Luke ii, 7), which is further corroborated by the statement of abstinance from matrimonial intercourse until the birth of this child (Matt. xxi, 16; Luke 2, ed. ad loc.), which seems to imply that the brothers in question were later sons of Joseph and Mary. The circumstance that the sister of Jesus's mother had two sons similarly named—James and Joseph (or, as we understand Todaic Ia saho u goke v. 4) to mean "saw in a dream (son of Judas)"—is not conclusive against this view, since in two nearly-related families it is not even now unusual to find children of the same name, especially if, as in the present case, these names were in common use. Eichhorn's explanation (ut sup. p. 571) is based upon a long since exploded hypothesis, and requires no refutation. John xix, 26, contains no valid counter-argument: the brothers of Jesus may have been convinced by his resurrection (Matt. xxviii, 10), and, even had they been so at his death, yet perhaps the older and more spiritually-kindred John may have seemed to Jesus more suitable to carry out his last wishes than even his natural brothers (see Pott, ut sup. p. 76 sq.; Clement, ut sup. p. 360 sq.). At all events, the brothers of Jesus are not only expressed as having become at length believers in him, but they even appear somewhat later among the publishers of the Gospel (Acts i, 14; 1 Cor. iv, 5). See Jeroschinos. (d) Sisters of Jesus are mentioned in Matt. xxvii, 56; Mark vi, 3 (in Mark iii, 22, the words εξαι αδελφαί are of very doubtful authenticity). Their names are not given. That we are to understand their sisters is plain from the foregoing remarks respecting his brothers. Finally, an ecclesiastical tradition makes Salome, the wife of Zebedee, and mother of the apostles James and John (Mark xv, 40; xvi, 1, etc.), to have been a relative of Jesus. (See Hase, p. 58.) See SALLOME.

8. Jesus was educated at Nazareth (Hase, p. 57; Weiss, De J. C. educatione, Helmst. 1688; Lange, De prophetia, Christi adoece. & mort., 1699), but attended no (Rabbincal) schools (John vii, 15). He appears, according to the custom of the times, to have learned the trade of his adopted father (Justin Matt. c. Tryph. 88, p. 816, ed. Col.; comp. Theodor. Hist. Eccl. iii, 23; Sozomen, vii, 2, etc.), but this he did not continue to practice at the same time with his teaching, as also with the Rabbins (comp. Neander, p. 54). By this means he may in part have acquired his subsistence (comp. Mark vi, 3; but Origen, Contra Celsum, 6, p. 299, denies this statement, and Tischendorf omits πράκτορος). Besides, his followers supplied him with liberal presents, and, on

his journeys, the Oriental usages of hospitality (John v, 42 sq.), and served him in good stead (see Rau, L'homme, ditum vivus accoperit, Erlang, 1794). See Hospitality. A number of grateful women also accompanied him for a considerable time, who cared for his maintenance (Luke viii, 2; Mark xvi, 41). He had a common travelling-purse with the apostles (John xii, 6; xiii, 29, 31; Luke iv, 19, 20; Acts ii, 45), and his female cousins were frequently taken care of and provided (Luke ix, 18; Matt. xiv, 17 sq., etc.). We certainly cannot regard Jesus as properly poor in the sense of indigent (see Walch, Miscell. Sacr. p. 866 sq., for this appears (Henke's Mss. ii, 610 sq.) neither from Matt. viii, 20 (see Lune, De Christi divinitate et prosperitate, of the Targum: *iis qui... verumque infirminum Dei*, iv, 160 sq.), and John xii, 23, rather shows the contrary (comp. Bar-Hebræus, Chron. p. 251); yet his parents were by no means in opulent circumstances (see Luke xi, 24; comp. Lev. xii, 18), and he is hence possessed (Matt. vii, 20) at least of real estate whatsoever (see generally Rau, De causis cur J. C. prosperitat. se subjecertis principibus, Erlang, 1787; Siebenhaar, in the Sächs. ges. Stud. ii, 168 sq.). See HUMILITAS. During his public career of teaching, Jesus (when not travelling) staid chiefly and of choice at Capernaum (Matt. iv, 13), and to a limited extent at Nazareth (see Kiesling, De J. Nazar., ingratia patriae erula, Lips. 1741). In exterior he constantly observed the customs of his people (see A. Georgius, Christ. decoro genitivus se accommod. Helmst. 1794; Guido, De Christo et disciplis ejus decori sanc. in the Not. mat. Gent. lips. iii, 563 sq.), and among other things, wishing to attract attention by singularity or austerity, he took part in the pleasures of social life (John ii, 1 sq.; Luke vii, 31 sq.; Matt. xi, 16 sq.; compare iv, 14 sq.). Nevertheless, he never married (compare Clem. Alex. Strom. iii, 191 sq.; see Schleiermacher, De Christi sacris, ed. 1829), for the suppression of Schultes (Neutest. theolog. Nachr. 1826, i 20 sq.; 1826, i 102 sq.) that Jesus was married according to Jewish usage, with the addition that he his wife (and, perhaps, several children by her) had died before his entrance upon public life, is a pure hypothesis that at least derived its countenance from the silence in the N. T. as to any such occurrences; and the stupendous design already in the mind of the youthful Jesus afforded no motive for marriage, and, indeed, did not admit (compare Matt. xix, 12) such a confinement to a narrower circle (see Weiss, Leben Jesu, i, 247 sq.); but this is only seen on p. 140. An attempt to be seen in Volbeding, p. 17, 18; Hase, p. 59. See NAZARETH.

9. The length of Jesus's public ministry (beginning about the 30th year of his age, Luke iii, 24; see Rock, in the Brem. u. Ver. Biblioth. iii, 815 sq.), as well as the chronological sequence of the single events related in the Gospels, is very variously estimated. (See Hase, p. 17.) The first three evangelists give, as the sense of their transactions (after his temptation and the imprisonment of the Baptist, Matt. iv, 1-13), almost exclusively Gallus (De Gallioe opportuno Serratorum resurr. theorum, Gött. 1775), inasmuch as Jesus had his residence then in the city Capernaum, and he was present in the winter months (Matt. iv, 13; viii, 4-24; Mark i, 21; ii, 1, etc.). For the most part, we find him in the romantic and thickly settled neighborhood of the Sea of Tiberias, or upon its surface (Matt. viii, 23 sq; xiii, 1 sq.; xiv, 19; Luke viii, 22), also in Jerusalem and the other districts of Judæa (Matt. viii, 28; Luke viii, 26; Mark vii, 31), and he went as far as within the Phoenician boundaries (Matt. xv, 21; Mark vii, 24 sq.). But in the synoptic gospels he only appears once to have visited Jerusalem, at the time of the last Passover (Matt. xxvi, 2; Luke xii, 4). Until his death, the extent of his teaching might be limited to a single year (Ezech, iii, 24), and many (appealing to Luke iv, 19; comp. ls. i, 1 sq.; see Origen, Hom. 32; comp. Tertull. Ad. Jud. c. 8; but see Körner, p. 4) already in the ancient church (Clem. Alex. Strom. i, p. 147; Origen, Præcip. iv, 5) only
allow this space to his public mission (compare Mann,
Three Years of the Birth and Death of Christ, p. 161;
Priestly, Harmony of the Evangelists, London, 1744, ii, 4;
Brown, Ordo Secolorum, p. 634 sqq.; although, indepen-
dently of all the others, Luke vi, 1 (second-first Sab-
bath) affords indication of a second Passover which Je-
sus is said to have celebrated in Galilee.)

On the other hand, John's Gospel shows (comp. Joca-
v. Krz., 1836, iv, 845 sqq.) that Jesus was not only oft-
ener, but generally also in Judea (whence he once travelled
through Samaria to Galilee, John iv, 4; compare his re-
ported hours, xix, 11) such generalizing of his journeys
(but this difference agrees with the respective designs of
the several gospels; see Neander, p. 386 sqq.), and in-
forms us of his Jewish festivals which Jesus celebrated at
Jerusalem. The first, occurring soon after the bap-
tism of Jesus (John ii, 12), is a Passover; the second
(John v, 1, L) is called indefinitely "a feast of the Jews"
(Elop 0 7 loiv 'louiaueta); the third was the Festival of
Tabernacles (John vii, 2); the fourth the Feast of De-
coration (John x, 22); and, lastly, the fifth (John xii,
xxii) again a Passover: mention is also made (John vii,
41; xvi, 1) of Jesus being a guest in Galilee. Hence it
would seem that Jesus was in Galilee at least in the
three years (Origen, Contra Celsum, ii, 67) as a public
teacher; and if by the "feast of John," vi, 1 we are also to
understand a Passover (Paulus, Comm. i, 901 sq.; Stut-
kind, in Bengel's Archiv. J.1, 182 sqq.; B. Crusius, ad loc.;
See also Alford, in pand. sac. p. 114; Robinson, Harmony,
p. 190), which, however, is not certain (Levison, p. 103;
Augustin, De temp. in Act. Apost. ratione, x, 1 sqq.; Jacob;
us, in sup. p. 864 sqq.). We must assign a period of two and
a half years (Eusebius, i, 10, 3), as lately Seeleharf has
done (Summary of recent Discoveries in Chronology, N. Y.,
1857, p. 180), although on the most singular grounds
(comp. See Alford, in pand. sac. p. 115; Robinson, Harmony,
p. 190); the evangelists hardly afford more than two years and a few
months (see Augustin, in sup. p. 28; Hase, p. 17 sqq.) to
the public labors of Jesus (see generally Larrabe, De an-
nae missae Christ. Afr., Aldworth, 1700; Kernt, Quod Paschata
Christi post Pascham celebraretur, Leiden, 1708; Ficht, De
ceremo Paschatum Christi, Rostock, 1789; Lahode, De
die et anno ult. Pasch. Chr. Hal. 1749; Marsh's remarks
in Michaelis's Introit. ii, 46 sqq.). Again, as the apostles
were not uninteruptedly in company with Jesus, the
time of their proper association with him might be still
further reduced so much, although we can not without
Hœnlein, De temporis, qu. J. C. cum Apost. narratur, derelit,
duratione, ErL 1796) assume it to have been barely some
nine months. Under these three (or four) Paschal fes-
tival writers have repeatedly endeavored, for historical
and particularly apologetic purposes, to arrange all the
single occurrences which the first evangelists mention
without chronological sequence, and so to obtain a com-
plete chronological view of Jesus's entire journeys and
teaching. Yet, notwithstanding so great a degree of
ingenious has been expended upon this subject, none
of the Gospel Harmonies hitherto constructed can be
regarded as more than a series of historical conjectures,
since the narrative of the first three evangelists presents
but little that can guide to a measurably certain con-
clusion in such an arrangement, and John himself does
not appear to relate the incidents in strictly chronological
order according to these Passovers (see generally Everst, Emld. i., 2, 692 sqq.). The most im-
portant of these attempts are, Lightfoot, Chronicle of the O.
and N. T. Lond. 1653; Doddridge, Exposition of the N. T.
London, 1739; Rus, Harmonia Evangelistarum, Jen. 1727;
MacKnight, Harmony of the Four Gospels, London, 1756;
Larive feceo nanteos, etc., Rintschliefen, 1772; Hurst, Com-
mmentary on the New Testament, London, 1784; Dubois,
Chronology of the Gospels, Dublin, 1776; Robinson, Com-
ment, i, 446 sqq.; ii, 1 sqq.; 384 sqq.; iii, 82 sqq.;
Kaiser, C. de, die synopt. Zusammenstell. der 4 Evang. Nu-
rembs. 128; Clauen, Quod evangel. tabulce synopt. sec. ru-
tcum, Leipzig. Copenhagen, 1829; Wieseler, Chronology.

IV. — K K K
few exceptions, John alone assigns longer speeches of a dogmatic character to Jesus; nor is it any matter of surprise that the Wisdom which delivered itself to the populace in maxims and similes should permit itself to be understood, in the circle of the priests and those erudi
te in the law, connectedly and mystically on topics of the higher sphere of thought. Even though (in view of course) we
can not expect the ipsisimna verba. In a formal treat
tment, moreover, his representations, especially those ad
tressed to the people, could not be free from accommodation
(P. van Hemert, Urb. Acomm. in N. T. Dordtum
and Leipzig, 1757); but whether he made use of the ma
terially (negative) or the spiritual (positive) accommodation
is not a historical, but a dogmatic question (compare, there
on Brethneider, Handbuch d. Dogma, i. 420 sq.; Wegschnei
der, Institut, p. 119 sq.; De Wette, Sittenlehre, iii. 181 sq.;
Neander, p. 216 sq.). See ACCOMMODATION.
Like the O-T-Prophets, he sometimes also employed symboli
cal acts (John xiii, 1 sq., 20, 22; comp. Luke ix, 47 sq.).
A dignified expression, a keen but affectionate look, a
gestication reflecting the inward inspiration (Hege
meister, Christus gestus pro concione uxorae, Serveost,
1774), may have contributed not a little to the force of his
higher and spiritual word, to which the Pharisees and
esay and lawyers, the eloquent of eloquence (compare John vii, 46; xviii, 6; Matt. vii, 28 sq.). The tuition
which Jesus imparted to the apostles (comp. Greiling, p.
215 sq.), was apparently private (Matt. xiii, 11 sq.; see Col
t, Bibl. Theol. ii, 14). See APOSTLE. Finally, Jesus' com
edy as a Socratic teacher (Chaldéen), Clédat, Der Mark iii, 17;
v, 41; v, 34; Matt. xxvii, 47; see Malala, Chronograp
hie, p. 13, like the Palestinian Jews generally [see LANC
UAGE], not Greek (Diodati, De Christo Graeco bozente, Neap.
1767, translated in the Am. Bibl. Repos, Jan. 1844,
p. 125 sq.; comp. on the contrary, Ernesti, Neuere theol.
Bibl., i. 209 sq.), though he might be understood in the
latter language, or even Latin (Wermelsdorf, De Christo
date bozente, Viteb.; see generally Reiske, De lingua
vera, J. C. Jen. 1769; Bh. de Rossi, Dell i lingua propria
di Christo, Parn. 1778; Ziebich, De lingua Judaeos; comp.
Christi et. Apost. Vitebsi, 1781; Wiseman, in his Hor
susc. Rom. 1828). No warranty of his are extant (the
spuriousness of the so-called letter to the king of Edessa,
given by Eusebius, i, 13, is evident; comp. also Röhr's
Krit. Prediger-biblioth., i, 161 sq. [see ADAGI]): the al
leged written productions of Jesus may be seen in Fa
briani, De iis scriptis Christi div. 1, 1803 sq.; nor was
necessary, since he had provided for the immediate dissemination of
his doctrines through the apostles, and he wished
even to turn away attention from the literature of the
ag to the spirit and life of a thoroughly pious (compare Hug
felt), i, 94 sq.; Sartorio, Cursus scriptii nihil res
eriquem, Leipzig, 1815; Witting, Warum J. nuchts Schrifft,
historiuren, Basch. 1822; Giesseck, Warum hat J. C.
über sich u. s. Relig. nichts Schrifft, historiuren, Luneb.
1823; B. Crusius, Bibl. Theol., p. 22 sq.; Neander, p. 150;
comp. Hase, p. 11). Jesus has been improperly entitled a
Rabbi, or high rank of religious teacher (De synagogis,
in the sense of the Jewish schools, as having been thus
styled not only by the populace (Mark x, 51; John xx,
10), or his disciples (John i, 39, 50; iv, 31; ix, 2; x, 8; 
Matt. xxvii, 5, etc.), but also by Nicodemus (John iii, 2),
and even his enemies (v, 25) themselves (Vitringa, Syn
notur, p. 28; Paulus, Leben Jesu, i, 122 sq.; see, on the
contrary, E. C. Schmid, De promotorum aedae, Christi eque
quisque discipulis perpetuum tributa, Lips. 1740). In the
time of Jesus persons had no occasion to aspire to the formal
ity of learned honors, as in later ages (Neander, p. 50),
and Jesus had little sympathy with such an ostentatious
way of life. Compare also Lame: Warum J. C. über sich
mehr in Sevoldeing, p. 25.) See PROPHET.
11. The Jews expected miracles of the Messiah (John vii, 31; 4 Esdr. xiii, 50; comp. Matt. viii, 17; John xx, 30 sq.; see Bertholdt, Christologia Juxtor, p. 188 sq.),
such as Jesus performed (šapata, sphen, šāvītā). These all had a moral tendency, and aimed at beneficial
results (on Matt. viii, 28 sq.; 2 Cor. ad loc.; Brun
schneider, Handbuch d. Dogma, i. 307 sq.; Hase, Leben Jesu,
p. 194; on Matt. xxi, 18 sq., see Fleck, Verkünd. d. Chris
tenth, p. 138 sq.), in which respects they are in strik
ting contrast with the silly thaumaturgy of the apeory
philophs (see Tholuck, Gnadenstübch. d. evang. theol.
4th ed., 1853, pp. 280, 281). But the Jewish contention
concerning the cure (Mark vi, 5) of such maladies as had baf
all spiritual remedies (insanity, epilepsy, palsy, lepro
blindness, etc.). He asked no reward (comp. Matt. x, 5), and performed no miracles to gratify curiosity (Matt.
vi, 1 sq.; Mark vii, 11 sq.), or to excite the assenti
(John xix, 30, 36; Mark i, 44; vii, 36; viii, 26; Luke v, 14,
v, 36; Pil'tt, in der Hess. Hebegebr, 1850, p. 809 sq. takes
an erroneous view of Mark v, 19, for in verse 20 Jesus
bilds the man relate his cure to his relatives only, and
he avoids this popular outbursts of joy, which would
have swelled loudly at his particularly successful achieve
ments (John v, 13), only suffering these miracles to be
acknowledged to the honor of God (Luke viii, 39 sq.;
v, 16 sq.). In effecting cures he sometimes made use of
(mystical) means (Matt. vi, 5, see below). See COMP.
Spinossa, Tract. theol. pol. c. 6, p. 244, ed. Paul.
Med.-heur. Untersuch. p. 353 sq.; Paulus, Leben Jesu,
i, 223), but in general he employed simply a word (Matt.
vi, 1 sq.; John v, 8, etc.), even at a distance (Matt.
vi, 5 sq.; Luke vii, 6 sq.; John iv, 56), or merely a
touch (Mark vi, 5). He imparted no more (John iv, 46) to the
member (blind eyes, Matt. ix, 29; xx, 34; see Seier,
Christ. an in operibus mirabilibus. arcanum suis usus redim
Erlang. 1755; also Jesus an miraculum suis ipsius victus
rauberib, ib. 1799); on the other hand, likewise, a cure
was experienced when the infirm touched his garment
(Matt. xx, 34 sq.; John x, 49 sq.), and the apostles
on the presumption of a firm faith (Matt. ix, 28; compare
John v, 6), so that when this failed the miraculous
power was not exercised (Matt. xiii, 58; Mark xi, 6).
On this very account some moderns have asserted (Guts
Amoros's Theol. Jour., i, 177 sq.]; Eenensmer. Mag
net, p. 473 sq.; Kieser, Syst. des Tellermars, ii, 302 sq.;
Meyer, Naturalienköl. o. die Erzkrän. d. Antii. Mag
net, mit Hins. auf Theol. Hambl. 1889; comp. Weisse,
434 sq.) that these cures were principally effected by
Jesus through the agency of animal magnetism (comp.
T. medico primario, Erlang. 1743; Schultze, in der
Neuetl. Theol. Nachr. 1829, p. 360 sq.). See HEALING.
That the Jewish Rabbis and the Essenes performed, or
perhaps only pretended to perform, similar cures, at least
upon dyspepsia, appear from Matt. xii, 27; Luke
i, 19; Mark ix, 38 sq.; comp. Josephus, Wurr, ii, 6; Aw.
vii, 2, 5). The sentiments of Jesus himself as to the
value and tendency of his miracles are unearable: he
disapproved that eagerness for wonders displayed by his
contemporaries (Matt. xvi, i; John ii, 18) which sprung
from sensuous curiosity or from pure malvolence: Matt.
xxii, 39; xvi, 4; Mark viii, 11 sq., or else had a thank
less regard merely to their own advantage (John iv, 19;
vi, 24), which while he regarded them as a national method for
attaining his purpose of awakening and calling forth faith
(John vi, 20 sq.; John xxii, 12 sq.; and hence often lamented their ineffectualness (Matt.
vi, 20 sq.; Luke x, 13; see especially Nitsch, Querum
Christus miraculis trieburit, Viteb. 1768; Schott, Quer
mer, i, 111 sq.; Lemenhert, De numalials Christ. efficiat quo
quid quamquam, trieburitis miraculis competentem, Reuss
Lucas, p. 48; see Oken's geographical and physical
literature may be seen in Voelbing, p. 25.) See PROPHE
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That Jesus passed through a merely apparent death has been supposed by many (see especially Bahir, 3:166, on Deut. 32:35; Goecke, Jesus i, 1, 14 sq.; and Leben Jesu, i, ii, 281 sq.; on the contrary, see Richter, De morte Sacerdotum in crucis, Gott. 1757, also in his Dia. 4 med. i, p. 1 sq.; Gruner, De Jes. C. morte vera, non simulata, Jena, 1805; Schmidtmann, Medic-philo. Ber. 16, dass J. noch a. exsuscit. nicht von einer todtl. person. Hugh von Tho. von Th. von Hesycharch, De sanatione mort. sancti, De resurrectione mort. sancti, De resurrectione mort. sancti. The claim of the side of Jesus by the lance of a Roman soldier (John xix, 34; his name is traditionally given as Longinus, see Thilo, Apocr. p. 868) has been regarded as the chief circumstance upon which everything here depends (Triller, De mirando lateris cordisque Christi raidur, in De resuscitatione, Jena, 1778; Eichhorn, Scripta med.-bild., p. 82 sq.; Bartholini, De lateri Christi apertio, Lugd. Bat. 1648), inasmuch as before this puncture the above cited physicians assume but a torso and acon, which might seem the more probable because crucifixion could hardly have caused death in so short a time (Mark xv, 44). See Crucifix. But the account of the wound in the side is not such as to allow the question to be by that means fully and absolutely determined (see Briefe über Rationalismus, p. 256 sq.), since the evangelist does not state which side (ακρον) was pierced, nor have clipeus and clipeato be confused, nor has it been a very precarious argument to presume the left side (although the position of the soldier, holding the spear in his right hand and thrusting it opposite him, would strongly countenance this supposition), and equally so to assume a very deep incision, penetrating the pericardium and heart, thus changing a swoon into actual death; nevertheless, comp. John xx, 25, 26, in favor of this last particular. The purpose of the stab—to ascertain whether the crucified person was still alive—also demanded a forcible thrust, and the issue of blood and water vouched for by the evangelist (John xix, 33 sqq., 40 sqq.) would certainly point to real death as immediately resulting. By this we must understand the clotted blood (εκρον) in connection with the watery portion (σερσον), which both flow together from punctures of the larger blood-vessels (κρωνα) of body, and the ektos, as the artēres of the breast, as supposed by Hase [Lab. Jesu, 2 ed. p. 198], no blood would issue, for these are usually empty in a corpse, and the piercing of the side would therefore not cause, but only indicate death. See Blood and Water. In fine, the express assertion of the evangelist, that Jesus breathed his last (Ezech. [Mark xv, 37; Luke xxiii, 46], a term exactly equivalent to the Latin expiravit, he expired, and so doubtless to be understood in its common acceptance of death), admits no other hypothesis than that of actual and complete dissolution. See Agony.

The fact of the return of Jesus alive from the grave (comp. Ammon, De vera J. resuscit., Erlang. 1808; Griesbach, De fonth. unde Evangel. suas de resurrectione Domini narrationes haurient, Jena, 1785; Friedrich, in Eichhorn's Biblioth. vii, 294 sq.; Döderl. De J. in ex. redvit. Utr. 1841) is not invalidated by Strauss's ingenious hypotheses (ii, 645; see Hase, p. 212; Theile, p. 105 sq.; comp. Kühn, Wie gog Ch. durch des Grabs Thür, Strals. 1888); but if Jesus had been merely dead in appearance, so delicate a constitution, already exhausted by sufferings before crucifixion, certainly would not have revived with so much speed—that it is dead from the artēres (Neander, p. 708): in the cold rock-vaunt, in an atmosphere loaded with the odor of aromatics, bound hand and foot with grave-clothes, in utter prostration, he would, in the ordinary course of things, have rather been killed than resuscitated. His return to life must therefore be regarded as a true miracle, as a true resurrection. On the grave of Jesus, see Golgotha.

After he had risen (he lay some thirty-six hours in the grave; not three full days, as asserted by Seyffarth, Summary of Chronol. Discov. N. Y. 1857, p. 188), he first showed himself to Mary Magdalene (Matt. xxviii. 9;
another figure of Jesus is also mentioned (Nicophorus, w. supr.; this credulous historian names the evangelist Luke as the painter successfully of Jesus, Mary, sat several apostles), and a certain Publius Lentulus, a Roman officer (according to one M.S. proconculus) is reported to have composed a description of Christ's personal appearance; but yet another—by the crucified teacher (Neander, p.715 sq.), and even handled, although with some reserve (Luke xxiv, 57; John xxi, 12).

He did not appear in public; had he done so, his enemies would have found opportunity to remove him a second time out of the way, or to represent him to the people as a blasphemer; his resurrection could have its true significance to his believers only (see generally John, Nachträge, p. 1 sq.). After a stay of 40 days, he was visibly carried up into the sky before the eyes of his disciples (Luke xxiv, 51; Acts i, 9. Mark xvi, 19, is of doubtful authenticity). Of this, three evangelical witnesses (Matthew, Mark, and John) relate nothing (for very improbable reasons of this, see Plat. Magy., viii, 55 sq.), although the last implies it in the words of Jesus, "I ascend to my Father," and closes his Gospel with the last interview of Jesus in Galilee, at the Sea of Tiberias. See also compare Matt. xxviii, 16, 17. The apostles, in the doctrinal expositions, occasionally allude to this ascension (ἀνάβασις: cf. Acts i, 9; Tim. iii, 16; Rev. xvi, 5), and often speak (Acts ii, 33; v, 31; vii, 55, 56; Rom. viii, 34; Eph. i, 20; Col. i, 13) of Christ as seated at the right hand of God (see Griesbach, Sylog. tomus tertius, 3 sq.; Harnack, Hellenismus, p. 351 sqq.)—"in splendore," or "in spectaculum." But see also John, 17:3; also in his Opuscul. ii, 471 sq.; B. Crusiuss, Bibl. Theol. p. 400. Over the final disposal of the body of Christ after its ascension from the earth, an impenetrable veil must ever rest. The account of the ascension (see Stud. Theol. 1841, iii, 557 sq.) is still treated by many of the critical theologians (compare Ammon, in his Auslegung J. C. in col. hist. Bibl. Gotting., 1800, also in his Nov. opusc. theol.; Horst, in Horn's Gotting. Museum J. Theol. i, ii, 3 sq.; Br. über Rationell., p. 238 sq.; Strauss, ii, 672 sq.; Hase, p. 220) as one of the myths (moulded on the well-known G-T. examples, Gen. v, 24; 2 Kings ii, 11, and serving as a basis of the expectation was its visible return from heaven, Acts i, 11; for, that the Jew of this day believed in an ascension of the Messiah to heaven [comp. John vi, 62], appears from the book Zohar [Schoetgen, Hora Hebr. ii, 596]: the comparisons with Solomon, Hiram, etc., are not in place. Hase, in his Untersuch. über die Darstellung der G. in virum et col. redeutend ex narrativum loco, Delph., 1892; or Fogtmann, Coloss. â col. ascendens, Hamb. 1826 are as little as the purpose that originated among the Christians, or were even invented by the apostles (Grauberg, Verh. philos. ii, 461) — a view that is forbidden by the close proximity of the incident in point of time (London [Weiselyan] Heres., July, 1861). It can, therefore, only be regarded as a preternatural occurrence (Neander, p. 726). See Ascension.

13. Respecting the personal appearance of Jesus we know nothing with certainty. According to Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. vii, 18), the woman who bore the hemorrage (Matt. ix, 20) had erected from thankfulness a brazen statue (see Hassel, Dissertat. syllog., p. 314 sq.; comp. Heinichen, Ecc. 10 ad Eusebius, iii, 397 sq.; Tililo, Cod. apocr. i, 562 sq.) of Jesus at Panaces (Caesara, Philippi), which was destroyed (Sozom. Hist. Eccle. v, 21), as it was done again, under the emperor Hadrian (compare Lefèvre, Niph. Hist. Eccl. vi, 15). Jesus himself, according to several ancient (but scarcely trustworthy) statements (Evagr. iv, 27; Niph. ii, 7), sent his likeness to Abgarus (q. v.) at Edessa (comp. Bar-Hebr. Chron. p. 118), where it had been found the haakelent of the emperors, or chief of Christ with an imprint of his countenance (Cedrenus, Hist. p. 176; Bar-Hebraeus, Chron. p. 168). Still
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The question is an interesting one, had we the means of accurately determining, how and by what instrumentalities Jesus, in a human point of view, attained his spiritual power, or to what influence (aside from divine inspiration) he owed his intellectual formation as a founder of religion (Ammon, Bibl. Theol. i, 234 sq.; Handbuch der christl. Sittenlehre, i, 45 sq.; Kaiser, Bibl. Theol., i, 234 sq.; De Wette, Bibl. Dogm., p. 186 sq.; Collin, Bibl. Theol. ii, 8 sq.; Hase, p. 56 sq.; compare Rau, De momentis is quos ad Jes. dictur. rerum scientia inhumanae et habitus, evidenter, Erlang. 1796; Gelling, Biblical and Theological Essays, 1825. See also rational. p. 154 sq.). But while there has evidently been on the one side a general tendency to exaggerate the difficulties which the natural improvement of Jesus had to overcome (Reinhard, Plan Jesu, p. 485 sq.), yet none of the hypotheses proposed for the solution of the question satisfies the conditions of the problem, or has been free from clear historical difficulties. Many, for instance, suppose that Jesus had his religious education in the order of the Essenes (q. v.), and they think that in the Christian morals they especially find many points of coincidence with the doctrines of that Jewish sect (Keim, Christus und die Essener, p. 598 sq.; Schop, Gesch. d. Sittenlehre Jesu, i, 570 sq.; see, on the contrary, Luderwald, in Henke's Magaz. iv, 378 sq.; Bongel, in Flatt's Magaz. vii, 126 sq.; J. H. Dorffmüller, De dispari Jesu Essenerum disciplina, Wunscheit. 1803; Wegern, in Illiger's Zeitung für die christl. Religion, p. 2; cost. H. Heuglin, 3th Ap- pendix. to his edit. of Reinhard's Plan Jesu). Others attrib- ute the culture of Jesus to the Alexandro-Jewish religious philosophy (Bahrdt, Briefe über die Bibel im Volkstum, i, 570 sq.; Gfröer, in the Gesch. der Urchristen.). Still others imagine that Sadoceism (see Sado- ceae) perhaps had a complicity of this with the religious ideas of Jesus (see Pirrois), was the source of the pure religious views of Jesus (Henke, Magaz. vii, 425 sq.; De Cötes, Schütz- schrif. f. Jesus von Nazareth, p. 128 sq.). Although single points in the teaching and acts of Jesus might be illustrated by each of these theories (as could not fail to be the case with respect to one who threw himself into the midst of the religious efforts of the age, and combined efficiency with right aims), yet the whole of his spiritual life and deeds, the high clearness of understanding, the purity of sentiment, and, above all, the independence of spirit and matchless moral power which characterized this singular individual, cannot, if one will, be made alone, cannot be thus explained (Thomson, Land and Book, ii, 86 sq.). A richly-endowed and profound mind is, moreover, presupposed in all such hypotheses (comp. Paulus, Leb. Jesu, i, 89). Our object is simply to investi- gate the influences received, he received from his spon- sors, unfolded them, and directed them in that path. And in determining these, it is clear at the outset that a powerful impulse must have been given to the natural development of Jesus's mind (Luke iii, 52) by a diligent study of the Holy Scriptures, especially in the prophetic- al books (Isaiah the Psalms, Paulus, Leb. Jesu, i, 119 sq.), which contained the germs of an improved monotheism, and, are, for the most part, free from Jewish- ish niceties. It would also derive assistance from a comparison of the Pharisaic statutes, which were un- questionably known to Jesus, and particularly of the Jewish Hellenism (Alexandrianism; see ALEXANDRIAN SCHOOL), with those simple doctrines of old Judaism, especially as spiritualized by the prophets. How much may have been derived from outward circum- stances we do not know; that the maternal training, and even the open (Luke iv, 29) and romantic situation under the Nazareth cart, has a liberal influence in unfolding and cultivating his mind (Grelling, Leb. Jesu, p. 48); scarcely admits a doubt, nor that the neighborhood of Gentile inhabitants in the entire vicinity might have already weakened and repressed in the youthful soul of Jesus the old Jewish narrow-mindedness. The age also affor- ded a crisis, to bring out and strengthen the positive element of his genius. Learned instruction (see No. 6 above) Jesus had not enjoyed (Matt. xiii, 54 sq.; John vii, 15), although the Jewish fables (Toledoth Jesu, p. 5) assign him a youthful teacher named Elhanan (17728), and Christian tradition (Historia Josephi, c. 46 sq.) attributes to him wonderful aptness in learning (see generally Paulus, Leb. Jesu, i, 121 sq.). In addi- tion to all these natural influences operating upon his human spirit, there was above all, the plenary inspiration (John iii, 34) which he enjoyed from the intercom- munication of the divine nature; for the bare facts of his career, even on the lowest view that can be taken of the documents, are as perfect an evidence of a rational explanation on the ground of his mere humanity (see J. Young, Chair of History and Law, Lond. 1855, N. Y. 1857). See Churis. (For additional literature, see Volhdey, p. 36 sq.) His prediction of future events would not of itself be an evidence of a higher character than that of other prophets (see Prophecy.).

10. Respecting the enterprise on behalf of mankind which Jesus had conceived, and which he undevot- edly kept in view (see especially Reinhard, l'ersuch. üb. d. Plan den der Stifter der chr. Rel. zum Besten der Mensch. entwurf, 5th edit. by Heuglin, Wittenb. 1860; compare the Nieuwe Bijbel, xxxiv, 242 sq.; Schlicth. u. scheidt. drosselb. Leipz. 1816; Planck, i, 7 sq.; 86 sq.; Grelling, p. 120 sq.; Strauss, i, 463 sq.; Ne- ander, p. 115 sq.; Weisse, i, 117 sq., a few observations only can here be muluded. See REDEMPTION. That Jesus sought not simply to be a reformer of Judaism (John iv, 22; Matt. xv, 24; compare Matt. v, 17) [see LAW., much less the founder of a secret association (Klotzsch, De Christo ob institutandae societate clandestina alieno, Vitch. 1768), but to unite all mankind in one great sacred family, is vouched for by his own declara- tion (John iv, 22; xx, 16), by the whole tenden- cy of his teaching, by his constant expression of the deepest sym- pathy with humanity in general, and finally by the selec- tion of the apostles to continue his work; only he wished to confine himself personally to the boundaries of Judea in the publication of the kingdom of God (Matt. xv, 24), whereas his disciples, led by the Holy Spirit, should eventually traverse the world as heralds of the truth (Matt. xxviii, 19 sq.). It is evident that to Jesus himself the outline of his design was always clearly defined in the course of his labors, but, on account of the dogmatic conformity of the delineations in John's Gospel, it is the less easy to arrive at an appre- ciation of it in the synoptical gospels, it is impossible ac- curately to show historically the gradual realization of this subjective scheme. But that Jesus at any moment of his life whatever had stated the political element of his mission, which was the main point of the expected Messiah (indeed, ne even evaded the question, Luke xx, 1 sq., and forbade the spread of this report, Matt. xxvi, 20) unquestionably was, that the minds of the Jews were incapable of separating their carnal anticipa- tions from the true idea of the Messiah (q. v.). He
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strove, therefore, on every occasion to set this idea itself in a right position before them, and occasionally suggested the identification of his person with the Messiah, partly by the epithet of "Son of Man," which he applied to himself (see especially Matt. xii, 8), partly by explicit
statements (Matt. xiii, 16 sq.; Luke iv, 21). Hence it is not surprising that the opinion of the people re-
respecting him declined, and the majority regarded him only as a great prophet, chiefly interesting for his won-
derful predictions (Matt. xiii, 37); and pronounced himself as the Messiah only to individual susceptible hearts (John iv, 26; ix, 36 sq.), and also to the high-priest at the conclu-
sion of his career (Matt. xxvi, 64). The disciples re-
quired it merely for the confirmation of the faith they had (John xvi, 13 sq.; Luke xi, 20). See KINGDOM OF HEAVEN.

The moral and religious character of Jesus (humanly considered), which even in the syllogistical gospels, which are certainly chargeable with no embellishment, appears in a high ideality, has never yet been depicted with accurate psychological skill (see Volbeing, p. 53), but usually as a model of virtue in general (see Jerusalem, Niechinpau, S. 75 sq.; Grimm, 189 sq.; E. G. Winckler, Vers. e. Psychographie Jesu, Lips., 1826; Ull-
sq.; Thiele, in the Darm. Kirch.-Zeit., 1844, N. 92-94). (Comp. Hase, p. 62 sq.) On the (choleric) temperament of the Saviour, see "De temperamentis Christi" kong. Jen, 1753. Deep humility before God (Luke xviii, 19), and ardent love towards men in view of the determined sacrifice (John x, 18), were the distinguishing traits of his noble devotion, while the divine zeal that stirred his great soul concentrated all his virtues upon his one grand design. Jesus appears as the harmonious com-
plete embodiment of religious resignation; but this was so far from being a result of innate weakness (although Jesus might have had a slender physical constitution), that his natural force of character subsided into it (for examples of high energy in feeling and act, see John ii, 16 sq.; viii, 44 sq.; Matt. xvi, 28; xxiii, 5, etc.). Ev-
erywhere to this deep devotion was joined a clear, prud-
ent understanding—a combination which alone can preserve a man of sensibility and activity from the dan-
ger of becoming a reckless enthusiast or a weak senti-
mentalist. This is most unmistakably exhibited in the account of his passion and death. Neither do we find in Jesus any trace of the austerity and gloomy stern-
ness of other founders of religion, or even of his contempo-
rary the Baptist (Matt. xi, 18 sq.). In the midst of eager listeners in the public streets or in the Temple, he spoke with the simplicity and authority of one who knew what he said; yet how affectionately sympathetic (John xi, 55), how solicitous, how self-sacrificing did he exhibit himself in the bosom of the family, in the dear circle of his friends! What tender sympathy expressed itself in him on every occasion (Luke vii, 13; Matt. ix, 36; xiv, 19, xxx, 44). He was both (compare Rom. xii, 1) tearful among the tearful (John xi, 33), and cheerful amongst the cheerful (John ii, 1 sq.; Luke vii, 54). On this very account the character of Jesus has at all times so irresistibly won the hearts of the good and noble of all people, since it entered into the popular and sacred magisterium, the soul of the people, to cause amazement, but at the same time the purest, most disinterested humanity, and thus presents to the ob-
server not simply an object of esteem, but also of love. The history of Jesus's life is equally interesting to the child and the full-grown man, and certainly his exam-
ple will always appeal to the poor. On this subject, the above times not lost in vain. In accordance with this unmistakable sum of his char-
acter, certain single passages of the Gospels (e. g. Matt.
xxvi, 46 sq.; xv, 21 sq.; John ii, 4), which, verbally ap-
prehended [see CAXA], might perplex us concerning Je-
sus (comp./J. F. Volbeing: Utirum Christus matrem genere-
que suum dissimulati et desperserit, Vitbe, 1784; K. J. Klemm, De necessitatis J. Christi consanguinitis in-
tercadentes, Lips. 1816), may be more correctly explained (see Ammon, Leb. Jes., 1, 243 sq.), and may be placed in

harmony with others (e. g. Luke ii, 51; compare Lange, De subjectione Chr. sub parent. Lips. 1738). See Ex-

sPAMLE.

The task of the world's redemption, acting as an ever-present burden upon the Saviour's mind, produced that pensiveness, not to say sadness, which was a marked

characteristic of all his deportment. Rarely did his equanimity rise to exuberant joy, and that only in con-

nection with the great ruling object of his life (Luke x, 21 sq.; Matt. xii, 40 sq.; John xii, 27), at times to the depths of mental anguish (Mark xiv, 34). See AGONY. It was this interior pressure that so frequently burst forth in sighs and tears (John x, 35; Luke xix, 41), and made Jesus the ready symp-

pathizer with human affliction (John xiv, 21 sq.). For in the spiritual and turbulent trials that ripened every true moral character, and it was accordingly needful that God, in bringing many sons unto glory, should make the Captain of their salvation perfect through suffer-

ings. The fact that Jesus was emphatically "a man of sorrows and acquainted with grief," is the real key to the subdued and self-collected tone of his entire de-

meanor. See KENOESIS.

For an adequate explanation of the astonishing power which our Saviour exercised over his auditors, and, in-
deed, exerted over all who came within his circle of in-
fluence, we are doubtless to look to the facts which have not yet been exhibited, at least in con-

nection, with such graphic portraiture as to make his life stand out to the modern reader in its true moral
grandeur, force, and vividity. These elements are part-
lly suggested in the evangelist's statement that those who first hung upon the Redeemer's lips found in his discourses a new and divine assurance: "He taught them as one having authority, and not as the scribes" (Matt. vii, 29).

(1.) His doctrines were novel to his hearers. It was not so much because he announced to them the usher-
ing in of a new dispensation, for upon this he merely touched in his introductory addresses and by way of ar-
resting their attention; all details respecting that fresh era which could gratify curiosity, or even awaken it, he sedulously avoided, and he seemed anxious to divert the popular expectation from himself as the central figure in the coming scenes. It was the spiritual truth he communicated that burned upon the hearts of the list-

ening populace with a strange intensity. True, the es-

sential features of a religious life had been illustrated in their sacred books for centuries by holy men of old, and the most vital doctrines of the Gospel may be said to have been anticipated and propounded in unthought of apophthegmatic comments; nay, living examples were not want-
ing to confirm the substantial identity of religious ex-
perience under whatever outward economy. Yet, at the time of our Lord's advent, the fundamental principles of sound piety seem to have been forgotten or over-looked, especially by the Pharisees, whose views and prac-
tices were regarded as the models by the nation at large. When, therefore, our Lord brought back the popular at-
tention to the simple doctrines of love to God and man, not only as lying at the foundation of the O. T. ethics, but as being the very core of the New Testament; to the humanity, pertinence, and truthfulness of the sentiment came with an irresistible freshness of conviction to the minds of the humblest hearers. For this, too, they had al-
ready been prepared by the sad contrast between the precepts and the conduct of the highest sectaries of the old dispensation, and the high-mindedness which above all, by the bitter yearnings after religious liberty in their own souls, which the current system of belief failed to supply. Sin yet lay as a load of anguish upon their hearts, and they eagerly embraced the gentle in-
vitations of the Redeemer to the bosom of their forfeited

ed hearts. It was precisely the resurrection of these again obscured teachings that gave such power to the preaching of Luther, Whitefield, Wesley, Edwards and others in subsequent times, and which converted
the moral desert of their day into a spiritual Eden. But there was this to enhance the effect in the Saviour’s promises, that they awakened the expectation of a millennial reign; an idea misconstrued, indeed, by many of the Jews into that of a temporal dominion, but on that very account productive of a more boundless and more awed interest. The devoted mind of Jesus had been roused, and Jesus even found it necessary to repress and avoid the fanatical and disloyal manifestations to which it was instantly prone. Yet in those hearts which better understood “the kingdom of heaven,” there arose the dawn of that vaticinal day of which the Pentecostal effusion brought the meridian glory. It was a judicative of this difference between Christ’s and his predecessor’s, as well as rivals’ teaching, see Stier’s Words of Jesus, passim.)

(2.) He spoke as God. Later preachers and reformative felt a heroic boldness, and have realized a marvelous effect in their utterances, when fully impressed with the conviction of the divinity of their mission and the sacred character of their communications; but Jesus was no mere ambassador from the court of heaven; he was the Word of the Lord himself. Ancient prophets had actually appeared in this capacity, and the inspired apostle says (Eph. iii. 11), “unto them gave he power and strength to be apostles, and to be strong in the spirit to the comfort of the inward man,” a reiteration of Christ breathing in them a new life, a new sense of the fellowship of his sufferings, a new sense of his presence, or reborn by outward miracles that enforced respect, if they did not command obedience; but Jesus possessed no restricted measure of the Spirit, and wrought wonders in no other’s name; in him dwelt all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, and the Shekinah stood revealed in him. The mantle was not transferred, nor the angelfish, where the Lord appeared to Moses, that Jehovah might be revealed in a new way, a new form. “I am the door,” said he, “the door of the sheep. If any man enter in by me, he shall be saved” (John x. 9, 10). All the objects of religion are so interwoven with the life of Christ, that to seek to receive him without the faith, is to separate for ever the believer from the church. 

According to the sickle was so customary amongst all the religious authorities, reverent, decorous, and religious, that it was expected. 

(See Flanders.)

When I compare him with the Jewish Doctors, I see a whole host of men, men of learning, men of position, men of power, men of wealth, men of influence, who were opposed to him, not because he was a teacher, but because he was a Nazarene. 

(See also Flanders.)

The Saviour’s Life and Ministry. (For the further literature of each topic, see the articles referred to at each.) See Gospel. About four hundred years had elapsed since Malachi, the last of the prophet, had foretold the coming of the Messiah’s forerunner, and nearly the same interval had transpired since Ezra closed the sacred canon, and composed the concluding psalm (cix.); a still greater number of years had intervened since the last ministration by an angel, and he had been performed, and men not only in Palestine, but throughout the entire East, were in general expectation of the advent of the universal Prince (Suetonius, Von. 4; Tacitus, Hist, v. 15) - an event which the Jews knew, from their scriptures (Dan. ix. 25), was now close at hand (see Luke ii, 26, 80). See Also. Any mention of Israel under such circumstances, at a time when the Roman empire, of which Judaea then formed a part, was in a state of profound and universal peace (Orsius, Hist. vi, fin.), under the rule of Augustus (Luke ii, 1), that an incident occurred which, although apparently personal and inconsiderable, broke like a new oracle the silence of ages (comp. 2 Pet. iii. 4), and proved the dawn of the longlooked for day of Israel’s glory (see Luke i, 78). A priest named Zacharias was performing the regular functions of his office within the holy place of the Temple at Jerusalem, when an angel appeared before him, and pronounced a benediction that his hitherto childless and now aged wife, Elisabeth, should bear him a son, who was to be the harbinger of the promised Redeemer (Luke i. 5, 25). See Zacharias. To punish and at the same time remove his doubts, the power of articulate utterance was taken from him (comp. v. 12), and then the prediction (probably May, B.C. 7). See John the Baptist. Nearly half a year after this vision, a still more remarkable announcement (q. v.) was made by the same means to a maiden of the now obscure lineage of David, resident at Nazareth, and betrothed to Joseph, a descendant of the family of David (see Paper, on Genealogy): namely, that she was the individual selected to become the mother of the Messiah who had been expected in all previous ages (Luke i. 26-38). See Mary. Her scruples having been obviated by the assurance of a divine vocation, she acquiesced in the providence, although she could not have failed to foresee the ignominy to which it would expose her (see Adultery), and even joined her relative Elizabeth in praising God for so high an honor (Luke i, 89-96). As soon as her condition became known [see Conception], Joseph was deeply apprised of the magnitude of his intended wife’s innocence, and directed to name her child Jesus (see above), thus adopting it as his own (Matt. i. 18-25; probably April, B.C. 6). See Joseph. Although the parents resided in Galilee, they had occasion just at this time to visit Bethlehem (q. v.) in order to be enrolled along with their relatives in a census not in progress by order of the Roman authorities [see Censuses], and thus Jesus was born, during their stay in the exterior buildings of the public khan [see Carentan], at that place (Luke ii, 1-7). In fulfilment of the express prediction of Scripture (Mic. v. 2), prop. Ang. B.C. 6. See Nativity. The auspicious event was heralded on the same night by angels to a company of shepherds on the adjacent plains, and was recognised by two aged saints at Jerusalem [see Simeon; Anna], where the mother presented the babe at the usual time for the customary offerings (q. v.) in the temple (v. 25). The visitation (q. v.) having been meanwhile duly performed (Luke ii, 8-39; prop. Sept. B.C. 6). Public notice, however, was not attracted to the event till, on the arrival at the capital of a party of Eastern philosophers [see Magi], who had been directed to Palestine by astronomical phenomena as the wise men to Babel [see Star of the Wise Men], the intelligence of their inquiries reached the jealous ears of Herod (q. v.), who thereupon first ascertaining from the assembled Sanhedrin the predicted locality—sent the strangers to Bethlehem, where the holy family appear to have continued, pretending that he wished himself to do the illusory act of a babe reverence, but really only to render himself more
sure of his destruction (Matt. ii, 1-12). This attempt was foiled by the return of the Magi home by another route, through divine intimation, and the child was preserved from the murderous rage of Herod by a precipitous flight of the parents (who were in like manner warned of the danger) into Egypt (see Alexandria) under a like direction (prob. July, B.C. 5). Here they remained [see Egypt] until, on the death of the tyrant, at the divine suggestion, they returned to Palestine; but, avoiding Judea, where Archelaus, who resembled his father, had succeeded to the throne, they settled at their former place of residence, Nazareth, within the territory of the milder Antipas (Matt. ii, 19-33; prob. April, B.C. 4). See Nazareth. The evangelists pass over the boyhood of Jesus with the simple remark that his obedience, intelligence, and piety won the affections of all who knew him (Luke ii, 50, 51, 52). A single incident is recorded in illustration of these traits, which occurred when he had completed his twelfth year—an age at which the Jewish males were expected to take upon them the responsibility of attaching themselves to the public worship, as having arrived at years of discretion (Luke ii, 41-50; see Lightfoot and Wetstein, ad loc.). Having accompanied his parents, on this occasion, to the Passover at Jerusalem, the last tarried behind at the close of the festal week, and was discovered by them, as they turned back to the capital from their homeward journey, after considerable search, sitting in the midst of the Hab- bia in one of the anterooms of the sacred edifice, seeking information from them on sacred themes (or probably rather imparting than eliciting truth, after the manner of the Socratic questionings) with a clearness and profundity so far beyond his years and opportunities as to excite the liveliest astonishment in all beholders (April, A.D. 8). His pointed reply to his mother's ex- postulation for his seeming neglect of filial duty enunciates a comprehension already of his divine character and work: "Know ye not that I must be at my Father's?" (νομίζετε ἂν αύτός μου).  

1. Introductory Year.—Soon after John the Baptist had opened his remarkable mission at the Jordan, among the thousands of all classes who flocked to his preaching and baptism (q. v.), Jesus, then thirty years old, presented himself for the same initiatory rite at his hands as the only acknowledged prophet extant who was empowered to administer the rite which should be equivalent to the holy anointing oil of the kingly and priestly offices (Matt. iii, 13-17; Luke iii, 1-18, 23; and parallels). See Messiah. John did not at once recognize Jesus as the Messiah, although he had just declared to the people the near approach of his own Superior; yet, being doubtless personally well acquainted with his relative, in whom he must have perceived the tokens of an extraordinary religious personage, he modestly declined to perform a ceremony that seemed to imply his own pre-eminence; but upon his compliance with the request of Jesus, on the ground of the propriety of this prelimin- ary ordinance, a divine attestation, both in a visible [see Dove] and an audible [see Bath-kol] form, was publicly given to the sacred character of Jesus, and in such clear conformity to a criterion which John himself had already received by the inward revelation, that he at once began to proclaim the advent of the Messiah in his person (prob. August, A.D. 25). See John the Baptist. After this inauguration of his public career, Jesus immediately retired into the desert of Judea, where, during a fast of forty days, he endured those interior temptations of Satan which should suffice to prove the superior virtue of this revealer to which Adam had succumbed; and at its close he successfully resisted three special attempts of the devil in a personal form to move him first to doubt and then to presume upon the divine care, and finally to bribe him to such barefaced idolatry that Jesus indignantly repelled him from his presence (Matt. iv, 1-11; Mark i, 11-13; Luke iv, 13-20; parallels). The effect of John's open testimony to the character of Jesus, as he began his preaching afresh the next season on the other side of the Jordan, was such as not only to lead to a deputation of inquiry to him from the Sanhedrim on the subject, but also to induce two of the Baptist's disciples to attach themselves to Christ, one of whom immediately introduced his own brother to his newly-found Master, and to these, as he was departing for Galilee, were added two others of their acquaintance (John i, 39-36). On arriving at Cana (q. v.), whither he had been invited with his relatives and friends to a wedding festival, Jesus performed his first miracle by changing water into wine for the supply of the guests (John ii, 1-11; prob. March, A.D. 26). 2. First more public Year.—After a short visit at Ca- parauma, Jesus returned to Judea in order to attend the Passover; and finding the entrance to the Temple choked with various kinds of merchant-stalls, he fearlessly expelled their sacrilegious occupants, and vindicated his authority by a prediction of his resurrection, which was at the time misunderstood (John ii, 12-22). His
maritan female at the well of Jacob (q. v.), near Shechem, on the spiritual blessings of God's true worshippers, led to her conversion, with a large number of her fellow-citizens, among whom he tarried two days (John iv, 4-42; prob. December, A.D. 28). On his arrival in Galilee he was received with great respect (John iv, 43-46), and his public announcements of the advent of the Messianic age (Matt. iv, 17; Mark i, 14, 15) in all the synagogues of that country spread his fame still more widely (Luke iv, 14, 15). In this course of preaching he revisited Cana, and there, by a word, curst the son of one of Herod's courtiers that lay at the point of death at Capernaum (John iv, 46-54). Arriving at Nazareth, he was invited by his townsmen to read the Scripture lesson (Isa. lxi, 1, 2) in the synagogue, but they took such offence at his application of it to himself, and still more at his comments upon it, that they hurried him tumultuously to the brink of a precipice, and would have thrown him off had he not escaped from their hands (Luke iv, 16-30). Thenceforward he fixed upon Capernaum (q. v.) as his general place of residence.

Miracles during the Paschal week confirmed the popular impression concerning his prophetic character, and even induced a member of the Sanhedrin to seek a private interview with him [see Nicodemus]; but his doctrine of the necessity of a spiritual change in his disciples [see Regeneration], and his statement of his own passion [see Atoneinent], were neither intelligible nor agreeable to the worldly minds of the people (John ii, 23-25; iii, 1-21). Jesus now proceeded to the Jordan, and by the instrumentality of his disciples continued the baptismal baptism of the people instituted by John, who had meanwhile removed further up the river, where, so far from being jealous of Jesus's increasing celebrity, he gave still stronger testimony to the superior destiny of Jesus (John iii, 22-36); but the imprisonment of John not long afterwards by order of Herod (Matt. xiv, 3 sq.; Mark vi, 17 sq.; Luke iii, 19) rendered it expedient (Matt. iv, 12; Mark i, 14), in connection with the odium excited by the hierarchy (John iv, 1-3), that Jesus should retire into Galilee (Luke iv, 14). On his way thither, his conversation with a Sa-
home, carrying his couch (Luke v, 17–26, and parallels; prob. March, A.D. 27). On another excursion by the lake shore, after preaching to the people, he summoned as a disciple the collector of the Roman impost (Mark ii, 13, 14, and parallels; probably April, A.D. 27).

See Matthew.

8. Second more public Year.—The Passover now drew near, which Jesus, like the devout Jews generally, was careful to attend at Jerusalem (Saturday, April 13, A.D. 27). See Passover. As he passed by the beautiful pool of Bethesda, near the sheep-gate of the city, he observed in one of its porches an invalid waiting the intermittent influx of the water, to which the populace had attributed a miraculously curative power to the first bather thereafter; but, learning that he had been thus infirm for thirty-eight years, and ascertaining from him that he was even too helpless to reach the water in time to experience its virtue, he immediately restored him to vigor by a word. See Bethesda. This, happening to occur on the Sabbath, so incensed the hierarchy that they charged the author of the cure with a profanation of the day, and thus drew from Jesus a public vindication of his mission and an exposure of their inconsistency (John v, 1–47). As he was passing through the province of Galilee, on the eve of the Paschal week (Saturday, April 19, A.D. 27), his disciples chanced to pluck, as strangers were privileged to do (Deut. xxiii, 25), a few of the ripe heads from the standing barley, through which they were at the time passing, in order to allay their hunger; and this being reported to the Pharisees, who considered the fresh violation of the sacred day, Jesus took occasion to rebuke their over-scrupulousness as being confuted by the example of David (1 Sam. xxi, 1–6), the practice of the priests themselves (Numb. xxviii, 9–19), and the tenor of Scripture (Hos. vi, 6; compare 1 Sam. xv, 22), and, at the same time, to point out the true design of the Sabbath (q. v.), namely, man's own benefit (Matt. xii, 1–8, and parallels). On an ensuing Sabbath (prob. Saturday, April 26, A.D. 27), entering the synagogue (apparently of Capernaum), he once more excited the multitude by curing a man whose right hand was palsied; but his opponents, who had been watching the opportunity, were silenced by his appeal to the philan­thropy of the act, yet they thenceforth began to plot his destruction (Mark iii, 1–6, and parallels). Retiring to the Sea of Galilee, he addressed the multitudes who thronged from all quarters, and cured the demons among them (Mark iii, 7–12; Matt. xii, 17–21, and parallels). After a night spent in prayer on a mountain in the vicinity, he now chose twelve persons from among his followers to be his constant attendants and future witnesses to his career (Luke vi, 12–16, and parallels). See Apokalypse. Then, descending to the per­sian plain, he cured the diseased among the assembled multitude (Luke vi, 17–19), and, seating himself upon an eminence, he proceeded to deliver his memorable sermon exhibiting the spirituality of the Gospel in opposition to the formalism of the prevalent theology (Matt. v, 1–17; Luke vi, 15–20; see also Matt. v, 17–24; Matt. x, 17–27; vii, 1–5; vii, 12, 15–18, 20, 21, 24–27; viii, 1, and parallel passages; prob. May, A.D. 27). See Sermon on the Mount. On his return to Capernaum, Jesus, at the instance of the Jewish elders, cured the son of a possessor of a certain brook, who, although a Gentile, had built the village synagogue, and whose faith in the power of Jesus to restore by his mere word the distant invalid excited the liveliest interest in the mind of Jesus himself (Luke vii, 10, and parallel). The ensuing day, passing near Nain, he met a large procession issuing from the village for the internment of a young widow, and, commiserating her double bereavement, he restored the youth instantly to life, to the astonishment of the beholders (Luke vii, 11–17). John the Baptist, hearing while in prison of these miracles, sent two messengers to Jesus to obtain more explicit assurance from his own lips as to the Messiah, which he seemed so slowly to arrive at; but, instead of returning a direct answer, Jesus proceeded to perform additional miracles in their presence, and then referred them to the Scripture prophecies (Isa. lxi, 1; xxxv, 5, 6) of these distinctive marks of the Messianic age; but as soon as the messengers departed, he eluded the question of John, although the introducer of an era less favored than the period of Jesus himself, and concluded by severe denunciations of the cities (especially Capernaum, Chorazin, and Bethsaida) which had continued impenitent under his own preaching (Luke vii, 24, 28; xi, 20–24; and parallels). About this time, a Pharisee invited him one day to dine with him, but, while he was reclining at the table, a female notorious for her immorality came penitently behind him and believed with her tears his unadorned feet extended beyond the couch, then wiped them with her hair, and finally affectionately anointed them with ointment brought for that purpose, while the host scarcely restrained his surprise that Jesus should suffer this familiarity; but, in a pointed parable of two debtors released from dissimilar amounts,
den death of a rich worldling, by a comparison with various natural objects, by contrast with the heathen, and by the higher importance of a preparation for heaven (Luke xii, 1, 6, 7, 18-31, 33, 34, and parallels). Being informed of the atrocity of Herod against some Galileans, he declared that an unsuspected death awaited the impotent among his hearers, and enforced the admonition by the parable of the delay in cutting down a fruitless tree (Luke xiii, 1-9). Again leaving his home the same day, he delivered, while sitting in a boat, to a large audience upon the lake-shore, the several parables of the different fates of various portions of seed in a field, the true and false wheat growing together till harvest, the gradual but spontaneous development of a plant of grain, the remarkable growth of the mustard-shrub from a very small seed, and the dissemination of leaves throughout a large circumference (Matt. xiii, 1-9, 24-30; Mark iv, 26-29; Matt. xiii, 31-36; and parallels); but it was only to the privileged disciples (as he informed them) in private that he explained, at their own request, the various elements of the first of these parables as referring to the different degrees of improvement made by the corresponding classes of his own hearers, adding various admonitions (by comparisons with common life) to diligence on the part of the apostles, and then, after explaining the parable of the false wheat as referring to the divine forbearance to eradicate wickedness in this scene of probation, he added the parable of the several worthless and unproductive seeds of a skilful housekeeper (Matt. xiii, 10, 11, 18-23; vs, 14-16; vi, 22, 23; x, 26, 27; xiii, 12, 36-43, 47-50, 44-46, 51-53; and parallels). See PARABLE. As Jesus was setting out, towards evening of the same day, to cross the lake, a scribe proposed to become his constant disciple, but was rebuffed by being reminded of Jesus the hardships to which he would expose himself in his company; two of his attendants were refused a temporary leave of absence to arrange their domestic affairs, lest it might weaken them altogether from his service (Matt. xvii, 18-22; Luke x, 61, 62; and parallels). While the party was thus passing Jesus, overcome with the labors of the day, had fallen asleep on the stern bench of the boat, when so violent a squall took them that, in the utmost consternation, they appealed to him for preservation, and, rebuking their distrust of his divine presence, he spoke to them, breaking his sleep, with a word (Matt. xxi, 23-27, and parallels). See GALILEE, SEA OF. On reaching the eastern shore, they were met by two frantic demonsiacs, roaring in the desolated catacombs of Gadara, who prostrated themselves before Jesus, and implored his forbearance; but the Satanic influence that possessed them, on being expelled by him, with his permission seized upon a large herd of swine feeding near (probably raised, contrary to the law, for supplying the market of the Greek-imitating Jews), and caused them to rush headlong into the lake, where they were drowned (see DEMONIACT); and this loss so offended the worldly-minded owners of the swine that the neighbors generally requested Jesus to return home, which he immediately did, leaving the late maniacs to fill the country with the remarkable tidings of their cure (Mark v, 1-21, and parallels). Not long afterwards, on occasion of a large entertainment made for Jesus by Matthew, the Pharisees found fault with the eating habits because their Master had condescended to associate with the tax-gatherers and other disreputable persons that were guests; but Jesus declared that such had most need of his intercourse, his mission being to reclaim sinners (Matt. ix, 10-15, and parallels), and explained to an inquirer why he did not enjoin seasons of fasting like the Baptist, that his presence as yet should rather be a cause of gladness to his followers,
and he illustrated the impropriety of such severe requirements prematurely by the festivity of a marriage week, and by the parables of a new patch on an old garment, and new wine in old skin-bottles (Matt. ix. 14–17, and parallels). In the midst of these remarks he was entreated by a leading citizen named Jairus (q. v.) to visit his daughter, who lay at the point of death; and while going for that purpose he cured a female among the crowd of a chronic haemorrhage (q. v.) by her secretly touching the edge of his dress, which led to her discovery and acknowledgment on the spot; but in the meantime information arrived of the death of the sick girl: nevertheless, encouraging the father’s faith, he proceeded to the house where hcr funeral had already begun, and, entering the room with her parents and three disciples only, restored her to life and health by a simple touch and word, to the amazement of all the vicinity (Mark v. 22–43, and parallels). As he was leaving Jairus’s house two blind men followed him, whose request that he would restore their sight he granted by a touch; and on his return home he cured a dumb demoniac, upon which the Pharisees repeated their calumny of his collusion with Satan (Matt. ix. 32–34). Visiting Nazareth again shortly afterwards, his acclamations were astonished at his eloquence in the synagogue on the Sabbath, but were so prejudiced against his obscure family that but few had sufficient faith to warrant the exertion of his miraculous power in cures (Mark vi. 1–6, and parallels). About this time (probably Jan. and Feb. A.D. 29), commiserating the moral desolation of the community, Jesus sent out the apostles in pairs on a general tour of preaching and miracle-working in different directions (but avoiding the Gentiles and Samaritans), with special instructions, while he made his third circuit of Galilee for a like purpose (Matt. x. 5–28; x. 1, 5–14, 40–42; xi. 1; Mark vi. 12, 18; and parallels). Upon their return, Jesus, being apprized of the execution of John the Baptist by Herod (Mark vi. 21–29; probably March, A.D. 29), and of the tetrarch’s views of himself (Mark vi. 14–16; see Join this Baptist), retired with them across the lake, followed by crowds of men, with their families, whom at evening he miraculously fed with a few provisions at hand (Mark vi. 30–44, and parallels), an act that excited such enthusiasm among them as to lead them to form the plan of forcibly proclaiming him their political king (John vi. 14, 15); this design Jesus defeated by dismissing the multitude, and sending away the disciples by themselves in a boat across the lake, while he spent most of the night alone in prayer on a neighboring hill; but towards daylight he rejoined them, by walking on the water to them as they were tiring at the ears against the wind and tempestuous waves, and suddenly calming the sea, brought them to the shore, to their great amazement; then, as he proceeded through the plains of Genezareth, the whole country brought their sick to him to be cured (Matt. xiv. 22–36, and parallels), the populace whom he had left on the eastern shore meanwhile missing him, returned by boats to Capernaum (John vi. 22–24; prob. Thursday and Friday, March 25 and 26, A.D. 29). Meeting them in their search next day in the synagogue, he took occasion, in alluding to the recent miracle, to proclaim himself to them at large as the celestial “manna” for the soul, but cooled their political ambition by warning them that the benefits of his mission could only be received through a participation by faith in the atoning sacrifice shortly to be made in his own person; a doctrine that soon discouraged their adherence to him, but proved no stumbling-block to the steadfast faith of eleven of his apostles (John vi. 51–71; prob. Saturday, March 27, A.D. 29).

4. Third more public Year.—Avoiding the malicious plots of the hierarchy at Jerusalem by remaining at Capernaum during the Passover (John vii. 1; probably Sunday, March 28, A.D. 29), Jesus took occasion, from the fault found by some Pharisees from the capital against his disciples for eating with unwashed hands...
5. Last half Year.—On the opening of the festival at Jerusalem (Sunday, Sept. 21, A.D. 28), the hierarchy eagerly inquired for Jesus among the populace, who held discordant opinions concerning him; but, on his arrival, he boldly taught in the Temple, vindicating his cause, and claiming to be sent by God, to be put to death by his enemies to arrest him returned absolved, while the people continued divided in their sentiments, being inclined to accept his cordial invitations (Matt. xi. 28—30), but deterred by the specious objections of the hierarchy (John vii. 11—52). Next morning, returning to the Mount of Olives (Matt. xvi. 1—19), he placed on Bethany's, in the midst of his teaching in the Temple he dismissed, with merely an admonition, a female brought to him as an adulteress (q. v.), with a view to embarrass him in the disposal of the case, none of his conscience-stricken accusers daring to be the first in executing the penalty of law when allowed to do so by Jesus (John viii. 1—11). He then continued his expositions with his captious hearers respecting his own character, until at length, on his avowing his divine pre-existence, they attempted to stone him as guilty of blasphemy; but he withdrew from their midst (John viii. 55—59). That very same evening (Sept. 28—29) afterwards (prob. Oct. A.D. 28) with a report of great success, Jesus expressed his exultation in thanks to God for the humble instrumentality divinely chosen for the propagation of the Gospel (Luke x. 17—21, and parali.). Being asked by a Jewish sextary the most certain method of securing to himself the safe custody of Jesus, he replied he had impressed in the law (Deut. vi. 5; Lev. xix. 8), of supreme love to God and cordial philanthropy, and, in answer to the other's question respecting the extent of the latter obligation, he illustrated it by the parable of the benevolent Samaritan (Luke x. 28—37). Returning to the home of Lazarus, he gently reproved the impious zeal of the kind Martha in preparing for him a meal, and defended Mary for being absorbed in his instructions (Luke x. 38—42). After a season of private prayer (prob. in Gethsemane, on his way to Jerusalem, next morning), he dictated a law of prayer to his disciples at their request, stating the indispensableness of a placable spirit towards others in order to our own forgiveness by God, and adding the parable of the guest at midnight to enforce the necessity of urgency in prayer, with assurances that God is more willing to grant his children's petitions for their children's sake than from their parents are to supply their children's temporal wants (Luke xi. 1—18, and parali.). As he entered the city, Jesus noticed a man whom he ascertained to have been blind from his birth, and to the disciples' inquiry for whose sin the blindness was a punishment, he asserted that it was provided for the glory of God, namely, in his cure, as a means to which he moistened a little clay with spittle, touched the man's eyes with it, and directed him to wash them in the Pool of Siloam (Saturday, Nov. 28, A.D. 28); but the hierarchy, learning the cure from the neighbors, brought the man before them, because the transaction had taken place on the Sabbath, and disputed the fact until testified to by his parents, and then alleging that the author of the act, whose name was yet unknown even to the man himself, must have been a sinner, because a violator of the sabbath, if not a sinner, he was met with, they referred him to the duty of again excommunicating him. Jesus, however, meeting him shortly after, disclosed to his ready faith his own Messianic character, and then discoursed to his captious enemies concerning the immunities of true believers in him, the simile of a shepherd to his flock (Luke ix. 1—21). The same figure he again took up at the ensuing Festival of Dedication, upon the inquiry of the Jewish sectaries directly put to him in Solomon's portico of the Temple, as to his Messiahship, and spoke so pointedly of his unity with God that his auditors would have stoned him for blasphemy had he not hastily withdrawn from the place (cir. Dec. 1, A.D. 28), and retired.
to the Jordan, where he gained many adherents (John x, 22-42). Lazarus at this time falling sick, his sisters sent to Jesus, desiring his presence at Bethany; but after waiting several days, until Lazarus was dead, he informed his disciples of the fact (which he assured them would turn out to the divine glory), and proposed to go thither. On his arrival, he was met by Martha, and then by Mary, with tearful expressions of regret for his absence, which he checked by assurances (not clearly apprehended by them) of their brother's restoration to life; then causing the tomb to be opened (after over-ruling Martha's objection), he summoned the dead Lazarus to the assembly to the skies (John xi, 1-46; probably Jan. A.D. 29). See LAZARUS. This miracle aroused afresh the enmity of the Sanhedrim, who, after consultation, at the haughty advice of Caiaphas, determined to accomplish his death, thus unwittingly fulfilling the destined purpose of his mission (John xii, 47-53). Withdrawing in consequence to the city of Ephron (John xi, 54), and afterwards to Peroea, Jesus continued his teaching and miracles to crowds that gathered about him (Mark x, 1, and parallel). As he was preaching in one of the synagogues of this vic-inity, he cured a woman of a chronic paralysis of the back, and refuted the churlish cavil of one of the hierarchy present at the day on which this was done, by a reference to ordinary acts of mercy even to animals on the Sabbath (Luke xii, 10-17; prob. Feb. A.D. 29). Jesus now turned his steps towards Jerusalem, and took the way the nearer preparation for heaven, without trusting to any external recommendations (Luke xiii, 22-30); and replying to the Pharisees' insidious warning of danger from Herod, that Jerusalem alone was the destined place of peril for him (Luke xiii, 31-38). On one Sabbath, while eating at the house of an eminent Pharisee, he curbed a man of the dropsey, and silenced all objections by again appealing to the usual care of domestic animals on that day; he then took occasion, from the anxiety of the guests to secure the chief places of honor at the table, to discourse to the company on the advantages of modesty and charity, closing by an admonition to prompt compliance with the offers of the Gospel in the parable of the marriage-feast and the wedding-garment (Luke xiv, 1-15; Matt. xxii, 1-14, and parallel; prob. March, A.D. 29). To the multitudes attending him he preached as the withering condemnation of a true discipleship (Luke xv, 25, 26, and parallel), under various figures (Luke xiv, 28-33); while he corrected the jealousy of the Jewish scribes at his intercourse with the lower classes (Luke xvi, 1, 2), by teaching the divine interest in penitent wanderers from him (Luke xix, 10, and parallel), under the parables of stray sheep (Luke xxv, 3-7, and parallel), the lost piece of money, and the prodigal son (Luke xv, 8-32). At the same time, he illustrated the prudence of securing the divine favor by a prudent use of the blessings of this life in the parable of the fraudulent steward (Luke xvi, 1-12), showing the incompatibility of worldly wisdom with devotion (Luke xxii, 13, and parallel); and the self-sufficiency of the Pharisees he rebuked in the parable of the rich man and Lazarus (Luke xvi, 14, 15, 19-31), declaring to them that the kingdom of the Messiah had already come unob-servably (Matt. xii, 20-21). He impressed upon both classes of his hearers the importance of perseverance, and yet humility, in prayer, by the parables of the importunate widow before the unjust judge, and the penitent publican in contrast with the self-righteous Pharisee (Luke xviii, 1-14). To the insidious questions of the Pharisees concerning divine things he replied that it was inconsistent with the original design of marriage, being only suffered by Moses (with restrictions) on account of the inveterate customs of the nation, but really justifiable only in cases of adultery; but at the same time explained privately to the disciples that the opposite extreme of celibacy was to be voluntary only (Matt. xix, 11-12, and parallel). He welcomed infants to his arms and blessing, as being a symbol of the innocence required by the Gospel (Mark x, 13-16, and parallel). A rich and honorable young man visiting him with questions concerning the way of salvation, Jesus was pleased with his frankness, but proposed terms so humbling to his worldly attachments that he retired with- out receiving an answer. In the verses that follow (Matt. xx, 21-35; Mark x, 35-44; Luke xv, 11-16; and parallel), there is an opportunity of discerning his followers on the prejudicial influence of wealth on piety, and (in reply to a remark of Peter) of illustrating the rewards of self-denying ex-ertion in religious duty by the parables of the servant at meals after a day's work, and the laborers in the vineyard (Matt. xx, 1-16, and parallel). As they had now arrived at the Jordan opposite Jerusalem, Jesus once more warned the timid disciples of the fate awaiting him there (Mark x, 32-54); but they so little understood him (Luke xvii, 32), that the mother of James and John ambitiously requested of him a prominent post for her sons under his administration, they also igno- rantly professing their willingness to share his suffer- ings, until Jesus checked rivalry between them and their fellow-disciples by enjoining upon them all a mutual disinterestedness and submission (Matt. xx, 20-28). As they were passing through Jericho, two blind men implored of him to restore their sight, and, although rebuked by the by-standers, they urged their request so importantly as at length to gain the ear of Jesus, who called them, and with a touch restored their eyes. On the approach of a personal enemy (Luke xx, 39-42), he made an opportunity to them to see and to hear him, as in an opportunity of a personal sabbath. Passing along, he observed a chief publican, named Zaccheus (q.v.), who had run in advance and climbed a tree to get a sight of Jesus, but who now, at Jesus' suggestion, gladly received him to his house, and there indi-cated himself from the calmness of his insinuations as an opportunist to charity, an act that secured his commendation by Jesus (Luke xix, 2-9), who took occasion to illustrate the duty of fidelity in improving religious privileges by the parable of the "talents" or "pounds" (Luke xix, 11-26, and parallel). Reaching Bethany a week before their crucifixion, when the Sanhedrim were planning to seize him, Jesus was entertained at the house of Lazarus, and vindicated Mary's act in anointing (q.v.) his head with a flask of precious ointment, from the parsimonious objections of Juda, declaring that it should ever be to her praise as a woman's labour and care in preparing an anointing burial (John xi, 55-57; xii, 1-11, and parallel). 6. PASSION WEEK.—The entrance of Jesus into Jerusa-llem next morning (Monday, March 14, A.D. 29) was a triumphal one, the disciples having mounted him upon a young ass, which, by his direction, they found in the environs of the city, and spread their garlands and green branches along the road, while the multitude es-corting him proclaimed him as the expected descendent of David, to the chagrin of the hierarchy, who vainly endeavored to check the popular declarations [see HO-SANNA]; Jesus meanwhile was absorbed in grief at the ruin awaiting the impious metropolis (Matt. xxii, 1-9; John xii, 16, 17, 19; Luke xix, 39-44, and parallel). Arriving at the Temple amid this general excitement, he again cleared the Temple courts of the profane trade-men, while the sick resorted to him for cure, and the thieves prolonged his stay by a protracted demonstration upon both accounts. He turned to Bethany for the night (Matt. xxi, 10-17, and parallel). On his way again to the city, early in the morning, he pronounced a curse upon a green but fruitless fig-tree (q.v.) (to which he had gone, not having yet breakfasted, as if in hopes of finding on it some of the fruits which he had spoken of as eaten by the lares of the Jewish nation, the day being occupied in teaching at the Temple (where the multitude of his hearers pre-vented the execution of the hierarchical designs against him)), and the night, as usual, at Bethany. On the re-turning morning the fig-tree was withered out, and very root, which led Jesus to impress upon the disciples the efficacy of faith, especially in their public functions.
Map of our Saviour's Journeys on the first Day of Passion Week.

N.B.—The localities of Jerusalem on this Map are in accordance with the views of Dr. Robinson. For more exact identifications, see the map of Jerusalem. For the arguments assigning our Lord's triumphal entry into the city to Monday, see Palm Sunday.
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(Matt. xxi, 18, 19; Luke xxi, 37, 38; xix, 47, 48; Matt. xxi, 20, 22) This, the last day of Jesus's intercourse with the public, was filled with various discussions (Wednesday, March 16, A.D. 29). The hierarchy, demanding the authority for his public conduct, were perplexed by his counter-question as to the authority of the Baptist's mission, also as to whether they had inexcusably committed their insincerity and criminality by the parables of the two sons sent by their father to work, and the murderous gardeners, with so vivid a personal reference as to cover with confusion (Matt. xxi, 23, 46, and parallels). The mooted question of the lawfulness of tribute to a Gentile power was purposely proposed by Jesus to test the faith of the Pharisees and Herodians, was so readily solved by him with an appeal to the very coin paid in tribute, that they again retired, unable to make it a ground for public charges against him (Matt. xxi, 15-22, and parallels).
The case of seven brothers successively married (under the Levitical law) to the same woman being thus supposed by the Sadducees, he as easily disposed of the imaginary difficulty concerning her proper husband in the other world by declaring the non-existence of such relations there, and refuted their infidelity as to the future life (Matt. xxii, 23-33, and parallels). Seeing the Sadducees so completely silenced, one of the Pharisaical party undertook to puzzle Jesus by raising that disputed point, What Mosaic injunction is the most important? But Jesus cited the duties of supreme devotion to God and general benevolence to man as the most binding of all other moral enactments, to which the other so cordially assented as to draw a commendation from Jesus on his hopeful sentiments (Mark xii, 28-34, and parallels). Jesus now turned the tables upon his opponents by asking them, Whose descendant the Messiah should be? and on their replying, David's, of course he then asked how (as in Ps. cx, 1) he could be still David's Lord? which so embarrassed his enemies that they desisted from this mode of attack (Matt. xxiii, 41-46). Jesus then in plain terms denounced before the conourse the hypocrisy and ostentation of the hierarchy, especially their priestcraft, their sanctimony, their ambition, their excess, the cruelty, the wanton insolence, and bewailed the impending fate of the city (Matt. xxiii, 1-12, 14-21, 29-39, and parallels). Observing a poor widow drop a few of the smallest coins into the contribution-box in the Temple, he declared that she had given more truly liberal than wealthier donors, because she had given more in proportion to her means, and with greater self-denial (Mark xii, 41-44, and parallels). A number of proselytes [see HELLENIST] requesting through Philip an interview with Jesus, he met them with intimations of his approaching passion, while a celestial voice announced the glory that should thereby accrue to God, and he then retired from the unbelieving public with an admonition to improve their present spiritual privileges (John xii, 20-50). As he was crossing the Mount of Olives, his disciples calling his attention to the noble structure of the Temple opposite, he declared its speedy demolition, and on their asking the time and tokens of this catastrophe, he dismissed to them at length, first, on the coming downfall of the city and nation (warning them to escape betimes from the catastrophe), and then (by a gradual transition, in which, under varied imagery, he represented both events moving toward the consummation) he passed to the doctrine of judgment (described as a forensic tribunal, interpreting constant admonitions (especially in the parable of the ten virgins) to preparation for an event the date of which was so uncertain (Matt. xxiv, 1, 8; x, 17, 20, 34, 35; xxv, 9, 10, 12, 19, 29; xxvi, 13-37; Luke xxi, 34-36; Matt. xxiv, 43-44; Luke xii, 41, 42; Mark xiii, 8, 9, Matt. xxiv, 45-51; Luke xii, 47, 48; Matt. xxiv, 42; xxv, 1-12; Luke xii, 33-38; Matt. xxi, 13, 31-46). As the Passover was now approaching, the Sanhedrin held a secret meeting at the house of the high-priest, where they resolved to get possession, but by private means, of the person of Jesus (Thursday, March 17, A.D. 29), and Judas Iscariot, learning their desire, went and engaged to betray his Master into their hands, on the first opportunity, for a fixed reward (Matt. xxvi, 1-5, 14, 16, and parallels).
The same day Jesus sent two of his disciples into the city, with directions where to prepare the Passover meal (Luke xxii, 7, 8). When these returned, and partake of it with the whole number of his apostles [see LORD'S SUPPER], he affectionately reminded them of the interest gathering about this last repast with them; then, while it was progressing, he washed their feet to revive their mutual rivalry and enforce condescension to all, and by a coalition of the Pharisees and Herodians [see FEET], and immediately declared his own betrayal by one of their number, fixing the individual (by a sign recognised by him alone) among the amized disciples (Luke xxii, 14-17, 24; John xiii, 1-15; Luke xxii, 25-30; John xiii, 17-19, 21, 22; Matt. xxvi, 22-24; John xxi, 23-26; Mark xvi, 19, and parallels). Judas immediately withdrew, full of resentment, but without the rest suspecting his purpose; relieved of his presence, Jesus now began to speak of his approaching fate, when he was interrupted by the surprised inquiries of his followers as to his loss of friend and comforter. He replied, "Ye are not able to come because of your faith"; and relief to the question showed how little they comprehended him on his departure at hand, and the gift (in consequence) of the Holy Spirit, with exhortations to religious activity and mutual love, and, after a prayer for the divine safeguard upon them (John xiv, 1-xx, 17; xxi, 33-35: Matt. xvi, 28, and parallels) and the disciples (John xviii, 1, and parallels), Here, entering the garden of Getsemane, he withdrew, with three of the disciples, a short distance from the rest, and, while they fell asleep, he three times prayed, in an agony (q. v.) that forced blood-tinged sweat from the pores of his forehead, as from the horror-stirred anguish of his soul [see BLOODY SWEAT], and was partially relieved by an angelic messenger: but Judas, soon appearing with a force of Temple guards and others whom he conducted to this frequent place of his Master's retirement, immediately entered, and,浙江大学圣彼得大学数学科学学院的教授们一致认为，赵先生的成果是显著的。他声称自己是浙江大学数学科学学院的教授，但没有提供任何支持他这一声明的证据。他声称自己是浙江大学数学科学学院的教授，但没有提供任何支持他这一声明的证据。他声称自己是浙江大学数学科学学院的教授，但没有提供任何支持他这一声明的证据。他声称自己是浙江大学数学科学学院的教授，但没有提供任何支持他这一声明的证据。他声称自己是浙江大学数学科学学院的教授，但没有提供任何支持他这一声明的证据。他声称自己是浙江大学数学科学学院的教授，但没有提供任何支持他这一声明的证据。他声称自己是浙江大学数学科学学院的教授，但没有提供任何支持他这一声明的证据。他声称自己是浙江大学数学科学学院的教授，但没有提供任何支持他这一声明的证据。他声称自己是浙江大学数学科学学院的教授，但没有提供任何支持他这一声明的证据。他声称自己是浙江大学数学科学学院的教授，但没有提供任何支持他这一声明的证据。他声称自己是浙江大学数学科学学院的教授，但没有提供任何支持他这一声明的证据。他声称自己是浙江大学数学科学学院的教授，但没有提供任何支持他这一声明的证据。他声称自己是浙江大学数学科学学院的教授，但没有提供任何支持他这一声明的证据。
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use of this admission to charge him with blasphemy, to which the Sanhedrin present assented with a sentence of death; the officers who held Jesus thereupon indulged in the vilest insults upon his person (Matt. xxvi, 57, 59-63; Luke xxii, 67-71, 63-66; and parallels). See CAIA-
PIRUS. The formal vote of the Sanhedrin (q.v.) early in the forenoon. Jesus was next led to the procur-
ator Pilate's mansion for his legal sanction upon the determination of the religious court, where the hiera-
chy sought to overcome his reluctance to involve him-
self in the matter (which was increased by his exami-
nation of Jesus formal self, who strenuously denied the allegiations by giving Pilate to understand that his claims did not relate to temporal things) by charging him with sedition, especially in Galilee, an intimation that Pilate seized upon to remand the whole trial to IIIC. (q.v., to be in Jerusalem and the time), as the civil head of that province (John xviii, 28-38; Matt. xxvii, 12-14; Luke xxi, 4-7). Herod, however, on eagerly questioning Jesus, in hopes of witnessing some display of his miraculous power, was so enraged at his absolute silence that he sent him back to Pilate in amock attack on loyalty (Luke xxii, 43). The pro-
curator, thus compelled to exercise jurisdiction over the case, convinced of the prisoner's innocence (especially after a message from his wife to that effect), proposed to the populace to release him as the malefactor which custom required him to set at liberty on the holiday of the passover. But the hierarch insisted on the release of a notorious criminal, Barabbas, instead, and enforced their clamor for the crucifixion of Jesus with so keen an insinuation of Pilate's disloyalty to the em-
peror, that, after varied efforts to exonerate himself and discharge the prisoner (whose personal bearing enhanced his idea of his character), he at length yielded to their demands, and, after allowing Jesus to be beaten [see FLAGELLATION] and otherwise shamefully handled by the soldiers [see MOCKING], he pronounced sentence for his execution on the cross (Luke xxiii, 13-16; Matt. xxvii, 15-16; Mark xiv, 4-6; and parallels). See PILATE. The traitor Judas, perceiving the enor-
mity of his crime, now that, in consequence of his Mas-
ter's acquiescence, there appeared no chance of his es-
cape, returned to the hierarchy with the bribe, which, on their cool reply of indifference to his retraction, he flung down in the temple, and went forth in despairing remorse (Matt. xxvii, 3-10). See JUDAS. On his way out of the city to Golgotha, where he was to be crucified, Jesus fainted under the burden of his cross, which was therefore laid upon the shoulders of one Simon, who chanced to pass at the time, and as their procesion Jesus bore the discourse of the four fe-
males attending him to weep rather for themselves and their nation than for him; on reaching the place of ex-
ecution [see GOLGOTHA], after refusing the usual narc-
otic, he was suspended on the cross between two male-
factors, while praying for his murderers; and a brief statement of his offence (which the Jews in vain en-
deavored to induce Pilate to change as to phraseology) was placed above his head, the executioners meanwhile having divided his garments among themselves: while hanging thus, Jesus was reviled by the spectators, by the soldiers and crowd by one of his fellow-thieves, (whom the other penitently rebuking, was assured by Jesus of speedy salvation for himself [see THIEF ON THE CROSS]), and committed his mother to the care of John; then, at the close of the three hours' preternatural dark-
ness, [see ECLIPSE], giving utterance (in the language of Ps. cxxxvii) laden with the acquired emotion of the SAINTS AMONG THE A-MEN) amid the scoffs of his enemies, he called for some-
thing to quench his thirst, which being given him, he expired with the words of resignation to God upon his lips, while an earthquake (q.v.) and the revivification of the dead, a formal vote of the Sanhedrin (q.v.) were acknowledged [see CENTURION] were forborne to bear witness to the crucifixion [see CRUCIFIXION], and their bodies removed from so public a place; and as the soldiers were executing this order, they were surprised to find Jesus already dead; one of the soldiers, however, tested the body by plunging a spear into the side, when there flowed out of the wound (John xix, 31-37). See BLOOD AND WATER. A rich Arimathæan, named Jo-
seph (q.v.), a secret believer in Jesus, soon came and desired the body of Jesus for burial, and Pilate, as soon as he recognized the sainted and, as of Jesus, his permission; accordingly, with the help of Nicodemus, he laid it in his own new vault, temporarily wrapp-
iped in spices, while the female friends of Jesus observed the place of its sepulture (Mark xvi, 42-44; John xix, 38-42; Luke xxi, 25, 28; and parallels). See SAVVI-
CHRIST. In the absence of the hierarchy, remembering Jesus's predictions of his own resurrection, persuaded Pilate to secure the entrance to the tomb by a large stone, a seal, and a guard [see WATCH] at the door (Matt. xxvii, 62-66). The women, m.m., while prepared additional embalming materials in the morning, and by the body of Jesus (Mark xvi, 1). See EMBALM.

Very early next morning (Sunday, March 20, A.D. 29) Jesus arose alive from the tomb [see RESURRE-
RATION], which an angel opened, the guards swooning away at the sight (Mark xxi, 24, 46; and parallels). The woman soon appeared on the spot with the spices for completing the embalming, but, discovering the stone removed from the door, Mary Magdalene hastily return-
ed to tell Peter, while the rest, entering, missed the body, but saw two angels at the entrance, who informed them that he was resurrected at the east, and, as of Jesus, re-
turning to inform the disciples, they met Jesus himself: but the disciples, on their return, disbeliefed their re-
port (Mark xxi, 2-4; John xx, 2; Luke xxi, 3-4; Matt. xxviii, 7-10; Luke xxiv, 9, 10; and parallels). The guard, however, had by this time recovered, and, chaffing on the one hand, [see THIEF ON THE CROSS], relate a story of the abruption of the body during their sleep (Matt. xxxiii, 11-15). Mary Magdalene mean-
while had roused Peter and John with the tidings of the absence of the body, and, on their hastening to the tomb, they both observed the state of things there, without carrying away the clothes of the dead Jewish fe-
nery, who, arrived soon after they had left, as he stood weeping, saw a person of whom, mistaking him for the keeper of the garden, she inquired for the body, but was soon made aware by his voice that it was Jesus himself, when she fell at his feet, being forbidden a nearer ap-
proach, but bidden to announce his resurrection to the disciples (John xxi, 11-18; Mark xvi, 11; and parallels). On the same day Jesus appeared to two of the disciples who were going to Emmaus, and discovered to them re-
pecting the Christology of the Old Test., but they did not recognize him as the sufferer from whom they had parted at the meal; which, at their journey's end, they invited him, and then they immediately returned with the news to Jeru-
salem, where they found that he had in the meanwhile appeared also to Peter (Luke xxiv, 13-33; and parallels). At this moment Jesus himself appeared in their midst. [see PHYSIO-
gy], and recognizing emotion, Peter, John and two others (Luke xxi, 12, 13) to him, who, in reward of wounds and eating before them, and then gave them instructions respecting their apostolical mission (Luke xxvii, 36-49; John xx, 21; Mark xvi, 15-18; John x, 23, 22, 23; and parallels). Thomas, who had been absent from this interview, and therefore refused to believe the account of the appearance, also rested to, at the next ap-
pearance of Jesus a week afterwards (Sunday evening, March 27, A.D. 29), by handling him personally (John
Some time afterwards (prob. Wednesday, March 30, A.D. 29) Jesus again appeared to his disciples on the shore of the Sea of Tiberias, as they were fishing; and, after they had taken a preternatural quantity of fish at his direction, coming ashore, they partook of a meal which he had prepared, after which he tenderly reproved Peter for his unfaithfulness, and intimated to him the future of both higher bliss and greater service. Soon afterwards (probably Thursday, March 31, A.D. 29) he appeared to five hundred of his disciples (1 Cor. xvi, 6) at an appointed meeting on a mountain in Galilee, where he commissioned his apostles afresh to their work (Matt. xxviii, 16-20). Next he appeared to the larger number of his apostles together (see Appearance of Risen Christ), to whom, at the end of forty days from his passion (Thursday, April 28, A.D. 29), he gave a general charge relative to their mission (see Apostle), and, leading them towards Bethany, while blessing them he was suddenly carried up bodily into the sky (see Ascension) and enfolded from their sight in a cloud (see Ascension), angels at the same time appearing and declaring to them, in their astonishment, his future return in a similar manner (Acts i, 1-12, and parallels). For a fuller explanation of the details of the foregoing narrative, see Further narrative on the Ascension (see Matthew, xxvii, 50-56.—Mark, xvi, 9-20.—Luke, xxiv, 1-23.—John, xx, 1-18.—xxi, 1-25.)

Jesus Christ, also known as Jesus of Nazareth, was a central figure in the history of Christianity. He is believed to be the son of God according to Christian belief. The accounts of his life, known as the gospels, are central to the Christian faith.

Jesus was born in Bethlehem, according to the New Testament, and began his ministry in Galilee, where he taught and performed miracles. He travelled to Jerusalem, where he was crucified by the Romans. His resurrection is described in the gospels and is a central doctrine of Christianity.

Jesus' teachings and actions are recorded in the New Testament, which includes the four Gospels (Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John). These accounts are based on the sayings and actions of Jesus and are believed by Christians to be divinely inspired.

Jesus' message of love, forgiveness, and salvation for all people resonated with his listeners and continues to inspire millions today. His teachings on moral conduct, compassion, and social justice have had a profound influence on Christian ethics and theology.
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logica do not shrink from the field of inquiry thus

opened.

A time of quiet and rest seemed now to have dawned
upon this polemical field of Christian theology, when
suddenly, in 1685, the learned Frenchman Réinau
appeared with his Vie de Jesus, and stirred anew the spir-
its, as Saurin had done thirty years before. Most ar-
biters did Mr. Réinau deal with the facts upon which
his work professed to be based; while theologically he
proceeded throughout "on a really atheistic assumption,
disguised beneath the veil of a pantheistic physiolog-
ism. . . . It is, however, when we look at the Vie de Jesus
from the view of that the most apparent in their length and breadth.

its hero is a fanatical impostor, who pretends to be and to do
that which he knows to be beyond him, but who, never-
theless, is held up to our admiration as the ideal of hu-

manity" (Liddon, p. 500). It is sufficient to reply to this
characteristic by Mr. Réinau that, "If this be the found-
er of Christianity, and if Christianity be the right be-

lief, then all religion must cease from the earth; for not
only is this character unfit to sustain Christianity, but
it is unfit to sustain any religion; it wants the bond
(Lange, I. xvi). Yet "it may be that to the thou-
sands of Mustering all old objections and all the sym-

doctrine of the infamy and the death which the cultus of
the Latin Church brings so prominently before them; or, who,
having rejected these, have accepted nothing in their
place, the Vie de Jesus has given a sense of human
truth, a religious history which never knew before, and led them to study it with a more devout
sympathy" (Plumptre, p. 337). Countless editions and
translations were made of the work, and it was read
everywhere with as much interest as if it had been sim-
ply a work of fiction; indeed German theologians, even
the most rationalists, hesitated not to rank it among French
novels. Innumerable are the works which were writ-
ten against and in defence of this legendary hypothesis.
In Germany, especially, the contest raged fiercely, and
for a time it seemed as if the materialistic Frenchman
was to uproot all Christian feelings in the hearts of the
common people of Germany, when Strauss suddenly
reappeared on the stage in behalf of his mythical
theory with a new edition of his Leben Jesu, this time
prepared for the wants of the German people, "and the
new work, more popular in form, more caustic and sneer-
ings in its hostility, has been read as widely as is the old.
. . . as Bahr had done before, and like Bahr, he seeks to prove
that the first three gospels contradict each other and the
other. Without entering into the more elaborate theories as to their origin and their rela-
tion to the several parties and sects in early Christian-
tion, as Bahr did after, and he had his general theory
which accounts for them. Men's hopes and wishes, their
reverence and awe, tend at all times to develop
themselves into mytha. . . . The mytha were not 'cumin-
ingly devised, but were the spontaneous, unconscious
growth of the time in which they first appeared. If
men asked what then, was left them to believe in—what
was the idea which had thus developed itself through
what had been worked on as the facts of Christianity,
the answer was that God manifested himself, not in
Christ, but in humanity at large—humanity is the union of
the two natures, the finite and the infinite, the child of
the visible mother and the invisible father. But the invisi-
ble and the invisible against the book was, as might be expected,

enormous. It opened the eyes of those who had dallied
with unbelief to see that they were naked, and it stripp-
ped off the fig-leaf covering of words and phrases with
which they had tried to veil their nakedness. What
was offered as the compensation for all this work of de-
struction, if it were offered in any other spirit than that
of the mockery even then, and yet more now, so charac-
teristic of the author, was hardly enough to give warmth
and shelter to any human soul" (Plumptre, p. 354).

Amidst the efforts of Christian divines and scholars to
forward to refute the naked falsehoods, and up to our day
the contest rages, nor can it be said how soon it will be
ended; it is certain, however, that orthodox Christianity
is daily gaining ground, even in the very core of the
heart of Rationalism. In France it drew forth the able
work of Pressense, Jesus Christ son Temps, ou Vie son
Évèque (Paris, 1865), which has since appeared in an
English dress in this country. In England, Eeze Home,
a series of lectures, published in 1866, was a response to French and German Rational-
ists, in so far as the reality of our Savour's human
character is concerned. (See above, II. 3.)

Great service has also been done for the truth by the
work of J. I. Reiner, Der Weg der Prachts und der
Vorwärts (Stein Fortsatz der Perser Jesu Christi, Ingolstadt, 1864), Liddon (Bampton Lecture, 1866; see Christian Remembrancer, Jan. 1866, article vi),
and particularly by Row (London, 1866; N. Y. 1871; see
Princeton Rev. 1810, article vi), Plumptre (Bampton Lecture, 1856), R. Payne Smith (Bampton Lecture, 1869), Leathes, Win-
ners of Sto John to Christ (Bampton Lecture, 1870), Andrews, and Han.

Several popular treatises on the subject were also
published in Germany, England, and America, among
which are those of Abbott and Eddy. Henry Ward
Beecher has just published vol. i of a similar work.

2. The following is a list of the most important of the
works which have either rejected or criticism the person and history of Christ, of which Germany has been especially fruitful
comp. Walch, iii, 404; Haase, p. 28, 37, 41; Andrews, Preface.

(1) Of a general character are treatises by the fol-

lowing authors: none of which purporting to tig-

1. The following is a list of the most important of the
works which have either rejected or criticism the person and history of Christ, of which Germany has been especially fruitful
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1819. Ammon (Lpzg. 1819-7, 3 vols.), Müller (Berlin, 1819, 1821), Schmidt (Wien, 1822, 1826), Francke (Bresl. 1823, Lpzg. 1828, 1842), Buchfchler (Münch. 1828), Neveis (Aachen, 1826), Stephani (Magdeburg, 1826), Onynius (Sulzb. 1831), Blunt (London, 1834), Hartmann (Stuttg. 1834), Huber (Strassb., 1835), Hamburger (Hamb., 1835). Ammon (Münch. 1835, 1837, 1839, 1840, 1841, 1842), Schott (Münch. 1835), Spieß (Münch. 1835), Stein (Heidelberg, 1835), Reich (Quedlin., 1840), Hirsch (Tübingen, 1839), Wurkert (Meis. 1840), Hug (1840), Kraus (Kais., 1840), Lichtenstein (Elz. 1855), Bouguen (Paris and Lausanne, 1856), J. Bucher (Stuttg., 1859), Krummacher (Biefl. 1854), Baumannt (Brunsw., 1856), Uhborn (Hamb., 1856, Rost., 1857), Wachter (Münch. 1857), Theobald (Münch. 1857). Among those pictorially illustrated are the works of Schleich (Münch. 1821), Langer (Stuttg., 1823), Kito (Lond. 1814), Abbott (N. Y. 1864), Crosby (N. Y. 1871). Among those of a poetical character are Juvenesc, ed. Arevalos (Rom. 1792), Vida (L. R. 1856), ed. Müller; Hambl. 1811, Wisem. (Berlin, 1816, 1820), Güttemer (Hannover, 1821), Schincie (Halic., 1820), Klopotock (Hal., 1751, and often), Lavater (Winterth. 1788), Halem (Han- nover, 1810), Weihe (Elberf. 1822, 1824), Wilmy (Sulzb. 1825), Kirsch (Lpzg. 1825), Göpp (Lpzg. 1827).

(2.) Of a more special nature are treatises on particular subjects, a few of which are the following: on the nature of man, e.g.: his relations: Waelter (Berl. 1791), Oertel (Germ. 1792), Hase (Region. 1792, Berl. 1794), Ludwig (Wolfenb. 1801), Tülliner (Uspal. 1772), Geyer (Viteb. 1772), Blom (L. Bat. 1839), Osterzece (Traj. a. 1840); and upon heredity, Seiler (Elb. 1838), Wolters (Slees. 1838), on his birth: Korb (Lpzg. 1831), Meerheim (Viteb. 1878), Reimer (Lubeck, 1835), Oetter (Nürnb. 1774); and in a chronological point of view, among others: Masson (Koter. 1700), Mauis (Kilon. 1708, id. 1722), Heineccius (Hal., 1708), Liebknecht (Gies. 1735), Hager (Chemn. 1768), Hauptmann (Strassb., 1769, id. 1782), Hai- den (Praque, 1759), Recared (Region. 1768, id. 1769), Horix (Moonpt. 1799), Sanclemente (Rom. 1795), Michealis (Wien, 1797), Mitter (Kopen. 1827), Feldhoff (Frank., 1822), Mayer (Gryph. 1701), Hardt (Heilmsdt., 1754), Korner (Lipsie. 1778), Mynerston (Kopen. 1857), Hamel (Elz., 1857), Seiler (Elb. 1838), Sculzer (Elb. 1838), Gersemin (Duiss., 1802), Fliggy (Argent. 1811), Weichert (Vie- tob. 1811), Foggert (Hamb. 1826), Hanna (The Forty Days after our Lord's Resurrection, London, 1863).

The following are some of the treatises on the personal traits of Jesus, e.g. his physical constitution: Weber (Hal. 1825), Engelmann (Lpzg. 1834), Gisseler (Götting.) 1857). On his dress: Zeilich (Witt. 1754), Gerberon (Par. 1677). His language: Reiske (Jena, 1670), Klasen (Viteb. 1739), Diodati (Neapol. 1767), Pfannkuche (in Eichhorn's "Agr. Bibli." viii, 365-480), Wiseman (in his Hor. Syn. Rome, 1838), Zeilich (Viteb. 1721), Paulis (Jena, 1819). On his mode of life: Lunel (Lpzg. 1784), Rau (Erl. 1787, 1796), Jacobeus (Hafn. 1753), Schreiber (Jena, 1743), Tragard (Gryph. 1781). On his intercourse with others: Gesensius (Heilmsdt., 1734), Jetze (Liegn. 1792). Respecting the inner nature of his character, the following may be named as the most important: Waelter (Jena, 1758), Bücking (Stendal. 1708), Schinschier (Fleisen 1774 sq.), Winkler (Lpzg. 1826), Dorner (Stuttg. 1839); on his psychology, see the Biblioth. Sacra, April, 1870. On his sinlessness, among others: Waelter (Viteb. 1680), Baumgarten (Hafn. 1746), Erbse (Hal. 1747), Ullmann (Hamburg, 1833), Engelmann (Lpzg. 1878); Gisseler (Hann. 1799), Ullmann (Hamburg, 1833, translated in Clark's Biblical Cabinet, Edinburgh), Fritzsche (Halle, 1838). See MESSIAH.

Jesus Christ. Orders of. These were formed of temporal knighthoods in the countries paying homage to the Roman see for the protection and promotion of the Roman Catholic religion.

1. Such was the order founded under this name, also known as the Order of Dobrin, in 1213, by duke Conrad of Masovia and Kujavia, Poland. They followed the rules of St. Augustine as a religious society, and their aim was to carry on the work of the houses of the Western Prussians, their western neighbors. Their stronghold was the burgh of Dobrin, in Prussia. The insignia and dress of the order were a white mantle, on the left breast a red sword, and a five-pointed red star. The order was merged into the German order in 1254.

2. In Spain such an order was founded in 1216 by Dominicus. The knights bound themselves to practise monastic duties, and to battle in defence of their Church. It was approved by pope Honorious III, and confirmed, under various names, by different popes. When Fusi (1629) founded the Congregation of St. Peter the Martyr at Rome, composed of the cardinals, grand inquisitors, and other dignitaries of the Holy Office, this order was
A female order of like name with the above, whose origin is also attributed to the Jesusis, was founded in 1800 at Paris. The first leader of it was the maid
elen Barat, and it was approved by Leo XII December 22, 1826. As they engage in the education of young women, and the sisters of it, also, bear the name Jesusis in Churches, a favorable reputation, but are in a flourishing condition in many Protestant countries also. They have in Europe alone more than a hundred establishments. They exist also in America and Africa. Their private aims, to doubt, are those of the Jesuistical order.

Jesus, Society of. See Jesus.

Jether (Heb. Yether, יְתֶר, surplus), the name of six men, and perhaps also of a place.
1. (Sept. 1123p.) A son of Jada and great-grandson of Emeram, of the family of Judah; he had a brother Jonathan, but no children (1 Chron. ii. 92). RC considerably post 1856.
3. (Sept. 1123p.) The first named of the sons of Ezra (2 Ezcr.), of the tribe of Judah (his brothers being Mered [q. v.], Epher, and Jalon), but whose connections are not otherwise defined (1 Chron. iv. 17). RC prob. cin. 1618. In the Sept. the name is repeated: "and Jether begat Miriam, etc." By the author of the Ques. Hebr. in Par. he is said to have been Aaron, Ezra being another name for Amram (q. v.). Miriam (q. v.) in the second part of the verse—explained by the Targum to be identical with Efrath—is taken by many to be a maiden who fell in love with Judas.
4. (Sept. 1123p.) The oldest son of Gideon, who, when called upon by his father to execute the commandment of Jehovah, rose up on the evening of the 34th year of his age, and in one stroke of the sword cut down the Midianite kings, Zebah and Zalmunna, timely declined on account of his youth (Judg. viii. 20). RC 1382. According to Judg. ix. 5, he was slain, together with nine of his brothers—Jonathan alone escaping— upon one stone" at Ophrah, by the hands of Abimelech, the son of Gideon's concubine, of Shechem. See Gideon.
5. (Sept. 1123p., 1123p.) The father of Amasa, Da-
id's general (1 Kings ii. 5, 82; 1 Chron. ii. 17) elsewhere (2 Sam. xvii, 6) called Ithra (q. v.). He is described as a strong man, 17 as an Ishmaelite of the desert, and is more likely to be correctly than the "Ishmaelite" of the Hebrew in 2 Sam. xvii, or the "Jezreelite" of the Sept. and Vulg. in the same passage. "Ishmaelitis" is said by the author of the Ques. Hebr. in Isb. Reg. to have been the reading of the Hebrew, but there is no trace of it in the LXX. The Talmud records two divergent opinions on the subject (Jer. Jebom, 9, 8; comp. Bashi. Jeb. 78, 8). According to R. Samuel bar-Nachman, Jether was an Ishmaelite by birth, but became a prelate: hence the two appellations. Another opinion is that a slave of David's reign, he, when the king's descent through Ruth, a Moabish woman, was made a pretext by some of his antagonists to deprive him of his crown, "girded his loins like an Ishmaelite," and threatened to uphold the sword, if need be, the authority of the Halacha, which had decided that "a Moabite man, even a Moabite woman, should be prohibited from entering into the congregation." Similarly we find in the Targ. to 1 Chron. ii. 17 (Wilkins' edition—this verse belongs to those wanting in Ber. that the father of Amasa was Jether the Ishmaelite, but that he was called to the Israel allegiance as the Ishmael of the text) it said David מָתַּאַרְמִיָה (מָתַּאַרְמִיָה) before the tribunal [Wilkins, "cum Arabibus "]... Later commentators (Rashi, Abrabanel, David Kimchi) assume that he was an Ishmaelite by birth, but dwelt in the land of Ishmael.
and was for this reason also called the Ishmaelite, as Obed Edom is also called the Gittite (2 Sam. vii, 1) or Hiram's father the Zuri or Turyan (1 Kings vii, 43). David Kimchi also adds a suggestion of his father, to the effect "that in the Israelite tongue the word Ishmaelite, from his nationalitv, and in that of Israel they called him the Ishmaelite on account of his living in the land of Ishmael." Josephus calls him Ισθαμαλητας (Ant. vii, 10, 1). He married Abigail, David's sister, probably during the sojourn of the family of Jesse in the land of Moab, under the protection of his king. See ABIGAIL.

6. (Sept. 132r v. r. 132p) An Asherite (head of a warrior family numbering 20,000) whose three sons are named in 1 Chron, vii, 38; possibly the same with tirshah of the preceding verse.

7. Whether the lichrahs (לִכְרָה, Sept. Ἠρακλός, 132v, 132p Τιρσέως, Vulg. Jethratho, Jethretho, etc.) Iris and Gareb, mentioned in 2 Sam. xxiii, 38, etc., were natives of an otherwise unknown place called Jethre, of or of Jathir, לִכְרָה, one of David's places of refuge (1 Sam. xxx, 27), or descendants of one Jethre—the least probable suggestion—cannot now be determined. See TIRSHAH.

Jetheth (Heb. Teketh, תְכֵת, prob. a peg, or fig., or prince; Sept. 132v 133r and 132p, the last apparently from falsely reading "_previous, Vulg. Jetheth", the third name of the petty Edomite shieks in Mount Seir (Gen. xxxvi, 40; 1 Chron. i, 51). B.C. ante 1658. See ESSAO. As to identification, El-Weltid is a place in Nejd, said to be in the Dahna [see ISHRAKH]; there is also a place called El-Welti, and El-Weltidah, which is the name of mountains belonging to Bne Abd-Allah Ibn-Ghafsin (Maradid, s. v.) (Smith). See ARABIA.

Jethlah (Heb. Yihlah, יִלְחָה, suspended, i.e. lofty; Sept. 133v 133r v. סָלָה, Vulg. Jethela), a city on the borders of the tribe of Dan, mentioned in Josh. ix, 42. The associated names seem to indicate a locality in the eastern part of the tribe, not far from the modern el-Atrun (Ararat). Perhaps the ruined site marked on Van de Velde's Map (last ed.) as Ameikus (Nicopolis). See EMMAUS, 2.

Jethro (Heb. Yihro, יִהְרוּ, i. q. יִהְרָה, excellence or gain, as often in Eccles.; occurs in Exod. iii, 1, 4; xviii, 1, 2, 5, 6, 9, 10, 12; Sept. 133v 133r JETHRE, abundance, as often; occurs with reference to this person, Exod. iv, 18, where it is Anglicized "Jethro" in the modern English version. In the Samaritan the version reading the word הִרְוָה, as in the Syriac and Targ. Jun., one of Kennicott's MSS., and a MS. of Targ. Onk., No. 16 in De Rossi's collection; Sept. 133r Jethro, a priest or prince (for the word הִרְוָה carries both significations, and both these offices were united in the patriarchal sheiks) of Midian, a tract of country in Arabia Petraea, on the eastern border of the Red Sea, at no great distance from Mount Sinai, where Moses spent his exile from the Egyptian court. B.C. 1698. The family of this individual seems, in the sequel at least, to have observed the worship of the true God in common with the Hebrews (Exod. xviii, 11, 12), and from this circumstance some suppose it to have been a branch of the posterity of Midian, fourth son of Abraham, by Ketura, while others, on the contrary, maintain that the aspersion cast upon Moses for having married a Cushite is inconsistent with the idea of its genealogical descent from that patriarch (Calmet). See MIDIAN.

"Considerable difficulty has been felt in determining who this person was, as there is not an exact relation to Moses; for the word הִרְוָה, which, in Exodus, iii, 19, 20, is applied to Jethro, Judges, iii, 9, xix, 22, Judg. iv, 11, is translated "father-in-law," and in Gen. xix, 14, "son-in-law," is a term of indeterminate signification, denoting simply relationship by marriage; and besides, the transaction which in one place (Exod. xviii, 27) is related of Jethro, seems to be in another related of Hobab (Numb. x, 28). Hence some have concluded that, as forty years had elapsed since Moses's connection with this family was formed, his father-in-law (Exod. ii, 16, Reuel the father-in-law, which in the original is used in both places), was dead, or confined to his tent by the infirmities of age, and that the person who visited Moses at the foot of Sinai was his brother-in-law, called Hobab in Numb. x, 22; Judg. iv, 11; Jethro in Exod. iii, i; and in Judg. i, 16, Kesi (קֵסֶי), which, there as well as in iv, 11, is rendered "the Ke-site" (Kesiti). Against the tradition that Reuel or Hobab, because there lies this serious objection, that in Numb. x, 29 Hobab is expressly called the son of Raguil (or Reuel), who in Exod. ii, 16-21 is evidently made the father-in-law of Moses, and in iii, 1 is clearly the same as Jethro. Nor will the interpretation of the Targum avail, which makes Reuel the grandfather of Moses's wife (by a frequent Hebrewism of "daughter" for granddaughter, etc.); for then Moses's real father-in-law would be nowhere named; and it is clearly Jethro whose flocks he kept, and to whom he "made obeisance" (Exod. xviii, 7); which, with other incidental allusions, are all natural on the supposition that Moses was his son-in-law, but are out of place in a brother-in-law. Besides, it is Jethro who is called the ascendant and tribal head of the clan, which could not, under the patriarchal domestic constitution, have been the case had his father Reuel been still alive. If, indeed, we could accept the conjecture of Israel (Bucholz, des Isr. i, ii, 63) that, by an ancient clerical error, the words יִהְרוּ, "Jethro, son of," had dropped out before the name of Reuel, it would then be easy, with the Targum Jonathan, Aben-Ezra, Rosenmüller, etc., to assume that Jethro was Reuel's son; but there is no trace of such an error. All those methods of adjusting these accounts must therefore be abandoned which maintain the identity of Jethro and Hobab, in whatever way they seek (see Wine's Realwörterbuch, s. v. Raguil) to reconcile the discrepancies; and the whole of the statements may be cleared up by understanding, with Von Lengerke (Kesk., i, 505), Bertheau (Gesch. Isra. sec. 105), Kalisch (Exod. p. 85), and others, that Jethro and Raguil were but different names of Moses's father-in-law, and that the son Hobab was his brother-in-law (referring יִדְרוּ in Numb. x, 29 to Raguil, and in Judg. iv, 11 taking it in the general sense of affines, relative by marriage). Josephus, in speaking of Raguil, remarks once (Ant, ii, 12, 1), that he "had father (οικός) e. l. Euthro for a companion (εὐ πάρεις)," but does not give the name of his "father" or "companion" (οικός, εὐ πάρεις). "The abbreviated form of his name (Jethro or Jethro, for Jethron) is enumerated by the Midrash as the first of the seven (or, according to another version, eight) names by which this Midianish priest was known (viz. Jethro or Jethron, because he heaped up יִדְרוּ good deeds, or because 'he added a Parasha to the Torah'; Cheber (דְּרִיב), because he was a friend of the Lord; Chobei (בֹּר), because he was beloved by the Lord, or because he 'loved the Toran'; Reuel, because he was a companion (בֹּר) to the Lord; Petuel, because he freed himself (סֵדָּה) from idolatry). Indeed, Jethro is considered his original name, to which, when he became a believer and a convert to the faith, an additional signification (בֹּר) was affixed. According to the Midrash (fol. 53, 51), he had been one of Pharaoh's musicians, and had got possession of Aaron's staff, which had belonged to Joseph; but he was driven from Egypt because he opposed the decree for drowning the Israelitish infants." See HOBAB; RAQUIL.

"The hospitable, free-hearted and unsought, which Jethro at once extended to the unknown, homeless wanderer, on the relation of his daughters that he had watered their flock, is a picture of Eastern manners no less true than lovely. We may perhaps suppose that Je-
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tho, before his acquaintance with Moses, was not a worshipper of the true God. Traces of this appear in the delay which Moses had suffered to take place with respect to the circumcision of his son (Exod. iv, 24–26); indeed, it is even possible that Zipporah had afterwards been subjected to a kind of divorce (Exod. xviii, 2, יִניִסְהוֹב, on account of her attachment to an alien cult). The growing convictions were at work in the mind of Jethro, from the circumstance of Israel’s continued prosperity, till at last, acting upon these, he brought back his daughter, and declared that his impressions were confirmed, for now he knew that the Lord was greater than all gods, for in the thing wherein they dealt proudly, he was above them; consequently with this in mind Jethro, Moses’s father-in-law, took a burnt-offering and sacrifices for God: and Aaron came, and all the elders of Israel, to eat bread with Moses’s father-in-law before God; as if to celebrate the event of his conversion" See Moses.

"Shortly after the Exodous (B.C. 1658), Jethro paid a visit to Moses, while the Hebrew camp was lying in the environs of Sinai, bringing with his wife and two daughters, the Zipporah, Moses’s wife, who, together with her two sons, had been left with her family while her husband was absent on his embassy to Pharaoh. The interview was on both sides affectionate, and was celebrated first by the solemn rites of religion, and afterwards by festivities, of which Aaron and his tribe formed the ornaments, and Israel were invited to partake. On the following day, observing Moses incessantly occupied in deciding causes that were submitted to him for judgment, his experienced kinsman remonstrated with him on the speedy exhaustion which a perseverance in such arduous labors would superinduce; and in order to relieve himself, as well as secure a due attention to every case, he urged Moses to appoint a number of subordinate officers to divide with him the duty of the judicial tribunals, with power to decide in all common affairs, while the weightier and more serious matters were reserved to himself. This wise suggestion the Hebrew legislator adopted (Exod. xviii, 27). His brother-in-law Hobab naturally purposed to accompany his father back to Midian, and at first expressed a refusal to the invitation of Moses to accompany the Israelites to Canaan (Num. x, 29, 30). It is most probable that he actually returned with his father, "but if he did carry that purpose into execution, it was in opposition to the urgent solicitations of the Jewish leader, who entreated him, for his own advantage, to cast in his lot with the people of God; at all events to continue with them, and afford them the benefit of his thorough acquaintance with the wilderness. ‘Leave us not, I pray thee,’ said Moses, ‘forasmuch as thou knowest how we are to encamp in the wilderness, and thou mayest be to us instead of eyes’ which the Sept. has rendered ‘and thou shalt be an elder among us.’ But there can be little doubt that the true meaning is that Hobab might perform the office of a κυβέρνητης or guide (see Bruce’s Travel, iv, 586)—his influence as an Arab chief, his knowledge of the routes, the situation of the wells, the places for fuel, the prognostics of the weather, and the most eligible stations for encamping, rendering him peculiarly fitted to act in that important capacity at the head of the caravan. It is true that God was their leader, by the pillar of cloud by day and of fire by night, the advancement or the halting of which regulated their journeys and fixed their encampments. But beyond these general directions the keeping of their flocks and their not extended. As smaller parties were frequently sallying forth from the main body in quest of forage and other necessaries, which human observation or enterprise were sufficient to provide, so Moses discovered his wisdom and good sense in enlisting the aid of the son of a native sheik, who, from his family connection with himself, his powerful influence, and his long experience, promised to render the Israelites most important services.’ To these solemn representations Moses replied, ‘I will go no further, that Hobab finally yielded; a conclusion that, indeed, seems to be explicitly referred to in Judg. i, 16; iv, 11. See Kenite; Ishtrah.

No other particulars of the life of Jethro are known, but the Arabs, who call him Shoboel, have a variety of traditions concerning him. They say that Michael, the son of Taskir, and grandson of Midian, was his father; this last was the immediate son of Iahmael, according to the author of Le-Toruk, but Moses makes no mention of Midian among the sons of Jetham (Gen. xxx, 18, 19). Jethro gave his son-in-law Moses the miraculously bred; it had once been the rod of Adam, and was of the myrtle of Paradisæ, etc. (Lane’s Koran, p.190; Weil’s Bib. Legenda, p.107–109). Although blind (Lane, p.180, note), he was favored with the gift of prophecy, and God sent him to the Midianites to preach the unity of God, to withdraw the Israelites from idolatry, and to procure for them a more secure and safer abode in the wilderness, for buying by the larger and selling by the smaller. Besides these frauds of the Midianites in their trading, they offered violence to travellers, and robbed them on the highways. They threatened even Jethro for his remonstrances. This insolence obliged God to manifest his wrath: he sent the angel Gabriel, who, with a voice of thunder, made the earth to tremble, which destroyed them all except Jethro, and those who, like him, believed the unity of God (Lane, p.179–181). After this punishment Jethro went to Moses, as related in Exod. xviii, 1–5. The Mohammedans term him, from the advice he gave to Moses, ‘The preacher of the prophets’ (D’Herbelot, Bib. Orient. iii, 278 sq.; comp. J. C. Maier, De Jethrone, Helmst. 1715). ‘The name of Sho’eb still remains attached to one of the wadys on the east side of the Jordan, opposite Jericho, through which, according to tradition, Moses came out from Egypt (Rob. Reisen, 1824, ii, 919, 976), the children of Israel descended to the Jordan. Other places bearing his name and those of his two daughters are shown at Sinai and on the Gulf of Akaba (Stanley, Syr.: and Pal. p. 33)."
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the liberation of their comrades at Rome. But when
Jeter found that he had been imposed upon, he seri-
ously opposed the plot at the danger of his life. For
further particulars, see Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. book iv, cent.
xxvi, sec. i, ch. 1; § 12. See also Berne Conference.
Jefiel ( Heb. Yeiel), שֵׁיֶלֲךָ, matched away by God,
I. c. protected; Sept. 'Ish, Vulg. Jehoh), a descendant of
Jera, being the first of the number of 600, residing in Jerusalem after the captivity (1 Chron. ix, 6).
B.C. 536. This name is also everywhere written in
the text for Jefiel. See Jefiel. In the Apocrypha
(1 Esdr. viii, 39) it stands for the Heb. Jefel (Exra viii, 13) as the name of one of the Bene-Adonikam who re-
turned to Jerusalem after the captivity.
Je'ush (Hebrew Ye'ish or, יֵאֵשׁ, assemblers; written
Yeish', in the text of Gen. xxxvi, 5; 14 Chron. vii, 10), the name of several men.
1. (Sept. Ioqai, but 11061 in 1 Chron. i, 35; Vulg.
Johus.) The eldest of the three sons of Easa by Aholi-
abam, the daughter of Anah, born in Cansaan, but af-
terwards a sheik of the Edomites (Gen. xxxvi, 5, 14; 1 Chron. i, 35). B.C. post 1864.
2. (Sept. 'Ishai v. r. Ioqai, Vulg. Jehoh.) The first
named son of Bishan, grandson of Benjamin (1 Chron. vii, 10). B.C. considerably post 1856.
3. (Sept. 'Ishai, Vulg. Jaws.) A Levite, one of the four
sons of Shimei; not having many sons, he was reck-
oned with his brother Beriah as the third branch of
the family (1 Chron. xxiii, 10, 11). B.C. 1049.
4. (Sept. Ioqai, Vulg. Johus.) One of the three sons
of Rebhoam, apparently by Abihail, his second wife (2 Chron. xi, 19). B.C. post 973.
5. (Sept. 'Ishai v. r. 1166, Vulg. Johs. A. Vera. "Je-
hush"). The second son of Eshek, brother of Azel, of
the descendants of Saul (1 Chron. viii, 39). B.C. cir.
588.
Je'ziz (Heb. Ye'itz), יֵזִּיָּה, counsellor, q. d. Elhot-
loa; Sept. 'Ishai v. r. 'Ishai, Vulg. Jehoh), a chief
Benjamite, one of the sons apparently of Shaharaim,
born of his wife Hodesh or Basara in the land of Moab
(1 Chron. vii, 10). B.C. perh. cir. 1618.
Jew (Heb. Yehudhai, יְהוּדָּת, plur. יְהוּדִים, sometimes
Judee, Esth. iv, 7; vii, i, 13; ix, 15, 18 text; fem.
Judee, 1 Chron. iv, 18; Chal. in plur. emphat. יְהוּדִית, Dan.
iii, 8; Ezra iv, 12; v, 1, 5; adv. יְהוּדִית, Judges, in the Jews' language, 2 Kings xviii, 26; Neh.
xxiii, 24; Sept. and N. T. Tovhalac, hence verb 'Tovhalac, to
Judae, Gal. iv, 14; adj. 'Tovhalac, Jewish, Tit. i, 14, etc.), a name for a descendant of
Jehoshua, the son of Odoliel, and in a later period applied to its first use to one belonging to the tribe or
country of Judah, or rather, perhaps, to a subject of
the separate kingdom of Judah (2 Kings xvi, 6; xxv, 5;
Jer. xxii, 12; xxxiii, 19, 21; xi, 11; xiii, 3; xlv, 11; 29), in contrast distinction from the seeding ten tribes,
who retained the name of Israel or Israelites. During
the captivity the term seems to have been extended
(see Josephus, Ant. xi, 5, 6) to all the people of the
Hebrew language and country, without distinction (Ezek.
iii, 6, 9; Dan. iii, 8, 12); and this loose application of
the name was preserved after the restoration to Pale-
stine (Hag. i, 14; ii, 2; Ezra iv, 12; v, 1, 5; Neh. i, 2; ii,
v, 1, 8, 17), when it came to denote not only every
descendant of Abraham in the largest possible sense (2 Macc. ix, 17; John iv, 9; Acts xvii, 2, 24, etc.), es-
specially in opposition to foreigners ("Jews and Greeks," Acts xiv, 12; xvii, 34, 41; xix, 10; Acts i, 21, 29, 24), but even
proselytes who had no blood-relation to the Hebrews
(Acts ii, 5; comp. 10). An especial use of the term is
noticeable in the Gospels of John, where it frequently
stands for the chief Jew, the elders, who were opposed to
Christ (John i, 19; v, 15, 16; vii, i, 11, 13; ix, 22;
xviii, 12; Acts x, 19, 24, 22). See Judah.
The original designation of the Israelitish nation was
the Hebrews, by which all the legitimate posterity of
Abraham were known, not only among themselves (Gen.
xl, 15; Exod. ii, 7; iii, 18, 8; vii, 16; ix, 18; Jonah
i, 9, 10; comp. 4 Macc. ix)—although the name Jew was in
later times prevalent; see the Targum of Jonathan on
Exod. ut sup.), but also among foreigners (as the Egyp-
tians, Gen. xxxv, 26; Exod. xii, 11; John v, 44; the Per-
tines, 1 Sam. iv, 6, 9; xiiiii, 19; xxiii, 3; the Assyrians,
Judith xii, 11; and even the Greeks and Romans, see
Plutarch, Sympos. iv, 5; Appian, Civ. ii, 71; Pausan. i,
5, 24; v, 7; xii, 12; Forbryny, Vit. Fhugl. p. 185; Tacit.
Hist. v, 2). See Israelite. After the Exile, the title 
Jew becomes the usual one (compare Macc. iii, 22),
while the term "Hebrews" fell into disuse, being still
applied, however, to the Samaritans (Josephus, Ant. xi, 8, 6), or more commonly to designate the vulgar Syro-
Chaldee spoken by the Palestinian Jews (comp. Acts ix, 29;
Eusebius iii, 24), a distinction from the Egyptian Jews
(Acts vi, 1; comp. the title of the "Epistle to the He-
Yet Paul, who spoke Greek, was appropriately styled a Hebrew (2 Cor. xii, 22; Phil. iii, 5); and still later the terms Hebrew and Jew were applied with little distinction to the Du possion of Jewish descent (Eusebius, Hist. Ec. ii, 4; Philo, iii, 4). See HEbrew. (For a further discussion of these epi-
theses, see Genesius, Gesch. d. Hebr. Sprache, 9 sq.; Heng-
stienberg, Æbner, p. 201 sq.; Ewald, Krit. Gramm. p. 8,
and Israelit, Gesch. 1, 354; Hoffmann, in the Hist. Encycl.
ol, ii, 33, 50; Frollen, in the Hist. Encycl. ii, 33; Henkel's Htr. iii, 689 sq.; Cyparos, Crif. Sccra, p. 170 sq.)

The history of the Jewish nation previous to the
Christian era, is interwoven with that of their country
and capital. See Palestine; Jerusalem. During the
Biblical periods it consists mostly of the narratives of
the progeny and migrations of the sons of Jacob, and
the events of that marked its leading epochs. See Abraham;
Jacob; Moses; Joshua; Judges; David; Solomon;
Judah; Israel; Captivity; Macabees; Herod; Juda.
(A for further details, see list of works below.)

Eusebius iii, 24, in distinction of the Jews salience
perhaps to commence with the return of the remnant of
the chosen people of God from the exile (q. v.), but this
portion of their history, down even to the time of their
final dispersion, A.D. 135, has already been treated at
length in other parts of this work (we refer the reader to the articles on the provinces and the greater part of the
events that marked its leading epochs. See Abraham;
Jacob; Moses; Joshua; Judges; David; Solomon;
Judah; Israel; Captivity; Macabees; Herod; Juda.
(A for further details, see list of works below.)

Bar-Cochba, to regain their independence, that brought
about a repetition of scenes enacted under Titus, and
resulted actually in the depopulation of Palestine. Tal-
mud and Midrash (especially Midrash Echa) alike ex-
haust even Eusebius, and in his otherwise admirable
work, the Rabbins of that portion and the Jews of the
land, their severe and well-deserved correction, and the
capable consequences that followed the capture by the
Romans of the last of the Jewish forts—Bither, their greatest
strength. The whole of Judea was turned into a desert; about 985 towns and villages were laid in ashes;
fifty of their fortresses were razed to the ground;
even the name of their capital was changed to Edia Capitolina, and they were forbidden to approach it on
pain of death; thousands of those who had escaped
death were reduced to slavery, and such as could not be
thus disposed of were transported into Egypt. "The
previous invasions and conquests of the Sarmatians, the
Persians, the Parthians, the Armenians, the Cohns, the
Macedonians, the Romans, and even the Arabs, who
advanced upon the Hebrews, was the last of the invasions;
and thus suddenly scattered abroad into almost every
part of the empire, in the regions of Mt. Atlas, on both
sides of the Pyrenees, on the Rhine, the Danube, and
the Po, the Jews were deprived of the bond of con-
nexion which the possession of a common country only

can afford to the rest of the lot henceforth was oppression,
poverty, and scorn.

Yet even in their utmost depression, their religious
life asserted, as it has ever done, its superiority over all the disasters of time. No sooner had the war terminated than, as if rising from the ruins of the tomb, the Sanhedrin (q.v.) and the synagogue reappeared. Out of Palestine innumerable congregations of various sizes had long been established; but the late events in Egypt, Creyanaica, Cyprus, and Mesopotamia, as well as Palestine, would have insured their annihilation but for the religious idiosyncrasy of the people. If but three persons were left in a neighborhood, they would rally at the cry-stating-place of their law. The name of their community, dangers, miseries, and wants bound the Jewish people more closely to one another. A citizen of the world, having no country he could call his own, the Jew nevertheless lived within certain well-defined limits, beyond which, to him, there was no world. Thus, though exiled, as the Izaq say, he had not ceased to be a nation; nor did any nation feel its oneness and integrity so truly as they. Jerusalem, indeed, had ceased to be their capital; but the school and the synagogue, and not a Levitical hierarchy, now became their impregnable citadel, and the law their palladium. The old men, schooled in Babylon, rallied about the bar of the law in the midst of their com- munities, and, as it were, by common consent, and wants bound the Jewish people more closely to one another. A citizen of the world, having no country he could call his own, the Jew nevertheless lived within certain well-defined limits, beyond which, to him, there was no world. Thus, though exiled, as the Izaq say, he had not ceased to be a nation; nor did any nation feel its oneness and integrity so truly as they. Jerusalem, indeed, had ceased to be their capital; but the school and the synagogue, and not a Levitical hierarchy, now became their impregnable citadel, and the law their palladium. The old men, schooled in Babylon, rallied about the bar of the law in the midst of their com- munities, and, as it were, by common consent, and customs to keep alive forever the peculiur spirit of Judaism (see Rule, Karaite, p. 59).

Among the first things to be accomplished by the Jews of Palestine at this period of their history was the election, in place of the late Gamaliel II (q.v.), of a successor from the eminent rabbis who had escaped the sword of the Roman conqueror. A synod congregated at Us- cha (q.v.), and Simon ben-Gamaliel, presenting the best hereditary claims for this distinguished office, was chosen, and intrusted with the reconstruction of the syna- gogue and school around the (q.v.). Hence arose another and more important institution was founded on the banks of the Lake Gennesareth, in the pleasant town of Tiberias (q.v.). Here also was reorganized the Sanhedrin (q.v.), until Judaism was brought to stand out even in somber relief than it was before, the nation having no capital, since the calamities under Titus. In a great measure this success of the Jews was due to the Romans, who, under the government of the Antonines, mitigated their severity against this unfortunate people, restoring to them many ancient privileges, and permitting them to retain all civil honors in a limited degree, as political citizens. Indeed, of Antoninus Pius, Jewish writers as- sert that he had secretly become a convert to their faith (comp. Just, Gesch. d. Israeliten, bk. xiii., ch. ix.), but for this statement there seems to be no very good reason; at least Gratt (Gesch. der Juden, iv. 225, 226) does not even allude to it. Most prominently associated with Gamaliel II in this work of reconstruction, among the Jews of the West, were Meir, Juda, Jose, Simon ben- Jochai, to whose respective biographical articles we refer for further details; also Judah Ha-Nasi, the success- sor of Gamaliel II. In Babylonia likewise the Jews had strathed every nerve to regain their lost power and influence, and they had established a patriarchate very much like that of the West. At first they had looked to the Roman Jews for counsel, and had virtually ac- knowledged the superiority of their Jerusalem brethren in all matters ecclesiastic, confining it to the alone office of the Rech Gelutha (q.v.), or, "Prince of the Captivity," as they called their rulers; but as the chances for a rebuilding of the Temple and a return to power in the holy city grew less and less, they de- termined, encouraged by the growing celebrity of their own professors of the law, the "Gaonic" (q.v.), to establish their total independence of the schools of Pal- estine, and to unite in their office Rech Gelutha, who was chosen from those held to be descended from the house of David, both spiritual and temporal authority (see Etherege, Introd. a.v. 152, 158). We are told of the Rech Gelutha that, after the consolidation of the temporal and spiritual offices, he exercised a power almost despotic, and, those that opposed the king of Per- sia, he assumed among his own people the style of a mon- arch, lived in great splendor, had a body-guard, counselors, cup-bearers, etc.; in fact, his government was quite an imperium in imperio, and possessed a thoroughly se- cret cabinet. In the case of the best leaders of the people, there were, many of them at least, extremely wealthy, and pursued all sorts of industrial occupations. They were merchants, bankers, artisans, husbandsmen, and shep- herds, and, in particular, had the reputation of being the best weavers of the then famous Babylonian gar- mishments. And it was under his prelacy Jews for this time farce we cannot tell, but it seems quite certain that they had obtained a footing in China, if not before the time of Christ, at least during the 1st cen- tury. They were first discovered by the Jesuit mission- aries of the 17th century. They did not appear ever to have been in China, but they went to the southeast coast of East, and retained, on the whole, a very decided na- tionalism of creed and character. From their language, it was inferred that they had originally come from Per- sia. At one time they would appear to have been highly acquainted with various civilizations, and to have held the highest civil and military stations in any of the em- pires, and since the Russian embassies into Asia Jews have been found in many places (see North America Review, 1881, p. 244).

Reverting to the Jews of the Roman empire, we find them perfectly reconciled in a great measure of the national and comparative prosperity, until the time of Constantine the Great (q.v.). Indeed, the closing part of the 2d and the first part of the 3d century will ever remain among the most memorable years in the annals of Jewish history. It was during this period that Judah Hakkodesh (q.v.) flourished, and it was under his prelacy Jews for the school at Tiberias that the Jews proved to the world that, though they were now left without a metropolis, without a temple, and even without a country, they could still continue to be a nation. Driven from the sacred city, they changed Tiberias into a kind of Jews- land, and it was heard of them in every land, and the employed workmen in rearing another edifice, which even to this day continues to proclaim the greatness of the chosen people of God after their dispersion—the Mishna (q.v.), and the Gemara, better known as the Babylonian Talmud (q.v.), the so-called Oral Law en- tering into a written combination with other Jewish ex- planed, which became in the course of a few centuries a complete Digest or Encyclopaedia of the law, the reli- gion, and the nationality of the Jews. See RABBI NIM.

2. We have already said that under the Roman em- perors of the 2d and 3d centuries the Jews were in a somewhat flourishing condition. Quite different became their fate in the 4th century, when the emperor of Rome knelt before the cross, and the empire became a Chris- tian state. Not only were converts from Judaism pro- tected from the resentment of their countrymen, but Christians were prohibited from persecuting the Jews. The equality of rights to which the pagan emperors had admitted them was by degrees restricted. In short, from the establishment of Christianity in the Roman empire dates the great period of humiliation of the Jews; hereafter they change to a condemned and per- ceived people. The overthrow of the empire by the power of Christianity became baneful to the Jews, it does by no means fol- low that Christianity is to be blamed. Nay, the Jews of that age and country are altogether responsible for their sufferings. They appeared as the persecutors of the new religion whenever the opportunity presented itself, and, if they could not get rid of the prejudices of the revolution of 383 in destroying the property and lives of the Catholics. See ALEXANDRIA. Yet, though
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deried "as the most hateful of all people," they continued to fill, after this period, important civil and military situations, had especial courts of justice, and exercised the influence which springs from the possession of wealth and knowledge. Under the rule of Julian the Apostate, the barbarous tribes who were more barbarized than their Christian neighbors. The Jews also formed a part of all the kingdoms which rose up out of the ruins of ancient Rome: but, unfortunately, our information respecting them, for a considerable period at least, is very imperfect. "In the absence of a literature of their own, they were more known through deeds of violence and murders, who take notice of them chiefly as the objects of the converting zeal of the Catholic Church. The success of the Christian priesthood among their barbarous invaders inspired them with hopes of gaining converts among the Jews. But the circumstances of the two classes were altogether different. Among the heathen, when a prince or a successful warrior was converted to the faith, he carried along with him all his subjects or his companions in war. But the Jews moved in masses only in matters connected with their own religion; in every other respect they were wholly independent of each other. Their conversion, therefore, could only be the effect of conviction on the part of each individual. The character of the Christian clergy did not fit them for so arduous an undertaking. Their ignorance and frequent immorality placed them at a disadvantage in the eyes of those who were in the immediate sphere of the Scriptures, and had arguments at command which their opponents could not answer. Besides, there were no inducements of a worldly nature at this period to influence the Jews in exchanging their religion. They had no wish for the retreat of the cloister, nor did they stand in need of protection on account of deeds of violence and rapine. Their habits were of a description altogether different from those of the monk or brigand. The attempts of the clergy, however, were unremitting, and threats and blandishments were alternately resorted to, so that the struggle was constant between Catholicism and Judaism. In the appearance of a new religion, the Jews brought a diversion in favor of the latter."

4. According to Gritz (Geisch. d. Juden, v, 81), the history of the Jews in Arabia a century preceding Muhammad's appearance and during his activity presents a beautiful page in Jewish annals. Many were the Arabian chiefs and the tribes who were converted to the Jews or became actual converts to the Moslem religion. Indeed, for several centuries previous to Muhammad's appearance, a Jewish kingdom had existed in the south-west of Arabia, and some even claim that it existed even before the appearance of the Hinayamic kingdom to Judaism did not take place until the 5th century. So much, however, is now settled, that in the early part of the 5th century (about A.D. 950-530) the last king who reigned over the country Zunan or Zu-n-Nuwas was a Jew (comp. Perron, Sur l'histoire des Arabes avant l'islamisme, in the Journal Asiatique, 1888, Oct., Nov., p. 638 sq., 443 sq.), and that only with his death Judaism ceased to be the religion of the Hinayamic (or Gnostic) and Zunan (or Zunan) sect. The influence, then, which the Jews must have exerted in the Arabian peninsula at the time of Muhammad's appearance failed not to be perceived by the prophet, and he hastened to secure the aid of these countrymen of his, who were equally, with his other Arabian brethren, the descendants of the Hebrews, and who, in addition to their tenacity of faith and attachment to ancient traditions, contributed at least the common cause of extinguishing idolatry and Christianity. There was, perhaps, also another reason why the prophet of Arabia should have sought an association with the Jews. His own mother was a Jewess by descent, and had only in after life been converted to Christianity by the Syrian monk Simeon. To her maternal instructions he is supposed to have
been indebted for his first religious impressions; and though he did not remain long under her care, yet the slight knowledge of pure religion which he thus obtained must certainly have inclined him to draw the Jewish influence to his side in his attacks against the idolatrous hordes of Arabia (comp. Oden, Arabia, ii, 98; Von Hammer, Assasins, chap. i). The Jews, however, soon became convinced that the cause of Mohammed was not their own; that his object was a union of all forces under his sceptre, the supremacy of Islam, and the extermination of all rival religions; and the compact so lately formed was as quickly broken by an open revolt. Mohammed, however, proved the stronger, and in the wars which he waged against the different Jewish tribes he came forth conqueror. From 624 to 628 several of the latter were subdued and utterly destroyed, or obliged to quit the Arabian territory. In 632 all Jews were finally driven from Arabia, and they settled in Syria. A greater display of heroism than the Jews exhibited during these struggles with the Islamicim impostor has never been witnessed, and we do not wonder that a Jewish writer should point out the epoch as one of which every Jew has reason to be proud. The prophet himself very nearly paid by his life for the victories which he had gained over Masmus; but it seems that, when Mohammedanism had acquired sufficient strength to spread beyond Arabia, the hostility towards the Jews was forgotten, and they were kindly treated. So much is certain, that the extension of the religion of the Crescent through Asitc Turkey, Persia, Egypt, Africa, and the south of Spain, proved, on the whole, advantageous to the Jews. Excepting accidental persecutions, such as those in Maurtania A.D. 790, and in Egypt A.D. 1010, they enjoyed, under the caliphs and Arabian princes, comparative peace. The Jews actually entered upon a prosperous career in every country to which the Moslem arms extended. In North Africa, in Egypt, in Persia, their condition greatly improved, and in Moorish Spain, where the nation was enjoyed fulltolerance, their number greatly increased, and they became famous for their learning as well as for trade. "In the new impulse given to trade by the progress of the Moslem arms, the Jews, ever awake to their own interests, took their advantage. In the wide extent of conquest, new wants were created by the advance of victorious armies: Kingdoms which long ceased to hold intercourse with each other were brought into union, and new channels of commercial intercourse were opened up; and, leaving the pursuits of agriculture, which were placed at a disadvantage by the policy of the caliphs, the Jews became merchants by whom the relations between the Eastern and the Western world was conducted. In the court of the caliphs they were favorably received, and for centuries the whole management of the coinage was intrusted to them, from the superior accuracy and elegance with which they could execute it, and from their opportunities, by the extent and variety of their commercial relations, to give it the widest circulation, and at the same time to draw in all the previous mintages. But, as we have already said, it was not only in commercial greatness that they flourished. Not a few of them distinguished themselves in the walks of science and literature. They were counsellors, secretaries, astrologers, or physicians to the Moslem rulers; and this period may well be considered the golden age of Jewish literature. Poets, orators, philosophers of highest eminence arose, not isolated, but in considerable measure sustained by the encouragement of the state; and astronomy was a well-established study, that to them is chiefly due—through the Arab medium—the preservation and subsequent spreading in Europe of ancient classical literature, more especially of philosophy. (Compare, on the efforts of Nestorian Christians in this direction, Etheridge, Syriac Characters, p. 94 sq.) Their chief attention, however, continued to be ever directed to the Talmud and its literature, especially in Babylonia, where they still had a Resch-gelutha as their immediate ruler. Here their great schools, reorganized under the Soberains (thinkers), were put in a still more flourishing condition by the Geonim (eminent), of whom the most prominent are Saadis (q. v.) (about 892-942), the translator of the Pentateuch into Arabic, whom, for his great linguistic attainments, Aben Ezra designated as the "rabi el qadim", and Sherira Gaon (q. v.) (died 997), grandson of Judah, to whom we owe our most accurate knowledge of the Jewish schools in Babylonia. In this period (from the 6th to the 8th centuries) the Masora was developed, followed by numerous commentaries on it and on the Targum of Jerusalem. These expositions of the earlier Haftorahs (See Midrashim, see Midrash. From Palestine, also, came about this time signs of freshness and vigor in Jewish literature: the admirable vowel system; talmudical compendia and writings on theological cosmogony. See Caral. The Karaites (q. v.), likewise, according to some authorities, originated about the 8th century (this is, however, disputed now by Rule, Karaites Jews, Lond. 1870, sm. 8vo. who believes them to be of much earlier date), and under their influence a whole kingdom, named Khozir, is believed to have been converted to Judaism, on the shores of the Caspian Sea. See Juhudan (Ha-Levi Ben-Samuel. Here we desire mention, also, the most celebrated of the Jews in Africa under the Saracen princes, the grammarians Ibn-Korash (q. v.), Damsh (q. v.), Chayyag (q. v.); the lexicographer Hezef, and Isaac ibn-Gabirol. Very different was the fate of the Jews under Christian rulers. Few were the monarchs of Christendom who rose above the barbarism of the Middle Ages. By considerable pecuniary sacrifices only could the sons of Israel enjoy tolerance. In Italy their lot had always been most severe. Now and then a Roman pontiff would afford them his protection, but, as a rule, they have received only intolerance in that country. Down even to the time of the deposition of Pius IX from the temporal power, it has been the barbarous custom, on the last Saturday before the Carnival, to compel the Jews to proceed "en masse" to the capitol, and to receive the pontiff on the pontifical lift. But such an act was respected, after the foot of the hill the petition was refused them, but, after much entreaty, they were granted the favor when they had reached the summit, and, as their residence, the Ghetto was assigned them. Their circumstances were most favorable among the Franks. The Edict of Nantes is said to have made a forcible confidence not only in the ability, but also in the integrity of the Jewish merchants in his realm, and he even sent the Jew Isaac as his ambassador to the court of Harouin Akraschid. To Isaac's faithfulness and ability may perhaps be attributed the great privileges which the Jews enjoyed under Louis le Debonnaire, who is said to have made them "all-powerful." But if these two Christian rulers were noble and generous towards the Jews, the clergy of their day by no means shared the same feeling towards the despised race. Many a bishop of the Church of Rome, and many a member of the lower orders, were heard before the throne and before the people complaining of the kind treatment which the Jews received. One prelate hesitated not to condemn the Jews because the "country people looked upon them as the only people of God!" Hence we cannot wonder that the two noble monarchs, when the weaker Carlavongians began to rule, and the Church to advance with imperious strides, a melancholy change ensued—kings, bishops, feudal barons, and even the municipalities, all joined in a common persecution, and the history of the Jews becomes now a record of epochal series of persecution. (See below, 5; Brit. and For. Rev., 1842, p. 459 sq.) In England the Jews made their first appearance during the period of the Saxons. They are mentioned in the ecclesiastical constitutions of Egbert, archbishops.
op of York, A.D. 740; they are also named in a charter to the monks of Croyland, A.D. 888. They enjoyed many privileges under William the Conqueror and his son, William Rufus, who favored them in many ways. The lands of the vacant bishoprics were farmed out to them, which proves that the Jews must have been agreeable tenants. At the same time they were thus fixed upon at the schools they held many honorable positions. Thus, at Oxford, even at this time a great seat of learning, they possessed themselves three halls—Lombard Hall, Moises Hall, and Jacob Hall, to which Christians as well as Jews went for instruction in the Hebrew tongue. They enjoyed these and other advantages as a commercial people, held in considerable respect. The services of the Jews became indispensable to the nobles, whose hatred rose in proportion to their obligations; and, where there was the power, the temptation to cancel the debt by violence became irresistible.” A raid against the Jews was a favorite pastime of a bankrupt noble, and we need not wonder that the Jew had recourse to the only revenge that was left him to stave off this gross injustice—the exaction of a more exorbitant gain when the opportunity was afforded him. Thus, in England, at the enthronement of Richard I (1189), the Crusaders, on their departure for the Holy Land, were not to injure the Jews or their property by a pillage of the Jews. In the desperate defence which the latter waged against the knights of England in the castle at York, finding resistance useless, 500 of them, having first destroyed everything of value that belonged to them, murdered their wives and children, and then set fire to their houses of life, rather than fall a prey to Christian warriors. (See Hume, History of England.) A like treatment the Jews received under the two following monarchs; their lives and wealth were protected only for a consideration. With the tyrannical treatment they received at the hands of John (q.v.), ever ready to make any change of fortune is familiar. Under Henry III they were treated still worse, if possible. The reign of Edward I (1272-1307) finally brought suddenly to a terminus the miserable condition of this people by a wholesale expulsion from the kingdom (A.D. 1290), after a vain attempt on the part of the priesthood to convert them to Christianity, preceded, of course, by a wholesale confiscation of their property. These exiles amounted to about 16,000. They emigrated mostly to Germany and France. In the former country the same sort of treatment befell them. In the Empire they had to pay all manner of iniquitous taxes—church tax, capital tax, trade taxes, communication tax, and to present a multitude of gifts, to mollify the avarice or supply the necessities of emperor, princes, and barons. It did not suffice, however, to save them from the loss of their property. The populace and the lower clergy also must be satisfied; they, too, had pretensions to the wealth of the exiles. A wholesale slaughter of the “enemies of Christianity” was inaugurated. Trévès, Metz, Cologne, Mentsz, Worms, Spire, Strasburg, and other cities, were deluged with the blood of the “unbelievers.” The word Hep (said to be the initials of Hierosolum et perditia, Jerusalem is taken) throughout all the cities of the empire became the signal for massacre, and if an insensate monk sounded it along the streets, it threw the rabble into paroxysms of murderous rage. The choice of death or conversion was given to the Jews, but few were found willing to purchase their life by that form of reward. Rather they chose to submit to the indignities of the Roman Church and such Christian training, fathers presented their breast to the sword after putting their children to death, and wives and virgins sought refuge from the brutality of the soldiers by throwing themselves into the river with stones fastened to their bodies. (Comp. Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, i, 554.) Not less than 17,000 were supposed to have perished in the German empire during these persecutions; yet those who survived clung to the land that had given them birth, and suffered from pillage and maltreatment until they were expelled by force—from Vienna (A.D. 1196), Mecklenburg (1228), Brunswy (1296),
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Brandeburg (1248), Frankfort (1414), Munich (1285), Nuremberg (1390), Prague (1391), and Ratisbon (1476). The “Black Death,” in particular, occasioned a great and widespread persecution (1484-1590). They were murdered and burned by thousands, and many even sought death amidst the confinements of their synagogues. The cities were allowed to sack and plunder the land and towns. They were drenched with innocent blood, and even the interference of the emperor and the pope long proved insufficient to put an end to the atrocities that were perpetrated. When the phase had almost disappeared from Germany, feelings of humanity as well as the interests of his house led James Charles IV to some benefactions. The Hussites at Prague were pardoned; and in the Golden Bull (1566) the future condition of the Jews was so clearly pointed out, that it prevented, in a great measure, further bloodshed, though it still continued to leave them subject to oppression and injustice. Their residence was forbidden in places, and in many cities to which they had access they were confined to certain quarters or streets, known as ghettos or Jews’ streets (Judenstrasse).

No better, nor worse, if possible, was their condition in France from the 11th to the 16th centuries. All manner of persecution was circulated among them: it was said that they were wont to steal the host, and to contumaciously thrust it through and through; to inveigle Christian children into their houses and murder them; to poison wells, etc. They were also hated here as elsewhere on plea of excessive usury. Occasionally their dearth was laid to their beneficed nature, and they were persecuted. The laws rested on what they called Christian religion as a very easy means of getting rid of their obligations. Thus Philippe Augustus (1179-1226), under whose rule the Jews seem to have held mortgages of enormous value on the estates of Church and state dignitaries, simply confiscated the debts due to them, forced them to surrender the pledges in their possession, seized their goods, and finally even banished them from France; but the decree appears to have taken effect chiefly in the north; yet in less than twenty years the same proud but wasteful monarch was glad to let them come back and take up their abode in Paris. Louis IX (1226-1270), who was a very pious prince, among other religious acts, cancelled a third of the claims which the Jews had against his subjects, “for the benefit of his soul.” An edict also was issued for the seizure and destruction of their sacred books, as well as those of the Gospel; as Paris twelve carts filled with copies of the Talmud, etc., were consigned to the flames. See TALMUD. The Jews were also forbidden to hold social intercourse with their Christian neighbors, and the murderer of a Jew, if he were a Christian, went unpunished. Need we wonder, then, that in the following century, a religious epidemic, as known as the Rising of the Shepherds, seized the common people in Languedoc and the central regions of France (A.D. 1321), they indulged in horrible massacres of the detested race; so horrible, indeed, that in one place, Verdun, on the Garonne, the Jews, in the madness of their agony, threw down their children to the Christian mob from the tower in which they were gathered, hoping, but in vain, to appease the demoniacal fury of their assailants. “One shudders to read of what followed; in whole provinces every Jew was burned. At St. Palais alone, 4000 were put to the sword; and 160 of both sexes burned together! Yet Christianity never produced more resolute martyrs; as they sprang into the place of torment, they sang hymns as though they were going to a wedding; and, though “savage and horrible as such self-devotion is, it is impossible not to acknowledge the nobility of heart with which it was done.” To Ethiopia, without inspiration, one might foretell that, so long as a solitary heart of this description was left to be cut, it would treasure its national distinction as its sole remaining pride.” At last, in 1594, they were indefinitely banished from France, and the sentence rigidly executed (see Schmidt, Gesch. Frankreichs, 1, 504 sq.). Such is the frightful picture of horrors and gloom which the Jews of Germany, France, England, and Italy offer in their medieval history. “Circumscribed in their rights by decree and laws of the ecclesiastical as well as civil power, excluded from all honorable occupations, driven from place to place, from province to province, compelled to subsist almost exclusively by merce, and with the title of Jews added to the terms of contempt, plundered by lawless barons and penniless princes, an easy prey to all parties during the civil feuds, again and again robbed of their pecuniary claims, owned and sold as serfs (chamber-servants and personal attendants), the bundle of disdained peasants, chased by the monks, and finally burned in thousands by the Crusaders, who also burned their brethren at Jerusalem in their synagogues, or tormented by ridicule, abusive sermons, monstrous accusations and trials, threats and experiments of conversation.”

In Spain and Portugal, indeed, the days of prosperity to the Jews lingered longest. As we have already noticed, they enjoyed in these countries, while they remained under Moorish rule, almost equality with the Moors. As in France under the Carolingians, so in these parts of Spain, Christian rule was accompanied by an uncommon progress in civilization—a progress which left far in the distance all other nations, even those who professed to unfurl the banner of the Cross. But this was especially true of the Spanish Jews. Acquainted with the Arabic, they could easily dive into the treasures of science and literature, and when persecution and banishment forced them to turn to the Jews mastered all languages made them ready interpreters between Musulman and Christian. It was through their original thinkers, such as Avicen (Ibn-Gebirq, v. q.) and Moses Maimonides (q. v.), that the West became leavened with Greek and Oriental thought (Lewens, Phy, II, 11. 5 seq.). It was in Spain that the Jew was permitted and enjoined to be a guler. The despised race must be regarded as the chief instrument whereby the Arabian philosophy was made effective on European culture. “Dans le monde Musulman comme dans le monde chrétien,” said the late professor Munk, of Paris (Melanges, p. 335), “les Juifs exclu de la vie publique, vous à la haine et au mépris par la religion dominante, toujours en présence des dangers dont le menaçait le fanatisme de la foule, ne trouvant la tranquillité et le bonheur que dans un isolement complet. Ignorés de la société les savants Juifs vouaient leurs vies à leur science. L'attention, la culture, l'étude, la richesse, l'influence, le pouvoir étaient pour eux les termes de la gloire et de la puissance. Comme les Juifs de France et d'Espagne, ils ne rejetèrent jamais le fer de l'esclavage, et, par la force des choses, ils vinrent parfois jusqu'à leurs rivaux, pour leur montrer que leur religion avait d'autres vertus que l'inconfortable et l'impitoyable.*

*This is to be understood as extending to drain the treasures and to ensure the life of this devoted race. Kingdom after kingdom, and people after people, followed the dreadful example, and strove to seal the fate of the descendants of Israel; till at length, what we blush to call Christianity, with the Inquisition in its train, cleared the fair and smiling provinces of Spain of this industrious part of its population, and brought a self-inflicted curse of barrenness upon the benighted land (Milton, Paradise Lost, i. 310-330; cf. Luscinia, p. 380; and Isabella, pt. i, ch. vii; Jos. Gesch. d. Israelt. vi, 74, 110, 184, 216, 290; DA COSTA, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 221).

The condition of the Jews in Spain continued to be unfavorable from near the close of the 11th century (to which time we traced them in the preceding section) to the present day. The rejection of heart with which, in 1492, these children of the star of their fortune may be said to have culminated. It is true, the Mohammedan power was now on the wane, but then the Christian rulers felt not yet sufficiently well established in the peninsula to take severe measures against the Jews (DA COSTA, Israel and the Gentiles, p. 189 sq., 224). A capital tax was paid by the numerous synagogues, and presents were made to
the infante, the nobility, or the Church; but in every other respect the Jews lived like a separate nation, framing and executing their own civil and criminal jurisdiction. It is true they had not here a Redephol-
us as their authority, but a substitute was afforded them in the person of the inquisitor general, who "exercised his right in the king's name, and sealed his decrees, which the king alone could annul, with the royal
arms. He made journeys through the country to take cognizance of all Jewish affairs, and inquire into the disposal of the revenues of the different syna-
gogues and charitable institutions. Every land owner, every town councilor, every chancellor, a secretary, and several other officers. Two
different orders of rabbis, or judges, acted under him in the towns and districts of the kingdom." The first important danger that threatened them was in 1218, when a multitude of foreign knights and soldiers gathered together at Tarragona preparatory to a crusade against the Moors. The campaign was to be opened, as had been done in Germany, by a general massacre of the Jews; but, by the intervention of Alphonso IX, sur-
named the Good, the attack was in a great measure defeated, and a Jewish council was called to negotiate terms. A similar attempt made by the Cortes of Madrid had failed, until the middle of the 14th century. By this time the general hatred against the Jews had spread alarmingly in all countries of Europe, as we have al-
ready had occasion to see, in consequence of the terror which the discovery of the Inquisition brought to the Jewish community the world over. They were now also in Spain confined to particular quarters of cities in which they resided, and attempts were made for their conversion. In 1250 an in-
stitution had even been erected for the express purpose of training men to carry on successfully controversies with the Jews, and, if possible, to bring about their conver-
sion. But very different results followed the bloody persecutions which were actually and successfully inaugu-
rated against them at Seville in 1391, 1392. These were the outbursts of priestly and popular violence, and had no sooner commenced in that city than Cordova, Toledo, Valencia, and Murder in Majorca were followed in its train; immense numbers were murdered, and wholesale theft was perpetrated by the religious
rable. Escape was possible only through flight to other countries, or by accepting baptism at the point of the sword, and the number used to prosper afterwards to Christianity is reckoned at no less than 200,000. If the persecutions in Germany, England, France, and elsewhere had severely tried the Jewish race, these persecutions in Spain completely extinguished all hope of fur-
ther joy, for they hit, so to speak, the very core of the Jewish national existence and hurrying to its destruction. The 15th of March, 1391, forms a memorable day not only for the Jew, not only for the Spaniard, but for all the world; it was the seed from which germinated that monster called the Inquisition (Gratz, Gesch. d. Juden, viii, 61 sq.). Daily now the condition of this people, even in the Spanish peninsula grew worse and worse, until it fairly beggars description. A.D. 1412-1414 they had to endure another bloody persecution throughout the peninsula, and by the mid-
dle of the 15th century we read of nothing but persecu-
tion, violent conversion, massacre, and the tortures of the Inquisition; unmerited and unjustified, and "in one year 280 were burned in Seville alone." Sometimes the popes, and even the nobles, shuddered at the fiendish zeal of the inquisitors, and tried to mitigate it, but in vain. At length the hour of final horror came. In A.D. 1492 Ferdinand and Isabella issued an edict for the expulsion, within four months, of all who refused to be
come Christians, with the strict inhibition to take nei-
ther gold nor silver out of the country. The Jews of-
fered an enormous sum for its revocation, and for a mo-
ment the sovereigns hesitated; but Torquemada, the Dominican inquisitor-general, obtained his end by pre-
aing them to the Sanhedrin, as their own and Israel's al-
mal master and mistress to Judas; they shrank from the awful accusation; and the ruin of the most industrious,
most thriving, the most peaceable, and the most learned of their subjects—and consequently Spain her-
self—became irredeemable. (See Inquisition in this
volume, p. 601 sq.) This is perhaps the grandest and
most melancholy hour in their modern history. It is considered one of the great transgressions against God, the destruction of Jerusalem. 300,000 (some even give the numbers at 650,000 or 900,000) resolved to abandon the country, which a residence of seven centuries had made almost a second Judæa to them. The incidents that marked their departure are heart-rending. Almost ev-
ey family, every house, every land was against them. Some ventured into France, others into Italy, Turkey, and Mo-
rocco, in the last of which countries they suffered the most frightful privations. Of the 80,000 who obtained an entrance into Portugal on payment of eight gold
pennies a head, but only for eight months, to enable them to obtain means of deposit to other countries, many lingered after the expiration of the appointed time, and the poorer were sold as slaves. In A.D. 1495, king
Emanuel commanded them to quit his territories, but at the same time issued a secret order that all Jewish children under 14 years of age would be torn from their
mothers, retained in Portugal, and brought up as Chris-
tiars. Agony drove the Jewish mothers into madness; they destroyed their children with their own hands, and threw them into wells and rivers, to prevent them from falling into the hands of their persecutors. Nei-
ther the activities of the Inquisition, nor the fanatical
Christianity, but who, for the most part, secretly adhered to their old faith (Onasim, Aneasim—yielding to violence, forced ones) less dreadful. It was not until the 17th century that persecution ceased. Autors-da-fés of sus-
pected converts happened as late as A.D. 1655 (Cham-
ers, s.v.).

6. The discovery of America, the restoration of letters occasioned by the invention of the art of printing, and the reformation in the Christian Church opened in a certain sense a somewhat more beneficial era to the Jews. It is true, they reaped the benefits of this trans-
formation less than any other portion of European socie-
ty; "still, the progress of civilization was silently pre-
paring the way for greater justice being done to this people; and their conduct, in circumstances where they were allowed scope for the development of their better qualities, tended greatly to the removal of the preju-
dices that existed against them." They found a firm
basis in Reuchlin (q.v.), who made strenuous exertions in
behalf of the preservation of Jewish literature. Lu-
ther, in the earlier part of his public career, is supposed to have favored the conversion of the Jews by violent
means (quanta sunt libri et litterae, in Migne, Præf. Juden, ix, 220 sq.; 388 sq.; Etheridge, p. 440 sq.; Jost, Gesch. des Judenstaates u. s. Secten, iii, 217); and it is a
fact that all through Germany, where the Protestant
element, if any where, was strongly in those days, their lot actually became harder than it had ever been be-
fore. See below. On the other hand, we find a Roman
ponfitt (Sixtus V, 1585-90) animated by a far more
wise and kindly spirit towards them than any Prote-
tant prince of his time. In 1588 he abolished all the persecuting statutes of his predecessors, allowed them to settle and trade in every city of his dominions, to enjoy the free exercise of their religion, and, sound administration of justice and taxation, placed them on a
footing with the rest of his subjects. Of course, all this was done for a consideration. The Jews had money,
and it he made them furnish freely, but then they en-
joyed at least certain advantages by virtue of their pos-
sessions.

Strange indeed must it appear to the学生
ity that one of the first countries in modern days that
rose above the barbarism of the Middle Ages, and grant-
ed the Jews the most liberal concessions, was a part
of that country which is now one of their most
recent, most inveterate enemies. In 1713, under
Philip II of Spain, and that one of the principal causes contrib-
uting to this change was the very instrument selected
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by the hatred of the Dominicans—the bloody Inquisition. It was the active, energetic, intelligent Holland-er, readily appreciating the business qualifications of his Jewish brother, that permitted him to settle by his side as early as 1655. It is true, the Jew did not enjoy even in Holland the same rights as the Christian, but after nearly two hundred years of trial (1796), he had been found the equal of his Christian neighbor whenever he was permitted to exchange the garb of a slave for that of a master. It was Holland that afforded the hunted victims of a cruel and refined fanaticism a resting-place on the highest terms of equality, and even of honor, and on the stage of European history greatly improved the status of the Jews not only in Germany, but all over Europe, and we might say the world. Various other causes, among which, especially, the American and French revolutions, do great service to the Jew. Holland and Germany also enjoy the special privileges which the Dutch stood ready to administer to them. Denmark and Hamburg partook of the liberal spirit, and there also the Jews were heartily welcomed. In England, also, they soon after (1655), by the success of the Independents, gained another foothold. It is true, they did not really obtain public permission to settle again in the island until the reign of Charles II (1660-85), but Cromwell, it is generally believed, favored their admission to the country, and no doubt permitted it quietly in a great many instances. The right to possess land, however, was not granted until 1707, and the right of citizenship was not conferred on them until 1745. Into France, also, they were, in the middle of the 16th century, admitted again, though, of course, at first the places which opened their gates to them were few indeed. Most of those who came thither were relics of that high host of exiles which had left Spain and Portugal after the establishment of the Inquisition (see above). They went in considerable numbers to the provinces Avignon, Lorraine, and Alasce, and of the cities among the first to bid them enter were Bayonne and Bordeaux. The outbreak men caused the Revolution, towards the close of the 18th century, finally caused here, as elsewhere, a decided change in their favor (of which more below). In Germany, as we have already said, their worth failed to be recognized. They were maltreated even under the great and otherwise liberal monarchs, Frederick II; and, as Frisia (Brandenburg) was even then in the vanguard of German affairs, the intolerant treatment which they here received was speed in the other and less important realms of the empire. They were driven out of Bavaria in 1553, out of Brandenburg in 1573, and similar treatment befell them elsewhere. Their deaths are also excited by the popular tumults (as late even as 1730 in Hamburg, of whose liberal treatment of the Jews we spoke above in connection with the Low Countries), and, in fact, during the whole of the 17th and nearly the whole of the 18th century, the hardships inflicted on them by the German governments became positively more and more grievous. Russia also failed to treat with the least consideration the Jewish people. Admitted into the realm by Peter the Great (1689-1725), they were expelled from the empire, 85,000 strong, in 1743 by the empress Elizabeth. They were, however, readmitted by the Revolution, after the death of Catherine II. The only other two countries which truly afforded the Jews protection were Turkey and Poland. The Mohammedans, as we have already said, had an opportunity to observe, have, ever since the decease of the founder of their religion, been considerate in their dealings with Jewish subjects. At present, however, Turkey, the Jews were at this period held in higher estimation than the conquered Greeks; the latter were termed teskhir (slaves), but the Jews monacroph (visitors). They were permitted to re-establish schools, rebuild synagogues, and settle in all the commercial towns of the Levant. In Poland the Jews are to this day far better represented than in any other European country, they met a most favorable reception as early as the 14th cen-
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...under aed decree granting them liberty of trade and commerce, but the barbarous Nicholas deprived them of all these, and treated them quite inhumanly, especially in Poland, where they were known to be in sympathy with the Revolutionists. Since the accession of Alexander II their condition has been improving, and there is reason to think further amelioration of their circumstances. In Italy they were subject, more or less, to intolerance and oppression until the dethronement of the papal power. Since the establishment of a united kingdom they enjoy there the same high privileges as in France. In Spain, too, the establishment of a republic has secured them some measure of equality. Baron von Bunsen brought "glad tidings" to the Jews. They had suffered under the yoke of Romanism the general fate of the heretic; the downfall of the Bourbon dynasty, and the establishment of a popular government, at once secured for all religious toleration, and it has since been ascertained that Spain contains many adherents to the Jewish faith among the attendants of the Roman service.

In Denmark they were granted equality with other natives in 1814. In Norway they were excluded until 1860, and in Sweden their freedom is as yet limited. In Austria, as in other countries where Roman Catholicism has so long been the ruling religion, they are looked upon, not as the equals of the Christians, but as foreigners. In many of the more advanced countries political changes of late years have placed the Jew on an equality with his Christian neighbor, and not a few of the higher positions of the state are filled by Jews.

Our notice of their condition in other countries (aside from the United States of America, for which see above) will be necessarily limited to the moment of our limited space. In Turkey, in spite of the exaction of pashas, the insolence of janizaries, and the miseries of war, they are quite numerous and thriving. In Palestine, where they are rapidly increasing, they are very poorly and comfortably situated; and, as in many of the countries under Mohammedan authority, they are not, as a rule, willing to trade with or associate with the Christians.

In Persia they are quite numerous, but their condition is rather pitiable. They exist also in Afghanistan, a country whose importance will now be more realized since the occupation of Turkistan (June, 1871) by Russia leaves Afghanistan the only independent country separating the Russian empire from the wealth of India. The Jews here thrive as traffickeers between Cabul and China. Jewery is likewise found in India and Cochin-China, where they are both agriculturists and artisans; as also in Siam, where they possess equal rights with the other inhabitants, and are skilled in the manufacture of silks and metals; in Tartary and China, where, however, their number is believed not to be adequately known. In Africa, also, they exist in large numbers; especially numerous are they all along the North-African coast, where, indeed, they have had communities for perhaps more than a thousand years, which were largely re-enforced in consequence of the great Spanish persecutions. They are numerous in Fez and Morocco, and are found in small numbers in Egypt and Nubia, more numerous in Abyssinia and it is ascertained that they have even made their way into the heart of Africa; they exist in Sudan, and are also found further south. America, too, has invited their spirit of enterprise. In the United States, as in Great Britain, they enjoy absolute liberty. (See, for further particulars on the history of the Jews in our country, the article JUDAISM.) They have been in Brazil since 1625, and in Cayenne since 1639, and are also settled in some parts of the West Indies.

The entire number of Jews in the world is reckoned variously between 31 and 15 millions. Chambers, taking the former estimate, distributes them as follows: about 1,700,000 to Russian, Austrian, and Prussian Poland, about 600,000 to Germany, about 240,000 to Hungary and Transylvania, about 200,000 to Galicia, about 300,000 to Turkey, about 47,000 to Italy, about 36,000 to Great Britain; Asia, about 196,000; Africa, about 84,000; and America, about 90,000. We are inclined to estimate the number of Jews to be no less than 46 millions, and of these to give Europe about 4,000,000, and to the United States of America about 500,000. The estimate of Chambers for the United States might be more accurately adopted as the census of the city of New York only. "The Handbuch der Vergleichenden Statistik" by G. E. Lessing (Leipzig, 1849) gives the following as the number of Jews in the various countries named:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>478,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>1,124,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>723,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European Russia</td>
<td>377,000 A. Asia and Turkey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>4,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>64,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxemburg</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See, Eulers, Geschichte u. der Juden (Berlin, 1820—29, 3 vols. 8vo), his Neue Gesch. der Juden und anderer Verbreitung (Berlin, 1820—29, 3 vols. 8vo); Gratz, Gesch. der Juden (vol. iii.—vol. iv.), being the earliest and most important Jewish histories (the first three volumes appeared in 1833). The following is a list of the principal works on the subject:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Place of Publication</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geiger</td>
<td>Juden und s. Geschichte (Lpz. 1864—5, 2 vols. 8vo.)</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dessauer</td>
<td>Gesch. der Juden (Leipzig 1845)</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costello</td>
<td>Geschichte der Juden (Lpz. 1859, 8vo.)</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morgoliou</td>
<td>History of Jews in Great Britain (London 1851, 3 vols. 8vo.)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capelhage</td>
<td>Hist. philos. der Juden (Paris 1838)</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burniat</td>
<td>Rejois du monde juif (Paris 1854)</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euler</td>
<td>Ethnologie et architecture des peuples (Paris 1839)</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuentz</td>
<td>Geschichte der Juden (Berlin 1859)</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Berlin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smucker</td>
<td>Geschichte der Juden (N. Y. 1860)</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>N. Y.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decazes</td>
<td>Geschichte der Juden (Paris 1854)</td>
<td>French</td>
<td>Paris</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stillwell</td>
<td>Geschichte der Juden (London 1850)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chipiez</td>
<td>Geschichte der Juden (Leipzig 1839)</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stockdale</td>
<td>Geschichte der Juden (London 1840)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schmiding</td>
<td>Geschichte der Juden in Oesterreich, Preussen, und Schlesien (Lpz. 1842)</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tawosy</td>
<td>Anglia Judaica (Oxf. 1758)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>Oxford</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benjamin</td>
<td>History of the Jews in Asia and Africa (London 1850)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finn</td>
<td>History of the Jews in Portugal (London 1850)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boulain</td>
<td>History of the Jews in Portugal and France (Lpz. 1850)</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Leipzig</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassen</td>
<td>Geschichte der Juden (Hamburg 1847)</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harris</td>
<td>Geschichte der Juden (London 1848)</td>
<td>English</td>
<td>London</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassen</td>
<td>Geschichte der Juden (London 1849)</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassen</td>
<td>Geschichte der Juden (London 1850)</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassen</td>
<td>Geschichte der Juden (London 1851)</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassen</td>
<td>Geschichte der Juden (London 1852)</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hassen</td>
<td>Geschichte der Juden (London 1853)</td>
<td>German</td>
<td>Hamburg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The work of Bousage (Hist. de la Religion des Juifs depuis le debut du Premier Age) was compiled from second-hand sources, and so teems with errors and unjust statements towards Jews that we can hardly advise its perusal to any who seek accuracy and erudition. For the religious views, etc., of the Jews, see JUDAISM. (J. H. W.)

JEW, THE WANDERING. While the tradition obtained in the Christian Church that the "disciple whom Jesus loved" should not die (John xxi. 22), we find as a counterpart the tradition of an enemy of the Redeemer, whom remorse concealed to ceaseless wanderings until the second coming of the Lord. This tradition of the Wandering Jew has, like other traditions, undergone various changes. The first Christian writer by whom we find it mentioned is the Benedictine chronicler Matthaeus Parisius (1259). According to the account he gives in his Historia Major—an account which he professes to have received from an Armenian bishop, to whom the Wandering Jew had himself told it—his history as told by that Armenian was such that he was door-keeper of the palace, in the employ of Pilate. When the Jews dragged Jesus out of the palace, after his sentence had been pronounced, the door-keeper struck him, saying mockingly, "Go on, Jesus, go faster; why dost thou linger?" Jesus turned around sternly, and said, "I am going, but thou shalt remain waiting..."
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anti I return." The door-keeper was then about thirty years old; but since, whenever he reaches his hundredth year, a sudden faintness overcomes him, and when he awakes from his swoon he finds himself returned to the age he was at the time the Lord pronounced his punishment. Cartaphilus was baptized with Ananias under the name of Ahasuerus, which caused him to be confounded with Joseph of Arimathea. As a Christian, he led a life of strict penitence, in the hope of obtaining forgiveness. The scene of action of this Wandering Jew is in the East—namely, Armenia.

The tradition of the West is somewhat different. He was first mentioned in the 16th century under the name of Ahasuerus, and is said to have appeared in 1547 in Hamburg, then in Dantzitz and in other cities of Germany, and in other countries also. Dr. Paulus, of Eizen, bishop of Schleswig—the story goes—heard him relate his history as follows: Ahasuerus was a shoemaker in Jerusalem during the life of Jesus, and one of the lowest in crying. "Crucify him." When Jesus was led to the place of execution, he passed before the shoemaker's house. Tired with the weight of the cross, the Saviour leaned against the porch for rest. The shoemaker, who stood at his door with a child in his arms, bade him heartily welcome (according to some he even struck him), when Christ, turning round and looking severely at him, said, "I shall stay and rest, but thou shalt move on until the last day."

Towards the end of the 17th century and the beginning of the 18th, the tradition of the Wandering Jew, as current in England, changed to the original Eastern account. A stranger made his appearance claiming to be an officer of the upper council of Jerusalem, and that he had done what was generally attributed to Cartaphilus—namely, had struck Jesus as the latter left Pilate's palace. Ahasuerus told him, "So move thee, yet linger here?" The English universities sent their abest professors to question him. He proved himself able to answer them all; he related a great deal concerning the apostles, as also about Mohammed, Tamerlane, Soliman, etc., all of whom he professed to have known personally; he knew all the dates of the events connected with the Crusades, etc. Some considered him an impostor or a visionary, while others believed him.

Whether the allegory of Ahasuerus, or this ever-restless being, is to be understood as a type of the anti-Christian spirit of scepticism, or whether, in a more concrete sense, it is meant to typify the ever-wandering, homeless, yet still unchanged Jewish people, is a question for critics to decide. We will only add that this fanciful tradition has become the theme for a great number of works of imagination. It has been worked up into songs, as by Schubert, Schütz, etc.; into epics, as by Julius Mösen, Nich. Lenau, etc.; into dramas, as by Klingsmänn. French writers also have used it: Edgar Quinet and Beranger have composed songs on the Wandering Jew. But the most remarkable production to which this legend has given rise is Eugenie Sue's novel, The Wandering Jew (Le Jeu errant, Paris, 1844). See Dr. J. G. Th. Grasse, Sagen u. geschichten Juden, historisch enzeichelt (Dresden u. Leipzig, 1844, 4vo); Herzog, Real-Encyklopädie, xvi, 131 sq. (J. N. P.)

Jewel is the representative in the A. V. of the following terms in the original: 227 (ne'em, a ring), a nose-ring (Prov. xi, 22; Isai. xi, 21; Ezek. xvi, 12; elsewhere recorded as "ear-ring," Gen. xxiv, 22, 30, 47; see Jerom on Ezek. ad loc.; Hartmann's Hebrew, ii, 160, iii, 205), or an ear-ring (Gen. xxxv, 4; Exod. xxiii, 2, 3); elsewhere without specifying the part on which it was worn (Judg. vii, 24-26; Exod. xxxv, 32; Job xiii, 11; Prov. xxv, 12; Hos. ii, 16). 227 (chali, so called as being polished), a necklace or trinket (Cant. vii, 1; "ornament," Prov. xxvi, 12), and 277 (chevyah, fem. of preceding), a necklace or female ornament (Hos. ii, 18). 277 (kali, an implement or vessel of any kind), an article of silver-ware or other precious material (Gen. xxiv, 58; Exod. iii, 21; xii, 8; Num. vii, 50, 51; 1 Sam. vi, 8, 15; Job xxxvii, 18; Prov. xxv, 15), or any elegant trappings or piece of finery in dress (Isai. xi, 10; Ezek. xvi, 7, 39; xxxii, 16), elsewhere rendered "vessel," etc. 227 277 (seghullah, property), wealth or treasure (Mal. iii, 17; elsewhere usually "precious treasure," Exod. xix, 5; Psa. xxxix, 4, etc.). See Dazu; Pauvre; Sworze.

Jewells, Francis, a learned English writer and bishop, one of the fathers of the English Protestant Church, was born May 24, 1522, at Buden, in the county of Devon, and educated at Oxford, where he took the degree of bachelor of arts in 1541, became a noted tutor, and was soon after chosen lecturer on rhetoric in his college. He had early imbibed the principles of the Reformation, and incited them upon his pupils, though it had to be done privately till the accession of king Edward the Sixth, which took place in 1546, when he made a public declaration of his faith, and entered into a close friendship with Peter Martyr, who was visiting Oxford about this time. On the accession of queen Mary in 1558, he was one of the first to feel the rage of the storm then raised against the Reformation; he was obliged to flee, and, after encountering many difficulties, joined the English exiles at Frankfurt, in the second year of queen Mary's reign, and there made a public subscription to the poijah doctrines. He then went to Strasburg, and afterwards to Zürich, where he resided with Peter Martyr. He returned to England in 1559, after the death of queen Mary, and in the following year was consecrated bishop of Norwich. He now preached and wrote anew in favor of the Reformation, and sought in every way to extingush any attachment still remaining for the Roman Catholics. It was at this time, after more than twenty years spent in researches, that he published his famous Apologia pro Ecclesiis Anglicanae (translated into several languages, and into English by lady Bacon [wife of the cancellour], under the title, An Apology or Answer in defence of the Church of England, 1562, 4to). But his watchful and laborious manner of life impaired his health, and brought him quickly to the grave. He died at Mounkton Park, Sept. 29, 1557. "He was a priv- ate of great learning, piety, and moderation; irrepro-achable in his private life; extremely generous and charita-ble to the poor, to whom it is said, his doors always stood open. He was of a pleasant and affable temper, modest, mild, meek, and temperate, and a great master of his passions. His memory was remarkably strong and retentive, but he is said to have greatly improved it by art, insomuch that marvellous things are related of it by his biographers." The writings of bishop Jewell, which are chiefly controversial, are greatly valued even in our day, and are freely used in two departments of Church controversy—on the question between the Church of England and the Church of Rome, and on the question respecting the devotional sentiments of the English Protestant fathers. Besides his Apology, he wrote, in reply to Thomas Harding (q. v.), A Defence of the Apology (1565 and 1567, folio), the reading of which was obligatory in all par-ishes until the time of Charles I—A View of a nebulous Bull sent into England by Pope Pius I in 1559—A Treatise on the Holy Scriptures (London, 1842, 8vo)—An Ex- position of the two Epistles to the Thessalonians: A Treatise on the Sacraments (London, 1568, 8vo); besides several sermons, and, naturally, the books on which were collected and published in one folio volume (London, 1609, 1611, 1631, 1711; recent editions, Camb. 1845-50, 4 vols. 8mo. fol.; 1st ed., 1602-78, 8 vols. 8vo). See Full, Church Hist.; Burnet, Hist. of Reformation; L. Hemy, Life of John Jewell (1578); Hoepli, Briefe aus Griechenland, xxi, 710; Allibone, Diet. of Auth., 1, 967; Wood, Ais- mata Oozon, vol. i (see Index); Chas. Weigh to Bk. Life of Bishop Jewell (1855); Middleton, Reformers, ii, 235 sq. (J. H. W.)

Jewness (Towainah), a woman of Hebrew birth, without distinction of tribe (Acts xvi. 1; xxiv. 14). It is
JEWETT applied in the former passage to Eunice, the mother of Timothy, who was unquestionably of Hebrew origin (comp. 2 Tim. iii, 15), and in the latter to Drusilla, the wife of Felix and daughter of Herod Agrippa I.—Smith. See JEW.

Jewett, William, a Methodist Episcopal minis-
ter, was born in Sharon, Conn., in the year 1789. At the age of seventeen he was converted, commenced preaching the year following, and travelled a circuit by direction of a presiding elder. In 1808 he joined the New York Annual Conference. His ministerial labors were uninterrupted from 1807 to 1851, a period of forty-
four years, during nineteen of which he held the office of presiding elder of his appointment circuit. He died in Poughkeepsie, N. Y., June 27, 1857. (G. L. T.)

Jewett, William D., a Methodist Episcopal minis-
ter, was born at Ballston, N. Y., about 1788; was converted in 1811; was licensed to preach in 1821, and preached much, and was ordained deacon previous to entering the Genesee Conference in 1830; was superan-
tuated in 1845, and died at Huron, N. Y., Nov. 10, 1855, Mr. Jewett was a man of “unobtrusive piety, and a pat-
ttern of ministerial fidelity.” He labored with all faith-
fulness and love until his strength failed him. At death he left his property, about $3000, to the Bible and Mis-
sionary Society, and was superannuated at his own request. Minutes of Conference. (G. L. T.)

Jewish (יוּדָאִי), or of belonging to Jews: an epithet applied to the Rabbinical legends against which the apostle Paul warns his younger brother (Tit. i, 14). See JEW.

JEWISH CHRISTIANS. See JUDAIZERS.

Jew'ry (יוּדְדִי). Chal'd., Chal'd., Dan.v, 13, last clause; “Judaism” in Ezra v, 8; elsewhere “Judah”; “יוּדָאִי,” Luke xxiii, 5; John vii, 1; elsewhere “Jewish,” the name of the Jews, i. e., the kingdom of Judah in the latter.

Jewry” also occurs frequently in the A.V. of the Apocalypse (1 Esdr. i, 28; ii, 4; iv, 49; v, 7, 8, 57; vi, 1; viii, 81; ix, 3; Del 33; 2 Macc. x, 24).

Jews. See JEW.

Jezan'ah (Jer. xl, 8; xlii, 1). See JAAZANAH, 4.

Jez'ebel (Hebrew יְזֶבֶל, יְזֶבֶל, not-cohabited, q. d. דְּנָבָה, compare Plato, p. 249; Lat. Agnus, i. e. in-tractis, cæstata; an appropriate female name, remarks Gesenius, and not to be estimated from the character of Ahab’s queen; comp. Isabella; Sept. Ἰάζεβα, N. T. Ἰάζεβα, Rev. ii, 20; Joseph. Ἰάζεβας, Ant. ix, 6, 4; Vulg. Jez-
bel), the consort of Ahab, king of Israel (1 Kings xvi, 31), was the daughter of Ethbaal (qv., c.), king of Tyre and Sidon, and originally a priest of Baal (Josephus, Antiq., i, 18). This unsuitable alliance proved most dis-
astrous to the kingdom of Israel; for Jezebel induced her weak husband not only to conciliate at her introducing the worship of her native idols, but eventually to be-
come himself a worshipper of them, and to use all the means at his command to maintain or introduce the God of Israel. The worship of the golden calves, which previously existed, was, however mistakenly, in-
tended in honor of Jehovah; but this was an open alien-
ation from him, and a turning aside to foreign and strange gods, which, indeed, were no gods (but see Via-
ke, Ezech. Thes. i, 490). Most of the particulars of this bad but apparently highly-gifted woman’s conduct have

been related in the notices of Ahab and Jezebel. From the course of her proceedings, it would appear that she grew to hate the Jewish system of law and religion on account of what must have seemed to her its intolerance and its anti-social tendencies. She hence sought to put it down by all the means she could command; and the immense power of her husband and son, Jezebel, was to maintain all the powers of the state subservient to her designs. The manner in which she acquired and used her power over Ahab is strikingly shown in the matter of Naboth, which, perhaps, more than all the other affairs in which she was engaged, brings out her true character and plays the major part in the subsequent events. B.C. cir. 897. When she found him piling, like a spoiled child, on account of the refusal of Naboth to gratify him by selling him his patrimonial vineyard for a “garden of herbs,” she taught him to look to, to rely upon her for the accomplishment of his wishes; and after he had departed, she disposed of his home, not with tears from savageness of temper, she scribbled not at murder under the abused-forms of law and religion (1 Kings xxi, 1-29). She had the re-
ward of her unscrupulous decisiveness of character in the triumph of her policy in Israel, where, at last, there were but 700 who had not cursed her name to Baal, nor kissed their hand to his image. Nor was her success confined to Israel; for through Athaliah—a daughter after her own heart—who was married to the son and successor of Jehoshaphat, the same policy prevailed for a time in Judah, after Jezebel herself had per-
ished and the name of Jezebel had been wiped out of the land. It seems that after the death of her husband, Jezebel main-
tained considerable ascendancy over her son Jehoram; and her measures and misconduct formed the principal charge which Jehu cast in the teeth of that unhappy monarch before he sent forth the arrow that slew him. The last line of her influence was to intimate Jehu as he passed the palace by watching him of the eventual rewards of even successful treason. It is eminently characteristic of the woman that, even in this terrible moment, when she knew that her son was slain, and must have felt that her power had departed, she dis-
played herself, not with rent veil and dishevelled hair, “but tired her head and painted her eyes” before she looked out at the window. The eunuchs, at a word from Jehu, having cast down her, she met her death be-
neath the wall at the doors of the chamber of the king此后,” her corpse should not be treated with disrespect, nothing was found of her but the palms of her hands and the soles of her feet: the dogs had eaten all the rest (1 Kings xvi, 31; xviii, 4, 13; xx, 5, 6; 2 Kings ix, 7, 22, 30-37). B.C. 688.

The name Jezebel appears annually (as in modern times) to have become proverbial for a wicked termi-

gant (comp. 2 Kings ix, 22), and in this sense it is prob-
illy used in Rev. ii, 20, where, instead of “that woman Jezebel” (Ῥωμανή Ἡζεβήλ), many editors prefer the reading “thy wife Jezebel” (Ῥωμανή της Ἡζεβήλ), i. e. of the bishop of the Church at Thyatira, who seems to have assumed the office of a public teacher, although herself as corrupt in doctrine as in prac-
tice. In this address to the representative of the Church she is called his wife, i. e. one for whose char-
acter and conduct, as being a member of the congrega-
tion over which she had charge, he was responsible, and whom he should have taken care that the Church had long since repudiated. Her proper name is probably withheld through motives of delicacy. We need not suppose that she was literally guilty of licentiousness, but only that she disseminated and acted upon such cor-
rupt religious principles as made her resemble the idol-
atrious wife of Ahab in her public influence. (See Ja-
blonski, Dìaz de Jezebel Thyatironor, pseudo-propheti-
essa, Frankf. 1739; Stuart’s Comment. ad loc.) Others, however, maintain a more literal interpretation of the passage (see Clarke and Alford, ad loc.). See NICOLAI-
TAN.
Jezelus (11765), the Grecized form (in the Apocrypha) of the name of two Jews whose sons are said to have returned from Babylon with Ezra; but a comparison with the Hebrew text seems to indicate an identity or else confusion.

1. (Vulgate Zecelus). The father of Secchanias, of "the sons of Jezelus" (1 Esdr. viii. 32); evidently the Jahanzi of Ezra viii. 5.

2. (Vulgate Jehelus). The father of Abadias, of "the sons of Job" (1 Esdr. viii. 35); evidently the Juehel of Ezra viii. 9.

Jezer (Heb. Yezer, יְצֶר, formation; Sept. Ἰασάυ, Ἰασάυ, but in Chron. Χασάον v. τ. Ἰασάω), the third named of the four sons of Naphthali (Gen. xlv. 24; Num. xxvi. 49; 1 Chron. vii. 13), and progenitor of the family of Jezelrites (Heb. Yīzīrî, יְצִירִי, Septuag. Ἰασάου, Num. xxvi. 49; see Ezek.). B.C. 1666.

Jezerite (Num. xxvi. 49). See Jezero.

Jezira (Heb. Yázīqáh, יָצִירָה, for יְצִירָה, sprinkled by Jehovah; or perhaps to be written יָצִירָיה; Yízqáyāh; for יְצִירָה, assembled by Jehovah, comp. Jezireh; Sept. 'Aţâna, Vultgat Jezina, an Israelite, one of the "sons of" Parosh, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezra x. 25). B.C. 459.

Jezîli (some Jezîth) (Heb. Ye'tîlî, יֵתִלî, as in the margin, assembled by God; Sept. 'Aţâkāv v. τ. Ἰασάω, etc.; Vultg. Jezizâl, a son of Azmaveth, who, with his brother, was one of the Benjamite archers that reinforced David at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii. 8). B.C. 1055.

Jezirah (יְצִירָה, יְצִירָה, Sêpher Ye'tiszôrîh), or the Book of Creation, is the name of one of the cabalistic books which, next to the Zohar, forms the principal source whence we derive our knowledge of Jewish mysticism. The age of the book it has thus far been impossible exactly to determine. Jewish tradition claims it to be of divine origin. It was intrusted to the Lord to Abraham, and he handed it down to Akiba (q. v.). Modern scholars have come to the conclusion that the Jezirah is the product of the Jewish schools in Egypt at the time of Phile Judeus. Dr. Zunz, however, assigns it to the Gnostic period, the 8th or 9th century. For the latter assertion there seems to us to be no good reason, and we are inclined to believe it was composed during the period of the first Maimanaists, i.e. between a century before and about eighty years after the birth of Christ (comp. Etheridge, Intro. to Heb. Lit. p. 300 sq.; Endlich, Hist. Philos. p. 465). See Carabia, vol. ii, p. 1. We thus see determining that the Hebrew of this work is of that dialectic kind used by the learned Jews at the time of the opening of the Christian era. Indeed, it is barely possible that the work itself was a collection of fragments of various earlier times: a kind of résumé of what had hitherto been determined on the occult subject of which it treats. The Jezirah treats of the Creation of the World, and is, in fact, an ancient effort of the human mind to discover the plan of the universe at large, and the law or band which unites its various parts into one harmonious whole. It opens its instructions with something of the tone and manner of the Bible, and announces that the universe bears upon itself the imprint of the name of God; so that, by means of the great panorama of the world, the mind may acquire a conception of the Deity, and from the unity which reigns in the creation, it may learn the oneness of the Creator. So far, so good. But now, instead of tracing in the universe the laws which determine the universe, the Jezirah seeks to ascertain from those laws the thoughts of the law-giver, "it is sought rather to arrive at the same end by finding some tangible analogy between the ideas which exist and the signs of thought, or by the means by which those thoughts are conveyed and interpreted among men; and recourse is had for this purpose to the twenty-two letters of the Hebrew alphabet, and to the first ten of the numbers" (compare Etheridge, p. 304 sq).

"The book of Jezirah begins by an enumeration of the thirty-two ways of wisdom (תִּשָּׁבֵעָה, or, in plainer terms, of the thirty-two attributes of the divine mind (כְּלֵי בֹּא), as they are demonstrated in the founding of the universe. The book shows why there are just thirty-two of these; by an analysis of this number it seeks to exhibit, in a peculiar method of theosophical arithmetic, how to speak (on the assumption that figures are the signs of existence and thought), the doctrine that God is the author of all things, the universe being a development of original entity, and existence being but thought become concrete; in short, that, instead of the heathenish or popular Jewish conception of the world as outward or coexistent with Deity, it is coeval in birth, having been brought out of nothing by God, thus establishing a pantheistic system of emanation, of which, principally because it is not anywhere designated by this name, one would think the writer was not himself quite conscious. The following sketch will illustrate the curious process of this argumentation: the sum of 32 is the sum of 10 (the number of digits) and 22 (the number of the letters of the Heb. alphabet), this latter being afterwards further resolved into 3 + 7 + 12. The first chapter treats of the former of these, or the deities, and its elements, which are designated as figures (קַבְּלָה, Sephiroth), in contradistinction from the letters (כֹּלְלֵי בֹּא, Hebrew alphabet). In the details of this hypothesis, the existence of divinity in the abstract is not ignored, though not formally denied; thus the number 1 is its spirit as an active principle, in which all worlds and beings are yet included: 2 is the spirit from this spirit, i.e. the active principle in so far as it has before decided on creating; 3 is water; 4 fire, these two being the ideal foundations of the material and spiritual worlds respectively; while the six remaining figures, 5 to 10, are regarded severally as the signs manual of height, depth, east, west, north, and south, forming the six sides of the cube, and representing the idea of form in its geometrical perfection.

"We see, however, that this alone establishes nothing real, but merely expounds the idea of possibility or actuality, at the same time establishing the virtualliser as existing in God, the foundation of all things. The actual entities are therefore introduced in the subsequent chapters under the 22 letters. The connexion between the two is here shown by the Hebrew name of Sephirah (number) is yet identical in voice and action with the spirit; but afterwards these elements, separating as creator and substance, together produce the world, the materials of which are represented by the letters, these, by their manifold combination forming the name and describe all that exists. Next, three letters are abstracted from the 22 as the three mothers (composing the mummotetic word בּטִסָּה, i.e. the universal relations of principle, contrary principle, and balance, or in nature—fire, water, and air; in the world—the heavens, the earth, the air; in the seasons—heat, cold, moisture; in humanity—the spirit, the body, the soul; in the body—the head, the feet, the trunk; in the moral organization—guilt, innocence, law, etc. These are followed by seven doubles (consisting of וּלְפָס, i.e. the relations of things which are subject to change (opposition without balance), e.g. life and death, happiness and misery, wisdom and insolvency, riches and poverty, beauty and ugliness, man and woman, service and slavery. But these seven, so far as the material world, namely, the six ends (sides) of the cube, and the palace of holiness in the middle (the immanent deity) which supports it; also the seven planets, the seven heavenly spheres, the seven days of the week, the seven parts of the body, the seven members of speech, the seven symbols of the soul (i.e. the eyes, ears, nose, mouth, etc.). This theory further has express reference to the fact that..."
JEZELIAH
from the combination of the letters results, with mathematical certainty and in a geometrical ratio, a quantity of words so great that the mind cannot enumerate them; thus, from two letters, two words; from three, six; from four, twenty-four, etc.; or, in other words, that the letters, whether spoken as results of breath, or written as elements of words, is the ideal foundation of all things. Finally, a town of twelve single letters (constituting the remainder of the alphabet) show the relations of things so far as they can be apprehended in a universal category. Their geometrical representative is the regular twelve-sided polygon, such as that of which the horizon consists, or the zodiac. In Jezreel also are the twelve symbols of the zodiac and the twelve months of the lunar year; in human beings, the twelve parts of the body and twelve faculties of the mind (these being very arbitrarily determined). They are so organized by God as to form at once a province and yet be ready for battle, i.e. they are as well fitted for harmonious as for contentious action.

The text of the Jezira is divided into six chapters, which are subdivided into sections. Its style is purely dogmatic, having the air and character of aphorisms, or theorems laid down with an absolute authority. The abstract character is, however, redeemed by a harmonious addition which relates the conversion of Abraham from Chaldean idolatry to pure theism, so treated as to render the work a kind of monologue of that patriarch on the natural world, as a monument or manifestation of the glory of the throne of God. The book was published with five commentaries (Mantius, 1652); with a Latin translation and notes by Rittagliani (Amst. 1642), and with a German translation and notes by Meyer (Leips. 1830); with ten commentaries (Warsaw, 1842, etc.). See Grätz, in Frankel's Monatsschrift, viii, 217, etc. (146 sq.; Steinschneider, JERUSALEM, p. 115. Heb. in Bibliotheca Bodli. col. 835 sqq., 552, 638 sqq.; Först, Biblisch. Jud. i, 17 sqq.; ii, 258 sqq. See PANTHEISM.

Jezeliah (Heb.VESelah, जसलआ, perhaps drawn out, i.e. preserved). Sept.*117; ver. v. 117, Vulg. Jezelio, one of the "sons" of Ezapha, and apparently a chief Benjamite resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. vi, 18). B.C. prob. cir. 980.

Jezozar [some Jezur] (1 Chron. iv, 7). See Zor.

Jezreel (Neh. xii, 42). See Jezrahiah, 2.

Jezreel (Heb. Yezerel, जेजशेल, once Jezreel, 2 Kings i, 10; sown by God; Sept. ישריאל, but sometimes Yisrē'ā'el, ישריאל or ישריאל; Josephus ישריאל, Ant. viii, 13, 6; יְשֶׁרֵיאָל, Ant. ix, 6, 4). The name of two places and of several men.

A town in the tribe of Issachar, (Josh. xix, 18), where the kings of Israel had a palace (2 Sam. ii, 8 sq.), and where the court often resided (1 Kings xviii, 45; xxii, 1; 2 Kings ix, 30), although Samaria was the metropolis of that kingdom. It is most frequently mentioned in the history of the house of Ahab. "In the neighborhood, or within the town probably, was a temple and grove of Astariste, with an establishment of 500 priests supported by Jezreel (1 Kings vi, 38; 2 Kings x, 11). The palace of Ahab (1 Kings xx, 1; xxvii, 46), probably containing his "ivory house" (1 Kings xxii, 50), was on the eastern side of the city, forming part of the city wall (comp. 1 Kings v, 1; 2 Kings vi, 25, 30, 33). The seraglio, in which Jezebel lived, was on the city wall, and had a high window facing eastward (2 Kings ix, 30). Close by, if not forming part of this seraglio (as Josephus supposed, Ant. ix, 5, 6), was a watch-tower, on which a sentinel stood, to give notice of arrivals from the disturbed district beyond the Jordan (2 Kings x, 17). This watch-tower, well-known as 'the tower in Jezreel,' may possibly have been the tower or migdal near which the Egyptian army was encamped in the battle between Necho and Josiah (Herod. ii, 159).

An ancient square tower which stands among the hovels of the modern village may be its representative. The gateway of the city on the east was also the gateway of the palace (2 Kings ii, 34). Immediately in front of the gateway, and under the city wall, was an open space, such as existed before the neighboring city of Bethshan (2 Sam. xxii, 12), and is usually found by the walls of Eastern cities, under the name of 'the mounds' (see Arabic Nāyjāt, passion), whence the dogs, the scavengers of the East, prowled in search of offal (2 Kings x, 25). See Jezreel. A little further east, but adjacent to the royal domain (1 Kings xxii, 1), was a smooth tract of land cleared out of the uneven valley (2 Kings ix, 25), which belonged to Naboth, a citizen of Jezreel. This tract, called by the Arabs El Nabud (or Nabud, 2 Kings xxii, 3); but the royal grounds were so near that it would have easily been turned into a garden of herbs for the royal use (1 Kings xxii, 2). Here Elijah met Ahab (1 Kings xxii, 17)" (Smith). Here was the vineyard of Naboth, which Ahab coveted to enlarge the palace-grounds (1 Kings xvii, 15, 46; 22), and here Jehu executed his dread full commission against the house of Ahab, when Jezebel, Jehoram, and all who were connected with that wretched dynasty perished (2 Kings ix, 14-37; x, 1-11). These horrid scenes appear to have given the kings of Israel a distaste for this residence, and it was not again mentioned in their history. It is, however, named by Hosea (i. 4; compare i, 11; ii, 29); and in Judith (i, 8; iv, 3; vii, 3) it occurs under the name of 'Eberdonon (Eberdon) near Dothaim. In the days of Eusebius and Jerome it was still a large village, which the God of Israel had blessed (see Legio, called Eberdonon (Eberdon, Osma). v. *Yse- 
poel, Jezreel); and in the same age it again occurs as Stradela (Str, Hieros, p. 586). Nothing more is heard of it till the time of the Crusades, when it was called by the Franks Parcum Geremia, and by the Arabs Zerin (an evident corruption of the old name), and it is described as commanding a wide prospect—on the east to the mountains of Gilboa, and on the west to Mount Carmel (Will. Tyr. xxii, 26). But this line of identification seems to have been afterwards lost sight of, and Jezreel came to be identified with Jenin. Indeed, the village of Zerin ceased to be mentioned by travellers after Turner, Buckingham, and others after them again brought it into notice; and it is still more lately that the identification of Zerin and Jezreel has been restored (Rau- mer, Pallatino, p. 156; Schubert, iii, 164; Elliot, ii, 379; Robinson, iii, 164).

Zerin is situated on the brow of a rocky and very steep descent into the great and fertile valley of Jezreel, which runs down between the mountains of Gilboa and Hermon. Lying comparatively high, it commands a wide and noble view, extending down the broad valley on the east as far as the Jordan (2 Kings ix, 17) to Beisan (Bethheban), and on the west quite across the great plain to the mountains of Carmel (1 Kings xviii, 46). It is described by Dr. Robinson (Researches, iii, 169) as a most magnificent site for a city, which, being itself a conspicuous object in every part, would naturally give its name to the whole of the old province. In the valley directly under Zerin is a considerable fountain, and another still larger somewhat further to the east, under the northern side of Gilboa, called Ain Jalud. There can, therefore, be little question that as in Zerin we have Jezreel, so in the valley and the fountain we have the "valley of Jez- reel" and the fountain of Jezreel. Jezreel's name is at present little more than twenty humble dwellings, mostly in ruins, and with few inhabitants. (See De Sauly, i, 79; ii, 306 sq.; Schwarz, p. 164; Thomson, ii, 180.)

The inhabitants of this city were called Jezreelites (Heb. Yezerelîth, יזראהלת, i.e. bloodshed), put for the murder perpetrated by Ahab and Jehe at this place (Hos. i, 4). See below.

JEZREEL, DAY OF ( יזראל, i.e. period), put for the pre-
dictioned time of the execution of vengeance for the atrocities they there committed (Hos. i, 5). See below.

**JEZREEL, DITCH OF** (יהזם, Septuag. ἐμπορικοῦ), was simply the fortification or intrenchments surrounding the city, outside of which Naboth was executed (1 Kings xxi, 23; comp. ver. 18). See Trench.

**JEZREEL, FOUNTAIN OF** (יהזם, always a perennial natural spring), a place where Saul encamped before the fatal battle of Gilboa (1 Sam. xxix, 1). Still in the same eastern direction from Zerin are two springs, one 12 minutes from the town, the other 20 minutes (Robinson, Bib. Res. iii, 167). This latter spring flows from under a sort of cavern in the wall of conglomerate rock, which here forms the base of Gilboa. The water is excellent; and issuing from crevices in the rock, it spreads out at once into a fine limpid pool 40 or 50 feet in diameter, full of fish (Robinson, iii, 168). This probably, both from its size and situation, is the one above referred to. It is also probably the same as the spring (A. V. "well") of "Haroed," where Gideon encamped before his night attack on the Midianites (Judg. vii, 1). (Possibly the nearer spring may distinctively have been called that of Jezerel, and the farther one that of Haroed.) The name of Haroed, "trembling," probably was taken from the "trembling" of Gideon's army (Judg. vii, 3). It was the scene of successive encampments of the Crusaders and Saracens, and was called by the Christians Tubaia, and by the Arabs Aru Ablalaid, "the spring of Goliath" (Robinson, Bib. Res. iii, 69). This last name, which it still bears, is derived from a tradition mentioned by the Beorodes Pilgrim; that was David killed Goliath. The tradition may be a confused reminiscence of many battles fought in its neighborhood (Ritter, Jordan, p. 416); or the word may be a corruption of "Gilead," supposing that to be the ancient name of Gilboa, and thus explaining Judg. vii, 3, "depart from Mount Gilead" (Schwarz, p. 384). See Gilead. According to Josephus (Ant. viii, 15, 4, 6), this spring, and the pool attached to it, was the spot where both and his sons were executed, where the dogs and swine licked up their blood and that of Ahab, and where the harlots bathed in the blood-stained water (Sept.). But the natural inference from the present text of 1 Kings xxiii, 58 makes the scene of these events to be the pool of Samaria. See Naboriah.

**JEZREEL, PORTION OF** ( torrents, merely signifies the field or country adjoining the city, where the crime of Ahab had been perpetrated, and where its retribution was to be exacted (2 Kings ix, 10, 21, 36, 37; comp. ver. 25, 26). Naboth was stoned to death outside the city of Jezreel (1 Kings xxi, 19), and the dogs licked up Ahab's blood, and were to be kissed by his chariot, before it was washed, near the pool of Samaria (1 Kings xxiii, 35, 38); hence Schwarz (Palest. p. 165, note) proposes to render the expression נטראים, "in the place where," occurring in the sentence of retaliation, 1 Kings xxi, 19, as signifying "in punishment for that," but this construction is not in accordance with the Heb. idiom (see Gesenius's Lex. s. v. נטראים), and the other incidents furnish a sufficiently exact fulfillment of the prediction (see Clarke's Comment. ad loc.).

**JEZREEL, TOWER OF** ( יזipmap, Sept. πύργος), was one of the turrets or bastions guarding the entrance to the city, and sentinelled as usual by a watchman (2 Kings ix, 17). See above.

**JEZREEL, VALLEY OF** ( יזしばらく, Josh. xvii, 16; Judg. vi, 38; Hos. i, 5). On the northern side of the city, between the parallel ridges of Tabor and Moreh (now called Jebel ed-Duby; see Mount), lies a rich valley (hence its name, God's seating-place), an offshoot of Esraelon, running down eastward to the Jordan. This was called the "Valley of Jezreel," and Bethshan, with the other towns in and around the valley, was originally inhabited by a fierce and warlike race who had "chariots of iron" (Josh. xvii, 16). The region fell chiefly to the lot of Isachar, but neither this tribe nor its more powerful neighbor Ephraim was able to drive out the seamless ancient people (xix, 18). The "valley of Jezreel" became the scene of one of the most signal victories ever achieved by the Israelites, and of one of the most melancholy defeats they ever sustained. In the time of the Judges, the Midianites, Amalekites, and "children of the East" crossed the Jordan, and "pitched in the valley of Jezreel," almost covering its green pastures with their tents, flocks, and herds (Judg. vi, 33 sq.). Gideon hastily summoned the warriors of Israel round his standard, and took up a position on the lower slopes of Gilboa, close to the "well of Haroel" (vii, 1; also called "the fountain of Jezerel"), about a mile east of the city. (See above.) See Gideon. Two centuries later the Philistines took up the identical position formerly occupied by the Midianites and the Israelites under Saul pitched on Gideon's old camping-ground by the "fountain of Jezreel" (1 Sam. xxix, 1-11). The Israelites were defeated, and Saul and Jonathan, with the flower of their troops, fell on the heights of Gilboa (xxxvi, 1-6). See Saul.

In later ages the valley of Jezreel seems to have extended its name to the whole of the wider plain of Edreton, which continued to be the scene of great military evolutions of Palestine. This latter is, indeed, the most extensive level in the Holy Land (v πλεγμα, μυσαν συμπλεγμα, 1 Mac. xii, 49; Josephus, Ant. xv, 1, 27; vii, 2, 3; xii, 8, 5; xv, 8, 5; War, iii, 8, 1; Life, 41; fully οπλα πλεγμα, μυτατις, Judea, Judith i, 8). It is the modern Mery Bn-Amir, by which the whole of the plain is known to the Arabs. It is also known in Scripture as the plain of Megiddo (2 Chron. xxxvi, 22; Zech. xii, 11), and the Armageddon of the Apocalypse (Rev. xvi, 16). It extends about thirty miles in length from east to west, and eighteen in breadth from north to south. It is bounded on the north by the mountains of Galilee, and on the south by those of Samaria: on the eastern part by Mount Tabor, the Little Hermon, and Gilboa; and on the west by Carmel, between which range and the mountains of Galilee is an outlet, whereby the river Kishon winds its way to the bay of Acre (see Robinson's Researches, iii, 160-162, 181, 227). Here, in the most fertile part of the land of Canaan (see Hassiquest, Trar. p. 176; Trolle, p. 545; Maundrell, p. 76; Schubert, iii, 165, 166), the tribe of Issachar rejoiced in their tents (Deut. xxxii, 16). In the first ages of Jewish history, as well as during the Roman Empire and the Crusades, and even in later times, this plain has been the scene of many a memorable contact (see Rob-
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Is Notion, Researches, xi, 223). The same plain was the scene of the conflict of the Israelites and the Syrians (1 Kings xx, 25-30). Here also Josiah, king of Judah, fought in disguise against Necho, king of Egypt, and fell by the arm of the Assyrians. Josephus often mentions this remarkable part of the Holy Land, and always (as above) under the appellation of the Great Plain; under the same name it is also spoken of by Eusebius and Jerome (in the Onomasticon). "It has been a chosen place for encampment," says Dr. E. Clarke, "in every contest from the days of Nahuchadonosor, king of the Assyrians, in the history of whose war with Araphiil (Judith i, 8) it is mentioned as the great plain of Esdraelon, until the disastrous march of the late Napoleon Bonaparte from Egypt into Syria. Jews, Gentiles, Saracens, Christian Crusaders, Egyptians, Persians, Druses, Turks, Arabs, and French, warriors out of every nation which is under heaven, have pitched their tents in the plain of Esdraelon, and have beheld the various banners of their nation met with the dew of Tabor and of Hermon." (For other notices of this place, see De Saulcy's Narratives, ii, 306-311.) This noble plain, like the greater portion of all the rich plains of Palestine and Syria, is in the hands of the government, and is only partially cultivated; the soil is deep, of a dark red color, inclined to clayey, and cannot be surpassed in natural fertility (see Reland, Palest. p. 386 sq.; Hameauel, i, 416 sq.). See Esdraelon.

The towns of the mountains of Judah are mentioned between Juthlah and Jokdeam (Josh. xv, 50), situated (according to the associated names) in the district south-east of Hebron, on the edge of the desert of Judah. It is possibly identical with the modern ruined site Zurrat, which lies in a fertile region (Robinson, Researches, ii, 201), as the name Jezreel implies. See Nu, 3. It was probably this place (1 Sam. xxv, 43) from which came Abihai, of the son of Tola, the son of Issachar, a valiant chief, apparently of the time of David (1 Chron. vii, 2). B.C. cir. 1017.

Jid'lash (Hebrew Yidolah, לMembership, teetar; Sept. Ἰδώρα, the seventh named of the eight sons of Nahor (Abraham's brother) by Milcah (Gen. xxii, 22). B.C. cir. 690.

Jin'na (Numb. xxvi, 44). Jimnath (Gen. xlvii, 17). Jim'nite (Numb. xxvi, 44). See IMHAL.

Jip'hath (Heb. Yiphthach, רטפשת, the same name as Jepthah; Sept. Ἰπθαη, a town in the "lowland" district of Judah, mentioned between Ashan and Ashnah (Josh. xv, 48), and lying in the southern mediaeval group west of Hebron and east of Klethopolis. See JUDAH. Some (e. g. Keil, ad loc.) have located it in the mountains of Judah, or in the text; but, although the import of the name implies a "defile" adjoining, and the associated names are indicative of naturally strong positions, yet the "plain" or Shephelah (q. v.) here actually comes quite far in this direction to the proper "hill country" (Robinson, Researches, iii, 19).

We may therefore reserve a location for Jipthath at the ruined village Jimrin, where a smaller valley runs up south from wady el-Melek (Robinson, ii, 342, note; Van de Velde's Map, ed. 1864).

Jip'thah-el (Heb. Yiphthach-el, תיותחלא, opening of God; Sept. [Taw'] Ἰπθαη, a valley at the intersection of the line between Asher and Naphtali with the northerly boundary of Zebalon (Josh. xiv, 14, 57). Dr. Robinson, with great probability, suggests (new ed. of Researches, iii, 105, 107) that the name is represented by that of Jotapata (Iotapata), the renowned fortress of Galilee mentioned by Josephus as having been fortified by himself (War, ii, 20, 6; Life, 57), and then as the head of the mountain country of the Galileans, under the continued assaults of Vespasian, and where he was at last taken prisoner after the downfall of the place (War, iii, 7, 3-36). He describes it as surrounded by a precipice, except on the north, where the city extended out upon the sloping extremity of the opposite mountains, and deep valleys extending towards the other sides. It was overlooked by surrounding mountains. It contained no fountains, but only cisterns, with caverns and subterranean recesses.
Reland had already remarked (Palaest., p. 816, 667) that the Gopatanta of the Talmudic writings, three miles from Sepphoris, was probably identical with this place. It is doubtless the modern Jefat, which lies four or five English miles from Sefuriah. It was first visited and identified by Schultz (Ritter, Erdk. xvi, 703 sq.). The ancient city is said to have been built in six days, and the modern village situated on the hill overlooking the town and the valley below it.

2. The valley in which the town is situated is the same as that mentioned in the Book of Joshua (Josh. xix, 27), where it is called Jiftach (Josh. xix, 27). The town is situated on the edge of the long valley [rather plain] of Tarum, which would be identified with the "valley of Jiftahthek" (xii, 122); but this, on the other hand, lies even more to the east (Robinson, Mimrammon). The town is doubtless called Judah within Zebulon (1 Chron. vi, 77). The title (Jud. v, 18) means, and not מְדִינָה, is called a "city watered by a brook." See Gesenius, Lexic., s. v.) properly designates this fine pass (because the superlative name, God's Jiftah, which connects the rich plain el-Batataf on the east with the yet more fertile plain of Acre on the west, and is described by the Scottish deputation as "inclosed within hills; sometimes it0wes almost to the strangeness of a defile. . . . The valley is long, and declines very gently towards the west; the hills on either side are often finely wooded, sometimes rocky and picturesque. The road is one of the best in Palestine, and was no doubt much frequented in ancient days" (Robinson, The Land and the Book, 2:62). There seems to be an identification of the etymological force of the name (q.v., the opening out of a gorge into a plain) in the statement (Josh. xix, 14), "And the outgoings thereof are in the valley of Jiftahthek" (comp. Deut. xxxiii, 18, "And of Zebulon he said, rejoice, Zebulon, in thy going out").

Jireh. See Jehovah-Jireh.

Jischak. See Rashi: Satak.

Joab (Heb. Yoab, יֹאָב, "Jehovah is his father; Sept. Ιωαβ, but *יוחב* in 1 Chron. ii, 16), the name of the Ataroth-Adar.

1. The son of Seraiah (son of Kenaz, the tribe of Judah), and progenitor of the inhabitants of Charsashim or craftsmen (1 Chron. iv, 15). B.C. 1657.

2. One of the three sons of Zeruiah, the sister of David (2 Sam. vii, 16; xx, 33), and "captain of the host" (generalissimo of the army) during nearly the whole of David's reign (2 Sam. ii, 18; x, 1; xi, 1; 1 Kings xi, 15; 2 Sam. xvii, 3). It is a little remarkable that he is designated by his maternal parentage only, his father's name being nowhere mentioned in the Scriptures. Josephus (Wars i, 202), indeed, gives (4. v. vii, 13) the father's name as Sareh (Zorah), but this may be merely a repetition of the preceding Sarehiah (Zorohai). Perhaps he was a foreigner. He is said to have resided at Bethlehem, and to have died before his sons, as we find mention of his sepulchre at that place (2 Sam. ii, 32).

Joab first appears associated with his two brothers, Abishai and Asaiah, in the command of David's troops against Abner, who had set up the claims of a son of Saul in opposition to those of David, then reigning in Hebron. The arms having met at the pool of Gibeon, a general action was brought on, in which Abner was worsted, B.C. 1053. See Gimel. In his flight he had the misfortune to kill Joab's brother, the swift-footed Asaiah, by whom he was pursued (2 Sam. ii, 13-32). See Abner: Asaiah. Joab smothered for a time his resentment against the shedding of his brother's blood; but, being whetted by the natural rivalry of position between him and Abner, he afterwards made it the excuse of his policy by treacherously, in the act of friendly communication, slaying Abner, at the very time when he had the latter to thank for what he had then turned, had rendered him a most dangerous rival to him in power and influence (2 Sam. iii, 27-27).

That Abner had at first suspected that Joab would take the position of blood-avenger [see Blood-revenge] is clear from the apprehension which he expressed (2 Sam. ii, 23). Joab, however, thought that under the circumstances, abandoned this position, is shown by the unsuspecting readiness with which he went aside with him (2 Sam. iii, 26, 27); and that Joab placed his murderous act on the footing of vengeance for his brother's blood is plainly stated in 2 Sam. iii, 30; by which he also appa'own, Nahath, a brother (2 Sam. xxiii, 37; 1 Chron. xi, 39), and ten attendants to carry his equipment and baggage (2 Sam. xvii, 15). He had the charge, formerly belonging to the king or judge, of giving the signal by trumpet for advance or retreat (2 Sam. xvii, 16). He was called by the almost regal title of "lord" (2 Sam. xi, 11), "the protection of the king's army" (1 Chron. xxvii, 34). His usual residence (except when campaigning) was in Jerusalem, but he had a house and property, with barley-fields adjoining, in the country (2 Sam. xiv, 50), in the "wilderness" (1 Kings xii, 15), or he camped on the north of the city (compare 1 Sam. xiii, 18; 2 Sam. viii, 15, 29), and near an ancient sanctuary, called from its nomadic village "Baalahazar" (2 Sam. xviii, 23; compare with xiv, 30), where there were extensive sheepswalks. It is possible that this "house of Joab" may have given its name to the Ataroth Beth-Joab (1 Chron. vii, 54), to distinguish it from the Ataroth-Adar. His great military achievements, which he conducted in person, may be divided into three campaigns: (a) The first was against the allied forces of Syria and Amnon. He attacked and defeated the Syrians, while his brother Abishai did the same on the opposite side. The two armies met on the plains of Zepa, kindred tribes from beyond the Euphrates, and were finally routed by David himself. See Hadarezer. (b) The second was against Edom. The decisive victory was gained by David himself in the "valley of salt" and Edom. He celebrated the victory by a public sacrifice at the temple, and was accompanied by his fathers, and that Joab, the captain of the host, was dead," did he venture to return to his own country (2 Sam. xi, 21, 22). (c) The third was against the Ammonites.
They were again left to Job (2 Sam. x, 7-19). He went against them at the beginning of the next year, "at the time when kings go out to battle"—to the siege, of Rabbah. The ark was sent with him, and the whole assembly encamped in booths for five round the beleaguered city (2 Sam. xi, 1, 11). After a sortie of the inhabitants, which caused some loss to the Jewish army, Job took the lower city on the river, and then, with true royalty, sent to urge David to come and take the city. This plea they should pass from the king to his general (2 Sam. xii, 26-28).

It is not necessary to trace in detail the later acts of Job, seeing that they are in fact part of the public record of the king he served. See David. He served him faithfully, both in political and private relations; for, although he knew his power over David, and often treated him with little ceremony, there can be no doubt that he was most truly devoted to his interests. But Job had no principles apart from what he deemed his duty to the king and the people, and was quite as ready to serve his master's vices as his virtues, so long as they did not interfere with his own interests, or tended to promote them by enabling him to make himself useful to the king. (See Niemeyer, Charak. iv. 458 sq.) His ready apprehension of the king's meaning in the matter of Uriah, and the facility with which he made himself the instrument of the murder, and of the hypocrisy by which it was covered, show how deep a stain upon his character as his own murderers (2 Sam. xi, 14-25), B.C. 1035. As Job was on good terms with Absalom, and had taken pains to bring about a reconciliation between him and his father, we may set the higher value upon his firm adherence to David. As Absalom revolted, and upon his stern sense of duty to the king—from whom he expected no thanks—displayed in putting an end to the war by the slaughter of his favorite son, when all others shrank from the responsibility of doing the king a service against his own will (2 Sam. xv, 7-37), B.C. 1023. In like manner David, unhappily resolved to number the people, Job disapproved the evil and renounced against it, and although he did not venture to disobey, he performed the duty tardily and reluctantly, to afford the king an opportunity of reconsidering the matter, and took no pains to conceal how edifying the measure was to him (2 Sam. xxiv). David was certainly ungrateful for the services of Job when, in order to conciliate the powerful party which had supported Absalom, he offered the command of the host to Amasa, who had commanded the army of Absalom (2 Sam. xix, 18). But the inefficacy of the new command and the prestige which the revolt of Bichri's son produced, arising perhaps from the reluctance of the troops to follow their new leader, gave Job an opportunity of displaying his superior resources, and also of removing his rival by a murder very similar to that of Abner, and in some respects less excusable and more foul. See Amasa. Besides, Amasa was his own cousin, being the son of his mother's sister (2 Sam. xx, 1-18). B.C. cir. 1022.

When David lay apparently on his death-bed, and a demonstration was made in favor of the succession of the young Solomon, the king was highly displeased with the preference of the young Solomon, and joined the party of the former. B.C. cir. 1015. It would be unjust to regard this as a defection from David. It was nothing more or less than a demonstration in favor of the natural heir, which, if not then recognized, at least could not have been compromised by the preference of the young Solomon, Joab joined the party of the former. B.C. cir. 1015. It would be unjust to regard this as a defection from David. It was nothing more or less than a demonstration in favor of the natural heir, which, if not then recognized, at least could not have been compromised by the preference of the young Solomon.
contentions in his day for temporal power might ultimately result, as they eventually did, in the assumption of "spiritual things which do not belong to him." "Joachim's doctrines, however, are somewhat peculiar. His fundamental argument is that the Christian era closed with the year 1290, when a new era would commence under another dispensation. Thus the three persons of the Godhead divided the government of ages among them: the reign of the Father embraced the period from the world to the coming of Christ; that of the Son, the twelve centuries and a half ending in 1290, and then would commence the reign of the Holy Spirit. This change would be marked by a progress similar to that which followed the substitution of the new for the old dispensation. Thus man, after having been break under the Father, half carnal and half spiritual under the Son, would, under the Holy Ghost, become exclusively spiritual. So there have been three stages of development in society, in which the supremacy belonged successively to warriors, the secular clergy, and monks (comp. Neander, Church History, iv, 229 sq.)."

As Joachim found the third later Catholic Council, at the request of Alexander III, condemned Joachim's "mythical extravagances;" Alexander IV was still more severe in opposition to Joachim; and in 1290 the Council at Aries finally pronounced all followers of Joachim heretics. Joachim's ideas were chiefly presented in the form of meditations on the N.T. He strongly opposed the scholastic theology, which aimed at establishing the principles of faith dialectically, and also the manner in which Peter Lombard explained the doctrine of the Trinity. Towards the middle of the 15th century these views had gained a large number of adherents. Among the many works attributed to Joachim some are undoubtedly spurious, while others have probably been subjected to additions, etc., in consequence of his popularity (compare Neander, iv, 221, note). The Expositio super Apostolicam (Venice, 1517, 4to, often reprinted), Commentarius de Novi Testamento (Venice, 1519, 8vo), and the Pauserium deorum Chordurum appear to be genuine. Among the others bearing his name are commentaries on Jeremiah, the Psalms, Isaiah, parts of Nahum, Habakkuk, Zechariah, and Malachi; also a number of prophecies concerning the popes, and predicting the ruin of the patriarchates. All these were published at Venice (1519-1524) and Cologne (1577). His life was written by Gregory di Lauro (Naples, 1669, 4to). Among the MS. works attributed to him, Prophecies et Expositiones Sibyllarum; Exercitaciones et Libri Joachiini de terris, sie, et fururn, de pseudo-Christianis; Prophecies de Oinobio Priscovianum; Epistola Joachiini de suis Prophecies; and Revelations, are to be found in the public libraries of Paris. See Hist. litter. de la France, vol. xx; Dom Gervaise, Histoire de l'abbaye Joachiin; Timboschi, Storia della letter. Italian, vol. v; ed. G. Aron, De l'abbaye Joachiin; Hoefer, Nouv. Biblio. Generale, xxvi, 718; Neander, Ch. History, iv, 215 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyclopadie, vi, 718 sq.; Engelhardt, Joachim, etc., in Kirchengeach. Abhandlungen (Erl. 1832).

**Joachim I and II. See Reformation (German).**

**Joachimites.** See Joachim of Floris.

**Jo'achim (Iōāchīm), another Grecized form of the Heb. name Joachim, applied in the Apocalypse to:**

1. The son of Josiah, king of Judah (1 Esdr. i, 37, 38, 39) 
2. By corruption for Jehoiachin, the next king of Judah (1 Esdr. i, 43).

3. A son of Zerubbabel, who returned to Jerusalem after the exile (1 Esdr. vi, 5, 9), apparently a mistake for Zerubabel himself.

4. "The historian which was in Jerusalem" (Judith, iv, 6, 14) in the time of Judith, and who welcomed the heroine after the death of Holophernes, in company with "the ancients of the children of Israel" (y γενεσία τῶν ἡλικίων Ἰσραήλ, xv, 8 sq.). The name occurs with the various reading Elijah, but it is impossible to identify him with any historical character. No such name occurs in the lists of high-priests in 1 Chron. vi (compare Josephus, Ant. x, 6, 6); and it is a mere arbitrary conjecture to suppose that Elijah, mentioned in 2 Kings xviii, 18, was afterwards raised to that dignity.

Still less can be said for the identification of Joachim with Hilkiah (2 Kings xxiii, 4; Josephus, Ant. x, 4, 2; 2 Pet. xiii, 1). The name itself is inappropriate to the position which the high-priest occupies in a story of Judith ("The Lord hath set up"), and the person must be regarded as a necessary part of the fiction. See Judith.

5. The husband of Susanna (Sus. 1 sq.). The name seems to have been chosen, as in the former case, with a reference to its meaning; and it was probably for the same reason that the husband of Anna, the mother of the Virgin, is called Joachim in early legends (Proor. Jaci, i, etc.). See Susanna.

**J o'iānūs (Ἰωάννους, Vulg. Joanneus), one of the priests, "sons of Jesus, the son of Joas, and his brethren," who married foreign wives after the exile (1 Esdr. ix, 19): apparently the same as Jedidiah in the corresponding Hebrew text (Ezra x, 18) by a corruption (see Bähring, Genealogies, i, 167).

**Jo'lah (Heb. Ḥodh, Ἰαπῆς, Jerohah is his brother, i.e. helper), the name of four men:**

1. (Sept. Isaa v. r. Ḥodh, Vulg. Joana). The third son of Obed-edom (v. v.), appointed with his brethren to the charge of the sacred furniture (1 Chron. xxviii, 4).

2. (Sept. Izaiā v. r. Ḥodēth, Isaa, Ḥodēth; but in 2 Chron. first occurrence Izaiā v. r. Ḥodētēr, second Izaiā, Vulg. Joah). A Levite of the family of Gershom, the son of Zimmah and father of Eldo (1 Chron. vi, 21); apparently the same elsewhere called Eldo (Isaiah ver. 42). He is probably the same as the person who, with his son Eden, aided Hezekiah in his efforts at a religious reformation (2 Chron. xxxii, 12).

3. (Sept. Isaa, in Isa. Isaa, Vulg. Joach). Son of Assaph and historiographer of king Hezekiah, who was one of the messengers that received the insulting message of Rabshakeh (2 Kings xviii, 18, 26, 37; Isa. xxxvi, 8, 11, 22). C. 712.

4. (Sept. Isaiā v. r. Isaa, Vulg. John; Josephus, Ant. xiv, 4, 1). Son of Joasah and historiographer of king Josiah; he was one of the officers that superintended the repairs of the Temple (2 Chron. xxxiv, 8). C. 623.

**Jo'nah (Heb. Ḥoḏaḥ, Ἰαννάς, a contracted form of the name Jehoahaz, for which it occurs in speaking of others of the same name; Sept. Izaiā, Vulg. Junah, the father of Joah, which latter was also the father in the reign of Josiah (2 Chron. xxxix, 8). C. 623.

**Joan (papae), is the name of a fictitious female who was supposed to have occupied the chair of St. Peter, as John VIII, between the popes Leo IV and Benedict III, about 853-855. This personage is first said to have been a nun of Ravenna, then as a Roman knight, then as a knight of Scutum, a monk of the abbey of Fulda, who died at Menz in 1086, and who says in his chronicle (which many authorities declare to be spurious), under the year 853, the thirteenth year of the reign of the emperor Lothair, that Leo IV died on the 1st of August, and that this nun, supposed to have died two years, five months, and four days, after which Benedict III was made pope. But Anastasia, who lived at the time of the supposed pope Joan, and who wrote the lives of the popes down to Nicholas I, who succeeded Benedict III, says that fifteen days after Leo IV's death Benedict III succeeded him. Further, Hincmar of Rheims, a contemporary, in his twenty-sixth letter to Nicholas I, states that Benedict III succeeded Leo IV immediately. It is proved, moreover, by the unques-
tional evidence of a diploma still preserved, and of a contemporary coin which Garampi has published, that Benedict III was actually reigning before the death of the emperor Lothaire, which occurred towards the close of 855. It is true that some MS. copies of Anastasius, asserting them briefly and authoritatively, mention the story of Joan; but this has been ascertained to be an interpolation of later copyists, who have inserted the tale in the very words of Martinus Polonus, a Cistercian monk and confessor to Gregory X (latter part of the 12th century), who wrote the Lives of the Popes, in which, after speaking of the nomination of Joan during an English crusade, and then adds, "Hic, ut asseritur, femina fuit." Other authorities for this story are Siegbert of Gembloux († 1113) and Stephen de Bourbon, who wrote about 1225.

According to these accounts, she was the daughter of an English missionary, was born at Mayence or Ingelheim, and was a woman of very loose morals. She is said to have removed to Fulda, and having there established an improper intimacy with a monk of the convent, assumed male attire, entered the convent, and afterwards eloped with her paramour, who was a very learned man, to Athens, where she applied herself to the study of Greek, as well as to the sciences under the able directions. After the death of her companion she went to Rome, where she became equally proficient in sacred learning, for which her reputation became so great, under the assumed name of Johannes Anglicana, that she easily obtained holy orders, and, with such ability and adroitness as she displayed in the studies of the church, she was unanimously elected as his successor, under the general benefit of her male sex.

Continuing to indulge in sexual intercourse, the fraud was finally discovered, to the infinite mortification of the Roman Church, by her sudden delivery of an infant in the public streets, near the Colosseum, while heading a religious procession to the Lateran Basilica. The mother and child died soon after, and were buried in 856. This event is said to have caused the adoption of the Stella tercoraria, which was in use from the middle of the 11th century to the time of Leo V, for the purpose of proving the sex of the popes elect.

The story was generally credited from the latter part of the 11th until the opening of the 16th century. All Church historians after Martinus generally copied it from him, and presented it as an authentic narrative. The succeeding popes were not disposed to be diligent in the religious duties of their office (1421-1481), who, although repeating it in his Lives of the Popes, concludes with these words: "The things I have above stated are current in vulgar reports, but are taken from uncertain and obscure authorities, and I have inserted them here simply not to be taxed with obstinacy." Panvinius, Platina's compiler, seems to have been more critical: he subjoins a very elaborate note, in which he shows the absurdity of the tale, and proves it to have been an invention. Later Roman Catholic writers, seeing the arguments which their opponents in doctrine obtained from this story against papal succession, took great pains to impeach its accuracy; but it is truly curious that the best dissertation on the subject is that of David Blondel, a Protestant, who completely refutes the story in his Familiar Exercitatum de la question et si une Feme a été assise au Siège Papal entre Leo IV de Gratian (A viérandins 1493). He was followed on the same side by Letibitz [Flores sparri in tumulm Papiase, in [Chr. L. Scheidt] Biblith. Hist, [Götting, 1758], i, 297 sq.], and, although attempts have been made from time to time by a few writers to maintain the tale (among which one of the most noted was a Mr. Hume), the considerable number of moderns, entitled A Present for a Papist, or the History of the Life of Pope Joan, proving that a Woman called Joan really was Pope of Rome), it has been all but universally discredited, its latest patron being professor Kist, of Leyden, who, but a few years since devoted an elaborate essay (Vorhersendung der Frauen Joanne) to the subject. Nearly all ecclesiastical writers of our day seem to be agreed that no feminine character ever filled the papal chair, and it is certainly a variety of opinions as to the causes which provoked the story. Some attribute it to a misconception of the object of the Stella tercoraria; the canons excluded eunuchs from the papal throne, some held that the Canons contrived to prove that the person elected fulfilled the requirements of the canons. Others consider it as a symbolical satire. Still others look upon it as a lampoon on the indecency of the pope, John VIII; or, and perhaps more correctly, as a satire on the female regent (under Mamluk rule) during the pontificate of John X. For further details, Gieseler's Kirchengeschichte, vol. ii, pt. 1 (4th ed.), 29 sq.; also Wensing, Uer de Papian Joanne —in reply to Kist—(S'Gravenhage, 1845); Bianchi Givovio's Esame Critico degli atti relativi alla Papepe Giovanna (Milan, 1846); Bower, Hist. Popes, iv, 246 sq.; Faulmann, Handwörterf, der Kirchengech, ii, 469 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. vi, 721; Christ. Examinr. lxxv, 197; Western Rev. April, 1864, p. 279. (J. H. W.)
JOAN 924 JOASH

told by a Burgundian officer to the English for the sum of 16,000 francs. Being conveyed to Rouen, the head-quarters of the English, she was brought before the spiritual tribunal of the bishop of Beauvais as a sorceress and heretic; and after a long trial, accompanied with cruel tortures of which per[.]turbation of the most astounding is the fact that her own countrymen, and the most learned of these, representing the University of Paris, pronounced her under the influence of witchcraft. By their advice, she was condemned to be burned to death. Recanting her alleged errors, her punishment was converted into perpetual imprisonment. But the English feared her, and determined at all hazards to sacrifice her life, and they finally succeeded in renewing the trial; words which fell from her when subjected to great indignities, and her resumption of male attire when all articles of female dress were cruelly removed from her, were made grounds of concluding that she had relapsed, and she was brought to the stake May 30, 1431, and burned, and her ashes cast into the Seine. Her family, who had been ennobled on her account, obtained in 1440 a revival of her trial, and in 1456 she was formally pronounced by the highest secular and ecclesiastical authorities to have been innocent. The doubts respecting the fate of Joan d'Arc raised by M. Delapierre in his Doute historique (1850), who is inclined to think that she never suffered martyrdom, and that another person was executed in her stead, seem to have been good grounds.

JOAN OF KENT (JOAN BOCHER), a female character who flourished in the first half of the 16th century, and who was condemned to death as a heretic, April 25, 1552, for holding the doctrine that “Christ was not truly incarnate of the Virgin, whose flesh, being sinful, he could not partake of; but the Word, by the consent of the inward man in the Virgin, took flesh of her.” This scholastic nicety appalled all the grandees of the English Church, including even Cranmer, who, finding the king slow to approve the condemnation of Joan of Kent, presented to the sovereign the practice of the Jewish Church in stoning blasphemers as a counterpart of the duty of the head of the English Church, and secured the king’s approval for the execution of the poor woman, who “could not reconcile the spotless purity of Christ’s human nature with his receiving flesh from a sinful creature.” See: Neal, Puritans, i, 49; Strype, Memorials of the Reformations, i, 314.

JOICHAN (Yosanim v. r. lyuwi), a Gracized form (1 Esdr. xix, 1) of the name of JOHANAN (q. v.), the son of Eliashib (Ezra x, 6).

JOANES (or JUANES), VICENTE, a celebrated Spanish painter whose subjects are exclusively religious, was born at Fuerte la Higuera, in Valencia, in 1528. He studied in Italy, and, as we may infer from his style, chiefly the works of the Roman school, and died Dec. 21, 1579, while engaged in finishing the altar-piece of the church of Bocairent. His body was removed to Valencia, and deposited in the church of Santa Cruz in 1581. Joanes was one of the best of the Spanish painters: he is acknowledged as the head of the school of Valencia, and is sometimes termed the Spanish Raphael. His drawing is correct, and displays many successful examples of foreshortening; his draperies are well cast, his coloring is sombre (he was particularly fond of mulberry color), and his expression is mostly in perfect accordance with his subject, which is generally devotion or impassioned resignation, as in the “Baptism of Christ” in the cathedral of Valencia. Like his countrymen Vargas and D’Amato of Naples, he is said to have always taken the sacrament before he commenced an altar-piece. His best works are in the cathedral of Valencia, and there are several good specimens in the Prado at Madrid.

JOIANA, the name of a man (prop. JOANAN) and also of a woman in the New Testament.


2. (Jowin, i. q. Jowin, JOHN) the eldest brother of Judas Maccabees (1 Macc. ii, 3); elsewhere called JOHN (q. v.).

JOANES. See JOHN.

Jô-arib (Iowsip, r. Iosip), a Gracized form (1 Macc. ii, 1) of the name of the priest JEHOARIB (1 Chron. xxiv, 7).

Jô-ahâb (Heb. Yôdsah), the name of several persons, written in two forms in the original.

1. (Yôdsâh), a contracuted form of JEHOASH; Septuag. Yods. The father of Gideon, buried in Ophrah, where he had lived (Judg. vi, 11, 29; viii, 14; viii, 13, 29, 32). Although himself probably an idolater, he ingeniously screened his son from the popular indignation in overthrowing the altar of Baal (Judg. vii, 30, 31). B.C. 1062. See GIDEON.

2. (Yôdsâh or Yôdas), a form as preceding; Sept. Iosip, r. Iow. A son of Shemash or Haemath the Gibeathite, and second only to his brother Ahiezer among the brave Benjaminite archers that joined David at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 3). B.C. 1055.

(Jô-âdâh), a name as preceding; Sept. Iow. One of the descendants of Shalum, son of Judah, mentioned among those who were in some way distinguished among the Moabites in early times (1 Chron. iv, 22). B.C. perh. cir. 995. See JANHUB-LEHIRN. “The Hebrew tradition, quoted by Jerome (Quast. Hebr. in Paral.) and Jarchi (Comm. ad loc.), applies it to Mahlon, the son of Eleazar, who married a Moabitess. The expression rendered in the A.V., ‘who had the dominion of Moab,’ would, according to this interpretation, signify ‘who married in Moab.’ The same explanation is given in the Targum of R. Joseph.”

(Jô-âdôh or adôh), a name as preceding; Sept. Iow. An eminent officer of king Ahab, to whose close custody the prophet Micahiah was remanded for denouncing the allied expedition against Ramoth-Gilead (1 Kings xxii, 20; 2 Chron. xxvii, 25). B.C. 896. He is style “the king’s son,” which is usually taken literally, Thesius (Comment. ad loc, in Kings) suggesting that he may have been placed with the governor of the city for military education. Geiger conjectures that Maaseiah, “the king’s son,” in 2 Chron. xxviii, 7, was a prince of the Maccabean family, and that Joash was a priest of the same (Urschatz, p. 307). The title, however, may merely indicate a youth of princely stock.

(Jô-âdôh), a name as preceding; Sept. Iow. King of Judah (2 Kings xii, 3; xii, 19, 20; xiii, 1, 10; xiv, 1, 3, 17, 23; 1 Chron. iii, 11; 2 Chron. xxii, 11; xxiv, 1, 2, 24; 24, xxv, 23, 25). See JEHOSHAH, I.

(Jô-âdôh or Iow), a name as preceding; Sept. Iow. King of Israel (2 Kings xiii, 9, 12, 14, 25; xiv, 1, 23, 27: 2 Chron. xxxv, 17, 18, 21, 23: Hosea i, 1; Amos i, 1). See JEHOSHAH, II.

7. (Yôdsâh, to whom Jehoram ascends, i.e. for sist. See Iow), One of the sons of Becher, son of Benjamin, a chief of his family (1 Chron. vii, 8). B.C. prob. cir. 1017.
JOATHAM

B. (Same form as last; Septuag. Ιωαθαϊ.) The person having charge of the royal stores of oil under David and Solomon (1 Chron. xxvii, 28). B.C. 1014.

Jo’ātham (Matt. i, 19). See Jotham.

Jo’zāb’dus (יוֹזָבָדֵו v. r. יְוֹזָבָדֵו), a Graceful form (1 Esdr. ix, 48) of the name of Jozabad (q. v.), the Levite (Neh. viii, 7).

Jo’zār (יוֹזָר, יְוֹזָר, i. e. Jocor), a son of Boaz, and an ancestor of the high-priest Matthias (q. v.), whom he succeeded in the pontifical office by the arbitrary act of Herod the Great on the day preceding an eclipse of the moon (Josephus, Ant. xvi, 6, 4), which occurred March 18, B.C. 4. He was deprived of the office by Cyrenius (although he had aided that officer in enforcing taxes there) in B.C. 11 (Ant. xvi, 8, 1, 2). He was afterwards killed in the battle of Actium (ib. xvii, 2, 1), i. e. A.D. 7-8. It appears, however, that he had been temporarily removed (A.D. 4) by Archelaus during the short term of his brother Eleazar, and then of Jesus, the son of Sie (ib. xvii, 13, 1), and restored by popular acclamation (ib. xviii, 2, 1). See High-priest.

Job, the name of two persons, of different dimensions in the original.

1. (倭, יְבֹרֵס, persecuted; Sept. and N. T. Ἰαβρός). An Arabian patriarch and hero of the book that bears his name; mentioned elsewhere only in Ezek. xiv, 14, 20; Zeb. v, 11. The various theological, moral, and philosophical consequences connected with his history are involved in the discussions of the book itself, and we therefore treat them in considerable detail in that connection, aside from their critical bearings.

I. Analysis of Contents. I. The Introduction (i, 1-11), supplies all the facts on which the argument is based. Job, a chieftain in the land of Uz (apparently a district of Northern Arabia—see Uz), of immense wealth and high rank, is represented to us as a man of perfect integrity, and blameless in all the relations of life. The highest goodness and the most perfect temporal happiness are combined in his person; under the protection of God, surrounded by a numerous family, he enjoys in advanced life (from xiii, 16 it has been inferred that he was about seventy years old at this time), an almost paradoxical state, exemplifying the normal results of human obedience to the will of a righteous God.

The question, however, could be raised by envy: May not the goodness which secures such direct and tangible rewards be a refined form of selfishness? In the world of spirits, where all the mysteries of existence are brought to light, Satan, the accusing angel, suggests this doubt, and boldly asserts that if those external blessings be taken away, the test will show whether Job’s allegiance to the Law is genuine. The question thus distinctly propounded is obviously of infinite importance, and could only be answered by inflicting upon a man, in whom, while prosperous, malice itself could detect no evil, the calamities which are the due, and were then believed to be invariably the result of wickedness. The accuser receives permission to make the trial. He destroys Job’s property, then his children; and afterwards, to leave no possible opening for a cavil, is allowed to inflict upon him the most terrible disease known in the East. See Job’s Disease.

Each of these calamities assumes a form which produces an impression that it must be a visitation from God, precisely such as was to be expected, supposing that the patriarch had been a successful hypocrite, reserved for the day of wrath. Job’s wife breaks down entirely under the trial—in the very words of the text she “excited the patriarch himself would at last utter in his despair, she laments ‘to curse God and die.’ (The Sept. has a remarkable addition to her speech at ii, 9, severely reproaching him as the cause of her bereavements.) Job remains steadfast.

The destruction of his property draws not from him a word of complaint; the death of his children elicits the sublimest words of resignation with ever falling from the lips of a mourner—the disease which made him an object of loathing to man, and seemed to designate him as a visible example of divine wrath, is borne without a murmur; he repels his wife’s suggestion with the simple words, ‘What! shall we receive good at the hand of the Lord, and shall we not receive evil?’ “In all this Job did not sin, nor curse his God.”

2. The Controversy (ii, 11—xxxii, 40).—Still it is clear that, had the poem ended here, many points of deep interest would have been left in obscurity. Entire as was the submission of Job, he must have been inwardly perplexed by events to which he had no clee, which were quite foreign to any but divine intervention, and which, so far as they were entertained, and seemed repugnant to the ideas of justice engraved on man’s heart. It was also most desirable that the impressions made upon the majority of men by sudden and unaccountable calamities should be thoroughly discussed, and that a broader and firmer basis than heretofore should be found for speculations concerning the providential government of the world.

An opportunity for such discussion is afforded in the most natural manner by the introduction of three men, representing the wisdom and experience of the age, who came to console Job on hearing of his suffering. Some time appears to have elapsed in the interim, during which the disease had made formidable progress, and Job had thoroughly realized the extent of his misery. The meeting is described with singular beauty. At a distance they greet him with the wild demonstrations of sympathy and grief usual in the East; coming near, they are overpowered by the sight of his wretchedness, and sit seven days and seven nights without uttering a word (ii, 11—18). This awful silence, whether Job felt it as a proof of real sympathy, or as an indication of inward suspicion on their part, drew out all his anguish. In the agony of desperation he curses the day of his birth, and sees and hopes for no end of his misery but death (ch. iii).

This causes a discussion between him and his friends (ch. iv—xxxii), which is divided into three main parts, each with subdivisions, embracing alternately the speeches of the three friends of Job and his reply: the last part, however, consists of only two subdivisions, the third friend, Zophar, having nothing to rejoin; a silence by which the author of the book generally designates the defeat of Job’s friends, who are defending a common case (it has, however, been argued with much force by Winer, that some defense is interposed in the order of the composition; for chap. xxvii, 13—23, appears to contain Zophar’s third address to Job, while ch. xxviii is to be the conclusion of the whole book, containing the moral, added perhaps by some later hand. But see below, § 5.)

(a) The results of the first discussion (chap. iii—xiv) may be thus summed up. We have on the part of Job’s friends a theory of the divine government resting upon an exact and uniform correlation between sin and punishment (iv, 6, 11, and throughout). Afflictions are always penal, issuing in the destruction of those who are radically opposed to God, or who do not submit to his chastisements. They lead, of course, to correction and amendment of life when the sufferer repents, confesses his sins, puts them away, and turns to God. In that case restoration to peace, and even increased prosperity, may be anticipated (v, 17; xvi, 27). If the suffering always proves the commission of some special sin, while the demeanor of the sufferer indicates the true internal relation between him and God.

These principles are applied to them by the case of Job. They are, in the first place, scandalized by the vehemence of his complaints, and wonder how he maintains his freedom from wilful or conscious sin, they are driven to the conclusion that his faith is radically unsound; his protestations appear to them almost blasphemous; they become convinced that he has been severely guilty of some unpardonable sin, and their tone, at first courteous, though warning (compare ch. iv with
ch. xv), becomes stern, and even harsh and menacing. It is clear that, unless they are driven from their partial and exclusive theory, they must be led on to an unqualified condemnation of Job.

In this part of the dialogue the character of the three friends is developed. Eliphaz, as he represents the true patriarchal chieftain, grave and dignified, and erring only from an exclusive adherence to tenets hitherto unquestioned, and influenced in the first place by genuine regard for Job and sympathy with his affliction, Bildad, without much originality or independence of character, yet closely participating on the wine side and desiring to advance his party, and on the other hand Zophar, who is mainly on the authority of his older friend. Zophar differs from both: he seems to be a young man; his language is violent, and at times even coarse and offensive (see, especially, his second speech, ch. xx.). He represents the prejudiced and narrow-minded bigots of his age.

In order to do justice to the position and arguments of Job, it must be borne in mind that the direct object of the trial was to ascertain whether he would deny or forsake God, and that his real integrity is asserted by Job himself. His answers through correspond with these data. He knows with a sure inward conviction that he is not an offender in the sense of his opponents: he is therefore confident that, whatever may be the object of the afflictions for which he cannot account, God knows that he is innocent. This consciousness, which from time immemorial has been the life of things cannot be destroyed by others, enables him to examine fearlessly their position. He denotes the assertion that punishment follows surely on guilt, or proves its commission. Appealing boldly to experience, he declares that, in point of fact, prosperity and misfortune are not always or generally commensurate; both are often intermingled as vice and virtue. "the tabernacles of robbers prosper, and they that provoke God are secure" (xii, 6). In the government of Providence he can see but one point clearly, viz. that all events and results are absolutely in God's hand (xii, 9-25), but as for the principles which underlie those events he knows nothing. In fact, he is sure that his friends are equally uninformed, and are sophists defending their position, out of mere prejudice, by arguments and statements false in themselves and doubly offensive to God, being hypocritically advanced in his defence (xiii, 10). Still he doubts not that God is just, and although he cannot see how or when that justice can be manifested, he feels confident that his innocence must be recognised. "Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him, also will I be his salvation" (xiii, 14, 16). There remains, then, but one course open to him, and that he takes. He foresees a day of vindication, impatiently desired, a fair and open trial (xiii, 18-29). Admitting his liability to such sins as are common to man, being unclean by birth (xiii, 26; xiv, 4), he yet protests his substantial innocence, and in the bitter struggle with his misery he first meets the thought which is afterwards developed with remarkable distinctiveness. Believing that with death all hope connected with this world ceases, he prays that he may be hidden in the grave (xiv, 18), and there reserved for the day when God will try his cause and manifest himself in love (verse 15). This prayer represents, as but a dim, yet a profound and true presentiment, drawn forth, the evidently for the first time, as the possible solution of the dark problem. As for a renewal of life here, he dreams not of it (verse 14), nor will he allow that the possible restoration or prosperity of his descendants at all meets the exigencies of his case (xv, 17).

(b.) In the second discussion (ch. xv-xxii) there is a more resolute, elaborate attempt on the part of Job's friends to vindicate their theory of retributive justice. This requires an entire overthrow of the position taken by Job. They cannot admit his innocence. The fact that they cannot prove it, is unimportant to them that there must be something quite unique in his guilt. Eliaphaz (ch. xv), who, as usual, lays down the basis of the argument, does not now hesitate to impute to Job the worst crimes of which man could be guilty. His defence is blasphemous, and, that he is quite godless; that he disregards the wisdom of age and experience, denies the fundamental truths of religion (verse 16). He represents Bildad (ch. xviii) as taking up this suggestion of ungodliness, and, after enlarging upon the inevitable results of all infidelity, concludes that the special evils which had come upon Job, such as agony of heart, ruin of home, destruction of family, are peculiar to the penalties due to one who is without God. Zophar (ch. xx) draws the further inference that a sinner's sufferings must needs be proportioned to his former enjoyments (verse 5-14), and laments to his former gains (verse 15-19), and thus not only accounts for Job's present calamity, but menaces him with still greater evils (verse 20-29).

In answer, Job recognises the hand of God in his afflictions (xvi, 7-16, and xix, 6-20), but rejects the charge of ungodliness; he has never forsaken his Maker, and never ceased to pray. This, being a matter of inward conviction, cannot be answered, and Job therefore directly to earth and heaven: "My witness is in heaven, and my record is on high" (xvi, 19). The train of thought thus suggested carries him much further in the way towards the great truth—that since in this life the righteous certain are, it follows that their ways are watched and their sufferings recorded, with a view to a future and perfect manifestation of the divine justice. This view becomes gradually brighter and more definite as the controversy proceeds (xvi, 18, 19; xvii, 8, 9, and perhaps 13-16), and at last finds expression by a strong not without declaration of his conviction that at the latter day (evidently that day which Job had expressed a longing to see, xiv, 12-14) God will personally manifest himself as his nearest kinsman or avenger [see Goxt], and that he, Job, although in a desponded state (y®®®® y®®®®®®®®), should survive in spirit to witness this posthumous vindication, a pledge of which had already often been given him (y®®®®®®®®®®®, etc.—he, Job, although he cannot see it or feel it, is the outward man, remaining or recovering his personal identity (xix, 25-27). There can be no doubt that Job here virtually anticipates the final answer to all difficulties supplied by the Christian revelation.

On the other hand, sturdy by the harsh and narrow-minded bigotry of his opponents, Job draws out (chap. xxiii-xxvii) all the consequences. He shows that as the beginning to the end of their lives, ungodly men, avowed atheists (ver. 14, 15), persons, in fact, guilty of the very crimes imputed, out of mere conjecture, to himself, frequently enjoy great and unbroken prosperity. From this he draws the inference, which he states in a very unguarded manner, and in a tone calculated to give just offence, that an impenetrable veil hangs over the temporal dispensations of God.

(c.) In the third dialogue (chap. xxiii-xxv) no real progress is made by Job's opponents. They will not give up and cannot defend their position. Eliphaz (ch. xxiii) makes a last effort, and raises one new point which, he states with some ingenuity. The station in which Job was formerly placed presented temptations to certain crimes; the punishments which he undergoes are precisely such as might be expected had those crimes been committed, before he inferred them committed. The tone of this discourse thoroughly harmonizes with the character of Eliaphaz. He could scarcely come to a different conclusion without surrendering his fundamental principles, and he urges with much dignity and impressiveness the exhortations and warnings which are now needed. Bildad (ch. xxiv) has nothing to add but a few solemn words on the impenetrable comprehensiveness of God and the nothingness of
man. Zophar, the most violent and least rational of the three, is put to silence, and retires from the contest (unless we adopt the above suggestion of a transposition of the text).

In his last two discourses Job does not alter his position, nor, properly speaking, adduce any new argument, but he tries to prove, that he is not, and that he never was, in a different line or in a different principle, or as an absolute lord, according to his mere will and pleasure.

(3.) Humbly to adore God is our duty, even when we are subject to calamities not at all deserved; but we should abstain from hastily judging of those who, when distressed, seem to bear forth an example of divine favor. Thus ends the discussion, in which it is evident both parties had partially failed. Job has been betrayed into very hazardous statements, while his friends had been on the one hand dishonorable, on the other bigoted, harsh, and pitiful. The points which had been limited, or imperfectly developed, are now taken up by a new interlocutor (ch. xxxii.-xxxvii.), who argues the justice of the divine administration both from the nature of the dispensations allotted to man, and from the essential character of God himself. Elihu, a young man (ver. 7), descended from a collateral branch of the family of Abraham, is here introduced in indignation at the arguments of his elders (xxxii., 7), and, impelled by an inward inspiration, he now addresses himself to both parties in the discussion, and specially to Job. He shows, first, that they had accused Job upon false and insufficient grounds, and failed to convict him, or to vindicate God's justice. Job, again, had acted with unnecessary violence, and had arraigned that justice (xxxiii., 9-11). These errors he traces to their both overlooking one main object of all suffering. God speaks to man by chastisement (ver. 14, 19-22)—warns him, teaches him the necessity of self-knowledge and humility (ver. 18, 16-17)—and prepares him (ver. 23) by the mediation of a spiritual interpreter (the angel Jehovah of Genesis) to inspire and to obtain pardon (ver. 24), renewal of life (ver. 25), perfect access and restoration (ver. 26). This statement does not involve any charge of special guilt, such as the friends had alleged and Job had repudiated. Since the warning and suffering are preventive as well as remedial, the visitation anticipates the commission of sin; it saves man from pride, and other temptations of wealth and power, and it effects the real object of all divine interpositions, the entire submission to God's will. Again, Elihu argues (xxxiv., 10-17) that any charge of injustice, direct or indirect, against God involves a contradiction in terms. God is the only source of justice; the very idea of justice is derived from his governance of the universe, the principle of which is love. In his absolute knowledge God alone sees secrets, and by his absolute power he controls all events, and that for the one end of bringing righteousness to light (verse 21-30).

Man has, of course, no claim upon God; what he receives is purely a matter of grace (xxxv., 6-9). The occasional appearance of unanswerer prayer (verse 9), when evil seems to get the upper hand, is owing merely to the fact that man prays in a proud and insolent spirit (verse 12, 13). Job may look to his heart, and he will see if that is true of himself. Job is silent, and Elihu proceeds (ch. xxxvi.) to show that the almightiness of God is not, as Job seems to assume, associated with any contingency. The theme of this right Job freely avails himself, and maintains it against his friends.

(2) In a state of compose and calmer reflection, Job qualifies, chiefly in his concluding speech, some of his former rather extravagant assertions, and says that, although God generally afflicts the wicked, and blesses the righteous, still there are exceptions to this rule, single cases in which the pious undergo severe trials; the inference, therefore, of a man's guilt from his misfortune is by no means warranted. For the exceptions established by experience prove that God does not always distribute prosperity and adversity according to this rule, but that he sometimes acts upon a different principle, or as an absolute lord, according to his mere will and pleasure.

In his last two discourses Job does not alter his position, nor, properly speaking, adduce any new argument, but he tries to prove, that he is not, and that he never was, in a different line or in a different principle, or as an absolute lord, according to his mere will and pleasure.

(3.) Humbly to adore God is our duty, even when we are subject to calamities not at all deserved; but we should abstain from hastily judging of those who, when distressed, seem to bear forth an example of divine favor. Thus ends the discussion, in which it is evident both parties had partially failed. Job has been betrayed into very hazardous statements, while his friends had been on the one hand dishonorable, on the other bigoted, harsh, and pitiful. The points which had been limited, or imperfectly developed, are now taken up by a new interlocutor (ch. xxxii.-xxxvii.), who argues the justice of the divine administration both from the nature of the dispensations allotted to man, and from the essential character of God himself. Elihu, a young man (ver. 7), descended from a collateral branch of the family of Abraham, is here introduced in indignation at the arguments of his elders (xxxii., 7), and, impelled by an inward inspiration, he now addresses himself to both parties in the discussion, and specially to Job. He shows, first, that they had accused Job upon false and insufficient grounds, and failed to convict him, or to vindicate God's justice. Job, again, had acted with unnecessary violence, and had arraigned that justice (xxxiii., 9-11). These errors he traces to their both overlooking one main object of all suffering. God speaks to man by chastisement (ver. 14, 19-22)—warns him, teaches him the necessity of self-knowledge and humility (ver. 18, 16-17)—and prepares him (ver. 23) by the mediation of a spiritual interpreter (the angel Jehovah of Genesis) to inspire and to obtain pardon (ver. 24), renewal of life (ver. 25), perfect access and restoration (ver. 26). This statement does not involve any charge of special guilt, such as the friends had alleged and Job had repudiated. Since the warning and suffering are preventive as well as remedial, the visitation anticipates the commission of sin; it saves man from pride, and other temptations of wealth and power, and it effects the real object of all divine interpositions, the entire submission to God's will. Again, Elihu argues (xxxiv., 10-17) that any charge of injustice, direct or indirect, against God involves a contradiction in terms. God is the only source of justice; the very idea of justice is derived from his governance of the universe, the principle of which is love. In his absolute knowledge God alone sees secrets, and by his absolute power he controls all events, and that for the one end of bringing righteousness to light (verse 21-30).

Man has, of course, no claim upon God; what he receives is purely a matter of grace (xxxv., 6-9). The occasional appearance of unanswerer prayer (verse 9), when evil seems to get the upper hand, is owing merely to the fact that man prays in a proud and insolent spirit (verse 12, 13). Job may look to his heart, and he will see if that is true of himself. Job is silent, and Elihu proceeds (ch. xxxvi.) to show that the almightiness of God is not, as Job seems to assume, associated with any contingency. The theme of this right Job freely avails himself, and maintains it against his friends.

(2) In a state of compose and calmer reflection, Job qualifies, chiefly in his concluding speech, some of his former rather extravagant assertions, and says that, although God generally afflicts the wicked, and blesses
argumentative tone. The last words are evidently spoken while a violent storm is coming on, in which Elisha views the signs of a Thropean, such as cannot fail to produce an intense realization of the nothingness of man before God.

4. The Almighty's Response. — From the preceding analysis it is obvious that many weighty truths have been developed in the course of the discussion—nearly every theory of the objects and uses of suffering has been reviewed—while a great advance has been made towards the apprehension of doctrines hereafter to be revealed, and was known only to God. But the mystery is not yet really cleared up. The position of the three original opponents is shown to be untenable—the views of Job himself to be but imperfect—while even Elisha gives not the least intimation that he recognizes one special object of calamity. In the case of Job, as we are expressly told, that object was to try his sincerity, and to demonstrate that goodness, integrity in all relations, and devout faith in God can exist independent of external circumstances. This object never occurs to the mind of any one of the interlocutors, nor could it be proved without a revelation. On the other hand, the exact purpose of the trial of Job is not more explicit, nor does Elisha express in its full extent, that respect in which he had been betrayed, and to his three opponents for their harshness and want of candor, could only be awarded by an omniscient Judge.

Accordingly, from the midst of the storm, Jehovah, whom Job had several times vehemently challenged by accusing him and God's justice with great injustice and profound language of incomparable grandeur he reproves and silences the murmurs of Job. God does not condone, strictly speaking, to argue with his creatures. The speculative questions discussed in the colloquy are unnoticed, but the declaration of God's absolute power is illustrated by a marvellously beautiful and comprehensive survey of the glory of creation, and his all-embracing providence by reference to the phenomena of the animal kingdom. He who would argue with the Lord must understand at least the objects for which instinct so strange and manif statedly gven to the beings far below man in gifts and powers. This declaration suffices to bring Job to a right mind: he confesses his inability to comprehend, and therefore to answer his Maker (xl, 3, 4). A second address completes the work. It proves that a charge of injustice against God involves the consequence that the accusation is more competent than he for the universe. He should then be able to control, to punish, to reduce all creatures to order—but he cannot even subdue the monsters of the irrational creation. Baffled by leviathan and behemoth, how can he hold the reins of government, how contend with him who made and rules them all?

5. Job's unreserved submission terminates the trial (ch. xxxvii—xxxiii). There is probably another transposition at xl, 14, which belongs after xxxii, 1-6). He expresses deep contrition, not, of course, for sins falsely imputed to him, but for the bitterness and arrogance which had characterized some portion of his complaints. In the rebuke then addressed to Job's opponents the integrity of his character is distinctly recognised, while they are condemned for untruth, which, inasmuch as it was not wilful, but proceeded from a real but narrowed-minded conception of the divine justice, is pardoned on the intercession of Job. The restoration of his external prosperity, which is an inevitable result of God's personal manifestation, symbolizes the ultimate compensation of the righteous for all sufferings undergone by others.

II. Design of the Book. — From this analysis it may seem clear that certain views concerning the general object of the book are partial or erroneous. a. It cannot be the object of the writer to prove that there is no connection between guilt and sorrow, or that the old ethical doctrine of retribution was radically unsound. Job himself recognizes the general truth of the doctrine, which is, in fact, confirmed by his ultimate restoration to happiness. b. Nor is the development of the great doctrine of a future state the primary object. It would not, in that case, have been passed over in Job's last discourse, in the speech of Elisha, or in the address of the Lord God. In fact, critics who hold that view admit that the doctrine is rather suggested than developed, and amounts to scarcely more than a hope, a presumptuous, at the most a subjective conviction of a truth first fully revealed by him "who brought life and immortality to light." (See Pareau, De Immortalitate notis et in libro Job, Devent. 1807.) The cardinal truth of the immor tality of the soul is taught in Job's reasoning, as it is elsewhere assumed in the T. T. (comp. Matt. xxii, 32); and this thought, in fact, constitutes the afflicted patriarch's ground of consolation and trust, especially in that sublime passage (xxi, 25-27) where he expresses his confidence in his posthumous vindication, which could be of no satisfaction unless his spirit should survive to witness it. Yet this belief is nowhere carried out at length, as would have been the case had this been the main theme of the epopee. Much less is the later doctrine of the resurrection of the body contained in the poem. See RESURRECTION, c. G. On the passage above, see below. See FUTURE LIFE: IMMORTALITY.

2. It may be granted that the primary design of the poem is that which is distinctly intimated in the introduction, and confirmed in the conclusion, namely, to show the effects of calamity in its worst and most awful forms upon human nature. Job is the chief hero of the poem, his amiable character contrasted with the terrible trial to which he was subjected, and the hope that he would prove the type of the meek and lowly who, even in the midst of suffering, trust in God. A second character is the high priest of the tribe of Levi, Elisha, the law and the prophecies of the ancient world are here brought together, and the greatness of the event is seen in the fact that it was brought about by the hand of an ordinary man. The poem is, in fact, a history of the nation, and the history of the nation is told through the lives of its great men, who, by their suffering and triumph, bring the message of the future and the kingdom of God to the world. The poem is, therefore, a history of the nation, and the history of the nation is told through the lives of its great men, who, by their suffering and triumph, bring the message of the future and the kingdom of God to the world.
There is another fundamental error which has led nearly all modern interpreters to a mistaken idea of the design of this book. They assume that the problem could be satisfactorily solved only when the doctrine of retribution is held as a fixed point, which had not been done by the author of the book of Job: a perfect solution of the question was therefore not to be expected from him. Some assert that his solution is erroneous, since retribution, to be expected in a future world, is transferred by him to this life; others assert that he could not know, which he could not know, and he has been satisfied to ask for implicit submission and devo-
tedness, showing at the same time that every attempt at a solution must lead to dangerous positions: blind resignation, therefore, was the short meaning of the lengthened discussion on the doctrine of retribution after death our author does not enter; but that he knew it may be inferred from several passages with great probability; as, for instance, xiv, 14, "If a man die, shall he live again? All the days of my appointed time will I wait, till my change come." The y here shows that the writer had been before engaged in serious consideration of the subject of life after death; and when such is the case, a pious mind will necessarily indulge the hope, or will, at least, have an obscure presentiment of immortality. The truth also of God's undoubted grace, on which the doctrine of immortality is based, will be fully vindicated. Even a child can know [11] The lengthened discussion does not recur to this hope for the purpose of solving his problem; he did not intend in his discussion to exceed the limits of what God had clearly revealed, and this was in his time confined to the vague notion of life continued after death, but not connected with rewards and punishments. From these considerations it appears that those interpreters who, with Bernstein, De Wette, and Umbreit, assume that the book of Job was of a sceptical nature, and intended to dispute the doctrine of retribution as laid down in the other books of the Old Testament, have entirely misunderstood it.

On nearer examination, however, it appears that the doctrine of retribution after death is not of itself alone calculated to lead to a solution of the problem. The belief in a final judgment is firm and rational only when it rests in the belief in God's providential government of all the events of human life. Temporary injustice is still injustice, and destroys the idea of a holy and just God. A God who has something to redress is no God at all. Even the ancient heathen perceived that future rewards would not vindicate inequalities in this world; "For the ungodly are not cut off, but are of a certain age" (Psal. 108 sq.). God's just retribution in this world is extolled throughout the Old Testament. The New Testament holds out to the righteous promises of a future life, as well as of the present; and our Saviour himself, in setting forth the rewards of those who, for his sake, forsake everything, begins with life (Matt. xiv, 20).

A nearer examination of the benedictions contained in the Sermon on the Mount (Matt. v) shows that none of them exclusively refer to future blessings; the judgment of the wicked is in his view proceeding without interruption, and therefore his examples of the distribution of disgrace and justice in this world are most apt with those of refulent in a future order of things. The Gal-
leans, whose blood Pilate had mingled with their own sacrifices (Luke xiii, 1), were in Christ's opinion not accidentally killed; and he threatens those who would not repent that they should in like manner perish. That sickness and death, which so often appear as part of our Mosaic law, are clearly taught (John vi, 14; Luke, xvi, 20, 24): in the former passage it is threatened as a punishment for sins committed; in the latter it is placed in consequence of punishment remitted. The passage in John ix, 2, 3, which is often appealed to in proof that our Lord did not consider sickness as a punishment for sin, does not prove this, but only opposes the Jewish position—found-
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were sicknesses and infirmities were consequences of crimes. The solution of the problem regarding the suffer-
ings of the righteous rests on two positions:

1. Their necessity.—Even the comparatively righteous are not exempt from suffering, which, nevertheless, is not attended only by afflictions, and he who patiently endures them will attain a clearer insight into the otherwise obscure ways of God. The trials of the pious issue at once from God's justice and love. To him who entertains a proper sense of the sinfulness of man, no calamity appears so great as not to be deserved as a punishment, or useful as a correc-
tive.

2. The Compensations attending them.—Calamity, as the veil of grace, is with the pious never experienced alone, but manifest proofs of divine favor accompany or follow it. Though sunk in misery, they still are happier than the wicked, and when it has attained its object it is terminated by the Lord. The consolations offered in the Old Testament are, agreeably to the weaker judgment of its professors, derived chiefly from external circumstances, while in the New Testament they are mainly spiritual, being, moreover, directed beyond the limits of this world.

It is this purely correct solution of the problem which occurs in the book of Job. It is not set forth, however, in any one set of speeches, but is rather to be gathered from the concurrent drift of the entire discussion. For, without God (who cannot be "a man at the bar of" Job), for God proves himself gracious towards him only after he has been corrected and humbled himself. Although the author of the book does not say (i, 22; ii, 10; comp. xiii, 7) that Job had charged God foolishly, and sinned with his lips, yet the sentiment calling for correction in his speeches is clearly pointed out to be that "he was righteous in his own eyes, and justified himself rather than God" (xxiii, 1, 2). The entire purity of his character did not prevent his falling into misconceptions and even contradictions on this important subject; his discussion, therefore, only perplexed. Job continues to be embarrassed for the solution, and he is only certain of this, that the explanation of his friends cannot be satisfactory. Job erred chiefly in not acknowledging his need of chastisement; not withstanding his integrity and sincere piety, this prevented him from appreciating the object of the calamity inflicted on him, led him to consider God's dispensations as arbitrary, and made him despair of the return of better days. The greatness of his sufferings was in some measure the cause of his misconception, by exciting his feelings, and preventing him from calmly considering his blessing; he was in his own eyes tempted, and deserving God's indulgence. He had received considerable provocation from his friends, and often endeavored to soften his harsh assertions, which, particularly in ch. xxvii, leads him into such contradictions as must have occurred in the life of the tempted; he is loud in acknowledging the wisdom of God (ch. xxviii), and raises himself at times to burning hopes (comp. ch. xix). But this can only excuse, not justify him, and therefore it is in the highest degree honorable to him that he remains silent when, in Elihu's speeches, the correct solution of the question is suggested, and that he unreservedly acknowledges his fundamental error of doing justice to himself only.

[2] The solution of the question mooted cannot be contained in the speeches of Job's friends. Their de-

manner is reproved by God, and represented as a real sin, and that much sin it is hard to overlook, if Job was directed to offer a propitiatory sacrifice. Their error proceeded from a crude notion of sin in its external appearance; and, inferring its existence from calamity, they were thus led to condemn the afflicted Job as guilty of heinous crimes (ch. xxxii). The moral use of sufferings was unknown to them. It was often supposed that they themselves were not yet purged and cleared from guilt. If they had been sensible of the nature of man, if they had understood themselves, they would, on
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seeing the misery of Job, have exclaimed, "God be merciful to us sinners!" There is, indeed, an important correct principle in their speeches, whose centre it forms, so much so that they mostly err only in the application of the general truth. It consists in the perception of the invariable connection between sin and misery, which is indelibly ingrained on the heart of man, and to which many ancient authors allude. The problem of the book is then solved by properly uniting the correct positions of the speeches both of Job and his friends, by maintaining his innocence as to any moral obliquity (although changing a view which must have resulted in spiritual perdition, he was the Lord's "lamb," socially exposed, and his character before it ripened into guilt), and at the same time avoiding the idea that misfortunes are necessarily a punitive infliction (being only a curse when it follows the violation of the physical laws of the Creator, and even then capable of being overruled for the welfare of his saints), thus tracing the errors of both parties to a common source, the want of a sound insight into the nature of sin. Job considers himself righteous, and not deserving of such infusions, because he was not conscious of having committed any crime; and his friends think that it was because Job was highly criminal, in order to justify his misery. [3.] The solution of the question at issue is not exclusively given in the addresses of God, which contain only the basis of the solution, not the solution itself. In assigning forth his majesty, and in showing that imputing to him that which was repugnant to a correct conception to his nature, these addresses establish that there must be a solution which does not impair divine justice. This is not, indeed, the solution itself, but everything is thus prepared for the solution. We apprehend that God must judge further; he can show how he can be just, and still the righteouse be miserable. [4.] Nor yet can we justly regard the speech of Elihu as affording altogether a correct solution of this main question; for, as the preceding analysis has shown, it falls short of the purpose, and the text itself (xxxviii., 2) expressly states its 'belligerent and incompetency. Nevertheless, the position of this in the poem, and the general agreement of its doctrines with the final result, indicate that it contains, in germ at least, the correct solution, as far as human capacity can go. The leading principles in Elihu's statement, that calamity in the sight of God is inflicted even on the best of best men, but that God allowed a favorable turn to take place as soon as it had attained its object. Now this is the key to the events of Job's life. Though a pious and righteous man, he is tried by severe afflictions. He knew at the outset that his purpose he is relieved from the burden which oppresses him, and ample prosperity atoms for the afflictions he has sustained (the last vestige of injustice on the part of the Almighty in thus afflicting a good man at the instance of Satan, and for the sake of the example to future ages, disappearing with the consideration that the subject of it himself required the severe lesson for his own spiritual profit). Add to this that the remaining portion of Elihu's speeches, in which he points to God's infinite majesty as including his justice, is continued in the addresses of God; that Elihu foretells God's appearance; that he is not punished by God as are the friends of Job; in fine, that Job, by his very silence, acknowledges the problem to have been solved by Elihu; and his silenced, metaphorically "interred" as the highest sign of guilt, which had urged him to defend himself (xxxiii., 32), and because Job had repeatedly declared he would "hold his peace" if it was shown to him wherein he had erred,(vi, 24, 25; xix., 4), this view of the book of Job, and among modern authors been supported chiefly by Stiädelin (Briefläge zur Re- ligion, ii, 138) and Schultze (Das Buch Job, Lpzg. 1812), though it is equally mixed up with much erroneous matter; and it is further confirmed by the whole Old Testament giving the same answer is the question mooted which the speeches of Elihu offer: in its concentrated form it is presented in Psa. xxvii. xliii. At the same time, it must be conceded that the apprehension of Elihu's speech by Jehovah himself, as sup- plying a solution, is, as the tenor of the whole succeeding portion of the poem also implies, that there are mysteries in divine providence, the full solution of which, in this life at least, God does not deign nor think best to make to his creatures who are the subjects of them. The intractability of God's ways by hu- man judgment, the onset of events, especially inferring from him and his people, and the character of this life as a probation requires the withholding of many of his plans in order to their proper disciplinary effects. Especially is the saint required to walk by faith and not by sight, and the growth and fullest exercise of this faith can only occur under such circumstances as those in which Job was placed. While it is pre-eminently the doctrine of both the Old and the New Testament that afflictions are the earthly lot of the righteous, it is equally a maxim under both dispensations that the most emboldening motive for their patience is this, that the simple truth is in- spired by our heavenly Father, who alone fully knows why they are best for us. Could the subject of them at the time perceive clearly their necessity and advantage, half their value would be destroyed; for an assurance of this he must trust the known kindness and wisdom of God and the love of the Lord's people to his subtle position, finally attained by the tried patriarch (Job xxiii, 10), which gilds his character with its most sacred hue. The above is substantially the view of the moral design of the book entertained by the latest ex- plicators (e.g. Conant, Delitzsch, etc.), although they do not bring out these ethical considerations with sufficient distinctness.

It remains to consider the view taken by Ewald re- specting the design of the book of Job. He justly re- jects the common, superficial view of its design, which has recently been revived and defended by Hitzel (see his Commentar, Lpzg. 1839), and which represents the author as intending to show that man cannot apprehend the plans of God, and does best to submit in ignorance, without repining at afflictions. Nowhere in the whole book is simple resignation crudely enjoined, and no- where is man shown to be more righted then when he, in submission, pleads his sufferings as triad, and the epilogue declares that the end had proved this: consequently the author was competent to give a theo- olgy with reference to the calamity of Job and if such is the case he cannot have intended simply to recommend resignation. The Biblical writers, when engaged on this problem, know how to justify God with reference to the afflictions of the righteous, and have no inten- tion of evading the difficulty when they recommend resignation (see the Psalms quoted above, and, in the New Testament, the Epistle to the Hebrews, chap. xi. 24). The view of the book of Job alluded to would isolate it, and take it out of its natural connection. Thus far, then, we agree with Ewald, but we cannot approve of his own view of the design of the book of Job. According to his system, "calamity is never a punishment for sins committed, but always a mere accident, an imag- inary show, above which we must raise ourselves by the consciousness of the eternal nature of the human mind, to which, by external prosperity, nothing can be added, and from which, by external misfortune, nothing can be taken away. It was (says Ewald) the burden of the whole book, the way of the Lord's love, the study of the reality and naturalness of sorrow, and even allowing its exhibition, yet knows how effectually to cure its
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wounds by the most substantial considerations. Nor is
it in accordance with the book itself, which nowhere
impugns or mitigates the extent of Job's calamities, but,
from the high vantage ground of the prologue and epi-
logue, impresses us with a more solemn insight into their
significance than even Job was enabled to take, and
throughout the discussion (both on the part of the three
friends and that of the author) judicial impartiality is
asserted as evidence of the divine displeasure, and especially
in the key furnished by Elihu—which excites them to the
interest of the most interesting degree of importance in the moral
discipline of the people of God), admits and therefore
seeks to justify their pungency. Their design is as far
from being wanting as any; the contents are instructive
and admirable. Viewed in the light of the foregoing purpose, this book becomes one of the most precious legacies to the Church—to which tribula-
tion in this world has been left as a heritage; and a
sublime exposition of some of the most interesting prob-
lems of religious experience in its most highly developed
phase.

III. Historical Character of the Work.—On this sub-
ject there are three opinions. (1.) Some contend that the
book contains an entirely true history. (2.) Others
assert that it contains a narrative entirely imaginary,
and constructed by the author to teach a great moral
truth. (3.) The third opinion is that the book is founded
on a true history, which has been recast, modified,
and enlarged by the author.

1. The first view, taken by numerous ancient inter-
preters, is now abandoned by nearly all expositors.
Understandably so. All the details in the Book of Job were
not only that the persons and events which it describes
are real, but that the very words of the speakers were
actually recorded. It was supposed either that Job
himself employed the latter years of his life in writing it
(A. Schultens), or that at a very early age some in-
spired Hebrew collector of the speeches and sayings, preserved by oral tradition, and presented them to his
countrymen in their own tongue. Some such view
seems to have been adopted by Josephus, for he places
Job in the list of the historical books, and it was pre-
avalent with all the fathers of the Church. In its sup-
port several reasons are adduced, of which only the first
and second have any real force; and even these are over-
weighed by other considerations, which render it impos-
sible to consider the book of Job as an entirely true his-
tory, which may but be used in defence of the third
view alluded to. It is said (1.) That Job's name is [Estek. xiv,
14-20] mentions him as a public character, and says,
Noah and Daniel, and represented as an example of pi-
ety. (2.) In the Epistle of James (v, 11), patience in
sufferings is recommended by a reference to Job. (3.)
In the Greek translation of the Sept. a notice is appended
to the book of Job, evidently referring to Gen. xxxvi,
38, and stating that Job was the king Jobab of Edom.
It is as follows: "And it is written that he will rise
again with those whom the Lord will raise up. This
is translated out of a Syrian book. He dwelt indeed
in the land of Uz, on the confines of Idumea and Ara-
bia. His first name was Job; and having married an
Arabian woman, he had by her a son whose name
was Ennon. He was himself a son of Zare, one of the
sons of Esau, and his mother's name was Bosarra; so
that he was the fifth in descent from Abraham. And
these were the kings who reigned in Edom, over which
continued, the genius of the most ardent thinker has raised this,
the most remarkable monument of the Skmitic mind. The
first indications of this opinion are found in the
Talmud (Baba Bathra, xx, 1). In a discussion upon the
age of this book, while the Rabbins in general maintain
its historical character, Samuel Bar-Nachman declares
that its composition was not confined to a single
author, but the work is a parable." Hai Gaon (Ewald
and Duke's Beitraége, iii, 165), A.D. 1000, who is followed
by Rashi, altered this passage to "Job existed, and
was created to become a parable." They had evidently no
critical ground for the change, but bore witness to the
prevalent tradition of the Hebraists, "Nie der Reb
Nebochim, ii, 22), with his characteristic freedom of
mind, considers it an open question of little or no
moment to the real value of the inspired book. Ralph,
I.e., R. Levi ben-Gershom, treats it as a philosophic work.
A late Hebrew commentator, Simcha Arie (Schlott-
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mann, p. 4), denies the historical truth of the narrative on the ground that it is incredible that the patriarchs of the chosen race should be surpassed in goodness by a child of Edom. This is worth noting in corroboration of the argument that such a fact was not likely to have been invented by an Israelite of any age.

In opposition to this view, the following arguments may be adduced: (1) It has always seemed to pious writers incompatible with any idea of inspiration to assume that a narrative, certainly not allegorical, should be a mere fiction, and irreverent to suppose that the Almighty would be introduced as a speaker in an imaginative way.

(2) We are led to the same conclusion by the soundest principles of criticism. Ewald says (Evid. p. 15) most truly, "The invention of a history without foundation in facts—the creation of a person, represented as having a real historical existence, out of the mere head of the poet—is a notion so entirely alien to the spirit of all antiquity, that it only began to develop itself gradually in the latest epoch of the literature of any ancient people, and in its complete form belongs only to the most modern times." In the canonical books there is not a trace of any such invention. Of all people, the Hebrews were the least likely to mingle the most frivolous contentions of imagination with the sacred records revered as the peculiar glory of their race.

It is true that the arguments advanced by Ewald to show the historical character of the chief features of the book of Job are not conclusive, especially the literature of the name Job, which may have reference to the character sustained in the narrative (from 22:8 to hate, q.d. "the assailed," i.e. tempted; see Gesenius, Thes. Heb. p. 81); still they must be allowed to have some weight, and, taken in connection with the general usage of Scripture in its poetical and rhetorical amplifications, especially with the considerations presently to be adduced in the following, the author of this book must justify the presumption of a historical foundation, not only for the facts and personages represented in the book, but also, to a certain extent, for the speeches.

(3) To this it must be added that there is a singular air of reality in the whole narrative, such as must either proceed naturally from a faithful adherence to objective truth, or be the result of the most consummate art. The effect is produced partly by the thorough consistency of all the characters, especially that of Job, not merely as drawn in broad, strong outlines, but as developed out of the most trying circumstances; partly also by the minute and accurate account of incidents which in a fiction would probably have been noted by an ancient writer in a vague and general manner.

Thus we remark the mode in which the supernatural trial is carried into execution by natural agencies—by Chaldæan and Sabaean robbers—by whirlwinds common in and peculiar to the desert—by fire—and, lastly, by the chelaphasia (see Schottmann, p. 15; Ewald, L. C.; and Hengstenberg), the most formidable disease known in the East. The disease was indeed one which the Indians and most Orientals then probably believed to be peculiarly indicative of divine wrath, and would therefore be naturally selected by the writer (see the analysis above). But the symptoms are described so faithfully as to leave no doubt that the writer must either have introduced them with a view to giving an air of truthfulness to his account, or have learned them by a witness or received from an exact tradition. The former supposition is confuted by the fact that the peculiar symptoms are not described in any one single passage so as to attract the reader's attention, but are made out by a critical and scientific examination of words and by an inquiry into the complaint of the sufferer. The most refined art fails in producing such a result; it is rarely attempted in the most artificial ages, was never dreamed of by ancient writers, and must here be regarded as a strong instance of the disguised coincidences which the soundest critics regard as the best evidence of genuineness and authenticity in any work.

4. Luther first suggested the theory which, in some form or other, is most generally received. In his introduction to the first edition of his translation of the Bible he speaks of the author as having so treated the historical facts as to demonstrate the truth of those which are recorded in the Tischредen (ed. Walch, xxii, 2038) he says: "I look on the book of Job as a true history, yet I do not believe that all took place just as it is written, but that an ingenious, pious, and learned man brought it into its present form." This position was strongly attacked by Bellarmine, who declared that the theory was afterwards repudiated by most Lutherans. The fact that Spinola, Clericus, Du Pin, and Father Simon held nearly the same opinion, the first denying, and the others notoriously holding low views of the inspiration of Scripture, had of course a tendency to bring it into disrepute. J. D. Michaelis first revived the old theory of Bar-Nachman, not upon critical, but dogmatic grounds. In a mere history the opinions or doctrines enounced by Job and his friends could have no dogmatic authority; whereas, if the whole book were a pure inspiration, the strongest arguments could be developed from it, and the greatest indications of the resurrection and a future judgment, which, though implied in other early books, are nowhere so distinctly indicated. The arbitrary character of such reasoning is obvious. At present no critic doubts that the narrative rests on facts, although the previous Continental scholars never certainly in its form and general features, in its reasoning and representations of character, the book is a work of creative genius.

Taking this view, we must still abstain from undertaking to determine what the poet derived from tradition, and what he added himself, since it is evident how far it diverges from the original. The empirical character of the work must be distinctly acknowledged. Much of the preceding is a mere speculation; the author of this book must justify the presumption of a historical foundation, not only for the facts and personages represented in the book, but also, to a certain extent, for the speeches.

IV. Decent, Country, and Age of the Author.—1. Opinions differed in ancient times as to the nation to which the author belonged, some considering him to have been an Arab, others an Israelite. Various citations are made from the first (1785). We find in our book many ideas of genuine Israelitish growth: the creation of the world is described, in accordance with the prevailing notions of the Israelites, as the immediate effect of divine omnipotence; man is formed of clay; the spirit of man is God's breath; God employs the angels for the performance of his orders; Satan, the great enemy of the children of God, is his instrument for tempting them; men are weak and sinful; nobody is pure in the sight of God, moral corruption is propagated. There is a particularity to men the law of God, which they must not infringe, and the transgressor of which is visited on offenders with punishments. Moreover, the naked world, or Sheol, is depicted in hues entirely Hebraic. To these particulars might, without much trouble, be added many more, but the deep-seeking inquirer will particularly weigh, (286), the fact that the book displays a strength and force of language which could only be expected within the domain of revelation. Monotheism, if the assertions of ancient Arabian authorities may be trusted, prevailed, indeed, for a long period among the Arabs, and it held its ground at least among a portion of the nation till the age of Mohammed, who died for it, and the religion of his party which was spreading from Syria. Still the god of the Arabs was, as those of the heathens generally were, a retired god, dwelling far apart, while the people of the Old Covenant enjoyed the privilege of a vital communion with God, and the warmth with which our author enters into the
view incontrovertibly proves that he was an Israelite. (Sdl), As regards the language of our book, several ancient writers asserted that it was originally written in the Aramaic or Arabic tongue, and afterwards translated into Hebrew by Moses, David, Solomon, or some unknown Israelite. (Note on Job, in the Appendix in the Septuagint, and the compiler of the tract on Job added to the works of Origen and Jerome; in modern times it has been chiefly defended by Spanheim, in his Historia Job. But for a translation there is too much propriety and propriety in the words and sense, and the mode of writing and the phrases, for the time and the language. This parallelistism also is too accurate and perfect for a translation, and the whole breathes a freshness that could be expected from the original work only. Sensible of the weight of this argument, others, as Eichhorn, took a medium course, and assumed that the author was a Hebrew, though he did not live among his countrymen, but in Arabia. "The earlier Hebrew history," they say, "is unknown to the author, who is igno- rant of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph. The genealogy of angelic characters, also, he proves himself always familiar with Arabia, while he is silent respecting the characteristics of Palestine. With Egypt he must have been well acquainted, which can be accounted for by supposing him to have lived in Arabia than in Palestine." Hitzig and Delitzsch believe that the writer of the Elohist book was an Egyptian. Wetstein and Delitzsch say that he was a native of the Hauran. The usual place of the name in Hebrew, however, appears to imply a later date than the Exode, and the absence of allusion to the events of Hebrew history, it has been thought, may be accounted for by the peculiar line of argument (from natural religion) pursued in the book, as in Ecclesiastes. It has further been suggested that the author, without directly mentioning the Pentateuch, frequently alludes to portions of it, as in iii, 4, to Gen. 1, 3; in iv, 19, and xxxix. 21; to Moses' account of the creation of man; in v, 14, to Deut. xxxii, 32; in xxxiii, 11, to Deut. xxxv, 4. Moreover, history says nothing of the Israelites having permanently taken up their residence in the land of Arabia, so as to allow the supposition of the above origin of the book of Job by a Hebrew thus isolated from Palestine; nor was any of the arguments adduced to prove the acquaintance (and therefore neighborhood) of the author with Egypt bear a close examination. Thus it is a mistake to suppose that the description of the working of mines in ch. xxxvii must necessarily have reference to Egypt; Phoenicia, Arabia, and Edom afforded mining regions sufficient to the object of the description. It is also unknown that the Egyptian mauosea rests on an erroneous interpre- tation of iii, 14, which may also be said of the asser- tion that xxxix, 18, refers to the Egyptian myrtus of the phœnix. Casting aside these arbitrarily assumed Egyptian references, we have only the following: Our author knew the Egyptian vexillations of bulrushes, ix, 29; the Nile-grass, viii, 12; the Nile-horse (Bebemuth) and the crocodile (Leviathan), xi, 15; xiii, 1. Now, as these things belong to the more prominent peculiarities of a neighboring country, they must have been known to every educated man of ancient Egypt, and it is set better be- fore his eyes than anywhere else, is true, for there he had an opportunity of observing mines, caravans, drying up of brooks, etc. But this is not sufficient proof of the author having lived permanently in that remote part of Palestine, and of having there written his book: he was not a man of considerable attainments, endowed with the power of vividly representing things absent from him.

2. As to the age of the author of this book, we meet with three opinions: (a) That he lived before Moses, or was, at least, his contemporary. (b) That he lived in the time of Solomon, or in the centuries next follow- ing—the opinion of Hahn, Schottmann (Berl. 1857), and Delitzsch. (c) That he lived shortly after the Babylonian exile, or even after the Babylonian exile. Against this last view (adopted by Le Clerc among earlier interpreters, and by modern expositors by Bernstein, Gesenius, Umbreit, and De Wette) it is conclusively objected, (1) That the book is refered to in the Old Testament itself (Ezek. xiv, 14—20) as well known before the time of the captivity, and (2) the poetical character of the book, which is wholly different from the declamatory style of the later period.

The most complete statement of the reasons in support of the opinion that the book of Job was written between the age of Moses and the Exile may be found in Rieger's "Erste Jeremia," p. 163 sq.; in Rosenmüller's edition of Lowth's Fragmentations de Poet. Sacra Hieroborum, in which he maintains that it was written in the age of Solomon. Most of these rea- sons, indeed, are either not conclusive at all, or not quite cogent. Thus it is an arbitrary proposition, proved by modern researches to be erroneous, that the author of the book of Job was unknown previous to the age of Moses. The assertion, too, that the marks of cultivation and refinement observable in our book belonged to a later age rests on no historical ground. Further, it cannot be said that for such a short time the language is too smooth and neat, since in no Syrian dialect is it possible to trace a progressive improvement. The evident correspondence also between our book and the Proverbs and Psalms is not a point proving with restless force that they were all written at the same time. Nor is it the character of such a kind that the most unhallowed Psalms and Proverbs (esp. Ps. xxxix, 18, with Job vii, 19; xiv, 6; x, 20, 21; viii, 8, 21, in the Hebrew Bible), can be exactly said to have copied our book, but it may be accounted for by their all belonging to the same class of writings, by the very great uniformity and cohesion of thought, and the similarity of the sentiments expressed in the Old Testament, and by the stability of its religious character. The striking coincidence, in particular, observable between the eulogy of "wisdom" contained in Job xxviii and the numerous similar didactic strations found in the writings of Solo- mon (comp. especially Prov. xi, iv), may be accounted for by the above supposition that this chapter was added by a later hand than the author of the rest of the book, or at least as a sequel to the traditional part of the poem.

The traditional view of the authorship of the book of Job sacrifices it to Moses; the arguments in favor of this view have been collected by Spanheim, and may be seen with replies in Wymys (Life and Times of Job, p. 82 sq.). The following leading points are deserving of consideration: (1) There is in the book of Job no direct allusion to any portion of the Hebrew legislation; and other statements are suited to the period of the patri- archs; as, for instance, the great authority held by old men, the high age of Job, and fathers offering sacri- fices for their families—which leads to the supposition that when our book was written no sacerdotal order yet existed. Not to mention the ignorance of all the ordinary habits of living and associations of Judaism fully explainable on the ground of the author's desire to base the question
at issue wholly on religious consciousness and experience; for many of the incidents of Jewish and even patriarchal history were too apposite to his topic to be passed over (e.g. the overthrow of Pharaoh and the deliverance of the plagues), unless we suppose a degree of studied impersonation at variance with the naturalness and practical aims of Scripture. (2.) The language of the book of Job seems strongly to support the opinion of its having been written as early as the time of Moses. It has often been said that no writing of the Old Testament can be more strongly illustrated from the Arabic than this book. Jerome observes (Praef. in Dan.), "Jobum cum Arabica lingua plurimum habere societatem," and Schultens proved this so incontrovertibly that Gesenius was rather too late in denying the fact (see his Geschichte der hebräischen Sprache, p. 38). Nor, from this character of its language we might be induced to infer that the work was written in the remotest times, when the separation of the dialects had only begun, but had not yet been completed. It is true that this peculiarity of idiom is not such as to be of itself conclusive as to its date, and it might even have been to some extent assumed in order to correspond with the foreign garb of the poem. It also contains some Aramaisms and other signs of degeneracy; these (unless attributable to copyists) may easily be accounted for by the supposition of a later editorship more consonant with the Jewish tradition than the authorship of Moses (see Otho, Lex. Rabbin. p. 525; comp. Tobit ii, 12; Euseb. Prep. Ev. ix, 25), although not entirely uniform, seems to have been firmly established at an early period; and, lightly as it has been treated by some (see Dr. Davidson, in the new ed. of Horne's Introd. ii, 727), still affords the only writer of sufficient note to whom the work has ever been definitely ascribed. The facilities enjoyed by Moses during his quiet sojourn in Midian were greater perhaps than those of any other Hebrew author for such a production; and the contemplation of his ancestors and their experiences may have furnished as ample a motive for the task as can be found at any other period, or in the case of any other writer to whom the book has been assigned, even if no special outward occasion can be shown to have led to the literary effort at that time. This date, moreover, is precisely such as to admit the incorporation of Jewish theology without its history, and affords a locality where all the elements of the poem were at hand. (4.) The period in which Job himself lived is a distinct question from that of the age in which the book was written, it having been in this respect (on the supposition of the reality of the narrative) to locate the author very substantially at the times of his hero, and under such circumstances as to suggest the topic. The ante-Mosaic date of Job's life is evident from his longevity (probably two centuries and a half, xxii, 16, 17) while the Sept. expressly gives his total age as 240 years, assigning, however, 170 of these as preceding his affliction), which seems to mark him as contemporary with Peleg, Reu, or Serug (B.C. 2414-2122) as well as from the primitive character of his social relations, which are similar to those of Abrah- am (B.C. 2168-1898). His country could not have been the Mediterranean or Sinaitic peninsula. There is thus found to be a reasonable presumption in favor of the Mosaic authorship of this book, so far as time and place are concerned, while there is no internal evidence decidedly opposed to the tradition in its favor. Our conclusion, as being the most probable combination of all the facts in the case, is that, as a narrative poem in a rudimentary form, it was originally framed in Job's age (by that romance style of composition spontaneous with Orientals), and that, in its Arabic dress, it was gathered by Moses from the lips of the Midianitish harlot, "the wife of seven husbands," or by his countrymen, that it was first composed by him in the Hebrew language, but now reduced to its present complete form still considerably later, perhaps by Solomon. This progressive kind of authorship is vindicated by the fact that other epics have come down to us through similar stages of heroic legend, oral preservation, collection, formal composition, and editorial work, and is even illustrated in the origin of other less obscurely traceable books of the Bible. See Genesis. (5.) In defense of the theory that the book was written during the Assyrian invasion, B.C. cir. 708, see the introduction to Merx's Buch Job (Jena, 1870). V. Integrity of the Book. — It is satisfactory to find that the arguments employed by those who impugn the authenticity of considerable portions of this book are, for the most part, mutually destructive, and that the mass of reaching investigations bring out the most convincing proofs of the unity of its composition, and the coherence of its constituent parts. One point of great importance is noted by the latest and one of the most ingenious writers (M. E. Renan, Le Livre de Job, Par. 1859) on this subject. After some strong remarks upon the inequality of the style, and appearance of in- terpolation, M. E. Renan observes (p. xliii): — "The Hebrews, and Orientals in general, differed widely from us in their views about composition. Their works never have that perfectly defined outline to which we are accustomed, and we should be careful not to assume interpolation whenever it seems to meet with defects of sequence which surprise us." He then shows that in parts of the work, acknowledged by all critics to be by one hand, there are very strong instances of what Europeans might regard as repetition, or suspicion of interpolation: thus Elihu recommends his arguments four times, and discourses of Job, which seem to be distinct portions, such as to modern critics might seem unconnected and even misplaced, are impressed with such a character of sublimity and force as to leave no doubt that they are the product of a single inspiration. To this judgment true the narrative and the highly poetical language of the colloquy. Yet the best critics now acknowledge that the style of these portions is quite as antique in its simple and severe grandeur as that of the Pentateuch itself (to which it bears a striking resemblance), and comp. Lee, Job, p. 49), or as any other part of the book, while it is also true that the narrative style of all the later productions of the Hebrews. Ewald says with perfect truth, "These prosaic words harmonize thoroughly with the old poem in subject-matter and thoughts, in coloring and in art; also in language, so far as prose can be like poetry," (2.) It is said, again, that the doctrinal views are not in harmony with those of Job. This is wholly unfounded. The fundamental principles of the patriarch, as developed in the most solemn of his discourses, are identical with those maintained throughout the book. The form of worship belongs essentially to the patriarchal type; with little of ceremonial ritual, without a separate priesthood, thoroughly domestic in form and spirit. The representation of the angels, and their appeal, "was of God," peculiar to this book and to Genesis, is accord entirely with the intimations in the earliest documents of this type; (5.) It is, moreover, the fact that there are discrepancies between the facts related in the introduction, and statements or allusions in the dialogue. But the apparent contradiction between xix. 17 and the statement that all Job's children had perished rests upon a misinterpretation of the words "seven" or "two," children of my womb," I.e. "of the womb that bare me," and "my mother's children," but not "my mother's womb." Indeed, the destruction of the patriarch's whole race is repeatedly assumed in the dialogue (e.g. Gen. 4. 16). Again, the omission of all reference to the defeat
of Satan in the last chapter is quite in accordance with the grand simplicity of the poem (Schollmann, p. 39, 40). It was too obvious a result to need special notice, and it bad, in fact, been accomplished by the steadfast faith of the patriarch which so often measured. No allusion to the agency of that spirit was to be expected in the colloquy, since Job and his friends are represented as wholly ignorant of the transactions in heaven. At present, indeed, it is generally acknowledged that the entire work would be unintelligible without this portion. (4) The skew objection in the introduction chapter. It is certain that they first appear in Hebrew history about the year B.C. 770. But the name of Chaldea, an ancestor of the future, is found in the genealogical table in Genesis (xxii, 22), a fact quite sufficient to prove the early existence of the people as a separate tribe. It is highly probable that an ancient race bearing that name in Kurdistan (see Xenoph. Cyr. iii, 1, 34. : Abyd. iv, 3, 4; iv, 5, 17) was the original source of the nation, who were there trained in predatory habits, and accustomed, long before their appearance in history, to make excursions into the neighboring deserts, a view quite in harmony with the part assigned to them in this book. (5) Strong objections are made to the passage chap. xxxvii, 9, 10. The problem is to determine the character of the Jewish prophet of Zophar has been put into the mouth of Job. The fact of the contradiction is denied by able writers, who have shown that it rests upon a misapprehension of the patriarch's character and fundamental principles. He had been provoked under circumstances of peculiar aggravation into statements which at the close of a discourse by which he was to be anxious to guard or recall: he was bound, having spoken so rashly, to recognize, what, beyond doubt, he never intended to deny, the general justice of divine dispensations even in this world. Moreover, he intimates a belief or presentiment of a future retribution and recompense in any other way. Any one (see ver. 8). The whole chapter is thoroughly coherent: the first part is admitted by all to belong to Job: nor can the rest be disjoined from it without injury to the sense. Edwad says, "Only a grievous misunderstanding of the whole book could have led one to hold that this passage is interpolated or misplaced." Other critics have abundantly vindicated the authenticity of the passage (Hahn, Schollmann, etc.). As for the style, E. Rénan, a most competent authority in a matter of taste, declares that it is one of the finest developments of the style. It certainly differs exceedingly in its breadth, loftiness, and devout spirit from the speeches of Zophar, for whose silence satisfactory reasons have already been assigned (see the analysis). This last argument, however, applies rather to chap. xxviii, which may, without any impairment of the integrity of the poem, be regarded as an embellishment representing the times and sentiments of the final editor (e. i. Solomon).

3. The last two chapters of the address of the Almighty have been rejected as interpolations by many, of course rationalistic, writers (Stuhlman, Bernstein, Edwad), who hold that the inferiority of style, partly as not having any bearing upon the argument, but the connection of reasonings, involved, though, as was to be expected, not drawn out, in this discourse, has been shown in the preceding analysis; and as for the style, few who have a true ear for the Hebrew language have not been struck with the dissent from the judgment of E. Rénan, whose suggestion, that it may have been written by the same author at a later date, is far from weakening the force of his observation as to the identity of the style.

4. The speech of Elihu presents greater difficulties, and has been rejected by several rationalists, whose opinion, however, is not that of the writers, but by some of the most sceptical commentators. The former support their decision on the apparent, and, to a certain extent, the real difference between this and other parts of the book in tone of thought, in doctrinal views, and, more positively, in language and general style. Much stress is also laid on the fact that Elihu is not mentioned in the introduction nor at the end, and that his speech is unanswered by Job, and unnoticed in the final address of the Almighty. These points were observed by very early writers, and were accounted for in various ways. On the one hand, Elihu was regarded as a distinctly different person (S. Schollmann, p. 53). In the Seder Olam (a rabbinical system of chronology) he is reckoned among the prophets who declared the will of God to the Gentiles before the promulgation of the law. S. Bar-Nachman (12th century) notes his connection with the family of Abraham as a sign that he was the first person to expound the ways of God. The Greek fathers generally follow Chrysostom in attributing to him a superior intellect, while many of the best critics of the last two centuries consider that the true dialectic solution of the great problem, the book is to be found in the course of Elihu's discourse. On the other hand, Jerome, who is followed by Gregory, and many ancient as well as modern writers of the Western Church, speak of his character and arguments with singular contempt. Later critics, chiefly rationalists, see in him but an empty babbler, introduced only to heighten the contrast between the last part of the book and dignified discourse of Job. The alternative of rejecting his speech as an interpolation was scarcely less objectionable, and has been preferred by Stuhlman, Bernsteir, Edwad, Rénan, and other writers of similar opinions in other countries. A candid and searching examination, however, must convince us that double Elihu supplies exactly what Job repeatedly demands—a confutation of his opinions, not merely produced by an overwhelming display of divine power, but by rational and human arguments, and proceeding from one not, like his other opponents, bound to uphold the upright, candid, and truthful (comp. xxxiii, 3, with vi, 24, 25). The reasonings of Elihu are moreover such as are needed for the development of the doctrines insculpted in the book, while they are necessarily cast in a form which could not without irreverence be assigned to the Almighty. As to the objection that the doctrinal system of Elihu is in some points more advanced than that of Job or his friends, it may be answered, first, that there are no traces in this discourse of certain doctrines which were undoubtedly known at the earliest date to which those critics would assign the interpolation, whereas, it is evident that if they would have been adduced as the strongest arguments for a warning and consolation. No reader of the Psalms and of the Prophets could have failed to urge such topics as the resurrection, the future judgment, and the personal advent of Messiah. Secondly, the doctrinal system of Elihu differs but little from that of Job, which has been either developed or intimated in several passages of the work, and consists chiefly in a specific application of the mediatorial theory, not unknown to Job, and in a deeper appreciation of the love manifested in all providential dispensations. It is quite consistent with the plan of the book in general, and is shown in the arrangement of the whole work, that the highest view as to the object of afflictions, and to the
source to which men should apply for comfort and instruction, should be reserved for this, which, so far as regards the human reasoners, is the culminating point of the discussion. Little can be said for Lightfoot’s theory that the whole work was composed by Elihu, or for E. Reiman’s view that the discourse may have been composed by the author in his old age; yet these views imply an unconscious impression that Elihu is the fullest exponent of the truth. It is satisfactory to know that two of the most impartial and discerning critics (Ewald and Reiman), who unite in denying this to be an oration in which a large portion of the work is solely acknowledged as its intrinsic excellence and beauty.

There is no difficulty in accounting for the omission of Elihu’s name in the introduction. No persons are named in the book until they appear as agents, or as otherwise concerned in the events. Thus Job’s brethren are named incidentally in one of his speeches, and his relatives are, for the first time, in the concluding chapter. Had Elihu been mentioned at first, we should of course have expected him to take part in the discussion, and the impression made by his startling address would have been lost. Job does not answer him, nor, indeed, does Elihu deny the cogency of his arguments, while this silence brings out a curious point of coincidence with a previous declaration of the patriarch (vi. 24, 25). Again, the discourse, being substantially true, did not need correction, and is therefore left unnoticed, in exactly the same way as the Almsgiving of the Almighty, which could be more in harmony with the ancient traditions of the East than that a youth, moved by a special and supernatural impulse to speak out God’s truth in the presence of his elders, should retire into obscurity when he had done his work. More weight is to be attached to the objection resting upon diversity of style and dialectic peculiarities. The most acute critics differ indeed in their estimate of both, and are often grossly deceived (see Schottmann, p. 61); still, there can be little doubt as to the fact. It may be accounted for either on the supposition that the author adhered strictly to the form in which tradition handed down the dialogue—in which case the speech of a Syrian might be expected to bear traces of his dialect—or that the Chaldaic forms and idioms, which are far from resembling later vulgares or corruptions of Hebrew, and occur only in highly poetical passages of the oldest writers, as peculiarly suit the style of the young and fiery speaker (see Schottmann, Exil. p. 61). It has been observed, and with apparent truth, that the discourses of the other interlocutors have each a very distinct and characteristic coloring, shown not only in the general tone of thought, but in the nature of the expression (Ewald, and Schottmann). The excessive obscurity of the style, which is universally admitted, may be accounted for in a similar manner. A young man speaking under strong excitement, embarrassed by the presence of his elders and by the peculiar responsibility of his position, might be expected to use language obscured by repetitions, and, though ingenious and true, yet somewhat intricate and imperfectly developed arguments, such as, in fact, present great difficulties in the exposition of this portion of the book.

VI. Commentaries.—The following is a list of the exegetical helps on the whole book exclusively, the most important being designated by an asterisk [*] prefixed: Origen, Selecta (in Opp. ii, 499); also Scholi (in Bibl. Patr. Gallandii, xiv); Anon. Commentarius (in Origen’s Opp. ii, 808); Athanasius, Excerpta (in Opp. i, ii, 1063); Jerome, Commentarius (in Opp. Suppos. xi, 566); Philippius, Expositio (in Jerem. Opp. Spur. vii, 893; also in Bede’s Opp. iv; also Basil, 527, fol.); Augustine, Annotationes (in Opp. iii, 829); Chrysostom, Homiliae (in Opp. Spur. vii, 681); Ezechiel Syrus, Scholia (in Syriac, in Opp. iii, i-20); Gregory, Moralia (in Opp. i, 1; also tracts in Oxford, 1844, 50, 4 vols. 8vo); Olympiodorus, etc., Catena (Ludgundum, 1586, 4to); London, 1557, folio; Bruno Asteinus, In Jobum (in Opp. i).
versions has made of it, 7. It was also entertained by Abulafa (Hist. Ael) in p. 26, and, in modern times, by the best scholars generally. The passages which are considered to indicate this disease are found in the description of his skin burning from head to foot, so that his sleep was interrupted by scraping himself (ii, 7, 8); in its being covered with putrefaction and crusts of earth, and being at one time stiff and hard, while at another it cracked and discharged fluid (vii, 5); in the offensive breath, which drove away the kindness of attendants (xxx, 17), in the restless nights, which were either asleep or scarred with frightful dreams (vii, 18, 14; xxx, 17); in general emaciation (xvi, 8); and in so intense a burning of the hardship of life that strangling and death were preparable to it (vii, 16). In this picture of Job's sufferings the state of the skin is not so distinctly described as to enable us to identify the disease with leprosy in a rigorous sense. The difficulty is also increased by the fact that 7772 (shekheha), a sore, Sept. ένγος) is generally rendered "boils." But that word, according to its radical sense, only means burning, inflammation—a hot sense of pain, which, although it attends boils and abscesses, is common to other cutaneous infections. On this fact, the context is very clear; he scraped himself with a potsherds is irreconcilable with the notion that his body was covered with boils or open sores, but agrees very well with the thinned state of the skin which characterizes the disease. See Leprosy.

2. (216, Yob; if genuine, perh. returning, from 216 = 216; Sept. Τασαβρός, Vulg. Job). The third-named of the four sons of Issachar (Gen. xi, 19), elsewhere called Hushim (Num. xxxvi, 24; 1 Chron. vii, 1), for which this is probably an erroneous transcription.

Job of Rostoff), first patriarch of the Russo-Greek Church, flourishing in the second half of the 16th century. We have already had occasion to refer to the circumstances under which Russia succeeded in establishing an independent patriarchate in her dominions in the geographical sketch of the Greek patriarch Jeremias (q. v.). This important event took place in 1563, and was solemnly confirmed by the Constantinopolitan patriarch in a synod of the Greek Church held in 1592. The act was also confirmed in 1619 by Thophilus, the patriarch of Jerusalem. By the other Oriental patriarchs Job was recognized as the fifth patriarch of the orthodox Church. Of his history we are ignorant. See Aschbacher, Kirchenlex., iii, 291; Stanley, East Church, p. 435, 436; Strabli, Russ. Kirchengesch., i, 619. See Greek Church, vol. iii, p. 981, col. 2.

Job, Heb. Jobab, 271. The first named of the sons of Job, and founder of a tribe in Arabia (Gen. x, 29; 1 Chron. i, 29), B.C. post 2414. Bochart comments (Phaleg, ii, 29) the Jobab (Yapab) of Potemons (vii, 24) a people on the eastern coast of Arabia, near the Socotra, which, after Salmasius, he supposes to be Jobitis; so also Michaelis (Ab. i, 29; Supplem., 1659).

2. Son of Zerah of Beth, king of Edom after Bala and before Husham (Gen. xxxvi, 33, 34), i Chron. i, 44, 45, B.C. prob. long ante 1617. The supposition that he was identical with the patriarch Job rests only upon the apocryphal addition to the book of Job in the Sept., and is utterly unworthy of credit. See Jon.

3. The Canaanite king of Madon, one of those whose aid Jabin invoked in the struggle with the Israelites (Josh. xi, 1), B.C. 1617.

4. The first-named of the sons of Shaharaim by one of his wives, Hedef or Besa, of the tribe of Benjamin, although apparently born in Moab (1 Chron. viii, 9). B.C. cir. 1612.

5. One of the "sons of Elpaal, a chief of Benjamin, at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 18), B.C. probably cir. 588.

JOCHANAN

Joceline, bishop of Bath and Wells. See Jos. (king of England).

Joceline of Salisbury, a prelate of the early English Church, flourished from 1142 to 1184. In the controversy of Thomas à Becket with King Henry II, the prelate was a prominent supporter of the king in this great ecclesiastical war, and fell under the displeasure of the archbishop. See Lestiviste. The latter, in accordance with his incorruptible spirit, soon found a pretext to impress his inferior with his power at Rome by condemning Joceline for his assent to the royal election of appointments of John of Oxford to the deanship of Salisbury, notwithstanding the archbishop's prohibition. Joceline adhering to his former course, Becket pronounced excommunication against the rebellious prelate, and his act was approved shortly after by pope Alexander III (1160). Of course the bishop remained in his place, but he encountered many difficulties from the subordination of inferior ecclesiastics, as in the case of the monks of Malmsbury about 1180 (comp. Inett, Hist. Engl. Ch. ii, ch. xv, § 19). See England, Church of.

Joch, Johann Georg, a German theologian, born at Rotenburg, in Franconia, in 1668, became an Alessandria in Utrecht, and died in 1731. To him belongs the credit of having been the first to assert the superiority of practical Christianity over the then prevailing pietism, in the principal stronghold of Lutheran theology, the cathedra Lutheri at Wittenberg. While yet a boy, the then chief object of pietism in the 18th century was, both as a student and as private tutor, one of the disciples of Spener, and an ardent pietist; but when he became superintendent of the gymnasium of Dortmunt, where dogmatism and polemics alone filled the churches and the halls of learning, Joch turned his attention to the subjects of conversion and personal birth. He was of course involved in a controversy, but he seems to have been quite successful, for in 1728 he was made a professor of theology at Wittenberg. —Herzig, Real-Encyklop., v. p. 88. See Augusti, Der Pietismus in Jens, etc. (Jena, 1857); Göbel, Gesch. d. christl. Lehre d. r. -zweckh. ev. Kirche.

Jochanan Bar-Naphazah, a distinguished rabbi, was born in Judea about A.D. 170. He is said to have studied under Judah Hakkodesh and other Jewish teachers, and is believed to have formed a school of his own at Tiberias when quite a youth. His history, like that of all other distinguished rabbis of that period, has been very imperfectly preserved, and extraordinary legends that it is very high impossible to arrive at anything definite concerning his life. So much appears certain, that he lived to a very old age, instructing very nearly to his last hour (in 279). He is by some Hebraists supposed to have collected all the works written on the Jerusalem Talmud (q. v.); but this seems unreasonable. See J. Furst, Biblioth. Judaica, ii, 94, 99; Grätz, Geschichte der Juden, iv, 285 sq. See JUDEH HAKKODES. (J. H. W.)

Jochanan Ben-Zachia. Jewish rabbi of some note, and contemporary of the celebrated Gamaliel ii, whom he succeeded in the patriarchal See. He flourished about B.C. 50. But little is known of his personal history. He is said to have been a decided peace man, and to have greatly discouraged any revolutionary efforts of his suffering countrymen. This may account for the esteem in which he was held at the court of Vespasian, who was always found ready to oblige his Jewish friend. Jochanan Ben-Zachia is regarded as the restorer of Jewish learning and scholastic habits after the destruction of the Temple, by the founding of a school at Jabez, and a new sanhedrin, of which he was the first president, thus presenting to the unfortunate and dispersed race another centre in place of the latter in the sacred capital. How long he served his people at Jabez is not well known; Grätz inclines to put it at about ten years (comp. Frankel, Monatsschrift) [1852, p. 201 sq.]. He
JOEL, BOOK OF

JOEL was a prophet of the second minor prophets (Joel i, 1). His history is only known from the contents of the book that bears his name.

JOEL BOOK OF. I. Personal Circumstances. — 1. Birthplace.—Pseudo-Epiphanius (ii, 248) records a tradition that the prophet was of the tribe of Levi, born and buried at Bethhoron (v. r. Bethem, etc.), between Jerusalem and Cesarea. It is most likely that he lived in Judea, for his commission was to Judah, as that of Hosea had been to the ten tribes (Jerome, Comment. in Joel). He exuchs the priests, and makes frequent mention of Judea and Jerusalem (v. i, 18; ii, 2; iii, i, 12, 17, 20, 21). It has been made a question whether he were a priest himself (Winer, Real.builders, but there do not seem to be sufficient grounds for determining it in the affirmative, though some recent writers (e. g. Maurice, Prophets and Kings, p. 189) have taken this view.

2. Date.—Various opinions have been held respecting the period in which Joel lived. It appears most probable that he was contemporary with Amos and Isaiah, and delivered his predictions in the reign of Uzziah, B. C. cir. 800. This is the opinion maintained by Abarbanel, Vitringa, Leenhardt, Dr. Wilken, Holzhausen and others (see D. H. v. Kaulf, Dieis, de Joel estate, Marb. 1811; Jüger, in the Tübing. theol. Zeitschr. 1828, ii, 227). Credner (Joel, p. 88), with whom agree Movers (Chron. 119 sq.), Hitzig (Kleine Proph. p. 4), and Meier (Joel, p. 16). The principal reason (i, 18; ii, 1, 18; iii, 1, 17) for this conclusion, besides the order of the books (the Sept., however, places Joel after Amos and Micah), is the special and exclusive mention of the Egyptians and Edomites as enemies of Judah, no allusion being made to the Assyrians or Babylonians, who arose at a later period.

2. Contents.—We find, what we should expect on the supposition of Joel being the first prophet to Judah, only a grand outline of the whole terrible scene, which was to be depicted more and more in detail by subsequent prophets (Brown, Ordo Saec. p. 691). The scope, therefore, is not any particular invasion, but the whole day of the Lord. The book of Joel is but a brief Jewish prophetic discourse, and may explain to us what distant events in the history of the land would expand it, and bring fresh discoveries within the sphere of the inspired man's vision" (Maurice, Prophets and Kings. p. 170). The predominant events to which the prophecy related were a public calamity, then known as the plague on Judah, of a twofold character: want of water, and a plague of locusts, continuing for several years. The prophet exhorts the people to turn to God with penitence, fasting, and prayer, and then, he says, the plague shall cease, and the rain descend in its season, and the land yield her accustomed fruit—nay, the time will be a most joyful one; for God, by the outpouring of his Spirit, will impart to his worshippers increased knowledge of himself, and, after the excision of the enemies of his people, will extend through them the blessings of true religion to Israel and lands. Brown (Ordo Saec. p. 692) regards the contents of the prophecy as embracing two visions, but it is better to consider it as one connected representation (Hengstenberg, Winer). For its interpretation we must observe not isolated facts of history, but the scene. The swarm of locusts was the medium through which God's people, the "true Church," was represented to the inward contemplation of the prophet; but, in one unbroken connection, the idea goes on to penitence, return, blessing, outpouring of the Spirit, judgments on the enemies of the Church (1 Pet. iv, 17), final establishment of God's kingdom. All prior destructions and judgments, and visions of smaller circles, the final consummation of all things, to which the prophecy reaches, being the outmost one of...
1. The prophet opens his commission by announcing an extraordinary plague of locusts, accompanied with extensive famine. He begins his prophecy with regioned animates and sublime poetry under the image of an invading army (i, 1-11). The fidelity of his highly-wrought description is corroborated and illustrated by the testimonies of Shaw, Vedney, Forbes, and other eminent travellers, who have been eye-witnesses of the ravages of this pest, and this of a most terrible kind, the insect tribe. See Locust.

2. It is to be observed that locusts are named by Moses as instruments of the divine justice (Deut. xxviii, 39, 39), and by Solomon in his prayer at the dedication of the Temple (1 Kings viii, 57). In the second chapter the formidable aspect of the locusts, rapid progress, their spread, devastation, the awful murmur of their countless throng, their instinctive marshallng, the irresistible perseverance with which they make their way over every obstacle and through every aperture, are delineated with the utmost graphic force (Justl, "Commentaries on Joel ii, in Ellicott’s "Bibliothek," iv. 30-79). Dr. Hengstenberg calls in question the reality of their flight, but, as it appears to us, without adequate reason. Other particulars are mentioned which literally can apply only to locusts, and which, on the supposition that the language is inapplicable only as being auxiliary traits for filling up the picture (Davidson, Sacred Hermetica, p. 310).

Maurice (Prophets and Kings, p. 180) strongly maintains the literal interpretation of this judgment. Yet the plague contained a parable in it which it was the prophet's mission to unfold (comp. "beatitude," p. 6). Hence a figurative interpretation was adopted by an early paraphrast, Ephrem the Syrian (A.D. 350), who supposes that by the four different denominations of the locusts were intended Tijlah-pjeser, Shalmanser, Sennacherib, and Nebuchadnezzar. The Jews, in the time of Jeremiah, understood the passages under the Assyrists and Chaldæans; by the second, the Medes and Persians; by the third, Alexander the Great and his successors, and by the fourth, the Romans. By others, however, the prophecy was interpreted literally, and Jerome himself, in his "Expositio," has discussed, between the two opinions, though more inclined to the allegorical view. Grotius applies the description to the invasions by Ptol. and Shalmaneser. Holzhausen attempts to unite both modes of interpretation, and applies the language literally to the locusts, and metaphorically to the Assyrians and Chaldæans. This, however, that the literal invasion be intended, not the least hint is given of personal injury sustained by the inhabitants; the immediate effects are confined entirely to the vegetable productions and the cattle. Dr. Hengstenberg, while strongly avers from the literal sense, is not disposed to limit the metaphorical meaning to any one event or class of invaders. "The enemy," he remarks, "are designated only as north countries. From the north, however, from Syria, all the principal invasions of Palestine proceeded. We have therefore, no reason to think exclusively of any one of them; nor ought we to limit the prophecy to the people of the old covenant. Throughout all centuries there is but one Church of God existing in unbroken connection. That this Church, during the first period of its existence, was concentrated in a land into which hostile intrusions were made from the north was purely accidental. Under this circumstance this extraordinary event, as the foundation-stone of the fulfilment of prophecy were just as absurd as if one were to assert that the threatening of Amos, 'By the sword shall all sinners of my people die,' has not been fulfilled in those who perished after another manner' (Christology, Keith's translation, i, 104). In accordance with the literal (and certainly the primary) interpretation of the prophecy, we should render "הָיָה הָנִּים as in our A. V., 'the former rain,' with Rosenmuller and the lexicographers, rather than as (or the teacher of rightousness' with margin of A. V., Hengstenberg, and others.

The allusion to the Messiah which Hengstenberg finds in this word, or to the ideal teacher (Deut. xviii, 18), of whom Messiah was the chief, scarcely accords with the intended reference to the strain of animates and sublime poetry under the image of an invading army (i, 1-11). The fidelity of his highly-wrought description is corroborated and illustrated by the testimonies of Shaw, Vedney, Forbes, and other eminent travellers, who have been eye-witnesses of the ravages of this pest, and this of a most terrible kind, the insect tribe. See Locust.

3. The מִם (mimm) of i, in the Hebrew, "afterwards," ii, 27 of the A. V., raises us to a higher level of vision, and brings into view Messianic times and scenes (comp. Tyschen, Illustratio vaticinis Joelis iii [Gotz 1787]; Steudel, Disq. in Joelis iii [Tithagen 1820]). Here, says Steudel, we have a Messianic prophecy altogether. If this prediction has ever yet been fulfilled, we must certainly refer the event to Acts ii. The best commentators are agreed upon this. We must not, however, interpret it thus to the exclusion of all reference to preparatory events and the earlier declaration, and still less to the exclusion of later Messianic times. Acts ii virtually contained the whole subsequent development. The outpouring of the Spirit on the day of Pentecost was the αρραβον, while the full accomplishment and the final reality are yet to come. But here both are blended in one, and the whole passage has a Messianic aspect (see Dresd. Proph. Joels de αρραβων. Sp. [Sp. [Witt 1782]). The passage is well quoted by Peter from the first prophet to the Jewish kingdom. His quoting it shows that the Messianic reference was the prevailing one in his day, though Acts ii, 39 proves that he extended it to the end of the Dispersion. The expression "all flesh" (Acts ii, 17) is explained by the following clauses, by which no principle of distribution is meant, but only that all classes, without respect of persons, will be the subjects of the Spirit's influences. All distinction of races, too, will be done away (comp. Joel ii, 9, with Rom. xii, 18).

4. Lastly, the accompanying portents and judgments upon the enemies of God (ch. iii, A. V.; iv, Heb.), and their various solutions, according to the interpreters, in the repeated deportations of the Jews by neighboring merchants, and sale to the Macedonians [1 Mac. iv, 41; Es. xi, 13], followed by the sweeping away of the neighboring nations (Maurice); in the events accompanying the crucifixion, in the fall of Jerusalem, in the breaking up of all human polities. But here again the idea includes all manifestations of judgment, ending with the whole is shadowed forth, as the great outline, and, while some crises are past, others are yet to come (comp. iii, 13-21 with Matt. xxiv, 1, and Rev. xix). See Double Sense.

III. The style of Joel, it has been remarked, unites the strength of Micah with the tenderness of Jeremiah. In vividness of description he rivals Nahum, and in sublimity and majesty is scarcely inferior to Isaiah and Habakkuk (Couz. De caractere poetico Joeli [Tub. 1783]). "Imprimis est elegans, clarus, fusus, thumque; valde etiam sublimis ac fervidus" (Lorth. De Sacra Poetis HEB. Prael. xxi). Many German divines assign that the latter parts of all the prophetic books, some say that Isaiah ii, 4-6; Micah iv, 1-3, are direct imitations of him. Parts of the New Testament also (Rev. ix, 2 sq.; xiv, 18) are pointed out as passages in his style.

The commentary of this book has never been called in question.

IV. Commentaries.—The special exegetical help on the book of Joel as a whole are the following, to the most important of which we prefix an asterisk: Ephrem Syrus, Explanatio (in Sryr., in Opp. v, 249); Hugo de Victor, Annotationes (in Opp. i); Seb. Münster, Commentarium (in Opp. i); Caspar Hasse, C. I. S. F. (1680, 8vo); Caspar Hasse, Commentarius (brief, with Amos and Obadiah) (Argent, 1586, 8vo); also Commentarius (Vittem, 1547, 4to); both in German.
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Jen. 1558, 4to; and, together with Sentimenta, in Opp. iii. 479; iv. 781, 821; Sch. Tuscan, Commentarius (Colon. 1556, fol.); Tossell, Commentarius (London, 1556, 1615, 4to; also in Engl. ib. 1599, 4to); Mercier, Commentarios [on five minor proph. ] (Paris, a. a. o. fool. Lugd. 1621, 4to); Genebrard, Adnotaciones (from Aben-Erra and others, 1590, 4to); Dracos, Expositio [with Micah and Zechar. ] (Vittemb. 1665, fol.); and also Senecker, Anmerkungen (Lpz. 1784, 4to); Schnackus, Synopsia (Argent. 1888, 4to); Matthias, Praxis (Bat. 1896, 8vo); Simonis, Joil propheta (Cracow. 1596, 4to); Bunny, Enarratio (Lond. 1685, 1595, 8vo); Boneus, Paraphrasis (F. ad O. 1597, 4to); Wolker, Discovate (Vittemb. 1695, 4to); Geseuer, Comment. (Vittemb. 1614, 4to); Tarnovius, Commentarius (Rost. 1627, 4to); Ursinus, Commentarius (Franct. 1641, 8vo); Strahil, Erklärt. (Wittenb. 1640, 4to); Leuschen, Expositio (Rabbinical, incl. Obad.). (Utrecht, 1657, 4to); De Veil, Commentarius (Par. 1675, 8vo); *Pocock, Commentary (Oxf. 1691, fol.); in Latin, Lipsius, 1695, 4to). Hase, Analecta (Brem. 1697, 4to). *Van Tol, Velgelegen (Utrecht, 1700, 4to). Schuurman, Schauwplaet (Wesel, in Dutch, ib. 1703, 4to). Zierold, Analecta mystica [mystical] (Francofort. 1730, 4to). J. A. Turrin, in his De S. S. Interpretatione, p. 307. 4to). Muller, Tr. ad Rh. (Lpz. 1732, 4to); Chantilou, Commentarius (Lond. 1735, 4to). Richter, Animadversiones (Vittemb. 1747, 8vo), Baumgarten, Auslegung (Halle, 1756, 4to). Cramer, Commentarius (in his Scyth. Denkm. Kiel and Humb. 1777-8, p. 143-245). Couz, Dissertation, etc. (Tub. 1785, 4to); Buttner, Joel states (Coburg, 1784, 8vo); Eckermann, Exegesis (Tub. u. Lpz. 1786, 8vo); Justi, Erklärung (Lpz. 1792, 8vo); Wiggers, Erklärung (Got. 1799, 8vo); Horsey, Notes (in Bibl. Crit. ii, 8vo). M. Philippson, הָיוֹלֶא הַלָּא (including Hox.). (Dessau, 1805, 8vo); Swanborg, Note (Upsala, 1806, 8vo). *Rossmuller, Schola (in vol. ii, p. i. Lipsius, 1827, 8vo). Schröder, Ammerk. [incl. other poet. books] (in Har. 1827, 8vo); ib. 1827, 8vo; also separately, Lpz. 1829, 8vo); Holzhausen, Weisnauge, etc. (Götting. 1829, 8vo); *Credner, Erklärung [Rationalistic] (Halle, 1831, 8vo); *Meier, Erklärung (Tub. 1844, 4vo); Robinson, Homilies (Lond. 1865, 8vo). See PSEPHITES, MINOR.


10. A Levite, son of Uziah or Aaziah, and father of Elkanah, of the family of Kothah (1 Chron. vi, 36), and one of those who co-operated with Hezekiah in his restoration of the Temple services (2 Chron. xxix, 12). B.C. 726. In 1 Chron. vi, 24 he is called Shaal or by an error of the scribers.

11. A descendant of Simon, apparently one of those whose enraging families compelled them to emigrate to the valley of Gedor, whose aboriginal inhabitants they expelled (1 Chron. iv, 35). B.C. cir. 712.

12. Son of Zicht and prefect of the Benjaminites resident at Jerusalem after the captivity (Neh. xi, 9). B.C. 536.

13. One of the "sons" of Nebo, who divorced his Gentile wife after the return from Babylon (Ezra, x, 43). B.C. 465.

Joielah (Heb. Yodkah), גּוֹלֶא הַלָּא, a name or derivation uncertain; Sept. *Iωακι,v. 1.9.11, Vulg. Joelah), one of the two sons of Jeroham of Gedor, mentioned along with the brave Benjaminite archers and others who joined David's fortunes at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii, 7). B.C. 1055.

Jo’zer (Heb. Yozzer, יֶזֶר, Jehováh is his help); Sept. *Iωακαρ v. 1.9.11, one of the Korhites who reinforced David while at Ziklag, and remained among his famous body-guard (1 Chron. xii, 6). B.C. 1055.

Joga. See HINDUSTAN; VISNUH.

Jogbehah (Heb. Yoboak, יַעֹבָה, only with paragotic, גּוֹבָה, lofty; Sept. *Iουβα, but יָוָּאֵב, adj. in Num.; Vulg. Joppa), a place mentioned (between Jazer and Beth-nimrah) among the "fenced cities and folds for sheep" rebuilt by the Gadites (Numb. xxxiii, 85). It lay on the route of Gideon when pursuing the nomadic Midianites, near Nobah, beyond Peniel, in the direction of Karkor (Judg. viii, 11). These notices correspond sufficiently with the locality of the ruined village El-Jebel (Robinson's Researches, iii, Append. p. 108), laid down on Robinson's and Zimmerman's map on the edge of the desert east of Jebel el-Fuksa.

Joges. See YOGER.

Jogel (Heb. Togel, יַעַל, eldest; Sept. l.10), the father of Bikki, whom latter was the Danite commissioneer for partitioning the land of Canaan (Numb. xxxiv, 22). B.C. ante 1618.

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

Jo’ha (Heb. Yocha, יֹכָה, probably contracted for יָכָה, whom Jehocah revives), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. יָכָה v. יָכָה). A person mentioned as a Tizite, along with his brother Jediel, the son of Shimi, among David's famous body-guard (1 Chron. xi, 43). B.C. 1055.

2. (Sept. יָכָה v. יָכָה). The last named among the Benjamite chiefs, descendants of Beriah, resident at Jerusalem (1 Chron. viii, 16). B.C. apparently 888 or 856.

Johanan (Heb. Yochanan, יְיוֹחָנָן, יְיוֹחָנָן, a contracted form of the name JEHOHANAN; comp. also JOHN), the name of several men. See also JEHOHANAN, 3, 4, 6.

1. (Sept. יָוָּאֵב v. יָוָּאֵב). The eighth of the Gadite bravoes of Eth. (Joiner) [David's band in the fastness of the desert of Judah (1 Chron. xii, 12)]. B.C. cir. 1061.


3. (Sept. יָוָּאֵב v. יָוָּאֵב, יָוָּאֵב). Son of Aaziah and father of Azariah, high-priest (1 Chron. vi, 9, 10, where perhaps an erroneous repetition of names has occurred). He is thought by some to have been the same with Jehoiada (2 Chron. xxiv, 15). Josephus, however (Ant. x, 6, 6), seems to call him Joram, and the Seder Olam Jeroham, whom it places in the reign of Jehoashaphat. See HIGH-PRIEST.

4. (Sept. יָוָּאֵב). The oldest son of king Joash (1 Chron. iii, 15). He must have been born in the fifteenth year of his father's age, and he seems to have been of so feeble a constitution as not to have survived his father. See JEROHAM.

5. (Sept. יָוָּאֵב v. יָוָּאֵב v. יָוָּאֵב). Son of Aaziah and father of Azariah, high-priest (1 Chron. vi, 9, 10, where perhaps an erroneous repetition of names has occurred). He is thought by some to have been the same with Jehoiada (2 Chron. xxiv, 15). Josephus, however (Ant. x, 6, 6), seems to call him Joram, and the Seder Olam Jeroham, whom it places in the reign of Jehoashaphat. See HIGH-PRIEST.

6. (Sept. יָוָּאֵב). Son of Aaziah and father of Azariah, high-priest (1 Chron. vi, 9, 10, where perhaps an erroneous repetition of names has occurred). He is thought by some to have been the same with Jehoiada (2 Chron. xxiv, 15). Josephus, however (Ant. x, 6, 6), seems to call him Joram, and the Seder Olam Jeroham, whom it places in the reign of Jehoashaphat. See HIGH-PRIEST.
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1. The father of Matthew, of the Maccabean family (1 Macc. ii, 1). See Maccabees.

2. The son of Acco, and father of Eupolemus, who latter was one of the envoys sent by Judas Maccabaeus to Rome (1 Macc. viii, 17; 2 Macc. iv, 11).

3. Surnamed Caddis (q. v.), the eldest son of the same Mattathias, and one of the Maccabean brothers (1 Macc. i, 2), and cousin and possibly Joseph (q. v.), his elder brother. He had been sent by his brother Jonathan on a message to the Nabatheans, when he was taken prisoner "by the children of Jambri" (q. v.), from Medeba, and appears to have been put to death by them (1 Macc. i, 35, 36, 39).

4. One of the Maccabees sent by the Jews to a petition to the Syriac king, general Lydias (2 Macc. xi, 17).

5. The son of Simon Maccabaeus (1 Macc. xiii, 58; xvi, 1, 2, 9, 15, 21, 23), better known by the epithet Hycrana (q. v.).

II. In the New Testament the following are all that are mentioned, besides John the Apostle and John the Baptist, who are noticed separately below:

1. One of the high-priest's family, who, with Annas and Caiaphas, sat in judgment upon the apostles Peter and John for their cure of the lame man and preaching in the temple (Acts iv, 6). A.D. 29. Lightfoot identifies him with Johanan ben-Zachai, who lived forty years before the destruction of the Temple, and was president of the great synagogue after its removal to Jabne, or Jamnia (Lightfoot, Cent. Chor. Matth. proef. ch. 15; see also Selden, De Synedriis, ii, ch. xv). Grotsius merely says he was known to Rabbinical writers as "John the priest" (q. v.).—Smith, Dict. Base.

2. The Hebrew name of the evangelist Mark (q. v.), who throughout the narrative of the Acts is designated by the name by which he was known among his countrymen (Acts xii, 12, 25; xiii, 5, 13; xv, 37).

III. In Josephus the following are the most noteworthy of this name, besides John of Gischala, whom we notice separately below:

1. A high-priest (son of Judas, and grandson of Elia- shib), who slew his brother Jesus in the Temple, thereby provoking the vengeance of Bagose, the Persian victor over Artaxerxes (Ant. xi, 7, 1). He corresponds to the Jonathan (q. v.), son of Joia, of Neh. xii, 10, 11. See High-Priest.

2. Son of Dorcas, sent by the Scearei with ten executioners to murder the persons taken into custody by John of Gischala on his arrival in Jerusalem (Josephus, War. ii, 5, 4).

3. Son of Sosan, one of the four popular generals of the Idumaeans who marched to Jerusalem in aid of the zealots at the instance of John of Gischala (Josephus, War. iv, 4, 2). He was possibly the same with John the E-sene, spoken of as commander of the toparchy of Shamma at an earlier stage of the war (ib. ii, 29, 4; comp. ii, 2, 1). He was mortally wounded by a dart during the last siege (ib. v, 5, 6).

John (Ἰωάννης) the Apostle, and brother of the apostle James “the greater” (Matt. iv, 21; x; 2 Mark i, 19; iii, 17; x, 35; Luke x, 44; viii, 3). See John the Baptist.

1. Personal History.—Early Life. It is probable that he was born at Bethsaida, on the Lake of Galal The general impression left on us by the Gospel narrative is that he was younger than the brother whose name commonly precedes his (Matt. iv, 1: x, 5; xii, 1, etc.); but compare Luke x, 26, where the order is inverted in the Syriac, younger than his friend Peter, possibly also than his Master. The life which was re- tracted to the time of Trajan (Eusebius, H. E. i. 33, 25, following Irenaeus) can hardly have begun before the year B.C. 4 of the Dionysian era. The Gospels give us the name of his father Zebedee (Matt. iv, 21) and his mother Salome (comp. Matt. xxvii, 56 with Mark, xvi, 40; xvi, 1). Of the former we know nothing more. See ZEDEBEES. The traditions of the fourth century (Epiphanius, iii, Herr. 78) make the latter the daughter of Joseph by his first wife, and consequently husband to our Lord. By some recent critics she has been identi-
tilled with the sister of Mary, the mother of Jesus, in John xix. 25, (Wieseler, in Stud. u. Krit. 1840, p. 648), Ewald (Gesch. Israels, v. 171) adopts Wieseler's conjecture, and connects it with his own hypothesis, that the sons of Zebedee, and our Lord, as well as the Baptist, were of the tribe of Levi. On the other hand, more sobriety and judgment are found in the editor of the 8th and 9th editi., who, after Lücke (Johannes, v. 9), reject both the tradition and the conjecture. See also Salome. They lived, it may be inferred from John i, 44, or in the same town as those who were afterwards the companions and partners of their children. See Bethsaida. There, on the shores of the Sea of Galilee, with him to Galilee, they grew up. The mention of the "hired servants" (Mark v, 20), of his mother's "substance" (ἀντί των ἐπιστέφων, Luke viii, 3), of "his own house" (τὰ ἰδία, John xix, 27), implies a position removed by at least some steps from absolute poverty. The fact that the apostle was known from the high-priest Caiaphas, as that knowledge was hardly likely to have begun after he had avowed himself the disciple of Jesus of Nazareth, suggests the probability of some early intimacy between the two men or their families. The name which the parents gave to their younger child was too common to amount to a sign of a special favor; but it deserves notice (1) that the name appears among the kindred of Caiaphas (Acts iv, 6); (2) that it was given to a priestly child, the son of Zacharias (Luke i, 18), as the embodiment and symbol of Messianic hopes. The frequent occurrence of it in the lists of the Twelve those four names of the sons of Joseph of Arimathea, only the received as personal, traces of individual character, of special turning-points in their lives. Soon they find themselves in the number of the Twelve who are chosen, not as disciples only, but as their Lord's delegates—representatives—apostles. In the lists of the Twelve those four names of the sons of Jonathas and Zebedeus are found, only in the innermost circle of their Lord's friends, and are as the ἑξάκοιτον ἀδελφοί τύποι. The three, Peter, James, and John, are with him when none else are, in the chamber of death (Mark v, 57, in the glory of the transfiguration (Matt. xviii, 1), when he forewarns them of the destruction of the Holy City (Mark xiii, 8, 12); in this instance, with him, in the agony of Gethsemane. Peter is throughout the leader of that band; to John belongs the yet more memorable distinction of being the disciple whom Jesus loved. This love is returned with a more single undivided heart by him than by any other. If Peter is the φιλόκαισαρ, John is the φιλόσπουτος (Grotius, Prolegom. in Joann.). Some striking facts indicate why this was so; what the character was which was thus worthy of the love of Jesus of Nazareth. They hardly sustain the popular notion of a love fostered by the labors of the future Baptist, perhaps may have imparted a meaning to it for the parents of the future evangelist which it would not otherwise have had. Of the character of Zebedeus we have hardly the slightest trace. He interposes no refusal when his sons are called on to leave him (Matt. iv, 21). After this he disappears from the scene of high apostolic history; and we are led to infer that he had died before his wife followed her children in their work of ministration. Her character meets us as presenting the same marked features as those which were conspicuous in her son. From her, who followed Jesus and ministered to him of her substance (Luke viii, 3), he sought for her two sons that they might sit, one on his right hand, the other on his left, in his kingdom (Matt. xx, 20), he might well derive his strong affections, his capacity for giving and receiving love, his eagerness for the speedy manifestation of the Messiah's kingdom. The early years of the apostle we may believe to have passed under this influence. He would be trained in all that constituted the ordinary education of Jewish boyhood. Though not taught in the schools of Jerusalem, and therefore, in later life, liable to the reproach of having no recognised position as a teacher, no Rabbinical education (Acts iv, 15), he would yet be taught to read from the Law and the Prophets, to feed on the writings of the prophets with the feeling that their accomplishment was not far off.

2. Incidents recorded of him in the New Testament.—The ordinary life of the fisherman of the Sea of Galilee who was at last broken and united with him in his last journey to heaven upon a village of the Samaritans (Luke i, 54). About this time Salome, as if her husband had died, takes her place among the women who followed Jesus in Galilee (Luke viii, 3), ministering to him of his substance, and went up with them into the last journey to Jerusalem (John xii, 58). Through her, we may well believe, John first came to know Mary Magdalene, whose character he depicts with such a life-like touch, and that other Mary, to whom he was afterwards to stand in so close and special a relation. The fulness of his narrative of what the other evangelists omit (John xi) leads to the conclusion that he was united also by some special ties of intimacy to the family of Bethany. It is not necessary to dwell at length on the familiar history of the Last Supper. What is characteristic is that he is there, as ever, the disciple whom Jesus loved; and, as the chosen and favored friend, reclines at table with his head upon his Master's
breast (John xiii, 29). To him the eager Peter—they had been sent together to prepare the supper (Luke xxi, 8)—makes signs of impatient questioning that he should ask what was not likely to be answered if it came from any other (John xiii, 24). As they go out to the Mount of Olives, Peter was not in their Master's company. They only are within sight or hearing of the conflict in Gethsemane (Matt. xxvi, 37). When the betrayal is accomplished, Peter and John, after the first moment of confusion, follow afar off, while the others simply seek safety in a hasty flight (John xviii, 10). The personal acquaintance existed between Peter and Jesus, and enabled him to gain access both for himself and Peter, but the latter remains in the porch, with the officers and servants, while John himself apparently is admitted to the council-chamber, and follows Jesus thence, even to the prostomium of the Roman procurator (John xviii, 16, 19, 28). To trace, as if the desire to see the end, and the love which was stronger than death, sustained him through all the tears and sorrows of that day, he followed—accompanied probably by his own mother, Mary the mother of Jesus, and Mary Magdalene—to the place of crucifixion, where the teacher who had been to him as a son was to die, and he learned to him a brother's duty. He is to be as a son to the mother who is left desolate (John xix, 26-27). The Sabbath that followed was spent, it would appear, in the same company. He receives Peter, in spite of his denial, on the old terms of friendship. It is to the Magdalenite first meeting with the tidings of the emptied sepulchre (John xx, 2); they are the first to go together to see what the strange words meant. Not without some bearing on their respective characters is the fact that John is the most impetuous, running on most eagerly to the rock-tomb; Peter, the least restrained by awe, the first to enter in and look (John xx, 4-6). For at least eight days they continued in Jerusalem (John xx, 26). Then, in the interval between the resurrection and the ascension, we find them still together on the Sea of Galilee (John xx, 1), as though they would calm the eager suspense of that period of expectation by a return to their old calling and their old familiar haunts. Here, too, there is a characteristic difference. John is the first to recognise in the dim form seen in the morning twilight the presence of his risen Lord; Peter the first to plunge into the water and swim towards the shore where he stood calling to them (John xx, 6, 7). The last words of the Gospel reveal to us the deep affection which united the two friends. It is not enough for Peter to know his own future. That at once suggests the question—"And what shall this man do?" (John xxi, 21). The history of the Acts shows the same eager desire on the part of John and the other disciples. Peter's and John's presence on the Mount of Olives and on the day of Pentecost. Together they enter the Temple as worshippers (Acts iii, 1), and protest against the threats of the Sanhedrin (iv, 13). They are fellow-workers in the first great step of the Church's expansion. The apostle whose wrath had been roused by the unbelief of the Samaritans overcomes his national exclusiveness, and receives them as his brethren (vii, 14). The persecution which was pushed on by Saul of Tarsus did not drive him or any of the apostles from their post (viii, 1). When the persecutor came back as the convert, he, it is true, did not see him (Gal. i, 19), but this, of course, does not involve the least evidence that he had left Jerusalem. The sharper though shorter persecution which followed under Herod Agrippa brought a great sorrow to him in the martyrdom of his brother (Acts xii, 2). His friend was driven to seek safety in flight. Fifteen years after Paul's first visit he was still at Jerusalem, and helped to take part in the great settlement of the controversy between the Jewish and the Gentile Christians (Acts xvi, 6). His position and reputation were those of one ranking among the chief "pillars" of the Church (Gal. ii, 9). Of the work of the apostle during this period we have but the slightest trace. There may have been special calls to mission-work like that which drew him to Samaria. There may have been the work of teaching, organizing, restoring the churches of Judea. His fulfilment of the solemn charge intrusted to him may have led him to a life of loving and reverent thought rather than to one of conspicuous activity. We may, at all events, feel that he appreciated the tragedy of his Master's life, of his character, with all their fiery energy, became purified and mollified, rising step by step to that high serenity which we find perfected in the closing portion of his life. Here, too, we may, without much hesitation, accept the traditions of the Church as recording a historical fact Lampe fixes the charge and Caiaphas as the interlocutor (Tertull. De Monag. c. xiii). The absence of his name from 1 Cor. ix, 5 tends to the same conclusion. It harmonizes with all we know of his character to think of his heart as so absorbed in the higher and diviner love that there was no room left for the lower and the human. St. Ignatius of Antioch, in his "Epistle to Polycarp," says he was come, with more or less show of likelihood, to fill up the great gap which separates the apostle of Jerusalem from the bishop of Ephesus. It was a natural conjecture to suppose that he remained in Judea till the death of his Divine Master, and that he took place we can only conjecture. The hypothesis of Baronius and Tillemont, that the Virgin accompanied him to Ephesus, has not even the authority of tradition (Lampe, i, 51). There are no signs of his being at Jerusalem at the time of Paul's last visit (Acts xxii). The actual question is not whether he actually went to Ephesus before the work of the apostle of the Gentiles was brought to its conclusion. Out of many contradictory statements, fixing his departure under Claudius, or Nero, or as late even as Domitian, we have hardly any data for doing more than rejecting the two extremes and coming down to the time of John (v, 14), when he was besieged by the Roman forces under Cestius, as the most probable date. Nor is it certain that his work as an apostle was transferred at once from Jerusalem to Ephesus. A tradition current in the time of Augustine (Quast. Evang. ii, 19), and embodied in some MSS. of the New Testament respecting the 1st Epistle of John as addressed to the Parthians, and so far implied that his apostolic work had brought him into contact with them. In the earlier tradition which made the apostles formally partition out the world known to them, Parthia is the lot of Thomas while John respectively Pontus and Asia (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. iii, 1). In one of the legends connected with the Apostles' Creed, Peter contributes the first article, John the second; but the tradition appears with great variations as to time and order (comp. Pseudo-August. Serm. cxvi, cxvii). When the question arises, for what reason, at the ascertainment of the apostolic age, we are still left in great doubt as to the extent of his work and the circumstances of his outward life. Assuming the authorship of the Epistles and the Revelation to be his, the facts which the New Testament writings assert or imply are: (1) that, having come to Ephesus, some persecution, local or general, drove him to Patmos (Rev. i, 9); (2) that the seven churches of which Asia was the centre, were special objects of his solicitude (Rev. i, 11); that in his work he had to encounter men who denied the truth on which his faith rested (1 John iv, 1; 2 John 7), and others who, it is obvious, were not simply the successors of his master's mortality (3 John 9, 10). If to this we add that he must have outlived all, or nearly all, of those who had been the friends and companions even of his mature years—that this lingering age gave strength to an old imagination that his Lord had promised him immortality (John xiv, 3)—that, as if remembering the actual words which had been thus perverted, the longing of his soul gathered itself up in the cry, "Even so, come, Lord Jesus" (Rev. xxii, 20)—that from some who spoke with authority he received a solemn attestation of the confidence the Church possessed of his presence, it is not surprising that he has any claim to the character of historical truth. The picture which tradition fills up for us has the merit of
being full and vivid, but it blends together, without much regard to harmony, things probable and improbable. He is shipwrecked off Ephesus (Simeon Metaph. In vivd Johann. c. 2; Lampe, i, 47), and arrives there in time to check the progress of the heretics which sprang up after Paul's departure. Then, or at a later period, he numbers among his disciples men like Polycarp, Papias, Ignatius (Jerome, De vir. Illust. c. xvi.). In the persecution under Domitian he is taken to Rome, and there, by his boldness, though not by death, gains the crown of martyrdom. But he has, as it were, thrown his power to hurt him (Tertull. De Præscript. c. xxxvi.). The scene of the supposed miracle was the Porta Latina, and hence the Western Church commemorates it by the special festival of "St. John Port. Latin." On May 6th. He is then sent to labor in the mines, and finally to give the place of his all. (Victorius, In Apoc. ix; Lampe, i, 60). The accession of Nerva frees him from danger, and he returns to Ephesus. There he settles the canons of the Gospel history by formally attesting the truth of the first three Gospels, and writing his own to supply what they left wanting (Euseb., H. E. iii, 24). The elders of the Church are gathered together, and he, as a sudden inspiration, begins with the wonderful opening, "In the beginning was the word" (Jerome, De vir. Illust. 29). Heresiarchs continue to show themselves, but he meets them with the strongest possible denunciation: so as to show under the sun's blazing roof (that of the public baths of Ephesus)—against their foremost leader, lest the house should fall down on them and crush them (Iren. iii, 3; Euseb. H. E. iii, 28; iv, 14). Eusebius and Ireneaus make Cerinthus the heretic. In Epiphanius (Hær. xxx. c. 24) Eunomos is the hero of the discussion. To modern feelings the anacoluths may seem at variance with the character of the apostle of love, but it is hardly more than the development in act of the principle of 2 John 10. To the mind of Epiphanius there was a difficulty of another kind—nothing less than a special inspiration could account for such a departure from the canons of the Church to a book of its all. (Victorius, In the agency the great temple of Artemis is at last of its magnificence, and even (l) levelled with the ground. (Cyril. Alex. Ort. de Mar. Virg.; Nicephor. H. E. ii, 42; Lampe, i, 90). He introduces and perpetuates the Jewish mode of celebrating the Easter feast (Eusebius, H. E. iii, 24). Some time after the death of the Lord, bearing on his brow the plate of gold (μεταμφιεῖον; compare Suid. Thea. s. a.), with the sacred name engraved on it, which was the badge of the Jewish pontiffs (Polycrate, in Eusebius, H. E. iii, 31; vi, 24). In strange contrast with this ideal exaltation, a later tradition assigns to him the office of shepherding the flock, the playfulness and fondness of a favorite bird, and defended himself against the charge of unworthy tripping by the familiar apology of the bow that must sometimes be unblest (Caes. Collat. xxiv, c. 2). More true to the N.T. character of the apostle is the story, told with so much power and beauty by Clement of Alexan- dria (Quis divers, c. 42), of his special and loving interest in the younger members of his flock—of his eagerness in the young man's attempt to rescue one of them who had fallen into evil courses. The scene of the old and loving man, standing face to face with the young and backward, whom, in days gone by, he had baptized, and winning him to repentance, is one which we could gladly look on as belonging to his actual life—part of a story which is, in Clement's words, οὖ μὲν ἐδοκεὶ ἅλκη λαῖναι. Not less beautiful is that other scene which comes before us as that of St. John at Ephesus. The elder on whose breast the child, whom in days gone by, he had baptized, and winning him to repentance, is one which we could gladly look on as belonging to his actual life—part of a story which is, in Clement's words, "Little children, love one another" (Jerome, in Gal vi). Other stories have been added or adjoined to their most likely pass over rapidly. That he put forth his power to raise the dead to life (Euseb. H. F. v, 18); that he drank the cup of hemlock which was intended to cause his death, and suffered no harm from it (Pseudo-August. Soliloq.; Isidor. Hispal. De Morte Sanct. c. 78); that when he felt his death approaching he gave orders for the construction of his own epitaph (ibid.); that he declined to reapar on the point of a conflict which the orthodox christians in the last days (Suicer, Thes. s. v. 'Iwirynq)—these traditions, for the most part, indicate little else than the uncial spirit of the age in which they passed current. The very time of his death lies within the region of conjecture rather than of history; and the dates which have been calculated for it range from A.D. 69 to A.D. 120 (Lampe, i, 92).

See Perionii Vita Apostol. p. 95 sqq.; Edzard, De Joanne Ceriniti præsensium fugiuntе. Viteb. 1732; Schwallmann, Comment. de Joh. in Patrum exilii (Halle, 1577); Hering, Von d. Schule d. Apost. Joh. zu Ephesus (Bresl. 1774); Stich, Life, etc. of St. John (London, 1857); W. de la, The Beloved Disciple (Lond. 1849); Krummacher (in Life of Cornelius, etc., Lee, Life of St. John. (N.Y. 1854); Macfarrlane, The Disciple whom Jesus loved (Lond. 1865); Kienkel, Der Apostel Johannes (Berlin, 1871).}

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

I. Generousness.—There is no reason to doubt that the fourth Gospel was from the beginning received in the Church as the production of the apostle whose name it bears. We may decline to accept as a testimony to this the statement at the close of the Gospel itself (xxi, 24), for this can have the force of an independent testimony only on the supposition that the passage was added by another hand; and though there is evident allusion in 2 Pet. i, 4 to what is recorded in John xxi, 18, 19, yet, as the account taken from St. John the Evangelist, the latter tradition would be sure to send forth among the brethren (compare ver. 23), it cannot be inferred from Peter's allusion to it that it was then put on record as we have it in the Gospel. We may also admit that the passages in the writings of the apostolic fathers which have been adduced as evidence of their dependence on this Gospel are not decisive. The passages usually cited for this purpose are Barnab. Ep. vi, xii (comp. John
quainted with John's Gospel, and cited it; and this brings us up to the beginning of the 2d century, within a short time of the apostle's death.

This concurrence of external testimony is the more Noticeable, seeing the statement in the Synoptic manuscripts of the just utterance of Christian thought and feeling by different men; though in three other passages cited from Ignatius (Ad Rom. vii. 20, and Ad Philiad. vii.) the coinidence of the first two with John vi. 32 sq., and of the last with John iii. 8, is almost too close not to call for invariable feeling with the text, and place the former text in the form of a doxology, if (as Dr. Mermod, in his Exeg. Joh. p. 102, 103, Rothe, Anfänge der Christl. Kirche p. 715.) But Eusebius attests that this Gospel was among the books universally received in the Church (Hist. Eccles. iii. 23); and it cannot be doubted that it formed part of the canon of the churches, both of the East and the West, before the end of the 3d century. See CANON. It is in the Peshito, and in the Muratorian Fragment.

It is quoted or referred to by Justin Martyr (Apol. i. 52, 61; ii. 6; c. Tryph. 105, etc.; compare Olshausen, Echtheit der Kan. Evv. p. 304 sq.) by Tatian (Orat. ad Grecos. 4, 15) and Irenaeus (Adv. haer. iii. 29), Theol. Harrel. Fab. i. 20), in preparing which he must have had this gospel before him; in the Epistle of the Church at Antioch to the Corinthians (Eus. v. 1.), by Melito of Sardes (see Pinie, Speicleg. Sollemne i. 2, Prolegom. p. 5, Paris, 1803); in the pseudo-Clementian Letters (i. 11, 17, 20, p. 14, ed. Dindorf); by Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus (Hist. eccles. i. 24); and in the Clementine Homilies (xix. 22, ed. Dressel, 1853), in such a way that not only is its existence proved, but evidence is afforded of the esteem in which it was held as canonical from the middle of the 2d century. Still more precise is the testimony of Theodore, bishop of Antioch, who not only composed a Harmony of the four evangelists (Jerome, De viris illust., 25; Ep. 151, ad Aegyptum), but in an extant work (ad Autol. ii. 22) expressly quotes John i. 1 as part of holy Scripture, and as the production of the great John, who was among the circle of the Evangelists. More important still is the testimony of Irenæus (Hist. iii. 11, 5, p. 218, ed. Grabe), both because of his acquaintance in early youth with Polycarp, and because of the distinctness and confidence with which he asserts the Johannine origin of this Gospel. See IRENAEUS. To these testimonies may be added that of Celsius, the enemy of the Christians, who, in preparing his attack upon them, evidently had the four canonical Gospels before him, and of whose citations from them some are undoubtedly from that of John (compare Olshausen, ut sup., p. 345, 351; Lipsius, Comment. iv. 2, 9, ed. 1835, which shows that, at the time when he wrote, this Gospel must have been in general acceptance by the Christians as canonical. The heretic Marcion, also, in rejecting this Gospel on dogmatical grounds, is a witness to the fact that its canonical authority was generally held by the Christians (Tertull. c. Marcion. iv. 5; De Corp. Christi.). That the Gospel was recognised as canonical by the Valentinians, one of the most important sects of the 2d century, is placed beyond doubt by the statement of Irenæus (Hist. iii. 11), and by the fact that it is quoted by Ptolemaeus, a disciple of Valentinus (Epiph. Hist. vii. 28, ed. Schneckenburger), and was commented upon by him without an formulas, another of his disciples, both of whom lived about the middle of the 2d century. That Valentinus himself knew and used the book is rendered probable by this, and by the statement of Tertullian (De prafer. Haret. 33). In expounding the 2d verse of this chapter, though he perverted its meaning; and this probability is raised to certainty by the fact that, in the recently discovered work of Hippolytus, Valentinus is found twice (Philosoph. vi. 33, 34, ed. Miller) citing the phrase τὸ δόξα τοῦ κυρίου τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ, as applied to the devil, which occurs only in John's Gospel, and repeatedly there (xii. 31; xiv. 30; xvi. 11); and also quoting the saying, John x. 38, as the word of Christ. From the same source also (vii. 22, 27, p. 292, 242) we learn that Basilides was ac-
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regarded as discharged (Doplmatik i, 268, 3rd ed.). Since that work appeared, the claims of the Gospel have been opposed by Strauss in his Leben Jesus; by Weiss in his Evangelische Geschichte; by Lützelerberger (Die Kirchliche Tradition i, 7, d. Apost. J. Lpz. 1848, and in many other forms since); by Baur (Krit. Untersuch. über die Kanon. Schriften, 4th ed., 1858); and by the Briefe Joh. nach ihrem Lehrbegr. dargestellt, Halle, 1849), and by others. But the reasons advanced by these writers have so little force, and have been so thoroughly replied to, that even in Germany the general opinion has reverted to the ancient and catholic belief in its integrity. (Herder, Theologie, iii. 26; Schaltenbrand, Theol. Gesch., ed. 1850; d. d.; Ewald, Der Brief Joh., Halle, 1850, p. 178; Meyer, Kritik. Ezeg. Comm., Th. 2 Abs.: Die Apost. Gesch., 3rd ed., 1856; Bleek, Einl. in das N. T. (Berlin, 1865); Davidson, Introduction to the New Test., 6th ed., 1863; Schaff, Church History, 4th ed. 1865, p. 179.)

The importance of the fourth Gospel as a proof of the divine character of Jesus Christ led to this special assault on its genuineness by the Rationalists of the Tübingen school and their imitators elsewhere, but without shaking the convictions of the church. See Jesus Christ. For further details of the controversy, see Fisher, Supernat. Origin of Christianity (new edit. N. Y. 1870); Pressensere, Apostol. Age. (N. Y. 1871), p. 509 sq.; See Rationalism. The most important other express treatises in opposition to the authenticity of a later hand after the death of the apostle's direct authority are: 1. Zeller (Berlin, 1840), Zeller (Jahrh. 1845 sq.), Koestlin (ib. 1853), Volkmar (in several works and arts. in Ger. journals), Scholten (Leid. 1864, etc.), Mathes (ib. 1867), Tayler (Lond. 1867); in favor, Stein (Brandenburg 1822), Crome (Lpzq. 1824), Hauff (Nürnberg 1831); and in the Stud. and Krit. Jahrb., (1842, 1853). All these volumes have been made by one hand, and their defects reflected wholly on internal grounds, for there is no evidence that the Gospel was ever known in the Church without this chapter. At first sight it certainly appears as if the original work ended with ch. xx, and that ch. xxi was a later hand, and that the apostle's death's day evidence wholly belongs to this part. But the absence of any trace of the Gospel having ever existed without it must be allowed to afford strong prima facie evidence of its having been added by the author himself; still this is not conclusive, for the addition may have been made by one of the apostle's friends or disciples before the work was in circulation. Grotius, who thinks it was made by the elders at Ephesus, argues against its genuineness, especially from ver. 24; but, though the language there has certainly the appearance of being rather that of others than that of the party himself to whom it refers, still it is not impossible that John may have referred to himself in the third person, as he does, for instance, in xix, 35; and as for the use of the pl. οἶκος, that may be accounted for by its tacitly joining his readers with himself, just as he assumes their presence in xix, 35. There is more difficulty in accepting ver. 25 as genuine, for such a hyperbolic mode of expression is difficult to comport with the simplicity and sincerity of John; but there seems to be no valid reason for calling into doubt any other part of the chapter.

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

Another doubtful portion is the section relating to the woman taken in adultery (vii, 53-58, viii. 11). This is regarded as an interpolation because of the deficiency of critical evidence in its favor (see Tischendorf or Alex, ed. loc.), and because of reasons founded on the passage itself, viz., the apparent forced way in which it is connected with what precedes by means of vii, 53: the reason why the characteristic title of the one who so constant introduces himself into his narratives, and for which we have in this section βια, used as John generally uses εὐαγγ., and the presence of the expression εἰς ὡς, πάς ὁ λαὸς, καθαρσ. εἰς ἀλλήλοις αὐτός, οἱ γεγονήτευκαν καὶ αἱ φαραώαν ἤκουσαν, ἀναστησάμενοι, εὐαλλίκειοι, and εὐακρίνους, which are foreign to John's style. On the other side, it is urged that the section contains, as Calvin says, "Nihil apostolico spiritu indignum," that it has no appearance of a later legend, but bears every trace of an original account of a very probable fact, and that it has a considerable amount of diplomatic evidence in its favor. The question is one which hardly admits of a decided answer.

The preponderance of evidence is undoubtedly against the Johannean origin of the section, and it has consequently been regarded as an interpolation by the great majority of critics and interpreters, including among the latter Calvin, Beza, Tittmann, Tholuck, Olshausen, Lücke, and Luthardt, as well as Grotius, De Wette, Paulus, and Ernle. At the same time, if it did not form part of the original Gospel, it is difficult to account for its being at so early a period inserted in it. From a passage in Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. iii, 39) some have concluded that Pilatus inserted it from the Gospel according to the Hebrews; but it is not certain that it is to this section that the words of Eusebius refer, nor is it certain that he meant to say that Pilatus inserted the story he refers to in the Gospel. See ADULTERY, vol. i, p. 87.

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

IV. Design.—At the close of the Gospel the apostle has himself stated his design in writing by the words: "Thus have I written, and written to him in the third person, as he does, for instance, in xix, 35; and as for the use of the pl. εἶχος, that may be accounted for by its tacitly joining his readers with himself, just as he assumes their presence in xix, 35. There is more difficulty in accepting ver. 25 as genuine, for such a hyperbolic mode of expression is difficult to comport with the simplicity and sincerity of John; but there seems to be no valid reason for calling into doubt any other part of the chapter.

Now the design, therefore, is that the Gospel is to supply the omissions of the other three, but no such impression is conveyed by the Gospel itself, which is as far as possible from having the appearance of a mere series of supplement notes to previously existing writ-
ings a indeed, if this had been the apostle's purpose, it
cannot be said that he has in any adequate way fulfilled
it. Nor is there any ground for believing that it was a
poloical object which chiefly prompted him to write this
Gospel, though such a suggestion has often been
made. Thus Irenæus (Hær.iii, 11, 1) says that the Gospel
was written against the errors of all Ebionites and
Doctora the parties against whom the poloical of the
apostle is here directed. All this, however, is mere supposition.
 Doubtless in John has written there is that which
forms the fullest and full reflection of all Ebionites and
Doctora heresy: but that to confute those was the design
of the apostle, as these writers affirm, cannot be proved.
See Gnostics. At the same time, though he may have
had no intention of formally confuting any existing her-
ecy, it is more than possible that he was stimulated to
seek by means of this record to counterfeit certain ten-
dencies which he saw rising in the Church, and by which
the followers of Christ might be seduced from that sim-
ple faith in him by which alone the true life could be
enjoyed. Still this must be regarded, at the utmost, as
future and not actual, on the occasion, not the occa-
siun, of his writing. The latter is to be sought in the effect which this
Gospel is fitted to produce on the mind of the reader in
regard to the claims of Jesus as the divine Redeemer, the
source of light and life to darkened and perishing human-
ity. With this view John presents him to us as he
practised among men, and especially as he taught
when occasion called forth the deeper revelations which
he, as the Word who had come forth from the invisible
God to reveal unto men the Father, had to communic-
icate. John's main design is a theological one: a
conversion of which doubtless led to his receiving in the
primitive Church the title ear 'Prophet' of the gentle
Jesus. But the historical character of his writing must also
be acknowledged. As one who had been privileged to
"company" with Jesus, he seeks to present him to us as
he really appeared among men, in very deed a paraker of
his nature, yet, under that nature, vested in a higher,
which ever and anon broke forth in manifestation, so
that those around him "beheld his glory as the glory of
the Only Begotten of the Father" (i, 14). "There is
here no history of Jesus and his teaching after the man-
er of the other evangelists; but there is, in historical
form and manner, the Christ in relation to the person of Christ,
as its central point, and in this representation there is a picture, on the one hand, of the
antagonism of the world to the truth revealed in him,
and on the other of the spiritual blessedness of the few
who receive him as the Light of Life" (Reuss, Gesch. der Heil. Sch., ch. N.7, p. 354). As John
doubtless had the other Gospels before him, without for-
normally designing to supplement them, he would naturally
enlarge more particularly upon those portions which
they had left untouched, or passed over more briefly.

IV. Contents.—The Gospel begins with a prologue,
in which the author presents the great theme of which his
subsequent narrative is to furnish the detailed illus-
tration—"the theological programme of his history," as
one has called it, and which another has compared to the
overture of a musical composition in which the lead-
ing idea of the piece is expressed (i, 1-5). The histori-
cal exposition begins with verse 6, and the rest of the
book may be divided into two parts. Of these the for-
mer (i, 6-xii) contains the account of our Lord's public
ministry from his introduction to it by John the Baptist
and his solitary consecration to it by God, to its close in
the Passion Week. In this portion we see the Saviour
presented to us chiefly in his manifestation to the world as
a teacher sent from God, whose mission is authenti-
cated by signs and wonders, and whose doctrines, truly
divine, transcend in their spiritual import the narrow
limits of personal speculation, and can be comprehended only by a spiritual discernment.
The second portion (ch. xiii-xvi) may be divided into two parts, the one
of which is introductory to the other. The former (ch.
xiv-xvii) presents to us Lord in the retirement of
private life, in his intercourse with his immediate fol-
lowers, to whom he pours out his soul in loving counsel,
warning, and promise, in the prospect of his departure
from them; and in communion with his heavenly Fa-
therto, who, as an observer, as an executor of what he
had received to do, he intercedes for those whose re-
demption from sin and evil is the coveted recompense
of his obedience. To this succeeds the account of the
Passion, and the appearances of Christ to his disciples
after his resurrection (ch. xviii-xxi), which forms the
other portion of the book. The minute analysis of Lampre in his Comment, and a brief
one in Westcott, Introd. to Study of the Gospels, p. 281 sq.

The greater part of the book is occupied with the disc-
ourses of our Lord, the plan of the evangelist being ob-
viously to bring the reader as much as possible into
personal contact with Jesus, and to make the latter his
own expositor. Regarding the discourses thus reported,
the question has arisen, How far are they to be accept-
ed as an exact report of what Jesus uttered? and in re-
ply to this, three opinions have been advanced: 1. That
both in form and substance they have come from the lips of Christ: 2. That in substance they
present what Christ uttered, but that the form in which
they appear is due to the evangelist; and, 3. That they
are not the discourses of Christ in any proper sense, but
only speeches put in his mouth by the evangelist to ex-
press to which of them the teaching of his doctrine.
Of these views the last has found
adherents only among a few of the sceptical school: it
is without the slightest authority from the book itself.
irreconcilable with the simplicity and earnestness of
the writer, is foreign to the habits and notions of the
class of men to whom John belonged and
offered by the frequent explanations which he introduces of the sense in which he understood what he reports (comp.
ili, 19, 21, vii, 38, 39; xii, 32, 33, etc.), by the brief
notices, which evince an actual reminiscence of the scenes
and circumstances amid which the discourse was delivered, (e.g. xiv, 31), and by the prophetic announcements of his impending sufferings and death ascribed to the Saviour, which are couched in language such as he might naturally use, such as accounts for those to whom he spoke, even his disciples, not understanding his mean-
ing at the time, but comprehending it afterwards
airous of reporting his very words should, writing after
the fulfilment of these predictions, impute to him (comp.
vii, 33-36; viii, 21, 22; x, 17-20; xii, 23-36; xiv, 1-4,
18, 28; xvi, 19, etc.). Some of these considerations
are of weight also as against the second of the opinions above stated; for, if John could merely report what
substance of the Saviour's teaching in his own words, why clothe predictions, the meaning of which at
the time of the writing he perfectly understood, in obscure and difficult phraseology? Why especially impute to
the speaker language of which he feels it necessary to give an explanation, instead of at once putting the intell-
ligible statement in his discourse? Undoubtedly the
impression which one gets from the narrative is that
John means the discourses he ascribes to Jesus to be re-
ceived as faithful reports of what he actually uttered:
and this is confirmed by the Saviour's own words; for, in John the Baptist's sayings with those of our Lord, the
character of the one being totally different from that of
the other. To this view it has been objected that there
is such an identity of style in the discourses which John
ascribes to Christ with his own style, both in this Gos-
pel and the Epistles, that the Saviour is, for the most part, but not of a faithful reporter, but of one who gives in
the manner natural to himself the substance of what his
Master taught. In this there is some force, which is
but partially met by the suggestion that John was so
implused with the very mind and soul of Christ, and
formed by his doctrine, and so filled by his spirit, that
his own manner of thought and utterance became the
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same as that of Christ, and he incessantly wrote and spoke in the style of his Lord. Reuse objects to this that on this supposition the style of Jesus "must have been a very uniform and sharply-defined one, and such as excludes the very different style ascribed to him by the synoptists." (Gesch. der H. S. des N. T. p. 208.) But the formal and personal style of the Lord's discourses in John is by no means perfectly uniform, nor is it much further removed from that ascribed to him by the synoptists than the difference of subject and circumstance will suffice to account for. As for the objection that it is inconceivable that the evangelist could have retained from his collaboration with the Lord's disciples any of his former discourses heard by him only once, we need not, in order to meet it, resort to the foolish suggestion of Bertholdt that he had taken notes of them at the time for his own behoof; nor need we to lay stress on the assurance of Christ which John records that the Holy Ghost whom the Father should send to them would teach them all things, and bring all things to their remembrance whatsoever he had said unto them (John xiv, 26), though to the believer this is a fact of the utmost importance. It will suffice to meet the objection if we suggest that, as the apostle wrote the history of Christ, he did not wait till he sat down to write his Gospel to give forth his recollections of Master's words and deeds. What he narrates here in writing is only what he must have been repeating constantly during his whole apostolic career. Still, after due allowance has been made for these considerations, it cannot be admitted that the decided Johnean cast of all these discourses, as compared with our Lord's sayings reported in the synoptical Gospels, shows that while the evangelist gives the substance and essential form of Christ's public utterances, he nevertheless, to a large degree, modified them into his own style of phraseology and of expression. This is especially true of xii, 44-50, which is evidently a summary of statements made on perhaps more than one occasion not definitely given. Indeed, it is doubtful if any of the evangelists give us the exact words of our Lord, as they certainly do not tally in this particular any more than they do in the order and connection in which these are narrated. (See Tholuck, Glaubwürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte [2d ed.], p. 314 sq.) See HARMONIES.

V. CHARACTERS.—1. As to matters, the peculiarities of John's Gospel more especially consist in the four following doxologies. (1.) The mystical Son-Salvation, Son to the Father. (2.) That of the Redeemer to believers. (3.) The announcement of the Holy Ghost as the Comforter. (4.) The peculiar importance ascribed to love. Yet these peculiarities are not confined to this Gospel. Although there can be shown in the writings of the other evangelists some isolated dicta of the Lord which seem to bear the impress of John, it can also be shown that they contain thoughts not originating with that disciple, but with the Lord himself. Matthew (xi, 27) speaks of the relation of the Son to the Father so entirely in the style of John that persons not sufficiently conversed in Hebrew Writ are apt to search for this passage in the Gospel of John. The mystical union of the Son with believers is expressed in Matt. xxviii, 20. The promise of the effusion of the Holy Ghost in order to perfect the disciples is found in Luke xiv, 48. The doctrine of "baptizing with the Holy Ghost" (Col. i. 15, 16) Paul entirely resembles what, according to John, Christ taught on the same subject. Paul here desires our particular attention. In the writings of Paul are found Christian truths which have their points of coalescence only in John, viz., that Christ is the image of the invisible God, by whom all things were created (Col. i. 15, 16). Paul considers the Spirit of God in the Church the spiritual Christ, as Jesus himself does (John xiv, 16), frequently using the words οὐκ ον χριστός. 2. As to form, there is something peculiar in the evangelist's manner of writing. His language betrays traces of that Hebraistic character which belongs generally to the N.-T. writers, and the author shows his Jewish descent by various incidental indications; but he writes purer Greek than most of the others, and his freedom from Judaic narrowness is so marked that some have founded on this an argument against the genuineness of the book, forgetting that the experiences of the apostle in his more intense years of labor would more than correct the prejudices and party leanings of his earlier career. The apostle's style is marked by ease, simplicity, and vivisidity; his sentences are linked together rather by inner affinity in the thoughts than by outward forms of composition or dialectic concatenation— they move rather as the natural recollection of other discourses heard by him only once, we need not, in order to meet it, resort to the foolish suggestion of Bertholdt that he had taken notes of them at the time for his own behoof; nor need we to lay stress on the assurance of Christ which John records that the Holy Ghost whom the Father should send to them would teach them all things, and bring all things to their remembrance whatsoever he had said unto them (John xiv, 26), though to the believer this is a fact of the utmost importance. It will suffice to meet the objection if we suggest that, as the apostle wrote the history of Christ, he did not wait till he sat down to write his Gospel to give forth his recollections of Master's words and deeds. What he narrates here in writing is only what he must have been repeating constantly during his whole apostolic career. Still, after due allowance has been made for these considerations, it cannot be admitted that the decided Johnean cast of all these discourses, as compared with our Lord's sayings reported in the synoptical Gospels, shows that while the evangelist gives the substance and essential form of Christ's public utterances, he nevertheless, to a large degree, modified them into his own style of phraseology and of expression. This is especially true of xii, 44-50, which is evidently a summary of statements made on perhaps more than one occasion not definitely given. Indeed, it is doubtful if any of the evangelists give us the exact words of our Lord, as they certainly do not tally in this particular any more than they do in the order and connection in which these are narrated. (See Tholuck, Glaubwürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte [2d ed.], p. 314 sq.) See HARMONIES.

V. CHARACTERS.—1. As to matters, the peculiarities of John's Gospel more especially consist in the four following doxologies. (1.) The mystical Son-Salvation, Son to the Father. (2.) That of the Redeemer to believers. (3.) The announcement of the Holy Ghost as the Comforter. (4.) The peculiar importance ascribed to love. Yet these peculiarities are not confined to this Gospel. Although there can be shown in the writings of the other evangelists some isolated dicta of the Lord which seem to bear the impress of John, it can also be shown that they contain thoughts not originating with that disciple, but with the Lord himself. Matthew (xi, 27) speaks of the relation of the Son to the Father so entirely in the style of John that persons not sufficiently conversed in Hebrew Writ are apt to search for this passage in the Gospel of John. The mystical union of the Son with believers is expressed in Matt. xxviii, 20. The promise of the effusion of the Holy Ghost in order to perfect the disciples is found in Luke xiv, 48. The doctrine of "baptizing with the Holy Ghost" (Col. i. 15, 16) Paul entirely resembles what, according to John, Christ taught on the same subject. Paul here desires our particular attention. In the writings of Paul are found Christian truths which have their points of coalescence only in John, viz., that Christ is the image of the invisible God, by whom all things were created (Col. i. 15, 16). Paul considers the Spirit of God in the Church the spiritual Christ, as Jesus himself does (John xiv, 16), frequently using the words οὐκ ον χριστός. 2. As to form, there is something peculiar in the evangelist's manner of writing. His language betrays traces of that Hebraistic character which belongs generally to the N.-T. writers, and the author shows his Jewish descent by various incidental indications; but he writes purer Greek than most of the others, and his freedom from Judaic narrowness is so marked that some have founded on this an argument against the genuineness of the book, forgetting that the experiences of the apostle in his more intense years of labor would more than correct the prejudices and party leanings of his earlier career. The apostle's style is marked by ease, simplicity, and vivisidity; his sentences are linked together rather by inner affinity in the thoughts than by outward forms of composition or dialectic concatenation— they move rather as the natural recollection of other discourses heard by him only once, we need not, in order to meet it, resort to the foolish suggestion of Bertholdt that he had taken notes of them at the time for his own behoof; nor need we to lay stress on the assurance of Christ which John records that the Holy Ghost whom the Father should send to them would teach them all things, and bring all things to their remembrance whatsoever he had said unto them (John xiv, 26), though to the believer this is a fact of the utmost importance. It will suffice to meet the objection if we suggest that, as the apostle wrote the history of Christ, he did not wait till he sat down to write his Gospel to give forth his recollections of Master's words and deeds. What he narrates here in writing is only what he must have been repeating constantly during his whole apostolic career. Still, after due allowance has been made for these considerations, it cannot be admitted that the decided Johnean cast of all these discourses, as compared with our Lord's sayings reported in the synoptical Gospels, shows that while the evangelist gives the substance and essential form of Christ's public utterances, he nevertheless, to a large degree, modified them into his own style of phraseology and of expression. This is especially true of xii, 44-50, which is evidently a summary of statements made on perhaps more than one occasion not definitely given. Indeed, it is doubtful if any of the evangelists give us the exact words of our Lord, as they certainly do not tally in this particular any more than they do in the order and connection in which these are narrated. (See Tholuck, Glaubwürdigkeit der evangelischen Geschichte [2d ed.], p. 314 sq.) See HARMONIES.
I. Its Authenticity. — That this is the production of the same author as wrote the fourth Gospel is so manifest that it has universally been admitted (comp. Hauff, Die Autographen der heiligen Evangelien, p. 187 sq.). The establishment of the genuineness of the one, therefore, involves the admission of that of the other. The evidence, however, in favor of the Epistle is sufficient to establish its claims, apart from its relation to the Gospel. See § 7, below.

2. With this the internal evidence fully accords. The work is anonymous, but the apostle John is plainly indicated throughout as the writer. The author asserts that he had been an immediate disciple of Jesus, and that he testifies what he himself had seen and heard (1, 1-4, 13-14), and this assumption is sustained throughout in a way so natural and unaffected that it would be doing violence to all probability to suppose that it could have been attained by one who felt that he was practising in this a deliberate imposition. The circumstances also of the writer to which he alludes, the themes on which he dwells, the thought that is expressed in it, are all such as fall in with what we know of the apostle John, and suggest him as the writer. If this be the work of a pretender, he has, as De Wette remarks (Ezech. Hdb.), "shown incredible subtlety in concealing the name of the apostle, whilst he has indirectly, and in a most simple natural way, imparted his history to the readers.

A few German theologians in our own times (Lange, Schriften des Johan, iii. 4 sq.; Cluvis, Uerzeichnct des Christenthe, p. 52 sq.; Bretschneider, Probabil., p. 166 sq.; Zeller, in the Theol. Jahrb, 1845) have been the first critics to throw doubt on the genuineness of any of John's writings; and this altogether on internal grounds, but they have met with complete refutation from the pens of Bertholdt (vi), Harnack (Authent. d. Schr. d. Evangel., Johan.), and Lücke (Commentar, iii). See above. The only serious objections to the Epistles are those of Bretschneider, who has equally attacked the genuineness of the Gospel.

1. He maintains that the doctrine concerning the Logos, and the anti-docetic tendency of John's 1st Epistle, betrays an author of the second century, whom he assumes to be John the Presbyter. But it is beyond all question that this is not the apostle (De Wett, Hdb.), and it is by no means improbable, although not fully developed, existent in the Jewish theological notions respecting the Son of God, and that we find it distinctly expressed, although in different words, in the Pauline representation of Christ's exalted dignity (compare Coloss. i with Heb. i); that the rudiments of it appear in the literature of the Jews, canonical and apocryphal, Chaldaic and Alexandrian; that in the time of Christ it was considerably developed in the writings of Philo, and still more strongly in the fathers of the second century, who were so far from retaining the simple, Hebraizing, and canonical mode of expression peculiar to John that in them it had assumed a gnostic form, although essentially identical. John intends by the Word (Logos) to express the divine nature of Christ, but the patristic logology attempts to determine the relationship between the Logos and the invisible God on one side, and the world on the other. The earliest fathers, as Justin Martyr and Tatian, while they make use of John's phrasing, further support their doctrines by ecclesiastical tradition, which, as Lücke observes, must have its root in doctrines that were known in the first century. But, from Theophilus of Antioch downwards, the fathers, mentioning John by name, expressly connect their elucidations with the canonical foundation in the Gospel of John, without the granting of which the language of Justin would be inexplicable (Olshausen, On the Genuineness of the Four Gospels, p. 306 sq.). Accordingly, adds Lücke, on this side, the authenticity of the Gospel and Epistle remains unassailable. See Logos.

3. (23) On some of the grounds may be refuted Bretschneider's arguments derived from the anti-docetic character of John's Epistle. It is true, docetism, or the idealistic philosophy, was not fully developed before the second century, but its germ existed before the time of Christ, as has been shown by Moesheim, Walsh, and Niemeyer. The traces of Jewish theology which have been said to have been applied to the Christian doctrine in the apocalyptic age are to be found in the Epistles of Paul, and it would be unaccountable to suppose that the fully developed docetism should have first made its appearance in the Epistles of Irenaeus and Polycarp. We have the authority of the former of these for the fact that Cerinthus taught the docetic heresy in the lifetime of John in the simple form in which it seems to have been attacked in 1 John iv, 1-3; ii, 22; 2 John 7. See Docetism.

II. Integrity. — The genuineness of only two small portions of this writing have been called in question, viz., the words ο ὡμολογει τον Νίκων κα την παραμετρίας (i, 23), and the words την στήνον την πιεσκον, και συναίνει την τρίαν ν παιδι (κα την τρίαν κα την τρίαν μεταμετρίας ν την γνώσει (v, 7, 8). The former of these is omitted in the Text. Rec., and is printed in brackets in the Griesbach's edition. It is of no sufficient authority, and is inserted by Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Scholz, etc. The latter of these passages has given rise to a world-famous controversy, which can hardly be said to have yet ended (Orme, Memoir of a Controversy respecting the Heavenly Writings [London, 1830]). The prevailing judgment, however, of all critics and interpreters is that the passage is spurious (see Griesbach, Appendix ad N. T. ii, 1-25; Tischendorf on the passage; Lücke, Comment, on the Epistles of John, in Bib. Cabinet, No. xxv, etc.). See Witnesses, the Three Heavenly.

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

1. It has been conceived by many interpreters, ancient and modern, that it was written at the same place as the Gospel. The more ancient tradition places the writing of the Gospel at Ephesus, and the translator's report refers it to the island of Patmos. Irenaeus (Adv.), infers, from the absence of writing materials (3 John 13), that all John's Epistles were composed at Patmos. The most probable opinion is that it was written somewhere in Asia Minor, in which was the ordinary residence of the apostle (1 John 1, 4), and it is according to the tradition of the Greek Church, at Ephesus, for this but we have no historical warrant (Lücke, Comment.)

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

It has been argued by several, from ii, 18 (lofýrýnt ὑπο λας), that the Epistle was written before the destruction of Jerusalem, while others, founding their conjecture on the need of words to maintain the views of the first Epistle, among the former are to be found the names of Hammond, Grotius, Calovius, Lange, and Hahneline, and among the latter those of Baronius, Basnage, Mill, and Le Clerc.

Equally unsatisfactory is the argument, in respect to the time when this Epistle was written, derived from its superior age. It is true that the Gospel has more proleptical than polemical words, and that the words of the Gospel referred to in John's may be found in this writer. But if the Epistle and the Gospel are in the same spirit, and if the Evangelist has preserved the Gospel, there must be a writer who has preserved the Epistle.

The Epistle is therefore written before the destruction of Jerusalem. The two writers were contemporaries. They were both ministers of the same faith. They were both Christians, and the Gospel and the Epistle are both written in the same spirit, and the same style, and the same language.

V. Character. Though ranked among the catholic Epistles, this writing has not the form of an epistle—is it respect this it more resembles a free homily; still, in fact, it undoubtedly was sent as a letter to the persons for whose instruction it was designed. The general strain is salutary, and the author seems to have written for the good of his readers, and to have addressed himself to their need of instruction and consolation, to their need of spiritual life and growth. The author addresses present him with one thought, and the book is pervaded by a suppressed intensity of feeling that recalls the youthful Rejoicings in the aged apostle. The mighty power that in it has drawn to it in all ages the reverence and love of the nobles minds, "especially of those who more particularly take to heart the idea of the love of a religion of the heart" (Lucie, Int. p. 65).

VI. Contents. A strict analysis of this Epistle, therefore, seems hardly possible, as the writer does not appear to have been systematic in its plan, but rather to have written out of a full and loving heart. He "utters the heart's(French)" desire; he preaches the pure religion of Jesus. He appeals to opposition to false teachers, and for the comfort of the Church (i, 7; 2). Then follows a statement of the perfection of man, and the propitiatory of Christ, this propitiatory being intended to stir us up to holiness and love (i, 8; ii, 17). Jesus and the Christ are asserted to be one, in opposition to the false teachers (ii, 18-29).

The next chapter seems to be devoted to the sinfulness of man, and to the perfection of Christ, this perfection being intended to stir us up to holiness and love (2). The chapter then continues a exposition of love as love (3). The following chapter is principally occupied with marks by which to distinguish the teaching of the Spirit of God from that of false teachers and of Antichrist, with repeated exhortations to love as brethren (4). The next chapter shows the connexion between faith, renewal, love to God and to the brethren, obedience, and victory over the world, and one man's contribution to another's salvation (5). The last chapter is one of the most beautiful of all the Epistles (6). The spirit is unceasingly to be observed in the Spirit (7). The last chapter is one of the most beautiful of all the Epistles (8).

VII. Relation to the Fourth Gospel. The close affinity between this Epistle and John's Gospel has already been alluded to. In style, in prevailing formula of expression, in spirit, and in thought, the two are identical. The writer of 2 John is evidently the same who wrote the Fourth Gospel. There is no evidence that the writer of each had a similar connexion with his opponents in his mind—those who, like the Docete, denied the true humanity of Christ; those, again, who denied that the man Jesus was the Christ and Son of God; and those who, under pretence of being his disciples, were habitually living in violation of his commands. Both books are the same deeply loving and contemplative nature; in both, a heart completely imbued with the teaching of the Saviour; in both, also, the same tendency to abhorrence of those who opposed his Lord. Remarkable, too, (to use the words of Ebrard), is the similarity of the expressions of WERNER, that "a Parthos is an error for a Sophism," an expression which actually is found in several MSS. (Scholz, Bibl. Krit. Reihe, p. 67), is ingenious, and may be correct. If we are to understand the term catholikos, as applied to this Epistle, in the sense of circular, we may naturally infer, from the absence of the epistolary form, that this was an encyclical letter addressed to several of John's congregations, and in all probability to the churches of the Apocalypse. See § 8, below. Lardner is clearer right when he says that it was primarily meant for the churches in Asia, under John's inspection, to whom he had already orally delivered his doctrine (3; 31; 7). See REVOLV. 

See also, the notions of propitiation (λαταθηματος), of doing righteousness, sin, or iniquity (μαγιος), and the sharply-presented antithesis of light and darkness, truth and untruth, loving and hating, the love of the Father and of the world, the children of God and of the devil, spirit of truth and spirit of error (Fairbairn). Macknight, and, still more fully, de Wette, have drawn out a copious comparison of expressions in both the Epistle and Epistle.
some, a prolegomenon to the Gospel; according to other
its practical conclusion; and according to others, its
my commercial accomplishment. The probability is
that both were written at the same period of the author's
life, and that they both contain in writing what he had
been in his life. The same also holds true of the Reformed
ministry; but whether any closer relation than
this exists between them must remain matter entirely
of conjecture.

VIII. Design.—That the apostle sought to confirm the
believers for whom he wrote in their attachment to Christ:
by a twofold argument. 1. Christ by his resurrection
renounces this view, attempts to show that
Docetism was in the same way, in the same period of the
appeal to the case of Cerinthus, and to the references
to Docetism in three of the epistles of Ignatius (Ad
Smyrn. 2 ap.; Ad Trall. ix; Ad Eph. vii); but the
docetistic arguments of the period of Docetism and
which is not Docetic in the proper sense, and the passages
cited from Ignatius are all subject to the suspicion of
being interpolations, as none of them are found in the
Syrian recension. Lucke lays stress also on the words
in σοφοι δε ξαπλώσαντες (iv. 2); comp. 2 John vii) as indicating
an express antithesis to the doctrine of the
Christ that had come only in appearance. It may be
doubted, however, whether this means anything more
than that Christ had really come, the phrase in οὐκ ε但是他 regard it as such, and in this case even the appearance of allusion to a
direct contradiction vanishes (see Bleek, Eusebius, p. 668).
It may be added that, had John intended to express
a direct antithesis to Docetism, he would hardly have
tended himself with merely using the words in οὐκ ε
for, or to the exercise in which even the Docetists
would have admitted this.

The main object of the Epistle, therefore, does not
appear to be simply that of opposing the errors of the
Docetists (Schmidt, Bertholdt, Niemeyer), or of the
Gnostics (Kleuker), or of the Nicolaitans (MacKnight),
or of the Cerinthusians (Michaelis), or of all of them together
(Townsend), or of the Sabians (Barkey, Storr, Keil),
or of Judaeans (Lößler, Semler), or of apostates to
Judaism (Lange, Eichhorn, Händel): the leading pur-
purpose of the apostle appears to be rather constructive
than polemical. John is remarkable both in his history
and in his writings lost to the doctrine of the
Docetists, but he does not attack error as a controversialist.
He states the deep truth and lays down the deep moral
theology of Christianity, and in this way, rather than
directly, condemns heresy. In the introduction (i, 4-1
there is a twofold statement of the purpose of his Epistle. It is
to declare the Word of life to those whom he is address-
ing, in order that he and they might be united in true
Christian communion with each other, and with God the
Father, and his Son Jesus Christ. He at once begins to explain
the nature and conditions of communion with God, and,
besides the "faith that cometh by hearing," he brings himself back to the same subject. The first part of
the Epistle may be considered to end at i, 28. The
apostle begins afresh with the doctrine of sonship or
communion at ii, 29, and returns to the same theme at
iv, 7. His lesson throughout is, that the means of
union with God are, on the part of Christ, his atoning
blood (i, 7; ii, 2; iii, 5; iv, 10, 14; v, 6) and advocacy
(ii, 1)—on the part of believers, faith and love (i, 3;
purity (iii, 3), faith (iii, 23; iv, 3; v, 5), and, above
all, love (ii, 7; iii, 14; iv, 7; v, 1). John is designated as
the Apostle of Love, and rightly; but it should be ever remembered that his "love" does not exclude or ignore,
but embraces both faith and obedience as constituent
elements. He is called "the beloved" (John i, 16; v, 15;
love," and James's "works that are the fruit of faith," and
John's "love which springs from faith and pro-
duces obedience," are all one and the same state of
mind described according to the first, second, or third
stage into which we are able to analyze the complex
whole.

IX. Commentaries.—The special exegetical helps on
the whole of the three epistles of John, besides those
mentioned under the Gospel above, are the following,
of which we designate the most important by prefixing
an asterisk: *Baur, F., in Bibl. Max. Patr. vii (also in Bibl. Patr. Gall. vi); Bede, Expositio (in Opp. v); Althamer, Commentarius (Argent. 1521, 1528, 8vo); Hemming, Commentarius (Vitemb. 1569, 8vo); Schnecker,
Homilias (Franz. 1580, 1587, 8vo); Danneels, Commenta-
tarius (Genev. 1585, 8vo); Horne, Expositio [including
ii, 2, in Bibl. Patr. Gall. vi]; Crusius, Commentarius (laud.
Carpoz, Lips. 1687, and later, 4to); Croyghton, Outleid-
ing (Franck. 1704, 4to); Lange, Exegesis (Hain. 1718,
4to; including Pet., ibid. 1724, fol.); Rumsey, Erklärung
(Hamb. 1717, 4to); Whiston, Commentary (Lond. 1719,
8vo); Teglele, Versklärung (Delph. 1736, 4to); Ruhlis,
Note (Amst. 1739, 12mo); Beilitz, Commentarius (London
1738, 4to; includ. other cath. eph., ibid. 1756, 4to); Schirmer, Er-
klärung (Breslau, 1780, 8vo); Morus, Prælectiones (edit.
Hempel, Lips. 1797, 8vo); Hawkins, Commentary (Hal-
ifax. 1808, 8vo); Jaspis, Adnotationi [incl. Rev.] (Lips.
1816, 1821, 8vo); Paulus, Erklärung (Heidelberg, 1829,
8vo); Bickel'schütz, Exposition [incl. Jude] (London
1846, 12mo); Braune, Auslegung (Grim. 1847, 8vo);
Mayer, Commentar (Wien, 1851, 8vo); Sandor, Commenta-
tur (Ellerf., 1851, 8vo); Besser, Auslegung (Halle, 1851,
1866, 1852, 12mo); *Ditzenbecker, Commentar (Götting.
1852-56, 2 vols. 8vo); *Huber, in Meyer's Handbook
(Götting, 1858, 1861, 8vo); *Maurice, Lectures (Cambr.
1857, 1867, 8vo).

On the First Epistle alone there are the following:
Augustine, Præceptorius (in Opp. iv, 1091; tr. into French,
Pat. 1670, 16mo); Luther, Commentarius (ed. Neumann,
Lips. 1708; republished, ibid. 1823, 8vo); Reimarus, Er-
klärung (in Works, Lpz. xi, 572; Halle, ibid. 906); *Ge-
colampadius, Homilias (Basil. 1525, 8vo); Zwingle, Annotati-
ones (in Opp. iv, 580); Tyndale, Exposition (London, 1851, 8vo;
reprinted, in Expositiones, lb. 1829, p. 145); Megander,
Adnotationes [incl. Hebrews] (Tigur. 1589, 8vo); Fe-
ling, Commentarius (Venice, 1548, 8vo); Beurinus, Com-
mentarius (Tubing. 1571, 8vo); Humniss, Emarratio (F.
Ad M. 1586, 1592, 8vo); Hesselis, Commentarius (Duaci,
1599, 8vo); Eckhard, Disputationes (Ges. 1609, 8vo);
Scalinus, Commentarius (Sacov. 1614, 8vo; also in Opp.
1, 157); Egger, Erklärung (Goth. 1598, 8vo); *Rheinart,
Quaestiones (Jena, 1648, 1698, 4to); Roberts, Evidence,
etc. (Lond. 1649, 8vo); Mestrezat, Exposition (Fr., Ge-
neve, 1651, 2 vols. 12mo); Cotton, Commentary (Lond.
1656, fol.); Hardy, Infolioing [on i-iii] (Lond. 1656-9,
2 vols. 4to); *V. Smidt, Commentarius (Fet Lipcis,
1677, 1707, 2 vols. 8vo); Rapin, Ecclesiæ (Goth. 1598,
1697, 4to); Spener, Erklärung (Halle, 1691, 1711, 4to);
Zeller, Predigten (Lpz. 1709, 8vo); Marpberger, Auslegung
(Nurnb. 1710, 4to); Oporinus, Libratio (Götting. 1741,
4to); Freyheinhaus, Erklärung (Halle, 1741, 8vo);
Steinhofer, Erklärung (Tubing. 1732, Hamb. 1746, 8vo);
Carpoz, Standesgeschichte (Goth. 1723, 8vo).——*phrasis
(Riga, 1792, 12mo); Hesslengren, Prolegomena
(Upsala, 1800, 8vo); Weber, De authentico, etc. (Halla
JOHN 954

[Text]

after it, the general belief, both in the Latin and the Greek churches, was that they were written by John the apostle. 2. Both Jerome and Eusebius concur in ascertaining that all ascribed these Epistles either to John the apostle or to the Evangelist by Mrs. Conant. N. Y. 1892, 12mo): Erdmann, Argumentum, etc. (Berol. 1855, 8vo); Graham, Commentary (Lond. 1857, 12mo): Myrberg, Commentarius (Upsala, 1859, 8vo): Handeock, Exposition (Edinburgh, 1861, 8vo): Candlish, Lectures (Edinburgh, 1866, 8vo): Haupt, Einleitung, etc. (Cott. 1867, 8vo). JOHN, SECOND AND THIRD EPISTLES OF. The title catholic does not properly belong to the 2d and 3d Epistles. It became attached to them, although addressed to individuals, because they were of too little importance to be classed by themselves, and, so far as they went, were regarded as appendices to the 1st Epistle.

Chapter 1. Authorship. 1. The external evidence for the genuineness of these two Epistles is less copious and decisive than that for the 1st Epistle. They are not in the Peshito version, which at the time it was executed they were not recognised by the Syrian churches; and Eusebius places them among the ἄνακτλητα (H. E. iii, 23). See Antiq. Romana. The 11th verse of the 2d Epistle, however, is quoted by Irenaeus (Hær. i, 16, 5) as a saying of John, the disciple of the Lord, made before the Jews in the house of the high priest, that the Jewish Church, therefore, classed them with the other seven catholic Epistles, it would appear that he must have known and acknowledged the 3d also. If the adultoraciones are Clement's, he bears direct testimony to the 2d Epistle (Ad. dimb. p. 101, edit. Potter). Original Epistles of the apostle John having left the 2d and 3d Epistle, which, however, he adds, all did not accept as genuine (In Joan, ap. Euseb. vi, 25). Dionysius of Alexandria (ibid. vii, 25) recognises them as productions of the same John who wrote the Gospel and the 1st Epistle; and so do all the later Alexandrian writers. Eusebius himself elsewhere refers to them (Hær. Evan. iii, 5) without hesitation as John's; and in the synod held at Carthage (A.D. 256). Aurelius, bishop of Chullabi, confirmed his vote by citing 2 John 10 sq. as the language of the apostle John (Cyprian, Opp. ii, 129, ed. Oeberlin). Ephrem Syrus speaks of them in the 4th century, and they are found in the 5th century in almost universally received. A homily, wrongly attributed to St. Chrysostom, declares them uncanonical. In the Muratorian Fragment, which, however, in the part relating to the Epistles of John, is somewhat confused or apparently vitiated, there are at least two Epistles of John recognised, for the author uses the plural in mentioning John's Epistles. In all the later catalogues, with the exception of the Iambics ad Seleucum, they are inserted with the other canonical books of the N. T. There is thus a solid body of evidence in favor of the genuineness of these epistles; and not uniformly known and received is probably to be accounted for by their character as private letters to individuals, which would naturally be longer in coming under general recognition than such as were addressed to churches or the Christians of a district.

The external testimony which has reached us from antiquity is that of Jerome, who says (De vir. Illust. x, 18) that both epistles were commonly reputed to be the production, not of John the apostle, but of John the presbyter, confirmed by the statement of Eusebius (iii, 25) that it was doubtful whether they were the production of the evangelist or of another John. On this it may be observed, 1. That the statement of Jerome is certainly not true in its full extent, for there is evidence enough that both in his own time and before, as well as
II. The second Epistle is addressed to one whom the writer calls ἱερατὴς κυρία. This has been differently understood. By some it has been regarded as designating the Church collectively, by others as designating a particular congregation, and by others as denoting an individual. This expression cannot mean the Church (Jerome), nor a particular church (Casiodorus), nor the elect Church which comes together on Sundays (Michaelis), nor the Church of Philadelphia (Whiston), nor the Church of Jerusalem (Whitby). These opinions are rendered improbable partly by the reference in verse 11 to the children, and in verse 12 to the sister of the party addressed, partly by the want of any authority for such a usage of the term ἱερατὴς as would thus be imputed to the apostle. By those who understand this of an individual there are three renderings: according to one interpretation she is “the lady Electa;” to another, “the elect Kyria;” to a third, “the elect lady.” The first interpretation is that of Clement of Alexandria (if the passage above referred to in the Aδυναμίωνες be his), Wetstein, Grotius, Middleton; the second is that of Benson, Carpzov, Schleusner, Heumann, Bengel, Rosenmüller, De Wette, Lette, Neander, Davidson; the third is that of the renderings of the Epistles of Ephesians, to Philo, to the Hebrews, of First and Second Timothy, of Titus, and of the Epistle to Philemon. Of these, the last is the most common, and the second is that which has been most commonly spoken of as ἱερατὴς is fatal to the hypothesis. The rendering “the elect lady” is probably wrong, because there is no article before the adjective ἱερατὴς. It remains that the rendering “the elect Kyria” is probably right, though here too we should have expected the article—indeed, we should have expected it even in the third rendering (though the rendering “an elect lady” is not demanded—see Alford, Gr. Text. vol. v, proleg.). The choice, therefore, being between the last two of these renderings, two circumstances seem to be decisive in favor of the former: Kyria occurs elsewhere as a proper name (see Cyprian); and that ἱερατὴς is taken in its usual signification is rendered probable by its being applied in verse 13 to the sister of the party addressed. See ELECTA.

At the time of writing this Epistle the apostle was with the sister of the lady addressed, but expresses a happy contentment on her being good in all respects. He expresses confidence that she is not behind him in matters of which he could not then write. From this we may infer either that the apostle was at the time on a journey from which he expected ere long to return, or that the lady in question resided not very far from his usual residence, and that he intended some time to pay her a visit. Adopting the latter theory, we have the more probable, and viewing it in connection with the apostle’s styling himself πρεσβύερος, we may infer that the Epistle was written at a late period of the apostle’s life.

The object of the apostle in writing the 2d Epistle was to warn the lady to whom he wrote against abetting the teaching known as that of Basilius and his followers, by perhaps an undue kindness displayed by her towards the preachers of the false doctrine. After the introductory salutation, the apostle at once urges on his correspondent the great principle of love, which with him (as we have before seen) means right affection springing from right faith, and issuing in right conduct. The immediate consequence of the possession of this love is the abhorrence of heretical misbelief, because the latter, being incompatible with right faith, is destructive of the former, which is the great principle of love, which with itself. This is the secret of John’s strong denunciation of the “deceiver,” whom he designates as “Antichrist.” Love is in him the essence of Christianity, but love can spring only from right faith. Wrong belief, therefore, destroys love, and with it Christianity. Therefore says he, “If there come any unto you and bring not this doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God speed, for he that biddeth him God speed is partaker of his evil deeds” (2 Epist. 10, 11).

III. The third Epistle is addressed to Caius, a Christian brother noted for his hospitality to the saints. Whether this be one of those mentioned elsewhere in the N. T. by this name is uncertain. In the introduction it would appear that the object of the travelling was to preach the Gospel to the Gentiles without money and without price (3 Epist. 7). The apostle had already written to the ecclesiastical authorities of the place (1 John, ver. 9, not “scripsiissem,” as the Vulg.), but they, at the instigation of Diotrephes, had refused the missionary brethren, and therefore the apostle now commends them to the care of a layman. It is probable that Diotrephes was a leading presbyter who held Judaism views, and would not give assistance to men who were going about with the purpose of preaching solely to the Gentiles. The apostle thereby makes the probable route of his personal visitation the church, where he would deal with Diotrephes for his misconduct, and would communicate to Caius many things of which he could not then write. In the mean time he exhorts him to follow that which is Demetrius, that is, to receive the benediction and salutation. Whether this Demetrius (ver. 12) was a tolerant presbyter of the same community, whose example John holds up as worthy of commendation in contradistinction to that of Diotrephes, or whether he was one of the strangers who bore the letter, we are now unable to determine.

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

IV. Commentaries. The following are the exegetical helps on the whole of both the latter epistles exclusively, in addition to those noticed above: Jones, Commentary [including Philerm. etc.], (Lond. 1835, fol.); Smith, Exposition [on 2d Epistle] (Lond. 1663, 4to); Sonntag, Hypomnemata (Alton, 1655, 8vo); Feussel, Commentary (Vienna, 1707, 4to); Venema, Exercitations (Gedan, 1741, 4to); Heumann, Commentary [on 2d Epist.] (Helms. 1778, 8vo); Müller, Commentary [on 2d Epist.] (Schles. 1788, 4to); Sommer, Isagoge (Lond. 1798, 4to); Ramonnet, Spectum, etc. [on 2d Epistle] (Tr. ad Rh. 1818, 8vo); Gribnoff, Apostolische Auslegung (Mittlerer Diss. 8vo); Cox, Private Letters of Sts. Paul and John (Lond. 1867, 8vo). See Commentary.

JOHN, REVELATION OF. See REVELATION.

John the Baptist (Ἰωάννης ὁ βαπτιστής), or simply Ἰωάννης, when the reference is clear, as in Matt. iii, 4; iv, 12; Lat. Joannes (Tacitus, Hist. v, 12); Heb. יוחנן, denoting grace, or favor [see Simons, Lec. N. T. p. 813]. In the Church John commonly bears the honorable title of “forerunner of the Lord”—antecuror et preparator viarum Domini (Tertull. adv. Marc. iv, 53); in Greek, προφήτης ὁ βαπτιστής, προφήτης ὁ τοῦ Λόρντος, in which the Gospelists present are fragmentary and imperfect; they involve, too, some difficulties which the learned have found it hard to remove; yet enough is given to show that he was a man of a lofty character, and that the relation in which he stood to Christianity was one of great importance. From John’s own testimony, he was a more honored character and distinguished saint than any prophet who had preceded him (Luke vii, 28). See PROPHET.

1. John was of the priestly race by both parents, for his father Zacharias was himself a priest of the course of Abia, or Abijah (1 Chron. xxiv, 10), offering incense at the very time when a son was promised to him; and
Elizabeth was of the daughters of Aaron (Luke 1:5), the latter "a cousin" (συγγόνος, relative) of Mary, the mother of Jesus, whose senior John was by a period of six months (Luke 1). Both parents, too, were devout persons, walking in the commandments of God, and waiting for the assurance of redemption. The hope of Israel, the desire of ages, the desire of ages more definitely, "Behold, I will send my messenger, and he shall prepare the way before me" (iii, 1). His birth—"a birth not according to the ordinary laws of nature, but through the miraculous interposition of Almighty power"—was foretold by an angel sent from God, who announced it as an occasion of joy and gladness to many, and at the same time assigned to him the name of John, to signify either that he was to be born of God's especial favor, or, perhaps, that he was to be the harbinger of grace. The angel Gabriel, moreover, proclaimed the character and office of this wonderful child even before his conception, foretelling that he would be filled with the Holy Ghost from the first moment of his existence, and appear as the great reformer of his countrymen—another Elijah in the boldness with which he would speak truth and rebuke vice—but, above all, as the forerunner of the Messiah. This marvellous revelation as to the character and career of the son for whom he had so long prayed in vain were too much for the faith of the aged Zacharias, and, when he sought some assurance of the certainty of the promised blessing, God gave it to him in a vision. The privation of speech—until the event foretold should happen—a judgment intended to serve at once as a token of God's truth and a rebuke of his own incredulity. And now the Lord's gracious promise tarried not. Elizabeth, for greater privacy, retired into the hill-country, whither she was soon afterwards followed by this blind and aged Mary, who was herself the object and channel of divine grace beyond measure greater and more mysterious. The two cousins, who were thus honored above all the mothers of Israel, came together in a remote city, and immediately God's purpose was confirmed to them by a miraculous sign; for, as soon as Elizabeth heard the salutation, the babe leaped in her womb, thus acknowledging, as it were, even before birth, the presence of his Lord (Luke 1, 43, 44). Three months after this, and while Mary still remained with her, Elizabeth was delivered of a son, John, whose name the prophet Zacharias wrote down and determined. The rabbins (Othoo, Lex. Rabb. p. 824; Witsii Miscell. Sacerr, ii, 889) fix on Hebron, in the hill-country of Judaea; Paulus, Kuinoel, and Meyer, after Reiland, are in favor of Jutta, "a city of Judea." See JUTTAH. On the eighth day the child of promise was, in conformity with the law of Moses (Lev. xii, 6), brought to the priest for circumcision, and, as the performance of this rite was the accustomed time for naming a child, the friends of the family proposed to call him Zacharias, after the name of his father. The mother, however, required that he should be called John, a decision which Zacharias still speedily confirmed, by writing on a tablet, "his name is John." The judgment on his want of faith was then at once withdrawn, and the first use which he made of his recovered speech was to praise Jehovah for his faithfulness and mercy (Luke 1, 64). God's wonderful interposition in the child's position in the spirit impressed the minds of many with a certain solemn awe and expectation (Luke iii, 16). God was surely again visiting his people. His providence, so long hidden, seemed once more about to manifest itself. The child thus supernaturally born must doubtless be commissioned. In the midst of his youth the angel Gabriel took his departure from him, and his life passed as a common human being. He was cast into prison at the gates of Jerusalem, and spent probably thirty years, the whole period which elapsed between his birth and the commencement of his public ministry: "The child grew and waxed strong in the spirit, and was in the deserts till the day of his showing unto Israel" (Luke i, 80). John, it will be remembered, was ordained to be a Nazarite (see Numb. vi, 1–21) from his birth, for the words of the angel were, "He shall drink neither wine nor strong drink" (Luke i, 15). What we are to understand by this brief announcement is probably this: the chosen forerunner of the Messiah and herald of his kingdom was required to forego the ordinary pleasures and indulgences of the world, and live a life of the strictest self-denial in retirement and solitude. The apocryphal Protoc. Ject. ch. xxii, states that his mother, in order to rescue her son from the murder of the children at Bethlehem which Herod commanded, fled with her son to the long-expected country of refuge, the mountain opened at her request, and gave the needed shelter in its bosom. Zacharias, being questioned by Herod as to where his son was to be found, and refusing to answer, was slain by the tyrant. At a later period Elizabeth died, when angels took the youth under their care (Josephus, Ant. i, 17, § 1, p. 117; comp. Kuhn, Leben Jesu, i, 103, remark 4). It was thus that the holy Nazarite, dwelling by himself in the wild and thinly-peopled region westward of the Dead Sea, called "desert" in the text, prepared himself by self-discipline, and by constant communion with God, for the onerous office to which he had been divinely called. Here year after year of his stern probation passed by, till the time for the fulfilment of his mission arrived. The very appearance of the holy Baptist was of itself a lesson to his countrymen; his dress was that of the old prophets—a girdle made of camel's hair (2 Kings i, 8), attached to his loins by a girdle of leather. His food was such as the desert spontaneously afforded—locusts (Lev. xi, 22) and wild honey (Psa. lxxxii, 16) from the rock. (See Engelmann, De victis J. Bapt. Hcrald., 172; Thaul. s. St. Adamo, De victis Joc. Bapt. in desertto, Bâle, 1770, p. 170.) In this wilderness he was born is not disputed (see Hackett, Illustr. of Script. p. 96.) Desert though the place is designated, the country where he spent these early years—the wild mountainous tract of Judah, lying between Jerusalem and the Dead Sea, along which it stretches—was not entirely destitute of means for supporting human existence (Mat. iii, 12–13; Mark i, 1 sq; Luke iii, 1–20; John x, 28; Justin Martyr, Dial. cum Trypho, c. 88). Josephus, in his Life (ii, 2), gives an account of one of his instructors, Banaus, which throws light on John's condition in the desert: "He lived in the desert, and had no other food than what grew of itself, and his only clothing was a skin, woolly and rough, both by night and by day. I imitated him in these things, and continued with him three years." Some writers infer that John was an Essene; see sayn. C. Taylor, editor of Calmet's Dictionary of the Bible: comp. Josephus, Antiq. ix, iii, § 3. But this is denied by Bezan, Vie de Jean (13th ed. Paris, 1867), p. 101 sq.

2. At length, in the fifteenth year of the reign of the emperor Tiberius (see Jarvius, Areas, Intro. p. 228 sqq., 462 sqq.), or A.D. 25, the long-secluded hermit came back into the history of the world. His birth, his hard ascetic life, his reputation for extraordinary sanctity, and the generally-prevailing ex-
peculation that some great one was about to appear—
these causes, without the aid of miraculous power, for
"John did no miracle" (John x, 41), were sufficient to
attract to him a great multitude from "every quarter"
(Matt. iii, 5). Brief and startling was his first exhorta-
tion to "be not deceived; for he is the kingdom of God is
at hand." A few scores of verses contain all that is
recorded of John's preaching, and the sum of all is re-
pentance—not mere legal ablation or expiation, but a
change of heart and life. Herein John, though exhib-
ting a marked contrast to the scribes and Pharisees of
his own time, was the Christ of a new and powerful motive,
the lessons which had been again and again impressed upon them by their
ancient prophets (comp. Isa. i, 16, 17; Is. vii, Jer. vii, 3-7;
Ezek. xviii, 19-32, xxxvi, 25-27, Joel ii, 12, 18, Micah
vi, 8; Zechar. i, 3, 4). But, while such was his solemn
admonition at the multitude, he adopted at the time
leading the sects of the Jews a severer tone, de-
nouncing Pharisaics and Sadducees alike as "a genera-
tion of vipers," and warning them of the folly of trust-
ing to external privileges as descendants of Abraham
(Luke iii, 8). Now, at last, he warns them that "the
ax and the two-edged sword are come to cast into
the bosom of his house, and even his righteousness will
be cut down, but the root thereof will not be destroyed." Such
alarms were not new, but what was new, indeed, what
had not been heard before, was the very notion that God's
people could be abased and annihilated. It was a new idea,
for the people of Israel had been accustomed to think of themselves as God's
chosen and specially set apart as his instruments in the
establishment of his kingdom. John's message, therefore, was a
shock and a terrible message; and it is no wonder that it
met with such vigorous protest on the part of the
leaders and ruling classes in the nation. The people must
be "born again" if they were to be saved. The old order of
things must be swept away, and the kingdom of heaven must
be established on earth. This was the essence of John's
message, and it was this message that made his ministry
so dangerous to the rulers of the land. But, in spite of all
the opposition and persecution that he met with, John
continued to preach the gospel of righteousness and re-
pentance to all who would hear him. He was a true
prophet, a man of God, and his message was a power
for good among the people.

What, then, was the baptism which John adminis-
tered? See WASHING. (Comp. Ohlhausen, "Comment. on
loc. Joh.; Dale, "John's Baptism, Phila. 1871.) Not
altogether a new rite, for it was the custom of the Jews to
baptize proselytes to their religion: not as an ordinance in
itself conveying remission of sins, but rather a token and
symbol of that repentance which was an indispensable
condition of forgiveness through him whom John point-
ed out as "the Lamb of God that taketh away the sins of
the world." Still less did the baptism of John impart the
grace of regeneration—of a new spiritual life (Acts
xix, 8, 4). This was to be the mysterious effect of bap-
tism "with the Holy Ghost," which was to be ordained
by that "mightier one" whose coming he proclaimed.
The preparatory baptism of John was a visible sign to
the people, and a distinct acknowledgment by them that
a greater one than John was coming to make ready a
people for the kingdom of heaven, which the Baptist proclaimed to be at hand.

But the fundamental distinction between John's bap-
tism unto repentance and that baptism accompanied
with the gift of the Holy Spirit which our Lord af-
terwards obtained is clearly marked by John himself
(Matt. iii, 11, 12). See BAPTISM OF JOHN. As a preach-
er, John was eminently practical and discriminating.
Self-love and covetousness were the prevalent sins of
the people at large on them, therefore, he enjoined charity and
correction for others. The publicans he cautioned against extortion, the soldiers against
violence and plunder. His answers to them are, no doubt,
to be regarded as instances of the appropriate warning
and advice which he addressed to every class. The
first reason assigned by John for entering on his most
weighty mission is clearly marked by John himself
in these words: "The kingdom of heaven is at hand." It
was his great work to prepare the mind of the nation, so
that when Jesus himself came they might be a people
made ready for the Lord. What was the exact idea
which John intended to convey by the term "kingdom of
heaven"? It is not easy, at least in our space before us, to
determine with satisfaction. (See Richter, "De manne saecro Joanni Bap. divinitus delegato, Lips. 1756.)

We feel ourselves, however, justified in protesting against
the practice of those who take the vulgar Jewish notion
and assign it to John, that John, for a change, goes so far as to deny
that our Lord himself, at the first, possessed any other.

We have space to develop the moral character of John,
we could show that this fine, stern, high-minded teacher
possessed many eminent qualities; but his personal and
official modesty in keeping, in all circumstances, in the
lower rank assigned him by God did not pass without
special mention. The doctrine and manner of life
of John the Baptist were evidently the south of
Palestine, and people flocked from all parts to the spot
where, on the banks of the Jordan, he baptized thou-
 sands unto repentance. Such, indeed, was the fame
which he had gained, that "people were in expectation,
and all men mused in their hearts of John, whether he
might be the Christ" (Luke iii, 16). John might without doubt have assumed to himself the
higher office, and risen to great worldly power; but he
was faithful to his trust, and never failed to declare, in
the fullest and clearest manner, that he was not the
Christ, but merely his forerunner, and that the sole work
he had to do was to usher in the day-spring from on
high. (See Beecher, "Life of Jesus, vol. i, ch.v.)
The more than prophetic fame of the Baptist reached
the ears of Jesus in his Nazarene dwelling, far distant
from the locality of John (Matt. ii, 9, 11). The nature
of the report—namely, that his divinely-predetermined fore-
runner was not any man of the common people, but the
one who had been preparing the way for many months
in Judea, that he was the "Lamb of God." The people
baptized by John must have been a very select body,
for the time had now come for his being made manifec-
to Israel. The mission of the baptist—an extraordinary
one for an extraordinary purpose—was not limited to
those who had openly forsaken the covenant of God,
and so frequently its principles it was confined to the
whole people alike. This does not matter from the
point of view of those who had no confession to make, and no sins to wash
away. Jesus himself came from Galilee to Jordan to
be baptized of John, on the special ground that it be-
came him "to fulfill all righteousness," and, as man, to
submit to the same ordination as all other men which he chos-
ing upon the rest of the Jewish people. John, however,
naturally at first shrink from offering the symbols of-purity
to the sinless Son of God. Immediately on the
termination of this symbolical act, a divine attestation
was given from the opened vault of heaven, declaring
Jesus to be in truth the long looked-for Messiah—"this
is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased" (Matt.
iii, 17). The events which are found recorded in John
i, 19 sq. seem to have happened after the baptism of
Jesus by John. See JESUS CHRIST.

Here a difficult question arises—How is John's ac-
knowledge, as he was the forerunner at the moment of his presenting
himself for baptism compatible with his subsequent as-
sertion that he knew him not save by the descent of the
Holy Spirit upon him, which took place after his bap-
tism? It is difficult to imagine that the two counsels
did not personally recognize each other, from their close
relationship, and the confession which John could not have
failed to receive of the remarkable circumstances attend-
ing Jesus' birth; hence his general deference at that
time, but his explicit testimony subsequently (see Kui-
nol, Alford, "Comment, on Matt. iii, 14). The supposition
that John was not personally acquainted with Jesus is therefore out of the question (see Lütcke, "Comment,
on John i, 31). Yet it must be borne in mind that their
places of residence were at the two extremities of the
country, with but little means of communication be-
tween them. Perhaps, too, John's special destination
and mode of life must have kept him from knowing his
fellow-countrymen at Jerusalem. It is possi-
bly, therefore, that the Saviour and the Baptist had
not oft met. It was certainly of the utmost impor-
tance that there should be no suspicion of concert or
collusion between them. John, however, must assured-
ly have been in daily expectation of Christ's manifesta-
tion to Israel, and so a word or sign would have sufficed
to reveal to him the person and presence of our Lord,
though we may well suppose such a fact to be made
known by a direct communication from God, as in the
case of Simon (Luke ii, 26; comp. Jackson's "Greek
Works," Oxf. ed. vi, 404). At all events, it is wholly im-
conceivable that John should have been permitted to

baptize the Son of God without being enabled to distinguish him from any of the ordinary multitude. Upon the whole, the true meaning of the words καύξω ὄν ἄνωθεν αὐτὸν would seem to be as follows: And I, even I, though standing in so near a relation to him, both person and office, minimally, had no authority to proclaim him as such till I saw the predicted sign in the descent of the Holy Spirit upon him. It must be borne in mind that John had no means of knowing by previous announcement whether this wonder of the divine Son would be vouchsafed to his forerunner at his baptism or at any other time (see Dr. Mill's Hist. Character of St. Luke's Gospel, and the authorities quoted by him). See Baptism of Jesus.

With the baptism of Jesus John's more especial office ceased. The king had come to his kingdom. The function of the herald was discharged. It was this that John had with singular humility and self-renunciation announced beforehand: "He must increase, but I must decrease." It seems but natural to think, therefore, when their historical relative position is taken into account, that John would forthwith lay down his office of harbinger, which, now that the Sun of Righteousness himself had appeared, was entirely fulfilled and terminated. Such a step he does not appear to have taken. From incidental notices we learn that John and his disciples, as long as he lived, had no official position, but that Lord entered upon his ministry (see John iii, 23; iv, 1). We gather also that John instructed his disciples in certain moral and religious duties, as fasting (Matt. ix, 14; Luke v, 38) and prayer (Luke xi, 1). In short, the language of Scripture seems to imply that the Baptist Church continued side by side with the Messianic (Matt. xi, 3; Luke vii, 19; John xiv, 25), and remained long after John's execution (Acts xix, 3). Indeed, a sect which bears the name of "John's disciples" exists to the present day in the East, whose sacred books are said to be preserved by a Gnostic leave. (See Gnosis, in the Altheim, Litereutung, 1817, No. 48, p. 878, and in the Hall. Encyclop., prothetape, p. 95 sq.; Buckhardt, Les Nazoréens apéliés Zabiane et Christiens de St. Jean, tr. Gnosique, Strasbourg, 1840; also Blarkey, in the Hall. Hymn. iv, 355 sq.; Schaff, Ap. Hist, p. 279 sq.). See also John vii, 14, 18. The sovereign, pious, but spirit was like to the spirit of Jesus. The sect, they do not. Still, though it has been generally assumed that John did not lay down his office, we are not satisfied that the New Testament established this sect. John may have ceased to execute his own peculiar work as the forerunner, but may justly have continued to bear his most important testimony to the Messiahship of Christ; or he may even have altogether given up the duties of active life some time, at least, before his death; and yet his disciples, both before and after that event, may have maintained their individuality as a religious communion. Nor will the student of the New Testament and of ecclesiastical history, who knows how grossly a teacher far greater than John was, both during his life and after his crucifixion, misunderstood and misrepresented, think it impossible that some misconception or some sinister motive may have had weight in preventing the Baptist Church from dissolving and passing into that of Christ. (See Weber, J. d. Täufers und die Parteien seiner Zeit to, Gotha, 1878). It was, not improbably, with a view to remove some misunderstanding, that John addressed his disciples to Jesus which is recorded in Matt. xi, 3; Luke vii, 19. The spiritual course which the teachings of Jesus were more and more taking, and the apparent failure, or at least uneasy postponement of the promised kingdom in the popular sense, especially after their execution, his imprisonment and prison, and the imminent danger of losing his life, may well have led John's disciples to doubt if Jesus were in truth the expected Messiah; but no intimation is found in the record that John required evidence to give him satisfaction. (See below) Be that as it may, it is certain that John still continued to present himself to his countrymen in the capacity of witness for Jesus. Especially did he bear testimony to him before Herod Antipas (for John the brother of Bethabara, is the reading of the best MSS.). So confidently, indeed, did he point out the Lamb of God, on whom he had seen the Spirit alighting like a dove, that two of his own disciples, Andrew, and probably John, being converted by his testimony, followed Jesus as the true Messiah.

8. But shortly after he had given his testimony to the Messiah, John's public ministry was brought to a close. He had, at the beginning of it, condemned the hypocrisy and worldliness of the Pharisees and Sadducees, and was thereupon cast into prison. Josephus, however, assigns a somewhat different cause for Herod's action, and the story of John's imprisonment and death is told in the Gospels: "Now some of the Jews thought that the destruction of Herod's army came from God, and that very justly, as a punishment of what he did against John that was called the Baptist; for Herod slew him, although he was a good man, and commanded the Jews to exercise righteousness and piety towards God, and so to come to baptism. Now when others came in crowds about him—for they were greatly moved by hearing his words—Herod, who feared lest the great influence John had over the people might put it into his power and inclination to raise a rebellion (for they seemed ready to do anything he should advise), thought it best, by putting him to death, to prevent any mischief he might cause, and not bring himself into difficulties by sparing a man who might make him repent of it when it should be too late. Accordingly he sent an occasion of but a trivial and insipid counsel of the Herod's—of Machærus, the castle I before mentioned, and was there put to death" (Matt. xxi, 32). There is no contradiction between this account and that which is given in the New Testament. (See Lamy, Dis. de vicesis Joa. Bapī.; Van Till, De Joa. Bapī, resurrectionibus, tab. x, etc.) Both may be true: John was condemned in the mind of Herod on political grounds, as endangering his position, and executed on private and ostensible grounds, in order to gratify a malicious but powerful woman. The scriptural reason was but the pretext for carrying into effect an ancient, and then a prevalent, policy of Herod. The fear of Herod was not without some ground may be seen in the popularity which John had gained (Mark xi, 92; see Lardner, Works, vi, 488).

The castle of Machærus, where John was imprisoned and beheaded, was a fortress lying on the southern extremity of Persia, at the head of the Lake Asphaltites, between the dominions of Herod and Aretas, king of Arabia Petrea, and at the time of our history appears to have belonged to the former (Lardner, vi, 488). It was here that the above-mentioned reports reached him of the execution of John the Baptist. This revelation was a proof to John of his mission and the confirmation of what he expected to hear as to the establishment of the Messiah's kingdom. But if Christ's kingdom were indeed established, it was the duty of John's own disciples, no less than of all others, to acknowledge him as their own master, and be slow to transfer their allegiance to another. With a view, therefore, to overcome their scruples, John sent two of them to Jesus himself to ask the question, "Art thou he that should come?" They were answered not by words, but by a series of signs wrought in the nature of a peculiar foretelling, which prophecy had specified as the distinguishing credentials of the Messiah (Isa. xxxv, 5; 1st i, 1), and while Jesus
bade the two messengers carry back to John as his only answer the report of what they had seen and heard, he took occasion to guard the multitude who surrounded him against supposing that the Baptist himself was shaken in mind, by a direct appeal to their own knowledge of his life and character. He would not be appealed to as witnesses that the stern prophet of the wilderness was no waverer, biding every breeze, like the reeds on the banks of Jordan. Proof abundant had they that John was no worldling, with a heart set upon rich clothing and dainty fare—the luxuries of a king's court—and of his mission. He was ready to acknowledge that one so innured to a life of hardship and privation was not likely to be affected by the ordinary terrors of a prison. But our Lord not only vindicates his forerunner from any suspicion of inconstancy, he goes on to proclaim him a prophet, and more than a prophet; nay, inferior to none born of woman, though in respect to spiritual privileges behind the least of those who were to be born of the Spirit and admitted into the fellowship of Christ's body (Matt. xii, 11). It should be noted that the expression οὐδὲ ἡμῖν ἡμεῖς ἦμεν, τ. ὁ, λ. is understood by Chrysostom, Augustine, Hilary, and some modern commentators, and his grace and gentleness of spirit is held up in this connection. This interpretation is less agreeable to the spirit and tone of our Lord's discourse. Jesus further proceeds to declare that John was, according to the true meaning of the prophecy, the Elijah of the new covenant, foretold by Malachi (iii, 1, 2).

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

4. Thus was John added to that glorious army of martyrs who have suffered for righteousness' sake. His death seems to have occurred just before the Passover, in the course of the Lord's ministry, A.D. 28. Herod undoubtedly looked upon him as some extraordinary person, for no sooner did he hear of the miracles of Jesus than, though Sadadus himself, and, as such, a unbeliever in the resurrection, he ascribed them to John, whom he supposed to have risen from the dead. See HEROD ANTIPAS. Holy Scripture tells us that the body of the Baptist was laid in the tomb by his disciples, and ecclesiastical history records the honors which succeeding ages have paid it. A Pilgrim is mentioned in the Koran, with much honor, under the name of Jaḥja (see Hottinger, Historia Orientalis, p. 144–149, Tifṣur, 1609; Herbelot, Biblioth. Or. ii, 288 sq.).

The brief history of John's life is marked throughout with the characteristic graces of self-denial, humility, and holy courage. So great, indeed, was his influence that worldly men considered him possessed. "John came neither eating nor drinking, and they said he hath a devil." His humility was such that he had again and again to disavow the character and decline the honors which an admiring multitude almost forced upon him. To their questions he answered plainly he was not the Christ. Indeed, he refused to be thinking, nor one of their old prophets. He was not on a voice merely—the voice of God calling his people to repentance in preparation for the coming of him whose shoe-latchet he was not worthy to unloose. For his boldness in speaking truth, he went a willing victim to prison and to death.

Resembling, though John did, in so many things the Elijah of former days, the exit of the one from his field of labor was remarkable for its humiliating circumstances, as the other for its singular glory—the one dying as a felon by the hand of the executioner; the other, without tasting at all of death, ascending to heaven in a chariot of fire. But in John's case it could not be otherwise; the forerunner, no more than the disciple, could be above his Master; and especially in the treatment of the one must the followers of Jesus be prepared for what was going to be accomplished in the other. After John's death, and growing number of special acts and discourses were directed to this end by our Lord. The manner of John's death, therefore, is no account to be regarded as throwing a depreciatory reflection on his position and ministry. He himself testifies: "I am not worthy to untie the latch of John's shoe." (John xiv, 85), and he fulfilled his arduous course in a truly noble and valiant spirit—Fairbairn.

5. For the literature connected with this subject, see, besides the treatises noticed above, Hase, Leb Jesu (4th ed. Leipzig, 1854), p. 82, 86, 149; Volbeding, Index Programmatum, p. 29, 125, 132; Wach, Das Leben des Johannes, iii, 402; Wissi, Exzer. de Jeanne Baptist. (in his Miscell. Sacrae, ii, 567); Leopold, Johannem der Tauffer (Hannov. 1825); Usteri, Nachrichten von Johannes dem Tauffer (in the Studien und Kritiken, 1823, iii, 439); Von Rohden, Johannes der Tauffer (Lubeck, 1808); No nander, L. (Hamb. 1857), p. 49; Keim, L. Jesu, i, 469–529; Hausrath, Leb Jesu, p. 316–340. The ecclesiastical traditions touching John may be found in the Acta Synod. iv, 687–846; and, in a compendious form, in Tillemont, Memoires, i, 82–108, 482–505. Other treatises of a more special character, in addition to those above cited, are: Holzmann, Johann, 2. Bd., 1853, 1. Bd. in Teubner's Archiv für die altkrist. Lit. (Traj. a. R. 1729) p. 143 sq.; Deiting, Observations sacres, iii, 251 sq.; Ammon, Pr. de doctrina et morte Jo. Bapt. (Erlangen, 1809); Bau, De jo. Bapt. in rem Christi, stultitia (Friaul, 1785), ii, 4; Aberg, Orig. de Jo. Bapt. (Heidelberg, 1753), 1. Bd. (Stuttgart, 1821); Stein, Ueber. Grec. Lehr. u. Schicksale Joh. d. T. (in Keil's Analect. iv, i, 37 sq.); Wessener, Johannes der Vordiirfer un. Herrn (Constantia, 1821); Muller, Pr. de Jo. Bapt. (Helmst. 1738); Asp. Obs. phil. hist. de Jo. Bapt. (Upsala, 1738); Lisco, Elid. et Asia. Eritr. uber j. d. Tauffer (Berlin, 1826); Eckhardt, Josaphates de Jo. Bapt. testim. (Eisen, 1785); Hartenberg, De cibo Jo. Bapt. (in Oriae. Gent. sacr., Traj. a. R. 1740, p. 1 sq.); Amnele, Amicitia et victus J. Bapt. (Upsala, 1755); Stollberg, ed. (Vitenber, 1763); Carpoz, De culto Jo. B. Antiquat. Chr. (Rome, 1756); Huth, Nunc. Jo. B. Maria et discip. Chr. (Erlangen, 1757); Lock, Illust. de Jo. Bapt. in Jo. Bapt. et Johannis Message zu sein Gott. (London, 1778); Zeigerman, Comm. de consil. quod Jo. discip. ad Jesum obligaverit (Nuremberg, 1821); Frank, Joh. d. Tauffer (Eisleben, 1841); Kromayer, De baptismo Christi (Lips. 1680).

John Ἐξοδησία (ἀπόδοσις), a presbyter of Ἱππα (Πηπα) (probably in Cilicia, mentioned in the second list of apostles—Acts xvi, 6, ἡ ἐξοδησία) by Phoebus called him (Cod. 55) a Nestorian, but Fabricius, with reason, supposes that he was a Eucharian. When he flourished is not known; he may perhaps be consigned to the latter half of the 5th century. Vonstus places him under Zeno the Isaurian, but Carp/s (Chinkas he was later). He is the reputed author of (1) Ἐκκλησιαστικὴ ἱστογγ (Historia Ecclesiastica), in ten
books, of which Photius had read five, containing the history of the Church from the deposition of Nestorius at the Council of Ephesus (the third general council, A. D. 431) to the deposition of Petrus Fullo (A.D. 477), who had usurped the see of Antioch in the reign of the emperor Justinian. It is said that the Council of Chalcedon is the point at which the ecclesiastical history of Socrates leaves off, it is probable that the history of John of Ephes is commenced, like that of Evagrius, at that point, and consequently that these five books were the first five of his history. He describes his style as periphrastic and florid, and says that he was a great admirer of Diodorus of Alexandria, the successor of Cyril, and extolled the Synod of Ephesus (A.D. 449), generally branded with the epithet ἡ λαρξίων, "the synod of robbers," while he attacked the Council of Chalcedon. How late a period the history came down to cannot be determined:—(2) A work which Photius describes as Κατὰ τὴν ἁγίας τιτάρων συνόδου (Adamantius Quartam Sanctam Synodem). This must be Photius's description, not the original title of the work; for, opposed as we infer John to have been to the authority of the Council of Chalcedon, he would hardly have described it as "the fourth sacred council," Photius commends the style in which the work was written. Fabricius identifies John of Ephesus with the Joannes  ὁ ἐπὶ Μεσοποταμίας, i.e. "the dissenter," cited by the anonymous writer of the Διαγραφής τῶν νυν ποιουντων (Δομινικ φημομμένων Council), and which was printed by Comenius (in his Origenis C. Pollicinaria Maxima, p. 24, 83), but Comenius himself (ibid. p. 59) identifies this John with John Malalas. Whether John of Ephesus is the John  ὁ Πυργω, "the rhetorician," cited by Evagrius Scholasticus (Hist. Eccl. i, 16; ii, 12; iii, 10, etc.) is doubtful. Le Quien (Opera S. Ioannis Damasceni, i, 568, note) identifies them, but Fabricius thinks they were different persons. See Photius, Bibl. Cod. 41, 55; Fabricius, Bibl. Gr. vii, 419; Cave, Hist. Lit. i, 456, ed. Oxford, 1740-43; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography, ii, 585.

John AGRICOLA. See AGRICOLA.

John ALASCO. See ALASCO.

John of ALEXANDRIA. See John NICTIOTA; JOHN TALATA.

John ALEXANDRINUS. See JOHN THE LABORIOUS.

John the ALMSGIVER (JOHANNES ELEKROMOSYNARUS), one of the best of the patriarchs of the Eastern Church, was born of noble parentage at Amathous, in Cyprus, about 550. He had married young, but, losing his wife, he distributed his possessions among the poor. He had devoted himself to a life of ascetic practice. So irreproachable was his conduct, and so great his reputation for piety and charity, that, on the murder of Theodore, he was unanimously demanded as successor in the patriarchate. He was appointed by the emperor in A.D. 606. The first years of his reign were quiet; not so the last years, which were marked by the successful invasions of Chosroes II, king of the Persians, during the reign of Phocas, into the Roman possessions of the Orient (compare Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Rom. Empire, ch. xlv). From all parts of Syria Christians fled to Alexandria to find a protector in John, and when Phocas died Jerusalem also had fallen (A.D. 610), not content with feeding and clothing the refugees he found right at his own door, he sent large sums of money to the Holy City to redeem Christian captives and prevent further massacre. (The statement that at this fall of Jerusalem "50,000 Christians were massacred, and the chief principally by the Jews, who purchased them from the Persians on purpose to put them to death" [Neale], has no better basis than the inventions of prejudiced monastics, bent on the destruction of the Jews. Comp. Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, v, 34 sq., 458 sq.). In 620, when the Persians threatened Egypt also, he fled to his native island, and died there a short time after his arrival. He is commemorated in the Oriental Church November 11, and in the Latin January 23. Curiously enough, he is also commemorated by the Jacobites. It is from this John that the famous order of the Hospitallers, in its first instance, derived its name. Gardiner, bishop of Winchester, ascribed to him the authorship of the celebrated Epistola ad Cassianum, with which the most of the modern Catholic critics credit Chrysostom. Three biographical accounts were written of him:—(1) by Joannes Moschus and Sophronius (no longer extant); (2) by Leontius, bishop of Neapolis, in Cyprus (translated, between 538 and 676, into Latin by Anastasia and Basilia, printed); for the text of the Acta Sanctorum of the Bollandists (Jan. 23, ii, 496); (3) by Simeon Metaphrastes (but not trustworthy). See Neale, Hist. East. Ch. (Alexandria), ii, 52 sq.; Wetzer, Weltk., II. Welte, Kirchen-Lexikon, v, 718 sq.; Fabricius, Biblioth. Graec., i, 609; note xx; viii, 322; x, 262. (J. H. W.)

John of Antioch (1), a much more true representative of the Eastern Church, distinguished for the part he took in the controversy between Cyril and Nestorius, flourished in the first half of the 5th century, and succeeded Theodotos in the patriarchate of Antioch about A.D. 427. Favorably disposed towards Nestorius, who is said to have been a schoolmate of St. Ephrem, near Antioch, he was forced to take decided ground against Cyril by the impolite conduct of the latter at the Council of Ephesus (q. v.). Among the Eastern bishops who came with John of Antioch to attend the council, he was the acknowledged leader: he need not have given them all in favor of Nestorius, when, on arriving at Ephesus, they learned that the sessions had not only commenced, but that Nestorius had already been actually condemned without their sanction. As long as Irenaeus (q. v.) and Candidus succeeded in making a show of it, the emperor Theodosius, John proved faithful to his course taken at Ephesus; but when he found the Cyril- This is a digitized copy of a page from a book. For a PDF of the entire work, click on "View Full Text".
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John of Antioch (2), surmamed Codonatus, the successor of Petrus Galoepus, or Fullo (the Fuller), after his deposition, in the patriarchate of Antioch, A.D. 447, John had previously been bishop of Apamea; but, after the deposition of John, the same Anius procured his elevation to the bishopric of Tyre. Theophanes incorrectly ascribes this appointment to Calendyn of Antioch. See Theophanes, Chronog. p. 110, etc., ed. Paris (p. 88, etc., ed. Venice: p. 199, etc., ed. Bumm); Valerius, Not. ad Georgii H. E. iii, 15, and Observationes, Ecclesiast. ad Georgium, ii, 8—Smith, Dict. Greek and Roman Biog. ii, 586.

John of Antioch (3), surmamed Scholastiscus, an eminent Greek legislist, flourished in the 6th century. He entered the Church, and became patriarch of Constantinople (564-578). He compiled a collection of ecclesiastical laws, which greatly surpassed in extent and method that which preceded it, and which has retained the basis of canon law in the Greek Church. Another of his works, entitled Nomocanon, was an attempt to harmonize Justinian's constitutions relating to the Church with the older rules. Both works were for many centuries held in high estimation, and were inserted in Voell and Justel's Bibli. juris canonicae veteris (Paris, 1691), ii, 603-789. See Fabricius, Bibl. Graec. xi, 100; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Gr. xxvi, 530, (J. N. P.)

John Archiaphe (Αρχιαπή), an Egyptian schismatic of some note, was a contemporary of Athanasius. He was a devoted follower of Mulletius, who, just before his death, which occurred shortly after his condemnation by the Council of Nice (A.D. 325), made John the Melitian bishop of Memphis, and intrusted to him also the leadership of the Melitians as a body. John, supported by the Arians, renewed the attacks against the orthodox party, and the schism soon became as violent as ever. Athanasius, now patriarch of Alexandria, and leader of the orthodox party, was the great object of attack; and John and his followers sought to throw on him the odium of originating the disturbances, and of persecuting his opponents; and, especially, they charged him with the murder of Anesius, a Melitian bishop, whom they had secured in order to give color to the charge against Athanasius. In the name of the emperor, Constantine the Great, charging John and his successors with unsoundness in the faith, with a desire to alter the decrees of the Nicene Council, and with raising tumults and insulting the orthodox; he also objected to them as being irregularly ordained. He refuted their charges, especially the charge of murder, ascertaining that Anesius was alive, and obliged them to remain quiet. John professed to repent of his disorderly proceedings, and to reconcile to Athanasius, and returned with his party to the communion of the orthodox Church; Mulletius was reconciled but not silenced, or lasting; troubles broke out again, and a fresh separation took place. John, and his followers either being ejected from communion by the Athanasian party, or their return opposed. The Council of Tyre (A.D. 383), in which the opponents of Athanasius were triumphant, ordered John, and his followers to renounce allegiance to the emperor, and conciliated Athanasius taken down and published by Donatus Acciaiuoli, who is mentioned as a pupil of Arguropolu.—4. Commentarii in Aristotelis Metaphysicam, published with Bessarian's version of that work (Paris, 1515, fol.). The other original works of Arguropoli are scattered in MSS. through the libraries of Europe (of which a list is given by von Guerard, u. a. in Wuertter.) He also translated the Proclusi Philosopher, and the Homilies of Basil in Hebraic. His version of Porphyry was printed with his translations of Aristotle at Venice in 1496, and that of Basil at Rome in 1515. See Grynaeus, Biblioth. Græca, i, 373, 496, xvi, 450, etc. Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Engr. ii, 587.
John, abbot of St. Arnoul of Metz, is first mentioned in 969, when he succeeded Anstée in that office. He was reputed to be a learned and very liberal man for the times. He granted a charter of freedom to the inhabitants of Maurville, formerly serfs of the abbey, and of Audincourt. He returned among them for the abbey the right of levying certain taxes. He died about 977. John wrote a Life of St. Godtolide (Mabilion, Acta Sanctorum, vol. ii, col. 1087) and the Life of St. John de Vendré, abbot of Gorolle (Bollandii, vol. iii, Feb.). See Gallia Christ. vol. xiii, col. 986; Hist. Lit. de l'Art. 1911, p. 231; Hoefer, Nouveau Bléog. Général, xxvi, 530. (J. N. P.)

John of Avila (Juan de Avila), the apostle of Andalusia for the 16th century, was born at Almodovar del Campo, a small city of the province of Toledo, about the year 1500. His father intended him for the profession of law, but, after a short stay at the University of Salamanca, he returned home, and spent three years in strict asceticism. Then, after extended studies in philosophy and theology under Domingo de Soto, he commenced preaching with great success. His popularity excited envy, and he was imprisoned for a very short time by the Inquisition. After preaching for nine years in Andalusia, he visited Cordova, Granada, Baeza, Montilla, etc., where his sermons—chiefly in honor of the Virgin Mary—proved a great success. The highest ecclesiastical offices were now offered him; pope Paul III contemplated even creating him cardinal, but John preferred to continue the work of the great missionary. With a view to the early religious education of the people and to elevate their moral standing permanently, he established schools at Seville, Ubeda, Baeza, Granada, Cordova, and Montilla. His health failed him, however, and he remained for twenty years sick at the latter place, which accounts for his not accompanying the archbishop of Granada to the Council of Trent. Here he composed his Epistolario spirituale (2 vols., 4to), which has been translated into several languages. He died May 10, 1569. His Life has been written by Luis de Granada (see Obras del V. P. M. Luis de Granada, Madrid, 1819; Luis Munoz, Vida del V. Vener. el Maestro Juan de Avila; Antonio de Casamayor, Teatro Histórico de la Doctrina Española). See Fr. J. Schirmer, Werke des Juan de Avila (Sermones de sanctissimo sacramento; de la incarncación del Hijo de Dios; del Espíritu Santo; las faltas de los santísimos vírgenes; Muere el Rey Regensburg, 1856.—Hersoug, Real-Encykelopædi, vi, 737.

John Baptist, a French missionary priest in the latter part of the 18th and the beginning of the 19th century. The son of the emperor of Cochín China, Gya-Long, having come to France with the bishop of Adran in 1787, concluded a treaty with king Louis XVI, by which the latter was to aid him in regaining his throne, which he had lost by a revolution. Events prevented Louis from keeping his promise, but Gya-Long, having regained his kingdom, called to his court the bishop of Adran, who became his prime minister, and John Baptist, who was general vicar to the bishop. He also acted several laws favoring Roman Catholicism. The bishop of Adran died in 1817, and Gya-Long himself in 1819. His successor being opposed to Christianity, John Baptist left Hai-Foo, the capital of the empire of Annam, where he had resided, travelled through the East, and in 1827 settled in the convent of St. Francis at Macao, where he died July 9, 1847. He is said to have left a collection of interesting documents on China and the other countries he visited. See Le Constitutionnel, Oct. 17, 1847.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxvi, 567. (J. N. P.)

John of Bassora is the name of a prelate of the Eastern Church, who was connected at Bassora, the ancient Bostra, from A.D. 617-650, after whom one of the liturgies of the Oriental Church is named. He was formerly supposed to be the author of it, but Neale thinks it of later date, and supposes it had its origin in the northern parts of Arabia. See Neale, Hist. of East Church, Introd. p. 528 (6).

John Bersarion. See Bersarion.

John of Beverley. See Beverly.

John of Bohemia. See Bohemia.

John of Bruges. See John, David; Anabaptists.

John Buridanus, a celebrated Nominalist of the 14th century, was born at Bethune, in Artois. He is reputed to have been a pupil of Occam, then to have lectured with great ability and success in Paris, and to have risen to the distinction of rector of the University of the city of Paris, and to have been a great professor only after the Realists had gained the ascendancy [see Realism and Nominalism], and to have assisted in the founding of the university at Vienna. He was looked upon by his contemporaries as one of the most powerful adversaries of Realism, and distinguished himself also by his rules for finding the middle term in logic, a species of contrivance denominated by some the Ars de Bride, as well as by his inquiries concerning free-will, wherein he approached the principles of Determinism, maintaining that we necessarily prefer the greater of two goods. As for the celebrated illustration which he gave of an ass dying for hunger between two bundles of hay, it is not to be found in his writings, which are, Questions in X lib. Ethicorum Aristotelis (Paris, 1483, fol.; Oxford, 1637, 4to)—Question in Polit. Arist. (Paris, 1500, fol.)—Compendium Logicae (Ven. 1495, fol.; Summulae de Dialectic (Paris, 1467, fol.; etc. Complete editions of his works were published at Paris in 1500, 1516, and 1518. See Bayle, Histor. Dict. art. Buridanus; Tessennam, Greek of Phil. vii, 2914 sq.; Man. Philos. (transl. by Morell), p. 246.

John of Capistran. See Capistran.

John the Cappadocian, patriarch of Constantinople (he was the second patriarch of the name of John, Chrysostom being John I) from A.D. 517 or 518, was, before his election to the patriarchate, a presbyter and syncclius of Constantinople. Originally he sided with the opponents of the Council of Chalcedon, but he had either too little firmness or too little principle to follow out stoutly the inclination of his own mind, for he appears to have been in a great degree the tool of others. On the death of Anastasius, and the accession of the emperor Justin I, the orthodox party among the inhabitants of Constantinople raised a tumult, and compelled John to anathematize Severus of Antichion, and to insert in the formulas of the fathers of the Council of Chalcedon, and restore to them those of the patriarchs Euphemius and Macedonius. These disputations were two tables of ecclesiastical dignitaries, one containing those who were living, and the other those who had died in the peace and communion of the Church, so that insertion was a palpable declaration of orthodoxy, and erasure of heresy or schism. These measures, extorted in the first instance by popular violence, were afterwards sanctioned by a synod of forty bishops. In A.D. 519, John, at the expressed desire of Justin, sought a reconciliation with the Western Church, from which, under Anastasius, the Eastern name of the patriarchs of Antioch was transferred to the orthodox Church. See HORMISDAS. In this he failed. John died about the beginning or middle of the year 520, as appears by a letter of Hormisdas to his successor Epiphanius. John wrote several letters or other papers, a few of which are still extant. Two short letters to John, patriarch of Jerusalem, and one to Epiphanius, bishop of Tyre, are printed in Greek, with a Latin version, in the Concilia, among the documents relating to the Council of Constantinople in
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A.D. 586 (v. col. 185, ed. Labbe; viii, 1065-67, ed. Mansi). Four relations, or Libelli, are extant only in a Latin version among the Epistles of Pope Hormisdas (in the Concilia, iv, 1472, 1496, 1491, 1521, edit. Labbe; viii, 346, 451, 457, 488, ed. Mansi). It is remarkable that in the two short Greek letters addressed to Eastern princes, regarding the duty owed by the Christian churches to the See of St. Andrew, or to the See of Rome, or to the See of the Great Church (Ecclesiae præsidius), or to the See of Constantinople, and which are extant only in the Latin version, the title does not appear; and circumstances are not wanting to lead to the suspicion that its presence in the Greek epistles is owing to the mistake of some scribe, who has confounded this John the Cappadocian with John the Faster. It is certainly remarkable that the title, if assumed, should have incurred no rebuke from the jealousy of the popes, not to speak of the other patriarchs equal in dignity to John; or that, if once assumed, it should have been dropped again, which it must have been, since the employment of it by John the Faster (v. c.), many years after, was violently opposed by Pope Gregory I as an unauthorized assumption. We may conjecture, perhaps, that it was assumed by the patriarchs of Constantinople without opposition from their fellow-prelates in the East during the schism of the Eastern and Western churches, and quietly dropped on the termination of the schism, that it might not prove a source of embarrassment to the fulfillment of the church's mission.


John Chrysostom. See Chrysostom.

John of CITRUS (now Ktiro or Ktros), in Macedon, the ancient Pydna, was bishop of that see about A.D. 1290. He is the author of Αγιορειτικά τοῦ Καυσταντίου Ἀρχιεπισκοποῦ Διάφωτος τοῦ Κεφαλάτων (Response ad Constantium Cephalatan, Archiepiscopum Pyrrhacii), of which sixteen answers, with the questions prefixed, are given with a Latin version in the Jus Greecoromanorum of Leclercius (Frankf. 1596, folio), v. 323. A larger portion of the Response is given in the Synopsis Juris Iuris of Thomas Diplotavicus (Diplostatio). Several MSS. of the Response contain twenty-four answers, others thirty-two; and Nicholas Comnenus Papadopoli, citing the work in his Prognosis Mytylogikes, speaks of a hundred. In one MS. at Leiden, the title does not appear; and the name of Philalethes, Allatius, in his De Consensu, and Contra Hortogorvetum, quotes De Constantius et Dogmatibus Latinarum as the production of John of Citrus. See Fabricius, Bibl. Græca, xi, 341, 590; Cave, Hist. Lit. ii, 279; Smith, Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography, ii, 503.

John Cilicus. See John the Scholar. 2. See Reformata (in Germany).

John of Constantineople. See John the Deacon; John the Faster.

John (I, patriarch) of Constantinople. See Chrysostom.

John (II, patriarch) of Constantinople. See John the Cappadocian.

John (III, patriarch) of Constantinople. See John the Scholar (I).

John (VI, patriarch) of Constantinople was ap- pointed by Pope, Philippicus Bardanes, A.D. 712, for his Monothelite opinions and his rejection of the authority of the sixth oecumenical (third Constantinopolitan) council. Cyrus, the predecessor of John, was deposed to make way for him, according to Cave. John was excommunicated by the Nestorian council, apparently, of the deposition of his patron Philippicus, and the elevation of Artemius or Anastasius II. The

John of Cornwall was an eminent theologian of the 12th century whom both England and France claim as their own. Little is known of his life. He appears to have studied at Paris under Peter Lombard and Robert of Melun, and to have died towards the close of the 12th century. Great uncertainty also prevails respecting his writings; still he is generally considered as the author of a work entitled Elogium (publ. by Martène, Anecdotæ, v, col. 1637). It is a special treatise on the human nature of Christ, refuting the subtle distinctions of Gilbert de la Porre and other scholastic theologians, who maintained that Christ, quod homines, could not be considered as a mere person, adiectum or accident. In other words, his humanity was but a contingent or accidental form of his nature. This doctrine had already been condemned by pope Alexander III in the Council of Tours (1163). Casimir Oudin considers him also as the author of Libellus de Censio mystici idiomatis, contained in the works of Hugo of St. Victor, vol. ii, etc. See Cas. Oudin, De Scripto Eccles.; Hist. Lit. de la France, vol. xiv.—Hoefer, Nouv. Bioogr. Gén. xxxi, 548.

John of Crema, a cardinal who flourished in the first half of the 12th century, is celebrated for his exertions in behalf of the cause of pope Calixtus II against his adversary Burdin, and especially for his activity in the English Church, whither he was sent by pope Honorius II, in 1126, to enforce the laws of celibacy on the English clergy. How successful he was in this mission may be best judged from the sudden termination of his stay on the English continent. Not only did the English clergy violently oppose the cardinal's efforts, but he was even entangled in a snare that must have considerably annoyed the eminent Roman Catholic ecclesiast. Says Lea (Hist. Sacr.ord. Celib. p. 293; compare Inett, Hist. Eng. Ch. ii, chap. viii), the cardinal, "after fiercely denouncing the concubines of priests, and expatiating on the duties of a priest on the bier, that the body should be made by one who had just left the side of a harlot, he was that very night surprised in the company of a courtesan, though he had on the same day celebrated mass." Although instrumental, after his return to Rome, in the election of pope Innocent II (1198), the latter afterwards forsook him, and John for a time espoused the cause of the rival pope, Anacletus, returning, of course, again to obedience to Innocent II as soon as he had learned that by such an act only he could advance his own interests. The time of his death is not known to us.

John, the Deacon and orator (Διάκονος τοῦ Ρουμ) of Constantinople, was a deacon of the great church (St. Sophia) in that city about the end of the 9th century. He wrote λόγος εἰς τὸν βιον ἐν ἐνίγμας ποιούς ἡμῶν Ἡσομ, τοῦ ἐννομάζοντος (Vita S. Josephi Pyriformis), published in the Acta Sanctorum (April 3), vol. i, a Latin version being given in the body of the work, vol. ii, appendix. Other works are: De Vitris (ibid., p. 266, etc.), and the original in the Appendix, p. xxxvi. Allatius (De Pellis, c. xxx) cites another work of this writer, entitled Τις ὁ σκοτών τῷ διὸ τῆς πρότροσι τοῦ ἀνθρώπου πλάτων, κ. τ. τ. (Quid est Consilium Dei in primis hominum). A work De Consensu is common to several medieval writers, as John Galenus or Pedemus; John Hypatius.
John, deacon of Rome; and John Diamocan, a contemporary and correspondent of George of Trebizond. See Acta Sanctorum, l. c.; Fabricius, Biblica Graecae, x. 204; xi, 654; Cave, Hist. Lit. ii, Dissertatio i, 11; Oudin, De Scripturis et Scriptis Ecclesiae, ii, 355.—Smith, Dict. Grec. and Roman Bibliog., ii, 594.

John of Chressy. See John the Monk.

John Cyriaristia (Κυριαριστια), surnamed the One, an ecclesiastical writer, lived in the latter half of the 13th century, not in the 15th, as erroneously stated by Lalbe in his Chronologia Brevis Ecclesiasticae Scripturarum. Cyriaristia was an opponent of Gregory Palamas (q. v.) and his followers (the believers in the light of Mount Tabor), and most of whose works (as late as 1898) were written (1829) had reference to that controversy. They compose a series of five treatises, but only the first and fourth books of the first treatise of the series, Palaearistius Transgressio Libri iv, have been published. They appeared, with a Latin version, in the Aurelian Novellam of Combes, ii, 68-105, and the Latin version was given in the Bibliotheca Patrum, xxi, 476, etc. (ed. Lyons, 1677). Cyriaristia wrote also "Εκθέσεις στουκανδρίων ρημάτων θεολογικών (Expositio Materiae lorum que de Dea a Thelosia dicuntur). The work is divided into one hundred chapters, which are subdivided in ten decades or portions, each chapter containing, from which arrangement the work is sometimes referred to by the simple title of Decades. A Latin version of it by Francisca Turriana was published at Rome in 1851, 404, and was reprinted in the Bibliotheca Patrum, xxxi, 577, etc.—Combes, Aurelian Novellam, ii, 105; Fabriacius, Bibl. Gr. xi, 507; Cave, Hist. Lit., vol. ii, Appendix by Gery and Wharton, p. 65; Oudin, De Scriptor et Scriptis Ecclesiastici, iii, 1062; Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Bibliog., ii, 594.

John of Damascus (Johannes Damascenus, των ἀνδρὸς Δαμασκηνοῖς) (1), one of the early ecclesiastical writers, and the author of the standard text-book of dogmatic theology in the Greek Church, was born at Damascus about the year 676. His oratorical talents caused him to be surnamed Chyrrnnothos (golden stream) by his friends (the Arabs called him Munur). Little is known of his life except that he belonged to a high family, was ordained priest, and entered the convent of St. Sabina, where he passed the rest of his life in the midst of literary labors and theological studies. The other details found concerning him in his biography by John, patriarch of Jerusalem, are considered untrustworthy. According to this writer, John Damascenus's father was a Christian, and governor of the province of Damascus by the hands of the Saracens, and John was ably educated by an Italian monk. Under Leo the Isaurian and Constantine Capronius he zealously defended image worship both by his pen and tongue, and even went to Constantinople on that account. A legendary story relates that Leo, who was then a decided iconoclast, forged a treasonable letter from John to himself, which he contrived to pass into the hands of the caliph, who sentenced John to have his right hand cut off, when the severed hand was restored to the arm by a miracle. About that time, however, John withdrew from the convent of St. Sabina, near Jerusalem, where he passed the remainder of his life in ascetic practices and study. He died between 754 and 787. In the former year we find his last public act, a protest against the Iconoclastic Synod at Constantinople, and in the latter the Ecumenical Council of Nic, in which he took part. The Greek Church commemorates him on November 29 and December 4, and the Roman Catholic Church on May 6. Church writers agree in considering John Damascenus as superior to all his contemporaries in philosophy and erudition; yet his works, though justifying his reputation, are deficient in criticism. The most important literary achievement of Damascenus is the Πηγὴ γνώσεως (Source of Knowledge), comprising the following three works: (1) Κρόαμα Φιλοσοφία, or Didascalia, which treats almost exclusively of logical and ontological categories, based mainly on Aristotle and Porphyry.—(2) Περί συμμετηκός στην Συμφωνία, De heresibus, containing in 108 articles a chronological synopsis of the heresies in the Church; it differs from other works on the errors of pagans and Jews (the first eighty are really the work of Epiphanius; the remainder partly treat of the heresies from the time of Epiphanius to that of the image controversies, according to Theodoretus, Sophronius, Leontius of Byzantium, and others). This work is a most precise history and analysis of heresies, and its contents are not mere or partly fictitious. The third and most important work, to which the former two were really simply the introduction, is entitled "Εκθέσεις ανεφάλως της Πρωτοκλησίας, Doctrinae of the Orthodox Church, collected from the principal writers of the 4th century, especially Gregory of Nyssa, Athanasius, Basil the Great, (Gregory of Nyssa, Chrysostom, Epiphanius, Cyril, Nemesius, and others. The whole work is divided into 100 sections or four books (the latter is probably a later arrangement), and treats of the following subjects: (a) Doctrinae seniores, or the possibility of knowing them. Though John teaches that it is neither impossible to know God, nor possible to know him all; that his essence is neither expressible nor entirely inexpressible, he nevertheless inclines to the transcendent character of the idea of God, and insists on the necessity of human thought in its conception, and referring man, in the end, as Apopagiosis does, to the records of divinely revealed truth. It may be considered as a characteristic feature of his theology that it principally dwells on God's metaphysical attributes, hardly touching the ethical question. (b) The Trinity, to which he gives great prominence. He not only repeats the doctrines of the Greek Church, as well as the arguments of the Greek fathers, but resumes a scientific construction of the dogma within the established creed, though admitting that there are certain bounds to the inquiry, which human reason cannot cross. (c) Creation, Angels, and Demons. On these he simply collects the doctrines of his predecessors, chasing with a somewhat lengthy exposition of his views on heaven, heavenly bodies, light, fire, winds, water, earth, also chiefly based on the authority of the fathers. Some singular opinions of his own he attempts to support by scriptural passages. (d) Man, his creation and nature. His theory is that God created man for the participation of the divine in his person, and as such he has a share in the divine in his person, and as such he has a share in the divine. Whenever he ventures upon the latter he fluctuates between Peripateticism, tending to Trinitism, and Platonism, leading almost imperceptibly to Saebullianism and Modalism. (e) Creation, Angels, and Demons.
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John is now generally regarded as one of the oldest men of the Greek Church in the 8th century; but he by no means, on that account, deserves to be honored with the title of "philosopher." He was not an independent inquirer, but, like all able and diligent compiler and expounder of what others had thought, and the Church received. "He was," as an American ecclesiastic has well put it, "in design, method, and spirit, the precursor of the scholastic theologians. They, indeed, lived in another quarter of the globe from Symeon and in Peter of Lombardy, the first great scholastic theologian of the Latin Church. But no one who has compared the orthodox faith of the one with the sentences of the other can well doubt that some of the early translations of the former were employed in the composition of the latter. It cannot, probably, be far from the truth to say that, while Augustine is the father of the scholastic theology as to the matter of it, the learned Greek of Damascus was the father of it as to its form."

John of Damascus is generally considered as the restorer of the practice of chanting in the Greek Church, and he is also named as the author of a number of hymns yet in use in that Church. It is by no means proved, however, that he was the inventor of musical notation, as some have affirmed. Copies of a Mss. treatise on Church music, of which he is considered the author, are to be found in several European (public) libraries: it was published by abbe Gerbert in the 2d vol. of his treatise De Conto et Musica Sacra. It was translated into French by Villoteau in his memoire Sur l'Etat actuel de l'Art musical en Egypte (in Description de l'Egypte, xiv, 580 sq.). See Jean de Jerusalem, Vie de Jean Damascene (St. Jean de Jerusalem Surtis, 1558); Hübner, Lenzström, De fidél. orthod. autore J. Damasceno (Upsal, 1883); Fabricius, Biblioth. Graec., i, 682-744; Cave, Hist. Lit., i, 482 (Lond. ed. 1688); Cellier, Histoire gén. des auteurs sacrés, xvii, 110 sq.; Schröck, Kirchen- gesch. xx, 450; Christian Rev. vii, 694 sq.; Hagenbach, Doctrines (see Index); Félix, Bieg, des Musiciens.

JOHN OF DAMASCUS (2). See JOHN OF JERUSALEM (5).

John, Jacobite bishop of Dara (a city in Mesopotamia, near Nisibis) in the first half of the 9th century (not in the 6th or 7th, as says Cave in his Hist. Lit., i, 131, nor in the 4th, as is maintained by Abraham Chechelis, nor in the 8th, as it is said by Asseman in his Bibliotheca Orientalis, ii, 118; see also ii, 219 and 347). He was a contemporary of Dionysius of Telmahar, who dedicated his chronicle to him, as he states in his Preface: "Nos Côngelorum, "I am occasioned to fly to the writings of Dionysius of Mytilene, who was also the author of the work of Gregory of Nyssa, whose writings he also used otherwise (Asseman, iii, 22); and also an Anaphora (according to theCatalogue Sarcopoum, by Schulting, pt. iii, p. 106, No. 29)."—Herglotz, Real-Encyk., vi, 746. (J. N. P.)
JOHN DE DIEU (JOHANNES A DEO), saint, founder of the order of charity, was born at Monte-Mor-el-Novo, Portugal, March 8, 1495. An unknown priest stole him from his father, a poor man called Andrea Ciudad, and afterwards abandoned him at Oropesa, in Castile. After roaming about many years, he was led to dedicate himself to the care of the sick, and changed his family name for de Dieu (a Deo), by permission of the bishop of Tui. In 1540 he opened the first house of his order at Seville, and died March 8, 1550, without leaving any set rules for his disciples. In 1572 Pope Pius V subjected them to the rule of St. Augustine, adding a vow to devote themselves to the care of the sick, and sundry other regulations. See CHARITY, BROTHERS OF. John de Dieu was canonized by pope Alexander VIII, October 16, 1690. He is commemorated on the 8th of March. See Castro et Girard de Ville-Thierré, Vies de St. Jean de Dieu; Ballot, Vies des Saints, March 8; Helliot, Histoire des Ordres de Bienfaisance, vol. iv, ch. xxviii; Hoevel, Nouv. Bieg. Générale, xxvi, 442 sq.

JOHN DUNST SCOTUS. See DUNS SCOTUS.

JOHN OF EGYPT (JOANNEIS AEGYPTIUS), a Christian martyr who suffered in Palestine in the Diocletian persecution, is spoken of by Eusebius, who knew him personally, as the most illustrious of the sufferers in Palestine, and especially worthy of admiration for his philosophic (i.e., ascetic) life and conversation, and for the wonderful strength of his memory. After the loss of his eyesight he acted as anagnostor, or reader in the church, supplying the want of sight by his extraordinary power of memory. He could recite correctly whole books of Scripture, whether from the Prophets, the Gospels, or the apostolic Epistles. In the seventh year of the persecution, A.D. 310, he was treated variously with great cruelty; one foot was burned off, and fire was applied to his sightless eyeballs for the mere purpose of torture. As he was unable to undergo the toil of the mines or the public works, he and several others (among whom was a religious lady), who were under sentence of banishment, and had disabled from labor, were confined in a place by themselves. In the eighth year of the persecution, A.D. 311, the whole party, thirty-nine in number, were decapitated in one day by order of Maximin Daia, who then governed the eastern provinces. See Eusebius, De Martyribus, 4; Hist. Eccl. c. 13; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biog. ii, 585.

JOHN ELIZENSTAYRI. See JOHN THE ALMGIVER.

John (surnamed Lackland) king of England, and youngest son of Henry II, was born at Oxford Dec. 24, 1166. After the conquest of Ireland, his father, in accordance with a bull from the pope authorizing Henry II to invest any one of the bishops of Ireland, appointed him to the government of that country in 1178, and he removed thither in 1185; but he failed so utterly in the task that he was recalled in a few months. He had always been the favorite of his father, and was allowed to stand by his side as leader of the Irish party in the controversy with Thomas a Becket, and his removal after the archbishop's death, contributed no little to the sudden death of Henry II. Upon his brother Richard's succession he obtained a very favorable position in the English realm; indeed, so many enfeoffments were conferred on him that he was virtually sovereign of nearly one third of the kingdom. But this by no means satisfied John, by nature base, cowardly, and covetous. During the absence of his brother on a crusade, he sought even to obtain for himself the crown, but failed signally, as having only a very untenable pretension to it, and while greatly increasing the affection of the English people for Richard. Upon the death of the latter, John, by express wish of Richard on his death-bed, ascended the long-coveted throne (May 26, 1199). The accusation that John avoided the claims of Arthur, the son of his elder brother Geoffrey, by imprisoning him and privately putting him out of the way, are questions which belong to secular historians. It remains for us to state here only that king Philip Augustus of France, who had espoused John's cause in opposition to Richard, now espoused that of Arthur, and joined John in a war in which the latter was severely the loser, France regaining by 1204 the provinces that had been wrested from her. Far more serious were the results of another contest into which he was drawn, in 1205, by the death of the archbishop of Canterbury, and which formed a most important chapter in the history of investiture. Insisting upon the royal right of investiture, John first waged war against his own clergy, until finally Innocent III also took up the gauntlet, and thus drew upon himself not only the formidable hostility of the whole body of the national clergy, but also of one of the ablest and most enterprising of the popes of history, his chief opponent. The question at issue was, of course, the election of a successor to the lately vacated archbishopric. It had hitherto been the custom of the clergy to defer the election to any vacancies in their ranks until the king had favorably disposed himself with a congre d'elire. But some of the justiciars of the monks or canons of Christ Church, Canterbury, who possessed the right of voting in the choice of their archbishop, had proceeded to the election without such a grant from the royal chair, and chosen Reginald, their sub-prior, as successor, and installed him in the archiepiscopal throne before day-light. Having enjoined upon him the strictest secrity, they sent him immediately to Rome to secure the pontiff's confirmation of their act. The foolish Reginald, however, disclosed the secret, and it came to the ears of the king and the suffragan bishops of Canterbury. He at the same time procured the consent of the pope for him to proceed to a new election, and suggested John de Gray, bishop of Norwich, for the honorable position, who was accordingly installed, likewise against the wish of the suffragan bishops. These appeals to Rome, however, and any one of his successors, did not, as is too often the case, do likewise. This afforded Innocent III, ever on the alert to make his imperial power felt, a valuable opportunity to place forever at his own disposal one of the most important dignities in the Christian Church. According to the doctrine of the invalidity of Reginald's election, none of John's successors could have proceeded to Rome without the sanction of the sovereign pontiff, and that therefore the choice of the bishop of Norwich
also was illegal, and put forth as the candidate for the
priency cardinal Langton, an Englishman by birth, but
an energy quite uncommon to him suppressed all re-
bellious outbursts in his own domains. Innocent, finding
his "ecclesiastical artillery" to be inefficient against
England's king, entered into league with Philip Au-
grusus, and took the latter to prepare a new invasion of
England. This undertaking soon brought John to ter-
ms, and in 1213 (May 13) he at last consented to sub-
mit to all the demands of the Holy See, of which the
admission of the pope's nominee, Stephen de Langton,
to the archbishopric of Canterbury (May 24), he
even yielded much more than could have consistent-
ly been asked of him by the Roman see, and perpetra-
ted an act of disgraceful cowardice, which has heaped
everlasting infamy on his memory. Two days after, he
made over to the pope the kingdoms of England and
Ireland, to be held by him and by the Roman Church
in fee, and took to his holiness the ordinary oath taken
by vassals to their lords (see Reichel, The Roman See
in the Middle Ages, p. 251 sq.). It is not to be wondered
at that the Roman see now readily conceded to the
demand of John that hereafter there should be an oblivion
of the pact on both sides, and that the full of existen-
tial communication should be revoked by the pope, while, in return,
John was obliged to pledge that of his disaffected Eng-
lish subjects those who were in confinement should be liberated, and those
who had fled or been banished bey-
ond seas should be permitted to return home. Philip,
whereupon to France, and the larger
agreement of pope and king, persisted in his invasion
scheme, though no longer approved by Rome; but
the French fleet was totally defeated in the harbor of Dam-
me, 300 of their vessels were captured and above 100
destroyed. Subsequent events, however, proved
profitable to France, and the later
agreement and concert at home against John. At length the English barons, tired
of their tyrannical ruler, after vainly petitioning for more
liberal concessions, assembled at Stamford to wage
war themselves against him, and marched directly on London,
where they were hailed with great joy by the citizens.
The king, fearing for his throne, now gladly consented
to a conference. They met the king at Runnymead,
and, as a result of this meeting, they obtained, on June
15th, 1215, the Great Charter (Magna Charta), the basis
of the English Constitution. The pope, who had con-
stantly opposed the English in their revolution, now
annulled the charter, and the war broke out again.
The barons now called over the dauphin of France to be their leader, and Louis landed
at Sandwich on May 20th, 1216. In attempting to cross
the Wash, John lost his regalia and treasures, was taken ill,
and, being brought to the Syrian MSS. 1039, 1041, and 1042, of the
49th year of his age. "All English historians paint the
character of John in the darkest colors; and the history
of his reign seems to prove that to his full share of the
ferocity of his line he conjointed an unsteadiness and
volatility, a susceptibility of being suddenly depressed
by evil fortune, and exalted beyond the bounds of moder-
ation and prudence by his opposite, which gave a little-
less to his character not belonging to that of any of his
royal ancestors. He is charged, in addition, with a sav-
cage cruelty of disposition, and with the most unbounded
licentiousness, while, on the other hand, so many vices
are not allowed to have been relieved by a single good
quality" (Engl. Cyclopedia, a. v.). Of course this may
all be due to the fact that John has had no historian,
that his cause expired with himself, and that every
writer of his story has told it in the spirit of the oppo-
site and victorious party; and, further, that the intense
disgust always felt by every class of his countrymen at
his base surrender of his kingdom in vassalage to the
pope may have led them to regard with less distress all
adverse reports respecting his general character. See
Milman, Lat. Christ. v. ch. v.; Hallam, Middle Ages; Lin-
gard, Hist. of England, ii, ch. ii; Hume, Hist. of Engl. in
ch. xi; Gaseler, Ch. Hist, iii, § 54; Neander, Ch. Hist.
ii, 235 sq.; Innes, Engl. Ch. ii, ch, xix sq.; Riddle,
Vuphay, ii, 212 sq. (J. H. W.)

John, Monophysite (missionary) bishop of Ephes-
sus, generally called Epycopus Asia, as Ephesus is the
most important see of Asia Minor (see Assemiainen, Bibli.
Oriente. t. ii, Diss. de Monophysite, § ix, s. v. Asia), was
a native of Amid (9), Syria, and lived in the 6th century
(about 591). He was consecrated bishop in Constantinople,
and was highly esteemed at court, especially during the
regime of Justinian. The latter appointed him to inquire into
the state of the heathen, of whom there was yet a large
number in the empire, even in Constantinople, and to
secure their conversion. Quite successful in his efforts
at home, the emperor authorized John to take a mission-
ary tour through the whole empire, and we are told that
this time he converted 70,000 people, and founded 96
churches (comp. Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman
Empire, ch. xlvii). He seems not to have had any di-
rect spiritual jurisdiction over the metropolis of Asia
Minor, but to have been honored with the title simply
on account of his great success as a missionary, and we
are inclined to believe that in reality he was simply a
missionary bishop," for he is often styled "he who is
not over the heathen" (Syri. מנהיגים מברה), and also the
destroyer of idols" (Syri. מנהיגים מברה). How long
John remained a favorite with Justinian we do not
know, but have reason to suppose that his fate depend-
ed upon the successor of his Monophysite brethren.
In 626 (see assemiainen, Bibli. Orient. ii, 284) he
in his relations with the Roman
church, which befell the Monophysites at the instigation of John
of Stiriou. The period, circumstances, and place of his
death are uncertain. He is probably the John Rhetor
mentioned by Evagrius and Theodorus Lector, and
with whom the former in his works calls his relative.
Assemiainen (Bibl. Orient. ii, 84) opposes this
identity, but without good reasons. John wrote a his-
torical work, in three parts, in Syria, which is of great
importance for the Church history of the East. The
first part appears to be totally lost, and of the second
only a few fragments, quoted by Assemiainen, are preserved
to us. It is indeed the third part alone that has come
down to us, and that only in a somewhat mutilated
form. Dionysius of Telmahar, in his chronicle (from
Theodorus the younger to Justin II), used this part
freely; and Assemiainen obtained his passages (Biblioth.
Oriente. i, 215, 269, 360, 362, 367, 370, 312, 328, 329)
from this source and from Bar-Hebræus
were the only sources through which the work of John
was known to us until the third part of it (somewhat in-
complete) was discovered by William Cureton among
the MSS. of the Monastery of the Saints Peter and Paul
of the Egyptian monks of the eleventh century, the
49th year of his age. "All English historians paint the
character of John in the darkest colors; and the history
of his reign seems to prove that to his full share of the
ferocity of his line he conjointed an unsteadiness and
volatility, a susceptibility of being suddenly depressed
by evil fortune, and exalted beyond the bounds of moder-
ation and prudence by his opposite, which gave a little-

nected to the sixth year of the reign of Justinian II, nephew of Justinian, and consequently to the year 571. The first part forms six chapters, of which we have only the second and fifth in full; the others are all more or less incomplete (see Bernstein, Zeitsch. der d. Morgen. Gesellschaft, viii, 307).

It continues the history to the third year after the death of Justinus II (581) (see bk. vi, ch. xxv, p. 402), and mentions even later dates down to 588. We find in it accounts of many facts of ecclesiastical history not to be discovered in other sources. It is the more important from the fact that the author, though a portion of the Monophysite doctrine, and occasionally somewhat over-creedal, was a contemporary, and often an eyewitness of the facts he relates. Cureton promised an English translation of the work, but to our knowledge it has not yet appeared. The German scholar Schonfelder (Die Kirchengeschichte des Johannes von Ephesus. Aus dem Syrischen übersetzt. Mit einer Abhandlung i. d. Trühen [Münch. 1802, 8vo]) has, however, furnished a German translation, of which those who do not read the Oriental languages can avail themselves in their studies of the Eastern Church. In 1860 a young Dutch scholar published a treatise on John, Bishop of Ephesus, the first Syriac Church historian (for the full title, see below), in which he discussed the general relations of Syriac literature, and the productions of the Syriac Church historians in particular, the person and historical character of John, his relation to the Gospel of John, the development of Church history, and the contents of his work. Since then, Dr. Land has continued his studies of the Syriac writers, and in vol. ii of his Anecdotae Syriacae (also under the special title Jornana, Episopii Monophyti Scripta Historica [Leyd. 1868, 8vo]), he has published all the inedited works of John of Ephesus. See Herzog, Real-Encyklop. vi, 747; Kittto, Jour. Soc. Lit. xvi, 209 sq. (J. H. W.)

John of Euchaita (Euchaios or Euchania) (a city afterwards called Theodoropolis) was a bishop of Euchaita (Ὑπηρεσία στὴν Εὐχαία), and lived in the time of the emperor Constantine and Monomachus (A.D. 1042-1054), but nothing further is known of him. He is mentioned in the Menaion (Μηναίον), i.e. "Blackfoot.

He wrote a number of imitative poems, sermons, and letters. A volume of his poems was published by Matthew Bust (Eton, 1610, 4to). They were probably written on occasion of the Church festivals, as they are commemorative of the incidents of the life of Christ or the Church, or of the feasts, or ritual services, composed by him, and containing three canons or hymns, is given by Nicolaus Rayeus in his dissertation De Acolouthia Officii Canonic, prefixed to the Acta Sanctorum, June, vol. ii. John wrote also, Vita S. Dorothis Junioris, given in the Acta Sanctorum, June, I, 605, etc. Various sermons for the Church festivals, and other works of his, are extant in MS. See Fabricius, Biblioth. Orient. viii, 809, 627, etc.; x, 221, 226; xi, 79; Cave, Hist. Liter. ii, 139; Oudin, De Scriptoribus et Scriptis Eclesi, ii, 606; Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Bish. ii, 985.

John of Falkenberg, surnamed Jacobia de Saxonia, or Doctor de Prateniensis, a German Dominican, is celebrated for the zeal with which he defended pope Gregory XII in the Council of Constance. He also endeavored to defend the regiudical opinions of John Peti, but he failed in both instances. He next, at the request of the Knights of the Cross, wrote a libel against Wladislas Jagello, king of Poland, for which he was declared a heretic and condemned to imprisonment for life at Rome. Pope Martin V, however, commuted it a few years after, and John, encouraged, now demanded of the Knights of Paul of Rusoro, grand master of the Knights of the Cross, the price of the libel he had written. The latter offering him but a small amount, John of Falkenberg insisted that he was aggrieved, and condemned to be drowned. He escaped, however, repaired to the convent of Kämpen, and wrote against the order.


John the Faster (Johannes Jejunator or Nau- trites), of humble extraction, became patriarch of Constantinople in 582. He was distinguished for his piety, benevolence, strong asceticism, and fasting. He was the first who assumed the title of "ecclesiastical patriarch," and thereby involved himself in disputes with the bishops of Rome, Pelagius II and Gregory I, the opening of a struggle which resulted finally, in the 11th century (1054), in a complete rupture of the churches of Rome and Constantinople. (See the article Græcia, in Diet. de la lang. chrét. et de l'art, i, 17.) John died Sept. 2, 595. The Greek Church counts him among its saints. He is reputed the author of "Akolouthia kai tais tis "Ekoloupoliwmata"; λόγω πρῶτον τὴν μελίαν ἐκφυάσας τοῦ ἀγνωριστο- νον νόον, which belongs to the earliest penitential works of the Greek Church (pub. by Morinus, Compend. hist. de administratione sacramentorum, Paris, 1561, Vol. 179, etc.). See Oudin, De Scr. Ecles., i, 1473 sq.; Fabri- cius, Bibl. Graec. x, 164 sq.; Le Quien, Oriens Chris- tian., i, 216 sq.; Schröckh, Kirchengesch. xvii, 56 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop. vii, 748; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex., iii, 113.

John (called also Josselin), abbot of Fécamp. France, was born in the neighborhood of Vauxen. His family name Labbe supposed to have been Israel or D'Albe. He came to France with William, abbot of St. Bénigne of Dijon, and studied under that learned man. He practiced medicine with success; but William going to Fécamp to reform the abbey, and install there a col- lege of Benedictines, John accompanied him, was made prior, and finally succeeded William as abbot. He re- formed several convents, and by his firm adherence to discipline embodied himself with many prelates, sus- tained, however, in every instance by the pope. In 1054 he was sent to England, where he was welcomed by king Edward, but, having subsequently undertaken a journey to the Holy Land, he was made prisoner by the Mohammedans, and is said to have only returned to France in 1076. He died Feb. 2, 1079. He wrote a book of prayers, the preface of which is to be found in Mabillon, Anecdot. i, 133, and three chapters in the Meditations S. Augustini. He is also considered as the author of a treatise, De Divina Contemplatione, pub. in 1359, under the title of Confessio Theologica, and attrib- uted to John Cassian. See Gallia Christ. xi, col. 208: Hist. Lit. de la France, viii, 48; Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Générale, ii, 122 sq.

John Frederick, elector of Saxony. See SAXONY.


John of Gischala, son of Levi, named after his native place [see Gischala], was one of the most cele- brated leaders of the unfortunate Jews of Galilee in their final struggle with the Romans, A.D. 66-67. Of his personal history we know scarcely anything. The only writer to whom we can go for information—Josephus—is prejudiced, because John of Gischala proved the most formidable rival of the renowned Jewish historian. He is on that account depicted by Josephus in a very disparaging manner. His deeds, however, indicate to every fair-minded person that he belonged to that class of men who, for the defense of their country, readily ig- nore all other duties. We are furthermore encouraged to accept his statement (Gesch. der Juden, iii, 386) has drawn of John, when we remember that the virtuous and learned Simon ben-Gia- maliel was a devoted and life-long friend of our hero. (By this it must, however, by no means he inferred that we are ready to accept Gratia's views on the character of John of Gischala, as we refer rather to Josephus, as Josephus.) Though nature Josephus's superior, more particularly in the art of warfare, he readily submitted
John the Grammarian. See John the Laborious.

John Hyrcanus. See Hyrcanus.

John the Italian (Ioannes Italus) (1), a monk of the 10th century. He was at first canon at Rome, patronized by the Emperor Leo V., and afterwards by Odon, who led him to France, and he entered a convent there. Some say that he afterwards returned to Italy, and became prior of a Roman convent, while others say that he became abbot of some French Cistercian convent, and that he died in France after 945. Our information regarding his personal history is derived only from his biography in the Life of St. Odon (in Mabillon, Acta Sanctorum, vii., 152). He published extracts of St. Gregory's Moralia. See Hist. Litt. de la France, vi., 265; Ceillier, Hist. des Auteurs Sucrets, xii., 825.

John the Italian (Italus, Italeus, 2), a Greek philosopher and heretic who flourished in the time of Alexius I. Comnenus (1081-1118), escaped to Italy after the revolt of Maniaces against Constantine, and there prosecuted his preparatory studies. He finally returned again to Constantinople, and became a disciple of Michael Psellus the younger. His learning and ability attracted general attention, and the emperor Michael Ducas (1071-1178), finding himself in need of a man acquainted with the Italian provinces to influence them to a return to the Byzantine empire, selected John Italus for this purpose, and dispatched him to Dyrachium. He, however, proved unfaithful to the trust, and, in his intrigues humbugging some public, was banished from Rome to avoid persecution. He was subsequently allowed to return to Constantinople, and there entered the monastery of Pega. When Psellus was banished in 1077, John was made first professor of philosophy (Πατήρ τῶν φιλόσοφων), and filled this prominent post most acceptably, with logic and Aristotle's philosophy than with the other branches of science, and was but little versed in grammar and rhetoric. He was very passionate and hasty in argument, and sometimes even resorted to bodily violence, but he was, fortunately, prompt in acknowledging his errors. He expounded to his pupils Proclus, Plato, Jamblichus, Porphyry, and Aristotle, but often in a manner quite inconsistent with the position of Christian orthodoxy. Alexius, soon after ascending the throne, caused Italus's doctrines to be examined, and summoned him before an ecclesiastical court. The defense of the patriarch Eustadius, John Italus was obliged publicly to recant and anathematize eleven historical opinions advanced in his lectures. Among other things, he was accused of "ridiculing image-worship." Continuing, however, to teach the same doctrines, he was anathematized by the Church, and, fearing persecution, he forsook the rostrum. It is said that in later years he publicly renounced his errors. His principal works (all in MSS.) are, Έκκλησία τῆς ἁγίας Σαββάτου; Εκκλησία τῆς τοιαύτης; Περὶ ἐξουσίων; Μισίων ἐπισκοπῶν λεγείσης κατὰ σύνους; some discourses, etc. See Anna Comnenus, Alexius, v. 8, 9; Fabriicius, Bibli. Graec., iii., 213-217; vi., 131; xi., 646-659; Cave, Hist. Lit., ii., 154; Oudin, Comment. de Scriptronibus et Script. Ecclesie, ii., col. 760; Lambert, Commentar. de Biblioth. Cesarei, iii., col. 411, edit. Kollari; Le Beau, Hist. du Bas-Empire, ixxi., 19; Hoefnagel, Notitie d. Manuscripten, vol. x., Roma, Notiz. R. Acc. 4. 557.

John the Faster. See John the Faster.

John of Jerusalem (1), originally a monk, was bishop of Jerusalem (A.D. 386) when not much more than thirty years of age (Jerome, Epist. lxxxi., 8). Some speak of him as patriarch, but Jerusalem was not elevated to the dignity of a patriarchate until the following century. He was a man of great apostolical and monastic energy (Jerome, Lib. contra Joam. c. 10), but he was generally celebrated for eloquence, talent, and learning. He was acquainted, at least in some degree, with the Hebrew and Syriac languages, but it is doubt-
ful if he was acquainted with Latin. He is said to have been at one period an Arian, or to have sided with the Arians when they were in the ascendant under the emperor Valens (Jerome, Lib. contra Joan. c. 4, 8). For eight years after his apostasy, his bishopric he was on friendly terms with St. Jerome, who was then living a monastic life in Bethlehem or its neighborhood; but towards the close of that period strife was stirred up by Epiphanius of Constantia (or Salamis), in Cyprus, who came to Palestine to ascertain the truth of a report which had reached him, that the notorious sentiments of Origen were gaining ground under the patronage of John. Epiphanius's violence against all that had even the appearance of Origenism led him into a controversy with John also. See EPIPHANIUS. Whether John really cherished opinions at variance with the orthodoxy of that time, or only pretended to, towards those who held them a forbearance which was looked upon with suspicion, we do not know; but he became again involved in squabbles with the supporters of orthodox views. He was charged by them with favoring Pelagius, who was then in Asia, and who was accused of heresy in the councils of Jerusalem and Diocletian (A.D. 415), but was in the latter council acquitted of the charge, and restored to the communion of the Church. See PELAGIUS. In the controversies waged against Chrysostom, John of Jerusalem always sided decidedly with the Apologists. Eusebius, in his Church History, wrote, according to Gennadius (De Viris Illustribus 30), Adversus Oblectatores Sui Studii Liber, in which he showed that he rather admired the ability than followed the opinions of Origen. Fabricius and Cellier think, and with apparent reason, that this work, which is lost, was the apologetic letter to which he addressed the above-mentioned Theophilus, patriarch of Alexandria, which resulted in a reconciliation between John and Jerome. No other work of John is noticed by the ancients; but in the 17th century two huge volumes appeared, entitled Ioannis Nepoto Suri Episcopi, Episcopi xii, Opera omnia quae hactenus incolati, reperti sunt, collectae, eaque Autori et Authoritati tribuit Vitellius Libri libris asserta per A. P. Petrum Wustelium (Brussels, 1643, fol.). The Vidicici occupied the second volume.

The works professed to be translated from the Greek, and are as follows: (1) Liber de Institutione primum Monachorum, in Lege Veteri exzortur et in Nova persecutionum, ad Cupramiam Monarchum. Interpretatione Aquitico Patriarcha Antiocchena. This work is mentioned by Trithemius (apud Fabricius, Bibli. Gr. x, 520) as "Volumen insignis de principio et profecta ordoi Carmelitici," and is ascribed to him by a letter to a later John of Jerusalem (in the 8th century). It is contained in several editions of the Biblotheca Patrum, in which work, indeed, it seems to have been first published (vol. ix, Par. 1589, fol.), and in the works of Thomas a Jane, the Carmelita (i. 416, etc., Cologne, 1684, folio). It is generally admitted to be the production of a Latin writer, and of much later date than our John. -- (2) In stratummatia Beati Iohannis Libri iii, a commentary on the first three chapters of the book of Job, often printed in Latin among the works of Origen, but supposed to belong neither to him. -- (3) In Sophoclemmum, an imperfect commentary on the Gospel of Matthew, usually printed, under the title of Opus imperfectum in Matthaeum, among the works of Chrysostom, in the Latin or Graeco-Latin editions of that father, but supposed to be the work of some Anian or Anomarian about the end of the 8th century. One of the works of the 7th century: Fragmenta Ex Commentario ad Prima Capita vii et vii. Marcii, cited by Thomas Aquinas (Catena Aurea at Evang.), as a work of Chrysostom. -- (5) Fragmenta Ex Commentario in Lukum, extant under the name of Chrysostom, partly in editions of his works, partly in the Latin version of a Greek Catena in Lucas published by Cordemius (Antiv. 1628, folio), and partly in the Catena Aurea of Thomas Aquinas. -- (6) Homiliae Liiii, almost all of them among those published in the works of Chrysostom. There is no good reason for ascribing any of these works to John; nor are they, in fact, ascribed to him except by the Carmelites. See Fabricius, Bibli. Gr. ix, 299; x, 525, etc.; Cave, Hist. Lit. i, 281, etc.; Dupin, Nour. Bibliothèque des Actes Ecclésiastiques, iii, 87, ed. Par. 1600; Smith, Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography, ii, 596.

John of Jerusalem (2). A synodical letter of John, who was a patriarch of Jerusalem early in the 6th century, and his suffragan bishops assembled in a council at Jerusalem A.D. 517 or 518, to John of Constantinople [John of Capadocia], is given in the Concilia (vol. v, 187, etc., ed. Labbe; viii, 1067, ed. Mansi).

John of Jerusalem (3) [or of Damascus?]. There is no work relating to the persons mentioned, it is very near the name of John of Jerusalem, but it is doubtful how far they may be ascribed to the same author, hence we add him here simply under a separate heading. They are, 1. Ioannes uelvastator Martyrum Ἰουσαφελοῦ, Οικονομήματα τοῦ Ἱεροσόλυμων μοναχοῦ Διονυσίου, or Joannis Hierosolymitani renervenditii Monachi Narratio, a very brief account of the origin of the Iconoclastic movement, published by Combes under the title of the Scriptores Post Thokopalem (Par. 1685, fol.), and reprinted at Venice, A.D. 1729, as part of the series of Byzantine historians; it is also included in the Bonn edition of that series. It is also printed in the Bibliotheca Patrum (Par. 1724, fol.), vol. ii, 270: 2. Διάλογος προς τοὺς μισούντας πρὸς τὸν καιρόν και δοξολογοῦντα και πόδαν και ἣρμασάντα πρὸς τὰς ὑπηρεσίας τοῦ υἱοῦ τοῦ θεοῦ και τῆς ιεραπετρίας τῶν ἁγίων και δοξολογοῦντα ἤμεραν πιστώματος, or Discipatio inexcusa quod habet a de Sibedis et or. thodius, studiumque ac cæsarem orbis, seu Dionysios adversarius sibi adiutus doctrinae sacerdotum ortodoro- rumque patrium nostrorum, first published by Combes under the title of the Scriptores Post Thokopalem as the work of an anonymous writer, and contained in the Venetian, but not in the Bonn edition of the Bibliotheca Patrum (Par. 1724, fol.). It is also reprinted by Gallandius (ut supra), p. 352, and ascribed to John of Damascus or John of Jerusalem, some MSS, giving one name, and others giving the other. Gallandius considers that he is called Damascus from his birthplace. The author of this invective is to be distinguished from the greatly celebrated John of Damascus (q. v.), his contemporary, to whom, perhaps, the transcribers of the manuscripts, in prefixing the name Damascus, intended to ascribe the work: 3. Ioannes monachus et presbyteri prioris τοῦ δαμασκηνοῦ λόγου ἀναδικτικὸς περὶ τῶν ἅγιων και πολιτῶν ἐπιστημών, ἀπὸ τῶν και τῶν τοιουτῶν, πρὸς τοὺς ἀρχονταίς τοῦ Καπαλίου καὶ πρὸς πάντα ἀντικρι- στικῶν, or Joannis Damascusen Monachæ et Presbiteri Opera demonstrativa de sacris ac venerandis imaginibus, ad Christianos omnes, aduersaque Imperatorum Convivi- num Catalogum. The title is given in other MSS, "Ἐν Ευσταθίῳ Ιωάννου Ιεροσολυμίου Πραγματεύματα," etc. -- Epitola Joannis, or Hierosolymitani Archiepipei, etc. The work was first printed in the Acticri Nummum of Combes (Paris, 1648, folio), vol. ii, and was reprinted by Gallandius (ut supra), p. 356, etc. Fabricius is disposed to identify the authors of Nos. 1 and 3, and treats No. 2 as the work of another and unknown writer: but Gallandius, from internal evidence, endeavors to show that Nos. 2 and 3 are written by one person, but that No. 1 is by a different writer, and this seems to be the preferable opinion. He thinks there is also internal evidence of this. Nothing is written in the name of Damascus, and it was subsequently to No. 2. See Fabricius, Bibli. Gr. vii, 682; Gallandius, Bibli. Patrum, xiii, Prolegomena, ch. x, p. 15; Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Elog. ii, 596.

John of Jerusalem (4), patriarch of Jerusalem, who flourished probably in the latter half of the 10th century, was the author of a life of Joannes Damascenus, which is prefixed to his De vita et morte sive Hierosolymitana antiquus Pontificis Ioannis Hierosolymitani vita et morte scripta, &c. (Vita sancti Patrii nostri Joannis Damascenici & Ioannes Patriarcha Hierosolymitano conscripta). The
work is a translation from the Arabic, or at least founded upon an Arabic biography, and was written a considerable time after the death of John of Damascus (A.D. 756), and after the cessation of the Iconoclastic contest, which may be regarded as having terminated on the death of Theophanes (A.D. 842). We have no data for determining how long after these events the author lived. Le Quien identifies him with a John, patriarch of Jerusalem, who was burnt alive by the Saracens in the latter part of the reign (A.D. 963–9) of Nicephorus Phocas, upon suspicion that he had excited that emperor to attack them (Cedrenus, Concord. i. 661, edn. Paris, ii. 374, ed. Bonn). This life of John of Damascus was first published at Rome with the orations of Damascenus (De Sacris Imaginibus [1555, 8vo]; it was reprinted at Basel with all the works of John of Damascus A.D. 1576 in the Acta Sanctorum (May 6), vol. ii (the Latin version in the body of the work [p. 111, etc.], and the original in the Appendix [p. 725, etc.]); and in the edition of The Works of Damascenus by Le Quien, vol. i (Paris, 1712, folio). The Latin version is given (s. d. 6 Maii) in the Vita Sanctorum of Lippomanni, and the De Probatis Sanctorum Opera Posthuma, etc., part of the Opera Sacra, note at the beginning of the Vita S. John. Damasc. and Origenis Christianissim, iii, 466. Fabricius, Bibli. Graec. vii, 689, 699; x; 291: Cave, Hist. Lett. ii, 29; Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. i. 598.

John the Laboriosus (Joannes Philoponus, also known as Alexander and Grammaticus), an Eastern scholar of great renown, was born at Alexandria towards the close of the 6th century or the beginning of the 7th. Of his personal history but very little seems to be definitely known. He is said to have been present at the capture of the city by the Mohammedans (A.D. 639), and to have with great trepidation, when he learned the intention of the conqueror, fled to the monastery of the Monastery of the Presbyter, at which place he is said to have translated the writings of the Eastern Church, and to have died an exile, his death being recorded by the historian of the monastery. (Comp. the two lives of John of Damascus and of Damascenus in the Acta Sanctorum, May 6). The latter is attributed to the 8th century, and the former to the 11th century. (Vide his life in the Acta Sanctorum, May 6.)

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

John Maro. See Maronites.

John of Matha, St., founder of the Order of the Holy Trinity (also called Fathers of Mercy in Spain, and Mathurins in Paris), was born at Faucon, in Provence, in 1154, of noble parents. He studied at Paris University, and then entered the Church. "At his first celebration of divine service," the legend goes, "he beheld a vision of an angel clothed in white, having a cross of red and blue on his breast, with his hand, created over each other, resting on the heads of two slaves, who knelt on each side of him; and believing that in this vision the mind God spoke to him, and called him to the deliverance of prisoners and captives, he immediately sold all his goods and forsook the world, to prepare himself for his mission." In conjunction with Felix of Valois he arranged the constitutions of the new order, and together they went to Rome to obtain the approval of pope Innocent III. Felix having had, the legend continues, a similar dream, the pope gladly complied with their request, and the new order was approved and established by Pope Honorii III, of Châtillon, having given them the estate of Cerfroi, they there established their first convent. They also obtained several other convents and hospitals in France and Spain, and a convent and church at Rome. Having collected large sums of money, John dispatched two of his brothers to the deserts of Africa, whence they returned with 180 Christians redeemed from the Musulman's bonds. The year following John himself went to Tunis, preaching on his way all through Spain, and creating many friends for his noble undertaking; he returned with 110 captives. From another voyage he returned with 120 Christians. Hereafter he devoted himself to preaching at Rome. He died there Dec. 21,
1218, and was canonized by Innocent XI, July 30, 1679. He is commemorated on February 8. The dress of the order consists in a flowing white gown, with a red and blue cross on the breast. See P. Ignace Dilland, Vie de St. Jean de Brébeuf (2d ed.); Baillet, Vie des Saints, Feb. 8; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Grèce, xxvi, 460; and Mrs. Janens, Legends of Monastic Orders, p. 217 sqq.

John of Meda, St., founder, or rather reformer of the order of the Humiliati, was born at Meda, near Como, towards the close of the 11th century. He was a member of the Oldrati family of Milan. After ordination he withdrew to the solitude of Ransoneo, near Como, which he subsequently left to join the Humiliati, then a lay congregation. Chosen their superior, he subjected them to the rule of St. Benedict, only changing the appellations of brethren and monks into canons. He obliged them also to say the Virgin's mass every day, and composed a special breviary for their use, which was called canons' office. The Humiliati (q. v.) thus became a regular order, with clerical and lay members. John of Meda gained a large number of proselytes by his preaching, and was reputed very charitable. He died Sept. 26, 1159, and was canonized a few days after his death by Innocent II. See St. Amb., Hist. III, ii, § xv, ch. xxiii; Sylvestre Maurolyce, Mare Oceani di tutti i Relig. i Merici, Grand Dict. historique; Richard et Giraud, Biblioth. Sac.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxvi, 441.

John the Monk (Johannes Monachus), or John of Cassel, a Spanish Franciscan, was born at Cremes, vorthunie, in the 13th century. He was a Cistercian monk, and was created cardinal. He died in 1318. He wrote commentaries on the decretals of Boniface VIII and Benedict IX, and was the first who wrote on the whole Sexta of Boniface VIII. The same work was afterwards done by Guido da Bassano, and still better by Johannes Andreae. The glossaries of Johannes Monachus were annotated and published by Phil. Probus, doctor of the school of Bourges. His MSS., under the title Glossae in sextam decretalium, are preserved in the public library of Chartres. He is also considered by some as the author of the Deformator Juris, but this is not proved. See Savigny, Catalogue de la Bibl. de Chartres, iv, 274.—Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxvi, 559. (J. N. P.)

John of Monte Corvino, a celebrated early Roman missionary among the Mongols, belonged to the Franciscan order, and flourished towards the close of the 13th century. He was born in Monte Corvino, a small city in Apulia, and had, previous to his appointment as Eastern missionary, distinguished himself (in 1272) as ambassador of the emperor Michael Palæologus to pope Gregory X in behalf of a contemplated union of the Eastern and Western churches. He had travelled in the East, and, aware of the opening for Christianity among the Mongols, had urged the Roman see to dispatch missionaries to them; but their efforts proved unsuccessful, and in 1289 he finally, at the instance of pope Nicholas IV, set out for that distant field himself. Of an energetic character, discouraged by no reverses however great, and in trials however laborious, he finally succeeded in building up a Christian Church. As an instance of his undaunted courage may be cited the fact that he had to buy the children of natives in order to educate them in Christian doctrines, and through them to influence maturer minds. About 1295 he had some six thousand converts, and the prospect of still greater additions. In 1307 other laborers were sent into the field, and John de Monte Corvino was appointed archbishop (his see was named Cambaldu), and the Christian interests were advanced among the Mongols even after John's death in 1308, until the downfall of the Mongol dynasty. See Mongols. (J. H. W.)

John of Nomunik (more properly Pomuk), a very popular Bohemian saint of the Roman Catholic Church, and honored by them as a martyr of the inviolability of the seal of confession. He was born at Pomuk, a village in the district of Klatau, about the middle of the 14th century. After taking orders, he rose rapidly to distinction. He was created a canon of the Cathedral of Pardubec, and eventually vicar general of the diocese of Prague. He succeeded the second Duke of Wenceslaus IV, having selected him for his confessor. Wenceslaus, himself a man of mostolveable disposition, conceiving suspicions of her virtue, required of John to reveal to him what he knew of her life from the confessions which she had made to him. John steadfastly refused, and the king resolved to be revenged for the refusal. An opportunity occurred soon afterwards, when the monks of the Benedictine abbey of Kladran elected an abbot in opposition to the design of the king, who wished to bestow it upon one of his own disfavored favorites, and obtained from John, as vicar general, at once a confession, two hundred and thirty pounds of money, and a renunciation of the rights of the monks. Wenceslaus, having first put him to the torture, at which he himself personally presided, had him tied hand and foot, and flung, already half dead from the rack, into the Moldau (March, 1391). These historical facts have been considerably enlarged, and embellished with legendary additions, in his biographer, Robert Balzani. According to these, his birth was signalized by miraculous signs, and after his martyrdom his body was discovered by a miraculous light which issued from it, was taken up, and buried with the greatest honor. Several able Romanists have argued that the story is too well adapted to reconcile the points of conflict between the legend and the historical accounts. (See Sourz, Reist.-Encyklop. vi, 749 sqq.; Pezel, Kaiser Wenzels Nachrichten, i, 292 sqq.; Wetzer u. Welte, Kirchen-Lex. v, 725 sq. Dr. Otto Abel (Die Sagen u. heil. Johan. v. Nepomuk) supposes the legend to be a Jesuitic invention, and to date from the restoration of popery in Bohemia, and to serve as a popular counterpart to the martyrdom of Huss and Ziska. His memory is cherished with peculiar affection in his native country. He was canonized as a saint of the Roman Catholic Church by Benedict XIII in 1729, his feast being fixed for the 29th of June. The historic personages of the same name are enumerated—one the martyr of the confessional seal, the other of the resistance to the simoniacal tyranny of Wenceslaus; but the identity of the two is well sustained by Balzeck, Gesch. von Böhmen, iii, 62. See Chambers, Cyclop. s. v.; Asbach, Kirchen-Lex. iii, 556 sq.)

John Nicota (from Nirina, probably the city of that name in the Indus valley), also known as the Belezu, and the Jacobite Alexander Church, flourished in the early part of the 6th century, and was in the patriarchal chair from 507 to 517. He is noted for his violent opposition to the decrees of the Council of Chalcedon, and is said to have refused communication with any that did not agree with them. He is acknowledged to have promised the emperor Anastasius two hundred pounds of gold if he would procure their final and decisive abrogation (see Neale, Hist. Eccl. Ch. [Alexandria] ii, 35, 57; Theophanes, n. a. A.D. 512). Among the Jacobites, who in his day enjoyed especial favor at the imperial court (a period on which, says Neale, "the Jacobite writers dwelt with peculiar complacency," and in which "their boasted had gained a footing which it never before or since possessed"), John Nicota, better known as patriarch John I of Alexandria, is reckoned among the saints. He is believed to be the author of a learned work against the Pelagians, addressed to pope Gelasius. Some think it was written by John I of Alexandria, but it is in all probability the production of John Nicota, and was written before his accession to the patriarchal chair. (J. H. W.)

John of Nicklaushausen, a German religious fanatic, flourished, in the second half of the 15th century. He was a member of the House of Lichtenstein, and was engaged in a livelihood as a swineherd when it suddenly occurred to him that an attack upon the clergy, and a summons to them to reform their profligate ways, might meet with applause from the people, to whom at
JOHN NICHOMEDIA, a presbyter of the Church of Nicomedia, in Bithynia, in the time of Constantine the Great, is noted as the author of Μαρτύριον τοῦ ἁγίου Βασίλεως εἰς Ἰσπαύσον Ἀγίασμα, Acta martyris S. Basilei episcopi A. mattress, which is given in the Acta Sanctorum. Fish of Nicomedia, in April, the Latin version in the body of the work (p. 417), with a preliminary notice by Henschen, and the Greek original in the Appendix (p. 50). An extract from the Latin version, containing the history of the female saint Glaphyra, had previously been given in the same work (Januar. 1721). The Latin version of the De sanctis S. Basili et alii, which had already been published by Alcibiades Lippomani (Vita Sanctarum. Patrum, vol. vii) and by Surius (De probatis Sanctorum Vitis, s. d. 26 Aprilis). Basilius was put to death at close of the reign of Licinius, A.D. 322 or 323, John, who was at Nicomedia, pre- fuses to have conversed with him in prison. Cave thinks that the Acts have been interpolated, apparently by Metaphrastes. See Acta Sanctorum, ii, cc.; Cave, Hist. Lit., i, 185.—Smith, Diet. Gr. and Rom. Biog. ii, 601.

JOHN OF OXFORD, an English prelate, flourished in the second half of the 12th century, and took an active and important part in the controversy between King Henry II of England and his archbishop Thomas a Becket, of Canterbury. Henry hated and feared the latter, and the unlimited confidence he enjoyed. He had attended the Diet at Wurzburg in 1165, held to cement a union between Henry and the emperor of Germany, and had there taken the oath of fidelity to the rival pope of Avignon, the anti-pope Paschal II, whom the church at Nicomedia, pro- fesses to have conversed with him in prison. Cave thinks that the Acts have been interpolated, apparently by Metaphrastes. See Acta Sanctorum, ii, cc.; Cave, Hist. Lit., i, 185.—Smith, Diet. Gr. and Rom. Biog. ii, 601.

the death of the latter John further received evidence of the grateful remembrance of his royal master by the appointment to the bishopric of Norwich (1175), and as such attended the Lateran Council in 1179. The exact time of his decease is not known to us, neither are we aware that he performed any literary work of value; but his action in his king's controversy absorbed all his interests. See Milman, Latin Christianity, iv, 364 sq., 408. (J. H. W.)

JOHN OF PARIS, a celebrated French Dominican of the 13th century, was professor of theology at the University of Paris. He owes his renown to the part he took in the condemnation then raging of the Franciscan monk, Philip the Fair, and pope Boniface VIII. The latter, fearing his deposition on the plea that the resignation of his predecessor Celestine was illegal, took every means to advance the doctrine of papal absolutism. Not only in matters spiritual, but also in matters temporal, the pope was to be regarded supreme; in short, to save his office, he carried his schemes for the enlargement of the papal power to the verge of frenzy. Unfortunately for Boniface, however, he found his equal in Philip the Fair, who not only denied the temporal power of the pope, but finally even scorned the foolish conduct of Boniface, who was so frightened by the issuing of bulls against him and his kingdom. The University of Paris sided with the king, and among his most outspoken friends were John of Paris and Accidius of Rome. The former even published a work against the papal assumptions, De regimine potestatium populi (in the collection of Goldast, vol. ii), in which he dis- serted that "the priest, in spiritual things, was greater than the prince, but in temporal things the prince was greater than the priest; though, absolutely considered, the priest was the greater of the two." He also main- tained that the pope had no power over the property of either the pope or his subjects. As the kingdom of Christ is a spiritual one, having its foundation in the hearts of men, not in their possessions, so the power conferred on the pope relates simply to the wants or to the advantage of the universal Church. He also stood up, in defence of the independent power of the king and priests, and denied that this is derived from God through the mediation of the pope alone, maintaining that it springs directly from God, through the choice or concurrence of the communities. "For it was not Pe- ter, whose successor is the pope, that sent forth the first apostles, whose success is that of the Church, but Christ; and no other apostles, whose success is that of the Church, but Christ; and no other apostles, whose successors are the bishops, or who sent forth the seventy disciples, whose successors are the parish priests; but Christ himself did this directly. It was not Peter who detained the apostles in order to impart to them the Holy Ghost; it was not he who gave them power to forgive sins; but Christ himself. Does Paul say that he received from Peter his apostolical office, but that he said that it came to him directly from Christ or from God; that three years had elapsed after he re- ceived his commission to preach the Gospel before he had an interview with Peter." But more than this he argued. The pope himself was even amenable to a worldly power for his conduct in the papal chair. As such he regarded not simply the Ecumenical Council, but to the secular princes also he believed this right belonged, subject, however, to a demand on the part of the clergy for aid. Neander says (Ch. Hist. v, 18), "If the pope gave scanty- tles, to refuse obedience to him pope. John of Paris, or the pope, had the power of secular rulers to bring about his abdication or his deposition by means of their influence on him or on his cardinals." If the pope would not yield, they might so manage as to compel him to yield. They might command the people, under severe penal- ties, to refuse obedience to him pope. John of Paris, or why were anxious to make null and void the resignation of pope Celestine, and to reassert the latter's claim to the papa-
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John Phurnes (Φωνεὺς), a monk of the monastery of Mount Gannus, who flourished in the reign of the emperor Alexius Comnenus (11th century), was an opponent of the Latin Church, and is noted as the author of Ἀπολογία, Ἀμφιβολία, or Συμβολή. A discussion which was carried on with Peter, archbishop of Milan, in the presence of the emperor. If this is the work which John Veccias cites and replies to in his De Unitio Ecclesiarum Oratio (apud Allatius, Graec. Orthodozi, i, 173, etc.), it appears that the form of a dialogue was assumed for convenience’ sake, and that it was not the dialogue of a real conference. According to Fabricius, Allatius also published in his work de Consensu (ac. De Ecclesia Occidentalis et Orientaliae perpetuus Consensione), p. 1158, a work of John which is described as Epistolae de Ritus immediatas in Sacra Communia. Other works of John are extant in MS. See Allatius, Graec. Ordozo, l. c.; Fabricius, Bibliocr. i, 648, 650.—Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. ii, 601.

John the Presbyter, a supposed disciple of Jesus, and instructor of Papias of Hierapolis, is said to have been a contemporary of the apostle John (with whom it is thought he has been confounded by early Church historians), and to have resided at Ephesus. For the assertion that there existed such a person, the testimony advanced is that of Papias (in Eusebius, Hist. eccl. iii, 39), who, in speaking of the personal efforts he put forth to establish himself in the Christian faith, says: “Whenever any one arrived who had had intercourse with the elders [τοὺς πρίγκιπας], I made inquiry concerning the declarations of these, what Andrew, John, Peter, Philip, or Thomas, or Matthew, or any other of the disciples of the Lord said, as also what Aristion and John the Presbyter, disciples of the Lord, say.” For I believed that I should not derive so much advantage from books as from living and speaking discourse.” Eusebius, in reporting this, takes special pains to report that Papias purposely adds the name John twice, first in connection with Peter, James, and Matthew, where only the apostle can be intended, and again along with Arias, where he distinguishes him by the title of “the Presbyter.” Eusebius further says: “This he confirms in the respect that he relates that there were two men in Asia Minor who bore that name, and had been closely connected with Christ, and then continues by showing that two tombs had been found in Ephesus bearing the name of John. Further proof is found in another part of his history (vii, 25), where he mentions a certain Papias, bishop of the city of Hierapolis, in the middle of the 3rd century, as uttering the same tradition concerning the finding of the two tombs at Ephesus inscribed with the name of John, and as ascribing to John the Presbyter the authorship of the Apocalypse, which Eusebius himself was inclined to do. The existence of a presbyter John is (2) declared in the Apostolical Constitutions (vii, 36), where it is said that the second John was bishop of Ephesus after John the Apostle, and that it was by the latter that he was instituted into office. Further testimony is obtained from Jerome (De Vir. l. c., 9), who says that the second and third epistles of John are the production of John the Presbyter, “cujus et hocie alterium apud Ephesum ostenditur, etsi nonnulli paean duas memorias ejusdem Johannis evangelicai esse.” In defence of the existence of such a person as the Presbyter John, see against the anonymous writers (Grotius, Beck, Fritzsch, Bretschneider, Creder, Erdard, and Steltz, Jahrb. deutsch. Theol. 1609, ii, 139 sq.) all of whom ascribe to him the authorship of the last two epistles of John, generally believed to be the production of John himself; and finally published by Allatius, with a Latin version, in his Simeon. The Latin version is also given in the Acta

John the Laborious. See John the Little.

John Philoponus. See John the Laborious.

John Phocas (Φόκας), a Cretan monk and priest, son of Mathias, who became a monk in Patmos, had served in the army of the emperor Manuel Comnenus (who reigned A.D. 1143-80) in Asia Minor, and afterwards visited (A.D. 1183) Syria and Palestine, is noted for a short geographical account which he wrote of those countries, entitled Εκθέσεις ιεροπόλεων ιών και Μαρτυρίους and χωρών Συρίας και Φοινίκης και τῶν κατὰ Παλαιστίνην τῆς Ἀραβίας, Compendiaria Descriptio Civitatum et Urbarum (sic in Alatt. vers. ob Urbe Antiochiae urbe Hierosolymis, nomon Syriac ex Phoenice, et in Palatinae Stirorum Locorum, which was transcribed by his son (for he was named Bonacides) by his last conclusions, and finally published by Allatius, with a Latin version, in his Simeon, i, 1-46. The Latin version is also given in the Acta
whether another John existed in Asia Minor contemporary with John the Apostle would, of course, be of little import, but the fact that the apostolical authorship of some of the epistles and of the Apocalypse is doubted has called to critical inquiry most of the leading theological minds of our day. The result is that, while some maintain the identity of the apostle John, others consider him as a person clothed even with episcopal dignity (Dollinger, First Age of the Church, p. 113), others have denied altogether the probability of the existence of such a person contemporary with the apostle John (see Schaff, Church History, ii. 661, sqq.). Dr. W. de W. Smith, in his Dictionary of the Bible, adds, in reviewing the proofs of those who assert the existence of John and his authorship of some of the Johannine writings, that "in the way of this assumption stands the following: 1. The negative evidence arising from the silence of all other ancient authorities, especially the silence of Polycrates, bishop of Ephesus, who, in a list of eminent teachers and bishops in Asia Minor, preserved by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. v. 24), makes no mention of John the Presbyter; and, 2. The positive evidence afforded by the statement of Irenaeus, who not only omits all mention of the Presbyter, but says that Papia was the son of the presbyter John. For this reason it cannot be unsuitable, and could only have created confusion, to denote by this title another John, who lived with the apostle and under him in Ephesus. Credner supposes, indeed, that these two epistles came not from the apostle, but, like the Apocalypse, from the 'presbyter John' in question. The latter is evident even at first sight; the epistles are far more akin, even in their language, to the first epistle than to the Apocalypse (comp. 2 John 4-7 with 1 John ii, 7; iv, 2, 3; 2 John 9 with 1 John ii, 27; iii, 9, etc.). This is De Wette's reason for considering them genuine. When Credner supposes that the Presbyter John afterwards commemorated himself to the apostle's way of thinking and speaking, he makes an entirely arbitrary assumption which he himself condemns in pronouncing a like change in the apostle's "altogether unnatural and inadmissible" (p. 735). (3) The Ephesian bishop Polycrates, in the 2nd century, in his letter to Victor, bishop of Rome, on the Paschal controversy (in Euseb. v. 24), mentions but one John, though he there enumerates the μεγάλη αποστολή of the Asian Church, Philip, with his pious daughters, Polycarp, Thrasybes, Sagaris, Papirius, Mcito, most of whom were not so important to the Presbyter John may have been, in Credner, a personal disciple of the Lord, and the author of the Apocalypse. We can hardly think that in this connection, where it was his object to present as many authorities as possible for the Asiatic usage respecting the feast, Polycrates would have passed over this John if he had known anything about him; and if his tomb could have been really pointed out in Ephesus, as the later Dionysius and Jerome intimate. Jerome, however, in speaking of this, expressly observes, 'Nonnulli putant, duas memorias ejusdem Johannis evangelistiae esse' (De Vir. Ill. c. 9); which, again, makes this whole story doubtful, and destroys its character as a historical testimony in favor of this obscure presbyter."

Ridiculous, certainly, is the argument which some have advanced, that the different Johannine epistles differ so much in style that they cannot possibly be ascribed to one and the same person. Dr. F. Erdmann (Einleitungen, etc.) laid particular stress, but he is easily answered by Dr. Tholuck in his Glaubewürdigkeit der evangel. Geschichte, 2d ed. p. 283. From the rich treasury of his reading the latter draws such analogies as the "varietas dicitionis Appuleiana," the difference between the "Discours des Deux Freres" and the "Dialogus Domini et Iacobi," the "Logos" and the earlier dialogues of Plato; the sermons and the satires of Swift, etc. "This catalogue," says Dr. Schaff, "may easily be increased from the history of modern literature. Think, for example, of the immense distance between Schleiermacher's Bekenntnisse der Religion und des Weltgeistes and Hegel's Logik und Aesthetik; the first and second part of Goethe's Faust;"
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Carlyle's Life of Schiller and his Latter-day Pamphlets, etc." Comp. also Liddon, Divinity of Christ, p. 512 sq. See John, second and third Epistles of.

John, Prester (Priest John), a supposed Christian king and priest of a medieval kingdom in the interior of Asia, the locality of which is vague and undefined. In the 13th and 14th centuries the missionary activities of the Syrian missionaries translated by analogy with their own language, converting Ung into "Jachanan" or "John," and rendering Khan by "priest." In their reports to the Christians of the West, accordingly, their royal convert figured as at once a priest and the sovereign of a rich and magnificent kingdom. Genghis Khan having thrown off his allegiance, a war ensued, which ended in the defeat and death of Ung Khan in 1292; but the tales of his piety and magnificence long survived, and not only furnished the material of numerous medieval legends (which may be read in Assemani's Bibliotheca Orientalis, iii, 280 sq.), but supplied the occasion of several of those missionary expeditions from Western Christendom to which we owe almost all our knowledge of medieval Eastern geography. The reports regarding Ung Khan, carried to Europe by two Arab missionaries in 1145 to Eugene III, created in Rome profound impression; and the letters addressed in his name, but drawn up by the Nestorian missionaries, to the pope, to the kings of France and Portugal, and to the Greek emperor, impressed all with a lively hope of the speedy extension of the Gospel in a region hitherto regarded as hopelessly lost to Christianity. They are printed in Assemani's Bibliotheca Orientalis. The earliest mention of Prester John is in the narrative of the Franciscan father John Carpini, who was sent by pope Innocent IV to the court of Bath Khan of Kiptchak, the grandson of Genghis Khan. Father Carpini supposed that Prester John's kingdom lay still further to the east, but he did not prosecute the search. This was reserved for a member of the same order, father Rubruquis, who was sent as a missionary into Tartary by St. Louis, and, having reached the camp of Bath Khan, was by him betrayed to Kiptchak and put to death. This is the story of the supposed Prester John. He failed, however, of his hope of finding such a personage, the Khagan of Karakorum, Mangh, being still an unbeliever; and his intercourse with the Nestorian missionaries whom he found established there satisfied him that the accounts were grievously exaggerated. His narrative, which is printed in Purchas's Collection, is one of the most interesting among those of medieval travellers. Under the same vague notion of the existence of a Christian prince and a Christian kingdom in the East, the Portuguese sought for traces of Prester John in their newly-acquired Indian territory in the 16th century. A similar notion prevailed as to the Christian kingdom of Abyssinia, which, in the hope of finding Prester John, was visited so late as the reign of John II of Portugal (1481-95) by Pedro Covilhão and Alfonso di Pava, the former of whom married and settled in the country. See Gießer's Kirchengeschichte, iii, 43; Ritter's Erkundungen aus Asien, i, 283 sq.; Schmidt, Forenungen im Gebiete d. älteren Bildungsgesch. d. Mongolen und Tuber (Veters, 1824), p. 162.

John Puffer. See Goch.

John Pungen Asinum. See John of Paris.

John Raithicus or Raithinus, i. e. of Raithus or Raitha (ra' or Paris'), seneschal or abbot of a monastery at Etampes, or the Seventy Springs, on the western coast of the peninsula of Mount Sinai, flourished in the 6th century. He is celebrated on account of the friendly relations he sustained and the influence he exerted over John the Scholar, or John Climacus. It was at the desire of Raithenus that Climacus wrote the work Kifayat or Scala Paradisi, from which he derives his name, and to which Raithenus wrote a Compendium and Scholion. The "Exegetick του αγιου λειτουργιου τοι Soultun, Liutere Jhonou Stromaten," addressed to Climacus, requesting him to undertake the work, and the answer of Climacus are given by Radares in the original Greek, with a Latin version, in his edition of the works of Climacus (Paris, 1633, fol.). This version of the Liitera of Raithenus, and a Latin version of his Commentarium and Scholion, are given in various editions of the Bibliotheca Patrum: the Liitere in vol. iii, edit. Paris, 1575; the Liitere and Commentarium, vol. v, edit. Paris, 1899 and 1864; the Liitere, Epistola, Commentarium, and Scholion, in vol. vi, pt. ii. ed. Cologne, 1815, in vol. x, ed. Lyons, 1677. See Fabricius, Bibl. Gr. ii, 523-524; Itinera, De Bibliotheca Patrum.—Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog., ii, 601.

John of Ravnenna. See Nicholas I; Ravnenna.

John the Recluse. See John Nicotia.

John de la Rochelle, a French theologian, was born in the early part of the 13th century, probably in the city of La Rochelle. He joined the Franciscans, and studied under Alexander of Hales, whose ordinances he observed in 1298, and was ordained in 1298 in the cathedral of St. Brevin. He died at Paris in 1271, according to Luc Wadding. John de la Rochelle was a successful teacher, yet his works did not enjoy much renown, probably because he did not follow the mystical tendency of the times. Among his works we notice commentaries on a number of the books of the Bible; sermons, preserved in the MS. collections of divers libraries, chiefly in that of Troyes, France; De Anima, MSS. in the library of St. Victor; and he is also considered the author of some other works, but on doubtful grounds. He is especially deserving of notice as one of the first, if not the first, who attempted to explain Aristotle's Hippi Verum, a task of which he ably disposed. Thomas Aquinas probably availed himself of this work. See Cas. Oudin, De Script. Eccles.; Histoire lit. de la France, xix, 171: B. Hautef, De la Philosophie Socratique, i, 475; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxvi, 549. See John of Repussissa or Roquetaille, a French Franciscan, who flourished near the middle of the 14th century, at Auriverpe, is noted for his severe denunciations of the gross immorality of the clergy of the Roman Church in his day. He was especially opposed to the court at Avignon, and hesitated not to brand the papal court as the most great whoredom. Popes Clement VI and Innocent VI imprisoned him on account of his continued remonstrances and prophesying, but even while in prison he wrote much against the papal court and the clergy. He died while in prison, but the cause of his death is not known. His works of interest are, (1) Lademum in tribulatione (in Ed. Brown's addition to Ortus Aquae graciæ, rer. expectandae. et fugienda. London, 1609), wherein he handles the French clergy without gloves, and prophesies much trouble to their native land on account of their wicked life and contempt of the French. (2) Commentary on the Psalter of the Shenut. (3) Hermit Cyril of Mount Carmel and of abbot Joachim (q. v.). See Thirtheimi, De Script. Eccles. c. 611 (in Fabricius, Bibli. Ecc., pt. ii, p. 145); Wolfius, Lett. vm. cent. xiv, p. 623 sq.; Fuhrmann, Hanze der Kirchengesch. i, 422; Asbach, Kirch.-Lex. iii, 565. (J.H.W.)

John of Salisbury, an eminent English pupil of Peter Abelard, was born at Salisbury (old Suryam) about 1110. He was first educated at Oxford, and in 1136 went to France, where he continued his studies under Abelard, and many other celebrated French divines of that age. About 1151 he returned to England, and was appointed chaplain to the archbishop of Canterbury. On the death of the archbishop on a mission to pope Hadrian IV in 1156, he openly approached the latter on the abuses of the Church and of the papacy, though always an earnest advocate of the
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univ and liberty of the Church, and the independence of the episcopate from the secular princes. He was an intimate friend and admirer of Thomas à Becket, whose cause he espoused warmly, and whom he followed into exile returning only to England with him in 1176, and after the murder of Becket, a few months later, was called Becket's eye and arm. In 1176 he was appointed bishop of Chartres, and died about 1180. His works, which evince positive Realistic tendencies, and bear evidence of fruitful genius, sound understanding, and great erudition, are, Fislicticus s. de nagia curialium et testi- gusti philosophorum (Leiden, 1681); a celebrative treatise on the employment, duties, virtues, and vices of great men—a curious and valuable monument of the literature of John of Salisbury's time!—Metalogicia (Leyd. 1610, Amst. 1664), an exhibition of true and false science.—Enchilics de dogmate philosophorum (pub. by Chr. Petersen, Hamb. 1843) — Vita ac Passio S. Thomas (a Life of Thomas à Becket), etc. His collective works have been published by J. A. Giles (Lond. 1848, vol. 8vo). See H. Reuter. J. con Salibus (Berl. 1842); J. Schmidt, Joan Puris. Surtibns. etc. (1808), — Hist. Lit. de la France, etc., xiv, 89 sq. — Ritter, Gesch. d. Philso. viii, 605; Darling, Cyclopa. Biblical. s. v. See Becket; Pas- PACY.

JOHN III. the patriarch, surnamed the SCHOLAR (1), was born at Sirimis, near Antioch, towards the middle of the 6th century. He became successively attorney, then presbyter of Antioch, and finally, in 565, patriarch of Constantinople under Justinian I. He died in 577. He prepared a large Collectio canoniwm under fifty headings, which became authoritative in the whole Greek Church. He is also considered as the author of a collection of ecclesiastical rules and regulations under the title Nomoacwos (both in Justulli, Biblioth. juris canon- svari. Paris. 1662, ii, 499, 669). He is also said to have delivered a dissertation on the doctrine of the Trinity which involved him in a controversy with the renowned so-called Tritheste John Philoponus (Phot. Cod. 75).

JOHN THE SCHOLAR (2) (JOHANNES SCHOLASTICUS or CLIMACUS), a monk of the latter half of the 6th century, was a zealot partisan of monastic life, and became abbot of a convent on Mount Sinai. He died there about 606. He wrote Kýmaios to pavadosin, an ascetic mystical work (Latin, Scala paradisii, Ambrosium, Venice, 1531, etc.), which was greatly celebrated and widely circulated among Greek monks for centuries af- ter his death (Leyd. 1529). He was, however, also official canonic writer (pub. by Matth. Rader, 1606). A collection of his works in Greek and Latin has been published by Matth. Rader (Paris, 1863).—Pierer. Univer. Lex. s. v.

JOHN SCOTUS ERIGENA. See SCOTUS.

JOHN OF SCYTHERIOLI, a Greek ecclesiastical writer, who in all probability flourished in the latter part of the 5th century or the beginning of the 6th, wrote a work against the followers of Eutyches and Dioscorus, entitled Katar tov òn epistwrwv tis inxhporias. Contra deserteres ecclesias. It was divided into twelve parts, and was undertaken at the suggestion of a certain prelate, one Julianus, in reply to an anonymous Eutychian writer, who had published a book deceitfully entitled Katar Nostorwv, Adversus Nestorianum, and whom Pho- tius (Bibl. Cod. 95, 107) supposed to be Basilius, a pres-byter of Cilicia. This Basilius wrote a reply to John in very abusive style, charging him, among many other things, with being a Manichæan, and consisting of Lent to a period of three weeks, and not abstaining from flesh even in that shortened period. Certain Pagonia- siac, Scholias, to the works of the pseudo Dionysius Are- opagistis, which Ussher has observed to be mingled in the printed editions of Dionysius with the Schola of St. Victor, are supposed to be from the hand of this John. Anastasius Bibliothecarius, who was born in the 6th century, made a Latin translation of these mingled scholia, not

now extant, in which he professed to distinguish those of Maximus from those of John by the mark of a cross. Fabricius (Bibl. Gr. vii, 9; x, 707, 710) identifies the Scholias of John with those by him and the Commentarii in Dionysium Areopagiti cited by John Cyprianoeta as by Dionysius of Alexandria. See Ussher and Photius. He is supposed (και ἐκ τούτων, εἰσὶ καὶ προήγερα) a celebrated ec- clesiastic in the Eastern Church, being one of the deputa- tion sent by Saloacis, the twenty-seventh patriarch of Alexandria (A.D. 460-482), shortly before his decease, to the emperor Zeno, to secure his leave for a election of the next patriarch from among the de- fenders of the Council of Chalcedon by the clergy and laity of Alexandria. "The emperor," says Neale (East. Church [Alexand.], ii, 18), "received the deputes gra- ciously, complied with their request, and in the letter which he gave them by way of reply spoke strongly in favor of John. After the return of the embassy John, see- thus Saloacis died, and John was unanimously elect- ed to succeed him, but was almost immediately expelled from his see by order of the emperor. The cause of his expulsion is differently stated. Liberatus says that he was expelled mainly through the jealousy of Acacius, patriarch of Constantinople, to whom, on different oc- casions, he had failed in paying due attention. According to Evagrius, who quotes Zacharias as his authority, he was detected in having procured his own election by bribery, and had broken an oath which he had taken before Zeno not to seek for himself the see. But Neale thinks it doubtful whether John ever took such an oath, and holds that, even if he had, he can see no reason for the harshness with which he was treated, and for his ejection from the see, so long as it was freely proffered to him (which seems clear from the anonoimous inscription). The true expatriation seems to have been the delay of the announcement of his election to the patriarchate of Constantinople, sending the message by Illus, who was then in Antioch, instead of dispatching a mes- senger direct, as he had done in the case of Rome and Antioch, thereby provoking the patriarchate of Constanti- nople, also his selection of Illus for the messengers, when the latter was then the object of jealousy and suspicion to Zeno, if not actually in rebellion against him. John, expelled from Alexandria, first restored to Ilus, then to Antioch; and having, through Ilus's intervention, ob- tained from the patriarch of Antioch and his suffragans a synodical letter commending him to pope Simplicius, departed to Rome to plead his cause there in person. Simplicius, with the usual papal jealousy of the patri- archs of Constantinople, took the side of John; but uni- ted the exactions of Simplicius to that of his suc- cessor Felix, and did not retain the restoration of the banished patriarch, and John finally accepted from Felix the bishopric of Nola, in Campania, which he held several years, and at last died peaceably (the precise date of his death is not known). John (whom Theophanes ex- tens) for his piety and orthodoxy) wrote Προς Τιλιτον τον την Ρωμαιον Ακακιον, and, according to a tradition in which he anathematized Pelagianism, as well as its defenders Pelagius and Celestius, and their successor Ju- lianus. The work, which is noticed by Photius, is not extant. See Tillemont. Mem. vol. xvi. Cae. Hist. Lit. l. 144.—Smith. Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. ii, 602; Neale, Hist. East. Ch. [Alex.]. ii, 18 sq.

John, surnamed the TUTTUS, from his nationality, abbot of St. Victor, was a native of the diocese of Trèves. He studied at Paris, joined the canons regularly of St. Victor, and became their abbot in 1203. He was one
of the ablutions of the glossatores (q. v.) on canon law, and
appears to have exerted great influence in general over the ecclesiastical affairs of his time, and to have been in
great favor both with the pope and with the king of France. He died at Paris Nov. 28, 1229. He left
three sons and a daughter, among the MSS. of the Imperial Library at Paris. (Two Dominikan
c monks of like name flourished in the latter half of the 13th and the first half of the 14th century.) See
Césaire d'Heisterbach, Illustr. Mirac. et Histor. Memori,
lib. vi. c. 12; Jacques de Vitry, Hist. Franc. Occident. c. 34;
Hist. Litt. de Paris, xvii, 67; Gallia Christiana, vol. x,

John, archbishop of Thessalonica, who flourished
in the 7th century, is noted as a stout defender of the
orthodox faith against the Monothelitians. He attended as
papal legate the third Constantinopolitan (sixth ecumenical)
Council (A.D. 680), and to that character he subscribed the Acts of the council (Concilii, vol. vi, col.
1038, ed. Labbe; vol. iii, col. 1425, ed. Hardouin; vol. xi,
col. 639, ed. Mansi). The time of his death is alto-
gether uncertain. He wrote (1) Εἰς τὰς μορφὰς τῶν
ναυσικᾶς, in maliæs ferentes uestigia, a discourse or
treatise in which he argues that there is no contradiction
in the several accounts of the resurrection of Christ
given by the four evangelists. This piece appears to
have been regarded by some as a work of Chrysostom,
and was first published (but from a mutilated and cor-
r uptext) by Savile in his edition of Chrysostom (v. 740,
Elm. 1610, fol.), though with an expression of doubt
to its genuineness. It was subsequently printed
more correctly in the Novum Auctarium of Combebi
(vol. i, Paris, 1648, folio), and by him assigned to the
right author. It is given in a mutilated form in Mont-
laucun's edition of Chrysostom among the Spongiv, viii,
159 (Paris, 1718, fol.); or in viii, 1518 of the 20th reprint
(Paris, 1839). It is also given in the Bibliotheca Pa-
trimon of Gallandii, xiii, 185, etc. A Latin version is
given in the Bibliotheca Patrum, vol. xii (Lyons, 1677):
—(2) ὁδος, Ortatio, of which a considerable extract
was read by Nicolaus, bishop of Cyzicus, at the second
Nicene (seventh ecumenical) Council, and is published in
the Concilia, vol. vii, col. 335, ed. Labbe; vol. iv, col.
292, ed. Hardouin; vol. xiii, col. 168, ed. Mansi; and
by Gallandius in his Bibliotheca Patrum, xiii, 196. See
cave, Hist. Litt. i, 357; Fabricius, Bibli. Graec. x, 250.—
S0m. Rom. Bieg. iii, 940.

John of Turchesmata. See Turchesmata.

John of Wessel. See Wessel.

John of Wessel. See Wessel.

John I, pope of Rome, a Tuscan by birth, ascended the
papal throne Aug. 13, 523. About this time the
bigoted Eastern emperor Justinus II had issued an edict
against heretics of all denominations, commanding them to
be put to death wherever found in his dominions; but
as it was principally aimed against the detested
Manicheans, all went well until, in 524, the emperor is
sued another edict, this time against the Arians of Italy.
Their patron Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, was in-
duced to interfere for them by Byzantium, and he des-
parted in which lay for this purpose, armed by the
orthodox pope John himself, who had thus to plead a
cause for which he had no sympathy. The latter
promised, in undertaking the mission, to procure the revoca-
tion of the edict, and in this he succeeded, but, failing to
procure also the emperor's permission for all those
who had forsaken Arianism unwillingly to return to
their former faith, and Theodoric fearing that the whole
work on the part of the pope was a piece of deception,
and that the Romans, with the bishop at their head,
instead of seeking relief from the intolerance of Greek
orthodoxy, solicited aid against the Goths, imprisoned
the pope on his arrival at Ravenna, where he died in the
18, 528. A Roman tradition reports, not without some
complacency, that in Constantinople the emperor bowed
down before the bishop of Rome, and that at high mass
the seat of the latter, by his special request, was raised
above that of the patriarch; seemingly, of course,a
concession of superiority to the Roman see. John is
numbered among the martyrs. Two letters are ascribed
to him, addressed to others, but they are not now
rejected. See Bower, Hist. of the Popes, ii, 312 sq; Riddle, Papastry, i, 199.

John II, pope, a Roman by birth, surnamed Mer-
curius, succeeded Boniface II in the Roman see in 582,
being elected by the clergy and the people of Rome after
considerable agitation and many simoniacal practices
and confirmed by king Athalaric, for which confirmation
a certain payment was fixed by an edict of the same
king. The emperor Justinian, in a letter addressed to
him shortly after his accession, after earnest assurances
of his endeavor to unite the Western and Eastern
churches, makes full confession of superior power be-
longing to the Roman hierarchy, designating him as
"the head of the holy Church." The only other im-
portant events in his life are his decision on the Trinity
question in favor of Justinian (q. v.) [see ACCEPTEM],
and in the case of the bishop of Riez (q. v.). He died in
582. See Bower, Hist. of the Popes, ii, 330 sq; Riddle,
Papacy, i, 209.

John XIII, pope, a native of Rome, was elected to
succeed Pelagius I in 560, and was confirmed by the
exarch of Ravenna in the name of the emperor Justinian.
Like many of his predecessors, he used his powers
mainly for the aggrandizement of the Roman see. He
consequences, only noted the excommunication of the
archbishop of Embrun and of Gap, who had been deposed
by local councils for improper conduct. Though known
to be guilty, he ordered their restoration, which Con-
stantine, the Burgundian king, was only too happy to en-
force in opposition to the French clergy. But the Gal-
lican Church, which had wits very great hesitancy
permitted the restoration of the guilty men, soon proved
them to be unworthy of ecclesiastical office, and a new
French council confirmed their previous deposition.
John died in 574. See Riddle, Papacy, i, 210; Bower,
History of the Popes, ii, 334.

John IV, pope, a Dalmatian by birth, was conse-
crated Dec. 28, 640. He displayed great zeal in found-
ing convents and endowing the churches of Rome.
He is noted especially for his strife against the Greek
rival. The Monothelitism creed of the patriarch Sergius
promulgated by the emperor Heraclius as istor, was
denounced as a heresy, and condemned by the Roman
symod A.D. 641. John IV defended Honorius
from the charge made by the Eastern Church that he
was guilty of the Monothelitism heresy, and Eutychius
informs us that, before his death (Oct. 12, 642), the
emperor Constans gave John IV the promise of with-
drawing the této, but the controversy continued under his
successors. See Bower, History of the Popes, iii, 24 sq:
Hergoz, Real-Encyklop, vi, 764.

John V, pope, a native of Syria, elevated to the
papal dignity in May or July, 685, hardly ever left the
bed during the short time of his insignificant pontificate.
The authenticity of the letters assigned to him, and the
fact that the "simplex papist" has been contested. He
died Aug. 2, 686.

John VI and VII, Popes, both Greeks by birth,
were quite insignificant occupants of the papal throne.
The former was consecrated October 10, 701, and buried
January 10, 705. He was defended by Roman akarians
against the exarch Theophylact, who was ordered to
drive him from the apostolic see. In a council which
he held at Rome he acquitted Wilfred, archbishop of
York, of several charges brought against him by the
English clergy. The latter (consecrated March 1, 704,
buried Oct. 18, 707) is described as weak and spiritless.
The happiest illustration of the unimportance of the
Roman see at this time is afforded us in the action of this
pope, who did not dare to venture to express an opinion
on the Trullan canon, submitted to his examination by the
emperor Justinian II, for fear of giving offence to somebody; and we do not wonder that an able ecclesiastical writer of our day (Butler, in his Ch. History, i, 658) says that the whole period from Gregory I to Gregory II "may be briefly designated as that in which the popes were under subjectio to the emperors of the East and their lieutenants, the exarchs of Ravenna." See the Preface to Vol. II of the Popes, iii, 168 sqq., 167 sq.; Riddle, Popacy, i, 305 sq.

John VIII. Pope (styled the ninth by those who believed in the story of pope Joan [q. v.], whom they style John VII.), a native of Rome, succeeded Adrian II Dec. 16, 672. He displayed much tact, and harbored great respect, for the power of the Court, but the spirit displayed during his administration is in keeping with the ideas of the pseudo-Isidorean collection, to which his predecessor Nicholas I had first ventured to appeal. John's designs, however, found but a tardy response in the little minds with which he had to deal, and the prevalence of general anarchy was not more auspicious to their execution. The pope, as well as the clergy, in the strife after power, actuated only by worldly ambition, knew no other arms than cunning and intrigue, and with these they were neither able to control the only power on earth that could claim its disposal from the Carolingian monarchy, nor to erect on its ruins the fabric of ecclesiastical dominion. When Louis II died, 875, without an heir to his land and crown, Charles the Bald marched hastily into Italy, and took possession of the Italian dominions. Then he proceeded to Rome, Dec. 16, 877, at Turgovia, the chair of St. Peter, the imperial crown, to which he had no lawful claim. Some Church annalists claim that the two then entered into a compact by which the emperor ceded to the pope the absolute and independent government of Rome, a confirmation and amplification of Pepin's donation; an explanation very proper (and of an ambiguous kind) can be deduced only for the surrender of Capua (compare Mansi, Concil. xvii, 10). By this alliance not much was directly gained by either party, for Charles, having once secured his coronation, cares not little for the papal interests; yet eventually the manner in which Charles had become possessed of the empire and of Italy increased very materially the papal power, especially when, in a moment of fear for his throne, Charles the Bald suffered the pope to declare to him that he had intrusted the imperial diadem by the only power on earth that could claim its disposal from the vicar of Rome. The emperor, however, failed to protect the papal dominions from the attacks of the Saracens. It is true he at one time led an army against the infidels (877), but his sudden death cut off all further hope of relief, especially after Athanasius's (bishop-duke of Naples) double-handed game of pleasing the pope and forming alliances with the Saracens became known at Rome, and we do not wonder that the plundering of Campania and the exactations of John make Milman say of the pope's difficulties from this score that "the whole pontificate of John VIII was a long, if at times interrupted, agony; an oppression; every proof (and that of an ambiguous kind) can be deduced only for the surrender of Capua (compare Mansi, Concil. xvii, 10). By this alliance not much was directly gained by either party, for Charles, having once secured his coronation, cares not little for the papal interests; yet eventually the manner in which Charles had become possessed of the empire and of Italy increased very materially the papal power, especially when, in a moment of fear for his throne, Charles the Bald suffered the pope to declare to him that he had intrusted the imperial diadem by the only power on earth that could claim its disposal from the vicar of Rome. The emperor, however, failed to protect the papal dominions from the attacks of the Saracens. It is true he at one time led an army against the infidels (877), but his sudden death cut off all further hope of relief, especially after Athanasius's (bishop-duke of Naples) double-handed game of pleasing the pope and forming alliances with the Saracens became known at Rome, and we do not wonder that the plundering of Campania and the exactations of John make Milman say of the pope's difficulties from this score that "the whole pontificate of John VIII was a long, if at times interrupted, agony; an oppression; every proof (and that of an ambiguous kind) can be deduced only for the surrender of Capua." (Latin Christianity, iii, 84). Much more precarious became the condition of the Roman pontiff after the death of Charles the Bald, whose son and successor in the West Frank dominion, Louis the Hammer, engaged in warfare with the Normans, found himself not the papal vassal, nor the imperial candidate for the imperial crown, nor to afford assistance to the vicar of Christendom. The only one from whom the pope really received any assurances of succor was Car郟mn, who at this time, with an army in Upper Itaangelo, and just recognised as king at Pavia, was aiming at the imperial throne against the French line. But, finding the pope more favorably inclined toward the French, he suddenly departed, and left to his nobles the disposition of the pope's case. Lambert, duke of Spoleto, and Adelbert, count of Tuscany, immediately made themselves masters of Rome, and, after imprisoning the pope, compelled the clergy and the nobles to swear allegiance to Car郟mn. But no sooner had Rome been cleared of Car郟mn's friends than the pope himself set out for France, determined no longer to conceal his desire to create for himself an emperor whom all the world should recognise as absolutely indebted for the crown to the see of Rome only. Arrived in France, the pope made Provence his capital, and there he was received with enthusiasm. Everywhere he was received with respect, but especial deference was paid him by one Boso, duke of Lombardy, connected with the imperial house by marriage, possessed of great influence and wealth, and an aspirant for the imperial purple. He succeeded in winning the good graces of the Roman pontiff, and John was designated as the vacant throne (compare Mansi, xiii, 121). Boso was, however, only made king of Burgundy, as Charles the Fat proved too fast for the pope; he had marched with a preponderating force into Italy, and the pope, foreseeing that the prince would not be likely to wait the pontiff's decision as to the rights of the Carolingijans to the throne, hastened to meet him at Ravenna, and reluctantly (though contriving to avoid the appearance of constraint) placed the crown upon the head of Charles the Fat. But, if John failed in placing upon the throne his own favorite, he certainly succeeded in exalting the see of Rome in the eyes of the Car郟mn, the bald, the pope above the emperor. To this, as well as to his efforts to make the clergy independent of the temporal princes, may be ascribed his popularity as a pope, and the magnificent reception he enjoyed on his visit to France. "At the Council of Ravenna in May 877, and again at Cosenza, in the following year, during his stay in France, he pronounced several decrees, to the astonishment of the bishops themselves, claiming for them various rights and privileges which they had not themselves hitherto ventured to demand. This proceeding produced upon them a better impression of his character than anything he had long been desirous of advancing their social position. Never until now had they been made aware of the points at which they ought to aim in order to secure for themselves the highest rank and influence in the state, and the pontiff who gave them powerful assistance in this weighty affair could not fail to be highly popular among them. It was perhaps by this measure that John chiefly contributed to the strengthening of the papacy to such an extent that it remained without any considerable loss during a long succession of ungodly and even heretical popes, and only at last sank so low as to have been despised and disgraced through the troubles which shook Italy for more than half a century" (Riddle, Popacy, ii, 81, 92). The controversy with the Eastern Church on the question of ecclesiastical jurisdiction over Bulgaria was continued under John. At first he inclined to favor Photius (q. c.), and acknowledged him as patriarch of Constantinople, but he was afterwards obliged to excommunicate him, as the Latin party severely condemned his course. Foulkes (Christendom's Division, ii, p. vii) says that the fable of pope Joan must have originated with the Latin party of this time, and that it was aimed against John VIII. "not because his theology was defective, or his life immoral, or his rule arbitrary, but solely because he had had the courage, the manliness, to appreciate the abilities and desire to cultivate the friendship of the great patriarch his brother." But his excommunication of Photius was by no means the only one he pronounced, but so much as the pope was more prodigal of excommunication than John VIII. Of his letters, above 300 (found in Mansi, Concilii, vol. xvi), it is remarkable how large a proportion threaten, inflict, or at least allude to this last exercise of sacerdotal power (Mans. Lat. Christianity, iii, 92 sqq.). John found his death, stultus et armatos, a molia Amuleos de Vigoletis, Cyprius, attributed to a conspiracy of his own curia. The assassins first tried poison; when this did not operate quick enough, they slew him with a hammer, Dec. 15, 882. See Milman, Lat. Christ., bk. v, ch. iii; Bower, History of the Popes, v. 36 sqq.; Riddle, Popacy, ii, 27 sqq.; Reichel, Rom. See in
the Middle Ages, p. 169 sq.; Gieseler, Eccles. Hist. ii, 347; Gieseler, Gesch. der deutschen Kirchezeit, i, 188 sq.; Herzog, Real-Encyklop., vi, 754; Muratori, Script. ii, pt. ii, ii. (J. H. W.)

John IX, Pope, a Benedictine of Tivoli, was con
corated to the pontifical office June, 898. He held two
councils, one at St. Peter's, where the wrong done to his
badly-abused predecessor Formosus was redressed; the
other at Ravenna, which passed an act for the better
protection of the Church against thieves and in
cendiaries. John displayed an honest zeal in defending
the rights and regulating the discipline of the Church.
His rival for the papal throne, Sergius (q. v.), he suc
cessfully combated, and, by authority of a council he
called, excommunicated him with several other ec
celesiastical accessories. John died July, 906. On
his life, see Muratori, vol. iii, pt. ii; on the synods, Mansi,
vol. xviii. See also Milman, Latin Christianity, iii, 112
sq.; Bower, History of the Popes, vii, 77 sq.

John X, Pope, according to Liutprand (discredited
by Milman, Latin Christianity, iii, 163), owed his pro
motion in ecclesiastical offices to the dissolute Theodore
(q. v.), which attracted by his handsome figure, made
him successively archbishop of Bologna, Ravenna, and
finally pope (May 15, 914). The profligacy of his times,
especially in Rome, surpassed that of the most degener
eate period of paganism. The popes were merely the
companions in revelry of the Roman nobility. But, if
the archbishop of Ravenna was not a fit example of pi
ety or holiness to be selected for the spiritual head of
Christendom, "he appears," says Milman (Latin Chris
tianity, iii, 161), "to have been highly qualified for the
secular part of his office." He was a man of ability and
daring, eminently fitted for this juncture to save Rome
from becoming the prey of Mohammedan conquest.
The Saracens from Africa, who had landed in Italy and
fortified themselves near the banks of the Liris, had
made frequent irruptions into the Roman territory. At
first John contented himself with inviting the neigh
boring dukes to come to his defence; but, finding the aid
of the two emperors necessary to combat successfully the
Mohammedans, he crowned Berenger emperor of the
West, March 24, 916, and, after having united all forces
previously at his command with Berenger and the
dukes of Benevento and Naples, he marched in person
against them, and completely routed and exterminated
them. After a reign of fourteen years, this powerful
prelate of Rome came to a miserable end by the legiti
mate consequences of the same vices that had been in
strumental in raising him to his high dignity. Maro
zia, the wife of Theodore, attempted to secure for
herself and her lover the government of Rome, and find
ing John too much in their way, surprised him in the
Lateran palace, and thrust him into a prison, where,
some months after, he died, either of want or by some
more summary means (A.D. 929). Comp. Bower, Hist
of the Popes, vii, 90 sq.; H. de deut. Pütten, i, 163;
Milman, Lat. Christ. iii, 158 sq. (J. H. W.)

John XI, Pope, a natural son of Marozia, and, in all
probability, of pope Sergius III, was seated on St. Pe
ter's chair by his mother, in whose hands rested at this
time (931) the power to supply any vacancies in the
papal chair. Of course spiritual government was by
such people not in consideration; in fact, Rome was
now by all Christendom detested as a pestiferous swamp.
"Marozia, not content with having been the
wife of a marquis, the wife of a wealthy and powerful
duke of Tuscany, perhaps the mistress of one, certainly
the mother of another pope, looked still higher in her
lucrative title, and must wed the emperor of a king of
Italy her hand was offered, and by him accepted.
But, if the Romans had brokered the rule of a Roman
woman, they would not so readily consent for her par
mour, a foreigner, to rule over them, and, headed by
Marozia's own son, Alberic, the nobles put an end to the
government of Marozia (and Hugh of Provence) and of
John XI by expelling the former and imprisoning
the latter, who died of poison, as is generally supposed
in January, 936. See Milman, Lat. Christ. iii, 163 sq.;
Du Cheyne, Hist. des Papes, ii, 460; Aachbach, Kirchen
Lez. i, 518; Bower, Hist. of the Popes, v, 96 sq.

John XII, Pope, a son of Alberic, and grandson of
the profligate and ambitious Marozia, whose wiles he
had seen used with such success, succeeded to the dignity
of Roman patron upon the death of his father Alberic,
and in November, 955, after the death of Agapetus,
was elevated to the papal see, though only about sixteen
years old. His own name was Octavianus, but as pope
he took that of John XII, thus inaugurating a memory
since been followed by the popes of assuming a pontifical
name. Ambitious to exceed the boundaries of the States of the Church, he soon
involved himself in a disastrous war with Berenger II,
himself full of ambition, and anxious to become
master of Rome. In this most extreme hour of
the pope hesitated not to beseech help from one whom
he had formerly declined to receive as worthy of the
imperial crown, the emperor Otto I. Daring and in
omitable as was the spirit of Otto I, he was no sooner
asked by Rome than we find him crossing the Alps with
the son of Berenger, having entered into the pope not
only personal safety, but also confirmed
his title to the States of the Church. The extent
of these promises, however, has been subject to contro
versy, and it is not without a reason that the Vatican
record, by which Pepin's donation was confirmed and
unlimited, was attacked from critical scrutiny. See Pa
pacy. At Pavia, already, Otto had been crowned king
of Italy, here, at the Eternal City, he received from the
pope himself the imperial diadem. "Never did a more
important event in history take place, making less im
portant to those who witnessed it, and less important
certified by subsequent historians, than the coronation
of Otto I at Rome in the year 962. By the coronation
of Charles 162 years earlier the first foundations had
been laid for the empire; by the coronation of Otto that
empire itself was founded fresh, and from that time for
wards it had an uninterrupted existence." (Welsh, Pe
man See in the Middle Ages, p. 124.) For a short period
the spiritual and temporal heads of Christendom seemed
to be happily united, but the fickle John, influenced
by either mistrust or jealousy, again interrupted
that happy concord by concealing anew intrigues with
Alberic, the son of Berenger. Rumors of un
suitable conduct of John reached the ears of Otto I, but the
noble German would hardly believe the reports until
some trustworthy officers whom he had hastily des
dpatched to Italy pronounced them true. The profligacy
and vices of the pope were also reported to Otto I, and
the latter determined to return to Rome and depose the
vicar, if found guilty of the charges preferred against
him. A council composed of the first ecclesiastics of
Germany, France, and Italy was quickly called by Otto
I, he himself presiding, and the vicar of Christ, accused
of the crimes of murder, adultery, and perjury, was sum
moned to appear in defence. Failing to comply with
the emperor's request, judgment was pronounced, and
he was deposed and excommunicated Dec. 4, 963, and
Leo VIII (q. v.) declared his successor. Hardly had the
emperor left Rome when John, supported by the roman
nobility, returned to the pontificate as Peter's, and caused it to rescind the resolutions of the for
mer one. Otto I, informed of these outrages, was per
paring for a return to Rome for the third time, when
John suddenly died of apoplexy while he was engaged
in an adulterous intrigue, May 14, 964. "It was a
brute, a man of most licentious habits, associating as
he did to Peter's, and caused it to rescind the resolutions of the former one. Otto I, informed of these outrages, was preparing for a return to Rome for the third time, when John suddenly died of apoplexy while he was engaged in an adulterous intrigue, May 14, 964. "It was a brute, a man of most licentious habits, associating as he did with women of every station, and filling the Lateran with the noisy profanity of a brothel." Panvinius, in a note to Plinius's account of pope Joan, suggests that the licentiousness of John XII, who, among his numerous mistresses, had one called Joan, who exercised the chief influence at Rome during his pontificate, may have given rise to
the story of "pope Joan." Comp. Luitprand, Historia
Ottoniana, in Monum. Germ. Script. vol. iii; Milman, Lat.
Christ. iii, 175 sq.; Neander, Ch. History; Gieseler, Ch.
Hist. ii, 380; Reichel, See of Rome in the Middle Ages,
p. 32; Riddle, The Rise of the Papacy, bill 69 sq.; John
XIII., Pope, who was made such A.D. 965, was of
noble descent, and held, previous to his election, the
bishopric of Narbona. Provoking the wrath of the
Roman nobility on account of his severity, and being
a favorite of the imperial party, they instigated a riot
against him, and finally secured him as prisoner. The
pope, however, effected his escape, and returned to the
City about a year after, when the emperor himself made
his appearance, visiting the disorderly factions of the
city with unsmiting severity. After the appointment of
a prefect as representative of the imperial power, Otho
the Great went to Ravenna, followed by the pope. Here
a great and influential council was held, Easter 967,
and fresh guarantee offered to the pontifical church
on all the territory to which it had ever been entitled,
including Ravenna. In return for these favors, John
crowned the younger Otho (afterwards Otho II) as em-
peror, a name which he might have hoped for the sake of his
wife Theophania, the daughter of the Greek emperor. He
also evinced his gratefulness by establishing, at the em-
peror's expressed desire, a mission among the north-east-
erian Slavonians. John died in 972. The few letters
are found in Mansi, Concil. Suppl. i, 1148, and Harduin,
Cod. Dipl. R. ii, 630. See Pagl, Rer. Pontif. R. ii, 283
sq.; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. iii, 520; Herzog, Real-En-
cyklop. vi. 757.

John XIV., Pope, who was, previous to his eleva-
tion, Peter, bishop of Pavia, and arch chancellor of the
emperor, was elected pope through the influence of Otho
II in November or December, 986, in place of Bon-
iface VIII. Unfortunately, he also married, which the
pope died at Rome December 7 of the same year, and the
e-pope, encouraged by the anti-empirical party, ventured
to return the following spring (April 984) from Con-
stantinople, whither he had fled, and proving sufficient-
ly strong to convince John, his person was secured, and
he was imprisoned in the Castle del Angelo, where he
was either poisoned or starved to death. See Aschbach,
Kirchen-Lexikon, iii, 520.

John XV., Pope, who began his inglorious reign in
September 988, was in reality only the puppet of Crescens-
tius, the true governor of Rome, for he presided and ruled
at the Castle del Angelo, and the patricians. At one
John fled to Tuscany, but at the interven-
tion of Otho III he was afterwards permitted to return
and live in the Lateran, but he remained destitute of
all authority. By way of compensation for his lack of
power, he enriched himself and his relatives with the
revenues of the Church. Concerning the dispute about
the bishopric of Rheims, see Sylvester II. He died in
April 996.

Some believe that another John, son of the Roman
Rupertus, was the fifteenth pontiff under the name of
John, and that the present John was the sixteenth pope
of that name, holding the see four months af

after the murder of Boniface VIII; but this is a very
dubious statement, and is wholly denied by modern critics.
Comp. Willman's Jahrbiicher des deutschen Reichs unter
Otto III., p. 208, 212; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lex. iii, 520;
Herzog, Real-Encyklop. vi. 757.

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

John XVIII. or XVII., Pope, succeeded Sylvester
II in 1008, and died four months after his election.
JOHN, 982
JOHN'S, EVE OF ST.

ple of Rome, to the effect that the pope should reside at Rome, and, if absent more than three months, should be considered as deposed. These measures, however, were defeated. In 1803, the German and the Guelphic predominance at Rome was restored, the papal representative resuming his authority. But John XXII never personally visited Rome, having died at Avignon in 1354, when he had accumulated in his coffers the enormous sum of 18,000,000 florins of gold. John is renowned in theological history as the author of a portion of the canon law called the Extra-ambagantes, and also for the singular opinion he entertained that the just will not be admitted to the beatific vision until after the general resurrection. This opinion he was obliged formally to retract before his death (see Reichel, Romus Sec., p. 325). The writings of the Council of Pavia (a.v.), under his pontificate the clergy and people of the towns were deprived of the right of electing their bishops, which right he reserved to himself on payment of certain fees by the persons elected. He was especially rapacious in the collection of the Annates, or First Fruits. See Bower, History of the Popes, vi, 419 sq. Lebbe, xxv, 147; English Cyclopedia, s. v.

John XXIII, Pope, a native of Naples, and previously to his election known as cardinal Cossa, succeeded Alexander V in 1410. A man of great talents, but worthless in character, his reputation as cardinal under his predecessor is by no means enviable. Indeed, he is accused of being one of the most scandalous of popes (Cyclopedia, vii, 211). A witless pontiff, he supported the claims of Louis of Anjou against Ladislaus, king of Naples; but Ladislaus, having defeated his rival in battle, advanced to Rome, and obliged John to flee to Florence. He then preached a crusade against Ladislaus, which gave occasion to denunciation of the pope by Gregory XI, after the great schism continued, and Gregory, styled XII, and Benedict, antipopes, divided with John the homage of the Christian states. In his exile, wishing to secure the favor of the emperor, he proposed to Sigismund the convocation of a general council to restore peace to the Church, and Sigismund fixed on the city of Constance as the place of assembly. On hearing of the death of Ladislaus, by which event Rome became again open to him, John repented of what he had proposed, but was obliged to comply with the general wish by repairing to Constance. By this council (see vol. ii, p. 480) John was forced to drop the papal tiara; but, soon after, by the assistance of Frederick of Austria, he resumed his authority by ordering the council to dissolve. This provoked the question whether the pope is the supreme authority in the Church, and the fourth and fifth sessions, at Constance. With the general Council of Constance, John, now again Balthazar Cossa, escaped from Germany, and made his submission to the new pope, who treated him kindly, and gave him the first rank among the cardinals. He died soon after, Nov. 22, 1415, at Florentine, within the name of John, which most of those who bore it disgraced, either by debauchery, heresy, or other crimes, has since been avoided by the occupants of the chair of St. Peter. See Herzog, Reitl-Fencklop, vi, 759; Eng. Cyclopedia, s. v.; Muratori, Vite, i, ii, 2, p. 846 sq.; Ridgley, Papacy, ii, 333.

John (Sr.), Christians of. See SABIAN.

John's (Sr.) Day, a festival to commemorate the nativity of John the Baptist. It was observed as early as the 4th century. The birth of John is known to have preceded that of Jesus Christ significantly by six months. June 24 is therefore the day fixed upon for this festival. Augustine had commented upon the peculiarity of observing his birthday rather than his martyrdom, and the Church of Rome seems to have acted on this suggestion, for it set aside also a day, namely, August 29, in commemoration of his beheading; but both his birth and martyrdom are celebrated writings the same venerable service of the Church of England, the chief passages relating to his life and death being included in the lessons. See below, John's, Eve of St.

John's, Eve of St., one of the most joyous festivals of Christendom during the Middle Ages, was celebrated in many countries with great pomp and festivity. It is presumed that the observance of it at first was only local. The Council of Lyons, A.D. 1240, ordered that it should be perpetually and universally celebrated.

John's, Eve of St., one of the most joyous festivals of Christendom during the Middle Ages, was celebrated in many countries with great pomp and festivity. It is presumed that the observance of it at first was only local. The Council of Lyons, A.D. 1240, ordered that it should be perpetually and universally celebrated.
Johns, Richard, a celebrated member of the Society of "Friends," was born at Bristol, England, in 1645, and, coming to this country in early manhood, settled in Maryland. He was won over to the Quakers by George Fox, and preached for many years. He died Oct. 16, 1717. For further details, see Janney, Hist. of Friends, i, 190.

Johns, W. G., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Pulaski County, Ky., October 24, 1828, joined the Church at thirteen years of age, was licensed to preach in 1845, and continued in the work for twenty-one years, with interruptions for war of health. Indeed, it is said that so great was his devotion to the Christian ministry that he often preached when barely able to leave his room. He died October 23, 1866. — Conf. Min. Meth. Episc. Church South, iii, 157.

Johnson, Albert Osborne, an American missionary of the Presbyterian Church to India, was born in Cadiz, Ohio, June 22, 1833. He was educated at Jefferson College, Pa., where he was converted, and, on graduation (1852), went to the Theological Seminary at Alleghany, where he graduated in 1855, and was ordained by the presbytery of Ohio June 12, in the same year. He at once entered the missionary work, which was shared by his wife, whom he had married the day he left the Theological Seminary. He long endured the toils of a missionary life; during the Sepoy rebellion in 1857 they suffered martyrdom by the hands of the Indian rebels. For details, see Walsh, Memorial of the Fuggthorl Mission and her Martyred Missionaries (Philadelphia, 1859, 12mo), p. 241 sq. Mr. Johnson is spoken of by Walsh as "a man of very great influence and of fine social qualities. As a Christian he was zealous and devoted, a man of prayer, and faithful in all his duties; as a missionary he bade fair to excel in every department of labor. His qualifications were of a high order."

Johnson, Enoch, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born in North Carolina; he was early converted; joined the Itinerancy in 1819, and died November 25, 1824. He was a man of deep piety and useful talents. His labors were abundantly successful, and his character greatly beloved. — Minutes of Conferences, i, 492.

Johnson, Evan M., D.D., a minister of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Rhode Island, June 10, 1792. He was ordained to the ministry in the Trinity Church, Newport, by bishop Cопwood, July 4, 1818; removed to New York City in 1814, and became assistant rector of Grace Church, but the year following he exchanged this position for the rectory of St. James' Church, Newtown, L. I. In 1824 he settled in Brooklyn, and built St. John's Church. During his ministry he united nearly 4000 couples in marriage, and baptized nearly 10,000 children. He was, at the time of his decease, March 19, 1865, the oldest settled Episcopal clergyman in the State of New York.

Johnson, Haynes, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Newbury, Vermont, in 1801; converted in 1829; entered the New Hampshire Conference in 1831, and died at Newbury, April 5, 1866. He was "a faithful and laborious teacher," and in the last month of his life he made his death nine hundred pastoral visits. He was very successful in winning souls to Christ. — Minutes of Conferences, vi, 75.

Johnson, Herman Merrill, S.T.D., L.L.D., a prominent minister and educator of the Methodist Episcopal Church, was born in Oswego County, N. Y., Nov. 25, 1816. Early on account of its numerical importance, he entered, in 1837, the junior class of Wesleyan University, graduating with distinction in 1839. The same year he was elected professor of ancient languages in St. Charles's College, Missouri, where he remained for three years. Thence he was called to occupy the chair of ancient languages in St. Louis, Missouri; but he held for two years, when he was elected professor of ancient languages and literature in the Ohio Wesleyan University at Delaware, Ohio. Here he performed for a while the duties of acting president of the institution, organizing its curriculum, and was especially interested in introducing the Bible into the method of ministerial education. In 1850 he was elected professor of philosophy and English literature in Dickinson College, a position which he filled for ten years, when he was called to the presidency of this institution, together with the chair of moral science, in 1860. Dr. Johnson died April 5, 1868. Several memorial resolutions in behalf of the Methodist centenary had secured to Dickinson College a fair endowment. He contributed largely to the Church periodicals, especially the New York Christian Advocate and the Methodist Quarterly Review. Indeed, he was decided ally both as a writer and an instructor, and his contributions were always written with uncommon interest; for, as a thinker, he was clear, concise, original, and his writings were often eminently distinguished for their simplicity and grace of expression. He had an especial liking for all questions of historical and philological inquiry, and published a learned edition of the City of Herodotus (N. Y., 1842, and often). He left unfinished another large and valuable philological contribution, the translation and revision of Eberhard's great Synonymical Dictionary of German, French, Italian, Spanish, and English. It is especially to be regretted that he did not live to complete it. He made a valuable translation of The historical Books of the Old Test. "Personally, Dr. Johnson was a man of many and rare excellencies. He was pre-eminently a scholar, extensively learned, and yet distinguished for culture rather than for mere learning. He was especially eminent as a teacher, and as an administrator and disciplinarian he had few superiors. In private he was a model Christian gentleman, affable, refined, and unassuming; able and entertaining in conversation, and as a companion gentle, without descending to any thing out of harmony with his elevated character and position. As a preacher he was both forcible and instructive, though too rigidly correct in his teaching to allow him to become extensively popular. In his relations to the Church he belonged to an important but very small class. His Christian character, his learning, and his confessed abilities fitted him for almost any one of the highest and most responsible offices in the Church. Such was the Church he occupied, while others of equal dignity and importance were ready to be offered to him" (Christian Advocate, N. Y., April 16, 1868). (J. H. W.)

Johnson, John (1), an eminent and learned divine of the Church of England, was born Dec. 30, 1662. He was educated at King's School, in the city of Canterbury, and at St. Mary Magdalen College, Cambridge. Soon after he graduated he was twice married: he was priest of Palace of West and dean of Canterbury to a scholarship in Corpus Christi College, and there took the degree of master of arts in 1685. Shortly after he entered into deacon's orders, and became curate to Thomas Hardress, at Hardres, near Canterbury. In 1686 he became vicar of Boughton under the Bless, and in 1687 he held the vicarage of Hernhill, adjoining to Boughton. In 1697 he obtained the living of St. John, in the Isle of Thanet, which he shortly after exchanged for that of Appledon, and in 1707 he was inducted to the vicarage of Cranbrook. He died in 1725. His works display the highest scholars, a mastery both of the Greek and Hebrew languages, and a deep research into the Holy Scriptures. His Unbloody Sacrifice (London, 1714, 8vo; latest ed., Oxon, 1847, 2 vols. 8vo) is the most complete work on the Eucharist, considered as a sacrifice, extant, particularly in its large collection of extracts from the fathers, which are printed in full. These are cited to prove that the Eucharist is a proper material sacrifice; that it is both eucharistic and propitiatory; that it is to be offered by proper officers; that the oblation is to be made on a proper altar; that it is to be consumed by the congregation; that it cannot be proved that what our Saviour speaks concerning eating
his flesh and drinking his blood in the 6th chapter of St. John's Gospel is principally meant of the Eucharist. This publication, having involved him in a bitter controversy on account of its High-Church views, induced him to publish, in 1717, The Doctrine, the Sacrament, and All that We Need and Supported, part ii, showing the agreement and disagreement of the Eucharist with the sacrifices of the ancients, and the excellency of the former; the great importance of the Eucharist both as a feast and a sacrifice; the necessity of frequent communion; the respect of the people at the Eucharist; the nature of excommunication; the primitive method of preparation, with devotions for the altar. His other works are, A Collection of all Ecclesiastical Laws, etc., concerning the Government, etc., of the Church of England (Lond. 1720, 2 vols. 8vo; Ox ford, 1850-51, 2 vols. 8vo).—A Collection of Discourses, etc. (Lond. 1728, 2 vols. 8vo).—The Pastor, or Holy David and his Old English Translators cleared (London, 1707, 8vo). See Life, by Rev. Thos. Brett.—Hook, Eccles. Dict. s. v.; Allibone, Dict. Engl. and Am. Auth. ii, s. v. (E. de F.)

Johnson, John (2), an able and popular minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church, born in Lounsbury Co., Va., July 7, 1873; joined the Church in 1897, and entered the Conference at Liberty Hill, Tennessee, in 1898. Two years after he removed to Kentucky, and was appointed to the Sandy River Circuit, and in 1881 to Natchez Circuit. His early educational advantages had been limited, but since he entered the ministry of his Church he can hardly be said to have possessed a fair English education; but unremitting efforts to gain knowledge at last made him one of the best scholars of his Conference. Thus, while at the Natchez Circuit, he displayed an extensive knowledge of the Greek and Hebrew, of which no one had ever before had an idea, and from that time he began to rise rapidly in the estimation of his colleagues. He now took rank with Lakin, Sale, Page, Blackman, and Oglesby, and was regarded by many as the most remarkable preacher of the West. In 1812 he was appointed to the Nashville Circuit; then successively to the Livingston, Christian, and Goose Creek, and finally again to the Livingston Circuit; and in 1818 he was sent to the Nashville Station. While he here engaged in a controversy on the question of immortality with the Baptist preacher Varden, in which he is generally believed to have come off victor; at least from this event dates his great popularity in the West. "Henceforth," says Redford (Methodism in Kentucky, ii, 143), "the name of John Johnson was the synonym of success in religious controversies." From 1820 to 1828, successively the Red River, Hopkinsville, and Russellville Circuits, and in 1828 stationed at Louisville, and in 1829 at Maysville, and, after several years of rest, was in 1831 appointed presiding elder of the Green River, and in 1832 of Hopkinsville District. In 1836 he was finally located, and he now removed to Mt. Vernon, Illinois. Here he died April 9, 1838. "As a Christian," says the Western Christian Advocate (May 26, 1838), "brother Johnson was consistent, exemplary, and deeply devoted. 'Holiness to the Lord' appears to have been his motto. He died in great peace, testifying, as his flesh and heart failed, that God was the author of his heart and his portion forever." (J.H.W.)

Johnson, John (3). See Johnsonians.

Johnson, John, Barent, a minister of the Reformed (Dutch) Church, was born in 1769 in Brooklin j. I.; graduated at Columbia College, 1792; studied theology under Dr. John H. Livingston, and entered the ministry in 1795. He was co-pastor of the Reformed Dutch Church, Albany, with Rev. Dr. John Bassett, from 1796 to 1799, and afterwards pastor of the church in Brooklin, 1802-3. Of presiding presence and engaging manners, he won many friends by his dignified and courteous bearing. He was popular with all classes, especially with the young. As a preacher he was distinguished for a melodious voice, a natural manner, and effective oratory. His oration on General Washington "produced a great sensation throughout the community. The oration was spoken of at the time as a rare specimen of eloquence; and the whole performance was spoken of as a very high order." It was published by the Legislature, at whose request it was delivered. He also published several other discourses, and contributed largely to literary periodicals of his day. In person he was tall, slender, well proportioned, and graceful. His imagination was brilliant and his fervor profound. His intellects to qualities and theological and literary attainments were eminent. He wrote his sermons, but delivered them extemporaneously, with great simplicity, directness, and unctu. He died of consumption, Aug. 29, 1803. Of his three children, two became Episcopalian clergymen: one at Jamaica, L. I.; the other a professor in the General Theological Seminary at New York. —Rogers, Historical Discourse (Albany, 1856); Sprague, Annals, ix, 167. (W. J. H. T.)

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

Johnson, Samuel (1), an English divine, and a learned but violent writer against popery in the reign of James II., was born in Warwickshire in 1649. He studied at St. Paul's School and at Trinity College, Cambridge, where he obtained the living of a college chaplain. He went to Essex, but continued to reside in London, and mingled much in politics. He was a friend of Essex, and chaplain to Lord William Russell, and advocated the succession of the duke of York. He was a decided opponent of king James II and of his schemes to introduce popery as the religion of the state, and attacked Dr. Hickey (p. v.), the upholster of passive obedience, in a pamphlet entitled Julianus the Apostate. He would have gone further had not the death of his protector, lord Russell, obliged him to become more prudent, and to keep his Juliae et Vivae Christianae Monarchiae, which he published for having written the former work he was summoned before judge Jeffries, and of course condemned to a heavy fine. Unable to pay the fine, he was imprisoned, and during his confinement wrote An humble and hearty Address to all Protestants in the present Army, intended to provoke a rebellion against king James II. He was now put in the pillory in Palace Yard, at Charing Cross, whipped, and fined, after being degraded from orders. After the Revolution of 1688, William III. caused the verdict to be reversed, and gave him an indemnity. He died in 1708. His writings were collected and published under the title Works (3d ed. London, 1713, 3 vol.) See Biographia Britannica; Hoefer, Nouv. Bio. Gen. xxvi, 791; Debarby, Hist. Ch. of Engl. from James II. to 1717, p. 70; Allibone, Dict. Engl. and Amer. Authors. i. 971. (E. de F.)

Johnson, Samuel (2), D.D., an American divine, was born at Guilford, Conn., Oct. 14, 1836, and passed A.B. in 1741 at Yale College, then situated at New Haven. On the removal of Yale to New Haven he became one of its tutors, and in 1720 pastor of the Congregational Church, West Haven. Determined to change his ecclesiastical relations, he went to England, and received episcopal ordination in 1723. He then visited Oxford and Cambridge, where he was made acquainted with America. Upon his arrival he entered on the mission of Stratford, Conn., and formed the acquaintance of William Burnet, son of the bishop of Salisbury. His
ministerial duties were now considerably increased, and his pen warmly engaged for some years in defence of episcopacy. But in 1743 he was made D.B. by the University of Oxford. In 1744 he was appointed president of King's College, New York, in which office he continued till 1754, when he returned to Stratford, where he spent a tranquil and dignified old age, chiefly in literary labor. In 1746 he issued A System of Morality, and in 1747, A Dictionary of the English Language, and other theological and miscellaneous treatises after this date. He died Jan. 6, 1772.—Sprague, Am. Annals, v., 52; Allibone, Dict. Eng. and Am. Auth., ii, 971. (E. de F.)

Johnson, Samuel (3), LL.D., one of the most distinguished literary ministers of the eighteenth century, was born at Stratford, near London, on Dec. 13, 1709. His education was acquired in his native town. In 1728 he was entered at Pembroke College, Oxford, but, in consequence of the want of means, did not remain long enough to obtain his degree. In 1731 his father died insolvent. In the same year he went to Bosworth as usher of a school. He conformed to the independency of mind, the drudgery of teaching, and preferred to support himself by working for booksellers in Birmingham. In 1736 he married Mrs. Porter, the widow of a mercer, who brought him £800. Failing in an effort to establish an academy, he repaired in 1737 to London to accompany his colleague, the Rev. Mr. David Garrick. He devoted himself entirely to literary labor. His first production which attracted notice was his London, a poem in imitation of the third satire of Juvenal. Having entered into an engagement with the Gentleman's Magazine, he became active in the parliamentary debates, which, being then a breach of privilege, came out under the fiction of Arguments in the Senate of Lilliput. These obtained great celebrity on account of their extraordinary eloquence, and were almost exclusively the product of his own invention. The works which were now produced were crowded with new cold fancy, and should be regarded as extraordinary monuments both of vigor and originality in thinking, and of great though ponderous power of expression.

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

Dr. Johnson is generally charged with extreme bigotry, and want of charity towards religionists who differed from him. This charge, however, is very unfair in the face of his repeated declaration to the contrary. "All denominations of Christians," he is reported to have said, "have really little difference in point of doctrine, though they may differ widely in external forms." "What would we ourselves be," he said in 1750 concerning Methodists, "if Protestant, agree in the essential articles, and that their differences are trivial, and rather political than religious." He spoke in the highest terms of Wesley from intimate knowledge of his character, having been at the same college with him, and said that "he thought of religion only." "What would we be," he said, "if we ourselves were Methodists teachers," he said, "he could scarcely doubt the sincerity of that man, who travelled 900 miles in a month, and preached twelve times in a week; for no adequate reward, merely temporal, could be given for such indefatigable labor. The established clergy in general did not preach plain enough; polished periods and glittering transitions were the effect. They always used the Latin style and novelty, and even in religion itself courted new appearances and modifications." His views on the great subjects of original sin, in consequence of the fall of man, and of the atonement made by our Saviour, as reported by his celebrated biographer, were decided and evangelical; the adherence to the orthodox tenets of the church, and the independence of mind of his religious views were equally explicit. In short, it appears that few men have ever lived in whose thoughts religion had a larger or more practical share. His habitual piety, says lord Brougham, "his sense of his own imperfections, his generally blameless conduct in all the various relations of life, have already been sufficiently described. He was a good man, as he was a great man; and he had so firm a regard for virtue that he wisely set much greater store by his worth than by his fame." "Though consciousness of superiority might sometimes make him sit at a table high with man and above his own station, and even this was much insisted on by himself in the last part of his life, his devotions have shown to the whole world how humbly he walked at all times with his God." "If, then, it be asked," says lord Mahon, "who first in England, at that period, breathed the waves and stemmed the tides of infidelity which threatened the freedom of the press, or who, in conjunction together with argument and learning, on the side of revealed religion, first turned the literary current in its favor, mainly prepared the reaction which succeeded—that praise seems most justly to belong to Dr. Samuel Johnson. Religion was with him no mere lip service but an active life. He was a man of cold fancy and cold heart; and it can be shown that his meditations, his long hours as much as in his grave labors, he brought to it not merely erudition such as few indeed possessed, but the weight of the highest character, and the respect which even his enemies could not deny him. It may be said of him that, though not in orders, he did the Church of England service better and with more skill than most of those who at that lastest era ate her bread."

The death of this great man was a beautiful commentary on his life. "When at length," says lord Macaulay, "the moment dreaded through so many years came close, the dark cloud passed away from Johnson's mind. His spirit became light; he talked of the grave without a ghastly tale; he ceased to think of death and of that which lies beyond death, and he spoke much of the mercy of God and the propagation of Christ. Though the tender care which had mitigated his sufferings during months of sickness at Streatham was withdrawn, he was not left desolate. . . . In this serene frame of mind he died, Dec. 13, 1784; a week later he was laid in Westminster Abbey, among the eminent men of whom he had been the historian—Cowley and Denham, Dryden and Congreve, Gay, Prior, and Addison." (E. de F.)

It remains for us to append a brief outline of all the literary labors of his life. In addition to his contributions to the Gentleman's Magazine and his poem London, Johnson wrote in 1744 an interesting Life of Richard Savage; in 1749 his best poem, The Vanity of Human Wishes, an imitation of the tenth satire of Juvenal; and in 1751, The Rambler, a periodical which was conducted for two years, and the contents of which were almost wholly his own composition. But perhaps one of his greatest accomplishments is his Dictionary, a noble piece of work, enlisting its author to be considered the founder of English lexicography; it appeared in 1755, after eighteen years of labor, and another periodical, was begun by him in 1758, and carried on for two years also; and in 1759 occurred one of the most touching episodes of his life—the writing of Ras-
JOHNSON was written, he tells us, "in the evenings of a week." But, with all these publications before the public, he did not really emerge from obscurity until 1762, when a pen who, with a name, was confirmed by him by lord Bute; and in the following year occurred an event, apparently of little moment, but which had a lasting influence upon his fame: this was his introduction to James Boswell, whose Life of Dr. Johnson is probably more imperishable than any of the doctor's own writings. In 1764 the famous Literary Club was instituted, and in the following year began his intimacy with the Thrales. In the same year appeared his edition of Shakespeare. In 1773 he visited the Highlands with Boswell, and in 1781 appeared his Essay to Works; Memoir by Walter Scott; Essays by Macaulay and Carlyle; a brief but elaborate character of Dr. Johnson, written by Sir James Mackintosh, in his Life, ii. 168-9; Dr. Johnson, his Religious Life and Works (N.Y. 1865, 8vo); Chambers, Cyclop., s. v.; English Cyclopedia, s. v.; and the excellent and elaborate article in Allibone, Dict. Engl. and Amer. Authors, s. v.

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


JOHNSON, William Bullein, D.D., a Baptist minister, was born on John's Island, near Charleston, S. C., June 13, 1782. He was ordained for the priest's profession, but after conversion (1804) he decided for the ministry, and was ordained, January, 1806, pastor of a church at Eutaw, S. C. In 1809 he removed to Columbia; in 1810 he went to Savannah, Ga., whence he returned to Columbia in 1816. In 1819 he was placed in charge of the female academy at Greenville, S. C. Eight or nine years later he removed to Edgeville, S. C., as pastor, teaching also at the same time at a female high school, and subsequently to Anderson, S. C., where a university for ladies bears his name. He finally returned to Greenville, S. C., where he labored faithfully for the Church of his choice up to the hour of his death, in perfect vigor of mind and soundness of body very unlike an octogenarian. He died there in 1862. The degree of D.D. was conferred upon him by Brown University in 1838. Dr. Johnson was a prominent member of the Bible Revision Society, and one of the presidents of the General Baptist Convention of the United States (formed in 1814). Over the Baptist Convention of his native state he presided for a score and a half of years. He wrote largely for religious and periodical religious and periodical publications. He was the author of several books. Among his Chief works were: "Development of the Gospel of Jesus Christ through the Government and Order of the Churches," sermons, circulars, and addresses. — Appleton, Cyclop. x. 36.

JOHNSONIANS, followers of John Johnson, a Baptist minister at Liverpool, England, in the last century, of whom there are still several congregations in different parts of England. He denied that faith was a duty, or even action of the soul, and defined it "an active principle" conferred by grace; and denied also the duty of the regenerate man to rain and plead for his own sins, or to claim special sentences and moral duties whatever. Though Mr. Johnson entertained high supralapsarian notions on the divine decrees, he admitted the universality of the death of Christ. On the doctrine of the Trinity, his followers are said to have embraced the indwelling scheme, with Calvinistic views of justification and the atonement. See See Johnson's Faith of God's Elect; Brine's Mistakes of Mr. Johnson (1745).

JOHNSTON, Arthur, a Scotch writer of great celebrity, a native of Caskieben, near Aberdeen, was born in 1587. He was a physician by profession, but spent most of his time in literary pursuits; especially throughout his acquaintance. See with Latin, for his Latin version of the Psalms, one of his last and best works, that we mention his name here. They were published under the title of Psalmorum Daviis Paraphrasis Poetica, et Cantico Evangelicorum. Edinburgh, 1607, 12mo, and often since. As another writer of note, George Buchanan, also furnished a Latin version of the Psalms; a comparison was frequently instituted as to the comparative merits of their work. Hallam (Liter. Hist. of Europe, 4th ed. Lond. 1854, iii. 53), in alluding to it, thinks that "Johnston's Psalms, all of which are in elegiac metre, do not fall far short of those of Buchanan either in elegance of style or correctness of Latinity." Johnston spent the earlier part of his life in France and Italy. His medical degree he obtained at Padua. He returned to Scotland in 1625, and about 1628 was appointed physician to the court of Charles I. In 1637 his literary attainments received recognition by his election to the rectorate of King's College. He died in 1641. Besides the Psalms, he translated into Latin the Te Deum, Creed, Decalogue, etc.; also Solomon's Song (Lond. 1638, 8vo). His other publications are Elegiae in Obiturum R. Jacobsi (Lond. 1625, 4to); — Epistularum (Aberdeen, 1608); — The, etc. See also Johnson, ed. of Johnston's version of the Psalms: Allibone, Dict. Eng. and Amer. Authors, ii. 983; Cyclop. Brit. vol. xii. s. v.

JOHNSTON, John, a Scotch minister, was a native of Aberdeen, and flourished in the latter half of the 16th century. He was, like his relative Arthur Johnston (q. v.), a supporter of bishop Wishart; but, as a minister of the Church (the Presbyterian) in the capacity of professor of divinity at St. Andrew's College. He died in 1612. He wrote Consolatio Christiana sub Cruce, (1617, 8vo); — Jamb Secr (Lond. 1651); — Terrestriachi et Lemmon Sacra—Item Cantica Sacra — Item lones Regnum Judaeorum ac Gentium — Item Saturni aetatem. — Informed by the title-page, Dict. of English and American Authors, vol. ii. s. v.

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

JO'fáda (Heb. Yôfáda), "a contraction of Jôhó'fáda, found only in Nehemiah, who invariably was ii), the name of two men.

1. (Sept. Iôso'dá v. r. Iôso'dá, Vulg. Joseph, A. V.) Son of Phashah, and apparently one of the chief priests; in conjunction with Meshullam he repaired the Old Gate [see JERUSALEM], with its appearance, after the captivity (Neh. iii. 6). B.C. 446.

2. (Sept. Iôso'dá v. r. Iôso'dá, "the". Son and successor of Eliahib in the high-priesthood, himself
JOIAKIM
succeeded by his son Jonathan (Neh. xii, 10, 11, 22); another of his sons having married a daughter of Sanballat, on which account he was banished (Neh. xiii, 26). B.C. post 446. Josephus (Ant. xi, 7, 1) gives the name to Jezebel (Ibid.). See HIGH-PRIEST.
Jo'ak'in (Hab. Yogakí'im, דָּוָיִקִּים, a contraction of Jeroham, used exclusively by Nehemiah; Sept. 'Iwaqvíyí v. r. 'Iwaqívíq, son of Jehoahaz and father of Eli-shah高等, high-priests successively (Neh. xii, 10, 12, 26). B.C. ante 446. Josephus does not mention him. See HIGH-PRIEST.
Jo'arîb (Hab. Yogarîb, דָּוָיִרִב, a contraction of Jeroham, occurring exclusively in Ezra and Nehemiah), the name of three or four persons.
1. (Sept. 'Iwaqvíyí v. r. 'Iwaqívíq.) A priest named (Neh. xii, 10) in connection with Jachin, and as father of Jediah (q. v.), but by some error; compare 1 Chron. ix, 10, where he is called Jezaeliah (q. v.), well known as founder of one of the sacerdotal "courses." See PRIEST.
2. (Sept. 'Iwaqvíyí.) A descendant of Judah, son of Sechariah and father of Adiah (Neh. xi, 5), apparently through Shileah. See SHILLO. B.C. considerably ante 536.
3. (Sept. 'Iwaqvíyí, 'Iwaqívíq.) One of the priests who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh. xii, 6). He was the father of Mattenai, a contemporary with the high-priest Jeshua (Neh. xii, 19). B.C. 526.
4. (Sept. 'Iwaqvíyí v. r. 'Iwaqívíq.) A priest mentioned in connection with Elathann as a "man of understanding" (the others being called "chief men"), apparently among the priests, sent for by Ezra at the river of Ahava to devise means for obtaining a company of Levites to return with him to Jerusalem (Ezra viii, 16). B.C. 459.
Joining, besides its common sense (בָּנָה, to cling or adhere), is technically used of the binders (נָּפָיּית, mechabberoth), whether of wood or stone, of the walls of a building (1 Chron. xxii, 3). See COUPLING.
Joint, besides its usual meaning (יָבָנָה de bek, ṣiph, etc.), is, in one passage (Cant. vii, 1), very erroneously employed in the A.V. as a rendering of הָנָתִית, cham-mukhan (Sept. vaguely מִבְּּוֹצִית, Vulg. junctura, occurs nowhere else, the wrappers (of the thigs), i.e. drawers, a part of the female dress; which, in the case of bridal toilette, are represented as being fringed with a worked edging like lace or a skillfully chased jewel. See ATTIRE.
Jōk'ēśām (Hab. Yokešām, דָּוָיִשְׁאָמָה, burning of the people; Sept. 'Ikešādad, v. r. 'Ikešād, Vulg. Jucudam), a town in the mountains of Judah, mentioned between Jezeel and Zanoah (Jos. viii, 1). The association of the name with the locality in the district south-east of Hebron, perhaps at the ruined site marked as ed-Dur on Van de Velde's Map, just north of Jebel Ziph.
Jō'kīm (Hab. Yōkīm, דָּוָיִכִים, prob. a contraction of JOIAKIM; Sept. 'Iwaqvíyí v. r. 'Iwaqvíq, Vulg. paraphrases qui stare facit solem), a person mentioned among the descendants of Shelah (his third son, according to Berrington), son of Judah (1 Chron. iv, 22). B.C. prob. about 598. Josephus (Ant. xii, 5), 2nd century. See JOSHUA.
Jo'ah (Hab. Yōjah, דָּוָיִח, gathering of the people; 1 Kings iv, 12, Sept. 'Iwaqvíyí v. r. 'Iwaqvíq, Vulg. Jecmaan, Auth. Vers. "Joahneam", in 1 Chron. vi 68 [58], 'Iwaqvíq, Jecmaan), a place elsewhere called KIRZAIM (Josh. xxii, 22), but better known as JOKER\- AM (Josh. xiii, 22, etc.).
Jok'ne'am (Heb. Yōkne'am, דָּוָיִנָאָמ, possession of the people; Sept. 'Ikešvōyā, Vulg. Jugachanam, Jechnam, Jecnam), a royal city of the Canaanites (Josh. xii, 22), situated on the southwestern boundary of Zebulon (but not within it [see THIRTY], near Dabbasheth, and fronted by a stream [the Kishon] (Josh. xix, 11); assigned out of the territory of Zebulon to the Levites of the family of Merari (Josh. xxi, 34). From 1 Chron. vi, 68, the name appears to have been in later times written in the nearly synonomous form of JOKERAM, and it thus appears (in the original) as the boundary point of one of the purveyors of stores to King Josiah, who seems to have been identical with the Levitical city KIRZAIM (see Lightfoot, Opp. ii, 233) in Mount Ephraim (Josh. xii, 22). Dr. Robinson has lately identified it with the modern Tell Katam, a commanding position at the foot of Mount Carmel, across the Kishon from the plain of Esdraelon, and in a locality exactly agreeing with the scriptural data, and in name and situation with the CAYMON (q. v.) of the Apocrypha (Judith vii, 8), as well as with that of the Cammona of Eusebius and the Cynara of Jerome, although (in their Onomasticon) they profusely ignore the site of Jokne'am, now a town of Bibl. Researches, iii, 115). Schwartz (Palest, p. 91) gives a conjecture agreeing with the latter part of this identification. (See also Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 320; Tristan, Land of Israel, p. 119.)
Jōk'ṣān (Heb. Yōkṣān, דָּוָיִשְׁצָאָן, marer; Sept. 'Ikešvōv v. r. 'Ikešōv or 'Ikešrōv), the second son of Abrah\- am and Ketarah, whose sons Sheba and Dedan appear to have been the ancestors of the Sabaeans and Dedanites, that people part of Arabia Felix (Gen. xxv, 2, 3; 1 Chron. i, 22, 33). B.C. cir. 2920. "If the Keturahites stretched across the desert from the head of the Arabian to that of the Persian Gulf (see DEDAN), then we must suppose that Jokshan returned westwards to the trans-Jordanic country, where are placed the settlements of his sons, or at least the chief of their settlements, for a wide spread of these tribes seems to be indicated in the passages in the Bible which make mention of them. The writings of the Arabs are rarely of use in the case of Keturahite tribes, whom they seem to confound with Ishmaelites in one common name. Allah mentions a dialect of Jokshan (Yakshas, who is in Jokshan, as having been formerly spoken near 'Aden and El-Jened, in Southern Arabia: Yakṭṭās Moqam, cited in the Zeitschrift d. Deutsch. Morgenl. Gesellschaft, viii, 600-1; x, 30-1; but that Midianites penetrated so far into the peninsula we hold to be completely improbable" (Smith). Stem� Knobel (Genes. p. 188) suggests that the name Jokshan may have passed into KASHAN (کشان), and that his descendants were the Cassanians (Cassanvatia) of Tolemy (vi, 7, 6) and Stephan. Byzant. (s. v.), the Cassanides (Cassari-joctic) of Agatharchides (p. 6, ed. Hude), the G assay s (Tarsaviatia) of Dios. Sic. (iii, 44), and the Cassani or Gessani of Pliny (Hist. Nat. vi, 32), who dwelt by the Red Sea, to the south of the Cassanides, and extended to the most norther of the Joktanites." See ARABIA.
Jōk'tān (Heb. Yōk'tān, דָּוָיִךְתָאָן, little; Sept. 'Ikeśāv, Josephus 'Ikešração, Ant. i, 6, 4; Vulg. Jectan), a Shemithe, second named of the two sons of Eber, his brother being Peleg (Gen. x. 25; 1 Chron. i, 19). B.C. cir. 2400. He is mentioned as the progenitor of thirteen sons or heads of tribes, supposed to have resided in the head region (Gen. xx. 30); 1 Chron. i, 20-23). The Arabians called him Khahtan and assert that from him the eight original residents of Yemen sprang. His name is still pointed out by them near Kishbuhr (Niebuhr, Beschreib, p. 287), and traces of the same name appear in a city mentioned by Niebuhr (Beschr. p. 275) as lying between the Red Sea and the Aqurney north of Nejeran, perhaps the station Juktan alluded to by Edrisi as situated in the district of Sanan. (See

All accounts of the Jotkanidae are stated in the Bible: "Their dwelling was from Mecha, as thou goest unto Shepar, a mount of the East" (Gen. x, 30). The position of Mecha, which is reasonably supposed to be the western boundary, is still uncertain [see Mecha]; but Shepar is well established as being the same as Zafar, which the Arabians placed on the east of the Yemed, and formerly one of the chief centres of the great Indian and African trade. See SEPHAL.

1. The native traditions respecting Jotkan himself commence with a difficulty. The ancestor of the great southern peoples was called Kahtan, who, say the Arabs, was the same as the ancient. To this son of Kahtan some European critics have objected that there is no good reason to account for the change of name, and that the identification of Kahtan with Jotkan is evidently a Jewish tradition adopted by Mohammed or his followers, and consequently at or after the promulgation of the Koran. M. Cauvin de Perceval commences his essay on the history of Yemen (Essai, i, 39) with this assertion, and adds, "Le nom de Cabtân, dissent-ils [les Arabes], est le nom de Ye'ttân, légèrement altéré en passant d'une langue étrangère dans la langue Arabe." In reply to these objections we would say:

1. The Rabbins hold a tradition that Jotkan settled in India (see Joseph, Ant., i, 6, 4), and the supposition of a Jewish influence in the Arab traditions respecting him is therefore untenable. In the present case, even were this not so, there is an absence of motive for Mohammed or his followers to adopt traditions which alienate from the race of Ishmael many tribes of Arabia: the influence here suspected may rather be found in the contradictory assertion, put forward by a few of the Arabs, and rejected by the great majority and the most judicious of their historians, that Kahtan was descended from Ishmael.

2. That the traditions to which reference is here made are post-Mohammedan cannot be proved; the same may be said of everything which Arab writers tell us dates before the prophet's time; for then oral tradition alone existed, if we except the rock-cut inscriptions of the Himyarites, which are too slight to admit of much weight attaching to them.

3. In the Mirat es-Zemam it is stated, "Bin El-Kebbi says, Yuktan [the Arabic equivalent of Jotkan] is the same as Kahtan, son of 'Abir," i.e. Eber, and so say the genealogers of the Arabs. El-Bedelhdri says, "People differ in their adopting Kahtan for their ancestor; some say he is the same as Yuktan, who is mentioned in the Pentateuch; but the Arabs arabized his name, and said Kahtan, the son of Hud [because they identified their prophet Hud with Eber, whom they call 'Abir]; and some say, son of Es-Senefya," or, as is said in one place by the author here quoted, "El-Hemeya, the son of Nebir [or Nabii, i.e. Nebiath], the son of Ismail," i.e. Ishmael. He then proceeds, in continuation of the former passage, "Abi-Hanife ed-Dinawarti says, He is Kahtan, the son of Abir, and was named Kahtan only because he is suffering from drought;" [which is termed in Arabic Kaht]. (Mirat es-Zemam; account of the sons of Sem.)

Of similar changes of names by the Arabs there are numerous instances. (See the remarks occurring in the Koran chap. ii, 248, in the Expositions of Ezanakshebert and El-Beydawi.)

2. The settlements of the sons of Jotkan are examined in the separate articles bearing their names, and generally in Arabia. They colonized the whole of the south of the peninsula, the old "Arabia Felix," or the Yemen as it has a very wide significance in early times, stretching, according to the Arabs (and there is in this case no ground for doubting their general correctness), to Meckh on the north-west, and along nearly the whole of the southern coast eastwards, and far inland. At Meckh tradition connects the two great races of Arabia and Israël, the modern Yemenites and the descendants of Jurhum the Jotkanites with Ishmael. It is necessary, in mentioning this Jurhum, who is called a "son of Jotkan (Kahtan), to observe that "son" in these cases must be regarded as signifying "descendant," and that many generations (though how many, or in what order, is not known) are missing from the existing list between Kahtan (embracing the most important time of the Jotkanites) and the establishment of the comparatively modern Himyaritic kingdom, from this latter date, stated by Cauvin, Essai, i, 63, at B.C. c. 100, the succession of the Tubaas is apparently preserved to us. At Meckh the tribe of Jurham long held the office of guardians of the Kaabah, or temple, and the sacred enclosure, until they were expelled by the Ishmaelites (Kutd ed-Dyn, Hist. of Meckh, ed. Wustenfeld, p. 35 and 39 sq.; and Cauvin, Essai, i, 194).

Finally, the Biblical Sheba, that the kingdom of Jotkan attained its greatness. In the southwestern angle of the peninsula, Sana (Uza), Seba (Sheba), and Hadramaut (Hazarath), all closely neighboring, formed together the principal known settlements of the Jotkanites. Here arose the kingdom of Seba, followed in later times by that of Himyar. The dominion of tribes from remote ages seems to have been that of Seba (or Sheba, the Sabaei of the Greeks), while the family of Himyar (Homerya) held the first place in the tribe. The kingdom called that of Himyar we believe to have been merely a late phase of the old Seba, divided in both its rise and its name, only shortly before our era.

Next in importance to the tribe of Seba was that of Hadramaut, which, till the fall of the Himyaritic power, maintained a position of independence and a direct line of rulers from Kahtan (Cauvin, i, 185 sq.). Jotkanite tribes followed in later times by that of himyars. The dominion of tribes from remote ages seems to have been that of Seba (or Sheba, the Sabaei of the Greeks), while the family of Himyar (Homerya) held the first place in the tribe. The kingdom called that of Himyar we believe to have been merely a late phase of the old Seba, divided in both its rise and its name, only shortly before our era.

The name of Jotkheil, that of the two cities. 1. (Sept. 112.229, v. 112.229.) A town in the plain of Judah, mentioned between Mizpeh and Lachish (Josh. xv, 49). The associated name, city of Jotkheil, is a village from the tribe of Judah in the district south-west and south of Hebron (Keil's Commentary, ad loc.); possibly at Balad, a small modern village a little south of Tell es-Safak (Eddesm, Researches, ii, 368).

2. (Sept. 112.229, v. 112.229.) The name was given by king Azazah to Shokel, the capital of ancient Arabia Petraea, and subsequently borne by it (2 Kings xiv, 7); from which circumstance it appears to have improved it after having captured it. See PETRA.
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JOLLY, Alexander, an English prelate, was born in 1756. He was ordained for the ministry in 1777, and became pastor at Turiff the same year. In 1778 he removed to Fraserburgh, where he resided for forty-nine years. In 1796 he was elevated to the bishopric of Dundee, and later he became bishop of Moray, a see founded in the 12th century, and which, after bishop Jolly's decease, was absorbed in other dioceses. He died in 1838. Bishop Jolly's works are, Baptismal Regeneration (Lond. 1828; new edition, with Life of author by Cheyne, 1840, 12mo) — Sunday Services and Holy Days, etc. (1829; 3d ed., with Memoir of author by Bp. Walker, Elderslie, 12mo) — The Christian Sacrifice in the Eucharist (1832, 12mo; 2d ed. Aberdeen, 1847, 12mo). See Allibone, Dict. of Eng. and Amer. Authors, ii, 986. Jontob. See LIEPFMAN. 

Jon, Francis Du. See JONIUS. 

Jona (John i, 42). See JONAS. 

Jon'adab, a shortened form of the name Jehonada'bal, for which it is used indifferently in the Hebrew as applied to either of two men in certain passages; but these have not been accurately represented in the A.V., which applies the briefier form indeed to either, but the full form to but one in three of these passages. See JEHOANADAB. 

1. The son of Shimeah and nephew of David (A.V. correctly in 2 Sam. xiii. 3 twice, 35; incorrectly in ver. 5, where the Hebrew has Jehonadab). 

2. The Bechatele (Jer. xxxiv. 6, 10, 19; incorrectly in verse 8, 14, 16, 18). 

Jona'h (Heb. Yona'h, יְוָנָה, a dove, as often, but in that sense only, Sept. Isaü in 2 Kings xiv, 25; elsewhere and in the N.T. Ἰωάνης; see JONAS), the son of Amittai, the fifth in order of the minor prophets. No ara is assigned to him in the book of his prophecy, yet there is little doubt of his being the same person who is spoken of in 2 Kings xiv. 25 as having uttered a prophecy of the relief of the kingdom of Israel, which was accomplished by Jeroboam's recapture of the ancient territory of the northern tribes between Cæle-Syria and the Ghor (compare ver. 29). The Jewish doctors have supposed him to be the son of the widow of Sarepta by a puerile interpretation of 1 Kings xvii. 24 (Jerome, Prefat. in Jonam). His birthplace was Gath-hepher, in the tribe of Zebulon (2 Kings xiv. 25). Jonah flourished in or before the reign of Jeroboam II (B.C. cir. 820), since he predicted the successful conquests, enlarged territory, and brief prosperity of the Israelitish kingdom under him. (Jonah's away (comp. Josephus, Antiq. ix, 10, 1). The oracle itself is not extant, though Hit zig has, by a novel process of criticism, amused himself with a fancied discovery of it in chap. xv and xvi of Isaiah (Dea Proph. Jon. Orakel über Mose krutscher, etc., Heidelberg, 1831). The personal history of Jo-

nah is, with the exception of this incidental allusion, to be gathered from the account in the book that bears his name. Having already, as it seems (from 1 in 1, i), prophecied to Israel, he was sent to Nineveh. The time was one of political revival in Israel; but ere long the Assyrians were to be employed by God as a scourge upon them. The Israelites consequently viewed them with repulsiveness; and the prophet, in accordance with his name (יְוָנָה, a dove), out of timidity and love for his country, shrunk from a commission which he felt sure would result (iv, 2) in the sparing of a hostile city. He attempted, therefore, to escape to Tarshish, either Tar- tesseus in Spain (Bochart, Titcomb, Hengstenberg), or

more probably (Drake) Tarus in Cilicia, a port of commercial intercourse. The providence of God, however, watched over him, first in a storm, and then in his being swallowed by a large fish (3:7—2) for the space of three days and three nights (see Hauber, Jonas im Beiche des Waldfiches [Leng. 1753] — Delitzsch, in Zeitschr. f. Luther, Kirche u. Theol. [1840], ii, 112 sq.; Baumgarten, itul. [1841], i, 187; Keil, Bibl. Commentar zu d. Kl. Propheten [Leips. 1866]). After his deliverance Jonah executed his commission; and the king, having heard of his miraculous deliverance (dean Jackson, On the Creed, bk. ix, c. 42), ordered a general fast, and averted the threatened judgment. But the prophet, not from personal, but national feelings, grudged the mercy shown to a heathen nation. He was therefore taught, by the significant lesson of the gourd, whose growth and decay (a known fact to naturalists: Layard's Nineveh, i, 123, 124) brought the truth at once home to him, that he was sent to testify by deed, as other prophets would afterwards testify by word, of the capacity of Gentiles for salvation, and the design of God to make them partakers of it. This was "the sign of the prophet Jonas" (Luke xxi, 29-32), which was given to a proud and perversive generation of Jews after the ascension of Christ by the preaching of his apostles. (See the monographs on this subject cited by Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 160). But the resurrection of Christ itself was also shadowed forth in the history of the prophets, as is made certain to us by the words of our Saviour (see Jackson as above, bk. ix, c. 40). Titcomb (Bible Studies, p. 237, note) sees a correspondence between Jon. i, 17 and Hos. vi, 2. Besides this, the fact and the faith of Jonah's prayer in the belly of the fish betokened to the nation of Israel the intimation of a resurrection and of immortality. 

On what portion of the coast-Jonah was set down in safety we are not informed. The opinions held as to the peculiar spot by rabbins and other thauatographic expositors need not be repeated. According to modern tradition, it was at the spot now marked as Khan Nemi Yumus, near Sidon (Kelly's Syriac, p. 382). The particular plant (1:18, יְקוֹגָו, "gourd") which sheltered Jonah was possibly the Bechanea, whose name קִדֵּס is yet preserved in some of the tongues of the East. It is more likely, however, to have been some climbing plant of the gourd tribe. The Sept. renders it צִוָּוָנוֹ (kiswano, 'gourd') which sheltered Jonah was possibly the Bechanea, whose name קִדֵּס is yet preserved in some of the tongues of the East. It is more likely, however, to have been some climbing plant of the gourd tribe. The Sept. renders it צִוָּוָנוֹ (kiswano, 'gourd') which sheltered 

Jonah was possibly the Bechanea, whose name קִדֵּס is yet preserved in some of the tongues of the East. It is more likely, however, to have been some climbing plant of the gourd tribe. The Sept. renders it צִוָּוָנוֹ (kiswano, 'gourd') which sheltered 

"Tomb of the Prophet Jonah" at Mosul. 

Various spots have been pointed out as the place of his sepulchre, such as Mosul in the East, and Gath-he-
phal prophecies ascribed to Jonah may be found in the pseudo-Epiphanius (De Vita Prophet. c. 16) and the Chronic. Paschale, p. 149.

Jonah's Prophecy contains the above account of the prophet's commission to denounce Nineveh, and of his refusal to undertake the embassy—of the method he employed to evade the commission, and the miraculous means which God used to curb his self-willed spirit, and subdue his petulant and querulous disposition (Reindel, Die Sendung des Prophet. Jonah nach Ninive. Bamm. 1892). His attempt to flee from the presence of the Lord seems like a partial insanity, produced by the excitement of distracting motives in an irascible and melancholy heart (J. C. Lange, Dias. de mirabilis fuga Jonah, Hal. 1751).

I. Historical Character of the Book. The history of Jonah is certainly striking and extraordinary. Its characteristic prodigy does not resemble the other miraculous phenomena recorded in Scripture, yet we must believe in its literal occurrence, as the Bible affords no indication of its being a mythus, allegory, or parable (Piper, Historia Jona a recens. consulis vindicato. Gryph. 1786). On the other hand, our Saviour's point of view and peculiar allusion to it is a presumption of its real occurrence. The historical character of the narrative is held by Hess, Lilienthal, Sack, Reindel, Hüvernic, Hengstenberg, Laberens, Baumgarten, Delitzsch, Wele, Stuart, and Keil, Eisleit. sec. 89. (See Friedrichsen, Krit. Uebericht der verschied. Ansichten von dem Buch Jonas, 2d edit. 1841.) The opinion of the earlier Jews, Persians, Greeks, Masoretes, and churchmen of the 1st, 2d, and 3d cent. (Ant. x1, 10, 2) is also in favor of the literality of the adventure (see Buddel Hist. V. Test. ii, 589 sq.) It requires less faith to credit this simple excerpt from Jonah's biography than to believe the numerous hypotheses that have been proposed to explain it. The supernatural character of the Lord's manifestation and the extraordinary nature of the event are authentically recorded in the Book of Jonah, and the question is not raised as to whether it was reported to the people of Nineveh, whether it was actually done, or whether it was a dream produced in that sleep which fell upon Jonah as he lay in the sides of the ship. The fanciful opinion of the famous Herman von der Hardt, in his Jonas in face, etc., a full abstract of which is given by Rosenmüller, P. Gossen, p. 19, was begun by the book of the author in his essay, and it was a historical allegory, descriptive of the fate of Manasseh, and Joseph his grandson, kings of Judah. Tarshish, according to him, represents the kingdom of Lydia; the ship, the Jewish republic, whose captain was Zadok the high-priest; while the casting of Jonah into the sea symbolized the temporary captivity of Manasseh in Babylon. Less (Vom historischen Styl der Ir. wedl) supposed that all difficulty might be removed by imagining that Jonah, when thrown into the sea, was taken up by a ship having a large fish for a figure-head—a theory somewhat more pleasing than the rancid hypothesis of Antion, who fancied that the prophet took refuge in the interior of a dead whale, floating near the spot where he was cast overboard (Rosenm. Prolegom. in Jon. p. 528). Not unlike the opinion of Less is that of Charles Taylor, in his Fragments affixed to Calmet's Dictionary. No. civ. 27, that signifies a life-preserver, a notion which, as his manner is, he endeavors to support by a series of apert and superfluous arguments. Neither is the characteristic historical form and names of the famous fish-god of Philistia. There are others who allow, as De Wette and Knoch, that Jonah was a real person, but hold that the book is made up, for didactic purposes, of legendary stories which had gathered around him. A slender basis of fact has been allowed by some—by Bunsen, for example—for the idea of a strange enough, fixes upon the very portion which to most of his rationalistic countrymen bears the clearest marks of spuriousness, as the one genuine part of the whole—Jonah's thanksgiving from the perils of shipwreck (as Bunsen judges); and thinks that some one had mistaken the matter, and fabricated out of it the present story—by others, such as Krahmer (Das Buch Jonas, introd.), who suppose that Jonah was known to have uttered a prophecy against Nineveh, and to have been impatient at the delay which appeared in the fulfillment, and was hence, for didactic purposes, made the hero of the story.

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

The plain, literal import of the narrative being set aside with missapplying ingenuity, the supposed design of it has been very variously interpreted. Michaelis (Ueber die d. N. T. part xi, p. 101) and Semler (Apparatus ad Lk. Vi. 30, p. 271) suppose the narrative to be intended to show the injustice of the arrogance and hatred cherished by the Jews towards other nations. So in substance Bleek. Similarly Eichhorn (Einl. § 577 and Jahn (Introducat. § 127) think the design was to show that the love of other peoples in times excelled them in pious observance. Kregel (Erbest. d. N. T. vii, 129 sq.) argues that this episode was meant to solace and excite the prophets under the discharge of difficult and dangerous duties; while Paulus (Memorabilia, vi, 32 sq.) maintains that the object of the author of Jonah is to impress the fact that God redeems punishment on repentance and reformation. Similar is the idea of Kimchi and Pareau (Interpretation of Old Testament, Biblical Cabinet, No. xxv, p. 263). Krehmer thinks that the theme of the writer is the Jewish colony in its relation to the Samaritans (Dea B. Jom. Kral. unter G. A. T. in Proph. Misia) adheres to the opinion which lies upon the surface, that it inculcates the sin of not obeying God, even in proclaiming severe threatenings on a heathen people. Ewald would make the design quite general, namely, to show how the real fear of God and repentance bring salvation — first, in the case of the heathen sailors; then in the case of Jonah; finally, in that of the Ninevites. Hitzig (first in a separate treatise, then in his commentary on the minor prophets) supposes the book to have been written by some one in the 4th century before Christ, "in Egypt, that land of wonders," and chiefly for its purpose of vindicating Jehovah in having failed to verify the prophecy in Obadiah respecting the heathen Edomites. Similarly, Köster (Die Propheten des A. und N. Test., Leipzig, 1839) favors the malignant inscription that its chief end was to save the credit of the prophet among the people, though the predictions against foreign nations might not be fulfilled, as Nineveh was preserved after being besieged and doomed.

These hypotheses are all vague and baseless, and do not merit a special refutation. Endeavoring to free us from one difficulty, they plunge us into others yet more important. The scene is a wonderful delineation of the eternal objections that have been brought against the book.

(1.) Much profane wit has been expended on the miraculous means of Jonah's deliverance, very unnecessarily and very absurdly; it is simply said, "The Lord had prepared a great fish to swallow up Jonah." Now the species of marine animal is not defined, and the Greek ἁλίκος is often used to signify, not the genus whale, but any large fish or sea-monster. All objections to its being a whale which lodged Jonah in its stomach from its great length or strength of haunt in the Mediterranean, are thus removed. He- scratch explains ἁλίκος as θαλάσσων ἠλίκος τιμήτωρ, Eustathius explains its correspondent adjective κτήσις

by μεγάλην (in the Iliad, ii, 88). Diodorus Siculus speaks of terrestrial monsters as κτήσις ζώων, and of sea-monsters as κτίσις. The Scripture thus speaks only of an enormous fish, which under God's direction swallowed the prophet, and does not point out the species to which the voracious prowler belonged. There is little ground for the supposition of bishop Jebb, that the asylia of Jonah was not the sacral throat or gullet of a whale, for, according to naturalists, is a very capacious receptacle, sufficiently large, that Captain Scoresby asserts, to contain a merchant ship's jolly-boat full of men (bishop Jebb, Sacred Literature, p. 178). Since the days of Bochart it has been a common opinion that the fish was of the shark species, Lamna cenis caroerias, or "sea-dog" (Bochart, Op. iii, 72; Calmet's Dissertation sur Jon.). Entire human bodies have been found in some fishes of this kind. The stomach, too, has no influence on any living substance admitted into it. Granting all these facts as proof of what is termed the economy of nature, the author supposed the narrative to be suited to the supernatural preservation of Jonah, is anything too hard for the Lord? See Whale.

(2.) What is said about the size of Nineveh, also, is in accordance with fact (see Pict. Bible, note, ad loc.). It was "an exceeding great city of three days' journey." Built in the form of a parallelogram, it made, according to Diodorus (iv, 34. 5) the circuit of 20,000 stadia, or 160 miles. It has been usual, since the publication of Layard's Nineveh, to say that the great ruins of Koyunjik, Nimrud, Keremels, and Khorsabad form such a parallelogram, the distances from north to south being about 16 miles, and from east to west about 12; the longer sides thus measuring 86 miles, and the shorter ones 24. But against this view professor Rawlinson has recently urged, with considerable force, that the four great ruins bore distinct local titles; that Nimrud, identified with Calah, is mentioned in Scripture as a place so far separated from Nineveh that a "great city"—resen—lay between them (Gen. x, 12); that the site of Khorsabad is a continuous town; and that the four sites are fortified on what would be the inside of the city." Still Nineveh, as represented by the ruins of Koyunjik and Nebbi-Yumus, or Tomb of Jonah, was of an oblong shape, with a circuit of about eight miles, and was therefore a place of unusual size for an exceeding great city. The phrase, "three days' journey," may mean that it would take that time to traverse the city and proclaim through all its localities the divine message; and the emphatic point then is, that at the end of his first day's journey the preaching had not taken effect; that the people "that cannot discern their right hand from their left hand," probably denotes children, and 120,000 of these might represent a population of more than half a million (Rawlinson's Five Great Monarchies, i, 310; Sir Henry Rawlinson's Comment on Can. Interc. iv, 17; Captain Jones's Topography of Nineveh, ii, 298). Jonah entered the city "a day's journey," that is, probably went from west to east uttering his incisive and terrible message. The sublime audacity of the stranger—the ringing monotony of his sharp, short cry—had an immediate effect. The story of his discourse alone would have been a wonderful delineation of the internal objections that have been brought against the book.
brute creation was at least one analogy in the lamentation made over the Persian general Maniastus: "The horses and beasts of burden were shaved" (Herodotus, ix. 24). According to Plutarch, also, Alexander commanded the observance of a similar custom on the death of Hephæstion. Therefore, in the accessories of the narrative there is no violation of probability—such is in accordance with known customs and facts. See NINEVEH.

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

II. Style, Date, etc.—The book of Jonah is a simple narrative, with the exception of the prayer or thanksgiving in chap. ii. Its style and mode of narration are uniform. There are no traces of composition, as Nachtmann supposed; neither is the prayer, as De Wette (Einl. § 257) imagines, improperly borrowed from some other sources. That prayer contains, indeed, not only imagery peculiar to itself, but also such imagery as at once was suggested to the mind of a pious Hebrew preserved in circumstances of extreme jeopardy. On this principle we account for the similarity of some portions of its parableology to Ps. lxx. 23, xlii, etc. The language in both places had been hallowed by frequent usage, and had become the consecrated idiom of a distressed and succored Israelite. Perhaps the prayer of Jonah might be uttered by him, not during his mysterious imprisonment, but after it (פרעה...לעשית, out, i.e. when out of the fish's belly; comp. Job xix. 26; xi. 10). The hymn seems to have been composed after his deliverance, and the reason why his deliverance is noted after the hymn is recorded may be to show the occasion of its composition. "The Lord had spoken unto the fish, and it had vomited Jonah on the dry land!" (See further Hamburger, in his Bibl. Hethitologica, Leiden, 1718; also an article on the subject in the Brk. Theol. Mh., i, 8, p. 18.)

There was little reason either for dating the composition of this book later than the age of Jonah, or for supposing it the production of another than the prophet himself. The Chaldaic name which Jahn and others find may be accounted for by the nearness of the canton of Zebulon, to which Jonah belonged, to the northern territories. Many of the Aramaic peculiarities might be insensibly borrowed. (Thus we have רַעַּו— a ship with a deck—not the more common Hebrew term; רַעַּו—a foreign title applied to the captain; רַעַּו—to appoint—found, however, in Ps. lix. a psalm which Humphed without any valid grounds places after the Babylonian captivity; רַעַּו, to command, as in the later books; רַעַּו, command, referring to the royal decree, and probably taken from the native Assyrian tongue; רַעַּו, to row, a nautical term; and the abbreviated form of the relative, which, however, occurs in other books, etc.) Gesenius and Berthold place it before the exile; Jahn and Köster afterwards. Rossmüller supposes the author may have been a contemporary of Jeremiah; Hitzig postpones it to the period of the Maccabees. The general opinion is that Jonah was the first of the prophets (Rossmüller, Dp. Lloyd, Davidson, Brown, Drake); Hengstengberg would place it after Amos, and indeed, adherents to the view of the books in the canon for the chronology. He, as well as Hitzig, would identify the author with that of Obadiah, chiefly on account of the initial "a." The king of Nineveh at this time is supposed (Úather and others) to be a certain Tarshish; and he is placed by Jahn (Bibl. p. 624) at B.C. 750; but an earlier king, Adrammelech II, B.C. 840, is regarded as more probable by Drake. The date above assigned to Jonah would seem to indicate the husband of the famous Semiramis. See ASYRIA.

III. Commentators.—The following are the special exegetical helps expressively on the whole book, the most important of which we designate by prefixing an asterisk: Ephraem Syrus, In Jonam (in Opp. iii. 562: transl. from the Syriac by Burgess, Hymnsy, Lond. 1838: 12mo); Basil, In Jonam (in Opp. p. 99: Tertullian, Cœnann (in Opp. p. 576); Tholuck, Commentarius in Jonah (in Opp. i. v. Breunti, Commentarius (in Opp. iv.); Luther, Augusteine (Wittenberg, 1526, 4to and 8vo; Erf. 1526, 1531, 8vo; also in Werke, Wittenberg, ed. v. 310; Jen. iii. 214; Alt. iii. 551; Lpz. viii. 516; Hal. vi. 496; in Latin, by Jonas, in Opp. Vitem. iv. 404; and separately by Oppenheim, 1583, 8vo; Argent. 1626, 8vo); Artomus, Commentarius (Stet. 1545, 1558, 8vo); Baggesonius, Expositio (Vitem. 1550, 1561, 8vo); Hooper, Sermons (London, 1550, 12mo; also in Writings, p. 431); Furtwängler, Comenarius (Lodzi, 1584, Antw. 1557, Ven. 1557, 8vo, also in German, Cola, 1567, 8vo; Willlich, Commenarius [incl. sev. minor propl.] (Bibl. 1566, 8vo; Selnecker, Augusteine [including Nahum, etc.] (Lpz. 1547, 4to); Tuckan, Commentarius (Ven. 1573, 8vo; Calvin, Lectures (trans. by Baxter, Lond. 1578, 4to); Pomeranz, Commentary (Magdeburg, 1579, 4to, 1694, 4to); Barson, Poëticæs (ed. Lake, Lond, 1578, folio); Grynus, catalogue (Basil, 1581, 8vo); Scachardus, Sungntas (Argent. 1588, 4to); Junius, Lectiones (Hemb. 1594, 4to; also in Opp. i. 1287)*; King, Lectura (Lond. 1594, 1600, 1611, 1618; Orx. 1597, 1599, 4to; Feustell, Germanius, Commentarius (Colon. 1594, folio; 1596, 8vo); Hain, Erotesia (ed. Lake, Lond, 1587, folio); Wolkerus, Jnscdors (incl. Joel) (Vitem. 1570, 4to; Krakewitz, Commentarius (Hamb. 1610, Gesenius, 1611, 4to; Miley, Erkärung (Heidelberg, 1614, 4to); Tarnowsky, Comenarius (Hamb. 1614, 8vo); Scheck, Commenarius (Hamb. 1619, 4to, 1626, 4to); Schröder, Comenarius (Hamb. 1619, 4to, 1626, 4to); Treminius, Commentarius (Rom. 1619, 4to); Puschnig, Comenarius (Franco. 1624, 1626, 4to); also in his Syllage, Amst. 1701, fol. p. 975); Traven, Comenarius (Antw. 1640, fol.); Acosta, Commentarius (Lodzi, 1641, fol.); Unimus, Commentarius (Franco. 1642, 8vo); Pasciaccini, Lessiones (Ven. 1650, 1650, 1664, 1704, folio;
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also in Latin, Monach. 1672, fol.; Antw. 1681–8, 3 vols. fol.; De Salinas, Commentarius (Lugd. 1652 sq., 3 vols. fol.); Crocius, Commentarius (Cassel. 1656, 8vo); Leusden, Paradaphrafas (Rabbinical) (Tr. ad Rh. 1656, 8vo); Petrusa, Nota (to a transl. from the A.V.) (L. 1660, 4to); *Scheid, Commentarius (Argent. 1659, 1660, 4to); Gerard, Annotatio (Hamburg 1670, 4to); Pfeiffer, Predictiones (Vitemb. 1671, 1706, Lippes. 1686, 4to; also in Opp. 11, 18 sq.); Moebius, Jonas typici cus (Lips. 1678, 8vo); Christiansen, Illustratio (Lips. 1683, 8vo); Bircherod, Expositio (Hafn. 1686, 4to); Von der Harth, Arminium, etc. (Heilp. in separate treatises 1719, 1720, 1725, fol.); Oetzel, Erklärung (Amst. 1723, 4to); Steuerbroot, Oeuleeving (Leyd. 1730, 4to); Van der Meer, Versklaarring (Gor. 1742, 4to); Reichenbach, De Rabbin's errata, etc. (All. 1761, 4to); Lessing, Observationes (Chemitz. 1789, 8vo); Lavater, Predigten (Wintenh. 1782 1785, 4to); [Sendungsgeschichte, etc. (Bonn, 1786, 4to); Piper, F. heidische (Gryph. 1786, 4to); Lüdewald, Allegorie, etc. (Heilp. 1787, 8vo); Höffner, Curis in Sept., etc. (Lips. 1787–8, 3 parts 4to); Kordes, Observationes in Sept., etc. (Jena, 1789, 4to); Lowe, *Noem (Berl. 1789, 8vo; also in his general commentary, Dessau, 1605); Grimm, Erklärung (Dussel. 1789, 8vo); Fabrius, Commentarius, etc. [from Jewish sources?] (Göt. 1790, 4to); Granzburg, Erklärung (Lpz. 1790, 8vo); Paulus, Zweck, etc. (in his Memorabilia, Leipzig, 1794, vi, 32 sq.); Griesdorf, Interprentatis ratio, etc. (Vitemb. 1794, 2 dissert. 4to); Benion, Notes (Cambr. 1796, 4to); Nachtigall, Aufschlief, etc. (in Eichhorn's Bibliothek, Lips. 1799, ix, 221 sq.); Elias of Wilna, hebrew (Wilna, 1799, 4to); Goldnour, Excursus (Lpz. 1805, 8vo); Jones, Portrait, etc. (London, 1801, and often since, 12mo); *Friedrichsen, Ueberblick, etc. (Alt. 1817, Lpz. 1814, 4vo); Young, Lectures (London, 1819, 8vo); Reindel, Versuch, etc. (Bamberg, 1826, 8vo); *Rosenmuller, Schola, part 11, etc. (Lpz. 1827, 8vo); Hitzig, Oeueli. üb. Morb (Heidelberg, 1833, 4to); Cunningham, Lectures (London, 1835, 12mo); Sibthorp, Lectures (London, 1834, 8vo); Krahmer, Untersuchung (Kassel. 1839, 8vo); Preston, Lectures (London, 1840, 8vo); Jäger, Endzweck, etc. (Tub. 1840, 8vo); Peddie, Lectures (Edinb. 1862, 12mo); Fairbairn, Jonah's Life, etc. (Edinburgh, 1849, 12mo); Macpherson, Lectures (Edinb. 1849, 12mo); Tweedie, Lesions (Edinb. 1850, 8vo); *Jones, Notes [including Lesions] (London, 1853, 8vo); Harding, Lectures (London, 1856, 12mo); Muir, Lessons (Edinb. 1854, 1857, 8vo); Wright, Glossaries, etc. (Lond. 1857, 8vo); Desprez, Illustrationes (London, 1857, 12mo); Broad, Lectures (London, 1860, 8vo); *Kaulen, Expositio (Mosq. 1862, 8vo); *Martin, Jonah's Mission (Lond. 1866, 8vo). See Prophets, Minor.

Jonah ben-Abraham GERUNDI, a Jewish savant, and one of the principal leaders of the opposition to the school of Maimonides, was born about 1155. A disciple of the celebrated Salomo of Montepensier, he had espoused the cause of the latter. He was one of the parties that pronounced the ban against all who should dare to read the writings of the celebrated Jewish philosopher, and his opposition had in every way been so brilliant, that he was chosen, without any surprise in the Jewish camp when he, upon the attempt of the inquisitors to destroy all copies of the Rabbinical writings, openly declared his former course a mistake, and pronounced the second Moses a great and good man. He even entered upon a pilgrimage to the grave of the man whose writings and discourses he had formerly opposed; and when, at the solicitation of a Jewish congregation which demanded his services, he halted on the journey, and there died (about 1270), his death was attributed by some of his contemporaries as a punishment of heaven for the non-fulfilment of his duty to visit the grave of Maimonides, and there declare the folly of his former course. Jonah was a man of splendid parts, and did much to allay strife among his people. *Gritz, Gesch. d. Juden, vii, 46, 117 sq. See Salomo of Montepensier. (J. H. W.)

IV.—R & N

JO'NAN (Yonah, perh. contr. for JONAH or JOHAN, or Leq. JONAS), the son of Eliah and father of Joseph among the maternal ancestors of Christ (Luke iii, 80). He is not mentioned in the Old Test. B.C. considerably ante 876. See Genealogy of Christ.

JO'NAS (Younah, for the Heb. Jonah), the Grecianized form of the name of three men in the Apocrypha and New Testament.

1. The prophet Jonas (2 Esdr. i, 39; Tobit xiv, 4; Matt. xi, 90, 40, 41; Luke xvi, 39, 80, 82).

2. A person occupying the same position in 1 Esdr. ix, 29 as ELIZER in the corresponding list in Ezra x, 23. Perhaps the corruption originated in reading Ἰωνᾶς, as appears to have been the case in the 1 Esdr. ix, 29 (compare Ezra x, 31). The former would have caught the compiler's eye from Ezra x, 22, and the original form Eionas, as it appears in the Vulg., could easily have become Jonas.

3. The father of the apostle Peter (John xxii, 15, 16, 17). In John i, 42 the name is less correctly Anglicized "Jonas" (some MSS. have Ἰωνᾶς). A.D. ante 25. See also BAR-JONA. Instead of Ἰωνᾶς (genitive) in all the above passages the correct form is Ἰωνᾶς, of which latter Lachmann has introduced into the text. Perhaps Jonas is but a contraction for Joannas (Luke iii, 27), which is the same as John.

Jonah, bishop of Orelans, an eminent prelate in the Latin Church, flourished in the first half of the 9th century. He died in 842. Jonas took an active part in the ecclesiastical affairs of his time, and played an important part in the Iconoclastic controversy, in which he assumed a mediatic role. In his De cultu imaginum (1645, 16mo) he wrote both against Claudius, bishop of Turin, and the Iconoclasts. The work was dedicated to king Charles the Bald, with whom he was in great favor. Although condemned by the destroyers of images, he did not approve the worship of them, and the most eminent Catholic writers, such as Bellarmine, therefore disapprove of his work. His other principal works are, Libri tres de institutione laicalli (transl. into French by De Meegh, 1622, 12mo):—De institutione regis (transl. into French by Desmarets, 1661, 8vo). These two works are to be found in Latin in D'Achery's Spicileg. He is also the author of a treatise on Miracles (in Bibl. Patr.). See Milman, Latin Christ. iv, 421; Schröck, Kirchengeschichte, xxiii, 294 sq., 416 sq.; Aschbach, Kirchen-Lexi. iii, 578.

Jonas, Justus, one of the most eminent reformers in Germany, a contemporary and associate of Luther, was born at Nordhausen, June 5, 1498. He studied law at the University of Erfurt. In 1519, however, encouraged by the advice of both Hess and Erasmus, he decided to study theology, and, inclining to the cause of the Reformers, he allied himself to Luther in 1521, and thereafter became closely connected with the great reformer. He went to Worms with him, and was soon after appointed provost of the church at Wittemberg. Here he was made D.D. by the university, in which he became a professor; and ever after worked zealously for the propagation of the principles of the reformation. His legal knowledge was of especial service to the Reformers. In 1529 he accompanied Luther to Marburg, and his letters on this occasion are a valuable historical contribution. In 1530 we find him assisting Melan- thion in the completion of his Augsburg. In 1541 he was summoned to the Hague to assume pastoral duties at St. Mary's church in that city, but in 1546 duke Maurice ordered him to quit the place, and he returned only after the election John Frederick had taken possession of the city in 1547. The battle of Mühlberg, which falls in this year, again turned the fate of the Protestants, and he once more quitted Halle. In 1551 he was appointed court preacher at Coburg, and in 1553 superintendent of Eisle- field, where he died Oct. 9, 1555. Jonas was particularly distinguished as a ready speaker and as a writer. He took part in the translation of the Bible by Luther,
and wrote Prefatio in Epistolae divi Pauli Apostoli, ad Corinthios, etc. (Erfurt, 1820, 4to).—Epistome Judicii I. Jonae, postpos. Wittemb., de corrigenda cerimoniam (1528):—Annotaciones I. Jonae in Acta Apostolorum (Wittemburg, 1524, Basle, 1525):—Vom alien u. neuen Gott, Glauben u. Lehre (Wittemburg, 1520).—Ezech d. Prophetische Kirsche (Wittemburg, 1534, 4to):—Oratio Justi Ionae, doct. theol., de Studior Theologici (Wittemburg, 1538; Melanchthon, Selecti, Declamatio, 25) :—Des xx Paulina Auslegung (Wittenberg, 1546):—Kurze Historia v. Luthers bildischen u. geistlichen Antheilungen (in Luther's Works) etc. He also published a number of translations into German, especially of works of Luther and Melancthon; also translations from German into Latin. See Reinhard, Commentatio hist, theol., de Vita et Obitu Justi Iona, etc. (Weimar, 1731); Knapp, Narratio de Justo Iona, etc. (Halle, 1817, 4to): Ersch u. Gruber, Allgemeine Enzyklop., Herzog, Real-Enzyklop., vii, 1 sqq.; Pressel, Leben u. ausgew. Schriften d. Vaters u. Begründers, d. luther. Kirche (1862), vol. vii.

Jonas, Ludwig, one of the ablest German theologians of our day, was born at Neustadt a. O. February 11, 1797. During the Franco-Prussian war of 1812-1815 he fought against the foreign invader, but as soon as peace dawned on his native land he resumed his theological studies at the celebrated Schleiermacher's, under whom he was one of the most prominent and faithful followers. After preaching at different places, he removed to Berlin in 1834, and soon secured a place in the foreground among Berlin's large array of theological writers. He published Schleiermacher's MSS.: his Philosophische Dissertation in 1835, the Dialogetic in 1839, Morals in 1843, Letters in 1858. He died Sept. 13, 1859. Jonas was one of the founders of the Monatschrift of the United Church of Prussia (comprising the Reformed and Lutheran churches at that time. See art. Prussia).

Jonathan (Heb. Yonathan, יואנְן, 1 Sam. xiii, 2, 8, 16, 22; xiv, 1, 3, 4, 12, 13, 14, 17, 21, 27, 29, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 49, xix, 1; Kings i, 42, 43; 1 Chron. ii, 32, 33; x, 21; xii, 9; Ezra viii, 6; x, 15; Neh. xii, 11, 14, 35; Jer. xi, 8; Sept. 1°wadva), a contracted form of Jehonathan (יהונתן, q. d. Theophile, 1 Chron. xxvii, 2; 2 Chron. xvii, 8; Neh. xii, 18; Anglicized "Jonathan" elsewhere, Judg. xviii, 30; 1 Sam. iv, 6, 8; xiii, 1, 3, 4, xiv, 1, 2, 6, 7; xx, 1, 3, 4, 5, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 16, 17, 18, 26, 27, 38, 39, 52, 53, 84, 85, 87, 88, 90, 40, 42, xxii, 10, 11, 12; 1 Sam. 4, 5, 12; 2 Sam. 23, 26; 16; 4; 1, 8, 6, 7; xxv, 26, 36; xvii, 29; xxii, 7, 12, 18, 14, 21, xxiii, 82; 1 Chron. viii, 33, 34; ix, 39, 40, xxvii, 32; Jer. xxxvii, 15, 20, xxxix, 26; Sept. 1°wadva), the name of fifteen or more men in the canonical Scriptures, besides several in the Apocalypse and Josephus.

1. A Levite descended from Gershom, the son of Moses (Judg. xviii, 30). It is indeed said, in our Masoretic copies, that the Gershom from whom this Jonathan sprang was the "son of Manasseh," but it is on very good grounds supposed that in the name Moses (תֹּמַשָּׁם), the single letter nun (n) has been interpolated (and it is usually written suspended, Buxtorf, Tiber., p. 14), changing it into Manassas (תֹּמַשָּׁס). The letter waw is to save the character of the great lawgiver from the stain of having an idolater among his immediate descendants (Bikhn. Buthara, 109, b). The singular name Gershom, and the date of the transaction, go far to establish this view. Accordingly the Vulgate, and some copies of the Septuagint, actually exhibit the name of Moses instead of Manasseh. (See on 1 Chron. ii, 32, 33, etc.). The history of this Jonathan is involved in the narrative which occupies Judges xvii, xviii, and is one of the two accounts which form a sort of appendix to that book. The events themselves appear to have occurred soon after the death of Joshua, and of the elders who outlived him, when the government was in a most unsettled state. Its proper place in the chronological order would be between the second and third chapters of the book. B.C. cir. 1590.

Jonathan, who was resident at Bethlhelm, lived at a time when the dads of the sanctuary did not afford a livelihood to the numerous Levites who had claimed upon the ground of the promised inheritance of the land which possessed which gave to all others a sufficient maintenance. He therefore went forth to seek his fortune. In Mount Ephraim he came to a "house of a god who was divided by a priest to whom he had pledged his establishment complete. See Micah. This person made Jonathan what was manifestly considered the handsome offer of engaging him as his priest for his victuals, a yearly sum of clothes, and ten shekels (about six dollars) a year in money. Here he lived for some time, till the Danite spies, who were sent by their tribe to explore the country, passed this way and formed his acquaintance. When, not long after, the body of armed Danites passed the same way in going to settle near the sources of the Jordan, the spies mentioned Micah's establishment to them, on which they went and took away not only "all the victuals," but the priest also, that they might set up the same worship in the place of which they were going to take possession. Micah vainly protested against this robbery: but Jonathan himself was glad at the improvement in his prospects, and from that time, even down to the captive state of his descendants continuing to be priests of the Danites in the town of Laish, the name of which was changed to Dan.

There is not any reason to suppose that this establishment, whether in the hands of Micah or of the Danites, involved an apostasy from Jehovah. It appears rather to have been an attempt to localize or domesticate his presence, under those symbols and forms of service which were common among the neighboring nations, but were forbidden to the Hebrews. The offence here was twofold—the establishment of a sacred ritual different from the only one which the law recognized, and the worship by symbols, naturally leading to idolatry, with the ministration of one who could not legally be a priest, but only a Levite, and under circumstances in which no Aaronic priest could legally have officiated. It is more than likely that this establishment was eventually the outcome of the golden calf's worship. But it seems set up in this place, his choice of which may very possibly have been determined by its being already in possession of a "house of gods." The Targum of R. Joseph, on 1 Chron. xxiii, 16, identifies this Jonathan with Shebuel, the son of Gershom, whom it is said there to have repented (שְׁבֹעֵל, בַּוָּל), in his old age, and to have been appointed by David as chief over his treasures. All this arises from a play upon the name Shebuel, from which this meaning is extracted in accordance with a favorite practice of the Targumist.

2. Second of the two sons of Jada, and grandson of Judah, of the family of Judah; as his brother Jether died without issue, this branch of the line was continued through the sons of Jonathan (1 Chron. ii, 32, 33, B.C. considerably post 1612.

3. The eldest son of king Saul and the bosom friend of David (Josephus Antiq. vii, 6, 1). He first appears some time before the death of Saul (1 Sam. xvi, 2). If his younger brother Ishobadiah was forty at the time of Saul's death (2 Sam. i, 8), Jonathan must have been at least thirty when he is first mentioned. Of his own family we know nothing except the birth of his two sons (4 Kings ii, 8; 1 Chron. ii, 32). He is regarded in his father's lifetime as chief to the throne. Like Saul, he was a man of great strength and activity (2 Sam. i, 22), of which the exploit at Michmash was a proof. He was also famous for the peculiar martial exercises in which his tribe excelled—archery and slinging (1 Chron. xii, 2). His bow was to him what the
speans to his father: "the bow of Jonathan turned not back" (2 Sam. 1, 29). It was always about himself (2 Sam. xvii, 4; xx, 35). It is through his relation with David that he is chiefly known to us, probably as related by his descendants at David's court. But there is a background, not so clearly given, of his relation with his father. From the time that he first appears he is Saul's son (1 Sam. xviii, 1). He had listened to the voice of his father's meals. As Abner and David seem to have occupied the places afterwards called the captains of the "host" and of the "guard," so he seems to have been (as Hushai afterwards) "the friend" (comp. 1 Sam. xx, 25; 2 Sam. xv, 37). The whole story implies, without expressing it, the close relationship of the two. It is a notable fact in life, that Jonathan can only go on his dangerous expedition (1 Sam. xiv, 1) by concealing it from Saul. Saul's vow is confirmed, and its tragic effect deepened, by his feeling for his son, "though it be Jonathan my son" (ibid. xiv, 20). "Tell me what thou hast done" (ibid. xiv, 40). Jonathan cannot bear to believe his father's error, to David: "My father will do nothing, great or small, but that he will show to me: and why should my father hide this thing from me? it is not so" (1 Sam. xx, 2). To him, if to any one, the wild frenzy of the king was amenable. The unspoken word was the voice of 1 Jonathan" (1 Sam. xix, 6). Their mutual affection was indeed interrupted by the growth of Saul's insanity. Twice the father would have sacrificed the son: once in consequence of his vow (1 Sam. xiv): the second time, more deliberately, on the discovery of David's flight; and on this occasion it is evident that his mind was grieved in a darker history. Were the phrases "son of a perverse rebellious woman"—"shame on thy mother's nakedness" (1 Sam. xx, 30, 31), mere frantic invectives? or was there something in the story of Ahinoam or Kishpah which we do not know? "In fierce anger" Jonathan left the royal presence (1 Sam. xix, 6), and the face of Saul would turn, in the father's decline, not with his son's rise, and "in death they were not divided" (2 Sam. i, 23; 1 Sam. xxiii, 16).

1. The first main part of his career is connected with the war with the Philistines, commonly called, from its locality, "the war of Michmash" (1 Sam. xiii, 21, Sept.), as the last years of the Ped-eponim's father's war were called, for a similar reason, "the war of Deceesea." In the previous war with the Ammonites (1 Sam. x, 4–15) there is no mention of him; and his abrupt appearance, without explanation, in xili, 2, may seem to imply that some part of the narrative has been lost. B.C. 1060. He is already of great importance in the state. Of the 3000 men of whom Saul's standing army was formed (xili, 2; xxiv, 2; xxvi, 1, 2), 1000 were under the command of Jonathan at Gibeah. The Philistines were still in the general command of the country; an officer was stationed at Geba, either the same as Jonathan's position or close to it. In a sudden act of youthful daring, as when Tell rose against Gesslar, or as in sacred history Moses rose against the Egyptian, Jonathan slew this officer (Auth. Ver. "garrison," Sept. τοῦ ἀνωτέρου, 1 Sam. xiii, 3, 4). See Ewald, ii, 478, and thus gave the signal for a general revolt. Saul took advantage of it, and the whole population rose. But it was a premature attempt. The Philistines poured in from the plain, and the tyranny became more deeply rooted than ever. See Saul. Saul and Jonathan (with their immediate attendants) alone had arms, whilst the general weakness and disarming of the rest of the people came to Gibeah, with a small body of 600 men, and as they looked down from that height on the misfortunes of their country, and of their native tribe especially, they went abut (Sept. ἀνατρέφει, 1 Sam. xiii, 16).

From this oppression, as Jonathan by his former act had borne the first to provoke it, so now he was the first to deliver his people. On the former occasion Saul had been equally with himself involved in the responsibility of the deed. Saul "blew the trumpet;" Saul had "smitten the officer of the Philistines" (xili, 4). But now it would seem that Jonathan was resolved to undertake the whole risk himself. "The day," the day fixed by him (Sept. τὸν ἡμέραν τῆς Μαγγίας, 1 Sam. xiv, 1) approached; and without communicating his project to any one, except the young man, whom, like all the chiefs of that age, he retained as his armor-bearer, he sallied forth from Gibeah to attack the garrison of the Philistines stationed on the other side of the steep defile of Michmash. He fought by himself; and probably the ancient and peculiar spirit of the Israelitish warrior: "Come, and let us go over unto the garrison of these uncircumcised; it may be that Jehovah will work for us; for there is no restraint to Jehovah to save by many or by few. The answer is no less characteristic of the pride of the close relationship of the two, than it is of the zeal that afterwards sprang up between Jonathan and David. "Do all that is in thine heart; . . . behold, I am with thee, as thy heart is my heart (Sept., 1 Sam. xiv, 7)." After the manner of the time (and the more, probably, from having taken no counsel of the high-priest or any prophet before his departure), Jonathan proposed to draw an omen for their course from the conduct of the enemy. If the garrison, on seeing them, gave intimations of descending upon them, they would remain in the valley; if, on the other hand, they raised a challenge to advance, they would accept it. The latter event not to be the business of the two warriors from behind the rocks was taken by the Philistines as a furtive apparence of the Hebrews coming forth out of the holes where they had hid themselves; and they were welcomed with a scoffing invective (Sept. υποχείρωτας, afterwards offered to David). "Come up, and we will show you a thing" (xiv, 4–13). Jonathan immediately took them at their word. Strong and active as he was, "strong as a lion, and swift as an eagle" (2 Sam. i, 23), he was fully equal to the adventure of climbing on his hands and feet up the steep rock and on the face of it at the hour when his father's heart was thus in the extremity of his, with his armor-bearer behind him, they both, after the manner of their tribe (1 Chron. xii, 2), discharged a flight of arrows, stones, and pebbles from their bows, cross-bows, and slings, with such effect that twenty men fell at the first onset. A panic seized the garrison, thence spread to the camp, and led to the surrounding horde of marauders: an earthquake combined with the terror of the moment; the confusion increased; the Israelites who had been taken slaves by the Philistines during the last three days (Sept. rose in mutiny: the Israelites who lay hid in the numerous caverns and deep holes in which the rocks of the neighborhood abound, sprang out of their subterranean dwellings. Saul and his little band had watched in astonishment the wild retreat from the heights of Gibeah; he now joined in the pursuit, which led him heedling after the fugitives, over the rugged plateau of Bethel, and down the pass of Beth-horon to Ajalon (xiv, 15–31).

See GIBEAH. The father and son had not met on that day: Saul only conjectured his son's absence from not finding him when he numbered the people. Jonathan had not heard of the rash curse (xiv, 24) which Saul invoked on any one who stood before the evildoer. In the din and darkness (Hebrew, 1 Sam. xiv, 27) that came on after his desperate exertions, he put forth the staff which apparently had (with his sling and bow) been his chief weapon, and tasted the honey which lay on the ground as they passed through the forest. The pursuers in general were driven back; one man fled even from the presence of the pursuers in the silence of fear of the royal curse; but the moment that the day, with its enforced fast, was over, they flew, like Muslims at sunset during the fast of Ramadan, on the captured cattle, and devouried them, even to the brutal neglect of the law which forbade the desecration of the fresh carcases with the blood thereof (xii). The law Saul endeavored to prevent and to expiate by erecting a large stone, which served both as a rude table and as an altar; the first altar that was raised under the monarchy. It was in the dead of night, after this wild revel was over, that he proposed that the pursuit
should be continued till dawn; and then, when the silence of the oracle of the high-priest indicated that something had occurred to intercept the divine favor, the lot was tried, and Jonathan appeared as the culprit. Jephthah's dreadful sacrifice would have been repeated; but the people interposed in behalf of the hero of that grief, and his life was saved. See Judges i, 46, 47.

2. But the chief interest of Jonathan's career is derived from the friendship with David, which began on the day of David's return from the victory over the champion of Gath, and continued till his death. It is the first Biblical instance of a romantic friendship, such as we find1 among the heroes of Greece, and has been since copied in Christendom; and is remarkable both as giving its sanction to these, and as filling with a pathos of its own, which has been imitated, but never surpassed, in modern works of fiction. "The soul of Jonathan was knit with the soul of David, and Jonathan loved him as his own soul."—"Thy love to me was wonderful, passing the love of women" (1 Sam. xvi, 1; 2 Sam. i, 26). Each found in each the affection that he found not in his own family; no jealousy of rivalry between the two, as claimants for the same throne, ever interposed: "Thou shalt be king in Israel, and I shall be next unto thee"(5 Sam. xxi, 7). The friendship was soon called into trial by the insane rage of his father against David. He interceded for his life, at first with success (1 Sam. xix, 1-7). Then the madness returned, and David fled. It was in a secret interview during this flight, by the stone of Ezel, that the second covenant was made between the two friends; now that more binding kind, and having to the mutual posterity—Jonathan laying such emphasis on this portion of the compact as almost to suggest the belief of a slight misgiving on his part of David's future conduct in this respect. It is this interview which brings out the character of Jonathan in the liveliest colors. His little articles of love for both his father and his friend—his bitter disappointment at his father's unmanageable fury—his familiar sport of archery. With passionate embraces and tears the two friends parted, B.C. cir. 1062, to meet only once more (1 Sam. xx). Their subsequent meeting was on the borders of Zeph, during Saul's pursuit of David. Jonathan's alarm for his friend's life is now changed into a confidence that he will escape: "He strengthened his hand in God." Finally, and for the third time, they renewed the covenant, and then parted forever (1 Sam. xxxii, 16-18). B.C. cir. 1052.

From this time forth we hear no more till the battle of Gilboa. In that battle he fell, with his two brothers and his father, and his corps shared their fate (1 Sam. xxxi, 2, 8). B.C. 1053. His remains were buried first at Jabesh-Gilead (ib. 19), but afterwards removed with those of his father to Zelah in Benjamin (2 Sam. xxii, 12). The news of his death occasioned the celebrated elegy of David, in which, as the friend, he naturally occupies the chief place (2 Sam. i, 22, 23, 25, 26), and which seems to have been sung in the education of the archers of Judah, in commemoration of the one great archer, Jonathan. "He had them teach the children of Judah the use of the bow" (2 Sam. i, 17, 18).

Jonathan left one son, aged five years old at the time of his death (2 Sam. iv, 4), to whom he had probably given his original name of Merib-baal, afterwards changed for Mephibosheth (comp. 1 Chron. viii, 34; ix, 40). See Mephiboseth. Through him the line of descendants was continued down to the time of Ezra (1 Chron. ix, 40), and even then their great ancestor's archery was practised among them. See David.

See Niemeyer, Charakter, iv, 418; Härder, Geist. der Hebr. Poesie, li, 287; Köster, in the Stud. u. Krit. 1832, li, 866; Ewald, Jbr. Gesch, ii, 580; Parean, Fleißig Dichter, etc. (Groningen, 1829); Simon, De amiciss Dardel. et Jon. (Hildburgh. 1739).

4. Son of Shage, a relative of Ahiam, both among David's famous warriors and descendants of Jashen of the mountains of Judah (2 Sam. xxiii, 32; 1 Chron. xi, 34). See B.C. cir. 1000.

5. Son of the high-priest Abiathar, and one of the adherents to David's cause during the rebellion of Absalom (2 Sam. xxv, 27, 36). He remained at En-rogel under pretext of procuring water, and reported to his master the proceedings in the camp of the insurgents (2 Sam. xv, 20-38; 1 Chron. xxvii, 20; Josephus, Ant. vii, 8, 2). B.C. cir. 1023. At a later date his constancy was manifested on a similar occasion by announcing to the ambitious Adonijah the forestalling of his measures by the succession of Solomon (1 Kings i, 42, 43). B.C. cir. 1013.

"On both occasions it may be remarked that he appears as the swift and trusty messenger. He is the last descendant of Eli of whom we anything" (Smith). See David.

6. Son of Shammah (Shimeah or Shimea), and David's nephew, as well as one of his chief warriors, a position which he earned by slaying a gigantic relative of Goliath (1 Sam. xvii, 7; Josephus, Ant. vii, 12, 12). B.C. 1018. He was also made secretary of the royal cabinet (1 Chron. xxxvii, 32, where סוחי is mistaken in the Auth. Vers. for the usual sense of "uncle"). B.C. 1014. "Jerome (Quast. Hebr. on 1 Sam. xvii, 12) conjectures that this was Nathan the prophet, thus making up the eighth son, not named in 1 Chron. ii, 13-15. But this is not probable" (Smith).

7. Son of Uzziah, and steward of the agricultural revenue of David (1 Chron. xxvii, 25; Heb. and A.V. "Jehonathan").

8. One of the Levites sent by Jehoshaphat to aid in teaching the Law to the people (1 Chron. xvii, 8; Heb. and A.V. "Jehoshaphat").

9. A scribe whose house was converted into a prison in which Jeremiah was closely confined (Jer. xxvi, 13, 20; xxxviii, 26). B.C. 589.

10. Baron of Johanan, the son of Kareah, and associated with him in his intercourse with Gedaliah, the Babylonian governor of Jerusalem (Jer. xi, 9). B.C. 587.

11. Son of Shemaijah and priest contemporary with Joiakim (Neh. xii, 18; Heb. and A.V. "Jehonathan").

12. Son of Melic and priest contemporary with Joiakim (Neh. xii, 14). B.C. between 536 and 459.

13. Father of Ebed, which latter was an Israelite of the "sons" of Adin that returned from Babylon with Ezra (Ezra viii, 9) at the head of fifty males, a number which is increased to 290 in 1 Esdr. viii, 22. Where Jonathan is written יואו נבשכ. B.C. ante 459.

14. Son of Asshkel, a chief Israelite associated with Jahaziah in separating the returned exiles from their Gentile wives (Ezra x, 15). B.C. 439.

15. Son of Joiada and father of Jaddua, Jewish high-priest (Neh. xii, 11); elsewhere called Johanan (Neh. xii, 22), and apparently John by Josephus, who relates his assassination of his own brother Jesus in the Temple (Joi. vii, 1, 7 and 2). Jonathan, or John, was high-priest for thirty-two years, according to Eusebius and the Alexandrin. Chron. (Selden, De Success. in Temp. cap. vii, Jordan: in Temple-Work).

16. Son of Shemaijah, of the family of Asaph, and father of Zechariah, which last was one of the priests appointed to flourish the trumpets as the procession moved around the rebuilt walls of Jerusalem (Neh. xii. 35).

17. A son of Mattathias, and leader of the Jews in their war of independence after the death of his brother Judas Maccabaeus, B.C. 161 (1 Macc. xiv, 19 sq.). —Smith. See Maccabees.

18. A son of Absalom (1 Macc. viii, 11); and by Simon with a force to occupy Joppa, which was already in the hands of the Jews (1 Macc. xii, 33), though prob-
ably held only by a weak garrison. Jonathan expelled
the inhabitants (רְאוּךְ בְּאָרָא עַיָּרָה; comp. Jose-
phus, Αντ. xiii, 6, 8) and secured the city. Jonathan
was probably a brother of Mattathias (2) (1 Macc. xi, 70).

19. A priest who is said to have offered up a solemn
prayer on the occasion of the sacrifice made by Nebu-
heimah after the recovery of the sacred fire (2 Macc. i, 23
sq.); compare Ewald, Gesch. d. V. Ir. iv, 184 sq.). The
narrative is interesting; as it presents a singular ex-
ample of the combination of public prayer with sacrifice
(Grimm, in Arch. f. Lit. i. c. C. L.).

20. A Sadducee at whose instigation Hyrcanus (q.
*) abandoned the Pharisees for their mild sentence
against his maligner Eleazar (Josephus, Αντ. xiii, 10, 6).

21. Son of Ananus, appointed Jewish high-priest, A.
D. 36, by Vitellius in place of Joseph Caiphas (Αντ.
xviii, 4, 2), and deposed after two years, when his brother The-
ophilus succeeded him (5, 5, 2). He was reappointed by
Agrippa A.D. 43, but this time he declined that honor in
favor of his brother Matthias (Josephus, Αντ. xix, 6, 4); he
was sent by Cumanus to Claudius in a quarrel with the
Samaritans, but appears to have been released by
the emperor (War, ii, 12, 6 and 7); he was at last mur-
dered by the Sicarii (War, ii, 13, 5). He was per-
haps the high-priest whom Felix caused to be assassi-
nated for his reproves of his bad government (Josephus,
Αντ. xx, 8, 5). (See Franke, Monatsschrift, i, 589;
Graetz, Gesch. der Juden, iii, 263, 287, 557.) See HIGH-
PRIEST.

22. A common weaver, leader of the Sicarii in Cy-
rene, captured and put to death by the Romans after
various adventures (Josephus, War, vii, 11, 12).

23. A Jew who challenged the Romans to single
combat during the last siege, and, after slaying one
combatant, Pudens, was at length killed by Pricus (Jo-
sephus, War, vii, 12).


Jonathan ben-Uzziel, the celebrated translator of the
Hebrew prophetic writings into Chaldee, a disciple
of Hillel I, one of the first of those thirty disciples of
Hillel who, in the language of the Talmud, "were worthy
to possess the power of stopping the sun like Joshua,"
flourished about B.C. 30. His expositions were especially
on Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, a fanciful reason for
which is given in the Talmud: "When the illuminating
sun arose upon the dark passages of the prophets, through
this translation, and breadth of Palestine where these
prophets are rooted, (תַּנִּית בְּאָרָא) the voice of the people
(vox populi vox dei) was heard asking, 'Who has disclosed
these mysteries to the sons of men? With great humility and becoming
modesty Jonathan b.-Uzziel answered, 'I have dis-
closed the mysteries; but thou, O Lord, knowest that
I have not done it to get glory for myself, or for the house
of my father, but for thy glory's sake, that discourses
might not not in Israel'" (Megill. 3, a). From these
notices in the Talmud, it is manifest that Jon-
athan was only the Chaldee translator of the prophets;
for it is distinctly declared in the last quoted passage
that when Jonathan wished also to translate the His-
grama (חִסְגֹּרַחֹמַר), the same voice from heaven
(חָגֵרְךָ דְבָּרֵן) emphatically forbade it (יִהְיֶה), because of
the great Messianic mysteries contained therein (יָאָסֵי
מְשֶׁאָס). So Daniel (comp. Raishi in loco). But tradition has also ascer-
ted to him the paraphrase of the Pentateuch known under
the name of Pseudo-Jonathan and the Targum of theive Megillota.

The question of the authorship of the paraphrases
will be treated in full in the article TARGUM (q. v.). We
are, however, content for a few points in the discus-
section, and will mainly speak of the work which is gen-

eral fastened upon him. Firstly, then, as to this Par-
aphrase of the Prophets which embraces Joshua, Judges, Samuel,
Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, and the twelve minor
prophets, i.e. its importance is not only great because it con-
tains expositions of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi,
but mainly so because, dating, as it does, from a period
when the Hebrew language gave place to the Aramaic
dialect, and when ancient Jewish and Phoenician dia-
literal expositions were introduced in the paraphrases
read during the divine services of the Jewish people,
it contains very many ancient readings, which go far
to explain many an obscure passage in the prophetical
writings, and is also marked by false criticism and loose
conjectures. A list of these various paraphrases has been
collected in the Hebrew annual entitled תניה (Len-
burg, 1852), i, 109 sq. The paraphrase was first publi-
cated in 1494, and afterwards with that of Onkelos on
the Pentateuch (Venice). It is found in all the Rab-
ic Bibles; also in Walton's Biblioth Poligl. (ii, iii, and
iv), and in Buxtorf's Bibli Hebraea (Basle, 1720, ii-iv),
etc., with a Latin translation.

As to the other reputed writings of Jonathan, we have
(a) the Paraphrase on the Pentateuch (יִדְרֵשׁ מְדִים
לְלִחְדַּרְתוֹן; see above); it is nothing more or less than a com-
pleted version of what is called the Jerusalem or Pale-
stine Targum (תָּרָעְא מְדִים לְלִחְדַּרְתוֹן), which of itself is in
reality but desultory glosses on Onkelos' paraphrase.
This completed version was at first called Targum Jeru-
alem, after the fragment on which it was based, but af-

erwards it obtained the name of Targum Jonathan and was erroneously resolving the abbreviation יִדְרֵשׁ מְדִים
לְלִחְדַּרְתוֹן into ידְרֵשׁ מְדִים לְלַחְדַּרְתּוֹן.
The additions to the work were probably not made prior to the seventh
century. The work was first published in Venice 1590-91,
with the Hebrew text of the Pentateuch, the paraphrase
of Onkelos, the fragments of the Jerusalem glosses,
the commentaries of Rashi and Jacob ben-Ascher, then in
Basle (1497), Hanau (1614), Amsterdam (1640), Prague
(1646), etc., and has lately been printed, with a com-
mentary, in the beautiful edition of the Pentateuch with the
Rabbinic commentaries (Vienna, 1869). Explan-
a
dations of it were also written by David b.-Jacob (Prague,
1609), Feivel b.-David Secherja (Hanau, 1614), Monte-
cel Kremisen (Hanau, 1617), and others, and it was transla-
ted into Latin by Chevalier, in Walton's Polyglott.
An English translation was published by the late learned
Wesleyan preacher, J. W. Etheridge (Lond. 1862, 2 vols.
8vo); but the masterly treatises on this Pseudo-Jona-
than are by Bähr, Rosenmüller, Oesterley, and others.
Zeit.

The translation into Latin by Chevalier, in Walton's Polyglott.

A few early critics have attributed this work to Mar Jec-
sef, of Sora (died 382), but of late it is assigned to a
later period even than the paraphrase of the Pen-
tateuch, and is considered simply a compilation from
ancient materials made by several individuals. This
version is generally published, together with the Hebrew
text, in the Jewish editions of the Pentateuch, and is contained in all the
Rabbinic Bibles. A rhymed
version of the whole of this paraphrase was published by
Jacob ben-Samuel, also called Koppelman ben-Bonem
(about 1584). A Latin version of it is given in Wal-
ton's Polyglott. It has been again set out in a more
lete paraphrase of the Song of Songs (Com-
tent. on the Song, 1728); and Dr. Ginsburg has lately
translated the first chapter of the paraphrase of the Song
(Comment. on the Song, p. 29 sq.) and the whole of
Ecclesiastes (Comment. on Eccles., p. 560 sq.). Hebrew com-
mentaries on the entire paraphrase have been pub-
declor Lorc (Cracow, 1880) and Chajim Feivel
(Berlin, 1705). See also Bartolocci, Biblioth. Magna Rabbincia,

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

**Jones, Benjamin (2), a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Sandwich, Mass., July 28, 1786; united with the Church in 1806; entered the New York Conference in 1809; was made presiding elder in 1820; was a delegate to the General Conference in 1844; was by poor health superannuated in 1846; and died at Lincolnsville, Me., July 18, 1850, aged 64. Mr. Jones was a man of more than ordinary ability and influence. His preaching was bold, sustained, and independent; dealing in truthful logic and the word of God rather than fancy, and very strong in argument. His efforts were often eloquent in the highest degree.**—*Conf. Min.,* iv, 606; Stevens, *Memorials of Methodism*, chap. xiii. (G. L. T.)

**Jones, Charles Colcock, D.D., a Presbyterian divine, was born at Liberty Hall, Ga., Dec. 20, 1804.** While yet a youth he entered a large counting-house in Savannah, Ga., but when converted, in his 24th year, he decided to quit mercantile life and enter the ministry. He prepared for college at Phillips Academy, then entered Andover Seminary, and later the theological seminary at Princeton. He was licensed in 1830 by the New Brunswick Presbytery at Allentown, New Jersey, and returned to Georgia in the autumn, and shortly afterwards became missionary to the negroes of Liberty County, Ga. He soon became interested in the colored race, and during the remainder of his life sought by extensive correspondence, by his annual reports as a missionary, and by all other means in his power, to engage the colored people in the Christian faith. The condition of this class of our population. In 1833 he was elected professor of Church history and polyline in the seminary at Columbia, and after having been earnestly urged to accept the chair, on the plea that he might then there continue to work for the colored people, by inciting the students to engage with him in the work, he accepted the position in 1836. But he felt restless in his new place, and in 1838 returned again to his former work. In 1847 he was re-elected to the professorship, and again prevailed upon to accept the professorship, and he continued in it until 1838. In 1840 he removed from Georgia to return to Georgia. During the Rebellion he attached himself to the Southern cause. But his health was too feeble to permit much exertion, for he suffered from consumption. He died March 10, 1863. (Dr. Jones delivered a large part of the esteem and affection of the Church of God. As a man there was decision and energy of character, united with great friendliness of heart, cheerfulness of disposition, activity of mind, and ease and polish of manners. Few equalled him in all that makes
up the ease and polish of the Christian gentleman. As a preacher there was much that was attractive in his appearance and manner. A delightful simplicity, ease, and unctious pervaded his happiest efforts." Dr. Jones published the ministerial work of Scripture Doctrine and Practice:—Catechism on the Creed;—Hist. Catechism of the O. and N. T.; besides several pamphlets on the Religious Instr. of the Negro. His Catechism of Scripture Doctrine and Practice was extensively used, and was found so serviceable to missionaries generally that it was translated into several languages, and was much commended for the instruction of the heathen. He also began a History of the Church of God, which he did not live to complete (it was published by Scriber). See Wilson, Presb. Hist. America, 1867, p. 438. (J. H. W.)

**Jones, Cornelius**, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Hinsdale, Mass., May 20, 1800; was converted in Geauga Co., Ohio, Feb. 12, 1811; he entered the Pittsburgh Conference in 1827; and died at Alleghanytown, Aug. 27, 1835. He was a diligent student, an able minister, and a successful evangelist.—Conference Minutes, ii. 483.

**Jones, David** (1), a Baptist minister, was born in White Clay Creek Hundred, New Castle Co., Del., May 12, 1774. He was determined to improve his education, which had been somewhat neglected. He entered Hopewell School, and remained there three years, eagerly pursuing the study of the classic languages. In 1761 he became a licticate, and was regularly ordained pastor in 1767 to the church at Freehold, Monmouth Co., New Jersey. In 1772 he removed to enter upon the missionary work among the Indians in Ohio. But he failed so utterly in these efforts that after the lapse of two years he returned again to his former charge. In the Revolutionary War he served as chaplain, and was a member of the regular work of the ministry at the close of the war. In 1786 he became pastor at Southampton, Pa. In 1794 he again entered the army, this time at the special request of General Wayne. He also served as chaplain during the War of 1812. He died in Chester Co., Pa., Feb. 5, 1820. See Sprague, Annae Am. Pulpit, vi, 85 sq.

**Jones, David** (2), another Baptist minister, was born in the north of Wales in April, 1785. He united with the Independent Church when about fifteen years old. Shortly after he emigrated to this country, and lived in Ohio. After a stay of two years among the Baptists, who were thickly settled in that immediate vicinity, he joined their Church, and was licensed to preach. He accepted a call to the Beaver Creek Baptist Church, teaching at the same time. From 1810 to 1813 he had no settled charge, and he travelled through several of the middle and border states, preaching from place to place. In 1813 he went to Newark, New Jersey, where, in 1814, he was the pastor of a church. He assumed the pastorate of the Baptist Church at "Low- ler Dublin," near Philadelphia, where he had preached occasionally before his departure for Newark. With these people he spent the remainder of his life. He died April 25, 1850, being the author of a tract on Baptism, entitled Letters of David and John, and wrote also the tract Salvation by Grace, published by the Baptist General Tract Society. See Sprague, Annae Am. Pulpit, vi, 518 sq.

**Jones, Greenbury R., a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Brownsville, Pa., April 7, 1784; was converted in August, 1805; entered the itineracy on Baptism, entitled Letters of David and John, and wrote also the tract Salvation by Grace, published by the Baptist General Tract Society. See Sprague, Annae Am. Pulpit, vi, 518 sq.

**Jones, Griffith**, a Welsh divine, generally known as the Welsh Apostle, was born at Killrediis, Caernarthenshire, in 1864. His parents, who were eminently pious, took great pains to imbue the mind of their son from his earliest years with impressions of piety and religion. The serious turn which they gave to his mind inclined him towards the Christian ministry. At the completion of his theological studies he was ordained by bishop Bull, Sept. 17, 1706, and shortly after appointed to the rectory of Llanddowror by Sir John Phillips, whose own religious character made him wish to secure the services of a man of piety and learning like Jones. "In this situation," says Middleton (Evangelical Biography, s. v.), "he soon developed all the best qualities of a man of God, and a most eloquent and evangelical preacher. Christ was all to him; and it was his greatest delight to publish and exalt the wondrous riches of his Redeemer's righteousness. Nor was he less blessed in his private plans of doing good. He founded among his countrymen free schools, and by this means more than a hundred and fifty thousand poor people were taught to read. He also circulated thirty thousand hand copies of the Welsh Bible among them, besides other religious and useful books. His humility gave lustre to all these labors of love. On his dying bed he said, 'I must bear witness to the goodness of God to me. Blessed be God, his comforts fill my soul.' He died in April, 1830. It may be truly said of Griffith Jones that few lives were more heavenly and useful, and few deaths more triumphant." Jones also wrote and published several religious treatises in Welsh and English, of which many thousands were distributed as had been the Bible. See Jamieson, Cyclop. Relig. Biog. p. 289; Allibone, Dict. Engl. and Amer. Authors, vol. ii, s. v.

**Jones, Horatio Gates** (son of David Jones, 1), also a Baptist minister, was born at Easttown, Chester County, Pa., Feb. 11, 1777. His early education was quite thorough, and remarkably so for a young man destined for agricultural life. Gifted with great fluency of speech, young Jones became "the politician" of his own immediate vicinity, and before he had reached his majority enjoyed the prospect of preferment in political life. Just about this time he became conscious, however, of his responsibility to his Maker, and, believing himself to have been the subject of spiritual renovation, he made public declaration of his belief, June 24, 1796, and determined to devote his life to the Christian ministry. He was licensed Sept. 28, 1814, and was ordained to Salem, New Jersey, Feb. 18, 1820. In 1805 his health became enfeebled, and he was obliged to resign, however reluctantly, the charge. Hereafter he devoted himself to farm life on a place which he bought on the banks of the Schuylkill River, about five miles above Philadelphia. But Jones had engaged too heartily in the cause of his Master not to be tempted to re-enter the work of the Christian ministry whenever his health should warrant the task. At first he went to different places from time to time and preached; finally he made the "Philadelphia Home Mission" at Lower Merion, Montgomery County, belonging to the Presbyterians, his head-quarters, and he succeeded, after several years of ardent labor, in building up there a Baptist Church, which he served until the end of his earthly days, Dec. 12, 1865. Mr. Jones held a prominent position in the Board of trustees of the Philadelphia Baptist Association, and was at one time its treasurer. He was a member of the Board of Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania, and was at one time its chancellor. This high school conferred on him the degree of D.D. The degree of M.A. he received from Brown University in 1812. He was also a member of the Baptist Board of Missions, and was at one time (1829) president of the Philadelphia Baptist Association. He published a History in 1823, and held a co-editorship of the Letter-day Luminary, an early Baptist missionary magazine. Indeed, we are told that "few men of his
day have written so much and so well, and published so little." See Sprague, Annals Am. Pulpit, vi, 492 sq.

JONES, Jeremiah, a learned English dissenting minister, was born, as is supposed, of parents in opulent circumstances, in the north of England, in 1698. After finishing his education under the tuition of Samuel Jones of Tewksbury, who was also the tutor of Chandler, But- ler, Secker, and many other distinguished divines, he became minister of a congregation at Forest Green, in Gloucestershire, where he also kept an academy. He died in 1734. His works are as follows: A Vindica- tion of the former Part of the Gospel by Matthew from Mr. Whitton's Charge of Dialoogation, etc. (London, 1719, 8vo); Salop, 1721, 8vo, Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1808; —also, A new and full Method of settling the Canonical Authority of the New Testament (London, 1726, 2 vols. 8vo); vol. iii, 1727, 8vo; Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1798, 3 vols, 8vo, and since. See Chalmers, Biog. Dict. (Lon- don); Gentleman's Magazine, vol. xxiii; Monthly Maga- zine, April, 1808; Allibone, Dict. of English and Ameri- can Authors, ii, 988.

JONES, Joel, a celebrated lay writer on theological subjects, and jurist by profession, was born of Puritan ancestry at Stratford, Conn., Oct. 26, 1755, and educated at Yale College, where he graduated in 1777. He was one of the judges of the Philadelphia District Court, and later mayor of Philadelphia. In 1848 he was elected president of Girard College, and he held that position for two years. He died Feb. 3, 1860. Distan- guished for his services in legal abilities, Jones deserved a place in our work on account of his extensive re- searches in the Biblical department. His acquirements extended far beyond the widest range of professional attain- ment. Judge Jones wrote extensively for literary journals and quarterly; he also published largely. Of special interest to the theological student are, Story of Joseph, or Patriarchal Age (originally published for the use of Girard College students): The Knowledge of One Another in the Future State: Notes on Scripture (published by his widow, Phila. 1860). He also edited several English works on Prophecy, which he published under the title of Liberale (5 vols. 8vo), enriched with many valuable additions of his own, and translated from the French, Outlines of a History of the Court of Rome and of the Temporal Power of the Popes (to which he appended many original notes). Judge Jones was a ruling elder in the Presbyterian Church, and held pos- itions in various ecclesiastical boards, where his services were greatly prized. See Princeton Review, Index, ii, 219 sq.

JONES, John (1), an English Roman Catholic theo- logian, was born at London in 1675. He studied at St. John's College, Oxford, where he roomed with Laud, afterwards archbishop of Canterbury. Having turned Roman Catholic, he went to Spain, completed his stud- ies at the University of Compostella, and became a Benedictine under the name of Lermani a Santen- Martino. After teaching for a while Hebrew and theology in the College of St. Vedast, he returned to England to invite him to the establishment of a college in Lon- don, Dec. 17, 1636. He wrote Sacra Ars Memorialis, or Scripturas divinas in promptu habendor accommodata (Douay, 1623, 8vo)—Concilii locorum communem totius Scripturis (Douay, 1625, 8vo). He also publish- ed some editions of the Bible, with interlinear glosses (9 vols. fol.); of the works of Biosinius; of Arnohe, Adscensis, and Tindes (Douay, 1634); and worked with P. Reynier on the Apostolicae Benedictinorum. See Wood, Athenae Ox- honiensis, vol. i; Dodd, Ch. History; Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Insulaires, xxvi, 905. (J.N.P.)

JONES, John (2), an English Protestant divine, was born in 1700. He was educated at Worcester College, Oxford, and was admitted a fellow in 1726. He became vicar of Acombury, he resigned in 1751, to take the rectory of Boule Hurst, Bedfordshire. His death was caused by a fall from his horse; the time of its occurrence is not recorded. He wrote: Anon.] Free and candid Discip- linations relating to the Church of England, etc. (London 1748, 50, 8vo): this work produced a great controversy, last- ing in 1749 Anon. [Cursus Anaemdato, and Candid Discipulations," etc. (London. 1758, 8vo): —Catho- lical Faith and Practice (1765). See Nichols, Literary Anecdotcs: London, Gentil. Magazine, i, xxii, pt. i, p. 510 sq.; Allibone, Dict. Eng. and Am. Auth. ii, 9.

JONES, John (3), L.L.D., a Welsh Sociocian divine and philological writer, was born in Caerseathenshire, and educated at the Unitarian New College, Hackney. In 1797 he became a matirical teacher in the Welsh Academy, Swansea, which situation he held about three years, and then settled at Plymouth Dock over the Unitarian congregation. In 1797 he became minister of the Unitarian congregation at Halifax, in Yorkshire, and about 1800 he removed to London, where he resided during the remainder of his life, chiefly occupied as a classical teacher, and teaching only occasionally. He died January 10, 1827. A few years before his death he received the diploma of L.L.D. from the University of Aberdeen. Dr. Jones was the author of several works, some of which are re- ligious and some of which are of an erudite or critical sort or defence of Christianity. Of these the most important are Illustra- tions of the Four Gospels, founded on circumstances peculiar to our Lord and the Evangelists (London. 1808, 8vo): —Ecclesiastical Researches, or Philo and Josephus proved to be historians and apologists of Christianity (London, 1818, 1 vol. 8vo); —Epistle to the Ro- mans analyzed (1802, 8vo); —New Version of the Epis- toles to the Colossians, Thessalonians, Timothy, Titus, and the general Epistle of James (1819-20, 12mo); —New Ver- sion of the first three Chapters of Genesis (1819, 8vo). He also wrote a number of philological works which are considered valuable. It may not be out of place here to state that Dr. Jones was the first English philologist who taught Greek by the medium of the English instead of the Latin. See Lond. Gentil. Mag. April, 1827; Eng. Cyclop. s. v.; Allibone, Dict. Eng. and Am. Auth. i, 573.

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

JONES, J. Taylor, D.D., a Baptist missionary, was born at New Ipswich, N. H., July 16, 1802. He graduated at Amherst College in 1825; studied theology at Andover and Newton Seminary; and, having joined the Baptist Church in 1828, was the following year ap- pointed a missionary to Burmah. He arrived at Madra- main, his destined place of labor, in Feb., 1832, and after having mastered the Teling and Siamese languages, he was chosen to go to the kingdom of Siam, and reached Bangkok in April, 1833. After a successful mission, he left Siam in 1839, on account of his children, went to Singapore, and thence on a visit to the United States. After returning to Siam for six years he came home again in 1846, and in the fall of 1847 went away for the last time. He died at Bankok Sept. 13, 1851. The de- gree of D.D. was conferred upon him a few years before his death. Dr. Jones published three tracts in Siem- ese, 1834; and a translation of the New Testament in the same tongue, 1835. These works, and especially the says of Dr. Jones's qualifications for the missionary work, "Take him altogether, I have never seen his equal; and among more than a hundred men I have met
among the heathen, I would select Dr. Jones as the model missionary."—Sprague, Anna's Am. M. Pulpit, vii. 772.

JONES, Joseph Huntington, D.D., an able Presbyterian minister, and brother of judge Joel (see above), was born at Coventry, Conn., Aug. 24, 1737, and graduated at Yale College in 1757. About the same time at Bowdoin College, he decided on the ministry for his life-work, and entered Princeton Theological Seminary. His first charge he entered June 1, 1824, at Woodbury, New Jersey. The year following, after a most successful work on the small and feeble charge, he was called to New Brunswick, New Jersey, and was installed the second Wednesday of July, 1825. In 1838 he removed to Philadelphia, to take charge of the Sixth Presbyterian Church in that city, and he continued his relation there for twenty-three years. "Beginning with a church reduced to so low that a resuscitation was deemed well-nigh impossible, and struggling with difficulties that would have discouraged ordinary men, a manly blessing crowned his efforts." In 1861, finding that the secretarial committee of the college on the "fund for disabled ministers," etc., which he had filled nearly for seven years in connection with his pastoral duties, found itself generous enough in its duties, he resigned his position as pastor, and devoted himself hereafter entirely to this noble cause of providing for those of his brethren who were in need of assistance. He died Dec. 22, 1868, in the midst of his work, "suddenly, as it were with the harness off." He was buried in Princeton College cemetery, with the degree of D.D. Dr. Jones published Revivals of Religion (Philadelphia, 1839):—Effects of Physical Causes on Christian Experience (1846, and often, 18mo):—Memor of the Rev. Ashbel Green, D.D. (N. Y., 1849, 8vo):—History of the Brethren at New Brunswick in 1871; and several of his sermons and essays.—Princeton Review, Index, vol. ii, 722 sq.

JONES, Lot, D.D., a clergyman of the Protestant Episcopal Church, was born in Brunswick, Maine, Feb. 21, 1797, and was educated at Bowdoin College, Maine, where he graduated in 1821. Joining the Protestant Episcopal Church, he studied for the ministry under bishop Griswold, and was by him ordained deacon January 19, 1823, and priest September 1823. In 1823 he was settled at Marblehead and Marshfield, Mass., in 1827 at Macon, Ga.; in 1827 at Savannah; in 1827 at Gardiner, Maine; in 1829 at South Leicester, Mass.; and in January 1838, he removed to New York, and took charge of the new mission church of the Episcopalians. By humility, single-hearted devotion to his one great work, and untried industry, made his ministry remarkably effective. In 1858 he published his 25th anniversary discourse. During those 25 years he baptized 2,001—255 adults and 1,948 children; married 728 couples presented 915 for confirmation, enrolled 1494 as communicants, and attended 1362 funerals. He died in Philadelphia Oct. 12, 1865. His death was the result of accident in falling upon the pavement at St. Luke's Church, where he was in attendance upon the meeting of the Board of Missions.—Church Review, Jan. 1866, p. 565.

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

JONES, Samuel, D.D., a Baptist minister, was born in Glastonbury, South Wales, Jan. 14, 1735, and was brought by his parents to this country during his infancy. He was educated at Harvard College, and at Cambridge, where he received the degree of M.A. May 18, 1762, and turned his attention to the study of theology. He was ordained in January, 1763, and became pastor of the united churches of Pennepek and Southampton. In the same year he, by request, remodeled the charter of the college in Newport, R. I., which institution afterwards became Brown University. In 1770 he resigned the pastorate of the South Baptist Church, and devoted himself thereafter to that of Pennepek, afterwards called Lower Dublin. He received the honorary degree of M.A. from the College of Rhode Island in 1769, and that of D.D. from the College of Pennsylvania in 1786. While attending faithfully to his ministerial labors, he so devoted much of his time to the labors of the press, which he was so successful. He died Feb. 7, 1814. Dr. Jones made several compilations for divers associations in which he filled high offices, and published some occasional sermons.—Sprague, Anna's, vi, 104 sq.

JONES, Thomas, an English divine, was born in 1729, and educated at Queen's College, Cambridge. He was chaplain at St. Savior's, Southwark, and is noted for his deep piety and great exertions in behalf of the conversion of the masses at a time when the English pulpit was in that deep lethargy from which Wesley and his coadjutors first earnestly aroused it. Like the Wesleyan, he met with much opposition in his noble efforts, and "his sweetness of natural temper," says his biographer, "greatness of soul, would never have been depressed under the numberless insults he met with had it not been strengthened, as well as adorned, by a sublimer influence." His health finally gave way under his extraordinary labors, and he died, while yet a young man, in 1761.—Middleton, Evans, Biog. iv, 880.

JONES, William, M.A., F.R.S., of Nayland, as he is generally called, was born at Lowick, in Northamptonshire, July 28, 1706. He was educated at the Charter House and University College, Oxford. He there became a convert to the philosophy of Hutchinson, and, having induced Mr. Horne, afterwards bishop of Norwich, to adopt the same system, together they became the principal champions of that philosophy. He was admitted to deacon's orders after having received the degree of B.A., in 1749. In 1751 he was ordained priest by the bishop of Lincoln, and on quitting the university became curate of Finedon, and afterwards of Wadsboro, both in his native county. In 1764'archbishop Secker presented him to the vicarage of Bathedon, in Kent, and in the next year to the rectory of Pluckley, in the same county. In 1776 he took up his residence at Nayland, in Suffolk, where he held the perpetual curacy; and soon after he exchanged his living of Pluckley for the rectory of Paston, in Northamptonshire. In 1780 he became fellow of the Royal Society. In this capacity, for many years he was engaged in the composition of a treatise on philosophy, which was intended to elucidate his favorite system. In that work he displayed great learning and ingenuity, as well as ardent attachment to the interests of piety and virtue, united with the eccentric peculiarities of the Hutchinsonian school. Alarm at the progress of radical and revolutionary opinions during the French Revolution, he employed his pen in opposition to the advocates of such destructive principles, and his writings were widely circulated by the friends of the British government. He sanguine with equal success on the subject of theology, morals, literature, philosophy, and, in addition to all these, showed great talents in musical composition. "He was a man of quick penetration," says bishop Horsley, "of extensive learning, and the soundest piety, and he had the talent of writing upon everything, with a clear and strong understanding." In the year 1792 he met with a severe loss in the death of his most intimate friend, bishop Horne, to whom he was chaplain. Being now of advanced age, and obliged, by his growing infirmities, to discontinue his practice of taking pupils, that he might not be subjected to inconvenient travelling, he moved from his home, in the year 1798 the archbishop of Canterbury presented him to the sinecure rectory of Hol- lingbourn in Kent, which, however, he did not live long.
to enjoy, dying Feb. 6, 1800, in consequence of a para-
lytic stroke. His most important works are, A full
Answer to By. Clayton's Essay on Spirit (1738, 8vo)—
Cursory Thoughts. Remarks upon Mr. Green's Scrip-
tures Commentarv (1757)—Course of Lectures on the Figurative
Language of the Holy Scriptures (1787, 8vo)—Sermons
(1790, 2 vols. 8vo)—The Scholar armed against the
Errors of the Times (2 vols. 8vo)—Memoirs of the Life,
Studies, and Writings of George Horne (1736 and
1738, 8vos) a large collection of his works; also,
letters, &c., 12 vols. 8vo (Lond. 1801). The theological and
miscellaneous works were republished separately (London,
1810, 6 vols. 8vo). Two posthumous volumes of ser-
mons were published for the first time in 1830 (London,
8vo). See W. Stevens, Life of W. Jones (1801), Aikin,
Gen. Biography; Hooper, Noun, Digest, Generale, xxvi, 908;
Buck; Davenport; Darling, Cyclopaedia Bibliog., ii,
1682. (E. de F.)

Jones, Sir William, an eminent poet, scholar,
and lawyer, was born in London Sept. 28, 1746, and
was sent to Harrow in 1758, where he soon eclipsed all his
fellows, particularly in classical knowledge. In 1764 he
was entered at University College, Oxford, where he was
enabled to gratify that desire for a knowledge of the
Oriental languages which had shown itself during the last
two years of his residence at Harrow. In 1765 he left
Oxford, and went to France as tutor to the son of one of
Spencer's friends, with whom he travelled on the Continent.
In 1770 he was admitted to the Inner Temple, and the
same year he published, at the request of the king of
Denmark, A Life of Nadir Shah, translated into French
from the Persian; in the following year a Persian Gram-
nar was republished seven years ago, with corrections and
additions, by the late professor Lee; and in 1774 his Commen-
taries on Asiatic Poetry, republished by Eich-
born at Leipzig in 1776. In 1776 he was made a com-
missioner of bankrupts. In 1780 he completed a trans-
lation of seven Arabic poems, known as the Moolidas-
kat; verse, Biography; Hooper, Noun, Digest, Generale, xxvi, 908;
and another, entitled Essay on the Law of Bailments,
and two or three odes. In March, 1783, Jones obtained a
judgeship in the Supreme Court of Judicature in Ben-
gal, and landed at Calcutta in September. He at once
set about the acquisition in 1758, where he soon eclipsed all his
fellows, particularly in classic knowledge. In 1764 he
was entered at University College, Oxford, where he was
enabled to gratify that desire for a knowledge of the
Oriental languages which had shown itself during the last
two years of his residence at Harrow. In 1765 he left
Oxford and went to France as tutor to the son of one
of Spencer's friends, with whom he travelled on the Con-

tinent. In 1770 he was admitted to the Inner Temple, and the
same year he published, at the request of the king of
Denmark, A Life of Nadir Shah, translated into French
from the Persian; in the following year a Persian Gram-
nar was republished seven years ago, with corrections and
additions, by the late professor Lee; and in 1774 his Commen-
taries on Asiatic Poetry, republished by Eich-
born at Leipzig in 1776. In 1776 he was made a com-
missioner of bankrupts. In 1780 he completed a trans-
lation of seven Arabic poems, known as the Moolidas-
kat; verse, Biography; Hooper, Noun, Digest, Generale, xxvi, 908;
and another, entitled Essay on the Law of Bailments,
and two or three odes. In March 1783 Jones obtained a
judgeship in the Supreme Court of Judicature in Ben-
gal, and landed at Calcutta in September. He at once
set about the acquisition of the knowledge of Oriental
languages, literature, and customs. He established the
Royal Asiatic Society "for investigating the history,
antiquities, arts, sciences, and literature of Asia," of
which he was the first president. To the vol-
umes of the Asiatic Researches Sir William contributed
largely, and in 1799, he wrote a short and
verse, called The Enchanted Fruit, or the Hindu Wife;
and a translation of an ancient Indian drama, called
Sacaita, or the Fatal Ring. A translation by him of the
Ordinances of Menu (q. v.) appeared in 1794. He
was busily employed on a digest of the Hindu and Mo-

hammedan laws, when he was attacked with an inflam-
mation of the liver, which terminated fatally April 27,
1794. Sir Wm. Jones was one of the first linguists and
Oriental scholars that Great Britain has produced, be-
ing more or less acquainted with no less than twenty-
eight different languages. His poems are always ele-
mental and their ideas and their versification
are melliflu-
oun. His learning was extensive, his legal knowledge
was profound, and he was an enlightened and zealous
champion of constitutional principles. He was also an
earnest Christian. To devotional exercises he was ha-

bilitated attentive to the above works, Sir
William Jones published a translation of the
and a half,
translations of two Mohammedan law tracts On the Law
of Inheritance, and of Succession to Property of Inte-
sates—Tales and Fables by Nizami; Two Hyms to
Praviri; and Extracts from the Vedas. The East In-
dia Company erected a monument to his memory in St.
Paul's Cathedral, and a statue in Bengal. A complete
edition of his works, in 6 vols. 4to, was published by
Livy Jones in 1799; and another appeared, in 18 vols. 8vo, in
1807, with a life by the author lord Teignmouth.

Joneson, Finn (known also by the Latin name of
Finnus Johanneus), the historian of the Icelandic
Church and literature, was born on the 16th of January,
1704, at Skagafjarðar, and his Genealogic Name
Athab. Jon Hal-
dursen, was minister. He was educated at the School
of Skalholt, and in 1725 passed to the University of
Copenhagen. On his return to Iceland his intention was
to become a lawyer, but the death of his uncle, a parish
priest, who left behind him a numerous family of small
children, induced him to devote himself to the Church, that he might bring up the orphans. He obtained the vacant benefice, brought up the family,
married, and in 1754 was appointed to the bishopric of
Skalholt. He was very attentive to the revenues of his
diocese, and the account of his episcopate by Petursson
is chiefly occupied with his disputes with refractory
tenants of Church property. He died on the 23d of
July, 1789. He composed several works in Latin and
Icelandic, especially a Historia Ecclesiasticae Islandiae,
first published with valuable additions by his son Finn-
son (Copenhagen, 1772-8, 4 vols. 4to), and continued
by Petursson (ib. 1835), a valuable and inter-
esting work, embracing the literary as well as ecclesia-
tical affairs of Iceland—English Cyclopa. a. v.

Joppeh (Heb. Yahpo'h), "fl. Josh. xix. 46; 2 Chron.
ii, 16; Josiah i, 3, or N£E" Extra iii, 7; beauty; Sept. N.
T. and Josephus 'ToPw', other Greek writers 'ioovTt',
'ioovTt', or 'ioow'; Vulgate Joppa; Auth. Vern. "Japho," except in Josiah; usually "Joppe" in the Apocrypha,
town on the south-west coast of Palestine, the port of
Jerusalem in the days of Solomon, as it has been ever
since.

1. Legends. The etymology of the name is variously
explained; Rabbinal writers deriving it from Japho'h,
but classical geographers from Jopha (ToPw), daughter of
Abulus and wife of Cepheus, Andromeda's father, its
reputed founder; others interpreting it as the "waste"
or "cast off town" (Rom. Paulos, p. 864). The fact is,
that, from its being a sea-port, it had a pro-
fane as well as a sacred history. Pliny, following Mela
(De situ orb. i, 12), says that it was of antediluvian an-
tiquity (Hist. Nat. v, 14); and even Sir John Mannde-
ville, in the 14th century, bears witness—though, it must
be confessed, a slight one—to that tradition (Early
Travels in F. p. 142). According to Josephus, it origin-
ally belonged to the Phoenicians (Ant. xiii, 15, 4). Here,
writes Strabo, some say Andromeda was exposed to the
whale (Geograph. xvi. p. 759; comp. Müller's Hist. Gev.
vii. 127), and when he was brought back from the
sea, he appeals to its elevated position in behalf of those
who laid the scene there; though, in order to do so consis-
tently, he had already shown that it would be neces-
sary to transport Ethiopia into Phoenicia (Strabo. i, 43).
However, in Pliny's age—and Josephus had just
before affirmed the same (War, ii, 9, 3)—they still
showed the chains by which Andromeda was bound;
and not only so, but M. Scaurus the younger, the same
that was so much employed in Judaea by Pompey (War
i, 6, 2 sq.), had the bones of the monster transported to
Rome from Joppa, where till then they had been ex-
hibited. Yet, with all his regard for the Phoenicians and
his adhesions to the public amongst other prodigies.
Nor would they have been uninteresting to the modern
geologist, if his report be correct; for they measured
forty feet in length, the span of the ribs exceeding that
of the Indian elephant, and the thickness of the bone
or vertebrae was such as to make them useful for the
interchange of commerce between the Greeks, personi-
fied in their errant hero Perseus, and the Phoenicians,
whose lovely, but till then unexplored clime may be
shadowed forth in the fair virgin Andromeda. Perseus,
in the tale, is said to have plunged his dagger into the right shoulder of the monster. Possibly he may have discovered or improved the harbor, the roar from whose foaming surf might have been surpassed by the barkings of Scylla or Charybdis. Even the chains shown there may have been those by which his ship was attached to the shore. Rings used by the Romans for mooring their vessels are still to be seen near Terracina, in the south angle of the ancient port (M. Liv. xxvi. 13). It is not known when it was started or when it was forsaken by Rome, but it ceased to be the port of the Usilii (i.e. Gessius Florus) it was destined amidst great slaughter of its inhabitants (War, ii, 18, 10); and such a nest of pirates had it become when Vespasian arrived in those parts that it underwent a second and entire destruction, together with the adjacent villages, at his hands (iii, 9, 5). Thus it appears that this port had already begun to be the den of robbers and outcasts which it was in Strabo's time (Geogr. xvi, 750), while the district around it was so populous that from Jamnia, a neighboring town, and its vicinity, 40,000 armed men could be collected (ibid.). There was a vast plain around it, as we learn from Josephus (Ant. xiii, 4, 4); it lay between Jamnia and Cesarea—the latter of which might be reached "on the morrow" from it (Acts x, 9 and 24)—not far from Lydda (Acts ix, 38), and distant from Antipatris 150 stadia (Joseph. Ant. xiii, 15, 1).

It was at Joppa, on the house-top of Simon the Tanner, "by the sea-side"—with the wind from the west and the sea circumscribed on the east by the high ground on which the town stood, but commanding a boundless prospect over the western waters—that the apostle Peter had his "vision of tolerance," as it has been happily designated, and was for the first time of the Gentiles—"but from the east to embrace, from still worse threshold, the virgin daughter of the west. The Christian poet Arator has not failed to discover a mystical connection between the raising to life of the aged Tabitha—the occasion of Peter's visit to Joppa—and the baptism of the first Gentile house of Cornelius (De Act. Apost. L 840, ap. Migne, Patrol. Curs. Compl. ixxviii, 164).

In the 4th century Eusebius calls Joppa a city (Onomast. a. v.); and it was then made the seat of a bishopric, an honor which it retained till the conquest of the country by the Saracens (Roland, p. 889; S. Paul. Geogr. Zoe, p. 304); the subscriptions of its prelates are preserved in the acts of various synods of the 5th and 6th centuries (Le Quen, Oriens Christian., iii, 629). Joppa has been the landing-place of pilgrims going to Jerusalem for more than a thousand years, from Arculf in the 7th century to his royal highness the prince of Wales and his retinue. It is mentioned in all the itineraries and books of travel in the Holy Land which have appeared in different languages (Early Travels in Pal. p. 10, 34, 142, 286). None of the early travellers, however, give any explicit description of the place. During the Crusades it was several times taken and retaken by Franks and Saracens. It had been taken possession of by the forces of Godfrey de Bouillon previous to the capture of Jerusalem. The town had been deserted, and was allowed to fall into ruin, the Crusaders contenting themselves with possession of the citadel (William of Tyre, Hist. viii, 24); but it was assigned there for the support of the Church of the Resurrection (ibid. ix, 16), though there seem to have been bishops of Joppa (perhaps only titular after all) between A.D. 1258 and 1365 (Le Quen, 1291; compare p. 1241). Saladin, in A.D. 1186, destroyed its fortifications (Secret. Fid., ch. x, v. 5); but Richard of England, who was confined here by sickness, rebuilt them (ibid., and Richard of Devizes in Bohn's Ant. Lib. p. 61). Its last occupation by Christians was that of St. Louis, A.D. 1258, and when he came it was still a city and governed by a count. "Of the immense sums," says Joinville, "which he was anxious to inclose Jaffa, it does not become me to speak, for they were countless. He inclosed the town from one side of the sea to the other; and there were twenty-

restored to the Jews, but its revenues—whether from land or from export-duties—were bestowed upon the 2d Hyrcanus and his heirs (xiv, 10, 6). When Herod the Great commenced the city, it was therefore enlarged, lest he should leave a hostile stronghold in his rear when he marched upon Jerusalem (xiv, 15, 1), and Augustus confirmed him in its possession (xv, 7, 4). It was afterwards assigned to Archelaus when constituted ethnarch (xvii, 11, 4), and passed with Syria under Cyrenius when (M. Claud. xvi, 1, 10) for Archelaus has retired (xvii, 11, 3). On the con-

2. History.—We find that Japho or Joppa was situated in the portion of Dan (Josh. xix, 40), on the coast towards the south, and on a hill so high, says Strabo, that people affirmed (but incorrectly) that Jerusalem was visible from its summit. Having a harbor attached to it though not large, says the Roman, it was the port of Jerusalem, when Jerusalem became metropolis of the kingdom of the house of David, and certainly never did port and metropolis more strikingly resemble each other in difficulty of approach both by sea and land. Hence, except in journeys to and from Jerusalem, it was not much used for its fleets. Accordingly, after the above incidental notice, the place is not mentioned till the times of Solomon, when, as being almost the only available sea-port, Joppa was the place fixed upon for the cedar and pine wood from Mount Lebanon to be landed by the servants of Hiram, king of Tyre, under Zerubbabel (1 Kings v, 2; 2 Chron. ii, 16; Ezra iii, 7). Here Jonathan, whenever and wherever he may have lived (2 Kings xiv, 25, certainly does not clear up the first of these points), "took ship to flee from the presence of his Maker" (Jonah i, 3), and accomplished that singular historic tour which brought him one of the principal scenes in the great drama of his own (Matt. xii, 40).

After the close of O. T. history Joppa rose in importance. The sea was then beginning to be the highway of nations. Greece, Egypt, Persia, and some of the little kingdoms of Syria, had used their fleets for, after the change and war. Until the construction of Cæsarea by Herod, Joppa was the only port in Palestine proper at which foreign ships could touch; it was thus not only the shipping capital, but the key of the whole country on the sea-board. During the wars of the Maccabees it was one of the principalholds of Palestine (1 Macc. x, 75; xiv, 5, 34; Josephus, Ant. xiii, 15, 1). It would seem that Jews then resided not only a majority of the population, and the foreign residents—Greeks, Egyptians, and Syrians—were so rich and powerful, and so aided by the fleets of their own nations, as to be able to rule the city. During this period, therefore, Joppa experienced many vicissitudes. It had sided with A pollonius, and was attacked and captured by Jonathan Mac cabæus (1 Macc. x, 76). It witnessed the meeting between the latter and Ptolemy (ibid. xi, 6). Simon had his council at Joppa, as did his grandson John Hyrcanus (ibid. xii, 34), which he afterwards strengthened considerably (ibid. xii, 11). But when peace was restored, he re-established it once more as a haven (ibid. xiv, 5). He likewise rebuilt the fortifications (ibid. v, 34). This occupation of Joppa was one of the grounds of complaint against the work of Ptolemaus, king of Egypt, who represented Simon; but the latter alleged in excuse the mischief which had been done by its inhabitants to his fellow citizens (ibid. xv, 30 and 35). It would appear that Judas Maccabæus had burnt their haven some time back for a gross act of barbarity (2 Macc. xii, 6). Tribute was subsequently exacted for its use by Ptolemaus, king of Egypt, by Antiochus Sidetes. By Pompey it was once more made independent, and comprehend under Syria (Josephus, Ant. xiv, 4, 4); but by Cæsar it was not only
four towers, including small and great. The ditches were well scoured, and kept clean, both within and without. There were three gates (Chron. of Cris., p. 456, Bobb.), and of the three, the sultan of Egypt, together with the rest of Palestine, by which it was once more laid in ruins; so much so that Bertrand de la Broquiere, visiting it about the middle of the 15th century, states that it then consisted only of a few leaning walls covered with ruins, having been a strong place under the Christians. Guides, accredited by the sultan, here met the pilgrims and received the customary tribute from them; and here the papal indulgences offered to pilgrims commenced (Early Trav., p. 286). Finally, Jaffa fell under the Turks, in whose hands it still is, including the usual latitude of the cities possessed by them, and depending on Christian commerce for its feeble existence. During the period of their rule it has been three times sacked—the Arabs in 1722, by the Mamelukes in 1775, and lastly by Napoleon I in 1799, when a body of 400 Albanians, who held a strong position in town, surrendered on promise of having their lives spared. Yet the whole 4000 were afterwards pinioned and shot on the strand! When Napoleon was compelled to retreat to Egypt, between 400 and 500 French soldiers lay ill of the plague in the hospitals of Joppa. They could not be removed, and Napoleon declared them to be poisoned! (Porter, Handbook for S. and P. p. 288).

3. Description.—Yafé is the modern name of Joppa, and is identical with the old Hebrew Japho. It contains about 5000 inhabitants, of whom 1000 are Christians, about 150 Jews, and the rest Moslems. It is built on a level site, surrounded by a little rounded hill, dipping up to the west of the waves of the Mediterranean, and on the land side encompassed by orchards of orange, lemon, apricot, and other trees, which for luxuriance and beauty are not surpassed in the world. It extends for several miles along the coast. The principal towns, however, it looks best in the distance. The houses are huddled together without order; the streets are narrow, crooked, and filthy; the town is so crowded along the main street that the rickety dwellings in the upper part seem to be toppling over on the flat roofs of the houses. The most prominent features of the architecture from without are the whitewashed domes by which most of the buildings are surmounted, and the appearance of arched vaults. But the aspect of the whole is mean and gloomy, and inside the place has all the appearance of a poor though large village. From the sea side, situated on a little rounded hill, dipping up to the west of the waves of the Mediterranean, and on the land side encompassed by orchards of orange, lemon, apricot, and other trees, which for luxuriance and beauty are not surpassed in the world. There are three mosques in Joppa, and Latin, Greek, and Armenian convents. The former is that in which European pilgrims and traders usually lodge. The bazaars are worth a visit. The chief manufacture is soap. It has no port, and it is only under favorable circumstances of wind and weather that vessels can ride at anchor a mile or so from the shore. There is a place on the shore which is called "the harbor." It consists of a strip of water from fifteen to twenty yards wide and two or three deep, inclosed on the sea side by a ridge of low and partially sunken rocks. It may afford a little shelter to boats, but it is worse than useless so far as commerce is concerned. The town is defended by a wall, on which a few old gun embrasures are built. The principal rivers are the Wadi el Loom (mentioned in the time of Zobah), the Wadi el Amsa, and the Wadi el Maghara, which is only a few broken columns scattered about the streets, and through the gardens on the southern slope of the hill, and the large stones in the foundations of the castle, Joppa has no remains of antiquity; and none of its modern buildings, not even the reputed "house of Simon the tanner," which the monks show, are worthy of note, although the locality of the last is not badly chosen (Stanley, S. and P., p. 263, 274; and see Seddon's Memoir, p. 86, 185). The town has still a considerable trade as the port of Jerusalem. The oranges of Jaffa are the finest in all Palestine and Syria; its pomegranates and watermelons are likewise in high repute, and its gardens and orange and citron groves deliciously fragrant and fertile. But among the population of Jaffa, as in all other places in the East, there are many differences from all countries; and Europeans have little security, whether of life or property, to induce a permanent abode there. A British consular post is now in place, and a railroad has been projected to Jerusalem.

See Baumner's Palestine; Seddon, i. 136 sq.; Chatteubrandt, ii, 108; Clarke, iv, 436 sq.; Buckingham, i, 227 sq.; Richter, p. 12; Richards, n, ii, 16; Skinner, i, 175-184; Robinson, i, 18; Stent, ii, 27; M'Culloch's Gazetteer; Reland, p. 864; Cellar, Noti. ii, 248; Hameleveld, i, 442; ii, 229; Hasequi, p. 187; Niebuhr, iii, 41; Sacy, i, 236, 243; Light, p. 125; Körner, Erdk, ii, 659; Schwarz, p. 142, 378, 378; Thomson, Land and Bed, ii, 275.

Joppé (Ἰωάννης), the Greek form (1 Esdr. v. 55; 1 Macc. xv, 75, 76; xi, 6; xii, 33; xiii, 11; xiv, 5, 34; 2 Macc. iv, 21; xi, 3, [Ἰωάννης]) of the name of the town Joppe (q. v.).

Jo'ra (Heb. Yoraḥ, יְוּרָה, prob. for יְוּרָד, יְוֹרָד, spriral, or autumnal rain; Sept. Ἰουρᾶνιος, v. Ὠράα, Vetr. Jor.); a man whose descendants (or a place whose former inhabitants) are numbered to the number of 115 when brought from the Babylonian captivity (Ezra ii, 18); called Ἀριφας in the parallel passage (Neh. vii, 24). "In Ezra two of De Rossi's MSS. and originally one of Kennicott's had ᾽Ιουρᾶνιος, i.e. Joshe, which is the reading of the Syriac and Arabic versions. One of Kennicott's MSS. had the original reading in Ezra altered to ᾽Ιουρᾶνιος, i.e. Joram; and two in Nehemiah read ᾽Ιουρᾶνιος, i.e. Harim, which corresponds with Ἀριφας of the Alexandrian MS., and Ἀριφας of the Syriac. In any case, the change or confusion of letters which might have caused the variation of the name is so slight that it is difficult to pronounce which is the true form, the corruption of Jorah into Hariph being as easily conceivable as the reverse. Burrington (General, ii, 75) decides in favor of the latter, but from a comparison of both passages with Ezra xiii 31 we should be inclined to regard Harim (᾿Ιουρᾶνιος) as the true reading in all cases. But, on any supposition, it is difficult to account for the form Aseriphath, or, more properly, Ἀριφαςις, in 1 Esdr. vi, 16, which Burrington considers as having originated in a corruption of the two readings in Ezra and Nehemiah, the second syllable arising from the error of the transcriber in mistaking the uncial Ε for Σ."

Jo'ra (Heb. Yoraq, יְוּרַק, perh. i. q. Jorah; Sept. Ἰουρᾶς, Vetr. Jor.;) the fourth name of the seven chieftains of the Gadites other than those resident in Hebron (1 Chron. vi, 13). B.C. perh. cir. 782. "Four of Kennicott's MSS. and the printed copy used by Luther read יְוּרַק, i.e. Jodal (Smith)."

Jo'ram (Heb. יְוּרָם, וּרָם, prop, a shortened form of the name יְהוּרָם, q. v., for which it is indifferently used in the Heb., and arbitrarily in the L. V., as the following classification shows: a. The son of the king of Zobah (2 Sam. viii, 10; Sept. יְוּרָמ; elsewhere called Hadoram). b. The king of Judah (2 Kings vii, 21, 23, 24; xi, 2; 1 Chron. iii. 11; elsewhere Jehoram). c. The king of Israel (2 Kings vii, 16, 25, 28 [twice]; 29 [twice]; ix, 14 [twice]; ix, 15, 16 [twice]; 14 [twice]; 20 [twice], incorrectly for διὼραμ; with Kings i, 7, 17, 21 [twice]; 22; elsewhere correctly so). d. The Levite (1 Chron. xxvi, 25, 29), b. By error for Jozabah (1 Esdr. i. 9)."

Jor'dan (Heb. Yarden or, יֶרְדָּן, always with the article יְרֵדָן; Tadavign, the chief and most celebrated river of Palestine, flowing through a deep valley west of the centre of the country from north to south. The principal river of the entire region, however, usually styled in the original "the River", is the Euphrates (q. v.). See Rivah."

See Kamal.
1. The Name.—This signifies descender, from the root תָּם, "to descend"—a name most applicable to it, whether we consider the rapidity of its current, or the great depth of the valley through which it flows, or whatever part of the country its banks are approached, the descent is long and steep. That this is the true etymology of the word seems evident from an incidental remark in Josh. iii, 16, where, in describing the effect of the opening of a passage for the Israelites, the word used for the "coming down" of the waters (טָלָק מִשָּׁם) is almost the same as the name of the river (see Stanley, and S. and P. p. 279, note). Other derivations have been given. Some say it is compounded of נָה, a down, and לָכַּה, the name of the city where it rises; but this etymology is impossible (Heald, Palest., p. 371).

Another view is, that the river having two sources, the name of the one was Jor, and of the other Dan; hence the united stream is called Jordan. So Jerome (Comm. in Matt. xvi, 13). This theory has been copied by Adamnanus (De Loc. Sanct. ii, 19), William of Tyre (xii, 19), Brocardus (p. 3), Adrichomius (p. 109), and others: and the etymology seems to be read among the Christians in Palestine, from whom Burckhardt heard it (Travels in Syria, p. 42, 43; see Robinson, Bib. Res. iii, 412, note). Arab geographers call the river either El-Urdun, which is equivalent to the Hebrew, or Esphos, which signifies "the great," and this latter is the name almost universally given to it by the modern Syrians, who sometimes attach the appellative el-Kebir, "the great," by way of distinction from the Sheriat el-Mandhur, or Hieromax.

2. Sources.—The snows that deeply cover Hermon during the whole winter, and that still cap its glittering summits during the hottest days of summer, are the real springs of the Jordan. They feed its perennial fountains, and they supply from a thousand channels those superabundant waters which make the river "overflow all its banks in harvest time" (Josh. iii, 10). The Jordan has two historical sources. a. In the midst of a rich but marshy plain, lying between the southern prolongation of Hermon and the mountains of Naphtali, is a low cup-shaped hill, thickly covered with shrubs. On it once stood Dan, the northern border-city of Palestine; and from its western base gushes forth the great fountain of the Jordan. The waters of this large pond encircled with rank grass and jungle—now the home of the wild boar—and then flow southward. Within the rim of the cup, beneath the spreading branches of a gigantic oak, is a smaller spring. It is fed, doubtless, by the same source, and its stream, breaking through the rim, joins its sister, and forms a river some forty feet wide, deep and rapid. The modern name of the hill is Tell el-Kady, "the hill of the judge;" and both fountain and river are called Leddan—evidently the name Dan corrupted by a double article, El-ed-Dan (Robinson, Bib. Res. iii, 594; Thomson, Land and Book, p. 214; and in Biblical ears Soc., 1846, p. 190). Josephus calls this stream "Little Jordan" (יוֹרֵם מַגִּיסוֹן, War, iv, 1, 1; comp. Ant. i, 10, 1; viii, 8, 4); but it is the principal source of the river, and the largest fountain in Syria.

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

c. The Jordan also has a fabled fountain, thus described by Josephus: "Apparent Panium is the source of the Jordan, but the water is, in reality, conveyed thither unseen by a subterranean channel from Phiala, as it is called, which lies not far from the high road, on the right as one leaves Baniyat to Trachonitis, at a distance of 120 stadia from Cesarea... That the Jordan hence derived its origin was formerly unknown, until it was ascertained by Philip, tetrarch of Trachonitis, who, having thrown chaff into Phiala, found it cast out at Panium" (War, iii, 10, 7). The lake here referred to appears to be Lake Huleh, which Robinson visited and described (Bib. Res. iii, 389). The legend has no foundation in reality.

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

•

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

- **Fountain of Jordan at Hasbela:** 1700 ft. elevation.
- **Banias:** 347
- **Dan:** 647
- **Lake Huleh:** 126
- **Lake of Tiberias:** 600 ft. depression.
- **Dead Sea:** 1327

There may be some error in the elevations of the fountains as here given. Lake Huleh is encompassed by a great plain, extending to Dan; and as it appears to the eye almost level, it is difficult to believe that there could be a difference of 500 feet in the elevations of the fountain and the lake. Porter estimated it on the spot not above 100 feet; but it is worthy of note that Von Wildenbruch makes it by measurement 837 feet, and De Berton 344.

The general course of the Jordan is due south. From their fountains the three streams flow south to the points of junction, and common in the same direction to the Huleh; and from the point of juncture of this lake the Jordan again issues and resumes its old course. For some two miles its banks are flat, and its current not very rapid; but on passing through Jir Benatia Yakkib ("the Bridge of Jacob's Daughters"), the banks suddenly contract and rise high on each side, and the river is narrowed to a shallow channel, dashes in sheets of foam over a rocky bed, rebounding from cliff to cliff in its mad career. Here and there the retreating banks have a little green meadow, with its fringe of oleanders all wet and glistening with spray. Thus it rushes on, often winding, occasionally doubling back like the coils of a serpent, till, breaking from rocky barriers, it enters the rich plain of Bethlah, where on
the bank stands the ruins of Bethsaida (q.v.). The stream now expands, and glides lazily along till it falls on the still bosom of the Sea of Galilee. Between Bethsaida and the sea the Jordan averages about twenty yards in width, and flows sluggishly between low alluvial banks. Bars of sand extend across its channel here and there, and it is easily fathomed. (Hart, Handbook, p. 426; Robinson, ii, 414 sq.; Burckhardt, Syria, p. 815.) From Jien Belen Yakob the distance is only seven miles, and yet in that distance the river falls 700 feet. The total length of the section between the two lakes is about eleven miles as the crow flies.

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

Valley through which this section of the Jordan flows is a narrow, running, to the north, and shut in by steep and rugged parallel ridges, the eastern ridge rising fully 5000 feet above the river's bed, and the western about 3000. This plain is the great plain of the later Jews; the great desert (παλαιν της αγκέλας) of Josephus; the basin or "channel" of the Greek geographers; the "region of Jordan" of the N.T. (Matt. iii. 5; Luke iii. 3); and the Ghor or "sunken plain" of the modern Arabs (Stanley, p. 277; Josephus, War, iii, 9, 7; iv, 8, 2; Reland, Palest, p. 805, 361, 377 sq.). It is about six miles wide at its northern end, but it gradually expands until it attains a width of upwards of twelve at Jericho. Its sides are not straight lines, but nor is its surface perfectly level. The mountains on each side here and there send out rocky spurs, and long, long roots far into it. Winter torrents, descending from wild ravines, cut deep through its soft strata. As a whole, it is not a desert. In its northern division, above the fords of Succoth, small springs cause the ground to sparkle with fountains, and along the banks of streamlets, where irrigation is easy; but all the rest is a wilderness—in spring covered with rank grass and thistles, but in summer parched and bare. The southern section—known as the "shrubbery"—is different in aspect. Its surface is covered with a white nitrous crust, like hoarfrost, from which not a blade of grass or green herb springs. Nothing could be imagined more dreary or desolate than this part of the plain.

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

The Jordan issues from the Sea of Galilee close to the hills on the western side of the plain, and sweeps round a little peninsula, on which lie the ruins of Tarichea (Pomparama) (Porter, Antiqu. of the Jews, i. 217). This peninsula is about 100 feet wide, and the current strong (Lynch). A short distance down are the remains of a Roman bridge, whose fallen arches greatly obstruct the river, and make it dash through in sheets of foam. Below this are several weirs, constructed of rough stones, and intended to raise the water two or three feet, so as to irrigate the neighboring plain (Molyneux). Five miles from the lake the Jordan receives its largest tributary, the Sheriat el-Mandhib (the Hieromax of the Greeks), which drains a large section of Bashan and Gilead. This stream is 130 feet wide at its mouth. Two miles further is el-Meiraj, the only bridge now standing on the Lower Jordan. It is a quaint structure, one large pointed arch spanning the stream, and double tiers of smaller arches supporting the roadway on each side. The river here deep and impetuous, having many high ledges. Below this point the ravine inclines eastwards to the centre of the plain, and its banks contract. Its sides are bare and white, and the chalky strata are deeply furrowed. The margin of the river has still its beautiful fringe of foliage, and the little islands which occur here and there are covered with shrubbery. Six and a half miles south of the bridge, wady Yabes (so called from Jabesh-gilead), containing a winter torrent, falls in from the east. A short distance above it a barren sandy island divides the channel, and with its bars on each side forms a ford, probably the one by which Jacob crossed, as the site of Succoth has been identified on the western bank. The plain round Succoth is extensively cultivated, and abundantly watered by fountains and streamlets from the adjoining mountains. The richness of the soil is wonderful. Dr. Robinson says, "The grass, intermingled with tall daisies and wild oats, reached to our knees; the only one we saw was the black thawed the riders' heads. All was now dry, and in some places it was difficult to make our way through this exuberant growth" (iii, p. 315). Jacob exercised a wise choice when he "made booths for his cattle at this fair and fertile place" (Gen. xxxi. 21). This great plain is equal in richness. The ravine of the Jordan is here 150 feet below the plain, and shot in by steep, bare banks of chalky strata (Robinson, l.c., p.316).

About nine miles below Succoth, and about half way between the lakes, the Jabbok, the only other considerable tributary, falls into the Jordan, coming down through a deep, wild glen in the mountains of Gilead.
When Lynch passed (April 17) it was "a small stream trickling down a deep and wide torrent bed. . . . There was another bed, quite dry, showing that in times of freshet there were two outlets." Lynch gives some good pictures of the scenery above the junction. "The plain that sloped away from the bases of the hills was broken in crags and titanicous cone-like mounds . . . A low, pale yellow ridge of conical hills marked the termination of the higher terrace, beneath which swept gently this low plain, with a similar undulating surface, half redeemed from barrenness by sparse vegetation and thistle-covered hillocks. Still lower was the valley of the Jordan—its banks fringed with perpetual verdure—winding a thousand graceful mazes . . . its course a bright line in this cheerless waste."

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

On approaching the Dead Sea, the plain of the Jordan attains its greatest breadth—about twelve miles. The mountain ranges on each side are higher, more rugged, and more desolate. The plain is clothed with a nitrous crust, like hoar-frost, and not a tree, shrub, or blade of grass is seen except by fountains or rivulets. The gleam winds like a serpent through the centre, between two tiers of banks. The bottom is smooth, and sprinkled on the outside with stunted shrubs. The river winds in curves and meanders along the bottom, now touching one side and now another, with its beautiful border of green foliage, looking all the greener from contrast with the desert above. The banks are of soft clay, in places ten feet high; the stream varies from 80 to 120 feet in breadth, and from five to twelve in depth. Near its mouth the current becomes more sluggish, and the stream expands. Where wadis Hezhan falls in, Lynch found the river 150 feet wide and 11 deep, "the current four knots." Further down the banks are low and sedgy; the width gradually increases to 180 yards at its mouth, but the depth is only three feet (Lynch, Official Report; Robinson, i, 388 sq.; Stanley, p. 290).

Lynch in a few words explains the secret of the great and almost incredible fall in the Jordan. "The stream varies from 80 to 150 feet in breadth, and from five to twelve in depth. Near its mouth the current becomes more sluggish, and the stream expands. Where wadi Hezhan falls in, Lynch found the river 150 feet wide and 11 deep, "the current four knots." Further down the banks are low and sedgy; the width gradually increases to 180 yards at its mouth, but the depth is only three feet (Lynch, Official Report; Robinson, i, 388 sq.; Stanley, p. 290).

The bridge was probably built during the 15th century, when the caravan road was constructed from Damascus to Egypt (Porter, Handbook, ii, 466). The origin of the name, "Bridge of Jacob's Daughters," is unknown. Perhaps this place may have been confounded with the ford of Succoth, where the patriarch crossed the Jordan, or perhaps the "Jacob" referred to was some Muslim saint or Turkish pasha (Ritter, Pal. and Spo., p. 269 sq.). See Bridge.

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

The first ford on the southern section of the Jordan is about half a mile from the lake, where the ruins of the Roman bridge now lie. It was the means of communication between Tiberias and Galilee, and it was doubtless at this point our Lord crossed when he went from Galilee to Judea by the farther side of Jordan.
JORDAN

Mark x. 1; Matt. xix. 1, 2). Jair el-Mejajim is a Saracen bridge on an old caravan route from Damascus to Egypt. Probably a Roman bridge may have stood at the same place, connecting Scythopolis with the other cities of Decapolis. There is no ford here. At a point east of the ruins of Scythopolis, ten miles below the bridge, the river is now fordable, but the passage is deep and dangerous (Robinson, iii, 825; Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 137).

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

Lower Ford of the Jordan at Wady Navamelh. (From Photograph 228 of the “Palestine Exploration Fund.”)

5. Historical Notices. — The first notice of the Jordan is in the story of the separation of Abraham and Lot—Lot “beheld all the plain of Jordan, that it was well watered everywhere, before the Lord destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah” (Gen. xiii. 10). Abraham had just left Egypt (xii. 10), and therefore the comparison between the fertilizing properties of the Jordan and of the Nile is very apposite. The section of the valley visible from the heights of Bethel, where the patriarchs stood, was the plain of Jericho and southward over a part of the Dead Sea. The “plain” or circle (“22”) of the Jordan must have been different then from what it is now. It is now a parched desert—then it was well watered everywhere. The waters of numerous springs, mountain torrents, and probably of the Jordan, raised by winds such as are seen at its northern end, were used by the old Phoenician inhabitants in the irrigation of the vast plain. The treachery of the Gerasites had not yet come upon it; the fire of heaven had not yet passed over it; the Lord had not yet destroyed Sodom and Gomorrah (Stanley, p. 215). It is manifest that some great physical change was produced in the valley by the convulsion at the destruction of the cities. The bed of the Dead Sea was probably lowered, and a greater fall thus given to the river. See DEAD SEA.

Another wonderful epoch in the Jordan’s history was the passage of the Israelites. They were encamped on the east of the river—on the low bench of the river, extending along the northern shore of the sea to the foot of the mountains. It was harvest-time—the beginning of April—when the rains were still falling heavily in Hermon, and the winter snows were melting under the rays of the warm sun, and when a thousand mountain torrents were sweeping down into the Jordan, which made it “overflow all its banks;” or, as the Hebrew literally signifies, made it full up to all its banks (see Robinson, Bib. Res. i. 540); that is, perhaps, up not merely to the banks of the stream itself, but up to the banks of the glen; covering, as it still does in a few places (Molyneux, p. 116; Van de Velde, Memoir, p. 120), the whole bottom of the glen, and thus rendering the fords impassable for such a host as the Israelites. There can be no doubt that in ancient times the Jordan rose higher than it does now. When the country was more thickly wooded and more extensively cultivated, more rain and more snow must have fallen (Van de Velde, Narrative, ii. 271). There are wet seasons even yet, when the river rises several feet more than ordinarily (Reland, p. 273; Kassar, Pulât, p. 61, 2d ed.). The opening of a passage through the river at such a season was the greater miracle. To the Israelites, who had thought it would be impossible by nature, the time of the overflow—the finger of God must have been manifest to all. It is a remarkable fact that at this same spot the Jordan was afterwards twice miraculously opened—by Eliah and Elisha (2 Kings ii. 8, 14).

At a later period it was considered a sin and a daring that a party of David’s “mighty men” crossed the Jordan “in the first month (April), when it had overflowed all its banks,” and subdued their enemies on the east side (1 Chron. xii. 15). Jeremiah speaks of the lions “coming up” from the “swellings of the Jordan;” but the Hebrew word נְגֵל signifies beauty or glory, and refers to the dense jungles and verdant foliage of its banks; these jungles are impenetrable except to the wild beasts that dwell there. No allusion is made to the rise or overflow of the river (Genesius, Thesaurus, a. v.; Robinson, i. 540). Travellers have often seen wild swine, hyenas, and jackals, and also the tracks of panthers, on the banks of the Jordan (Molyneux, p. 114).

The passage of the river by king David in his flight from Absalom has one peculiarity—a ferry-boat was used to convey his household over the channel (2 Sam. xix. 18). The passage was probably effected at one of the fords in the plain of Jericho. The word צָרָם simply signifies a thing for carrying; it may have been a “boat,” or a “raft,” or a few inflated skins, such as are represented on the monuments of Nineveh, and are still used on the Euphrates and the Jordan. See FERRY.

Naaman’s illustrious deprecation of the Jordan, as compared with the “rivers of Damascus,” is well known. The rivers of Damascus water its great plain, converting a desert into a paradise; the Jordan rolls on so deep and so broad, to the Sea of Death.

The great event of the N.T. history enacted at the Jordan was the baptism of our Lord. This has made it the queen of rivers, and has given it the title “sacred.” The exact spot is disputed. See BETHERAH; ENON. The topography and the incidents of the narrative, both before and after the baptism, unquestionably point to the same place, already famous as the scene of three miracles (Porter, Handbook, p. 198). In commemoration of the baptism, the Christian pilgrims who assemble at Jerusalem at Easter visit the Jordan in a body and stand at the spot (279). The references to the Jordan in the writings of Josephus contain nothing of importance beyond what has already been mentioned in connection with the four-
Arab tribes—so savage as scarcely to be considered exceptions—had become extinct on its banks.

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

In addition to the works above cited on the physical features of the Jordan, the following afford important information: Journal of R. Geog. Society, xvii, part ii, articles by Robinson, Petermann, and Molyneux; Ber- tou, in Julum de la Soc. Geograph. de Paris, xii, 166 sq.; missionary accounts of Upper Jordan; Erdkunde zu Berlin, 1845-46; Capt. Newbold, Jour. Roy. Armt. Society, xvi, 8 sq.; Rev. W. Thompson, Bibl. Sac. iii, 184 sq. A clear summary of all known about the Jordan up to 1850 is given by Ritter, in Palatina und Syrien, ii, 152-556; also in his separate essay, Der Jordan und seine Flussige, 1850. More popular descriptions are those published by the Religious Tract Society (London, 1858), and Nelson (ib. 1854). Most travellers in Palestine have likewise given an account of the river, chiefly at its mouth. See PALESTINE.

JORDAN, Joseph, a minister of the Society of Friends, was born in Nansendid County, Va., in 1665, and began preaching about 1718, first in the States, and later in various parts of England and Ireland, and some portions of Holland. He died Sept. 26, 1735. He was acquainted himself, was the testimony of the annual meeting of Virginia Quakers in the year of his death, "as a workman that need not be ashamed." See Janyey, Hist. of Friends, iii, 261.

JORDAN, Richard (1), a minister of the Society of Friends, was born in Nansendid County, Va., in 1668, and began preaching the same year with his younger brother Joseph (see above). The two brothers frequently traveled together, preaching the word of God, in Virginia, Maryland, and Carolina, and suffered little from persecution. In 1728 he visited the Quakers in England, Ireland, Scotland, Wales, and in Barbadoes. After two years he returned to the States, and settled in Philadelphia, where he died August 5, 1742. His ministry was convincing and consolatory, his delivery graceful, but unaffected; in prayer he was solemn and reverent. See Janyey, Hist. of Friends, iii, 270.

JORDAN, Richard (2), a minister of the Society of Friends, was born in Norfolk County, Va., Dec. 12, 1756. He entered on ministerial labors in 1775 in New York and New England, and in 1802 visited Europe, where he spent two years. On his return he settled at Hartford, Conn., and five years later removed to Newton, N. J., where he died Oct. 14, 1826. He was an able minister of the Gospel, devoted to the service of his heavenly Master. See Janyey, Hist. of Friends, iv, 105.

JORDANES. See JOHN DAEZ.

JORDANES DA GIANO, or DE YANE. See MINORIT.
elected general in 1222, ten months after the death of St. Dominic. The order grew rapidly under his administra-
tion, and soon possessed establishments as far as 
Poland, and even in Palestine, whither Jordanus went 
in 1228. The ship was wrecked on the return voyage, 
and he was shipwrecked, in 1229. He wrote, De du 
cordis Ordinis Prisciorum (Echard, Scriptores Ordinis 
Prisciorum, vol. i.) — Epistola de Translatione corpo-
rum B. Dominici (Bovius, Annales, 1238, vol. iii.) — 
Super Priericianum, et quamdam grammaticum, a MS. in 
the Leipzig Library. See Acta Sanctorum, Feb., ii, 720; 
Ecclesiasticae Res, Procedentia, Rom., 1581; Spuler, 
Hoe-
fer, Not. Böö. Générale, xxvi, 941. (J. N. P.)

Joribas (1 Esdr. viii, 44) or Joribus (1 Esdr. ix, 19), 
Gracce forms (Ιορίμος, Vulg. Joribus) of the name 
Jarib (q. v.) of two persons (corresponding to 
Ezra viii, 16, and Ezra x, 18, in the Hebrew text of the 
above passages respectively). 

Jorim (Ἰωρίμ, perh. i. q. Joram), the son of Mat-
thath and father of Eleazar, maternal ancestors of Jesus, 
not mentioned in the O. Test. (Luke iii, 29). B. C. post 
876. See Genealogy of Christ.

Joris (really Joriszon, i.e. Georgios). David, founder of an Anabaptist sect of 
the 16th century, known under the name of Dora DRAWATIS, or more 
generally under that of Joridis, himself altogether 
a most extraordinary character: was born either in 1501 or 
1509 at Giessen, or, as Nipphold states, at Ghenau. 
He has generally been spoken of as of low parentage, but 
nipphold tells that David's father was originally a mer-
chant, and afterwards the head of a company who went 
about acting the play of the life of David the Psalms-
mist, but that his mother was of noble origin. David 
was early placed at school, but the boy's inclination 
was more to a roving life, like that of his father, than to 
books. He early evinced a particular fondness for the 
art of glass painting. He was therefore finally taken 
from school and apprenticed to a glass painter, and soon 
displayed great aptitude in his profession. To perfect 
himself in this art he set out on a journey to neighboring 
countries, and travelled through Belgium, France, 
and England, until a dangerous disease hastened his return to 
Holland. He now (1524) settled at Delft, and mar-
ried. Hitherto the young painter had displayed no ex-
treme religious zeal; it is true he was strong in 
in all his religious observances, and had frequently de-
clared himself in favor of vital piety, but this, at a time 
when the reformatory movement was in its infancy, was 
not remarkable. Even now he continued his attention 
to his business, and only on a few public occasions dur-
ing the first years of the Reformation, did he become a 
Hollandese against the fanatic zeal of the Romanish 
clergy, and the religious excesses of the Dutch Church. In 1500, 
however, he appears more prominently on the stage. 
It is true he had previously written a few pamphlets 
against Romanism, but these had failed to provoke reply, 
or a demand for interference on the part of the authori-
ties. But this year, while a procession of Roman Cath-
olics was moving through the streets of Delft, he stop-
ped the priests and accused them of the crime of de-
ceiving the people by false teachings; he especially repro-
ached them for their worship of images and pic-
tures. The burgomaster of Delft favored Joris not a 
little, being a friend of his; but this daring action could 
not go unpunished, and Joris was arrested and impris-
ioned for some time. After a trial, however, he escaped, 
no doubt by the aid of his friend, without any severe 
punishment. Delft for the time being was the last city he 
visited during his wanderings at this time that he became 
estranged from the true Reformation principles and 
an adherent to Anabaptist views, and finally even the 
founder of an independent sect. His roving life, so 
very much akin to that of all the Anabaptist leaders, 
inspired him with protest against the causes he had 
been moved to, but he was, on the whole, a more 
moderate than they, and opposed to their tumultuous 
proceedings, especially to their views of establishing 
their authority by the sword, it was not until 1534 that 
he actually joined them by rebaptism. At this time 
the Anabaptists were at the zenith of their success, es-
pecially at Münster. See Anabaptists. Being re-
quested to preach and espouse their cause before the 
people, he at first refused; but his sense of his own 
pleaded incompetency; but at last was prevailed upon, and was consecrated by 
Dammus, Ubbo, and others as bishop of Delft. The same 
peace which he had manifested in the cause of the 
Lutherans he now displayed in behalf of the Anabaptists, 
and we may infer from the hesitancy in which the author 
his influence had become quite extended and his followers very numerous. 
Certainly Joris himself was quite conscious of the extent 
of his power, and he hesitated not to use it for the ac-
complishment of the one great object that seemed to be 
nearest his heart,—the union of all Anabaptists under 
one common leader, the secure establishment of the 
principles which he himself espoused, and which no 
doubt he as yet believed to be based on the Scriptures 
and indorsed by divine favor. But his course soon 
aroused suspicion among the other Anabaptist leaders. 
They publicly stated how they could not recognise in Joris the 
determined leader, and, jealous of the success he had al-
ready achieved, and fearful of their own position, they 
openly disavowed him. Such a course was adopted, es-
pecially, by Batenburg himself, the founder of an 
Anabaptist sect, a determined ruffian, void of 
feeling, the people, who, being the espouse of 
wealth and power. He preached the extinction of 
all non-Anabaptists by the sword. Strangely enough, 
however, his very followers, after his decease, became 
the most faithful adherents of Joris. Opposed within 
the camp of the Anabaptists, Joris led the party of the 
Convocation of Anabaptists held at Bocholt, assumed a still 
more independent position, and proudly declared him-
self divinely appointed as leader. This further provoked 
the jealousy of the other leaders; and, as, immediately 
after the Convocation of Bocholt, Joris issued a pamph-
let calling all parties to a peaceful union, the views 
of the different leaders was stimulated anew, and resulted 
in an entire estrangement of most of the Anabaptists. 
Those who now continued to espouse his cause were 
hereafter known as Jorists or Oradisits. Providence 
seemed to favor his effort. Letters came to him from 
all directions urging him to state his views in this short 
or long hour; to these were added visions and revelations 
which he fancied he had. Even the persecutions to which his 
followers were now subjected by the authorities were 
interpreted by him as a further proof of the divine 
favor. Was it not gain for them to die? From 
Delft he fled to the land of the Zuiderzee, and took 
back again to his native state to comfort his suffering 
believers, and to attend and animate them in their dying 
hours. Nor did he waver when he saw his own mother 
led to the scaffold (at Delft, 1537), attesting in her 
dying hour the doctrines which his son was preaching. 
The extent of his influence may be inferred from the 
number who at this time became the subjects of per-
secution. At Delft thirty-five persons were executed for 
their adherence to Joris; at Haarlem, Amsterdam, Ley-
den, Rotterdam, and other cities also many suffered 
likewise. In a space of two years, in many thousands 
hundred betokened their faithfulness to Anabaptist views 
at the expense of their life. Nor was Joris him-
self safe from persecution. He was obliged to leave 
Delft, where he had lived for a while secretly, and, after 
flight from place to place in his native country, he 
was at last arrested, and it was during his wanderings at 
this time that he became estranged from the true Reformation principles and 
an adherent to Anabaptist views, and finally even the 
founder of an independent sect. His roving life, so 
very much akin to that of all the Anabaptist leaders, 
a hazardous undertaking; he therefore sought a home 
within the dominions of the landgrave of Hesse, but the 
landgrave also refused the weary wanderer a resting-place 
unlesse a man was strong and active; but now not 
likely to yield up all that his imagination had fas-
ced to be divine truth, and he continued his roving
until he felt safe nowhere. Suddenly we meet in Switzerland, in the city of Basel, a person by the name of John of Bruges, the owner of real estate in the town and in the country, a peaceable and good citizen, a communicant in the Reformed Church, who had come to Basel with his family in the spring of 1544. This man was an Augustinian and later a developed system of Montanist (q.v.). He denied the doctrine of future judgment, as he declared that perfection is attained in this world, and therefore the dependence of the subject on the Creator ceases. Of course he also ruled out of existence angels, both good and bad. He held, with Manes, that the body only, and not the soul, was defined as evil; and he took a most impotent step when he adopted the precepts of the Adamites with respect to marriage.

Of his 250 books and 1000 letters, the most important is his Book of Miracles, which appeared at Deventer in 1542, under the title of Wonderboek, etc. (2d ed. 1551, folio). A list of all his writings, and a very elaborate statement of his life and work, were written by Prof. Nippoldt, of Heidelberg University, in the Zeitschrift für die Geschichte der Kirche in Deutschland, vol. iv., sect. iv., pp. 186, 483 sqq.; 1864, p. 476 sqq.

Jorissen, Matthias, a minister of the Dutch Reformed Church, was born at Wezel, Holland, October 26, 1738, and educated at the University of Utrecht. His first settlement was at Haarlethen, where he was called to Hasselt, and thence, in 1782, to the Hague, to preach to a German congregation. This charge he held up to his death, Jan. 13, 1823. Jorissen's characteristics were the vigor of intellect, the power of affection, solidarity of judgment, and a remarkable talent to read men and things. His native endowments were cultivated by extensive reading, thorough study, and much intercourse with the best society. He was an evangelist in sentiment, of eminent personal piety, devoted to the best interests of the Reformed Church, and commanded universal esteem and love. He was one of the founders of the Netherlands Missionary Society. A new version of the Psalms in German was prepared by him. To it he added a few hymns. It was welcomed and adopted by German congregations in the Reformed Church of Holland. His other published writings were very few. See Glasius, Godgeleerd Nederland, ii, 186 sq.; Geschiedenis der Nederlandsche Hervormde Kerk, by A. Ypej and J. Dernont, iv, 320. (J. P. W.)

Jor'koön [some Jorkoöm] (Hebrew Yorkeüm, יְורֶכִּים, 'orām, pa leness of the people, or, more extended people; Sept. Ἰορκόον, v. t. ἵολον, both confounded with Re kem following; Vulgate Jeronem), a person apparently named as the son of Raham, of the descendants of Caleb, the brother of Jerahmeel, of the tribe of Judah (1 Chron. ii, 44); but others (e.g. Gesenius after Jarchi) understand "father" there to mean "founder", so that this would be the name of a town settled by Raham—an interpretation sustained by a similar use of other names in the same connection. The locality thus alluded to is otherwise unknown, but from the associated places may be presumed to have been a place in the region south-east of Hebron.

Jornandez (Jornandes or Jordanes), a celebrated historian of the 8th century, was by birth a Goth, or both of Alan and Gothic descent. After adopting the Christian religion he was appointed the bishop of Aosta, subsequently entered a monastery, and was finally made bishop of Croton, in Italy. He wrote two historical works in the Latin language, De Regnum ac Temporum Successione—a short compendium of the most important events in history from the Creation down to A.D. 652; valuable from the account it contains of sev-
eral barbarous northern nations—and De Getarum Origine et Rebus Gestis (concerning the origin and deeds of the Goths), which has obtained great renown, chiefly from its being our only source of information about the Goths and other barbarian tribes, except when they are casually mentioned by some Greek or Latin historian. The main reason of this absence of information is a corruption of other writers, is full of inaccuracies, both of time, place, and person; Jornandes himself, however, seems to have been aware of the imperfect condition of his works, for he makes no claims to erudition or extended research. The aim of the works is believed to have been first to extol the houses of these nations, and, secondly, to bring about a union of the Goths and the Romans, for he tries to prove that both nations have long been friends and confederates, and that their perpetuation depended upon the most intimate alliance of the two. See Grimm and Kraft, K. gesch. d. german. Volker, i, 1, 77, etc.; Schmidt's Zeitc. f. Gesch. Altertumsk, vi, 516 sqq.; Sybel, De fontibus libri Jordanius, etc. (Berlin, 1888); Herzog, Real-Encyklop. vi, s. v.

Jorini, John, D.D., an eminent English divine, was born in London Oct. 23, 1638. His parents were French Huguenots, who had been part of that devoted body which fled from France at the revocation of the Edict of Nantes, giving up all in preference to abjuring their faith. He received his grammatical education at the Charter House. In May, 1715, he was admitted to Jesus College, in Cambridge, of which he became a fellow. He attracted attention by his remarkable proficiency as a scholar, particularly his mastery of the learned languages, and two years after being admitted to the college was recommended by his tutor, Dr. Swayne Thirlby, to make extracts from Eustathius for the use of Pope's Homer, and for his services in this work he received the highest commendations from that distinguished poet. While at Cambridge he published a small volume of poems, which are greatly admired, and allowed by scholars to possess a very high rank among modern Latin verses. In 1729 he was admitted to dean's orders, and the following June to that of priest. In 1726-27 he was presented to the living of Swavesey, near Cambridge, but, in consequence of his marriage soon after, he resigned that living, and removed to London, where he soon became an admired and popular preacher. When his friend, Dr. Orme, the last bishop of London, died in 1732, Jorini was appointed his domestic chaplain, and was presented with a prebend in the Church of St. Paul and the living of Kensington. To these was soon added the archdeaconry of London. He fixed his residence at Kensington, where he died in 1770. He was as much beloved for his private virtues as admired for his learning, abilities, liberality of mind, and contempt of subserviency. Few men have ever enjoyed the intimacy of so many eminent persons. Among these may be mentioned the names of bishops Horsey, Warburton, Sherlock, Hare, Lowth, and Secker, besides Cudworth, Middleton, Pope, Ken, Dr. Samuel Johnson, Dr. Parr, Dr. Dodderidge, and others. The most intimate relations subsisted between Dr. Jorini and bishop Warburton until he incurred the displeasure of that distinguished prelate by controvverting his doctrine with regard to the state of the dead before the Messiah. He gained by his "Divine Legation of Moses." The critical writings of Dr. Jorini are greatly admired by all who have a taste for curious literature. It is not merely on account of the learning which is displayed in them, and the use which is made of obscure authors, but there is a terseness in the expression of his thoughts, a playful satire in his profound speculations, which render them very entertaining. His principal works are, Discourses concerning the Truth of the Christian Religion, etc. (Lond. 1746, 3 vols. 8vo.);—Life of Erasmus (Lond. 1758-60, 2 vols. 4to.);—Sermons on different Subjects, and the Doctrine of a Future State, etc. (Lond. 1771, 4 vols. 8vo.);—See Dissertations upon different Subjects (Lond. 1772, 7 vols. 8vo.);—Tracts, philologico, critical, and miscellaneous (Lond. 1790, 2 vols. 8vo.)—Miscellaneous Observations upon Authors, ancient and modern (1781, 2 vols. 8vo.)—On Cursoryness (Tracts of Engl. Fathers, iv, 226); and Remarks on Eccl-nostical History, a work which is universally allowed to be curious, interesting, and impartial; full of many sense, sensate. and profound erudition. English Cyclopaedia, s. v. Allibone, Dictionary of English and American Authors, s. v. (E. de P.)

Jos'abad, a less correct form for I. Jozabad (q. v.), a 1 Chron. xii. 4; b (Josaphat) v. r. (Josaphat). 1 Esdr. viii. 63; compare Ezra viii. 33. 2. For Zabad (Josaphat) v. r. (Josaphat), 1 Esdr. viii. 39; and Ezra, v. 29.

Jos'aphat (Josaphat), a Grecized form (Matt. i, 8) of the name Ἰωσηφάθ (Josiah), king of Judah.

Josapháth (Josaphat), a Grecized form (1 Esdr. viii. 30) of the name Ἰωσιφάτ (Josiah) of the Hek ta (Ezra viii. 10).

Joscelin, bishop of Soissons, a rival of Abèlard, and one of the most distinguished teachers in Paris, was born in the latter part of the 11th century. In 1115 he became archdeacon of Soissons, and in 1126 succeeded his illustrious predecessor. He took part in the councils of Troyes and Rouen, and in the coronation of king Philip. In 1131 Innocent II sent him, together with St. Bernard, on a mission to the archbishop and to the count of Bourdeaux. On his return in 1132 he founded the famous priory of Moisson, and was made a judge of Abèlard at the Council of Sens, and at the Council of Paris in 1147 was commissioned to inquire into the propositions attributed to Gilbert de la Place. He died Oct. 23, 1152. Joscelin enjoyed great reputation for learning and wisdom, and in his diocese fulfilled all the duties of his charge with scrupulous faithfulness. He wrote an Expositio symboli and an Expositio orisonis Dominici, both of which were published in Mar tene and Durand's Amplissimus Collectio, ix, 1101, 1111, Martene, Amedo, p. 434, gives also two of his letters. See Gallia Christi, i, 557; Hist. Lit. de la France, ii, 419.—Hoever, Nou. Bih. Générale, xxvi, 946. (J. N. P.)

Jocuicius (called also Jocondus, Joculcius, Joculcius, Jocuicius, Jostho, and Gottso), a French Roman Catholic prelate, became bishop of St. Brieuc in 1150. In 1157 he was translated to the see of Tours, and immediately began to quarrel with the canons of his diocese, till king Louis VII was obliged to interfere. When Frederick, who preceded him, endeavored to judge between the rival popes, Victor and Alexander, Jocuicius was sent to the latter by England and France to assure him of their support and bring him to France. In 1167 Jocuicius was the prelate who, after the murder of Thomas à Becket, was commissioned by the pope to excommunicate the king of England. It was Jocuicius also who, when Henry had received absolution in 1172, went to him at Carc, and publicly declared him reconciled to the Church. He died in 1173 or 1174. See Gallia Christi, xiv, col. 89, 1088.—Hoever, Nou. Bih. Générale, xxvi, 940.

Jos's (Josue, or, rather, Joshu, Gen. of of Joshu, Jo, the son of Eleazar and father of Er, among the matriculated ancestors of Christ, unmentioned in the T. (Luke iii, 29). B.C. between 876 and 628. See Genealogy of Jesus Christ.

Jos'edoc (Joshuedoc), a Grecized form (1 Esdr. v. 5 48, 56; vi, 2; ix, 19; Exclus. xiv, 12) of Josedec that the high-priest (Hag, i, 1). See Josibadak.

Jos'eph (Heb. Yeosaph, יְשֹׁפֶה, containing, according to Gen. xxx, 23, 24, a two-fold significance [the the Heb. roots coinciding in form in Hiphil], removers, from יָשָׁא, and increaser, from יָשָׁה, the latter favored by the uncontracted or Chaldaic form יְשֹׁפֶה, יֶשֹׁפֶה, occurring only Psa. xxxi, 9, 9 Sept.). He was the son of of seven men in the tribe of Benjamin, all doubtless after the first, the name,
whose beautiful history is told at length in the Scriptures with inimitable simplicity. See also JOSIAH.

1. The elder son of Jacob and Rachel, born (B.C. 1915; comp. Gen. xli, 46) under peculiar circumstances, as may be seen in Gen. xxx, 22; on which account, and because he was the son of his old age (xxxvii, 3), he was beloved by his father more than all his children, though Benjamin, as being also a son of Jacob's favorite wife Rachel, was in a peculiar manner dear to the patriarch. The partiality evinced towards Joseph by his father excited jealousy on the part of his brethren, the rather as they were born of different mothers (xxxvii, 2-11). Jacob at this time gave two pieces of land in Canaan, Abraham's burying-place at Hebron in the south, and the "parcel of a field, where he [Jacob] had spread his tent" (xxxiii, 19), at Shechem in the north, the latter being probably, from its price, the lesser of the two. He seems then to have staid at Hebron with the aged Issac, while his sons kept his flocks.

1. Joseph had reached his seventeenth year, having hitherto been engaged in boyish sports, or aiding in pastoral duties, when some conduct on the part of "the sons of Bilhah and the sons of Zilpah, his father's wives," seems to have been such as, in the opinion of Joseph, to require the attention of Jacob. Accordingly he communicated the facts. This regard to virtue, and this manifestation of filial fidelity, greatly increased his brothers' dislike, who henceforth "hated him, and could not speak peaceably unto him" (xxxii, 4). Their jealousy was aggravated by the fact that Jacob had his brothers possessed by a mad phantasy, and had them dress up in a dress of scarlet and purple, with stripes of多样化 designs, which appears to have been a long tunic with sleeves, worn by youths and maidens of the richer class. See ATTIRE. Their avarice, however, was carried to the highest pitch when Joseph acquainted them with the two dreams that he had had, to the effect—the first, that while he and they were binding sheaves, his sheaf arose and stood erect, while theirs stood round and did obeisance to his; the second, that "the sun and the moon and the eleven stars did him homage." These dreams appeared to indicate that Joseph would acquire pre-eminence in the family, if not sovereignty; and even while his father rebuked him, his brothers were filled with envy (xxxvii, 11). Jacob, however, was not aware of any danger of their ill will; so that one may imagine, having a desire to hear intelligence of his sons, who were pasturing their flocks at a distance, he did not hesitate to make Joseph his messenger for that purpose. They had gone to Shechem to feed the flock, and (xxxviii, 3) every means were taken to undermine his father to bring him word of their welfare and that of the flock. They were not at Shechem, but had gone to Dothan, which appears to have been not very far distant, pasturing their flock like the Arabs of the present day, wherever the wild country (ver. 22) was unowned. His appearing in view of his brothers was the signal for their malice to gain head. They began to devise means for his immediate destruction, which they would have unhesitatingly effected but for his half-brother Reuben, who, as the eldest son, might well be the party to intercede on behalf of Joseph. A compromise was arrived at in virtue of his ill will, and the brothers took advantage of the opportunity to strip him of the distinguishing vestments which he owed to his father's affection, and cast into a pit. Having performed this evil deed, and while they were taking refreshment, the brothers beheld a caravan of Arabian merchants ( Ishmaelites = Midianites), who were bearing the spices and aromatics of India down to the well-known and much-frequented mart, Egypt. Judah on this feels a better emotion arise in his mind, and proposes that, instead of allowing Joseph to perish, they should sell him to the merchants, whose trade obviously, from the nature of the country, being as profitable as it was spurious. Accordingly the unhappy young man was sold for a slave (at the price of twenty shekels of silver, a sort of fixed rate: see Lev. xxvii, 5), to be conveyed by his masters into Egypt. While on his way thither, Reuben returned to the pit, intending to rescue his brother, and convey him safely back to their father. Finding Joseph gone, he returned with expectation of the wicked young man, he soon from relenting, now concerted a fresh act of treachery, by which at once to cover their crime and also punish their father for his partiality towards the unoffending sufferer. With this view they dipped Joseph's party-colored garment in the blood of a kid and surreptitiously laid it on him in order that he believe that his favorite child had been torn to pieces by some wild beast. The trick succeeded, and Jacob was grieved beyond measure (Gen. xxxviii, 12-35). B.C. 185.

2. Meanwhile the merchants sold Joseph to Potiphar, an officer of Pharaoh's, and captain of the royal guard, who was a native of the country (Gen. xxxvii, 56). It is by no means easy to determine who at this time was the Pharaoh, or ruling monarch, though, what is far more important, the condition of the country, and there- in the progress of civilization, are in certain general and important respects to make clear in the course of the narration. According to Syncellus, however, the general opinion in his day was that the sovereign's name who ruled Egypt at the time of the deportation of Joseph was Aphiopis. See EGYPT. In Potiphar's house Joseph enjoyed the highest confidence and the largest prosperity. His power was such that his master permitted whatever he undertook to succeed, till at length his master gave every thing into his hands. He was placed over all his master's property with perfect trust, and "the Lord blessed the Egyptian house for Joseph's sake" (ver. 5). The sculptures and paintings of the ancient Egyptian tombs throw vividly into the light of daily life and duties of Joseph. The property of great men is shown to have been managed by scribes, who exercised a most methodical and minute supervision over all the operations of agriculture, gardening, the keeping of live-stock, and fishing. Every profit was carefully registered to check the dishonesty of the laborers, who in Egypt have always been famous in this respect. Probably in no country was farming ever more systematic. Joseph's previous knowledge of tending flocks, and perhaps of husbandry, and his truthful character, exactly fitted him for the post of overseer.

The Hebrew race have always been remarkable for personal beauty, of which Joseph seems to have had an unusual share. This fact explains, though it cannot palliate, the conduct of Potiphar's wife, who, with the well-known profligacy of the Egyptian women, tried every means to ensnare Joseph to satisfy her unchaste desires. Foiled in her evil wishes, she resolved to punish Joseph, who thus a second time innocently brings on himself the vengeance of the ill-disposed. Charged with the very crime to which he had in vain been tempted, he is, with a fickleness characteristic of Oriental lords, at once cast into the state prison (Gen. xxxix). If the suddenness and magnitude of this and other changes in the lot of Joseph should surprise any one, the feeling will be mainly owing to his want of acquaintance with the manners and customs of the East, where vices notwithstanding less marked and refinements those presented in his native history are not common; for those who come into the charmed circle of an Eastern court, especially if they are persons of great energy of character, are subject to the most wonderful alternations of fortune, the slave of to-day being the vizier of to-morrow, and vice-versa.

It must not be supposed, from the lowliness of the morals of the Egyptians in practice, that the sin of unfaithfulness in a wife was not ranked among the heaviest vices. The punishment of adulterers was severe, and a moral tale, entitled "The Two Brothers" (contained in a papyrus of the 12th dynasty, found in the British Museum, and translated in the Cambridge Essays for 1838), is founded upon a case nearly resembling that of Joseph,
JOSEPH

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

Potiphar, although believing Joseph guilty, does not appear to have brought him before a tribunal, where the enormity of his alleged crime, especially after the trial placed in him, and the fact of his being a foreigner, would have made it likely that the virtuous one of the severest kind. He seems to have only cast him into the prison, which appears to have been in his house, or, at least, under his control, since afterwards prisoners are related to have been put "in ward [in] the house of the captain of the guard," which is the prison (xxix, 1), and simply "in ward [in] the captain of the executioners' house" (xli, 10; comp. xl, 7). The prison is described as "a place where the king's prisoners [were] bound" (xxxix, 39). Here the hardest time of Joseph's period of probation began. He was cast into prison on a false accusation, to remain there for at least two years, and perhaps for a much longer time. At first he was treated with severity; this we learn from Psa. cxv. 7. "He sent a man before them, Joseph [who]: was sold for a slave: whose feet they afflicted with the fetter: the iron entered into his soul" (ver. 17, 18). There is probably here a connection between "fetter" and "iron" (comp. cx, 8), in which case the signification of the last clause would be "the iron entered into him," meaning that the fetters cut his feet or legs. This is not inconsistent with the statement in Genesis that the keeper of the prison treated Joseph well (xxxix, 21), for we are not justified in thence inferring that he was kind from the first.

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

The famine, whose fate was auspicious, promised the young Hebrew to employ his influence to procure his restoration to the free air of day; but when again in the enjoyment of his "butlership," he forgot Joseph (xli). B.C. 1885. Pharaoh himself, however, had two dreams which did not impress him with a sense of the reality of famine; the other people resolved that Joseph should be made (to borrow a term from Rome) dictator in the approaching time of need. "And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, Forasmuch as God hath shown thee all this, there is none so discreet and wise as thou art. Thou shalt be over my house, and according to thy word shall all my people be ruled; and the other princes I have in the land will I be greater than thou. See, I have set thee over all the land of Egypt." And Pharaoh took off his ring and put it upon Joseph's hand, and arrayed him in vestures of fine linen, and put a gold chain about his neck; and he made him to ride in the second chariot which he had; and they cried before him, bow the knee. (See AHERON.) And Pharaoh said unto Joseph, I am Pharaoh, and without thee shall no man lift up his hand or foot in all the land of Egypt. And Pharaoh called Joseph's name Zaphnath-paaneah, [saviour of the world; comp. Hab. i, 5]; and gave him to wife Asenath, the daughter of Potipherah, priest of On. And Joseph went out over all the land of Egypt" (xli, 59 sq.). The monuments show that on the investiture of a high official in Egypt, one of the chief ceremonies was the putting on him a collar of gold, and giving him a golden scepter, etc. As a consequence, their par- particulars, the vestures of fine linen and the riding in the second chariot, are equally in accordance with the manner of the country. It has been supposed that Joseph was taken into the priestly order, and thus ennobled. The Biblical narrative does not support this opinion, though it leaves it without a doubt that in reality, if not in form as well, the highest trust and the proudest honors of the state were conferred on one so recently a Hebrew slave. The age of Joseph is stated to have been thirty years at the time of this promotion (xli, 46). B.C. 1885.

3. Seven years of abundance afforded Joseph opportunity to carry into effect such plans as secured an ample provision against the seven years of need. The famine came, but it found a prepared people. The representations of the monuments, which show that the contents of the granaries, now securely closed when they were filled, will illustrate this part of the history. See GRANARY. The visitation was not merely local, for "the famine was over all the face of the earth;" and all countries came into Egypt to Joseph to buy corn" (ver. 56, 57). The expressions here used, however, do not require us to suppose their commerce extended beyond the countries around Egypt, such as Palestine, Syria, and Arabia, as well as some part of Africa, although of course it may have been more widely experienced. It may be observed, that although fam-
ines in Egypt depend immediately upon the failure of the inundation, and in other countries upon the failure of rain, yet that, as the rise of the Nile is caused by heavy pressure, extra heavy season there in and in Palestine would produce the result described in the sacred narrative. It must also be recollected that Egypt was anciently the granary of neighboring countries, and that a famine there would cause first scarcity, and then famine, around. Famines are not very frequent in Egypt, as Ethiopia is a remunerative season there in the seven years famine in the reign of the Fatimite Caliph El-Mustansir-billah is the only known parallel to that of Joseph. See Famine. Early in the time of famine, Joseph's brethren came to buy corn, a part of the history which we mention here only as indicating the liberal policy of the government of Egypt, by which the storehouses were opened to all buyers, of whatever nation they were.

After the famine had lasted for a time, apparently two years, there was "no bread in all the land; for the famine was very sore, so that the land of Egypt and [all] the land of Canaan fainted by reason of the famine. And Joseph gathered up all the money that was found in the land of Egypt, and in the land of Canaan, for the corn which they bought; and Joseph brought the money into Pharaoh's house." (xvi, 13, 14). When all the money of Egypt and Canaan was exhausted, barter became necessary. Joseph then obtained all the cattle of Egypt, and in the next year, all the land, except that of the priests, and apparently, as a consequence, the Egyptians themselves. He demanded, however, only a fifth part of the produce as Pharaoh's right. It has been attempted to explain this enactment of Joseph as the result of the two fragments of Egyptian history preserved by profane writers, but the result has not been satisfactory. Even were the latter sources trustworthy as to the early period of Egyptian history, it would be difficult to determine the age referred to, as the actions of at least two kings of the third dynasty and of their successors were at times in the script very particularized. Herodotus says that, according to the Egyptians, Sesostris "made a division of the soil of Egypt among the inhabitants, assigning square plots of ground of equal size to all, and obtaining his chief revenue from the rent which the holders were required to pay him every year." (ii, 109). Elsewhere he speaks of the priests as having no expenses, being supported by the property of the temples (ii, 37), but he does not assign to Sesostris, as has been rashly supposed, the exemption from taxation that we may reasonably infer. Diodorus Siculus ascribes the division of Egypt into ninety-six districts to the kings of the fourth dynasty, calling Sesostris, "a veritable Sesostris". Taking into consideration the general character of the information given by Herodotus respecting the history of Egypt at periods remote from his own time, we are not justified in supposing anything more than that some tradition of an ancient allotment of the soil by the crown among the population was current when he visited the country. The testimony of Diodorus is of far less weight.

There is a notice, in an ancient Egyptian inscription, of a famine which has been supposed to be that of Joseph's time. In an inscription on the temple of Amon at Luxor and records of Amon, a governor of a district of Upper Egypt, that when there were years of famine, his district was supplied with food. This was in the time of Sesostris I, of the twelfth dynasty. It has been supposed by Bunsen (Egypt's Place, iii, 594) that this must be the famine of Joseph's time, and of Joseph's period, but strictly the record inapplicable to that instance, but the calamity it relates was never unusual in Egypt, as its ancient inscriptions and modern history equally testify.

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

4. We have now to consider the conduct of Joseph at this time towards his brethren and his father. Early in the time of famine, which prevailed equally in Canaan and Egypt, Jacob reproved his helpless sons and sent them to Egypt, where he knew his son Joseph had been bought. Benjamin alone he kept with him. Joseph was now governor, an Egyptian in habits and speech, for like all men of large mind he had suffered no scruples of prejudice to make him a stranger to the people he ruled. In his exalted station he laboured with the zeal that he showed in all his various charges, prescribing himself at the sale of corn. They had, of necessity, to appear before Joseph, whose license for the purchase of corn was indispensable. Joseph had probably expected to see them, and he seems to have formed a deliberate plan of action. His conduct has on him the air of one of those who think with his ears rather than study the Bible, and even friends of that sacred book have hardly in this case done Joseph full justice (Niemeyer, Charakt., ii, 566; Heuser, Dieis. non inhumanitati sed prudensissime Josepham cum fratris faciens, Hal. 1770). Joseph's main object appears to have been to make his brothers in dread recognize his guilt in their conduct towards him. For this purpose suffering, then as well as now, was indispensable. Accordingly, Joseph feigned not to know his brothers, charged them with being spies, threatened them with imprisonment, and allowed them to return home to fetch their younger brother. It is only on this condition that one of them should remain behind in chains, with a prospect of death before him should not their words be verified. Then it was, and not before, that "they said one to another, We are verily guilty concerning our brother, in that we slew him with our souls, and would not hear; therefore is this distress come upon us. And Reuben said, Speak I not unto you, saying, Do not sin against the child, and ye would not hear? therefore, behold, also his blood is required." (xlii, 21). Upon this, after weeping bitterly, he by common agreement bound his brother Benjamin, and left him, asking earnestly, fully deeply concerned Joseph was for his family, how true and affectionate a heart he had, may be learned from the words which escape from the brothers in their entreaty that Jacob would allow Benjamin to go into Egypt, as required by Joseph: "The man asked us straitly of our youngest brother. What if your father yet alive? have ye another brother?" (xliii, 7).

At length Jacob consents to Benjamin's going in company with his brothers: "And God Almighty give you mercy before the man, that he may send away your other brother and Benjamin. If I be bereaved of my children, I am bereaved; yea, I am, I am bereaved." (ver. 14). The present consisting of balm, honey, spices, and myrrh, nuts and almonds, and with double money in their hands (double, in order that they might repay the sum
which Joseph had caused to be put into each man's sack at their departure, if, as Jacob supposed, "it was an oversight"), they went again down to Egypt and stood before Joseph (xlii, 15); and there, too, stood Benjamin of its beloved Joseph, who agreed to his father's pledge of truthfulness was given. If it is asked why such a pledge was demanded, since the giving of it caused pain to Jacob, the answer may be thus: Joseph knew not how to demean himself towards his family until he ascertained its actual condition. That knowledge he could hardly be certain of, having been cut off from the mere words of men who had spared his life only to sell him into slavery. How had these wicked men behaved towards his venerable father? His beloved brother Benjamin, was he safe? or had he suffered from their jealousy and malice the worse fate with which he himself had been threatened? Nothing but the sign of Benjamin could answer these questions and resolve these details.

Benjamin had come, and immediately a natural change took place in Joseph's conduct: the brother began to claim his rights in Joseph's bosom. Jacob was safe, and Benjamin was Joseph's eye (Gen. 47: 9). But guilt is always the ready parent of fear; accordingly, the brother had no need of anything to fear. When taken to their own brother's house, they imagined they were being entrapped. A colloquy ensued between them and Joseph's steward, whence it appeared that the money put into their sacks, to which they now attributed their peril, was in truth a present from Joseph's hand, designed, as he so often acted, to aid his family in their actual necessities. The steward said, "Peace be to you; fear not; your God and the God of your father hath given you the treasure in your sacks. I had your money" (ver. 23).

Noon came, and with it Joseph, whose first question regarded their welfare, and said, Is your father well, the old man of whom ye spake? is he yet alive? And he lifted up his eyes and saw his brother Benjamin, his mother's son, and said, Is this your younger brother? And he said, God be gracious unto thee, my son. And Joseph made haste, for his heart melted towards his brother, and Joseph's heart was troubled when he looked for him; and he entered into his chamber, and wept there. How does this look like harshness?

The connection brings into view an Egyptian custom, which is of more than ordinary importance, in connexion with the religious and political history of Pharaoh. This was the act of placing a brother in the place of another, as in Genesis 44: 22-23. And they set on (food) for him by himself (Joseph), and for them by themselves (the brethren), and for the Egyptians which did eat with them, by themselves: because the Egyptians might not eat bread with the Hebrews; for that is an abomination with the Egyptians (ver. 39). This passage is also interesting, as proving that Joseph had not, in his princely grandeur, become ashamed of his origin, nor consented to receive adoption into a strange nation: he was still a Hebrew, waiting, like Moses after him, for the proper season to use his power for the good of his own people.

Other customs appear in this interesting narrative: "And they (the brothers) sat before him (Joseph), the first-born according to his birthright, and the youngest according to his youth." "And he sent messes (delicacies) unto them from before him; but Benjamin's mess was five times so much as any of theirs" (ver. 32, 35). For Joseph had sat down to eat with his brethren, stretched out his length issued in joy and mirth (comp. ver. 18, 33, 34). The scenes of the Egyptian tombs show us that it was the custom for each person to eat singly, particularly among the great; that guests were placed according to their right of precedence, and that it was usual to drink freely, men and even women being represented as overpowered with wine, probably as an evidence of the liberality of the entertainments. See Banquet.

Joseph, apparently with a view to ascertain how far his brethren were faithful to their father, hit upon a plan which would in its issue serve to show whether they would make any, and what sacrifice, in order to fulfill their promise of quite truthfully giving Jacob in safety to Jacob. Accordingly, he orders not only that every man's money (as before) should be put in his sack's mouth, but also that his "silver cup, in which my lord drinketh, and whereby he divineth," should be put in the sack's mouth of the youngest. The brethren leave, but are soon overtaken by Joseph's steward, who charges them with having surreptitiously carried off this costly and highly-valued vessel. They, on their part, vehemently repel the accusation, adding, "with whomsoever of thy servants it be found, both let him die, and we also will be my lord's bondmen." A search is made, and the cup is found in Joseph's brother's sack. Apprised, they return to the city. And now comes the hour of trial: Would they purchase their own liberation by surrendering Benjamin? After a most touching interview, in which they prove themselves worthy and faithful, Joseph declares himself unable any longer to withstand the appeal of parental affection. Once upon a time Judah, who is the spokesman, shows the deepest regard to his aged father's feelings, and entreats for the liberation of Benjamin even at the price of his own liberty. In the whole of literature we know of nothing more simple, natural, true, and unimpeachable, as the cords of this kind of bond in the Pentateuch, can we even understand what is meant by terming that collection of writings "the Hebrew national epic," or regarding it as an aggregation of historical legends. If here we have not history, we can in no case be sure that history is before us (chap. xliii, 10-17).

Most natural and impressive is the scene also which ensues, in which Joseph, after informing his brethren who he was, and inquiring, first of all, "Is my father alive?" expresses feelings free from the slightest taint of revenge, and even shows how, under divine Providence, the wrong he had done them was repaid to them in a thousandfold. In the words of the king of Egypt who had Joseph at his hands, "God sent me before you to preserve a posterity in the earth, and to save your lives by a great deliverance." Five years had yet to ensue in which "there would be neither earing nor harvest," and therefore the brethren were directed to return home and bring Jacob down to Egypt with them. And when Joseph met his father Benjamin's neck and wept; and Benjamin wept upon his neck. Moreover, he kissed all his brethren and wept upon them; and after that his brethren talked with him" (xlv, 14, 15).

The news of the returning vessels was carried to Pharaoh, who, while pleased at Joseph's conduct, gave directions that Jacob and his family should come forthwith into Egypt: "I will give you the good of the land of Egypt, and ye shall eat the fat of the land: regard not your stuff, for the good of all the land is yours." The brethren departed, being well provided for: "And to his father Joseph sent ten asses laden with the good things of Egypt, and ten she-asses laden with corn, and bread, and meat for his father by the way." The intelligence which they bore to their father was of such a nature that "Jacob's heart failed, for he believed them not." When, however, he had recovered from the thus naturally told effects of his surprise, the venerable patriarch said, "Enough; Joseph, my son, is yet alive: I will go and see him before I die" (xlv, 26, 29). Accordingly Jacob and his family, to the number of three thousand and ten souls, go down to Egypt, and by the express efforts of Joseph, have all the ground in which they live and carry on their labors, where Joseph met his father: "And he fell on his neck, and wept on his neck a good while." There Joseph "nourished his father and his brethren, and all his father's household, with bread, according to their families" (xlvii, 27). B.C.

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

6. By his Egyptian wife Asenath, daughter of the high-priest of Heliopolis, Joseph had two sons, Manasseh and Ephraim (Gen. xii, 50 sq.), whom Jacob adopted (xlviii, 5), and who accordingly took their place among the heads of the twelve tribes of Israel.

Joseph lived a hundred and ten years, kind and gentle in his affections to the last; for we are told, "The children of Machir, the son of Manasseh, were brought up upon Joseph's knees" (I, 28). Having obtained a promise from his brethren that when the time came, as he assured them it would come, that God should visit them, and "bring them unto the land which he sware to Abraham, to Isaac, and to Jacob," they would carry up his bones out of Egypt, Joseph at length "died, and they embalmed him, and he was put in a coffin." (I, 29). B.C. 1892. This promise was religiously fulfilled. His descendants, after carrying the corpse about with them in their wanderings, at length put it in its final resting-place in Shechem, in a parcel of ground that Jacob bought of the sons of Hamor, which became the inheritance of the children of Joseph (Josh. xxiv, 32). A tomb of which probably is the same as the one appertaining to travellers in the vicinity of Jacob's Well (Hackett's Illustrations, p. 197). It is a flat-roofed rectangular building surmounted by a dome, under which is pointed out the real tomb, in shape like a covered wagon (Wilson, Bible Landu, ii, 66).

The history of Joseph's posterity is given in the articles devoted to the tribes of Ephraim and Manasseh. Sometimes these tribes are spoken of under the name of Joseph (Josh. xiv, 4; xvii, 14, 17; xviii, 5; Judg. i, 23, 35, etc.), which is even given to the whole Israeliitish nation (Psa. lxxv, 1; lxxvi, 5; Amos v, 15; vi, 6). Ephraim is, however, the common name of his descendants, for the division of Manasseh gave almost the whole political weight to the brother-tribe (Psa. lxxvii, 67; Ezek. xxxvii, 16, 19; Zech. x, 6). That great people seems to have inherited all Joseph's ability with none of his goodness, and the very knowledge of his power in Egypt, instead of stimulating his offspring to follow in his steps, appears only to have constantly drawn them into a hankering after that forbidden land which began when Jeroboam introduced the calves, and ended only when a treasonable alliance laid Samaria in ruins and sent the ten tribes into captivity.

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

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

8. For further discussion of the events of Joseph's history, see Wullen. Fragment. p. 26; Less, Geschichte der Rel. i. 267; J. T. Jacob, Samml. Schrift. part 3; Hess, Gerack, der Patriarchen, ii. 324; Neumayer, Charakter. ii. 340; Allgem. Weltaht, ii. 332; Heeren, Ideen, ii. 551; Jablonowski, Opusc. i. 207; Gesenius, Thec. Heb. p. 1181; Hammer, D. Osman, Reich, ii. 88, Hengstenberg, Mos. und Agg. p. 30; J. B. Burcard, in the Mus. Helv. i. iii. 355; Voigt, in the frem. u. frem. Bibel. v. 500; Bauer, Het. Gesch. i. 181; Ewald, Jac. Gesch. i. 461; Doederlein, Theol. Bibel. iv. 717; Rosenmüller, Alterth. iii. 103; Lengerke, Kedum. i. 283; Otto, Lex. Raab. p. 381; Herbelot, Bibl. Orient. ii. 382; Kitt, Daily Bible Illustr.; Kurzt. Hist. of the Old Covenant; Stanley, Hist. of the Jewish Church; Adamson, Joseph and his Brothers (Lond. 1844); Bedelmann, Sermons on the Hist. of Joseph (Lond. 1839); Leighton, Lectures on Hist. i. (Lond. 1848); Plumptre, Hist. of Joseph (Lond. 1848); Randall, Lectures on Hist. of Joseph (Lond. 1852); Wardlaw, Hist. of Joseph (new ed. Lond. 1851); Gibson, Lectures on Hist. of Joseph (2nd ed. Lond. 1852); Vincent, Lectures on Life of Joseph (London, 1866). Treatises on special points are the following:

Hoppe, De philosophia Josephi (Helmst. 1706); A Review of the Life and Administration of Joseph (London, 1743); J. B. Burckhard, De criminalibus Josepho incauctis (Basel, 1745); Ananias, Josepho religio vindicata (Brix. 1747); Triguid, De Josepho adorato (Lond. 1750); Winkler, Utens. einiger Schwierig. vom Jos. (in his Schriftsteller, iii. 1); Heuser, De non humanitatis Josephum fecisse (Halle, 1773); Kühcher, Quare Josephus patrem non de se certiorum fecerit (Leipz. 1798); Nicolaus, De medicina et herb. Bibel. (Crefeld, 1799); De nomine Josephi in Aegypto (Marb. 1768-9); Reiniccius, De nomine יוסף (Weissen, 1725); Schröder, De Josepho laudibus (in Schönfels's Vita Jacobi, Marb. 1713); Von Seelen, De Josepho Aegyptiorum rectore (Lond. 1742); T. Smith, Hist. of Joseph in connection with Eg. Antiquities (Lond. 1856); Walter, De Josepho aegyptiaco (Hertford, 1754); Wunschald, De cognomine Josephi Aegyptiaco (Wittenb. 1609). See Jacob.

2. The father of Igal, which latter was the Issacharite "spy" to explore Canaan (Numb. xiii. 30). B.C. ante 1651.

3. The second named of the sons of Asaph, appointed head of the first division of sacred musicians by David (1 Chron. xxv. 2, 9). B.C. 1014.


5. Son of Shebaniab, and one of the chief priests contemporary with Jehoiakim (Neh. xii. 14). B.C. post 536.

6. One of the "sons" of Bani who divorced his Genitive whale after the exile (Ezra x. 42). B.C. 459.

7. The son of Judah, and father of Semei, maternal ancestors of Jesus (Luke iii. 26); probably the same with Schemanian, the son of Oolah, and father of Schemian (1 Chron. iii. 21, 92). B.C. between 356 and 410.


9. (Iassaph.) Son of Oziel, and father of On, an ancestor of Judith (Judith viii. 1).

10. A young man of high character, son of Tobias, and nephew of the Jewish high-priest Onias II, whose avarice he rebuked, but prevented its evil consequences by propitiating Ptolemy, and becoming the collector of his taxes. His history is given at considerable length by Josephus (Ant. xii. 4, 2-19), including his unintentional marriage with his own niece, by whom he had a son named Ishmael, and, after the death of his wife, married Zeruiah, the sister of Absalom.

1.1. (Iosaph.) Son of Zacharias, left with Azarias as general of the Jewish troops by Judas Maccabaeus, and defeated by Gorgias, B.C. cir. 164 (1 Macc. v. 8, 56; Josephus, Ant. xii. 8, 5).

1.2. (Iossaph.) In 2 Macc. viii. 22; x. 19 Joseph is named as one of the heroes of Judas Maccabaeus apparently in place of John (Ewald, Gerack, iv. 384; note; Grimm, ad 2 Macc. viii. 22). The confusion of these two names is well seen in the various readings in Matt. xiii. 55. See Josaph.

2. Son of Heber, the Great, who left him in charge when he went to plead his cause before Antony, with injunctions to put Marianne to death in case he never returned; but this order, being disclosed to Marianne, led to Joseph's death by command of Herod through suspicion of criminal intercourse with Marianne (Josephus, Ant. xiv. 5, 6; Luke i. 26). He married Salome, Herod's sister (War, i. 22, 4). He seems to be the same elsewhere called Herod's treasurer (τραπεζιατης, Ant. xvi. 6, 5).

3. Son of Antipater, and brother of Herod the Great (Josephus, War, i, 8, 9), was sent by the latter with a large force to subdue the Idumeans (Ant. xiv. 14, 4, and 5), and to protect his sons by driving his rivals to act on the defensive against Machæus, neglecting which orders he lost his life in an engagement near Jericho (War, i. 17, 1-4).

He also had a son named Joseph (Ant. xviii. 5, 4), who seems to be the one mentioned as cousins (ἐκαίρως) of Archelaus (War, ii. 3, 2). He built Agrippaopolis, a relative of the high-priest Matthias, in whose place he officiated for a single day (apparently that of the annual atonement), in consequence of the accidental disqualification of the pontiff (Josephus, Ant. xvii. 6, 4).

3. Son of Abiathar, a relative of the high-priest Matthias, in whose place he officiated for a single day (apparently that of the annual atonement), in consequence of the accidental disqualification of the pontiff (Josephus, Ant. xvii. 6, 4).

4. The son of Simeon, the Saviour, being "the husband of Mary, of whom was born Jesus, who is called Christ" (Matt. i. 16). By Matthew he is said to have been the son of Joseph, whose lineage is traced by the same writer through David up to Abraham. Luke represents him as being the son of Heloi, and traces his origin up to Adam. He appears to have had some special object in view, since he introduces his genealogical line with words of peculiar import: "Jesus being (as was supposed) the son of Joseph, which was the son of Heloi" (Luke iii. 23).—ος ἤπειρος, "as was supposed." In other terms, as accounted by law, as enrolled in the family, the mother of Joseph being the wife of his Warren, became thereby, in law (φυλακτος), the father of Jesus. See GENEALOGY OF JESUS CHRIST. He lived at Nazareth, in Galilee (Luke ii. 4), and it is probable that his family had been settled there for some time, since Mary lived there too (Luke i. 26, 27).

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

Joseph was by trade a carpenter, in which business he
probably educated Jesus (Thilo, Apor. i. 311). In Matt.
xxii, 55, we read, "Is not this the son of the carpenter?" and in Mark vi, 3, "Is not this the carpenter, the
son of Mary?" The term employed, ἄντρωπος, is of
a general character, and may be fitly rendered by the
English word "artisan or artist", signifying any one
that labors in the fabricum (from Latin) of articles
of ordinary use, whatever the material may be out
of which they are made. See CARPENTER. Schles-
ner (in voc.) asserts that the universal testimony of the
ancient Church represents our Lord as being a carpenter's
son. This is, indeed, the statement of Justin Marty-
r, and is repeated by Irenaeus (Adv. haeres. ii. 30. 1),
and by Tertullian, who applies to Jesus, by saying that he
made ἀποστολοὺς καὶ κυδώνια, ploughs and yokes; but Origen,
in replying to Celsus, who indulged in jokes against
the humble employment of our Lord, expressly denied that
Jesus was so termed in the Gospels (see the passage
cited in Otho's Jesus Christianus, p. 596, 1843), a decla-
ration which suggests the idea that the copies which Origen read differed from our own; while Hilari-
us, on Matthew (quoted in Simon's Dictionnaire de la
Bible, i. 691), asserts, in terms which cannot be mistak-
en, that Jesus was a "fabricium (I. f.) in various, pas-
sauber formantur, etc.

The ancient Jews all
handicrafts were held in so much honor that they were
prized and pursued by the first men of the nation. See
ARTIFICER.

Jewish tradition (Hieros, Sheph. c. 14) names the
father of Jesus Νατάλης, Penidara, or Penithra (Νάταλης,
Midrash, Kohel, x. 5; lladavrop, Thilo, Apor. i. 528),
and represents him (Orig. c. Cel. i. 32) as a rough soldier,
who came from Gilead, and was the father of Jesus.
Joseph, the carpenter, is brought to Joseph. Another form of the legend sets him forth (Told. Jeshu, p. 8, ed. Wagenseil; comp. Epiph.
Her. 78, 7) under the name of Joseph Pendaria (Παντή
νατάλης).

Christian tradition makes Joseph an old man
when first espoused to Mary (Epiph. Her. 78, 7), be-
ing no less than eighty years of age, and father of four
sons and two daughters. Theophylact, on Matt. xxii,
55, says that Jesus Christ had brothers and sisters, all
children of Joseph, whom he had by his sister-in-law,
wife of his brother Cleophas, who having died without
issue, Joseph was obliged by law to marry his widow.
Of the sons, Jesus, the brother of the Lord, was, he
states, the eldest born (Irenaeus, Adv. haeres. i. 25:3; Euse-
ex Eccles. ii. 1) agrees in substance with Theophylact; so
also does Epiphanius, adding that Joseph was fourscore
years old when he married Mary. Jerome, from whom
it appears that the alleged mother's name was Escha,
opposes this tradition, and is of opinion that what are
taken by some to be brothers and sisters are actually
See JAMES; MART. The painters of Christian antiqui-

ty confine with the writers in representing Joseph as
an old man at the period of the birth of our Lord—an
evidence which is not to be lightly rejected, though
the precise age mentioned may be but an approximation to
the fact. Another story, which gives the name of Salome as that of Joseph's first wife, who was related to
the family of John the Baptist. The origin of all the
earliest stories and assertions of the fathers concerning
Joseph, as, e.g., his extreme old age, his having sons by
a former wife, his having the custody of Mary given to
him by lot, and so on, is to be found in the apocryphal
Gospels, of which the earliest is the Protevangelium
of St. James, apprised of the work of Gnostics in the
2d century, quoted by Origen, and referred to by
Clement of Alexandria and Justin Martyr (Tischendorf,
Proleg. xiii). The same stories are repeated in the oth-
er apocryphal Gospels. The Monophysite Coptic Chris-
tians are said to have first assigned a festival to St.
Joseph in the Calendar, viz., on the 20th of July, which
is thus inscribed in a Coptic Almanac: "Requies sancti se-
is justi Josephi fabri lignarii, Deipare Virginia Maria
sponsi, qui pater Christi vocari promeruit." The apoc-
ryphal Historia Josephi fabri lignarii, which now exists
in Arabic (ed. Wallisii Lips. 17), and Latin, Fabrici-
us, Pseudopt. i. 800; also by Thilo and Tischendorf),
is thought by Tischendorf to have been originally writ-
ten in Coptic, and the festival of Joseph is supposed to
have been transferred to the Western churches from
the East as late as the year 1999. The above-named his-
tory is acknowledged to be quite apocryphal, and which
belong probably to the 4th century. It professes to be
an account given by our Lord himself to the apostles
on the Mount of Olives, and placed by them in the library
of Jerusalem. It ascribes 111 years to Joseph's life, and
makes him old, and the father of four sons and two
two daughters before the assumed marriage of Mary
in this sentence: "Benediciones ejus et preces servat nos
omnes, o fratres. Amen." The reader who wishes to
know the opinion of the ancients on the obscure subject
of Joseph's marriage may consult Jerome's acrimonious
tract Contra Helvidium. He will see that Jerome high-
ly disapproves of the canonisation of the so-called
apocryphal (Gospels) of Joseph being twice married,
and that he claims the authority of Ignatius, Polycarp,
Ireneus, Justin Martyr, and "many other apostolical men,"
in favor of his own view, that our Lord's brethren were
all his counte unto the age of 80, and that the work of
Helvidius, which had been held by Eblon, Theodotus
of Byzantium, and Valentine, that they were the chil-
dren of Joseph and Mary. Those who held this opin-
ion were called Antidicomariani, as enemies of the
Virgin. (Epiphanius, Adv. haeres. i. iii. t. ii; Hier.
xxxviii, also See Vener); comp. On the Virgin, art. Virgin Mary; Mill, On the Brethren of the Lord;
Calmet, De St. Joseph. St. Mar. Virg. conjuge; and,
for an able statement of the opposite view, Alford's note on
Matt. xxi, 55.) See GOSPELS, SPHOUR.

It is not easy to determine when Joseph died. That
event may have taken place before his son entered on
his public ministry. This has been argued from the fact
that his mother only appeared at the feast at Cana in
Galilee. The premises, however, hardly bear out the
inferences. With more force of argument, it has been
alleged (Simon, Dict. de la Bible) that Joseph must have
been dead before the crucifixion of Jesus, else he would
in all probability have appeared with Mary at the cross.
Certainly the absence of Joseph from the public life of
Christ, and the failure of reference to him in the dis-
courses and history, while "Mary" and "his brethren"
not unfrequently appear, afford strong evidence not only of
Joseph's death, but of the inferior part which, as the legal
father only of our Lord, Joseph might have been ex-
pected to sustain. So far as our scanty materials ena-
ble us to form an opinion, Joseph appears to have been
a good, kind, simple-minded man, who, while he af-
forded aid in every beneficial way to his son, yet by
force of age, and by way of caution, would leave Mary unrestrained to use all the impres-
sive and formative influence of her gentle, affection-
ate, pious, and thoughtful soul. B.C. cir. 45 to A.D.
cir. 26.

Further discussion of the above points may be seen
in Meyer, Novo Joao. tempore notici. C. recti aequo de-
ceptum (Lips. 1792); comp. Reay, Narratio de Jos. e. a.
codice desumpta (Oxon. 1823); Walther, Deus Jeso.
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Joseph was a noble officer of the Persian court. His name is found in the Greek text of the Old Testament as "Józêph" (Matthew 1:6, 12; 2:23; Acts 7:14). He was the son of Jacob and Mary, and the brother of Jesus Christ. Joseph was sold into slavery by his brothers and later rose to become the governor of Egypt. His story is told in the Book of Genesis, chapters 37-50. 

Joseph was a man of great wisdom and integrity, and he was respected by both Egyptians and Jews. He was known for his ability to interpret dreams and was able to save Egypt from famine. His story is a testament to the power of faith and the importance of staying true to one's principles, even in the face of adversity.

Joseph's story is one of the most well-known stories in the Bible, and it continues to inspire people today. His life is a reminder of the power of hope and the importance of perseverance, even in the face of great challenges.
and conveyed to Constantinople. On his return he found his friend and leader Gregory deod, and attached himself to another leader, John, on whose death he caused his body, together with that of Gregory, to be transferred to the deserted church of St. John Chrysostom, in connection with which he established a monastery.

Joseph was soon, by the attractiveness of his eloquence, filled with inmata. After this he was, for his stern and beneficent image of worship, banished to Cherone, apparently by the emperor Theophilus, who reign- ed from A.D. 829 to 842; but, on the death of the em- peror, Joseph b. Chija rejoined the court of the new emperor, and obtained, through the favor of the patriarch Ignatius, the office of cænonaphylax, or keeper of the sacred vessels in the great church of Constantinople. Joseph was equally acceptable to Ignatius and to his competi- tor and successor Photius. He died at an advanced age in A.D. 883. Joseph is chiefly celebrated as a writer of canones or hymns, of which several are extant in MS., but there is some difficulty in distinguishing his com- positions from those of Joseph of Thessalonica. His Canones in omnia Beatae Virginis Mariæ festa, and his Theologia, hymns in honor of the Virgin, scattered through the various liturgical books, were published, with a learned commentary and a life of Joseph, translated from the Greek of the Deacon, by Hippolytus Maracci, under the title of Marcius Josephi Hymnographi (Rome, 1661). The version of the life of Joseph was by Laizi Maracci, of Lucassau, and published by Jespers. Another version of the same life, but less exact, by the Jesuit Floritius, was published among the Vita Sancitorum Scolorum of Oc- taviano Cajetanus (Ottavio Gaetano), ii, 43 (Palermo, 1657, folio), and reprinted in the Acta Sancitorum (see below). Some writers suppose that there was another Joseph, a writer of hymns, mentioned in the title of a MS. typicon at Rome as of the monastery of St. Nicolaus Casularum (νας Κασταλίου). See Vita S. Josephi Hymnographi, in the Acta Sancitorum, s. d. III Aprilis, i, 289, etc., with the commentary of Prauicius of Papele- roche, and Appenine, p. 138 (Paris, 1727, folio); 79; Menologium Gradus, Ioseph, Basili, Imperatoris editum, s. d. III Aprilis (Urbino, 1727, folio).—Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Biog. iii, 929.

Joseph ben-Chija (in the Talmud simply styled Rabbi Joseph), one of the greatest of Israel's Rabbis, was born in Babylon about A.D. 270. Rabbi Joseph was a disciple of Jehudah ben-Hekekel, the founder and president of the college at Pumbedita, and a fellow-student and intimate lifelong friend of the celebrated Rabbi Rabbah ben-Babila. Having censed Rabbi Rabba, the reputed author of the Midras Rabbah, or the traditional com- mentary on Genesis, whom he succeeded in the presi- dency at Pumbedita about A.D. 380. He died, however, only three years after (about A.D. 383). Joseph de- serves our notice not so much from his connection with the school at Pumbedita, which, though brief, was yet of marked benefit to the development of Biblical scholar- ship at that centre of Jewish learning, as for his Chal- ded versions of the Hebrew Scriptures (i. e. the Psalms, Proverbs, and Job), particularly of the Hagiographa, of which alone the authorship can be ascribed to him with any certainty (comp. the Rabbinic Biblia). Some Jewish critics credit him with a version of the whole O. T. ; and, indeed, from passages quoted in the Talmud (comp. Mord. Katan, 26, a; Peschem, 68, a; Menachoth, 110, a; Jonah, 92, b; 77, b; Aboda Zara, 44, a; Kidde- sha, 111, b; Nedarim, 38, a; Baba Kama, 68, b; Berachoth, 28, a) from a paraphrase with which he is accredited, it would appear that he translated Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Hosca, Amos, Obadiah, Zephaniah, and Zechariah, since these passages are from these books, and are distinctly cited in the Talmud.

"The 'R. Joseph has rendered it into Chaldaic.' These renderings are, however, almost exactly those given in the Targum of Jonathan ben-
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ing it to the earlier part of the 10th century is that Dunash b.-Tanaim (who flourished about 955) knew the work and spoke of parts of it (comp. Milman's Gibbon, Decline and Fall of the Roman Empire, ii, 6, note). But as to the chronicle itself, it consists of six books, each of which the author explains in a genealogical table in Gen. xi.; then passes on to the history of Rome, Babylon, Cyrus, and the fall of Babylon; reumes again the history of the Jews; describes the times of Daniel, Zerubbabel, Esther, etc.; gives an account of Alexander the Great, his connection, his exploits, and expeditions to the East; and continuesto the history of the Jews; of Heliopolis's assault on the Temple; the translation of the O.T. into Greek; the deeds of the Maccabees; the events of the Herodians; and the last war which terminated in the destruction of the Temple by Titus. The authorities quoted in this remarkable book are: 1. Nicolaus the Damascene; 2. Strabo of Capadocia; 3. Titus Livius; 4. Togthas of Jerusalem; 5. Pororpus of Rome; 6. The history of Alexander, written in the year of his death by Magi; 7. The book of the antediluvian patriarch Cainan b.-Eneas; 8. Books of the Greeks, Medians, Persians, and Macedonians; 9. Josephus in Alexander about the wonders of India; 10. Treaties of alliance of the Romans; 11. Ciceron, who was in the Holy of Holies of the Temple during the reign of Pompey; 12. The intercalary years of Julius Caesar, composed for the Nazarenes and Grecians, and the chronicles of the Christians. Josephus, in it, 14. The constitutional diploma which Vespasian venerated so highly that he kissed every page of it: 15. The Alexandrian Library with its 950 volumes; 16. Jewish histories which are lost; and, 17. The national traditions which have been translated orally. The first printed edition of this work appeared in Mantua, 1476—1479, with a preface by Abraham ben-Salmon Chasot. A reprint of this edition (the text vitiated), with a Latin version by Münster, was published at Basle, 1511. There appeared an edition from a MS. containing a somewhat different version of the work, and divided into eleven chapters, edited by Tarn Ihn-Jaach ben-David (Constantinople, 1510). New editions of it were published in Venice, 1544; Cracow, 1589; Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1689; Amsterdam, 1728; Prague, 1784; Zol- kiew, 1805; Vilna, 1819. It was partly translated into Arabic by Zacharia ben-Saïd El-Tamini about 1255, and into English by Peter Morwong (Loud, 1586, 1561, 1575, 1579, 1602). There are two other Latin translations, besides the one by Münster, 1541; one was made by the learned English Orientalist, John Gagnier (Oxford, 1719), and one by Breithaupt; the last has also the Hebrew text and the German notes. He always continued to be the student's edition. There are German translations by Michael Adam (Zurich, 1546), Moses b.-Bezailei (Prague, 1607), Abraham ben-Morlecai Cohen (Amsterdam, 1661), and Seligmann Reis (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1707). Compare, besides the authorities already cited, Zunz, Die Gottesschatzbriefe der Juden (Berlin, 1832), p. 146-151; Delitzsch, Zur Geschichte der jüdischen Poesie (Leipzig, 1836), p. 37-40; Carmoly in Jost's Annalen (Frankfort-on-the-Main, 1839), i, 149 sq.; Milman, Hist. of the Jews, iii, 131; First, Bibliotheca Judaeorum, ii, 111-114; Steinueschneider, Catalogus Libror. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, 1457-1503; Kitto, Bibb. Cyclopedia, s. v.

Joseph ben-Isaac Kimchi. See KIMCHIL

Joseph ben-Satia. See SAADAH

Joseph ben-Shemtob, a noted Jewish philosopher, polemic, and commentator, flourished in the middle of the 15th century in Castile, and was in high office at the court of Juan II. He was especially noted in his day as a philosopher, and wrote many philosophic works, and made important contributions to the history of Jewish philosophy. He was especially rigid in defence of Judaism as a religious system, in opposition to the Christian, and in that line freely used Prophit Du-

John's writings, upon which he commented. See PASS.

In his later days he lost his position at court through the machinations of the papists and the so-called converts from Judaism, and finally died the death of martyrdom about 1460. His works of especial interest are: a) his commentary on the Mishna, titled Prophit Duran against Christianity (Constantinople, 1577); contained also in Geiger's Bibliotheca Rabbinica, 1844:—(2) Course of Homilies delivered in the synagogue on different Sabbaths on various portions of the Bible, entitled הינני קדש, The Eye of the Reader (still in MS. in the Bodleian Library at Oxford, Codex Michael, 581);—(3) Commentary on Lamentations, composed at Medina del Campo in the year 1441 (MS. by De Ross, No. 177).—(4) Commentary on Genesis ii. 1-14, being the Sabbath lesson which commences the Jewish year [see HAPITAH]; and—(5) Exposition of Deut., xv, 11. Comp. Steinschneider, in Ersch and Gruber's Allgemeine Encyclopedia, sec. ii, vol. xxxii, p. 87-89; Catalogi Libror. Hebr. in Bibliotheca Bodleiana, col. 1527; Grätz, Gesch. d. Juden, viii, 173 sq.; also note 4 in the Appendix; Kitto, Bibb. Cyclopedia, s. v.

Joseph, Joel. See WITZENHAUSEN

Joseph Taitatzak. See TAITATZAK

Josephus (Ἰωάννης ὁ Ἰουδαῖος, Ιωάννης), the Greek-Latin form (1 Esdr. ix, 34) of the Heb. name Jesus (q. v.) 6 ( Ezra x, 42).

Josephus, Flavius, the celebrated Jewish historian, was born at Jerusalem A.D. 37. His father's name was Mattathias, and in his autobiography (the only source left us to write his history, as the works of his rival, Justus of Tiberias, are unhappily lost) he lays claim to royal and sacred descent and alliances to the renown he enjoyed while yet a youth (Life, i, 1). His early years seem to have been spent in close study of the Jewish traditions and the O.T. writings. Satisfied with all of the three principal Jewish sects while yet a young man he spent three years as the follower of one Banus, an eremite, in the desert, and at last joined the sect of the Pharisees. He was only 19 when he left Banus, and he joined the Pharisees between 19 and 30, when he went to Rome. Soon afterwards, the imprisonment of some Jewish priests by the procurator Felix afforded him the means of pleasing his people's cause before the emperor himself at the Roman capital, whither these men had been sent. On the way he was shipwrecked (some have unwarrantably imagined that he was Paul's companion in that disastrous voyage), but, being rescued by a Cyrenian vessel, he made his way to Rome. He there passed several years, and in some of them also ingratiated himself in the favor of the empress, and at length returned home loaded with presents. He found the mass of his countrymen determined on a revolt from the empire, and he anxiously sought to dissuade them sofro rash a course. The Jews, however, refused to listen to his advice; and the only alternatives for him were either to follow the popular will, and thus perhaps make himself the leader of his people, or to return to Rome, and there receive the rewards of treachery. In his description of the Jewish insurrection he has given us a graphic account of the numerous plots and their concerted working: and he became a fugitive during the whole period of his life. After the disastrous retreat of Cestius Gallus from Jerusalem, and the barbarous massacre of the Jews at Sepphoris (q. v.) and the Syrian cities, the most peacefully inclined of the Jews joined the zealots, and Josephus, no less than had hesitated as to the best course to be pursued. With great ostentation of revenge and self-declaration, he declared in favor of war —a covenant," and he soon secured for himself the appointment as general. Together with Joazar and Judas he was sent to Galilee, the province on which the storm would prevail, where, however, devoted themselves to their priestly functions, and Josephus became the sole commander (Life, 47; War,
Finding the Galilean Jews divided among themselves (see John of Gischala), and fearing that his command was too weak to meet the army of the approaching Vespasian, he retired to the Jewish stronghold of Jotapata, and there awaited the attack of the Romans. For fear of the treachery of the Roman soldiery to deeds that immortalized his name. (For an interesting description of this siege, see Weber and Holzmann, Gesch. d. Volks Israels, ii, 475 sq.; Milman, Hist. of the Jews [Midleton's edition], ii, 252 sq.) After his surrender to Vespasian he was put in chains, with a view to being sent to Rome. Through the influence of Herod the Great, he was saved from this danger by predicting (he distinctly claims the gift of prophecy, War, iii, 8, 9) to Vespasian his future elevation to the imperial throne, but was still held in confinement for three years, until, on the realization of his prediction, his chains were cut from him, as a sign that he was destined for great things. By 43 A.D. at the latest, Vespasian had been declared emperor by the Roman soldiers in the East, and he immediately set out for the West, leaving Titus in command, with orders to hasten the conclusion of the war still raging in Palestine. In this expedition on Jerusalem Josephus accompanied Titus. Titus had supposed this task, with the aid of the title of the "renegade" (so Milman calls him), an easy one; but the Jews braved the attack of the Romans much more obstinately than the latter had expected, and, finally, Josephus was induced to go forth and urge his countrymen to capitulate, and thus to save the place from certain and total destruction. The people, by his account, were touched and ready to yield, but the leaders remained obstinate; but the fact is that they were naturally distrustful to listen to the counsels of a man who had quitted them in the hour of their greatest need. They were, however, that among his countrymen he would hardly find a safe refuge, he returned with Titus to Rome to enjoy the honors which Vespasian might bestow upon him. He was received with great kindness by the emperor; but, although the privileges of Roman citizenship were conferred upon him and an annual pension awarded him, he was detested by the Romans no less than by the Jews. It is supposed that his death occurred in the early years of Trajan's reign, perhaps A.D. 103. For other facts of a more directly personal character, such as his three marriages, the names of his sons, etc., see the seventy-six chapters of his life, and the following other passages of his other works: Aion, i, 9, 10; War, i, ii, 20, 3 sq.; 21, 2 sq.; iii, 7, 13 sq.; 8, 1 sq.; vii, vi; Ant. ed. Havercamp, i, 5, 226, 586, 545, 682, 982; Suidas, s. v. Ιωάννης. The character of Josephus has been very differently delineated by different writers. From his own works, especially the Aion, it is evident that although he dealt rather treacherously with his people, he yet felt a pride in the antiquity of the nation and in its ancient glories; and in the description of the misfortunes of the Jews he is by no means wanting in sympathy for them. Thus his account of the miserable fate of Jerusalem is altogether free from that tone of revolting coldness which shocks us in Xenophon's account of the downfall of Athens (Hell. ii, 2, 3 sq.). Yet the mildest interpretation that his conduct can receive certainly is that he despaired (as earnest patriots never do) of his country, and that he deserted his countrymen in their greatest extremity. From the very beginning, he appears to have looked on the nation as hopeless, and to have cherished the intention of making peace with Rome whenever he could. Thus he told some of the chief men of Tiberias that he was yet aware of the invincibility of the Romans, though he thought it safer to dissemble and he advised them to do the same, and to wait for a convenient season — περιμένων καιρόν (Life, 55; compare War, iii, 5); and we find him again, in his attack on Justus the historian (Life, 65), earnestly defending himself from the charge of having in any way caused the war with Rome. Had this feeling originated in a religious conviction that the Jewish nation had forfeited God's favor, the case, of course, would have been different; but such a spirit of living, practical faith we do not discover in Josephus. Holding in the main the abstract doctrines of a Pharisee, but with the principles and temper of a Herodian, he strenuously attempted to unite his religion to heathen tastes and prejudices; and this by actual commissions (Ottius, Prætermissa a Josepho, appended to his Spicilegium), no less than by a nationalistic system of modification (Smith, Dict. Greek and Rom. Biog., ii, 612). A more favorable opinion is somewhat expressed by Josephus, as he appears in the gelicit Quiet, Review, 1870, p. 420. Prof. F. W. Farrar (in Kitto, Cyclop. Bibl. Literature, s. v.) has perhaps best summed up the religious character of Josephus as that of "a strange mixture of the bigoted Pharisee and the time-seeing Herodian," and as "mingling the national pride of the patriot with the apathy of the subject." Very different is the opinion of all on the writings of Josephus. Even in his day he was greatly lauded for his literary abilities. Though a Jew by birth, he had so audibly acquired the Greek that he could be counted among the classic writers in that language. St. Jerome designates him as the "Grecus Livius" (Epist. ad Eustach.); and, to come nearer our own days, Niebuhr pronounces him a Greek writer of singular purity (Aec. Hist. iii, 455). But, with all, he is hardly deserving of the epithet φιλολόγης, so often bestowed on him (Suidas, s. v. 'Ιωάννης). He sets himself, however, as a defender of the Jewish religion against the attacks of Philo and Simus and Philostratos, says Scaliger, De Jenua. Temp. Preec. et.). It is true, he understood the duty and importance of veracity in the historian (Ant. xiv, 1; War, i, 1; c. Apion, i, 19); nevertheless, 'he is," says Niebuhr (Lett. Rom. Hist. l. c.), "often untrue, and his history of the wars and events of the war abound in distortions of historical facts, and in falsifications which arise from his inordinate national pride; and wherever he deals in numbers, he shows his Oriental love of exaggeration" (this charge is, in a measure, refuted, however, in Stud. u. Krit. 1855, p. 48). But, even though Josephus may not in all things be implicitly relied upon, his writings are the best theologian especially invaluable, and we may well say, with Casaubon and Farrar, that it is by a singular providence that his works, which throw such a flood of light on Jewish affairs, have been preserved to us. They are of immense service in the entire Biblical department, as may be seen from the frequent references that have been made to his writings throughout this Cyclopaedia, in the elucidation of the history, geography, and archaeology of Scripture. Yet by this it must by no means be inferred that we detract in the least from our former statement, that Josephus was not an unadulterated author of the reflection of the Biblical writings. "In spite of his constant assertions (Ant. x, 11)," says Farrar (in Kitto), "he can have had no real respect for the writings which he so largely illustrates. If he had felt, as a Jew, any deep or religious appreciation of the O. T. history, which he professes to follow (οίκείος προσεχής καὶ θεοφάνους, Ant. i, proem.), he would not have tampered with it as
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he does, mixing it with pseudo-philosophical fancies (Apios, i, 10), with groundless Jewish Hugadoth or traditions (such as the three years' war of Moses with the Ethiopians, the love of Tharbis for him, etc. : Ant. ii, 10, 2), and with quotations from heathen writers of very different authorship (Ant. vii, 5, 9, 10, De Aritrd, p. 211). The worst charge, however, against him is his constant attempt, by alterations and suppressions (and especially by a rationalistic method of dealing with miracles, which contrasts strangely with his credulous fancies), to make Jewish history palatable to Greek readers. For to such an extent has this, that J. Ludolphius calls him 'fabulator saepius quam historicus' (Hist. Ethiop. p. 230). Thus it omits all the most important Messianic prophecies; it manipulates the book of Daniel in a most unsatisfactory manner (Ant. ix, 11); he speaks in a very loose way about Moses and Abraham (Ant. i, 8; ii, 15); and, though he can swallow the romance of the pseudo-Aristaeus, he rationalizes the account of the Exodus and Jonah's whale (Ant. ii, 15, 6; ix, 10, 2). On the whole subject of his credibility as a writer, his omissions, his variations, and his pandering to Gentile taste, comp. J. A. Fabre, De Joseph. et quorum Librum Edidit, in Jan Dale, De Aritaeis, ii, xi; De Idololatria, vii; Brinch, Examen Hist. Flavi. Joseph. in Havercamp, ii, 309 sq.; Ottius, Speciliegum ex Josepho; Ittigius, Prolegomena; Usher, Epist. ad Lud. Capitolium, p. 42; Whiston's Dissertation, etc.

For his literary interest, perhaps, we may first of all note that the readers must be the relation which Josephus, living as he did in the age of Christ himself, sustained towards Christianity. Some have gone so far as to assert not only the authenticitv of passages in his writings alluding to Christ, etc. (see below), but have even made out of Josephus an Evangelistic Christian (Whiston, Bence-Jones, 1760). If it is a true follower of Jesus the Christ, Prof. Farrar (in Kitto), speaking on this point, says: "Nothing is more certain than that Josephus was no Christian (ἐπάργυρος τὴ Ἡ σαοί ὡς Χρήστος, Orig. c. Cels. i, 85); the whole tone of his mind was alien from the noble simplicity of Christian belief, and as we have here already, he was not even a good Jew. Whatever, therefore, may be thought about the passages alluding to John the Baptist (Ant. xviii, 5, 2), and James, 'the Lord's brother' (ibid. xx, 9, 1), which may possibly be genuine, there can be no reasonable doubt that the famous allusion of Josephus (Ant. xviii, 3, 5) is either absolutely spurious or largely interpolated. The silence [partial or total] of Josephus on a subject of such importance, and with which he must have been so thoroughly acquainted, is easily explicable; and it is intrinsically much more probable that he should remain silent over the subject than should the work be done also by his contemporary, Justus of Tiberias, Phot. Cod. Bibl. 83) than that he should only have devoted itself to a few utterly inadequate lines. Even if he had been induced to do this by some vague hope of getting something by it from Christians like Flavius Clemens, he certainly would not have expressed himself in a language so strong (ἐγένετο αὐτοίς λόγια γονίς), and still less would he have vouched for the Messiahs, the miracles, or the resurrection of Jesus. Justin, Tertullian, Chrysostom, Origen, and even Photius, knew nothing of the passage, nor does it appear till the time of Eusebius (Hist. Ecles. i, 2, Dem. pr. Alex. iii, 5), a man for whom Niebuhr can find no better name than 'a de-testable falsifier,' and one whose historical credibility is well nigh given up. Whether Eusebius forged it himself or borrowed it from the marginitia of some other Christian, it cannot be determined, but that Josephus did not write it [at least in its present form] may be regarded as settled. Nay, the very next sentence (Ant. xvii, 3, 4) is a disgusting story, wholly irrelevant to the tenor of the narrative, and introduced in all probability for the sole purpose of a blasphemous parody on the miracles of Jesus, such as was usual with Rabbinical writers (e.g. in the Sepher Toladeth Jekuth; see Wagensell, Tela Ignea Satanae; see Jesus Christ).

That Josephus intended obliquely to discredit some of the chief Christian doctrines by representing them as having been anticipated by the Essenes seems by no means improbable (comp. De Quincey's Works, vol. ix, The Essenes). For a compendium of the abundant literary references to Josephus, see Van Daele, De Aritaeis, p. 34. The chief treatises are, Daubus, Pro testimonio Fl. Jos. de Jesu Christ (London, 1706); reprinted in Havercamp; Böhmer, Ueber des Fl. Josu. Zeugnisse von Christus (Lips. 1823); Le Moyn, Var. Sacr, ii, 361, Heinichen, Excurs. i, ad Euseb. H. E. iii, 331; comp. also Langen, Propheten und Prophetenizeiten (Freib. 1866), x, 440 sq.; Stud. u. Krit. 1856, 840 sq.

It remains for us only to add a list of the works of Josephus (here we mainly follow Smith [Hist. Gr. and Rom. Bks. v. 1.], which are, 1. A History of the Jewish War, (τοῦτοι γὰρ Φαβροτοί αἰανοί, οὐδὲν ἑκατέρους ἡμῖν γνώσατε γὰρ ὁ ἠλώνος, i.e. the seven Jewish tribes to which he wrote it first in his own language (the Syro-Cahalite), and then translated it into Greek, for the information of European readers (War, 1, 1). The original is no longer extant. The Greek was published about A.D. 75, under the patronage and with the permission of Emperor Vespasian, but it appears among the works of Josephus II, which contain fewer than sixty-two letters to Josephus, bore testimony to the care and fidelity displayed in it. It was admitted into the Palatine library, and its author was honored with a statue at Rome. It commences with the capture of Jerusalem by Titus in the year 70, and ends with the events before Josephus' own time, and gives a detailed account of the fatal war with Rome (Josephus, Life, p. 65: Eusebius, Hist. Ecles. iii, 9; Jerome, Catalog. Script. Ecl. p. 13: Ittigius, Prolegomena; Fabricius, Ebd. Grce. v, 4: Vossius, De Hist. Grce. p. 229, ed. Westminster:—2. Jewish Antiquities, in twenty books, completed about A.D. 90, and addressed to Epaphroditus. The title, as well as the number of books, may have been suggested by the Παμεμαίρκεια τοιχολογία of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The work extends from the creation of the world to A.D. 66, the 12th year of war. It is composed largely of the works of the pseudo-Josephus. See Josephus ben-Gorion:—3. His Life, is one book. This is an autobiography appended to the Antiquities, and is addressed to the same Epaphroditus. It cannot, however, have been written earlier than A.D. 97, the year before Josephus' death. Is (ibid. 65): —4. Κατά Απίωνος (a treatise against Apion), in two books, also addressed to Epaphroditus. It is in answer to such as impugned the antiquity of the Jewish nation on the ground of the silence of Greek writers respecting it. The title, "against Apion," is rather a misnomer, and is applicable only to a portion of the second book (1-18). It exhibits considerable learning, and is highly commended by Jerome. The greek text is deficient at ii, 5-9: —5. The Fourth of Maccabees (οι Μακεδανοίς, ὡς ἑπικοινωνίας λογομεθη) is, in one book. The genuineness of this treatise has been called in question, and was together (as was also Eusebius, Hist. Lit. Grec. v, 7; Ittigius, Prolegomena). Certainly, however, it does not read like his works. It is an extremely declamatory account of the martyrdom of the seven Maccabees and their mother, in the persecution under Antiochus Epiphanes: and this is prefaced by a discussion on the superstitious nature which reason possesses de jure over pleasure and pain. Its title has reference to the zeal for God's cause thus manifested by various persons and nations. There is a paraphrase of it by Erasmus, and in some Greek copies of the Bible it was inserted as the
fourth book of the Maccabees (Fabricius, L. C.). There are besides these, also attributed to him:— 6. The treatise "Πρωτόκολλον των πατριών," which was certainly not written by Josephus. For an account of it, see Phoebus, Cod. x. v. viii.; Fabricius, Bibliogr. Græc. v. viii.; Ittigius, Prolegomena, ed. ii. 7. Jerome (Pref. ad Lib. xi Comment. on 2 Thessal., chap. ii. 6) states that one of Josephus's sons, Daniel, was the student of Josephus's teaching for the seventy years of his life, but he probably refers to some other Josephus.—8. At the end of his Antiquities Josephus mentions his intention of writing a work in four books on the Jewish notions of God and his essence, and on the rationale of the Mosaic laws, but this task he never accomplished. At any rate, the works have not come down to us. (See Whiston's note, Ant. ad fin.; Fabricius, Bibliogr. Græc. v. viii.)

The writings of Josephus first appeared in print in a Latin translation, with no notice of the place or date of publication, contained in a portion of the Antiquities. These, with the seven books of the Jewish War, were reprinted by Schübler (Augsb. 1470) in Latin; and there were many editions in the same language of the whole works, and of portions of them, before the edict princes of the Greek text appeared in 1844, edited by A. Schimper. Since then the works of Josephus have frequently been printed, both in the Greek and in many other languages. One of the most valuable editions is that by Hudson (Oxf. 1730, 2 vols. fol.). The text is founded on a most careful and extensive collation of MSS., and the edition is further enriched by notes and indices. The principal English versions are those of Lodge (London, 1692): one from the French of D'Andilly (Oxford, 1676), reprinted at London, 1688); that of L'Estrange (London, 1702), and that of Whiston (London, 1757). The two last-mentioned versions have frequently been reprinted in various shapess. See, besides the authorities already noticed, Grätz, Geschichte d. Juden, iii. 399 sq.; Weber and Holzmann, Gesch. d. Juden, 467 sq.; Joel, Gesch. d. Juden, u. s. Skizzen, i. 225, 319, 444; De Wette, Hebr. jüd. Archäologie, p. 9; Ewald, Gesch. Christi (1850), p. 104 sqq.; Millen, Hist. d. Jews, vol. ii. (see Index in vol. iii); Smith, Dict. Gr. and Rom. Bio. s. v.; Fürst, Bibliotheca Judaica, ii. 117 sq. (J. H. W.)

Josēse (יוֹשֵׁכָה; perhaps, for Joseph, which is sometimes thus written in the Talmud, יושכ for יושך; see Lightfoot on Acts i. 23; and, indeed, יושכ actually appears in some codices for יושך in Matt. Mark xv. Acts; and better MSS. have יושך for יושך in Matt. xiii. others have יושכ in Luke), the name of two or three persons in the New Testament.

1. Eroneously in the A. V. (Luke iii. 29) "Jose" (q.v.).

2. The son of Mary and Cleopas, and brother of James the Less, of Simon, and of Jude; and, consequently, one of those who were called "the brethren" of our Lord (Matt. xxiii. 55; xxvi. 56; Mark vi. 3; xx. 40. 47). See James; Jude. He was the only one of the three brethren who was not an apostle—a circumstance which has given occasion to some unsatisfactory conjecture. It is, perhaps, more reasonable that those of them were apostles than that the fourth was not. A.D. 28.—Ritto. See Jesus Christ.

3. See Barnabas.

Jo'ahshah (Heb. יואשׁ, יואשׁ, prob. estab. v. r. יואשׁ; Vulg. Josea), son of Amaziah, and one of the chief Simeonites, the increase of which was specially induced to them to migrate to the valley of Gedor, where they expelled the aboriginal Habites (1 Chron. iv. 84), B.C. cir. 711.

Jo'ashaph (1 Chron. xi. 43). See Jehoshapha-

Jo'ashvīth (Heb. יואשכה, יואשכה, Jeokrah is sufficient, otherwise i. q. Joshib; Sept. 'ויאת, Vulg. Josapha, son of Eliaam, and (with his brother Jeribai) one of David's famous body-guard (1 Chron. xi. 46). B.C. 1046.

IV. — T T T
tile movements of the five confederate chiefs of the Amorites. Joshua, aided by an unprecedented hailstorm and a miraculous prolongation of the day (see below), obtained a decisive victory over them at Makkedah, and proceeded at once to subjugate the south country as far as Kadesh-barnea. He then returned to the camp at Gilgal near half of Palestine.

In another campaign he marched to the waters of Merom, where he met and overthrew a confederacy of the Canaanite chiefs in the north, under Jabin, king of Hazor; and in the course of a protracted war he led his victorious soldiers to the gates of Zidon and into the valley of Lebanon under Hermon. In six years, six nations, with thirty-one kings, swell the roll of his conquests; amongst others the Anaikim—the old terror of Israel—are specially recorded as destroyed everywhere except in Philistia. It must be borne in mind that the extensive conquests of Joshua were not intended to achieve, and did not achieve the complete extirpation of the Canaanites, many of whom continued to occupy isolated strongholds throughout the land. (See below.)

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

After an interval of rest, Joshua convoked an assembly from all Israel. He delivered two solemn addresses reminding them of the marvelous fulfilment of God's promises to their fathers, and warned them of the conditions on which their prosperity depended; and, lastly, he caused them to renew their covenant with God at Shechem, a place already famous in connection with Jacob (Gen. xxxv, 4) and Joseph (Josh. xxiv, 92). He died at the age of 110 years, and was buried in his own city, Timnath-serah (Josh. xxvii, B.C. 1350. According to Schwarz (Pal. p. 147), his grave, ornamented with a handsome monument, is still pointed out at Ke far Charas.

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

All that part of the book of Joshua which relates his personal history seems to be written with the unconscionable vivid power of an eye-witness. We are not merely taught to look with a distant reverence upon the first man who bears the name which is above every name. We stand by the side of one who is admitted to hear the words of God, and see the vision of the Almighty. The image of the armed warrior is before us as when in the sight of two armies he lifted up his spear over unguarded Ai. We see the majestic presence which inspired all Israel (iv, 14) with awe; the mild father who communed with Achan; the calm, dignified judge who pronounced sentence; the devoted warrior prostrating himself before the captain of the enemy's host. We see the lonely man in the height of his power, separate from those about him, the last survivor, save one, of a famous generation; the honored old man of many deeds and many sufferings, gathering his dying energy for an attempt to bind his people more closely to the service of God whom he had so long served and worshiped, and whom he was ever learning to know more and more.

The great work of Joshua's life was more exciting but less hopeful than that of Moses. He gathered the first fruits of the autumn harvest where his predecessor had reaped the wheat of spring. It was a far lighter task to watch beside the cradle of a mighty nation, and to train its early footsteps in laws which should last for centuries; and it was a fit end to a life of expectation to gaze with longing eyes from Pisgah upon the Land of Promise. But so much brightness gleaned upon the fields of Canaan by Joshua did not light the way for the people with foreboding, fell from him as he sat "under the oak that was by the sanctuary of the Lord in Shechem.

The excitement of his battles was past; and there had grown up in the mind of the pious leader a consciousness that it is the tendency of prosperity and success to make a people wanton and worldly-minded, idolaters in spirit if not in act, and to alienate them from God.

Holy Scripture itself suggests (Heb. iv, 8) the consideration of Joshua as a type of Christ. Many of the Christian fathers have enlarged upon this view; and Bishop Pearson, who has collected their opinions (On the Character and Design of the Jewish History, pp. 251-253), points out the following and many other typical resemblances: (1) the name common to both; (2) Joshua brings the people of God into the land of promise, and divides the land among the tribes; Jesus brings his people into the presence of God, and assigns them their crowns of victory as Joshua succeeded Moses and completed his work, so as the Gospel of Christ succeeding the law, announced (see by whom all that believe are justified from all things from which we could not be justified by the law of Moses (Acts xiii, 39); (4) as Joshua, the minister of Moses, renewed the rite of circumcision, so Jesus, the minister of the circumcision, brought in the circumcision of the heart (Rom. xvii, 8, ii, 29).

3. Difficulties in his Narrative.—It has been questioned whether the captain of the Lord's host (ch. v, 13-15) was a created being or not. Dr. W. H. Mill discusses this point at full length and with great learning, and decides in favor of the former alternative (On the Historical Character of St. Luke's First Chapter, Camb. 1841, p. 92). But J. G. Abicht (De Duce Exercitus, etc., etc., Nov. Thea, Theol. philologico-philogo, 508) is of opinion that he was the uncreated angel, the Son of God. Compare also Pfeiffer, Diff. Script. Loc. p. 173. See ANGEL.

The chronology and the names of the chief conquests are a subject of the most intense difficulty. The chronology is fully discussed by Dean Graves, On the Pentateuch, pt. iii, lect. i. He concludes that the extermination of the Canaanites was justified by their crimes, and that the employment of the Jews in such extermination was quite consistent with God's method of governing the world. Professor Fairbairn (Typeology of Scripture, bk. iii, ch. 4, § 1, ed. 1854) argues with great force and candor in favor of the complete agreement of the principles on which the war was carried on by Joshua with the principles of the Christian dispensation. See CA-

Among the supernatural occurrences in the life of Joshua, none has led to so much discussion as the prolongation of the day of the battle of Makkedah (x. 12-14). No great difficulty is found, in deciding as Pfeiffer has done (Diff. Script. loc. p. 173) between the length of the day and the shortening of the night. Joshua, in connection with both days with the Egyptian tradition mentioned by Herodotus, ii, 142. But since modern science revealed the stupendous character of this miracle, modern criticism has made several attempts to explain it away. It is regarded by Le Clerc, Duhou, and others, as a mere transcription of the chronicle of the east's host. It is called, following Iliken, as a mistake of the time of day: by Winer and many recent German critics, with whom Dr. Davidson (Intro. to O. T., p. 644) seems to agree, as a mistake of the meaning or the authority of a poetical contributor to the book of Joshua. So Ezraki (Gen. Jer. ii, 920) traces in the latter part of verse 13 an
terpolation by the hand of that anonymous Jew whom he supposes to have written the book of Deuteronomy, and here to have misunderstood the vivid conception of an old poet; and he cites numerous similar conceptions from the old poetry of Greece, Rome, Arabia, and Persia. But the literal and natural interpretation of the text, as intended to describe a miracle, is sufficiently vindicated by Deyling, Observ. Sacra, i. 19, p. 100; and G. J. Abicht, De stitumia Sodi sac. Noe, Theol. philol., i. 516; and is forcibly stated by Bishop Watson in the fourth letter in his Apology for the Greek, Roman, Arabic, Persian, and Sabean, from the Italian, Trieste, 1899) understands the word הַלָּדוֹ, "stand still" (lit. be dumb), to signify merely cease to shine, and the expression "hasted not to go down a whole day" as equivalent to withheld its full light. In other words, there was an eclipse: how this could be of service to the Hebrews does not appear.

See GIBSON; JASHER.

4. Length of his Administration.—According to Joshua (Ant. v. 1, 29), Joshua commanded the Jews twenty-five years, but, according to other Jewish chronologers, twenty-seven years. The Tzemach Dardel, on the years of the Jewish era 2489 and 2496, remarks: "It is written in the Seder Olam that Joshua judged Israel twenty-five years, commencing from the year 2488 immediately from the death of Moses, to the year 2516. This, however, would not be known to us but for cabalistic tradition, but in some degree also by reasoning," etc. Hottinger (Synogoga, p. 469) says: "According to the Tzemach Dardel, Joshua was ten years younger than Moses; and when the Israelites left Egypt; she playd the harlot during the forty years in which the Israelites were in the desert. She became the wife of Joshua, and eight prophets descended from her, viz. Jeremiah, Mahasias, Hamanias, Shabbaoth, Baruch, Ezra, and Zedekiah. Some say also that Huliah the prophet was her descendant. Some of those who have endeavoured to reduce the rule of Joshua to seventeen, and others to twenty-one years. There is no good reason for departing from the number assigned by Josephus (see Mith. Quart. Rev. 1856, p. 450). See CUMMINS.

5. Other Traditional Notices.—Lightfoot (Hor. Heb. in Matt. i, 5, and Chornog. Lucea prav. iv, § 8) quotes Jewish traditions likewise to the effect that the sepulchre of Joshua was adorned with an image of the sun in memory of the miracle of Ajaion. The Sept. and the Arabic version of the book of Joshua, xxiv, 30, state that in his sepulchre were deposited the flint-knives which were used for the circumcision at Gilgal (Josh. vi, 2).

There also occur some vestiges of the deeds of Joshua in other historians besides those of his own country. Ptolemy mentions a Phoenician inscription near the city of Timgad in Mauritania, the sense of which was: "We are those who fled before the face of Joshua the robber, the son of Nun" (De Bell. Vandal. ii, 10). Suidas (sub voc Xaraiai) says: "We are the Cannanites whom Joshua the robber persecuted." Compare Fabricii Codex Pseudopigrapharum Vetus Testamenti, i, 889 sq., and the doubts respecting this statement in Dols, De Origine et Progressu Idolatriæ, p. 749 sqq. Ewald (Gesch. Isr. ii, 297, 298) gives sound reasons for forbearing to use this story as authentic history. It is, however, accepted by Hawlinson (Bampton Lecture for 1859, iii, 91).

A letter of Shaubeck, קְרֹבּ, king of Armenia Minor, in the Samaritan book of Joshua (ch. xxvii), styles Joshua הוּשָׁנָה, lapus percussor, "the murderous wolf," or, according to another reading in the book, Joshua hima (p. 154, 1), and in the Shalshelet Rakkabot (p. 96), אֵרֶבּ הַלָּדוֹ, lapus saporinus, "the evening wolf" (comp. Hab. i, 8; Hottinger, Historia Orientalia, Tiguri, 1651, p. 40 sq.; Buddens, Hist. Ecles. p. 964 sq.). A comparison of Hercules, according to the Phoenician and Greek mythology, with Joshua has been attempted by Herckelius (Quid Hercules simus sit ac Josua, Lipsiae, 1768); comp. Anton. Commen. libror. sacr. V. T. iv, et script. siveon, iv, v, Gorlic, 1817.

6. Additional Literature on Joshua personally, and his Exploits.—The principal occurrences in the life of Joshua are reviewed by Bishop Hall in his Contemplations on the O. T. bk. 7, 8, and 9. See also T. Smith, Hist. of Joshua (Lond. 1802); Oetinger, Life of Joshua (Lond. 1860); Ihms, Gesch. Josuah (Zitt. 1759); Masius, Josuahistoria (Antw. 1754); and Flumpetr, Hist. of Joshua (Lond. 1848).

JOSHUA, BOOK OF, one of the first order of the בְּנֵי יָשָׁעַה, or Former Prophets in the Hebrew Canon. See Bible. It is so called from the personage who occupies the principal place in the narration of events contained therein, and may be considered as a continuation of the Pentateuch, since it commences with "ere continuous" in the word וַיָּכֹל, which may be rendered thereupon it hapned.

I. Contents.—This book gives an account of the fortunes of the Israelites from the death of Moses to that of Joshua, the son of Nun. Beginning with the appointment of Joshua to succeed Moses as the leader of the people, it proceeds to describe the arrangements made by Joshua in prospect of passing over Jordan (i. 1-2); the crossing of the river, and the setting up of the memorial on the further side at Gilgal (iii. 11); the dis- may which this occasioned to the Canaanites (v. 1); the circumcision of the males among the people, that rite having been neglected in the wilderness; the observance of the Passover by them in the camp at Gilgal; the giving of the law on the plains of Moab; the division of the land that had entered Canaan (v. 12-18); the encouragement given to Joshua to proceed on his enterprise by the appearance of an angel to him (v. 13-15); the siege and capture of Jericho (vi. 1-7); the defeat of the Israelites at Ai (vii. 1); the taking of Ai (vii. 1—29); the writing of the law on tables of stone; and the solemnity of the consecration of the so-called Gibeonites and the blessings and curses which Moses had written in the book of the law (viii. 30—35); the confederation of the kings of Northern Canaan against the Israelites; the cunning device by which the Gibeonites secured the tribes from being destroyed by the Is- raelites; the indignation of the other Canaanites against the Gibeonites, and the confederation of the kings around Jerusalem against Joshua, with their signal defeat by him (ix. x); the overthrow at the waters of Megiddo of the great northern confederacy, with the destruction of the Anakim (x. 1); the list of the kings of Canaan subdued by the Israelites who had taken under Moses and Joshua (xii. 1); the division of the country, both the parts conquered and those yet remaining under the power of the Canaanites, among the different tribes, chiefly by lot; the setting up of the tabernacle in Shiloh; the appointment of cities of refuge for the Levites for the Levites, and the Reubenites, the Gadites, and the half tribe of Manasseh, to their possessions on the east of the Jordan, after the settlement of their brethren in Canaan (xiii. xxiii); and the farewell addresses of Joshua to the people, his death and burial (xxiii—xxiv). The book naturally divides itself into two parts: the former (i—xii) containing an ac- count of the conquest of the land; the latter (xiii—xxiv) of the division of it among the tribes. These are fre- quently cited distinctively as the historical and the geographical portions of the book.

a. The first twelve chapters form a continuous narra- tive, which seems never to halt or flag. This description is frequently so minute as to show the hand not merely of a contemporary, but of an eye-witness. An awful sense of the divine Presence reigns throughout. We are called out from the din and tumult of each battle-field to listen to the still small voice. The progress of events is followed with intense interest in the first chapter (vers. 6). Step by step we are led on through the solemn preparation, the arduous struggle, the crowning triumph. Moving everything around, yet himself moved by an unseen power, the Jewish leader rises high and calm amid all.

b. The completion of the book (ch. xiii—xxiv) has been aptly compared to the Domesday-book of the Norman
conquerors of England. The documents of which it consists were doubtless the abstracts of such reports as were supplied by the men whom Joshua sent out (xviii, 8) to describe the land. In the course of time it is probable that changes were introduced into their reports—whether kept separately among the national archives or embodied in the contents of a book—by transcribers adapting them to the actual state of the country in later times when political divisions were modified, new towns sprang up, and old ones disappeared (comp. the two lists of towns, Josh. xxi, 1 and xvi, 5, and Josh. xii, 5, etc.).

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

III. Unity.—On this head a variety of opinions have been entertained. It has been asserted, 1. That the book is a collection of fragments from different hands, put together at different times, and the whole revised and enlarged by a later writer. Some make the number of sources whence these fragments have been derived ten (Herwerden, Disp.de Libro Jos. Groning, 1826); others five, including the reviser (Knobel, Exeget. Hdbkr. pt. 13; Ewald, Gesch. der Israel. i, 78 sqq.); while others count as many as seven (Herder, i. 4, 7; Naumann, Exeget. u. Geschichte, i. 4, to p. 326). 2. That it is a complete and uniform composition, intermixed with glosses and additions more or less extensive. 3. That the first part is the composition of one author; but the second betrays indications of being a compilation from various sources (Hävernick, i. 4, 7). 4. That the book must be regarded as uniform throughout, and, as a whole, is the composition of one writer. It is impossible here to enter into all the details of this discussion. The reader will find these fully presented by De Wette, Eichler, ins. a. T. 4, 7th and subsequent editions; Hävernick, Inschr. i. 4, 7, Königs, All. Testament. Studien, i. 4; Maurer, Comment. in Jos., vol. i, Comment. E. T. p. 8; Bleek, Einleit. ins. a. T. p. 311; Knobel, in the Exeget. Handbuch, pt. 13; and Davidson, Introd. to the O. T. i. 7, 412.

a. Events alleged to be twice narrated in this book are, Joshua's decease, ch. xxiii and xxiv; the command to appoint twelve men, one out of each tribe, in connection with the passing over Jordan (iii, 12; iv, 3); the stoning of Achan and his dependents (vii, 25); the setting of an ambush for the taking of Ai (vii, 9, 12); the rest from war of the land (xx, 9, 14); the command to Joshua concerning dividing the land (xili, 5); and the granting of Hebron to Caleb (xiv, 13; xv, 13). This list we have transcribed from Knobel (Exeget. Hdbkr. iii. 498). Is it incredible that Joshua should have twice represented the representatives of the people to address him before his decease? May he not have felt that, spared beyond his expectation, he had been enabled to avail himself of the opportunity thus afforded to address once more to the people words of counsel and admonition? In the case of the grant to Caleb of Hebron there is undoubtedly a repetition of the same facts, but it is not separate stories, as might be inferred from the same pen; for the two statements are made in different connections, the one in connection with Caleb's personal merits, the other in connection with the boundary

rises and occupation allotted to Judah. The taking of Ai will be considered further on. As for the other instances, we leave them to the judgment of our readers. b. Of the alleged discrepancies, one on which much stress has been laid is, that in various parts of the book Joshua is said to have divided the land, and destroyed the Canaanites (xxi, 10; xxii, 7 sqq.; xxiv, 43; xxxii, 4), whereas in others it is stated that large portions of the land were not conquered by Joshua (xxxii, 1 sqq.; xxvii, 14 sqq.; xxviii, 3 sqq.; xxxii, 5-12). It is worthy of note, however, that this is a disagreement which pervades the book, and on which, consequently, no argument for diversity of authorship, as between the first and the second parts of it, can be built. Again, a discrepancy of this sort is of a kind so obvious, that it is exactly such as a compiler, consciously surveying the materials he is putting together, would at once detect and eliminate; whereas an original writer might write so as to give the appearance of it from looking at the same object from different points of view in the course of his writing. Viewed in relation to purpose and effect, the land was conquered and appropriated; Israel was wi

ted in it as mastiff and protector; the power of Israel was broken, and God's covenant to his people was fulfilled. But through various causes, chieully the people's own fault, the work was not literally completed; and therefore, viewed in relation to what ought to have been done and what might have been done, the historian could justly say that there yet remained enemies to be conquered, and some portions of the land is be appropriated. It was intended (Ex. xxxiii, 28, 30) (Ex. xxxiii, 28, 30) that the people should occupy the land little by little. In like manner, it can not be allowed that the general statement (xxi, 29) that they gave the land unto all Israel according to their divisions by their tribes is inconsistent with the fact (xviii, 1; xix, 51) that many subsequent years passed before the process of division was completed and the allotments finally adjusted.

The division of the different tribes, it is said, are stated sometimes with greater, sometimes with less exactness. Now this may be a fault of the surveyors employed by Joshua; but it is scarcely an inconsistency to be charged on the writer of the book who transcribed their descriptions. Again, the divine promise that the people should have the coast of the sea, and the sea westward and southward, is not inconsistent with the fact that the country which Joshua was commanded to divide (xiii, 16) does not extend so far. Again, the statement (xiii, 3) that Ekron, etc., remained yet to be possessed is not inconsistent with the subsequent statement (xiv, 45) that it was assigned to Judah. Again, the promise that the land should be divided into seven equal parts after the death of Caleb is inconsistent with the former text is fact subsequent to the latter, or of his supposition that Ekron was in the possession of Judah at the time of its assignment. Another apparent discrepancy has been found between xxii, 2 and xxiv, 14, 23. How, it is asked, could there be "gross idolatry" amongst a people who had in all things conformed to the law of God given by Moses? This difficulty is dealt with by Augustine (Quast. in Jos. qu. 29), who solves it by understanding the injunction of Joshua to refer to alienation of heart on the part of the people from God. This explanation is fulled by substance by Calvin and others, and it is apparently the true one. Has Joshua known that "gross idolatry" was practiced by the people, he would have taken vigorous measures before this to extirpate it. But against secret and heart idolatry he could use only words of warning.

Another discrepancy is thus set forth by Dr. Davidson (Introd., i. p. 415): "It is related that the people assembled at Sichem, 'under an oak that was by the sanctuary of the Lord,' and 'they presented themselves before God,' implying that the tabernacle and ark were there. But the command from xxviii, 1 had been removed from its former place at Gilgal to Shiloh, where it remained for a long period after Joshua's
death" (1 Sam, iii, 31; iv, 8). Here are several mistakes.
The phrase "before God" (בָּעַל יְהֹוָה) does not necessarily mean "before the ark of the Lord" (comp. Gen. xxvii, 7; Judg. xi, 11; xx, 1; Kings xvii, 1, etc.; Hengstenberg, Brtr, iii, 43); and it is not related that "...the people assembled under an oak that was by the sanctuary of the Lord," but that Joshua "took a great stone..." and set it up in the sanctuary of the Lord (xxvi, 26). The oak referred to was probably a well-known one that stood within the spot which had been the first sanctuary of the Lord in Canaan (Gen. xii, 6, 7), and where the nation had been convened by Joshua, on first entering the Promised Land, and the word is given to the words of the law (Josh. vii, 23-35). No place more fitting as the site of a memorial stone such as Joshua is here said to have set up could be found.

These are the only discrepancies that have even the appearance of seriously affecting the claim of the book to be regarded as the work of one author throughout. The others, which have been discovered and urged by some recent critics in Germany, are such that it seems unnecessary to take up space by noticing them. The reader will find them noted and accounted for in the Introduction to the Commentary on this book, p. 9.

The treatment of the Canaanites which is sanctified in this book has been denounced for its severity by Eichhorn and earlier writers. But there is nothing in it inconsistent with the divine attribute of justice, or with God's ordinary way of governing the world. See above, Joshua; also Canaanites.

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

c. The differences of phraseology and style in different parts of the book might deserve more extended notice were it not for the very unsatisfactory state in which this method of inquiry as yet is. Without doubt, it is true that, if it can be shown that these differences are such as to indicate diversity of authorship, the argument must be admitted as legitimate and the conclusion as valid; but, if dealing with such questions, it would be well if it were settled on some scientific basis what is the competent test in each case, what kind and amount of difference in phraseology and style are sufficient to prove a diversity of authorship. On this head critics seem wholly at sea; they have no common standard to which to appeal; and hence their conclusions are frequently determined by purely personal leanings and subjective affections, and hardly any two of them agree in the judgment at which they arrive. This is remarkably the case with the instances which have been adduced from the book before us. Of these, some are of such a kind as to render an argument from them against the unity of the book little better than puerile. Thus we are told that in some places the word יָקָרַע is used for a tribe, while in others יָקָרַע is used, and this is employed as a test to distinguish one fragment from another. Accordingly, for instance, in chap. xviii, verses 4, 7 are pronounced to belong to one writer, and ver. 11 to another; which is just as if an author, in giving an account of the rebellion of 1745, should speak in the same chapter first of a body of Highlanders as a clan, and then of the same as a sept, and some critic were to come after him and say, "This could not have been written by one author, for he would not have called the same body by different names." Could it be shown that either יָקָרַע or יָקָרַע is a word introduced into the language for the first time at a date much later than the age of Joshua, while the other word had then become obsolete, an argument of some weight, and such as a scholar like Bentley might have employed, would have been advanced; but to attempt to assign passages in the same chapter to different authors and to different epochs simply because synonymous apppellations of the same object are employed, is nothing better than sheer trifling. Again, it is said that "the historical parts have the rare word יָקָרַע, inheritance [rather, division] (xi, 23; xii, 7; xviii, 10), which does not appear in the geographical sections" (Davidson, i, 417). Is chap. xviii, then, not in the geographical part of the book? or does a part become geographical or historical as suits the case, or the preconceived theory of the critic? Similar, the geographical portion has יָקָרַע, Jordan by Jericho, iii, 32; iv, 8; a mode of expression wanting in the historical" (ibid.). True; but suppose there was no occasion to use the phrase in the historical portions, what then? Are they, therefore, from a different pen from that which produced the geographical? Again, in the historical parts occur the words יָקָרַע, the priests, the Levites (iii, 8; viii, 8); or simply יָקָרַע, priests (iii, 6, 15; iv, 6, etc.); but in the geographical sections the same persons are termed sons of Aaron (xxv, 4, 10, 13, 19)" (ibid.). Is there not, however, a reason for this in the fact that, as it was in virtue of their being descended from Aaron, and not in virtue of their being priests, that the Kohathites received their portion, it was more proper to designate them "children of Aaron, of the Levites," than "priests"? And the Levites the Levitical portion, scuts this explanation as one which "only betrays the weakness of the cause." We confess ourselves unable to see this; the explanation is, in our judgment, perfectly valid in itself, and sufficient for the end for which it is adduced; and he has made no attempt to show that it is otherwise. All he says is, "The former is a Deuteronomistic expression; the latter Elohisic." What this is meant to convey we are at a loss to determine, for the only places in which the phrase "sons of Aaron" occurs is in connection with the names of Nadab and Abihu, who were sons of Aaron by immediate descent, and must have been so described by any writer, whether Deuteronomist or Elohisist.

A number of other words are adduced by the opponents of the unity of the book of Joshua for the purpose of showing that it includes fragments from different authors. On these we do not linger. There are two considerations which appear to us entirely to destroy their force as evidences for that which they are adduced to prove. The one of these is that, according to Ewald, "the later historians imitated the words and phraseology of those who preceded them, and, moreover, that they frequently altered the phrases which they found in the earlier documents." On this Kil (from whom we bor- row the statement) remarks with great force, "If that be the case, we can no longer think of peculiarities of style as characteristic signs by which the different sources may be distinguished. His entire theory is therefore built on sand." (Comment. on Josh. Intro, p. 9, E.T.). The other observation we would make is, that supposing it made out by indubitable marks that the book of Joshua has undergone a careful revision by a later editor, who has altered expressions and interpo- lated brief statements that would not seriously impeach the unity of the book, it would still remain substantially the work of one author. We cannot forbear adding that, in all such inquiries, more faith is to be placed on a sound literary perception and taste than on those mi- nuities of expression and phraseology on which so much stress has of late been laid by some of the scholars of Germany and Italy. We follow in us entirely to destroy their impression undoubtedly left on the mind of the reader is, that this book contains a continuous and uniform narrative; and its claims in this respect can be brought into doubt only by the application to it of a species of criti- cism which would produce the same result were it applied to the full narratives of Livy, the commentaries of Cesar, or any other ancient work of narrative.

IV. Date of Composition.—This can only be approxi-
mately determined. Of great value for this purpose is the frequent use of the phrase "until this day" by the writer, in reference to the duration of certain objects of which he writes. The use of such a phrase indicates indisputably that the narrative was written while the objects were still existing, and may also, which may be used with reference to a very limited period; as, for instance, when Joshua uses it of the period up to which the two tribes and a half had continued with their brethren (xxii, 3), or when he uses it of the period up to which the Israelites had been suffering for the iniquity of Jericho (xxvii, 17); compare xxviii, 9, 9. Now we find this phrase used by the historian in cases where the reference is undoubtedly to a period either within the lifetime of Joshua, or not long after his death. Thus it is used with reference to the stones which Joshua set up in the midst of Jordan, in the place where the priests had stood as the people passed over (iv, 9), and which we cannot suppose remained in that position for a very long time; it is used also of Rahab's dwelling in the midst of Israel (vi, 25), which must have ceased, at the furthest, very soon after Joshua's death; also of Caleb's personal possession of Hebron (xiv, 14), which of course terminated soon after the death of Moses. From these notices we infer that the book may have been written during Joshua's lifetime, and cannot have been written long after. With this falls in the use of the first person in the reference to the crossing of the Jordan (see note on 1:13) as a characteristic of the one who was present on the occasion is evidently the writer. To the same effect is the fact that no allusion is anywhere made to anything that is known to have been long posterior to the time of Joshua.

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

V. Author.—Assuming that the book is the production of Joshua, and that it was not written at the time above suggested, the question arises, To whom is it to be ascribed? That it is the work of Joshua himself is the tradition of the Jews (Baba Bathra, cap. i, fol. 14, B); and this has been embraced by several Christian writers, and among others, in recent times, by König, and, as respects the first half of the book, by Hävernick. That this might have been the case as respects all but the concluding section of the book cannot be denied, but the reasons which have been adduced in support of it have not appeared sufficient to the great majority of critics. These may be thus briefly stated: (a) It is evident (xxvi, 25) that Joshua could and did write some account of at least one transaction which is related in this book; (b) the numerous accounts of Joshua's intercourse with God (i. 1; iii. 7; iv. 2; v. 2, 9; vi. 2; vii. 10; viii. 1; x. 8; xi. 6; xii. 2; xiii. 1; xxiv. 2), and with the cause of the Lord's host (ver. 19), must have emamated from himself, (c) no one is more likely than the speaker himself to have committed to writing the two addresses which were Joshua's legacy to his people (xxiii and xxiv); (d) no one was so well qualified by his position to describe the events related, and hence the language of the documents contained in the example of his predecessor and master, Moses, would have suggested to him such a record of his acts; (e) one verse (vi, 25) must have been written by some person who lived in the time of Joshua; and two other verses, v. 1 and 6—assuming the common reading of the former to be correct—are most fairly interpreted as written by actors in the scene.

No one would deny that some additions to the book might be made after the death of Joshua without detracting from the possible fact that the book was substantially his composition. The last verses (xxiv, 23–35) were obviously added by some later hand. If, as is possible, though not certain, some subordinate events, as the capture of Ai (xxiv, 10–15), and of Le-Deshem (Josh. xix, 47; and Judg. xviii, 7), and the joint occupation of Jerusalem (Josh. xv, 63, and Judg. i, 21) did not occur till after Joshua's death, they may have been inserted in the book of Joshua by a late transcriber. The passages xiii, 24; xvi. 10; xvii, 11, which also are subsequently added, are in the book of Judges, may doubtless describe accurately the same state of things existing at two distinct periods.

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

VI. Credibility.—That the narrative contained in this book is to be accepted as a trustworthy account of the transactions it records is proved alike by the esteem in which it was always held by the Jews; by the references to events recorded in it in the national sacred songs (comp. Ps. cxviii, 24; Isa. xxxv, 14; xxxv, 13–15; xxiv, 1–8; Hab. iii, 8–13), and in other parts of Scripture (comp. Judg. xviii, 31; 1 Sam. i, 3, 9, 24; iii, 21; Isa. xxviii, 21; Acts vii, 45; Heb. iv. 8; xi. 30–32; James ii, 25); by the traces which, both in the historic and in the geographical portions, may be found of the use by his contemporaries of documents; by the minuteness of the details which the author furnishes, and which indicates familiar acquaintance with what he records; by the accuracy of his geographical delineations, an accuracy which the results of modern investigation are increasingly demonstrating; by the fact that the transactions described disagree as little as possible with the history and the barriers of their respective territories, but adhered to the arrangements specified in this book; and by the general fidelity to historical consistency and probability which the book displays (Hävernick, Enzl. sec. 148 sq.). Some of the narrations and accounts in the book are wholly in keeping with the avowed relation to the Almighty of the people whose history the book records, and they can be regarded as unhistorical only on the assumption that all miracles are incredible—a question we cannot stop to discuss here. See MİRAÇLER. In the list of such miraculous intercurrences we do not include the standing still of the sun, and the staying of the moon, recorded in ch. x, 12, 13. That passage is apparently wholly a quotation from the book of Joshua. and is probably a fragment of a poem composed by some Israelite on the occasion; it records in highly poetical language the triumph that is won by the Israelites, and the destruction of their enemies, and is no more to be taken literally than is such a passage as Ps. cxxiv, 4–6, where the Red Sea is described as being brightened and darkened, and it retains as skipping like rams. See JASHER. Book or. That God interposed on this occasion to help his people we do not doubt; but that he interposed by the working of such a miracle as the words taken literally would indicate, we see no reason to believe. The archaeological and geographical documents in the book CD; the theory of the taking of AI has been much dwelt upon as presenting a narrative which is unhistorical. It is incredible that Joshua and...
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Joshua two bodies of men, one comprising 30,000 soldiers, the other 5000, to lie in ambush against the city, while he himself advanced on it with the main body of his army; and yet, as it seems, to be what was called "an ambush." What increases the improbability here is that the larger body is never mentioned as having come into action at all, for the whole exploit was accomplished by the 5000 and those who were with Joshua. If the case were stated thus: That Joshua took 30,000 of his warriors, and the ambush sent away 5000 in ambush, while be, with the remaining 25,000, advanced against the city, the narrative would be perfectly simple and credible. The suggestion that verses 12 and 13 are a marginal gloss which has been supposed to creep into the text, leaves the narrative burdened with the improbable statement that 30,000 men could advance on Ai in daylight, and lie concealed in its immediate neighborhood for several hours without their presence being suspected by the inhabitants. Still less probable seems the suggestion that in these verses we have a fragment of an older record. Keil labors to show that from the peculiar style of Semitic narrative it is competent to supply, in ver. 3, in thought, from the subsequent narrative, that from the 30,000 whom Joshua took he selected 5000, whom he sent away by night. But, whatever may be the difficulties in this text, it would be unreasonable to account for its originality by relying on our confidence in the general credibility of the book.

VIII. Relation to the Pentateuch. - The Pentateuch brings down the history of the Israelites to the death of Moses, at which it naturally terminates. The book of Joshua takes up the history at this point, and continues it to the death of Joshua, which furnishes another natural pause. From resemblances between the language and forms of expression used by the author of the book of Joshua and those found in Deuteronomy, it has been supposed that both are to be ascribed, in part at least, to the same writer. This, of course, proceeds on the supposition that the book of Deuteronomy is not the composition of Moses; a question on which it would be out of place to enter here. See Deuteronomy; Pentateuch. It may suffice to observe, that whilst it is natural to expect that many similarities of phraseology and language would be apparent in works so nearly contemporaneous as that of Deuteronomy and that of Joshua, there are yet such differences between them as may cause us to conceive that they are the productions of the same writer. Thus, in the Pentateuch, we have the word Jericho always spelt רְפָאִי, whilst in Joshua it is רְפָעִי; in Deuteronomy we have נֹבֶל (iv, 24; v, 9; vi, 15); in Joshua נֹבֶל (xxiv, 19); in Deuteronomy the inf. of נֹבֶל to fear, is נֹפֶל (iv, 10; v, 26; vi, 24, etc.); in Joshua it is נֹפֶל (xxii, 25); in Deuteronomy we have warriors described as נֹפֶל (i, 18), whilst in Joshua they are called נֹפֶל (i, 14; vi, 2, etc.). We have also in Joshua the peculiar formula נֹפֶל נֹפֶל, which nowhere occurs in the Pentateuch, but only נֹפֶל (Lev. xx, 9, 11, 12, etc.); the expression נֹפֶל נֹפֶל נֹפֶל (iii, 13, 18), which occurs again only in Zech. vi, 5; the phrase, "the heart melt- ed" (ii, 11; vi, 1; vii, 5); etc. In the Pentateuch, also, we find the usage with respect to the third personal pronoun feminine fluctuating between נֹפֶל and נֹפֶל in the book of Joshua the usage is fixed down to נֹפֶל, which became the permanent usage of the language. We find, also, that in the Pentateuch the demonstrative pronoun, with the article, sometimes appears in the form נֹפֶל, while in Joshua and elsewhere it is always נֹפֶל. The evidence here is the same in effect as would accrue in the case of Latin am, an. aman, an, ap, etc., in Greek ἐκεῖνος, οὗτος, ἀλλ' οὗτος. That the author of the book of Joshua derived part of his information from the Pentateuch is evident, if we compare Deut. xviii, 1, 2, and Num. xviii, 20, with Josh. xiii, 14, 38; xiv, 4. Even the unusual form נֹפֶל is repeated in Joshua. Compare also Num. xxxi, 8, with Josh. xiii, 21 and 22. The author of the book of Joshua frequently repeats the statements of the Pentateuch in a more detailed form, and mentions the designation which had taken place when the Pentateuch was written. Compare Num. xxxiv, 13 and 14, with Josh. xiii, 7; Num. xxxiv, 37, with Josh. xiii, 17 sq.; Num. xxxv with Josh. xxii.

There is also considerable similarity between the following passages in the books of Joshua and Judges: Josh. xii, 4, 14; xlv, 13 sq.; Judg. ix, 12, 10; Josh. xv, 19-19, Judg. i, 11-15; Josh. xv, 62, Judg. i, 21; Josh. xvi, 10, Judg. i, 29; Josh. xvii, 12, Judg. i, 27; Josh. xix, 47, Judg. xviii.

VIII. Commentaries. - The exegetical helps expressly on the whole book of Joshua exclusively are the following: of which we designate the most important by an asterisk prefixed: Origine, Selecta (in Opp. ii, 303); also Homilia (ib. i, 397); also Scholia (in Edil. Patr. Gallandii, xiv); Ephraem Syrus, Expositio (in Opp. iv, 292); Procopius, Note (in his Octetraehem); Theodoret, Questiones (in Opp. i, i); Isidore, Commentaria (in Opp.): Beile, Questiones (in Opp. p. 8); Rabanus, in Jos. (in Opp. ed. Marcellus, Darmstadt, 1669); Baldwin, Commentarius (in Opp. i, 921); Stotius, In Jos. (in Opp.); Hasel or Jarcho, Commentarius (from the Heb. [found in the Rabbinical Bibles] by Breithaupt, Goth. 1710, 4to); Rabbi Essai, הָרְפָאִי (ed. with Lat. notes by Abicht, Lips. 1712, 4to; also in the Thes. Nov. Theol-Phil. L. B. 1732, i, 474 sq.); Bornhau or Cellarius, Commentarius [includ. Ruth, Samuel, and Kings] (Basil. 1557, fol.): Lavater, Homilia (Tigur. 1559, 4to); Calvin, Commentarius (in Opp. i); in French, Genev. 1566, 8vo; transl. in Engl. by W. F., Lond. 1576, 4to; by Beveridge, Edinb. 1854, 8vo); Bremius, Commentarius (in Opp. ii); Karoae, Excerpta (in Ugoili Theaem. xx. 497); Strigel, Scholia (Lips. 1570, 1575, 8vo); Fermis, Narrationes [includ. Exodus, etc.] (Colon. 1571, 1574, 8vo); *Marius [Rom. Cath.], Illustratio (Antv. 1754, fol.; also in Walton's Polyglot, vi, and in the Critici Sacri, i); Chytraeus, Praelectiones (Rost. 1577, 8vo); Montanus, Commentarius (Antwerp, 1589, 4to); Heidenreich, Prefigten (Leips. 1589; Sict. 1604, 4to); Heling, Pericopa [includ. Ruth, Samuel, and Kings] (Norh. 1590-4, 2 vols. 8vo); Laniado, יְרָפֶּל (Venice, 1603, fol.); Ibn-Chajim, רְפָאִי [includ. Judges] (Venice, 1609, 8vo; also in Frankfurter's Rabbinical Bible); Serarius, Commentarius (Mogunt. 1609-10, 2 vols. 8vo; Par. 1610, 8vo); Magalianism, Commentarius (Turvon. 1612, 2 vols. 8vo); Hänicken, Reropredigten (Leips. 1613, 4to); Drusius, Commentarius [includ. Judges and Samuel] (Franck. 1616, 4to); Rabbi, Prefigten (Wittenb. 1621, 4to); Stocken, Prefigten (Cassel, 1648, 4to); De Naxera, Commentarii (vol. i, Antw. 1650, ii, Lugd. 1652, fol.; à Lapide, In Jos. [and other books] (Antw. 1638, 4to.; Cocceius, Note in Opp. i, 309; xi, 47); Bonefriée, Commentaria [includ. Judges and Ruth] (Paris. 1659, fol.); Metzullius, Commentarius (Herib. 1661, 4to); Hannoeken, Adnotata (Giss. 1666, 8vo); Osander, Commentarius (Tubing. 1661, fol.); Ising, Exercitationes (Regiom. 1688, 4to); *Schmidt, Praelectiones [with Isaiah] (Hamb. 1698, 1699, 1703, 4to); Heidger, Exegesices [includ. Matthew, etc.] (Tigur. 1706, 4to); Uhlmann, Commentarius [includ. Judges and Samuel, etc.] (Leips. 1718, 4to); Felibien, Commentarii [includ. Judges, Ruth, and Kings] (Paris. 1704, 4to); Le Clerc, Commentarius (Amst. 1708; Tubing. 1735, fol.); Moldenhauer, Erläuterung [includ. Judges, etc.] (Quedlinb. 1774, 4to); Obornik, יְרָפֶּל (in the Hebrew Commentary, Vienna, 1792, 8vo, pt. 156); Lightfoot, Annotationes (in Works, x); Horsley, Notes (in Edil. Cru.;) Meyer, Ammon et alii, etc. (in Ammon and Bethuel, Kendal, 1815, 4to); Kley, Ueberset. (Leips. 1817, 8vo); Paulus, Elccke, etc. (in his Theol.-Ezech. Conserv. Heidelberg. 1822, ii, 149 sq.); Herderwien, Disputationi, etc. (Groningen, 1826, 8vo);
Maurer, Commentar (Stuttgart, 1831, 8vo); *Rosenmüller, Scholia (Lips., 1833, 8vo); *Keil, Commentar (Erlangen, 1817, 8vo; transl. in Clarke's Bib. Edinb., 1857, 8vo; diff. form in moll).—Bashi, commentar under Latin title, etc., 1870, 8vo; *Bush, Notes (N. Y., 1832, 12mo); Miller, Lectures (London, 1852, 12mo); Cumming, Reading (London, 1857, 8vo); *Knobel, Erklärung [including Numbers and Deuteronomy] (in the Kurzgez. Ezcl. Hdbk. Leips., 1861, 8vo); Anon., Gospel in Josh. (London, 1867, 8vo). See Commentaries.

JOSUAH, Spurious writings of. The Samaritans, who for dogmatical purposes endeavored to depreciate the authority of persons mentioned in the latter books of the Old Testament, such as Eli, Samuel, Zerubbabel, and others, had no such interest in attacking the person of Joshua. Eusebius, according to Phoebi Code, p. 280, states: "The Samaritan multitude believes that Joshua, the son of Nun, is the person concerning whom Moses said, ‘The Lord will raise us up a prophet.’" etc. (Compare Lampo, Comment. in Evangelium Johannis, 1, 748.) The Samaritans even endeavored to exalt the memory of Joshua by making him the nucleus of many strange legends which they embodied into their Arabic book of Joshua, a work which seems to have been composed in the Middle Ages, and is quoted by the Rabbinical chroniclers of that period, Sepher Jachash, R. Samuel, and other authors. (Shalhebeth, R., Shabbath, 1, 96, 97, 98.)—Hottinger (Historia Orientalis, p. 40 sqq.); Zanz (Gottesdienstliche Vorträge der Juden, p. 140). Reland supposed that this book was written at an earlier period, and augmented in the Middle Ages; but it is more likely that the whole is a late compilation. (Compare Hottinger in his Morgenland, p. 48.)

The so-called book of Joshua of the Samaritans consists of compilations from the Pentateuch, our book of Joshua, the books of Judges and of Samuel, intermixed with many Jewish legends. Its compiler pretends that it is translated from the Hebrew into Arabic, but it was written in Arabic as the first book in the Arabic manuscript, after the promulgation of the Koran, which exercised a perceptible influence upon it (comp. Reland, De Samaritana, Dissertationes Miscellaneae, ii, 12 and 68; Rödiger, in the Hall. Alg. Lit. Zeit. for 1848, No. 217). The author of this compilation endeavors to prove that the story of Joshua is legendary, and he claims for them the celebrity of the Jews. He attempts to turn the traditions of Jewish history in favor of the Samaritans. By his account Joshua built the temple on Mount Gerizim, and there established public worship; the schism between Jews and Samaritans communicated by Eleazar, who, as well as Samuel, was an apostate and sorcerer; after the return from the Babylonian exile, the Samaritan form of worship was declared to be the legitimate form; Zerubbabel and his sacred books, which were corrupted, were authoritatively rejected; Alexander the Great expressed his veneration, not for the Jews, but for the Samaritans; these were oppressed under the emperor Adrian, but again obtained permission to worship publicly on Mount Gerizim. The whole book consists of a mixture of Biblical history and legends, the manifest aim being to falsify facts for dogmatical purposes. This book is opposed to the history of the Jewish war under Adrian. The only known copy of this book is that of Joseph Scaliger, which is now in the library at Leyden. Although the language is Arabic, it is written in Samaritan characters. Even the Samaritans themselves seem to have lost it. Huntington, in his Epitome (London, 1544), mentions that he had found it at Nablus, nor have subsequent inquiries led to its discovery there. An edition, from the only MS. extant, appeared in 1848 at Leyden, with the title Liber Jacob: Chronicon Samaritanum; eddit., Latine vertit, etc., T. t. J. Juynboll. It seems never to have been recognized by the Samaritans themselves (De Wette, Einl., sec. 171).

Besides this adulatorized version of the history of Joshua, there exists still another in the Samaritan chronicles of Abul Phethach. See Acta Eruditorum Lips., anno 1691, p. 167; Schnurrer's Samaritanischer Briefwechsel, in Kihlhorn's Repertorium, ix, 54; a specimen by Schnurrer, in Paulina's Neues Repertorium, t. 117 sqq.

The mention of the book of Joshua has given rise to some spurious compilations under that name, as well in Hebrew as in English. See JOSHAU.

2. A native of Beth-shemesh, an Israelite, the owner of the field into which the cart came which bore the ark on its return from the land of the Philistines; upon a great stone in the midst of the field the Beth-shemites sacrificed the cows that drew the cart, in honor of its arrival (1 Sam. vi, 14, 18). R.C. 1124.

3. The governor of Jerusalem at the time of the re- formation; upon the occasion of the resurrection of his palace he was situated near one of the idolatrous erection at the city gates (2 Kings xxii, 8). R.C. 628.

4. The son of Joeschach (Hag. i, 1, 12, Zech. iii, i, 8, 9; vi, 11), a high-priest in the time of Haggai and Zechariah; better known by the name of JEHOVAH (q.v.).

Joshua ben-Hanania, one of the most honored men of the Jews in the second century of the Christian era. He was a mechanic by trade, and earned his livelihood by continuing to work at his trade even when teacher of the Rabbinical school at Bkhiin, whither he had removed from Jerusalem after its downfall. He was a disciple of the celebrated Rabbi ben-Zachai, and did honor to his memory as a teacher. The controversies with Gamaliel and Eliezer ben-Hanan, which are celebrated in the Mishna and the Talmud, evince that he was a very formidable antagonist on account of the force of his reasoning powers and the punish- ment of a faculty of mind. After his death Joshua ben- Gamaliel and Akiba to Rome, to plead with Trajan on behalf of his oppressed countrymen, and was received by the emperor with unusual courtesy and respect. It is even reported (though not on any certain authority) that Trajan's daughter, the princess Imra, honored the Jewish Rabbi with her friendship; and that on one occasion, looking at the homely garb in which so much wisdom was encased, she said to him, "Thou art the beauty of wisdom in an abject dress."—"Good wine," Joshua complacently replied, "is not kept in gold or silver vessels, but in vessels of earthen-ware." When we consider that about 100,000 Jews were numbered in the second century among the patrician ladies of Rome, to whose aching hearts the herd of old and disreputable deities presented no ground of comfort or hope at all comparable with that afforded by the Hebraic pure worship—the worship of the one true God—we need not hesitate to credit the truth to his history of the belief of the Christians as a Jewish convert. It is also related that Trajan, in a bantering way, begged the old Rabbi to show him his God, whom he had affirmed to be every where present. After some conversation, Trajan still adhering to his demand, he is said to have given it up (see the God of the Hebrews, Joshua 21, 22). "Well, let us first look at one of his ambassadresses," and, taking the emperor into the open air, he desired him to gaze at the sun in his full meridian power. "I cannot," replied Trajan; "the light dazzles me." "Cast thou then," said the Rabbi, "expect to behold the glory of the God of Israel who art unable to endure the light of one of his creatures?" In such anecdotes attributed to Joshua ben-Hanania the Talmud abounds, and it is evident that in his day Joshua figured as the most able of all the Rabbins. See Etheridge, Intro. to Jewish Law, p. 61; Gritz, Gesch. der Juden, iv, 56 sq. (J. H. W.)

Joshua (or Joshua) ben-Jehudah (called in Arabic Abu-Habbara Farhun, R., 1876, quoted by Earo as R. Joshua, II, 50 sq., "a distinguished Jewish philosopher, grammarian, and commentator of the Karaita sect, flourished in the 11th century. From his great piety and extensive knowledge, he obtained the honorable appellation of the aged or presbyter (Ha-Selem, Al-Sheikh). His expositions, which cover the whole
of the Old Test., are still in MS. The only fragmenta printed are given by Aben-Ezra on Gen. xxviii, 12; xlix, 27; Exod. iii, 2; iv, 4; iv, 8, 13; vi, 3, 12; viii, 22; x, 6; xii, 5; xv, 4; xvii, 14, 16; xxi, 37; xxvii, 7; xxxv, 7; Lev. xvii, 1; Hos. vi, 7; Joel iii, 1; Amos ix, 10; Obad. 17; Jonah iii, 6; Micah ii, 7, 12; Hab. ii, 7; Zeph. iii, 1; Hag. ii, 10; Mal. iii, 16; Dan. i, 3; iv, 17; vii, 17; xii, 2; Psa. lxxxvi, 1; cix, 8; cx, 3; cxxix, 160; cxxxi, 1; cxxix, 6. Compare Delitzsch, in Aarons ben-Elias, פִּסְקֵר (Leipzig, 1844), p. 815 sq. Finsker, Likute Kadmoniot (Vienna, 1860), text, p. 117; Grätz, Geschichten der Juden, vi, 94 sq.; Kittel, Bibel. Cyclop. s. v.

JOSHUA NARBONI. See VIDAL.

Josiah (Heb. Yosiyahu, יְשָׁיָהוּ, healed by Jehovah, Zech. vi, 10, elsewhere in the paragogic form Ἰσσία, Ἰσσία, and in the text of Jer. xxvii, 1, Ἰσσία; Sept., N. T., and Josephus 1 Antiq., "Josia"); Matt. i, 10, 11, the name of two men.

1. The sixteenth king of Judah after its separation from the kingdom of Israel, the son (by Jedidah) and, at the early death of his father, co-regent of his brother Amon (2 Kings xxii, 1; 2 Chron. xxxiii, 1). His history is contained in 2 Kings xxii-xxiv; 30; 2 Chron. xxxiv, xxxv; and the first twelve chapters of Jeremiah throw much light upon the general character of the Jews in his reign. While he was not at all a complete prince, yet his severe and exemplary conduct proves that he did that which was right in the sight of the Lord, and walked in all the ways of David his father, and turned not aside to the right hand or to the left (2 Kings xxii, 2; 2 Chron. xxxiv, 2).

So early as the sixteenth year of his age (B.C. 633) he began to manifest that eminence to integrity in all its forms which distinguished his character and reign; and he was not quite twenty years old (B.C. 629) when he proclaimed open war against it, although more or less favored by many men of rank and influence in the kingdom (2 Chron. xxxiv, 3). He then commenced a thorough purification of the land from all taint of idolatry by going about and superintending in person the operations of the men who were employed in breaking down idolatrous altars and images, and cutting down the groves which had been consecrated to idol-worship (see Berthold, De purgatione per Josiam, Erl. 1817). His character is rendered the more strongly expressed than by ransacking the sepulchres of the Idolatrous priests of former days, and consuming their bones upon the idol altars before they were overturned. This operation, although unexampled in Jewish history, was foretold 345 years before Josiah was born (Jer. xvii, 18). This is a solemn and solemn announcement to Jeroboam the future punishment of his sin. He even named Josiah as the person by whom this act was to be performed, and said that it should be performed in Beth-el, which was then a part of the kingdom of Israel (1 Kings xii, 2). All this seemed much beyond the range of human probabilities; but it was performed to the letter, for Josiah did not confine his proceedings to his own kingdom, but went over a considerable part of the neighboring kingdom of Israel, which then lay comparatively desolate, with the same object in view; and at Beth-el, in particular, executed all that the prophet had foretold (2 Kings xxiii, 1-19; 2 Chron. xxxiv, 3-7, 32). In these proceedings Josiah seems to have been actuated by an absolute hatred of idolatry, such as no other king since David had manifested, and which David had scarcely occasion to manifest; for the people had been too late; the heart of the people had hardened; and this recoil of the public cultus under Josiah that it forms an epoch whence Jeremiah dates many of his prophecies (Jer. xxx, 8, 11, 29).

2. In the eighteenth year of his reign and the twenty-sixth of his age (B.C. 627), when the land had been thoroughly purified, and all that belonged to it, Josiah proceeded to repair and beautify the Temple of the Lord (2 Kings xxii, 8; xxiii, 23). In the course of this pious labor the high-priest Hilkiah discovered in the sanctuary a volume, which proved to contain the books of Moses, and which, from the terms employed, seems to have been considered the original copy of the law as written by Moses himself. This volume has been much anxious discussion and some rash assertion. Some writers of the German school allege that there is no external evidence—that is, evidence besides the law itself—that the book of the law existed till it was thus produced by Hilkiah. This assertion it is the less necessary, as it will prove here, and it will be hotly contested in the article PENTATEUCH. (See also De Wette, Beitr., i, 168 sq.; Bertholdt, Progr. de eo quod in purgatione acoror, Jut. per Josiam facta omnium maxime congenti memorabile, Erl. 1817; also in his Opusc. p. 82 sq.) But it may be observed that it is founded very much on the fact that the age was greatly estimated when some parts of the law were read to him. It is indeed perfectly manifest that he had previously been entirely ignorant of much that he then heard; and he rent his clothes in consternation when he found that, with the best intentions to serve the Lord, he and all his people had been living in the Violation of the Law. What, then, is clared to be of vital importance. It is certainly difficult to account for this ignorance. Some suppose that all the copies of the law had perished, and that the king had never seen one. But this is very unlikely; for, if there have been, the pious king was likely to have been the possessor of one. The probability seems to be that the passages read were those awful denunciations against disobedience with which the book of Deuteronomy concludes, and which, for some cause or other, the king had never before read, or which had never before been read to him. This was the same strong conviction of the imminent dangers under which the nation lay, as now when read to him from a volume invested with a character so venerable, and brought with such interesting circumstances under his notice. We should bear in mind that it is very difficult for us in this age to be perfectly estimated when some of the opportunities which were then open to laymen of acquiring literary knowledge connected with religion. The special commission sent forth by Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xvii, 7) is a proof that even under such kings as Ass and his son the Levites were insufficient for the religious instruction of the people. What then must have been the amount of information accessible to a generation which had grown up in the reigns of Manasseh and Amon? We do not know that the law was read as a stated part of any ordinary public service in the Temple of Solomon (unless the injunction Deut. xxv, 10 was obeyed for seven years), though God was worshipped there with daily sacrifice, psalmody, and prayer.

The king, in his alarm, sent to Huldah "the prophetess" for her counsel in this emergency [see HULDAH]: her answer assured him that, although the dread penalties threatened by the law had been incurred and would be inflicted, he should be gathered in peace to his fathers before the days of punishment and sorrow came.

It was perhaps not without some hope of averting this doom that the king immediately called the people together at Jerusalem, and enjoined them in a solemn renewal of the ancient covenant with God. When this had been done, the Passover was celebrated with careful attention to the directions given in the law, and on a scale of unexampled magnificence. (On the public importance of this era, see Ezek. i, 2.) But all was not in this manner hastened; the kingdom of Judah was turned not from the fierceness of his great wrath, where with his anger was kindled against Judah" (2 Kings xxiii, 8-20; xxiii, 21-27; 2 Chron. xxxiv, 8-33; xxxvi, 1-19).

3. That removal from the world which had been promised to Josiah as a blessing was not long delayed, and was brought about in a way in which he probably had not expected. Pharaoh-necho, king of Egypt, sought
a passage through his territories on an expedition against the Chaldeans; but Josiah refused to allow the march of the Egyptian army through his dominions, and prepared to resist the attempt by force of arms. His reason for this decision has usually been assumed to have been a high sense of loyalty to the Assyrian monarch, whose tributary he is supposed to have been. Such is at least the conjecture of Pridesux (Consection, anno 610) and of Milman (History of the Jews, i. 813). But the Bible ascribes no such chivalrous motive to Josiah, and it does not occur to the historian who has assumed the death of Zephaniah as a sequel of the war which we are here assumed to have been started by a design of the Egyptians to force the submission of the small country of Judah, which they were about to attack (2 Kings, xxi, 19). Josiah’s resistance merely to Fate urging him to destruction, nor to the author of 1 Esdr. i, 26, who describes him as acting wilfully against Jerusalem’s advice; nor to Ewald, w. (Gesch. Isr. iii., 707) conjectures that it may have been the constant aim of Josiah to fortify not only the ritual, but also the kingdom of David in its full extent and independence, and that he attacked Necho as an invader of what he considered as his northern dominions. This conjecture, if equally probable with the former, is equally without adequate support in the Bible, and is already contrary to the character of Josiah. Necho was very unwilling to engage in hostilities with Josiah; the appearance of the Hebrew army at Megiddo (comp. Herod. ii., 159), however, brought on a battle, in which the king of Judah, although disguised for security, was so desperately wounded by a javelin that his attendants, hailng him from the war-chariot and placed him in another, in which he was taken to Jerusalem, where he died, after a reign of thirty-one years. B.C. 609. (See J. R. Kiesling’s Es- say on this subject, Lips. 1754.) No king that reigned in Israel was ever more deeply lamented by all his subjects than Josiah; and we are told that the prophet Jeremiah composed on the occasion an elegiac ode, which was long preserved among the people (2 Kings xxiii, 29-37, 2 Chron. xxxvi, 20-27). See LAMEN- TATIONS. Compare the narrative in 2 Chron., xxxix, 25 with that in Jer., xxxii, 19, and with Jackson, in On the Creed, bk. viii, ch. xxiii, p. 678. The prediction of Huldah that he should “be gathered into the grave in peace” must be interpreted in accordance with the explanation of that phrase given in Jer. xxxiv, 5. Some excellent remarks on this may be found in Jackson, in On the Creed, bk. xxv, ch. xxxvi, p. 644. Josiah’s reformation and his death are commented on by bishop Hall, Contemplations on the O. T., bk. xx. See also Howard, History of Josiah (London, 1842). 4. It was in the reign of Josiah that a nomadic horde of Scythians and Ascalonites, or a mixed rabble of desert-dwellers, flocked towards Egypt by the way of Philistia; somewhere southwards of Ascalon they were met by messengers from Psammetichus and induced to turn back. They are not mentioned in the historical accounts of Josiah’s reign; but Ewald (Die Paumen, p. 165) conjectures that the 50th Psalm was composed by king Josiah during a siege of Jerusalem by these Scythi- ans. The town Bethelanan is said to derive its Greek name Scythopolis (Reland, Palest., p. 992; Lightfoot, Chron. Marc. vii, § 2) from these invaders. The facility with which Josiah appears to have extended his author- ity over the Philistines and the whole of the Israelite dominions is another indication of the fact that the Assyrian conquerors of that land were themselves at this time under the restraining fear of some enemy. The prophecy of Zephaniah is considered to have been written amid the terror caused by their approach. The same people are named in 1 Chron. xxvi, 15 and in a later passage (2 Kings ix, 9). See Ewald, Gesch. Isr. iii., 689. Abarbanel (ap. Eisenmenn, Ent, Jud. i, 868) records an oral tradition of the Jews to the effect that the ark of the covenant, which Solomon deposited in the Temple (1 Kings vi, 19), was removed and hidden by Josiah in expectation of the destruction of the Temple, and that it will not be brought again to light until the coming of Messiah. 2. Son of Zephaniah, and a resident of Jerusalem after the captivity, in whose house the prophet was directed to crown the high-priest Jeshua as a type of the Messiahs (Zeck. vi, 10). B.C. prob. 520. “It has been conjectured that Josiah was either a goldsmith, or treasurer of the Temple, or one of the keepers of the Temple, who received the money for the temple taxes; but it is certain that nothing is known of him. Possibly he was a descendant of Zephaniah, the priest mentioned in Jer. xxii, i, xxxvii, 8; and if Hen in Zech. vi, 15 be a proper name, which is doubtful, it probably refers to the same person, elsewhere called Josiah.” Josiah is an Aramaicized form of the name of (a) ‘I- aqia, Vci. ‘I- tisi. Josiah (q. v.), king of Judah (1 Esdr. i, 1, 7, 18-21, 25, 28, 29, 32-34; Exclus. xlive, 14; Bar. i, 8; Matt. i, 10, 11): (b) ‘I- aqia v. t. ‘I- aqia, Vulg. Massiae), Jeshiaiah (q. v.), the son of Athaliah (1 Esdr. viii, 33; comp. Ezra viii, 7). Josi’bi’ah (Heb. Yoshibiyah, זֶבִּיָּה, dweller with Jehorak; Sept. Isiaia v. r. Asaphia), son of Seriah and father of Jehu, which last was one of the Simeon- ites who migrated to Gedor (1 Chron. iv, 35). B.C. ante 711. Josipl’i’ah (Heb. Yosibiyah, זֶבִּיָּה, consecrated by Jehorak; Sept. Isiaia v. r. Asaphia), one of the “sons” of Se- limoth (as the Heb. text now stands), a chief Israelite, whose son (Ben-Josiphia) returned with a company of 100 males under Ezra to Jerusalem (Ezza viii, 10). B.C. 458. He was one of the scribes that translated the Hebrew text in the beginning of the verse, and is supplied by the Sept. and the author of 1 Esdr. viii, 36, as well as (less correctly) in the Syriac; namely, Bazari (Bozari), i.e. 232, omitted from similarity to 232 preceding; thus making Bani (q.v.) the son of Selimoth, and the leader of the party of returned exiles. JOSIPPION. See Joseph Ben-Gonia. Joso, Toriai, one of Whitefield’s preachers, a na- tive of Scotland, was a sea-captain by profession. He had a vigorous mind, had been fond of the Bible from his youth, and had acquired a good degree of education by industrious study alone. He was converted by the preaching of Mr. Wesley at Robin Hood’s Bay, and soon after began to preach to and exhort his sailors with much effect, who were converted and did likewise. After various reverses in his business, he was constrained by Whitefield to give himself wholly to the ministry, and in 1766 he became his colleague at the Tabernacle and Tottenham Court. His preaching in London had from the first drawn great throngs and been very popular, and he was the only second to the master of White- field, whose associate he was for thirty years in the Cal- vinistic Methodist societies of London, usually itiner- ating in England and Wales four or five months annu- ally. See Stevens, Hist. of Methodism, i, 450. (G. L. T.) Jost, Isaac Marcus, one of the most celebrated writers of modern Jews, the first of his people since the days of Josephus to write a complete history of the Jews, was born at Berneburg, Germany, Feb. 22, 1788. His father, a poor blind man, the head of a family of twelve children, was obliged to depend mainly upon Marcus, the only boy, for support, and great and severe were the struggles which he had to endure until, in 1803, his father died, and the youth removed to Wolfen- buttel, where his grandfather resided. He was now admitted to a Jewish orphan asylum, where one of his most intimate associates was the celebrated Jewish am- bassador Ladislaus Zundel, and together they both, by hard study, succeeded in bringing it so far in the course of the six months terminating with April, 1809, that we, Zanz in Wolfenbuttel and I in Brunswick, were put in the senior class (prima) in the gymnasium.” (Pancheles, Sippurim, ...


**JOTBATHAH**

3 col, Prague, 1855, p. 141 sq.). After four years of hard study he removed to the University of Göttingen, where for one year and a half he pursued with great earnestness studies in history, philology, philosophy, and theology, and then transferred to the University of Berlin. In the capital of Prussia Jost soon won the hearts of many of his people, and, though comparatively a youth, yet succeeded in the management of a first-class school, to which flocked the children of Jew and Gentile. In 1885 he accepted the head-mastership of the Jewish high-school at Frankfurt-on-the-Main, and in that capacity spent the remainder of his days. He died November 20, 1880, at Frankfurt-on-the-Main. While at Berlin he published: (1) The gigantic historical work entitled Geschichte der Israelis seit der Zeit der Maccabäer bis auf unsere Tage (Berlin, 1839-29, 2 vols., 8vo), being an abridgment, with corrections, of the former work; and (2) Allgemeine Geschichte des israelitischen Volkes, etc. (Berlin, 1831-52, 2 vols., 8vo), a town, probably of Judah, the residence of Haruz, whose daughter Meshullemeth became the wife of king Manasseh and mother of Amon (2 Kings xxxi, 19). M. de Saulcy (Narart, i, 94, note) suggests the identification of Tifa with Tyme, a village shown on the north side of the valley (wady Ribah), north of Lebanon and south of Nabíla (Robinson's Researches, ii, 92); but this would lie within the precincts of the late kingdom of Israel. It is usually identified with Jobath or Jothathah of the Exode (Num. xxvi, 8, 84; Deut. x, 7), as the names are essentially the same in the Heb.; but the latter is spoken of only as a region, not an inhabited town, and is out of the bounds of the Jewish monarchy. “The Arabic equivalent for Jobath is et-Taibib, or et-Taibibeh, and no less than three sites of this name are met with in modern Palestine. One is considerably south of Hebron (Robinson, Bib. Res. ii, 472); another to the west of that city (ib. p. 427-429); and the third is north of Jerusalem, in the country of Benjamin. This last is most likely to answer to Jobath, for the two first-named places are very insignificant, and never have been of much importance; whereas this is the site of Dr. Robinson as crowning a conspicuous hill, skirted by fertile basins of some breadth, . . . full of gardens of olives and fig-trees. The remarkable position (he adds) would not probably have been left unoccupied in ancient times (Biblic. Res. ii, 121, 124). In a subsequent visit to the place he was struck both with the depth and quality of the soil, which were more than one would anticipate in so rocky a region (Later Bib. Res. p. 290). These extracts explain while they justify the signification ‘goodness,’ which belongs both to Jobath and Taibibeh, against this explanation; however, he counts among his very few, very strong objections, namely, its distance from Jerusalem, and the fact of the probable coincidence of this site with that of Orphah (q. v.).

**Jotbath** (Deut. x, 7). See **JOTBATHAH**.

**Jotbath** [some Jobbath] (Heb. Yotbath, יֹתוַבָּת, goodness, i.e. pleasantness, compare Agapothos [the name is the same with יֹתוַבָּת, Yotbath, with מָמָּג appended]; Sept. Ἰφραμία. v. r. Toibath, etc., Auth. Vers. in Deut. x, 7, “Jothabite”), the thirty-fourth station of the Israelites along their journeying out of Egypt, in the desert, situated between Hor-hagidgad and Ebronah (Num. xxxiii, 38, 34), and again their forty-first station, between Gudgodah and the Red Sea (Deut. x, 7), described in the latter passage as a land of rivers יֹתוָבָת.
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winter-brook) of waters." The locality thus indicated is probably the expanded valley near the confluence of wady Jerachef in its southern part with wady Mukatta el-Tuwariq and others (Robinson's Researches, i, 201), especially wady Khirbat el-4d, which nearly approaches the Heb. name (Jour. Sac. Lit. April, 1860, p. 47-49). This is generally a region answering to the description of fertility (Borain's Descent of Sinai, p. 295). Schwarz (Palest., 218), however, thinks wady Tiba, nearer the Akabah, is meant. See EXOD.


I. The second named of the six sons of Jahdai, of the family of Caleb the Hezronite (1 Chron. ii, 47). B.C. post 1612.

2. The youngest of Gideon's seventy legitimate sons, and the only one who escaped when the rest were massacred by the order of Abimelech (Judg. ix, 5). B.C. 1292. When the fratricide was made king by the people of Shechem, the young Jotham was so daring as to make his appearance on Mount Gerizim for the purpose of lifting up a protesting voice, and of giving vent to his feelings (see Thomson, Land and Book, ii, 210). This he did in a beautiful parable, wherein the trees are represented as making choice of a king, and bestowing on the bramble the honor which the cedar, the olive, and the vine would not accept. See FABLE. The obvious application, which, indeed, Jotham failed not himself to point out, must have been highly exasperating to Abimelech and his friends; but the speaker fled, as soon as he had delivered his parable, to the tower of Beer, and remained there out of his brother's reach (Judg. ix, 7-21).

We hear no more of him; but three years after, if then living, he saw the accomplishment of the malversation he had pronounced (Judg. ix, 57).

3. A person named by Josephus (Jos2:24, Ant. viii, 1, 9) as the son of Bukki and father of Meraioth, in the regular line of Phinehas's descendants, although he (incorrectly) states that these lived privately; he seems to refer to Zerahiah (q. v.) of the scriptural list (1 Chron. vii, 5). See HIGH-PRIEST.

4. The eleventh king of the separate kingdom of Judah, and son of Uzziah (by Jeremiah, daughter of Zado, 2 Kings xvi, 22; 2 Chron. xxvi, 21, 22; 2 Chron. xxvi, 23). B.C. 742. See EZRA. For the chronological difficulties of his reign (see Crisius, De ara Jothamica, Lipp. 1756; Winer's Realwörterb., s. v.), see CHRONOLOGY. Jotham profited by the experience which the reign of his father, and of the kings who preceded him, afforded, and he ruled in the fear of God, although he was unable to correct all the corrupt practices into which the people had fallen. His sincere intentions were rewarded with a prosperous reign. He was successful in his wars. The Ammonites, who had "given gifts" as a sort of tribute to Uzziah, but had ceased to do so after his levies had been made, sent presents to Jotham. The principal of the Temple was rebuilt by him on a more magnificent scale; the quarter of Ophel, in Jerusalem, was strengthened by new fortifications; various towns were built or rebuilt in the mountains of Judah; and castles and towers of defence were erected in the wilderness. Jotham died greatly lamented by his people, and was buried in the sepulture of the kings (2 Kings xv, 38; 2 Chron. xvii, 3-7). B.C. 631. His reign approaches the time of the ministrations of the prophets Isaiah, Hosea, and Micah (Isa. i, 1; vii, 1: Hos. i, 1; Mic. i, 1). See JUDAH.

5. A high-priest named by Josephus (Jos2:24, Ant. x, 8, 6) as son of Joel and father of Urijah in the regular incumbency; probably the Amariah (q. v.) of 1 Chron. vii, 11). See HIGH-PRIEST.

Joufroy, THOLODORE SIMON, a noted modern French eclectic philosopher, was born at Pontets in 1768. In 1822 he became professor of philosophy at the College of France, and continued in this relation until 1827. He died in 1842. He was by far the most celebrated and of Cousin, and very popular as a writer of great elegance of style and terseness of diction. He first became known to the public at large through the medium of a translation of Dugald Stewart's Moral Philosophy. To this translation he prefixed an essay or preface, in which he vindicates the study of intellectual science against the attacks of those who would banish all except natural philosophy, out of the domain of human investigation. "Nothing," says Morell (Hist. of Med. Phil. p. 662), "can exceed the clearness, and even the beauty, with which he establishes in this little production the terms on which he signs himself an eclectic philosopher." To a careful observer it is evident that he deeply imbibed the principles and the spirit of the Scot-tish metaphysicians, whilst, at the same time, he would generally rise to those more expansive views of philosophical truth which were inculcated in the lectures of his master as instructed in the "Metaphysique des Phénomènes" (Paris, 1833; 2d edit. 1838-48), the second work to which we desire to call attention, "we see," says Morell, "the zealous pupil and successor of Cousin the genuine modern eclectic, touching more or less upon all the points of his master's researches in the philosophy of nature and morals. We have no space here to elucidate his system, and refer our readers to Morell. His works were published entirely in 6 octavo vola. in 1836. See Caro, in the Revue de deux Mondes, March 18, 1853.

Joumal, or DIURNAL, is the ancient name of the day hours contained in the Broadway (q. v.). It was also known in monasteries the day of daily expenses.

Journey (prop. 722, to pull up the stakes of one's
JOVE

In the East, a day's journey is reckoned about sixteen or twenty miles. To this distance around the Hebrew camp were the quails scattered for food for the people (Numb. xi. 31). Shaw computes the eleven days' journey from Sinna to Kadesh Barnea (Deut. i. 2) to be about one hundred and ten miles. A Sabbath-day's journey (Acts i. 12) is reckoned by the Hebrews at about seven furlongs, or a little less than the length of a bow-stick, but it is said that if any Jew travelled above this from the city on the Sabbath he was beaten. See SABBATH-DAY'S JOURNEY.

JOVE. See Jupiter.

Jouvencel or Jouvency, Joseph de, an eminent Jesuit, was born at Paris Sept. 14, 1648. He taught rhetoric with uncommon reputation at Caen, La Flèche, and Paris, and at length was invited to Rome, in order to continue the "History of the Jesuits" with more freedom than he could have enjoyed at Paris. His other principal works are two volumes of speeches, a small tract entitled De Ratione Discendi et Docendi, and notes on different classical writers. In his history of the Jesuits he avowed his determination to justify father Segneri, who was executed for enforcing the bigoted assassin Châtel in his attempt on the life of Henry IV. In France Parliament prohibited the publication or circulation of the work on that account. See Gorton, Dict. s. v.

Jovian (sometimes, but erroneously, called Jovinius), fully Flavius Claudius Jovinus, Roman emperor from A.D. 363 to 364. His predecessor Julian was slain on the field of battle, in his unhappy campaign against the Persians, June 26, A.D. 363. Jovianus, finding the continuation of the unfortunate struggle ineffectual in its destruction, and secured quite humane terms from the Persians, and, once free from the attacks of foreign enemies, he at once initiated measures to establish his authority in the West, and thereafter his time was mainly devoted to administrative and legislative business. Immediately after his election to the imperial dignity Jovianus had professed himself to be a Christian, and one of his first measures when peace was restored to his dominions was the celebrated edict by which he placed the Christian religion on a legal basis, and thus put an end to the persecutions to which the Christians had been exposed during the short reign of Julian. The heathen churches were, however, equally protected, and no superiority was allowed to the one over the other. The different sects assailed him with petitions to help them against each other, but he declined interfering, and referred them to the decision of a general council; and the Arians showing themselves most troublesome, he gave them to understand that impartiality was the first duty of an emperor. His friend Anthanasius was restored to his see at Alexandria. He died suddenly on his way home from the Orient, A.D. 364. It is possible, though not probable, that he died of a violent death, to wit, Ammannius Marcellinus (xxv, 5-10) seems to allude when he wrote the history of the Christian church, that with that of Eumilius Scipo. See De la Bitterie, Histoire de Jovin (Amsterdam, 1740), the best work on the subject.—Smith, Dict. Grk. and Rom. Biog, ii. 615.

Jovianus, emperor. See Jovian.

Jovinian, one of the early opponents of monachism, and, in a measure, one of the earliest reformers before the Reformation, flourished near the end of the 4th century. He was an Italian, but whether a native of Rome or Milan is not known. He taught in both cities, and gained a number of adherents. His real opinions, freed from the misrepresentations of his opponents, it is hard

father of the 4th century. He evidently maintained "that there is but one divine element of life, which all believers share in common; but one fellowship with Christ, which proceeds from faith in him; but one new birth. All who possess this in common with each other —all, therefore, who are Christians in the true sense, not barely in outward profession—have the same calling, the same profession, the same hope, and that the diversity of outward circumstances creating no difference in this respect, that all persons whatsoever, if they keep the vows they make to Christ in baptism and live godly lives, have an equal title to the rewards of heaven, and, consequently, that the same free estate of life is no more acceptable to God than those who live in wedlock, and nourish their bodies with moderation and sobriety." He also held that Mary ceased to be a virgin by bringing forth Christ; that the degrees of future blessedness do not depend on the meritoriousness of our good works; and that a truly overrated Christian, so long as he is such, cannot sin whiffly, but will resist and overcome the temptations of the devil. Yet, while upholding all these views, Jovianus himself remained single, and lived like all other monks, and his enemies even admit that the tenure of his life was always blameless. It is true that his opinions at Milan, but, being there denied by the stern Ambrose all liberty of speech, he went to Rome, which, as appears from the evidence of Jerome, was one of the last places to entertain the ascetic fanaticism, nor was it until after monasteries had darkened all parts of the East, as well as those of the West, that such monastic schemes were seen in that city. There, according to the report of pope Syricius and others, the doctrine of the Milanese monk had made many converts, so that the Church, "torn by dogs" in a manner heretofore unheard of, doubted where to look for an ascetic might proceed. A few of the holy men of the clergy had listened to Jovianus; and eight persons are named as his supporters, who, with him, were, by a unanimous decision of the Romish clergy, condemned and excommunicated in a council held at Milan in 390, as the authors of a "new heresy, and of blasphemy; and that they were excommunicated, and that he was not permitted to return, and that the cries of the multitude, De bone conjugali, and in others of a similar kind, he labors hard, by wily sophistry, to reconcile the prevailing absurdities with reason and Scripture. The mild, plious, and honest Augustine, however, was not the man to be the Church's thorough-going champion on this notable occasion. He had a better man at hand; "one who, by various learning, by a voluble pen, as well as by rancor of temper, and boundless arrogance, and a blind devotion to whatever the 'Church' had sanctioned, was well qualified to do the necessary work of cajoling the simple, of inflaming the fanatical, of frightening the timid, of calculating the ignorant, to sacrifice, in cold, of quashing, if it could be quashed, all inquiry concerning 'authorized' errors and abuses. The Church, right or wrong, was to be justified; the objector, innocent or guilty, was to be crushed; and Jerome would scruple nothing could he but accomplish so desirable an object."
JOY
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See Jerome. But, notwithstanding these attacks by the Church's three greatest doctors—Augustine, Ambrose, and Jerome, whose great irritation and anxiety for the cause of the Church is sufficiently betrayed by their determination to oppose Jovinianism jointly, though living at points quite remote from each other—the "hersy," instead of dying out, spread, and was favorably thought of and accepted in different parts of Christendom, and no doubt made easier the task of Vigilantius and of Luther. Neander does not hesitate to rank the services of Jovinian so high as to consider him worthy of a place by the side of Luther. See Neander, CA. Hist. ii. 265; Schaff, CA. Hist. ii. 226 sq.; Ambrosius, Epist. 42; Augustine, De Haeres, c. 92; Bonaparte, Annales Ecc. p. 590, 412; Walch, Ketzerhistorie, iii. 635 sq.; Baur, Christ. Kirche (4th to 6th century), p. 911 sq.; Lindner, De Joviniano et Vigilantiano pururio doctrina antiteismos (Lpz. 1889).

Joy (usually some form of θαυμάζει, which prop. means to spin round with pleasurable emotion, and is thus a stronger term than ηδονή, which expresses gladness; but less so than θαυμάζει, to excel or leap with exuberant joy; Gr. prop. χαρᾶ), a delight of the mind arising from the consideration of a present or assured approaching possession of a future good (Ezra vi, 16; Euth. viii, 16). 1. Natural joy is of various degrees: when it is moderate, it is called gladness; when raised on a sudden to the highest degree, it is then exultation or transcendent; when we wish our desires by our possessions, it is consentment; when our desires are raised high, and yet accomplished, this is called satisfaction. When our joy is derived from some comical occasion or amusement, it is mirth; if it arise from considerable opposition that is vanquished in the pursuit of the good we desire, it is then called triumph; when joy has so long possessed the mind that it is settled into a temper, we call it cheerfulness; when we rejoice upon the account of any good which others obtain, it may be called sympathetic or congratulation. 2. Moral joy is also of several kinds, as the self-approbation, or that which arises from the performance of any good actions; this is called peace, or serenity of conscience; if the action be honorable and the joy rise high, it may be called glory. There is also a spiritual joy, which the Scripture calls a "fruit of the Spirit" (Gal. v. 22), "the joy of the Spirit" (Phil. i. 25), and "a thing of hope" (Rom. xii. 6). The objects of it are—(1.) God himself (Ps. xii. 4, Isa. lx. 10). (2.) Christ (Phil. iii. 3; 1 Pet. i. 8). (3.) The promises (Ps. cxix. 162). (4.) The administration of the Gospel and Gospel ordinances (Ps. lixix. 15). (5.) The excellency of the interest (Isa. xlv. 16). (Rev. xi. 16, 17). (6.) The happiness of a future state (Rom. v. 2; Matt. xxv). The nature and properties of this joy: [1.] It is, or should be, constant (Phil. iv. 4). [2.] It is unknown to the men of the world (1 Cor. ii. 14). [3.] It is unspeakable (1 Pet. i. 8). [4.] It is permanent (John xvi. 22). See Watts, On Pious. sec. 11: Gill's Body of Div. Inst, iii, 111, 8vo ed.; Grove's Moral Phil. i. 556.

Joy of God relates, 1. To the delight and complacency he has in himself, his own nature, and perfection. 2. He rejoices in his own works (Ps. cxxv. 81). 3. In his Saviour Christ Jesus (Matt. xi. 17). 4. In the work of redemption (John iii. 15). 5. In the subjects of his grace (Ps. cxviii. 11; Zeph. iii. 17; Ps. cxlix. 4). Joy or Joye, George, an early promoter of the Reformation, a native of the county of Bedford, was educated at Cambridge, and he graduated M.A. in 1517. An associate of Tyndale, he was in 1527 accused of heresy, and obliged to go to Germany, where he resided for many years. He was concerned in the superintendence of Tyndale's Bibles, printed at Antwerp, and finally returned to his native country, but the time of his death is unknown. Besides his translation of part of the Bible, he published On the Unity and Schism of the ancient Church (1584)—Subservient of More's False Foundation (1584)—Commentary on Daniel, the messes from Melanchthon, etc. See Gorton, Biog. Dict. s. v.

Joyner, James E., a minister of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, was born in Amherst County, Va., and died at his own home in Henry County, Va., March 15, 1968. For more than thirty years Joyner served the Church with great acceptability and usefulness in various appointments. His preaching was earnest, pointed, and eminently practical. During the late war he served as a chaplain in the Confederate States army, and exerted among the officers and men an influence for good which was felt and acknowledged by all. —Conf. Minutes E. M. Church South, iii, 203.

Jos'abad (Heb. Ṣōḇāḇāḏ), a contraction of Ṣēw'haḥzādah; Sept. Ἰωσῆβάζη, but sometimes in Hose. Ῥωσῆβάζη; v. r. Ἰωσῆβαζ; but sometimes in Neh. Author. Vern. "Josabod" in 1 Chron. xxi. 4, the name of several men.

1. A Gederathite, one of the famous Benjazite archers who joined David at Ziklag (1 Chron. xii. 4). B.C. 1055.

2. A chieflard of Manasseh, who re-enforced David on retreating to Ziklag (1 Chron. xii. 20). B.C. 1053.

3. Another chieflard of Manasseh, who deserted Saul's cause for that of David when he made Ziklag his residence (1 Chron. xii. 20); it is possible, however, that the name may have erroneously repeated for the preceding. B.C. 1053.

4. Probably a Levite, one of the persons charged with the care of the Temple offerings under the superintendence of Cononiah and Shimei, at the reformation by Hezekiah (2 Chron. xxxii. 19). B.C. 726.

5. One of the chief Levites who made offerings for the renewal of the Temple services under Josiah (2 Chron. xxxv. 9). B.C. 629.

6. A son of Jeshua, and one of the Levites who took account of the precious metals and vessels offered for the Temple by the Israelites who declined personally to return from the captivity (Ezra viii. 33). B.C. 444. He was probably the same with one of the chief Levites who "had the oversight of the outward matters of the house of God" after the re-establishment at Jerusalem (Neh. xi. 16). B.C. cir. 440. He was possibly identical with No. 7.

7. An Israelite, one of the "sons" of Pahur, who divorced his Gentile wife after the exile (Ezra x. 27). B.C. 459.

B One of the Levites who divorced his heathen wife after the return from Babylon (Ezra x. 25). B.C. 425.

C One of those who accompanied the priests who assisted Ezra in expounding the Law to the people assembled in the Temple (Neh. viii. 7). B.C. cir. 410.

Jos'achar (Heb. Ḫosayārā, Ḫosayārā, Ḫosayārā, Ḫosayārā; Sept. Ἰωσαχάρ, Ἰωσαχάρ, Ἰωσαχάρ, Ἰωσαχάρ, v. r. Ἰωσαχάρ, the son of Shim-eath, an Ammonite, one of the two servants who assasinated Jehoahaz, king of Judah, in Millio (2 Kings xx. 21). In the parallel passage (2 Chron. xxiv. 26) the name is erroneously written Zara. B.C. 837. "It is uncertain whether their conspiracy was prompted by a personal feeling of revenge for the death of Zerahiah, as Josephus intimates (Ant. ix. 8, 4), or whether they were urged to it by the family of Jehoiada. The case of the chronicler to show that they were of foreign descent seems almost intended to disarm the suspicion that the king's assassination was an act of priestly vengeance. But it is more likely that the conspiracy had a different origin altogether, and that the king's murder was regarded by the chronicler as an instance of divine retribution. On the accession of Amaziah the conspirators were executed.

Jos'adak (Ezra iii. 28, v. 2, x. 18; Neh. xii. 30).

See Jehozadak.

Juan de Dios. See John de Diez.

Juan Valdez. See Valdez.
JUBAL

Jubal (Heb. נְבוֹל, nēḇōl, ἡμβολή, nēmbole), prob. for נְבוֹלָה, nēḇōlāh, jubiles, i.e. music; Sept. ναβόλας, Nabolos, Lamch.'s second son by Lahah, of the line of Cain; described as the 'father of harp and organ,' and 'the Inventor of the harp and the organ,' but perhaps more properly "the lyre and mouth-organ," or Panleian pipe (Gen. iv. 21). See Music. B.C. prob. cir. 3400. According to Josephus (Ant. i, 2, 2), he "cultivated music, and invented the psaltery and cithara." Some have compared him with Apollo of the heathen mythology (Isaac's Eusebius, ii, 57, comp. Euseb. Prep. Evan. ii, 6; Diod. Sic. i, 20; Buttmann, Mythol. i, 164; Kalisch, Commentary, ad loc.).

Jubilans. See SUNDAY.

Jubilees (Heb. נְבוֹלָי, nēḇōlāy or לְוֹלָי, lōḇlāy or לְוֹלֵי, lōḇlēy, a joyful shout or clang of trumpets; once in the Author. Versa. for לְוֹלָי, Lev. xxv. 9, which is elsewhere rendered "a shout," etc.), usually in the connection YEAR OF JUBILEE (נְבוֹלָה, nēḇōlāh), or merely לְוֹלָה, lōḇlah, in Lev. xxv. 28; Septuag. usually translates τροχὸς τῆς διάσπασης, or simply διάσπαση; but Grecines τωσοῦ in Jos. vi. 8, 13; Josephus Grescizes τωσοῦ, Ant. iii. 12, 3; Vulgate annum jubilum, but busce; or in Exod. xix. 13; also called the "year of liberty" (נְרוֹנָה, nōrlenāh, Ezek. xlvii. 17), the great semi-centennial epoch of the Hebrews, constituting a festival, and marked by striking public and domestic changes. The relation in which it stood to the Sabbatical year, and the general directions for its observance, are given Lev. xxv. 8-18. Its bearing on lands dedicated to Jehovah is stated Lev. xxvii. 16-25. There is no mention of the jubilee in the book of Deuteronomy, and the only other reference to it in the Pentateuch is in the appeal of the tribe of Manassach, on account of the daughters of Zelophehad (Num. xxxv. 2, 3). It is rarely spoken of in the apocryphal books, but is very frequently referred to by Talmudical writers. See FESTIVAL.

1. Signification of the Name. According to pseudo-Jonathan (Targum on Josh. vi. 5-39), the Talmud (Koš. Hikka-sha, 26, a), Rashbi, Aben-Ezra (on Exod. xix. 13), Kimchi (on Josh. vi. 6), and other Jewish authorities, the meaning ram, which נְבוֹלָה seems at times to bear (see First, Lexicon, s. v.; but Gesenius utterly denies this sense), is the primary one; hence metonymically a ram's horn (comp. Exod. xix. 13, with Josh. vi. 5), and so the sound of a ram's horn, like the Latin baccina. According to another ancient interpretation, the Heb. word is from a root לְבֹל, lōḇel, to liberate (parallel with יַרְדּה, a freed captive; comp. Hitzig on Jer. xxxvii. 6), an etymology which is somewhat sanctioned by Lev. xi. 21, the usual rendering of the Sept. (also Josephus, Άρσηπιαὶ ἡ ἐν εἰρήνῃ τοῦ ποιμένα, Ant. iii. 12, 3; and by St. Jerome, Jobel est demittens aut mittens, Comment. ad loc.). Others, again, regard the root לְבֹל as ornamentalpoetic, like the Latin jubilare, denoting to be jubilant (Gesenius, etc.). Most modern critics, however, derive לְבֹל from the better known root לְבֹל, to flow impetuously (Gen. vi. 17), and hence assign to it the meaning of the loud or impetuous sound (Gen. iv. 21) streaming forth from the trumpet, and proclaiming this festival. The other notions respecting the word may be found in Fuller (Misc. Sac. p. 1026 sq.; Critici Sacri, vol. ix), in Carpzov (p. 448 sq.), and, most completely given, in Kranold (p. 11 sq.).

2. Recension of landed Property. This provision is comprised in Lev. xxv. 13-34; xxvii. 16-24. The Mosaic law enacted that the Promised Land should be divided by lot, in equal parts, among the Israelites, and that the plot which should thus come into the possession of each family was to be absolutely inalienable, and forever continue to be the property of the original possessor. See LAND. When a proprietor, therefore, being pressed by poverty, had to dispose of a field, no one could buy it of him for a longer period than up to the time of the next jubilee, when it reverted to the original possessor. Of the sale, property taxes were not paid on the land, but of the produce of so many years, and the price was fixed according to the number of years (יֵשָׁהַ יָטָר, yeṣāha yāṭar) up to the next jubilee, so as to prevent any injustice being done to those who were compelled by circumstances to part temporarily with their land (Lev. xxv. 15, 16). The lessee, however, according to Josephus, in case he had made great outlays on the field just before he was required by the law of jubilee to return it to its owner, could claim compensation for these (Ant. iii. 12, 3). But even before the jubilee year the original proprietor could recover his field, if either his own circumstances improved, or if his next of kin (see GOÈL) could redeem it for him by paying back according to the regulations which regulated the price (Lev. xxv. 26, 27). In the interests of the purchaser, however, the Rabbinical law enacted that this redemption should not take place before he had the benefit of the field for two productive years (so the Rabbins understood יֵשָׁהַ יָטָר, yeṣāha yāṭar), exclusive of a Sabbatical year, a year of barrenness, and of the first harvest, if he happened to buy the plot of land shortly before the seventh month, i.e., with the ripe fruit (Ezech. xix. 1; Maimonides, Jobel, xi. 10-13). As poverty is the only reason which the law supposes might lead one to part with his field, the Rabbins enacted that it was not allowable for any one to sell his patrimony on speculation (comp. Maimonides, Jobel, xi. 3). Though nothing is here said about fields which were given away by the proprietors, yet there can be no doubt, as Maimonides says (ibid. xi. 10), that the same law is intended to apply to gifts (comp. Ezek. xlvii. 17), but not to those plots of land which came into a man's possession through marriage with an heiress (Num. xxxv. 4-9; Maimonides, Mishn. xxviii. 16, 17). Neither did this law apply to a house in a walled city. Still, the seller had the privilege of redeeming it at any time within a full year from the day of the sale. After the year it became the absolute property of the purchaser (Lev. xxv, 29, 30, 37). As this law required a more minute definition for practical purposes, the Rabbins determined that this right of redemption might be exercised from the very first day of the first year to the last day which made up the year. Moreover, as the purchaser sometimes concealed himself towards the end of the year, in order to prevent the seller from redeeming his house, it was enacted that when the purchaser could not be found, the original proprietor should hand over the redemption-money to the powers that be, break open the doors, and take possession of the house; and if the purchaser died during the year, the original proprietor could redeem it only in the whole of the following year. Maimonides, Jobel, xi. 1-7. Open places, however, which are not surrounded by walls, belong to landed property, and, like the cultivated land on which they stand, are subject to the law of jubilee, and must revert to their original proprietors (Lev. xxv, 31). But, although houses and buildings are thus the same as the inventor of the land-wants (יֵשָׁהַ יָטָר), but not to lay it up in their storehouses.

Footnotes:
value to the Levites as landed property had to the other tribes, these houses were subject to the jubilee law for fields, and could at any time be redeemed (Lev. xxv, 32; comp. Erashim, ix, 8), so that, even if a Levite redeemed the house which his brother Levite was obliged to sell through poverty, the general law of house property is not to gain, even among the Levites themselves, but they are obliged to treat each other according to the law of landed property. Thus, for instance, the house of A, which he, out of poverty, was obliged to sell to the non-Levite B, and was redeemed from him by a Levite C, reverts in the jubilee year from C to the original owner A. The provisions of this law are the most probable meaning of the enactment contained in Lev. xxv, 33, and it does not necessitate us to insert into the text the negative particle וַיֵּצְבוּ before ובְּנֵן, as is done by the Vulgate, Houbigant, Ewald (Alterthümer, p. 421), Knobel, etc., nor need we, with Raši, Aben-Ezra, etc., take בְּנֵן in the unnatural sense of buying. The lands in the suburbs of their cities the Levites were not permitted to part with under any condition, and therefore these did not come under the law of jubilee (ver. 34), nor was there any exception to this general law with regard to the houses and the fields consecrated to the Lord, or to the support of the sanctuary. If these were not redeemed before the ensuing jubilee, instead of reverting to their original proprietors, they at the jubilee became forever the property of the priests (Lev. xxvii, 20, 21). The question is, however, on what condition a redeemed property could be redeemed were as follows: A house thus devoted to the Lord was valued by the priest, and the donor who wished to redeem it had to pay one fifth in addition to this fixed value (Lev. xxvii, 14, 15). A field was valued according to the number of homers of barley which could be sown therein, at the rate of fifty silver shekels of the sanctuary for each homer for the whole fifty years, deducting from it a proportionate amount for the lapse of each year (Lev. xxvii, 16-18). According to the Talmud the fiftieth year was not counted. Hence, as any one wished to redeem his field, he had to pay one fifth in addition to the regular rate of a sela (shelih), and a pandium (= 1-48th sela) per annum for every homer, the surplus pandium being intended for the forty-ninth year. No one was therefore allowed to sanctify his field during the year which immediately preceded it, for he would have to pay for the whole forty-nine years, because months could not be deducted from the sanctuary, and the jubilee year itself was not counted (Mishna, Erashin, vii, 1). If one sanctified a field which he had purchased, i.e., not freehold property, it reverted to the original proprietor in the same year (Mishna, Lev. xxvii, 22-24).

3. Manumission of those Israelites who had become Slaves.—This enactment is comprised in Lev. xxv, 39-54. All Israelites who through poverty had sold themselves as slaves to their fellow-Israelites or to the foreigners resident among them, and who, up to the time of the jubilee, had neither completed their six years of servitude, nor redeemed themselves, nor been redeemed by their relatives, were to be set free in the jubilee, to return with their children to their family and to the patrimony of their fathers. Great difficulty has been experienced in reconciling the injunction here, that in the jubilee all slaves are to regain their freedom, with Exod. xxv, 6, where it is enacted that those bondmen who refuse their liberty at the expiration of the appointed six years’ servitude, and submit to the boring of their ears, are to be slaves forever (שֶׁהָלְכָּהָּ עַל עָרָבָּה). Josephus (Ant. iv, 8, 28), the Mishna (Kidushin, i, 8) and Talmud (Bab. Ked. 11, 14), Raši, Aben-Ezra, Maimonides (Hilkhot Abadim, ii, 6), and most Jewish interpreters, who are followed by Ainsworth, Bp. Patrick, and other Christian commentators, take the הָלְכָּהָּ עַל עָרָבָּה, maintaining that the slaves who submitted to have their ears bored are included in this general manumission, and thus try to escape the difficulty. But against this it is to be urged, that 1. The phrase הָלְכָּהָּ עַל עָרָבָּה is used in Lev. xxv, 46 for perpetual servitude, which is unaffected by the year of jubilee. 2. The declaration of the slave that he will not have his freedom, in Exod. xxi, 5, unquestionably shows that perpetual slavery is meant. 3. Servitude till the year of jubilee is not at all spoken of in Lev. xxv, 40-42 as something contemptible, for he would not be the person to refuse for him who refused his freedom, especially if the year of jubilee happened to occur two or three years after refusing his freedom; and that it is bondage beyond that time which is characterized as real slavery; and, 4. The jubilee, without any indication whether given or not, referring to this explanation, made to give the slave the right to take with him the maid and the children who are the property of the master—the very right which had previously been denied to him. Ewald, therefore (Alterthümer, p. 421), and others, conclude that the two enactments belong to different periods, the manumission of slaves in the year of jubilee having been instituted when the law enjoining the liberation of slaves at the expiration of six years had become obsolete; while Knobel (on Exod. xxx, 6) regards this jubilee law and the enactments in Exod. xxii, 5, 6 as representing one of the many changes which exist between the Jehovistic and Elieothic portions of the Pentateuch. All the difficulties, however, disappear when the jubilee manumission enactment is regarded as designed to supplement the law in Exod. xxi, 2-6. In the latter case the regular period of servitude is fixed, at the expiration of which the bondman is ordained to become free, whilst Lev. xxv, 39-54 institutes an additional and extraordinary period, when those slaves who had not as yet completed their appointed six years of servitude at the time of jubilee, or had not foreclosed their right of free discharge by means previously authorized, losing their power of bondage, and becoming slaves forever (כֵּן מַלְשֹׁנֵן), are once in every fifty years to obtain their freedom. The one enactment refers to the freedom of each individual at different days, weeks, months, and years, inasmuch as hardly any twenty of them entered on their servitude at exactly the same time, whilst the other legislation for a general manumission, which is to take place at exactly the same time, is enacted. The enactment in Lev. xxv, 39-54, therefore, takes for granted the law in Exod. xxi, 2-6, and begins where the latter ends, and does not mention it because it simply treats on the influence of jubilee upon slavery.

4. That there must also have been a perfect remission of debt, for which the jubilee is self-evident, is implied in the fact that all persons who were in bondage for debt, as well as all the landed property of debtors, were freely redeemed. Whether debts generally, for which there were no such pledges, were remitted, is a matter of dispute. Josephus positively declares that they were (Ant. xxi, 5, 3), whilst Maimonides (Jebetz, x, 16) as positively denies it.

III. Time when the Jubilee was celebrated.—According to Lev. xxv, 8-11, it is evident that forty-nine years are to be counted, and that at the end thereof the fiftieth year is to be celebrated as the jubilee. Hence the jubilee is to follow immediately upon the sabbatical year, so that there are to be two successive fallow years. This is also corroborated by verse 21, where it is promissed that the produce of the sixth year shall suffice for three years, i.e., forty-nine, fifty, and fifty-one or the two former years, which are the sabbatical year and the jubilee itself, and immediately following, and the ordinary produce of the preceding year would be wanting. Moreover, from the remark in verse 22, it would appear that the sabbatical year, like the jubilee, began in the autumn, or the month of Tisri, which commenced the civil year, when it was customary to begin sowing for the ensuing year. At all events, ver. 9 distinctly says that the jubilee is to be proclaimed by the
blow of the trumpet "on the tenth of the seventh month, on the day of atonement," which is Tisri. See ATONE-
MENT, DAY OF. The opinion that the sabbatical year and the jubilee were distinct, or that there were two
fallow years, is also rejected (Lev. xxv, 12). That the fields did yield a crop in their second fallow year is
most unquestionably presupposed by the prophet Isaiah (xxxvi, 30). Palestine was, at all events, not less fruit-
ful than Albania, in which Strabo tells us (lib. xi, c. iv, sec. 8), "The ground that has been sowed once produces
in a year, twice or three crops, the fruit of which is of even fifty-fold."
It must, however, be remarked, that many, from a very
early period down to the present day, have taken the jubilee year to be identical with the seventh sabbatical
year. Thus the "Book of Jubilees," which dates prior to the Christian era, and which is not only
the Biblical history from the creation to the entrance of the Israelites into Canaan into fifty jubilees of forty-
six years each, which shows that this view of the jubilees must have been pretty general in those days. Some
Rabbis, who lived in the Talmud (Eracli, 12), wrote with reluctance, as well as many Christian writers (Scaliger, Potavious, Ueb-
er, Cusanus, Caviterius, Gatterer, Frank, Schroder, Hug, Rosenmuller), support the same view.
As to the remark, "Ye shall hallow the sabbath year" (ver. 10), "a jubilee shall that sabbath year be unto you" (ver. 11), it is urged at the same time, in accordance with a breath of speech
which is common to all languages and ages. Thus we call a week eight days, including both Sundays, and the best
classical writers called an olympiad by the name of quinquennium, though it only contained four entire
years. Moreover, the sacred number seven, or the sab-
batical year, which underlies all the festivals, and connects them all into one chain, the last link of which is the
jubilee, corroborates this view, inasmuch as we have, 1.
A Sabbath of days; 2. A Sabbath of weeks (the seventh
week after the Passover being the Sabbath week, as the first
day of it is the festival of weeks); 3. A Sabbath of months (the first day of the month with the new
moon and the full moon, and its festival, the new year); 4. A Sabbath of years (the seventh year is the sab-
batical year); and, 5. A Sabbath of Sabbaths, inasmuch as the seventh sabbatical year is the jubilee. See Sab-
natur.
IV. Mode of Celebration.—As the observance of the jubilee, like that of the sabbatical year, was only to be
come obligatory when the Israelites had taken possession of the promised land, and cultivated the land for
that period of years at the conclusion of which the festi-
val was to be celebrated, the ancient tradition pre-
served in the Talmud seems to be correct, that the first
sabbatical year was in the one-and-twentieth, and the first jubilee in the sixty-fourth year after the Jews came
into Canaan, for it took them seven years to conquer it, and seven years more to distribute it (Erachin, xii, 6;
Maimonides, Jobel, x, 21). The Bible says nothing about the moserah in which the jubilee is to be celebrated, ex-
cept that it should be proclaimed by the blast of a trump-
et. See TRUMPET. As in many other cases, the law-
giver leaves the practical application of this law, and the
necessarily complicated arrangements connected therewith, to his interpreter. He has both directed us that the trumpets used on this occasion, like those of the feast of trumpets, or new year, were of rams' horns, straight, and had their mouth-piece covered with gold (Mishna, Rosh Ha-Shana, iii, 2; Maimonides, Jobel,
12, 11); that every Israelite blew nine blasts, so as to make a hundred and eighty-three rams' horns (Lev.
xxv, 9); and that "from the feast of trumpets, or new
year (i.e. Tisri), till the day of atonement (i.e.
IV.-U V U
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Tiri 10), the slaves were neither manumitted to return
to their homes nor made use of by their masters, but
ate, drank, and rejoiced, and wore garlands on their
heads; and when the day of atonement came the judges
blew the trumpets and cried out: "Let the slaves go to
their homes, and the fields were set free" (Rosh Ha-
Shana, 8 b; Maimonides, Jobel, x, 14). Though the
Jews, from the nature of the case, cannot now celebrate the jubilee, yet on the evening of the day of atonement
the conclusion of the feast is announced in all the syna-
agogues to the present day by the blast of one rams'
horn, which, according to the Rabbis, is intended to
commemorate the ancient jubilee proclamation (Orach
Chajim, cap. dxxiiii, sec. 6, note). Because the Bible does not record any particular in-
stance of the public celebration of this festival, Michaelis,
Winer, etc., have questioned whether the custom to the
ever came into actual operation; while Kranold, Hup-
feld, etc., have positively denied it. The following con-
siderations, however, speak for its actual observance: 1.
All the other Mosaic festivals have been observed, and
it is therefore surpassing strange to suppose that the ju-
bilee, which is historically connected with all the others, is the climax of all the times, is only the one that never
was observed. 2. The law about the inalienability of
landed property, which was to be the result of the jubilee,
actually obtained among the Jews, thus showing that this festival was observed, and that it was with a view to observing the jubilee law that the right of an heirens to marry was restricted (Num.
xxxvi, 4, 6, 7); and it was the observance of this law,
forbidding the sale of land in such a manner as to pre-
vent its reversion to the original owner or his heir in
the year of jubilee, that made Naboth's property
worthless, with his vineyard on the solicitation of king Ahab (1 Kings xxi, 1-4). 3. From Ezek. xlv, 17, where even the king is reminded that if he made a present of his
landed property to any of his servants it could only be
to the jubilee year, when it must revert to him, it is evi-
dent that this festival was observed. But the jubilee is also to be found in Neh. v, 1-19; Isa. v, 7, 8,
9, 10, lix, 1, 2; Ezek. vii, 12, 13 (Isa. xxxvii, 30 is less clear). Ewald contends that the institution is emi-
nently practical in the character of its details, and that the accidental circumstance of no particular instance of its observance being preserved in the Talmud proves nothing.
Besides the passages to which reference has been made, he applies several others to the jubilee. He conceives that "the year of visitation" mentioned in Jer. xi, 23; xxiii, 12; xlvii, 44, denotes the punish-
ment of those who, in the jubilee, withheld by tyranny or oppression the possessions of the poor.
From Jer. xxxvi, 6-12, he infers that the law was restored to operation in the reign of Josiah (Afterthamer,
p. 424, note I). It is likely, however, that in the gen-
eral declension of religious observances under the later
monarchs of Judah this institution yielded to its ar-
rice and worldliness of landed proprietors, especially as
mortgaged property and servants would thereby be re-
leased (see Jer. xxxiv, 8-11; comp. Neh. v). Indeed,
it is intimated that the Babylonian captivity should be of
such a duration as to compensate for the years (sab-
batical and jubilee together) of which Jehovah had been
defrauded (2 Chron. xxxvi, 21). 4. The general observance of the jubilee is attested by the unanimous
voice of Jewish tradition. This unanimity of opinion,
however, only extends to the observance of the jubilee
prior to the Babylonian captivity, for many of the later
Rabbis affirm that it was not kept after the return to
Judah. But in the Tiberias Olam (cap. xxx), the author
of which lived shortly after the destruction of Jerusalem, we are
positively assured that it was observed. Josephus, too (Ant. iii, 12, 3), speaks of it as being permanently
observed. This is, moreover, confirmed by Diodorus Sic-
lurus (iii. 10), who tells us that the Jews cannot dispose
of their own patrimony (ζιωνικά κληρονομος, pαλαιος), as
well as by the fact that we have distinct records of the
law respecting the redemption of houses in cities with- out walls, which forms an integral part of the jubilee law, being strictly observed to a very late period (Evra- chis, 91 b.; Baba Kamma, 1 b)."

2 Origen, Vitae Importance of the Jubilee. —The foundation of the law of jubilee appears to be so es- sentially connected with the children of Israel that it seems strange that Michaelis should have confidently affirmed its Egyptian origin, while yet he acknowledges that he has no specific evidence for the subject (Mos. Law, art. 78). The only well-proved instance of anything like it in other nations appears to be that of the Dalmatians, mentioned by Strabo, lib. vii (p. 315, edit. Casaubon). He says that they redistributed their land every eight years. Ewald, following the statement of Pliny, refers to the institution of Lycurgus, but Mr. Grote has given another view of the matter (History of Greece, ii, 530).

The object of this institution was that those of the people of God who, through poverty or other adverse circumstances, had forfeited their personal liberty or property to their debtors, should have their debts forgiven by their co-religionists every half centu- ry, on the great day of atonement, and be restored to their families and inheritance as freely and fully as God on that very day forgave the debts of his people and re- stored to them the perfect fellowship with himself, so that the people of the whole community, having forgiven each other, and being forgiven of God, might return to the original or- der which had been disturbed in the lapse of time, and, being freed from the bondage of one another, might un- reservedly be the servants of him who is their redeemer. The aim of the jubilee, therefore, is to preserve unim- paired the essential character of theocracy, to the end that there be no poor among the people of God (Deut. xv, 4). Hence God, who redeemed Israel from the bondage of Egypt to be his peculiar people, and al- lotted to them the promised land, will not suffer any one of them to become poor or end his days as Lord over the property that he has acquired as his own. It is the idea of grace for all the suffering children of man, bringing freedom to the captive and rest to the weary as well as to the earth, which made the year of jubilee the symbol of the Messianic year of grace (Isa. lxi, 2), when all the conflicts in the universe should be peace to their original harmony, and when not only we, who have the first-fruits of the Spirit, but the whole creation, which groaneth and travaileth in pain together until now, may be restored into the glori- ous liberty of the sons of God (comp. Isa. lxi, 1–3, Luke iv, 18–23; Heb. iv, 9). The importance of this institution will be apparent if it is considered what moral and social advantages would accrue to the community from the sacred observance of it. 1. It would prevent the accumulation of land on the part of a few to the detriment of the com- munity at large. 2. It would render it impossible for any one to be born to absolute poverty, since every one had his hereditary land. 3. It would preserve those inequalities which are produced by extremes of riches and poverty, and which make one man domineer over an- other. 4. It would utterly do away with slavery. 5. It would give fresh opportunity to begin again their career of industry, in the patrimony which they had temporarily forfeited. 6. It would periodically rectify the disorders which crept into the state in the course of time, prejudice the division of the people into nobles and plebeians, and preserve the inviolate.

VI. Literature.—The Mishna (Erachin, ch. viii, ix) gives very important enactments of a very ancient date respecting the jubilee. In Maimonides (Jod Ha-Che- zaka, especially the tract so often above referred to as Hilkoth Geva'ot, 1, p. 23, ch. x–xiii) an epitome will be found of the Jewish information on this subject which is scattered through the Talmud and Midrashim. Of the modern productions are to be mentioned the valuable treatises of Cuneus, De Rep. Hebr. chap. i, sec. iv (in the Critici Sacri, i, 278 sq.), and Meyer, De Tru- por, et Diebus Hebraeorum (in Ugolini Theaurum, i, 708, 1750), p. 541–560; Michaelis, Commentaries on the Laws of Moses, Engl. version, Lond., 1814, vol. i, p. 268; L小龙, 376 sq.; Idelsohn, Die Geschichte der Chassidismen, Berlin, 1920, i, 502 sq.; the excellent prize essays of Krano, De Amno Hebr. Jubilaeo (Gottingen, 1837), and Wolde, De anno Hebr. Jubilaeo (Gottingen, 1887); Bahr, Symbolik des Mos- aischen Cultus (Heidelberg, 1869), i, 572 sq.; Ewald, Die Altertumskunde der Israelitischen Völker, 3rd ed., 1846, 579 sq.; Schaab, Das Mosaische Recht (Berlin, 1858), i, 141, etc.; and Archäologie der Hebräer (Königsb. 1866, ii, 224, etc.; Herzfeld, Geschichte des Volks Israel (Nord-hausen, 1855), i, 463, etc., etc.; Keil, Handbuch der Bibliischen Archäologie (Frankf. a. M., 1856), i, 574, etc.; Hasek, Commentarium de Hebraeorum Festa (part iii, 1852), has lately dealt with it in a vigilant and restless style of crit- icism. Vitringa notices the prophetic bearing of the jubilee in lib. iv, c. 4 of the Observations Sacra. Light- foot (Harm. Evang. in Luc. iv, 19) pursues the jub- lee in a fanciful manner, and makes out that Christ suffered in different times. For further details, see Wigram, De anno Hebr. Jubilaeo (Altorf, 1700); J. C. Buczkowsky, Einbühl, jubilaeo (Viteb 1700); Carpa, De anno jubil- aio (Lips. 1730; also in his Apparatus, crit. p. 45): Ode, De anno Heb. jubilaeo (Traj. a. H. 1736; also in Oehricb's Collectio, i, 421); Otto, De anno Hebr. jubilaeo (Altenb. 1754); also Marx, Syglog. dissert. 302; Bauer, Gotted, Verfass. i, 277; Hultmann, Uebergesch. des Staats, 73; Van der Hardt, De jubil. Monis (Helmst. 1728); Joachim Salomo, De jubil. Heb. (Danz. 1767); Meier, De mysteriis Jubelae (Bremen, 1769); Reinecke, De origine Jubilae (Vesul. 1769); Stenler, De anno Jubelaeo (Lips. 1730); Van Poortvliet, Jubilaeus Hebraiorum (Cob. 1780); Walther, De Jubilaeo Judaicis (Solvin. 1762). Other monographs, relating, however, rather to later times, are cited by Vollend, Index, p. 129, 162. See Sarrabical Year. The jubilee is of two kinds, ordinary and extraordinary. The ordinary jubilee is that which is celebra- ted at stated intervals, the length of which has varied at different times. The first is traced to pope Boniface VIII, who issued, for the year 1300, a bull granting a plenary indulgence to all pilgrims-visiters of Rome dur- ing that year on condition of their penitently confessing their sins, and visiting the church of St. Peter and St. Paul. The number of pilgrims has varied at different times, and the revenues of the city. The invitation was accepted with marvellous enthusiasm. Innumerable troops of pilgrims from every part of the Church flocked to Rome. Gio- vanni Villani, a contemporary chronicler, states that the constant number of pilgrims in Rome, not reckoning those who were on the road going or returning, during the entire year, never fell below 200,000. Boniface, finding the jubilee a success, and having been informed, so the story goes, by a hoary patriarch, who, at the age of 107, attended it, that a hundred years ago a like jub- ilee had been held, now ordered that it should be repeated every 100 years. The great gain which the occasion afforded to the churches at Rome induced Clement VI to abridge the time to fifty years. His jubilee accordingly took place in 1350, and was even more numerous attended than that of Boniface. The average number of visitors, however, until suspended their frequency, being, according to Matthew Villani, no fewer than 1,000,000! The term of interval was still further abridged by Urban VI: but in the stormy days of his pontificate the jubilee could not take place, and his successor, Boniface IX, improved this to his advantage, and continued it in 1358. Ten years later he repeated it, and, besides, inaugurated extra jubilees and permitted their observance also in foreign cities provided the worshippers would pay into the Roman treasury the cost of a journey to
the holy city (comp. Amort, De origine, progressu, et
ac fructu indigent, i, 87 sq.). Paul II finally or-
dered in 1470 that thenceforward every twenty-fifth
year should be held as jubilee, an arrangement which
has continued ever since to regulate the ordinary jub-
ilee. As to the term jubilee period, it seems to have
drawn its origin from the contribution to ecclesiastical purposes, al-
ways be obtained at the home of the penitent, the pil-
grimages to Rome gradually diminished in frequency; but
the observance itself has been punctually main-
tained at each recurring period, with the single exception of the
year 1587, in which, owing to the vacancy of the holy
year and the troubles of the times, it was not held. For
the excuses committed in the sale of indulgences, see
Indulgences. The extraordinary jubilee is order-
ed by the pope out of the regular period, either on his
accession, or on some occasion of public calamity, or in some
special condition of the fortunes of the Church; one
of the conditions for obtaining the indulgence in such
cases being the recitation of certain stated prayers
for the particular necessity in which the jubilee origi-
nated. See Herzog, Real-Enzyklop., vii, 117; Cham-
bers, s. v.; Walcott, Sac. Arch., p. 334.

Jubilees, Book of. This apocyphal or Haggadic
book was written, as was held, by the Chief
Church, and was still known to the Byzantines, but of which
both the original Hebrew and the Greek were after-
wards lost, has recently been discovered in an Ethiopic
version in Abyssinia.

I. Of the Book, and its Signification.—The book is
called רבי יוחנן המడי, תדה הר, "the Jubilees," or
"the book of Jubilees," because it divides the period of
the Biblical history upon which it treats, i.e. from the
creation to the entrance of the Israelites into Ca-
nan, into fifty jubilees of forty-nine years each, equal
to 2450 years, and carefully describes every event ac-
cording to the jubilee, sabbatical year, or year in which
it is treated. It is also remarkable in the insulated
phrases in the words of the division of the days according
to the law and the testimony, according to the events of
the years in sabbatical years and in jubilees, etc. It is
also called by the fathers ימי משיח, ימי עדים, ימי
גורמים, ימי ודים, על ימי תorde ימיVES = ימיVES ימיVES, i.e., the small Genesis, compendium of Genesis,
because it only selects certain portions of Genesis, although
through its many comments upon Genesis, it is actually longer than this canonical book (comp. Ephi-
mine, 41., vi. i, tom. iii, cap. vi, edit. Petav.; G. Synel-
neu, p. 8); or, according to Ewald's rendering of it, על ימי תorde עגבלת עבט, because it di-
vided the period into two equal parts, in every jubilee
and small period (Geschichte des Volkes Israel, 111); it is
called by St. Jerome the apocyphal Genesis (see be-
low, sec. 3), and it is also styled ימי ודים, אפוקליפס
ה Apocalypse of Moses, by George Synellen and Cedrenus, because the book pretends to be a revela-
tion of God to Moses, and is denominated "the book of
the division of days" by the Abyssinian Church, from the
first words of the inscription.

II. Design and Contents of the Book.—This apocy-
phal book is designed to be a commentary on the
canonical books of Genesis and Exodus. (1) It fixes and
arranges more minutely the chronology of the Biblical
history from the creation to the entrance of the Israel-
ites into Canaan; (2) Solves the various difficulties to
be found in the narratives of these canonical books; (3)
Describes more fully events which are simply hinted at
in the sacred history of that early period; and (4) Ex-
patiates upon religious institutions, as the Sabbath,
the festivals, circumcision, sacrifices, lawsful and un-
lawful meats, etc., setting forth their sacred charac-
ter, as well as our duty to keep them, by showing the
high antiquity of these institutions, inasmuch as they
have been sacredly obeyed by the patriarchs, may be
seen from the following notice of these four points.

a. In its chronological arrangements we find that it
places the deluge in A.M. 1858 (Jubil. vi, 61), and the
exodus in the year A.M. 2410 (iv, 10). This, with the
forty years' sojourn in the wilderness, yields fifty jubil-
ées of forty-nine years each from the creation to the
entrance into Canaan, i.e. 2450, and also allows a new
generation immediately upon the entrance
of the Israelites into the Promised Land, and the
events in the calculations of this period the book of 
Jubilees agrees in its particulars with the Hebrew text of
Genesis and Exodus; yet it differs from the canonical
text both as to the time of the sojourn in Egypt and
the years in which the ante and post-diluvian patri-
archs begat their children. Thus Jared is said to have
lived 62 instead of 162 years before Enoch was born,
Methuselah was 67 instead of 187 at the birth of
Lamech, and Lamech again was 53 instead of 182 when
he begat Noah, agreeing partly with the Samaritan Pen-
tateuch, and partly with the Septuagint in their state-
ments about these antediluvian patriarchs. In the chron-
ology of the post-diluvian patriarchs, however, the book
of Jubilees deviates from these versions, and says that
Arphaxad begat Canaan when 74-75; after the deluge,
Canaan begat Salah when 57, Salah begat Eber when 68, Eber begat Peleg when 58, Peleg begat Reu 1961; the birth of Serug is omitted, so as to have begat Nahor in the year 116 after the birth of
Reu, and Nahor begat Terah in his 62d year (compare Jubil. iv, 40, etc.). The going down into Egypt is placed
about A.M. 2172-2173 (Jubil., xlv, 1-5), so that when we
deduct it from 7400, to which year they are placed,
there remains for the sojourn in Egypt 238 years. In
the description of the lives of Noah, Abraham (xxiii,
28), Isaac (xxxvi, 49-52), Jacob (xl, 40-43), and Jos-
eph (xvi, 9-15), the chronology agrees with the He-
brew text of Genesis.

b. Of the difficulties in the sacred narrative which
the book of Jubilees is designed to solve, it may suffice to say
that it accounts for the serpent speaking to Eve by saying
that all animals spoke before the fall in paradise (comp.
Gen. i, 1 with jubil. iii, 98); explains very minutely the first heads of families took their wives (Jubil.
iv, 24, 71, 106, etc.); how far the sentence of death pronounced in Gen. ii, 17 has been fulfilled literally (iv, 99, etc.); shows that the sons of God who came to the
daughters of men were angels (v, 3); with what help
Noah brought the animals into the ark (v, 76); where
with the tower of Babel was destroyed (xxvii, 87); why Sarah disliked Ishmael and urged Abraham to send
him away (xxvii, 105); why Reuben was not the firstborn (xvii, 90); how it was that Esau came to sell his
birthright for a mess of pottage (xxiv, 5-20); who told
Rebekah (Gen. xxvii, 42) that Esau determined to kill
Jacob (xxvii, 1, etc.) how it was that he afterwards
desisted from his determination to kill Jacob (xxvii,
29-106); why Reuben (Gen. xxi, 45) that she
would be deprived of both her sons in one day (xxvii,
9); why Er, Judah's first-born, died (xlii, 1-7); why
Onan would not redeem Tamar (xlii, 11-13); why Judah
was not punished for his sin with Tamar (xlii, 57-67); why Joseph had the money put into the sacks of his broth-
ers (xlii, 7-23); how Moses was taken away out of
ark (xlii, 13), and that it was not God, but the chief
m at e m a n, ה המה the enemy, who hardened the hearts
of the Egyptians (xlii, 58).
of the Amorites is described, to which allusion is made in Gen. xlvi., 22.

d. As to the religious observances, we are told that the Feast of Weeks, or Pentecost, in the Amorites, is contained in the covenants which God made with Noah and Abraham (comp. Jubil. vi, 56-60 with Gen. ix., 8-17; xiv., 51-54 with Gen. xv., 18-21; the Feast of Tabernacles was first celebrated by Abraham, Jubil. xlii., 61-101; and the Festival, which is on the 23d of Tishri, continuing the Feast of Tabernacles, see Festival, was instituted by Jacob (Jubil. xxxii., 87-94) after his vision at Bethel (Gen. xxxv., 9-14); and that the mourning on the Day of Atonement ( Lev. xvi., 29) to commemorate the mourning of Jacob, is over the loss of Joseph (Jubil. xxiv., 50-55).

(The German version by Dillmann, through which this book has recently been made known to Europeans, has been divided by the erudite translator into fifty chapters, but not into verses. The references in this article are to those chapters, and the lines of the respective chapters.)

III. Author and Original Language of the Book.—That this book was a Jew is evident from (1) the description of the Sabbath and festivals, as well as all the Rabbinic ceremonies connected therewith (l. 19-33, 49-60), which developed themselves in the course of time, and which we are told are simply types described by Moses from heavenly archetypes, and have not only been kept by the angels in heaven, but are binding upon the Jews as well, without end; (2) the elevated position he ascribes to the Jewish people, (ii., 79-91; xvi., 50-56); ordinary Israelites are in dignity equal to angels (xxv., 75-78), and the priests are like the presence-angels (xxxi., 47-49); over Israel only does the Lord himself rule, whereas he appointed evil spirits to execute dominion over all other nations (xxv., 80-90); and (3) the many Hagadic elements of this book which are still preserved in the Talmud and Midrashim. Compare, for instance, Jubil. i., 116, where the presence-angel, מִשְׁמַר הַבָּה, is described as having preceded the hosts of Israel, with Sanhedrim, 38, b; the description of the creation of paradise on the third day (Jubil. ii., 37 with Bereshith Rabba, c. xxv); the twenty-two generations from Adam to Jacob (Jubil. ii., 64, 91, with Bereshith Rabba and Midrash Talmud, 2), the animals speaking before the fall (Jubil. iii., 98 with the Midrashim); the remark that Adam lived 70 years less than 1000 years in order that the declaration might be fulfilled, which means that he would have died, "since 1000 years are as one day with the Lord (Jubil. iv., 99 with Bereshith Rabba, c. xix.; Justin Dial. c. Tryph. p. 278, ed. Otto); the causes of the deluge (Jubil. v., 5-20 with Bereshith Rabba, c. xxxi.); the declaration that the beginning of the first, fourth, seventh, and tenth months are to be celebrated as festivals, being the beginning of the four seasons called רַפָעֵי, and having already been observed by Noah (Jubil. vi., 31-55 with Per. R. Eliezer, cap. viii.; Pseudo-Jonathan on Gen. viii., 22); the statement that Satan induced God to ask Abraham to sacrifice his son (Jubil. xvi., 49-53 with Sanhedrim, 89, b); that Abraham was tempted time after time with Midrash, xix. 3; Parap. Jerusalem on Gen. xxiii., 1, etc.); and that Joseph spoke Hebrew when he made himself known to his brothers (Jubil. xili., 54 with Bereshith Rabba, cap. xxiii.). As, however, some of the practices, rites, and interpretations given in this book are at variance with the traditional exposition of the Rabbinists, Beer is of opinion that the writer was a Dositheus who was anxious to bring about a fusion of Samaritanism and Rabbinic Judaism by making mutual concessions (Das Buch d. Jubiläum, p. 61, 62); Jellinek, again, thinks that he was an Essene, and wrote this book against the Thrasiess, who maintained that the beginning of the month is to be fixed by observation and not by calculation (compare נַעַר הַלֶּחֶם), and that the Sanhedrim had the power of determining intercalary years (see Hillel II.), deducing in corroboration of this view the remark in Jubil. vii., 95-98, the chronological system of the author, which is based upon heptades; and the strict observance of the Sabbath, which, as an Essene loving the sacred number seven, he urges upon every Israelite (compare Jubil. xii., 23-35; iv., 19-24; Book 17, Midrash, iii., p. xi.; xii.), Frankel maintains that the writer was an Egyptian Jew, and a priest at the temple in Leontopolis, which accounts for his setting such a high value upon sacrifices, and tracing the origin of the festivals and sacrifices to the patriarchs (Monatsschrift, v., p. 399).

Notwithstanding the difference of opinion as to which phase of Judaism the author belonged, all agree that this book was written in Hebrew, that it was afterwards translated into Greek, and that the Ethiopic, of which Dillmann has given a German version, was made from the Greek. Many of the expressions in the book can only be understood by retranslating them into Hebrew. Thus, for instance, the remarks "and it is not impossible to be able to understand this, in the way we bear in mind that the original had had interreption. Moreover, the writer designates the wives of the patriarchs from the family of Seth by names which express a name given to the Virtue in Hebrew (Judith 3, reanim; Isaiah 36), reanim; Jared married Beracha, reanim; reanim; Enoch and Methuselah married wives of the name of Adni, reanim; reanim; whilst Cain married his sister Avan, reanim, reanim, where the words יִשְׁמַר הַבָּה, יִשְׁמַר הַבָּה, יִשְׁמַר הַבָּה, is described as having preceded the hosts of Israel, with Sanhedrim, 38, b; the description of the creation of paradise on the third day (Jubil. ii., 37 with Bereshith Rabba, c. xxv); the twenty-two generations from Adam to Jacob (Jubil. ii., 64, 91, with Bereshith Rabba and Midrash Talmud, 2), the animals speaking before the fall (Jubil. iii., 98 with the Midrashim); the remark that Adam lived 70 years less than 1000 years in order that the declaration might be fulfilled, which means that he would have died, "since 1000 years are as one day with the Lord (Jubil. iv., 99 with Bereshith Rabba, c. xix.; Justin Dial. c. Tryph. p. 278, ed. Otto); the causes of the deluge (Jubil. v., 5-20 with Bereshith Rabba, c. xxxi.); the declaration that the beginning of the first, fourth, seventh, and tenth months are to be celebrated as festivals, being the beginning of the four seasons called רַפָעֵי, and having already been observed by Noah (Jubil. vi., 31-55 with Per. R. Eliezer, cap. viii.; Pseudo-Jonathan on Gen. viii., 22); the statement that Satan induced God to ask Abraham to sacrifice his son (Jubil. xvi., 49-53 with Sanhedrim, 89, b); that Abraham was tempted time after time with Midrash, xix. 3; Parap. Jerusalem on Gen. xxiii., 1, etc.); and that Joseph spoke Hebrew when he made himself known to his brothers (Jubil. xili., 54 with Bereshith Rabba, cap. xxiii.). As, however, some of the practices, rites, and interpretations given in this book are at variance with the traditional exposition of the Rabbinists, Beer is of opinion that the writer was a Dositheus who was anxious to bring about a fusion of Samaritanism and Rabbinic Judaism by making mutual concessions (Das Buch d. Jubiläum, p. 61, 62); Jellinek, again, thinks that he was an Essene, and wrote this book against the Thrasiess, who maintained that the beginning of the month is to be fixed by ob-
and the services performed therein, but from its whole complexion, and this is admitted by all who have written on it. Its exact date, however, is a matter of dispute. Krüger maintains that it was written between B.C. 392 and 390; Dillmann and Frankel think that it was written in the first century before Christ; whilst Ewald is of opinion that it originated about the birth of Christ. The medium of the two extremes is the most probable.

The importance of this book can hardly be overestimated: we remember that it is one of the very few Biblical works which have come down to us, and it has been the object of research on the part of the O. T. canon and the beginning of the N.T. There are, however, several other considerations which render this book a most important contribution, both to the interpretation of the Bible and to the history of Jewish belief anterior to the Christian era. Many portions of it are literal translations of the books of Genesis, and therefore enable us to see in what state the Hebrew text was at that age, and furnish us with some readings which are preferable to those given in the tavoce rupicus, e.g. Jubil. xvii, 17 renders it probable that the correct reading of Gen. xxii, 11 is לֹא יָכֹ֣ב יִשְׂרָאֵל לָּמֹ֖ודה, which is corroborated by the verse immediately following, 12, which shows that the Jews at that age believed in the survival of the soul after the death of the body (xxiii, 115), though the resurrection of the body is nowhere mentioned therein; that they believed in the existence of Satan, the prince of legions of evil spirits, respecting which so little is said in the O. Test. and so much in the N.; and that these evil spirits have dominion over men, and are often the cause of their illnesses and death (x, 35-47; xlii, 7-10).

3. It shows us what the Jews believed about the coming of the Messiah, and the great day of judgment (xxiii, 97-118). 4. It explains the statements in Acts vii, 53; Gal. iii, 13; and Rom. ii, 16, which so much difficulty have been fute to interpreters, by most distinctly declaring that the law was given through the presence-angel (i. e., 99-102).

5. It even appears to be quoted in the N. T. (compare 2 Pet. ii, 4; Jude 6, with Jubil. iv, 7; v, 20).

V. Literature.—It has already been remarked that the Hebrew original of this book is lost. Chapters xxiv and xxxv are, however, preserved from Midrash Vajzau, in Midrash Jalut section Bereishith, xxxiii, as has been pointed out by Jellinek (see below); and Treuenfels has shown parallels between other parts of the book of Jubilees and the Hagada and Mirdashik in the Hebrew literature (1846, p. 1 sq.). The Greek version of this book, written in a very early period of the Christian era, as is evident from Clement's Recognit. cap. xxx. xxx-xxxii, through Ephi¬phanus (Adv. Hores. lib. i, cap. iv; lib. ii; tom. ii, cap. i, xxxvi, lxxxvi) and St. Jerome (Epist. ad Fabr. de sanct. menon) and Aesop, who, in his fables, 21, 22; Mansio xxiv on Numb. xxxiii, 27, 29) are the first who mention it by name, was soon lost in the Western Church, but it still existed in the Eastern Church, and was copiously used in the Chronography of Geor¬gian Syneclius and Georgian Czedenus, and quoted several times by James Zonaras and by Glosses, by za¬zantine theologians and historians of the 12th and 13th centuries (compare Fabricius, Codex Pseudo-aprophyl. V. Test. p. 851-863; Dillmann, in Ewald's Jahrbuch, iii, 94 sq.). From that time, however, the Greek version was also lost, and the book of Jubilees was quite unknown to European scholars until the 19th century, with the edition descript. für die Kunde des Morgenlandes, p. 176-179, that Dr. Krapf had found it preserved in the Egyptian church in an Ethiopic translation, and brought over a MS. copy which was made over to the Tubingen Uni¬versity. This Ethiopic version was translated into Ger¬man by M. P. Ewald in Ewald's Jahrbücher, ii, 230-236, and iii, 1-96 (Göttingen, 1849-51), and Ewald at once used its contents for the new edition of his Geschichte d. Völkes Israels (vol. i, Göttingen, 1851, p. 271; vol. ii, 1853, p. 294). This was seasonably followed by Jellinek's edition of the Midrash Vajzau, with an erudite preface in Beth Ha-Midrash, vol. iii (Leipzig, 1855); next by the learned treatises of Beer, Das Buch der Jubileen und die Lehre des Midrash Vajzau, (Leipzig, 1856), and Beer, Das Buch d. Jubileen (in the Monographs. d. Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judenthums, v, 311-316, 380-400); then by another masterly production by Beer, entitled Noch ein Wort über das Buch der Jubileen (in Frankel's Monatschrift, 1857); and strictures on the works of Jel¬linek, Beer, and Frankel, by Dillmann, in the Zeitschrift. der Deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft, xi (Leipzig, 1857), 161 sq. Krüger, too, published an article on Die Chronologie im Buche der Jubileen in the same journal, xii (Leipzig, 1858), 279 sq.; and Dillmann at last published the Ethiopic itself (Kiel and Lund, 1859), which Rohn has since translated with notes (Leips.1874, 8vo).

Juda (Jev. xxxviii, 1). See Joshua.

Judäa (Judah, merely the Genitive case of Judäa, the Grecized form of Judah), an incorrect Angelizing of the name Judas or Judah in several passages of the Auth. Vers. See also Jude.

1. The patriarch Judah, son of Jacob (Susan, 56; Luke iii, 33; Heb. vii, 14; Rev. v, 5; vii, 5). For the "city of Judah" (i.e. the tribe of Judah), in Luke i, 89, see JUTTH.".

2. The son of Joseph, and father of Simeon, in Christ's maternal ancestry (Luke iii, 30); probably the same with ADAH, the father of Masseiah, which latter was one of the Jewish centurions who aided Jephthah in restoring Joash to the throne (2 Chron. xxxiii, 1). B.C. ante 876. See Genealogy of Christ.

3. The son of Joanna, and father of Joseph (Luke iii, 28), another of Christ's maternal ancestors; probably identical with ABD, the father of Eliasim, among Christ's paternal ancestors (Matt. i, 18); and likewise with ZADANE, the son of ORAH, and father of Shecha¬niah (1 Chron. iii, 21). B.C. ante 406. (See Strong's "Harm. and Expos. of the Gospels," p. 16, 17."

4. One of the Lord's brethren, enumerated in Mark vi, 3. See Joses; Joseph. On the question of his identity with Jude, the brother of James, one of the twelve apostles (Luke vi, 16; Acts x, 19), and with the author of the general epistle, see James. In Matt. xiii, 55, his name is given more correctly in the A. Vers. as Judas.

Juda (or Judá) Leo. See Judah Leo.

Judae's (Judae, fem. of Judaeus, Jew or Jewish, sc. land; once in A.V. for Chalde. "Wid." Judah, Ezra v, 8; "Jewry," Luke xxiii, 5; John vii, 1), the southernmost of the three divisions of the Holy Land. It de¬noted the kingdom of Judah as distinguished from that of Israel. See Judah. But after the captivity, as most of the exiles who returned belonged to the kingdom of Judah, the name Judæa (Judah) was applied generally to the whole of Palestine west of the Jordan ( Hag. i, 1; ii, 2). Under the Romans, in the time of Christ, Palestine was divided into Galilee, Samaria, and Judæa (John iv, 4, 5; Acts ix, 31), the last including the whole of the southern part west of the Jordan. But this divi¬sion was only observed as a political and local distinc¬tion, for the sake of indicating the part of the country, just as we use the name of a county (Matt. ii, 1; 5, 3; i, 4, 5; Luke i, 65); but when the whole of Palestine was to be indicated in a general way, the term Judæa was still employed. Thus persons in Galilee and else¬where, when asking of going to Judæa (John vii, 5; xi, 7), to distinguish it, the son of Assine to which they were proceeding; but when persons in Rome and other places spoke of Judæa (Acts xxviii, 21), they used the word as a general denomination for the country of the Jews, or Palestine. Indeed, the name seems to have had a more restricted sense in the time of Palestine east of the Jordan. It denoted all the dominions of Herod, the Great, who was called the king of Judæa; and much of these lay beyond the river (comp. Matt. xix, 1, Mark..."
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x, 1). After the death of Herod, however, the Judea to which his son Archelaus succeeded was only the southern province so called (Matt. ii, 22), which afterwards became a Roman province dependent on Syria and governed by procurators, and this was its condition during the times of Josephus (see Not. introd. in Ant. 1, 4, 2; cfr. Romanorum, Upsal, 1822). It was afterwards for a time partly under the dominion of Herod Agrippa the elder (Acts xii, 1-19), but on his death it reverted to its former condition under the Romans. See Smith's Dict. of Class. Geog. s.v.

It is true Judea, in the provincial sense, that requires our present notice, the country at large being described in the article PALESTINE. In this sense, however, it was much more extensive than the domain of the tribe of Judah, even more so than the kingdom of the same name. There are no materials for describing its limits with precision, but it included the ancient territories of Judah, Benjamin, Dan, Simeon, and part of Ephraim. It is, however, not correct to describe Idumea as not ancienly belonging to Judah. The Idumeans of later times, or that which belonged to Judea, was the southern part of the ancient Judah, into which the Idumeans had intruded during the exile, and the annexation of which to Judea only restored what had ancienly belonged to it.

The name Judea occurs among the list of nations represented at the paschal outpouring of the Holy Spirit (Acts ii, 1-13). The Jews have preferred the various renderings Judæa or Idumæa (see Kunôl, ad loc.), and even Junia (Iouwïâ, Schultheis, De charismate, i, 146), a place in Armenia, with various other conjectural emendations (see Bowser's Conjectures on the N.T. ad loc.), all alike unnecessary (see Hackett, Alford, ad loc.).

In the Rabbinical writings, Judea, as a division of Palestine, is frequently called "the south," or "the south country," to distinguish it from Galilee, which was called "the north" (Lightfoot, Chorog. Cent. xii). The distinction of the tribe of Judah into "the Mountain," "the Plain," and "the Vale," which we meet with in the Old Testament (Num. xiii, 30), was preserved under the more extended denomination of Judea (for the more specific divisions in Josh. xv, 21-63, see Keil's Comment. ad loc.; Schwarz, Palest. p. 90-122). The Mountain, or hill-country of Judah (Josh. xxi, 11; Luke i, 39), has been called back of mountains by Lightfoot, who calls it (Chorog. Cent. xii), which fills the centre of the country from Hebron northward to beyond Jerusalem (for Luke i, 39, see JUTTAH). The Plain was the low country towards the sea-coast, and seems to have included not only the broad plain which extends between the stars of Judah and that of Simeon, but the whole parts of the hilly region itself in that direction. Thus the Rabbinins allude that from Beth-horon to the sea is one region (Talmud Hier. Sbhith, ix, 2). The Vale is defined by the Rabbinins as extending from Engedi to Jericho (Lightfoot, Pomeron, § 2); from which, and other indications, it seems to have included some parts of the Ghor, or great plain of the Jordan, as lay within the territory of Judea. This appropriation of the terms is far preferable to that of some writers, such as Lightfoot, who suppose "the Plain" to be the broad valley of the Jordan, and the "Vale" to be the valley of the lower Jordan river. Thus which is called the Wilderness of Judea was the wild and inhospitable region lying eastward of Jerusalem, in the direction of the Jordan and Dead Sea (Isa. xi, 3; Matt. iii, 1; Luke i, 80; iii, 2-4). In the N.T. only the Highlands and the Desert of Judea are distinguished, and may have some notion of the extent of the territory northward which Judæa had obtained, from Josephus calling Jerusalem the centre of the country (War, iii, 8, 5), which is remarkable, seeing that Jerusalem was originally in the northernmost border of the tribe of Judah. In fact, he describes the breadth of the country as extending from the Jordan to Joppa, which shows that this city was in Judea. How much further to the north the boundary lay we cannot know with precision, as we are unacquainted with the site of Amath, otherwise Beroea, which he says lay on the boundary-line between Judea and Samaria. The mere fact that Josephus makes Jerusalem the centre of the land seems to prove that the province did not extend so far to the north as the wilderness of Judea, mentioned above. The southern boundary of Judea was also that of the whole country, it is only necessary to remark that Josephus places the southern boundary of the Judea of the time of Christ at a village called Jordon, on the confines of Arabia Petra. No place of this name has been found, and Josephus' position is very different from the fact that all the country which lay beyond the Idumeans of those times was then called Arabia. In fixing this boundary, Josephus regards Idumea as part of Judea, for he immediately after reckons that as one of the eleven districts into which Judæa was divided. Most of these districts were denominated, like our counties, from the chief towns. They were, 1. Jerusalem: 2. Gophna; 3. Acarabatia; 4. Thumna; 5. Lydda; 6. Emmaus; 7. Pella; 8. Idumea; 9. Engaddi; 10. Herodium; and, 11. Jericho. Judea is, as the above intimations would suggest, a country full of hills and valleys. The hills are generally separated from one another by valleys and torrents, and are, for the most part, of moderate height, uneven, and seldom of any regular figure. The rock of which they are composed is easily converted into soil, which, for the most part, is the natural result of the rains, renders the hills cultivable in a series of long, narrow gardens, formed by these terraces from the base upwards. In this manner the hills were in ancient times cultivated most industriously, and enriched and beautified with the fig-tree, the olive-tree, and the vine: and it is thus that the cultivation which still subsists is now carried on. But when the inhabitants were rooted out, and the culture neglected, the terraces fell to decay, and the soil which had been collected in them was washed down into the valleys, leaving only the arid rock, naked and desolate. This is the general character of the scenery: but in some parts the hills are beautifully wooded, and in others the application of the ancient mode of cultivation still suggests to the traveller how rich the country once was and might be again, and how beautiful the prospects which it offered. As however, the result of this was the result of cultivation, the country was probably ancienly, as at present, naturally less fertile than either Samaria or Galilee. The present difference is very pointedly remarked by different travellers; and lord Lindsay plainly declares that "all Judea, except the hills of Hebron and the vales immediately adjoining, as Lightfoot calls it, was forested country and was probably /ancienly, as at present, naturally less fertile than either Samaria or Galilee. The present difference is very pointedly remarked by different travellers; and lord Lindsay plainly declares that "all Judea, except the hills of Hebron and the vales immediately adjoining, as Lightfoot calls it, was forested country and was probably ancienly, as at present, naturally less fertile than either Samaria or Galilee. The present difference is very pointedly remarked by different travellers; and lord Lindsay plainly declares that "all Judea, except the hills of Hebron and the vales immediately adjoining, as Lightfoot calls it, was forested country and was probably ancienly, as at present, naturally less fertile than either Samaria or Galilee. The present difference is very pointedly remarked by different travellers; and lord Lindsay plainly declares that "all Judea, except the hills of Hebron and the vales immediately adjoining, as Lightfoot calls it, was forested country and was probably ancienly, as at present, naturally less fertile than either Samaria or Galilee. The present difference is very pointedly remarked by different travellers; and lord Lindsay plainly declares that "all Judea, except the hills of Hebron and the vales immediately adjoining, as Lightfoot calls it, was forested country and was probably ancienly, as at present, naturally less fertile than either Samaria or Galilee. The present difference is very pointedly remarked by different travellers; and lord Lindsay plainly declares that "all Judea, except the hills of Hebron and the vales immediately adjoining, as Lightfoot calls it, was forested country and was probably ancienly, as at present, naturally less fertile than either Samaria or Galilee. The present difference is very pointedly remarked by different travellers; and lord Lindsay plainly declares that "all Judea, except the hills of Hebron and the vales immediately adjoining, as Lightfoot calls it, was forested country and was probably ancienly, as at present, naturally less fertile than either Samaria or Galilee. The present difference is very pointedly remarked by different travellers; and lord Lindsay plainly declares that "all Judea, except the hills of Hebron and the vales immediately adjoining, as Lightfoot calls it, was forested country and was probably ancienly, as at present, naturally less fertile than either Samaria or Galilee. The present difference is very pointedly remarked by different travellers; and lord Lindsay plainly declares that "all Judea, except the hills of Hebron and the vales immediately adjoining, as Lightfoot calls it, was forested country and was probably ancienly, as at present, naturally less fertile than either Samaria or Galilee. The present difference is very pointedly remarked by different travellers; and lord Lindsay plainly declares that "all Judea, except the hills of Hebron and the vales immediately adjoining, as Lightfoot calls it, was forested country and was probably ancienly, as at present, naturally less fertile than either Samaria or Galilee. The present difference is very pointedly remarked by different travellers; and lord Lindsay plainly declares that "all Judea, except the hills of Hebron and the vales immediately adjoining, as Lightfoot calls it, was forested country and was probably ancienly, as at present, naturally less fertile than either Samaria or Galilee. The present difference is very pointedly remarked by different travellers; and lord Lindsay plainly declares that "all Judea, except the hills of Hebron and the vales immediately adjoining, as Lightfoot calls it, was forested country and was probably ancienly, as at present, naturally less fertile than either Samaria or Galilee. The present difference is very pointedly remarked by different traveller..."
for Luke i, 29, see JUTTAH), the name of several persons, etc., in Scripture. See also JUDAH: JUNE.

1. The fourth son of Jacob by Leah, born B.C. 1916 (Gen. xxix, 35), being the last before the temporary cessation in the births of her children. His whole-brothers were Reuben, Simon, and Levi, elder than themselves, and Judah is mentioned last (Gen. xxxvii, 23). The name is explained as having originated in Leah's exclamation of "praise" at this fresh gift of Jehovah—"She said, 'Now will I praise יהוה Jehovah,' and she called his name Yehudah" (xxix, 35). The same play is preserved in the blessing of Jacob—"Jehuah, thou whom thy brethren shall praise!" (xxvii, 8).

The Genesis brings Joseph a hierarch more before the reader, and makes known more of his history and character than it does in the case of any other of the twelve sons of Jacob, with the single exception of Joseph. It was Judah's advice that the brethren followed when they sold Joseph to the Ishmaelites instead of taking his life. By the light of his subsequent actions we can see that his conduct on this occasion arose from a generous impulse, although the form of the question he put to them has been sometimes held to suggest an interested motive: "What profit is it if we slay our brother and conceal his blood? Come, let us sell him to the Hebrews, and let us not be guilty of blood" (Gen. xxxvii, 26, 27). Though we know Joseph afterward he "prevailed above his brethren" (1 Chron. v, 2), and we find him subsequently taking a decided lead in all the affairs of the family. When a second visit to Egypt for corn had become inevitable, it was Judah who, as the mouthpiece of the rest, headed the remonstrance against the donation of Benjamin by Jacob, and finally undertook to be responsible for the safety of the lad (Gen. xliii, 3-10). When, through Joseph's artifice, the brothers were brought back to the palace, he is again the leader and spokesman of the band. In that thorough ejection of Benjamin as Judah acknowledged the guilt which had never been committed, threw himself on the mercy of the supposed Egyptian prince, offers himself as a slave, and makes that wonderful appeal to the feelings of his disguised brother which renders it impossible for Joseph any longer to conceal his secret (xlii, 14-24). So, too, is Judah who is sent before Jacob to smooth the way for him in the land of Goshen (xlvii, 28). This ascendency over his brethren is reflected in the last words addressed to him by his father—Thou whom thy brethren shall praise! thy father's sons shall bow down before thee; and thou shalt be the gathering of the seven years of famine, 8-10). In the interesting traditions of the Koran and the Midrash his figure stands out in the same prominence. Before Joseph his wrath is mightier and his recognition heartier as the rest. It is he who hastens in advance to bear to Jacob the fragrant robe of Joseph (Well's Biblical Legends, p. 98-99).

Not long after the sale of Joseph, Judah had withdrawn from the paternal tents, and gone to reside at Adullam, in the country which afterwards bore his name. Here he married a woman of Canaan, called Shu-ah, and had by her three sons, Er, Onan, and Shela. When the eldest of these sons became of fit age, he was married to a woman named Tamar, but soon after died. See En. As he died childless, the patriarchal law, afterwards adopted into the Mosaic code (Deut. xxv, 6), required Judah to bestow upon the widow his second son. This was done, but not without difficulty (see Onan). Judah became reluctant to bestow his only surviving son upon this woman, and put her off with the excuse that he was not yet of sufficient age. Tamar accordingly remained in her father's house at Adullam. She had the usual passion of Eastern women for offspring, and could not endure the stigmas of having been twice married without bearing children, while the law precluded her from contracting any alliance but that which Judah withheld her from completing. Meanwhile Judah's wife died, and, after the time of mourning had expired, he went, accompanied by his friend Hirah, to attend the shearing of his sheep at Timnath, in the same neighborhood. These circumstances suggested to Tamar the strange thought of connecting herself with Judah himself, under the guise of a loose woman. Having waylaid him on the road to Timnath, she placed the article, seedless, before him. It was not long before the idea began to manifest in the person of Tamar, Judah was highly enraged at her crime, and, exercising the powers which belonged to him as the head of the family she had disinherited, he commanded her to be brought forth, and committed to the flames as an adulteress. But when she appeared the precious ring, the bracelet, and the staff which he had left in pledge with her, and put him to confusion by declaring that they belonged to the father of her coming offspring. Seeing Tamar Judah acknowledged them to be his, and confessed that he had been wrong in withholding Shelah from her. The result of this painful affair was the birth of two sons, Zerah and Pharez (B.C. cir. 1893), from whom, with Shelah, the tribe of Judah descended. Pharez was the ancestor of the line from which David, the kings of Judah, and Jesus came (Gen. xxxviii; xlvi, 12; 1 Chron. ii, 3-5; Matt. i, 8; Luke iii, 38). These circumstances seem to have been needed Judah was well{enlightened in town, for we find him ever afterwards at his father's tents. His experience of life, and the strength of his character, appear to have given him much influence with Jacob; and it was chiefly from confidence in him that the aged father at length consented to allow Benjamin to go to Egypt. That the offspring of Zerah, not misplaced has already been shown [see Joseph]; and there is not in the whole range of literature a finer piece of true natural eloquence than that in which Judah offers himself to remain as a bond-slave in the place of Benjamin, for whose safe return he had made himself responsible to his father. The strong emotions which it raised in Joseph disabled him from keeping up longer the disguise he had hitherto maintained, and there are few who have read it without being, like him, moved even to tears (xlvii, 14-54). B.C. 1874. See Jacob.

We hear nothing more of Judah till he received, along with his brothers, the final blessing of his father, which was conveyed in lofty language, glancing far into futurity, and strongly indicative of the high destinies which awaited the tribe that was to descend from him (Gen. xliii, 8-12). B.C. 1836. See Shishlong.

JUDAH, TRIBE AND TERRITORY OF. I. Historical Memoranda.—I. Judah's sons were five. Of these, three were by his Canaanitish wife Bath-shua; they are all insignificant; two died early, and the third, Shelah, does not come prominently forward either in his person or his family. The other two, Pharez and Zerah—twins—were illegitimate sons by the widow of Er, the eldest of the former family. As frequently the case, the illegitimate sons surpassed the legitimate, and from Pharez, the eldest, were descended the royal and other illustrious families of Judah. These sons were born to Judah while he was living in the same district of Palestine, which centuries after, Judah, with his posterity, issued from (Gen. xlvi, 12; Exod. i, 2). See Jacob.

2. When we again meet with the families of Judah they occupy a position among the tribes similar to that which their progenitor had taken amongst the patriarchs. At the time that the Israelites quitted Egypt, it already exhibited the elements of its future distinction in a larger population than any of the other tribes possessed (Stuart, 29, 30). Among the total of males, being nearly 12,000 more than Dan, the next in point of numbers, and 34,100 more than Ephraim, which in the end contended with it the superiority among the tribes. During the sojourn in the wilderness, Judah neither gained, like some tribes, nor lost like others.
Its numbers had increased to 76,500, being 12,100 more than Issachar, which had become next to it in population (Numb. xxvi, 22). The chief of the tribe at the former census was Nahshon, the son of Amminadab (Numb. 1:7; 7:3; 12:8); at the latter census it was Eleazar, the son of Zebulun (ii, 3-9; x, 14). The traditional standard of the tribe was a lion's whelp, with the words, Rise up, Lord, and let thine enemies be scattered! (Targ. Pseuda- dojón, on Numb. ii, 8.)

This west of the country the only incidents specially affecting the tribe of Judah are, (1) the misbehavior of Acham, who was of the great house of Zerah (Josh. vii, 1, 16-18); and (2) the conquest of the mountain-district of Hebron by Caleb, and of the strong city Debir, in the same locality, by his nephew and son-in-law Othniel (Josh. xiv, 6-15; xiv, 13-19). It is the only instance given of a portion of the country being expressly reserved for the person or persons who conquered it. In general the conquest seems to have been made by the whole community, and the territory allotted afterwards, without reference to the original conquerors. In this case the high character and position of Caleb, and perhaps a claim established by him at the time of the visit of the spies to "the land whereon his feet had trodden" (Josh. xiv, 9; comp. Numb. xiv, 24), may have led to the exception.

4. The history of the Judges contains fewer facts respecting the tribe than might be expected. It seems, however, to have been usually considered that the birthright which Reuben forfeited had passed to Judah under the blessing of Jacob; and a sanction was given to this impression when, after the death of Joshua, the divine oracle nominated Judah to take precedence of the other tribes in the war against the Canaanites (Judg. i, 2). It does not appear that any tribe was disposed to dispute the superior claim of Judah on its own account except Ephraim, although in doing this Ephraim had the support of other tribes. Ephraim appears to have rested its claims to the leadership of the tribes on the fact that the birthright, so far as interest it represented, had received the birthright, or double portion of the eldest, by the adoption of the two sons of Joseph, who became the founders of two tribes in Israel. The existence of the sacerdotal establishment at Shiloh, in Ephraim, was doubtless also alleged by the Ephraimites to give them a greater claim (2 K. xiv, 13). When, therefore, Judah assumed the sceptre in the person of David, and when the sacerdotal establishment was removed to Jerusalem, Ephraim could not brook the eclipse it had sustained, and took the first opportunity of erecting a separate church, and forming separate establishments for worship and sacrifice. Perhaps the separation of the kingdoms may thus be traced to the rivalry of Judah and Ephraim. After that separation the rivalry was between the two kingdoms, but it was still popularly considered as representing the ancient rivalry of these great tribes: for the prophet, in foretelling the repose of a coming time, describes it by saying, "The envy also of Ephraim shall depart, and the adversaries of Judah shall be cut off: Ephraim shall not envy Judah, and Judah shall not vex Ephraim" (Isa. xliii, 15).

When the kingdom was divided under Rehoboam and Jeroboam, the land of Judah and the land of Ephraim had that of Judah as a kingdom. See JUDAH, KINGDOM OF.

II. Geographical Data.—In the first distribution of lands, the tribe of Judah received the southernmost part of Palestine to the extent of fully one third of the whole country west of the Jordan, which was to be distributed among the nine and a half tribes for provision which was to be made to the members of the other tribes (Josh. xii, 1-19). This land was discovered and rectified at the time of the second distribution, which was founded on an actual survey of the country, when Simeon received an allotment out of the territory which had before been wholly assigned to Judah (Josh. xiii, 9). See SIMON. That which remained was still very large, and was proportioned to the future greatness than the actual wants of the tribe. We now also know, through the researches of recent travellers, that the extent of good land belonging to this tribe, southward, was much greater than had usually been supposed, much of that which had been laid down in maps as a desert being actually composed of excellent pasture-land, and in part of arable soil, still exhibiting some traces of ancient cultivation. Dan defended the western border against the incursions of the Philistines with a brave and well-trained band of soldiers, having a fortress and camp on the commanding height between Zorah and Eshtaol (Judg. xiii, 25; xvi, 31; xviii, 12; see DAS). Simeon bore the brunt of all attacks and forays made on the southern border by the tribes of the great "Wilderness of Wandering;" and when the Edomites attempted to penetrate Judah, Simeon could always check them by an attack upon their flank. When Judah became a kingdom, the original extent of territory assigned to the tribe was more than restored or compensated for it must have embraced the domains of Simeon, and probably also of Dan, and we know that Benjamin was likewise nearly as large. The boundaries and contents of the territory allotted to Judah are narrated at great length, and with greater minuteness than the others, in Josh. xv, 20-63. This may be due either to the fact that the lists were reduced to their present form at a later period, when the monarchical residence with Judah, was naturally looked upon as the home of the tribes, and as more detached from the other tribes, or to the fact that the territory was more important and more thickly covered with towns and villages than any other part of Palestine. The greater prominence given to the genealogies of Judah in 1 Chron. ii, iii, iv, no doubt arises from the former reason. The towns are also specifically named, not only under the general divisions, but even in detailed groups. See below.)

The north boundary—coincident with the south boundary of Benjamin—begun at the embouchure of the Jordan, entered the hills apparently at, or about the pass of Shechem, and followed the ridge of the Mesh—probably the present Ain-Hand, below Bethany—thence over the Mount of Olives to Enroth, in the valley beneath Jerusalem; went along the ravine of Hinnom, under the precipices of the city, climbed the hill in a north-west direction to the water of Nephtoah, and thence (probably by the road now covered by Kurieh el-Enab), Bethhemesh (Ain-Shehme), Timnah, and Ekron to Jabneh on the seacoast. On the east the Dead Sea, and on the west the Mediterranean, formed the boundaries. The southern line is hard to determine, since it is denoted by places many of which have not been identified. It left the Dead Sea at its extreme south end, and joined the Mediterranean at the wady el-Arish; but between these two points it passed through Maaleh Accablim, the Wilderness of Zin, Hermon, Adar, Farraka, and Azmon; the Wilderness of Zin was the extreme limit of this tract, the entire width of all (from 1-19). The country thus defined was sixty-five miles long, and averaged about fifty in breadth. But while this large tract was nominally allotted to Judah, the portion of it available for actual settlement was comparatively small, not amounting to one third of the whole. From it must also be subtracted the land of Judah which had been laid in across from the Mediterranean to the Dead Sea, being the part set off to the tribe of Simeon. The actual territory of Judaea therefore extended, on an average, only about twenty-five miles from north to south, by about forty miles from east to west. See TINAE. The whole of the above information was from a very early date divided into four main regions.

1. The South—the undulating pasture country which
intervened between the hills, the proper possession of the tribe, and the deserts which encompass the lower part of Palestine (Josh. xv, 21). It is this which is once designated as the wilderness (midbar) of Judah (Judg. i, 16). It contained twenty-nine towns, with their dependent villages (Josh. xv, 20-32), which, with Bethlehem, were to give it its own proper and constant appellation, the Shephelah—the broad belt or strip lying between the central highlands—the mountain—and the Mediterranean Sea; the lower portion of that maritime plain which extends through the whole of the sea-board of Palestine, from Sidon in the north to Rhinocorura at the south. This tract was the garden and the granary of the tribe. In it, long before the conquest of the country by Israel, the Philistines had settled themselves, never to be completely dislodged (Neh. xiii, 23, 24). There, planted at equal intervals along the coast line, were five chief cities, each with its dependencies, overlooking, from the natural undulations of the ground, the "standing corn," "shocks," "vineyards and olives," which excite the ingenuity of Samson, and are still noticeable to modern travellers. "They are all remarkable features of the gardens which surround them—the scarlet blossoms and the white hyacinths, the golden oranges which gild the green foliage of their famous groves" (Stanley, Syr. and Pal. p. 257). From the edge of the sandy tract, which fringes the immediate shore right up to the very wall of the hills of Judah, stretches the immense plain of broad, variegated fields. In those rich harvests lies the explanation of the Samranah; the contests between Israel and the Philistines (Syr. and Pal. p. 238). From them were gathered the enormous cargoes of wheat which were transmitted to Phenicia by Solomon in exchange for the arts of Hiram, and which in the time of Rehoboam still "nourished" the country of Tyre and Sidon (Acts xii, 20). There were the olive-trees, the sycamore-trees, and the treasures of oil, the care of which was sufficient to task the energies of two of David's special officers (1 Chron. xxvii, 29). The natural features of the locality would seem to be reflected in the names of many of its towns if interpreted as Hebrew words: Dilean=cucumbers; Gedera, Gederoth, Gederothaim, sheaf-fields; Zoreah, yaphe; Ex-gamnium, spring of gardens, etc. But we have yet to learn how far these names are Hebrew, and whether at best they are but mere Hebrew accommodations of the original names, and therefore not to be depended on for their significations.

The number of cities in this district, without counting the smaller villages connected with them, was forty-two. Of these, however, many which belonged to the Philistines can only have been allotted to the tribe, and, if taken possession of by Judah, were only held for a time. What were the exact boundaries of the Shephelah we do not know. We are at present ignorant of the principles on which the ancient Jews drew their boundaries between one territory and another. One thing only is almost certain, that they were not determined by the natural features of the ground, for we should not find cities enumerated as in the lowland plain whose modern representatives are found deep in the mountains. See JAREMUTH; JIPHTHAH, etc. (The latest information regarding this district is contained in Tobler's Dritte Wendeung. 1850.)

3. The third region of the tribe—the Mountain, the "hill-country of Judah"—though not the richest, was, if not the largest, yet the most important of the four. Beginning considerably below Hebron, it stretches northward to Jerusalem, eastward to the Dead Sea slopes, and westward to the Shephelah, and forms an elevated district or plateau, which, though thrown into considerable undulations, yet preserves a general level in both directions. It is the southern portion of that elevated hilly district of Palestine which stretches north until intersected by the plain of Esdraelon, and on which Hebron, Jerusalem, and Shechem are the chief spots. On every side the approaches to it were difficult, and the passes easily defended. The towns and villages, too, were generally perched on the tops of hills or on rocky slopes. The resources of the soil were great. The country was rich in corn, wine, oil, and fruits; and the daring shepherds were able to lead their flocks far out over the neighboring plains and through the mountains. The surface of this region, which is of limestone, is monotonous enough. Round swelling hills and hollows, of somewhat bolder proportions than those immediately north of Jerusalem, which, though in early times probably covered with forests [see HARETIA], have now, where not cultivated, no growth larger than a brushwood of dwarf-oak, arbutus, and other bushes. In many places there is a good soft turf, discoverable even in the autumn, and in spring the hills are covered with flow- ers. The number of towns enumerated (Josh. xv, 48-60) as belonging to this district is thirty-eight, but, if we may judge from the ruins which on the eye on every side, this must have been very far below the real number. Hardy a hill which is not crowned by some fragments of stone buildings more or less considerable, which are still inhabited surrounded by groves of olive-trees, and inclosures of stone walls protecting the vineyards and the wells. The springs are numerous, the springs are frequent—in the neighborhood of "Solomon's Pools" at Urtas most abundant ones.

4. The fourth district is the Wilderness (midbar), which here and there only appears to be synonymous with Aradah), the sunken district immediately adjoining the Dead Sea (Josh. xv, 6), averaging ten miles in breadth, a wild, barren, uninhabitable region, fit only to afford scanty pasturage for sheep and goats, and a secure home for leopards, bears, wild goats, and owls (1 Sam. xvii, 34; Mark i, 13; 1 Sam. xxii. 1 sq.). Different sections of it were called by different names, as "Wilderness of Engedi" (1 Sam. xiv, 1), "Wilderness of Judah" (Judg. i, 16), "Wilderness of Mammon" (1 Sam. xxii, 24; see art. DESERT). It was the training-ground of the shepherd-warriors of Israel, "where David and his mighty men were braced and trained for those feats of daring courage which so highly distinguished them. See BIBLEL; DAVID. It contained only six cities, which must have been either, like Engedi, on the edge of the cliffs overhanging the sea, or else on the higher slopes of the basin. The "city of Salt" may have been on the salt plains, between the sea and the cliffs which form the southern termination to the Ghor.

Nine of the cities of Judah were allotted to the priests (Josh. xxi, 9-19). The Levites had no cities in the tribe, and the priests had none out of it.

The following is a tabulated view of these subdivisions of the tribe, with the cities in each group, as laid down in Josh. xxi, 21-63:

1. "The South" (22/77), or Simeonish portion.
   1. Kedesh.
   17 and 18. Bealoth or Balah (Bethelath-Nekeb), and
   2. Judgment-Jab-Balah (Bethaleath-Leh). Or
   20. Adinah.
   22. Hazron.
   23. Hazor.
   24. Ithnian or Ithyan (Hazor-onah). (Hazoraddah). (Hazar-okhrah).
   25. Sennanah or Hazor-salath.
   26. Lebath or Beth-lebath.
   27. Shittim or Shamah.
   28. and 29. Beth-rim or Beth-salath.
   30. En-rimonim.
   31. Hebron.
2. Shema or Sheba (Hazor-onah).
4. Hammon or Azmon.
5. Beth-palet.
6. Hebron.

The villages (1.) Hazor-haddath and (2.) Kerieth-heron, or Hazor-amam, both belonged to Hazor proper; (3.) Hazor-ghaddah to Hazor-shanah.
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Also [1.] Ether and [2.] Asahel out of the "plain" subdivision.
11. "The Valley" (מַעֲרָתָיו, מַעֲרֵי), or Plain.
   a. First group—N.W. corner.
      1. Eshdol.
      2. Zareah.
      3. Ashnah.
      5. En-gannim.
      6. Tappuah.
      7. Enam.
   b. Second group—south of the above, in the west part of the tribe.
      1. Zenan.
      2. Hadassah.
      4. Iltehem.
      5. Mizpeh.
      6. Joktheel [no capulative].
      7. Lachish [between].
      8. Borkath.
   c. Third group—E. of group b.
      1. Libnah.
      2. Ether.
      3. Ashnah.
      5. Aznah.
   d. Fourth group—Philistine pentarchy, on the Mediterranean shore.
      1. Ekron (really in Dan).
      2. Ashdod.  
      3. Azekah.  
      4. (Askelon, and Gath (the last = Mizpeh, really in the "valley").
111. "The Mountains" (מַעֲרָתָיו), or Highland.
   a. First group—along the border of Simeon, in the middle.
      1. Shamir.
      2. Hazor.
      3. Sosoch.
      4. Aroer.
   b. Second group—N. of group a, in the southern part of the tribe, around Hebron.
      1. Arab.
      2. Dumah.
      3. Ezem.
      4. Soco.
      5. En-gannim.  
      6. Aroer.
   c. Third group—E. of group b.
      1. Maon [no capulative].
      2. Karmel [between].
      5. Jezreel.
   d. Fourth group—N. of groups b and c, to Jerusalem on the N. boundary.
      1. Halhal [no capulative].
      2. Beth-naph.
      4. Ellon.
   e. Fifth group—in the N. medial angle, between group d and the "Valley" district.
      2. Rabbah (merely a title of Jerusalem).

(f. Group added in the Septuagint between d and e and considered N. of group e, up to Jerusalem probably should be added to c.)
12. Tekoa.
   2. Beth—Hebron—Bethlehem.
   3. Phagor.
   4. Etam.
   5. Kiriath [Benjamin] (prob."

IV. "The Wilderness" (יְבָשוֹן, מַעֲרָתָיו), or Desert.
1. Beth—Arabah [no capulative].
2. Beth—Arabah B. Benjamin.

Supplementary—Jeba, The following table comprises all the scriptural localities in Judah (except those in Jerusalem), with their probable or ascertained identifications.

Acdelama.

Field. See Jerusalem.

Achor.

Valley. Wady Dabri.
JUDAH, KINGDOM OF. When the territory of all the rest of Israel, except Judah and Benjamin, was lost to the kingdom of Rehoboam, a special single name was needed to denote that which remained to him; and almost of necessity the word Judah received an extended meaning, according to which it comprised not Benjamin only but the whole region from Lebanon to Zadok; and it substantially included great numbers from Israel, and rallied round the house of David. At a still later time, when the nationality of the ten tribes had been dissolved, and every practical distinction between the ten and the two had vanished during the captivity, the scattered body had no visible head, except in Jerusalem, which most of the most resided mostly by a portion of Judah's exiles. See Captivity.

In consequence, the name Judah (or Jehu) attached itself to the entire nation from about the epoch of the restoration. See JEW. But in this article Judah is understood of the people over which David's successors reigned, from Rehoboam to Zedekiah; and it substantially corresponded to the Juda (q. v.) of later times.

I. Extent of the Kingdom. — When the disruption of Solomon's kingdom took place at Shechem, only the tribe of Judah followed the house of David. But almost immediately afterwards, when Rehoboam conceived the design of establishing his authority over Israel by force of arms, the tribe of Benjamin also is recorded as obeying his summons, and contributing its warriors to make up his army. Jerusalem, situated within the borders of Benjamin (Josh. xviii, 28, etc.), yet won from the heathen by a name and Levitical, connected the frontiers of the two tribes by an indissoluble political bond. By the erection of the city of David, Benjamin's former adherence to Israel (2 Sam. ii, 9) was cancelled, though at least two Benjamite towns, Bethel and Jericho, were included in the northern kingdom. A part, if not all, of the territory of Simeon (1 Chron. vii. 11, 1 Kings xix, 3; comp. Josh. xiv, 1) and of Dan (2 Chron. xi. 10; comp. Josh. xiv, 41, 42) was recognised as belonging to Judah, and in the reigns of Abijah and Asa the southern kingdom was enlarged by some additions taken out of the territory of Ephraim (2 Chron. xiii. 15; xv; xvi. 8; xxii. 41; xxvi. 16). By the influence of Hezekiah, the city of Jerusalem was restored to the national centre, and the ports of the coast fell to the dominion of Judah, and especially to the influence of the people to the One True God, which, if not always a pure and elevated sentiment, yet was a contrast to such devotion as could be inspired by the worship of the calves or of Baal, and, lastly, the popular reverence for and obedience to the divine law so far as they learned it from their teachers, their princes, and their priests. It was, therefore, to be attributed the fact that Judah survived her more populous and more powerful sister kingdom by 130 years, and lasted from B.C. 975 to B.C. 856. (See Bernhardt, De causa quibus effectum est quod regnum Juda dictum persisteret quam regnum Israel, in the Aeneid, Acad. Groning, 1822-23, p. 124 sq.; also Loven, 1891; Schmeidler, Der Uebergang der Reiche Juda, Bresl. 1831.)

II. Population. — A singular gauge of the growth of the kingdom of Judah is supplied by the progressive augmentation of the army under successive kings. In David's time (2 Sam. xxiii, 9, and 1 Chron. xxi, 5) the warriors of Judah numbered at least 500,000. But Rehoboam brought into the field (1 Kings xii, 21) only 180,000 men; Abijah, eighteen years after, 400,000 (2 Chron. xiii, 8); Asa (2 Chron. xiv, 8), his successor, 580,000, exactly equal to the sum of the armies of his two predecessors; Jehoshaphat (2 Chron. xvii, 14-19), the next king, numbered his warriors in five armies, the aggregate of which is 1,160,000, exactly double the amount of his father, and exactly equal to the sum of the armies of his three predecessors. After four glorious reigns, the energetic Amaziah could muster only 300,000 men when he set out to recover Edom. His son Uzziah had a standing (2 Chron. xxvi, 11) force of 307,500 fighting men. It would be out of place here to discuss the question whether the numbers have been raised by the accuracy of these numbers. See NUMBER. So far as they are authentic, it may be safely reckoned that the population subject to each king was about four times the number of the fighting men in his dominions. See Israel, KINGDOM OF.

III. Resources. — Unless Judah had some other means of acquiring wealth besides pastures and tillage—as by maritime commerce from the Red Sea coast, or, less probably) from Joppa, or by keeping up the old trade (1 Kings x. 28) with Egypt—it seems difficult to account for that ability to accumulate wealth which supplied the Temple treasury with sufficient store to invite so frequent the banditry of the spoiler. Egypt, Damascus, Samaria, Nineveh, and Babylon had each its share of a large share of the pillarage. The treasury was emptied by Shishak (1 Kings xiv, 26), again by Asa (1 Kings xv, 18), by Jehoshaphat of Judah (2 Kings xii, 10), by Jehoash of Israel (2 Kings xiv, 14), by Ahaz (2 Kings xvii, 4), by Hezekiah (2 Kings xviii, 15), and by Nebuchadnezzar (2 Kings xxiv, 13).

IV. Advantages of Position. — In Edom a vassal-king probably retained his fidelity to the son of Solomon, and guarded for Jewish enterprise the road to the maritime trade with Phœnicia. Phœnicia maintained, for the most part, a quiet trade in the height of her brief power, pushed her conquests along the northern and eastern frontiers of Judah, and threatened Jerusalem; but the interposition of the territory of Israel generally relieved Judah from any immediate contact with that dangerous neighbor. The southern border of Judah, resting on the desert, was an agitated by any turbulent stream of commercial activity like that which flowed by the rear of Israel, from Damascus to Tyre. Though some of the Egyptian kings were ambitious, that ancient kingdom was far less aggressive as a neighbor to Judah than Assyria was to Israel.

The kingdom of Judah thus possessed many advantages which secured for it a longer continuance than that of Israel. A frontier less exposed to powerful enemies, a soil less fertile, a population hardier and more united, a capital at the same time a commercial and administrative centre of administration and religion, a hereditary aristocracy in the sovereign caste, an army always subordinate, a succession of kings which no revolution interrupted, many of whom were wise and good, and strove successfully to promote the moral and spiritual as well as the material prosperity of their part, a quiet more than these, the devotion of the people to the One True God, which, if not always a pure and elevated sentiment, yet was a contrast to such devotion as could be inspired by the worship of the calves or of Baal; and, lastly, the popular reverence for and obedience to the divine law so far as they learned it from their teachers, their princes, and their priests. It was, therefore, to be attributed the fact that Judah survived her more populous and more powerful sister kingdom by 130 years, and lasted from B.C. 975 to B.C. 856. (See Bernhardt, De causa quibus effectum est quod regnum Juda dictum persisteret quam regnum Israel, in the Aeneid, Acad. Groning, 1822-23, p. 124 sq.; also Loven, 1891; Schmeidler, Der Uebergang der Reiche Juda, Bresl. 1831.)

V. History. — For the circumstances that led to the schism, and for a comparison with the history of the rival kingdom, see Israel, KINGDOM OF. For a further examination of the many chronological difficulties arising from the double list of kings, see Chronology. The annals of the kingdom will be found detailed under the name of the several kings, and a general view under the articles Jerusalem, and Palestine. (See White, Kings of Judah and Israel, Lond. 1868; Herzer, Die Jüdische Biographie, Freiberg, 1875; also Geschichte der Könige Juda und Israel, Zürich, 1787; and Gesch. der Regenten Juda nach dem Exil, ib. 1784.) It will be sufficient, as a resume, here to notice the fact that the kingdom of Judah, in the course of its history, acted upon three different lines of policy in succession.

1. From the Conquest to the Rebuilding of Jerusalem. — The first three kings of Judah seem to have cherished the hope of re-establishing their authority over the Ten
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For sixty years there was war between them and the kings of Israel. Neither the disbanding of Rehoboam's forces by the authority of Shemaiah, nor the pillage of Jerusalem by the irresistible Shishak, served to put an end to the fraternal hostility. The victory of Judah over the defiles of the Jordan was not a temporary accession of territory. Assyria appears to have enlarged it still further, and to have given so powerful a stimulus to the migration of religious Israelitish settlers to Jerusalem that Baasha was induced to fortify Ramah with a view to checking the movement. Assyra provided for the safety of his dominion by building fortifications like Rehoboam, several fenced cities; he repelled an alarming irruption of an Ethiopian horde, he hired the armed intervention of Benhadad I, king of Damascus, against Baasha; and he discouraged idolatry and enforced the worship of the true God by severe penal laws. (See JANGE, NELLA INTER JUDANT EM ISRAEL. TIB. 1710.)

2. Resistance (generally in Alliance with Israel) to Damascus. — Hanani's remonstrance (2 Chron. xvi, 7) prepares us for the reversal by Jehoshaphat of the policy which Asa pursued towards Israel and Damascus. A close alliance sprang up with strange rapidity between the two parties. Asa became persuaded of the justice of tithing the produce of Amaziah, there was no open war between them, and Damascus appears as their chief and common enemy, though it rose afterwards from its overthrow to become, under Rezin, the ally of Pekah against Asa. Jehoshaphat, active and prosperous, repelled nomad invaders from the desert, curbed the power of the petty states of the nearer neighbours, and made his influence felt even among the Philistines and the Arabians. A still more lasting benefit was conferred on his kingdom by his persecuting efforts for the religious instruction of the people and the regular administration of justice. The reign of Jehoram, the husband of Athaliah, a time of bloodshed, idolatry, and disaster, was cut short by disease. Athaliah was slain by Jeph. Athaliah, the granddaughter of a Tyrian king, usurped the blood-stained crown of David, till the followers of the ancient religion put her to death, under the crown of Jehoash, the surviving scion of the royal house. His preserver, the high-priest, acquired prominent personal influence for a time; but the king fell into idolatry, and failing to withstand the power of Syria, was murdered by his own officers. The vigorous Amaziah, flushed with the victory of Eben-ezer, was no more; and his successor, the contemptuous Jehoash, the conqueror of the Syrians, and Jerusalem was entered and plundered by the Israelites. But their energies were sufficiently occupied in the task of completing the subjugation of Damascus. Under Uziah and Joash, Judah long enjoyed political and religious prosperity till the wanton outrage of Ahaz surrounded him with united enemies, with whom he was unable to cope, became in an evil hour the tributary and vassal of Tiglath-pileser.

3. Defence. Perhaps Vansande, to the Assyrian Kings. — Already in the fatal grasp of Assyria, Judah was yet spared for a checkered existence of almost another century and a half after the termination of the kingdom of Israel. The effect of the repulse of Sennacherib, of the signal religious revivals under Hezekiah and Josiah, and of the extension of these kings' salutary influence over the lost ten tribes of the kingdom of Israel, was apparently done away by the ignominious reign of the impious Manasseh, and the lingering decay of the whole people under the four feeble descendants of Josiah. Provoked by their treachery and meanness, their Babylonian master, who had meanwhile succeeded to the dominion of the throne of Assyria, the Israelites were brought in successive deportations, all being the strength of the kingdom. The consummation of the ruin came upon them in the destruction of the Temple by the hand of Nebuzaradan, amid the wailing of prophets and the taunts of heathen tribes arrests the length from the yoke of David.

V. L. Morit State. — The national life of the Hebrews appeared to become gradually weaker during these suc-

cessive stages of history, until at length it seemed extinct; but there was still, as there had been all along, a spiritual life hidden within the body. It was a time of hopeless darkness to all but those Jews who had strong faith in God, with a clear and steady insight into the ways of Providence, and in that sense prophetic. The time of the division of the kingdoms was the golden age of prophecy. In each kingdom the prophetic office was subject to peculiar modifications which were required in Judah by the circumstances of the priesthood, in Israel by the existence of the house of Baal and the national character of its religion. Some historians have even stated that after the reign of Athaliah, the priesthood gradually acquired and retained excessive and unconstitutional power in Judah. The recorded facts scarcely sustain the conjecture. Had it been so, the effect of such power would have been manifest in the exorbitant wealth and unbridled luxury of the priests and the cruel enforcement of penal laws, like those of Assyria, against the people. But the peculiar offences of the priesthood, as witnessed in the prophetic writings, were of another kind. Ignorance of God's word, neglect of the instruction of the people, and parental judgments, are the offences specially imputed to them, just such as might be looked for where the priesthood is a hereditary caste and irresponsible, but neither ambitious nor powerful. When the priest either, as was the case in Israel, abandoned the land, or, as in Judah, ceased to be really a teacher, ceased from spiritual communion with God, ceased from living sympathy with men, and became the mere image of an intercessor, a mechanical performer of ceremonial duties little understood or heeded by himself, then the prophet was raised up to supply some of his deficiencies, and to exercise his functions as the mediator of God's word. But even his influence sinks into obscurity and almost disappear, except from the genealogical tables, the prophets come forward appealing everywhere to the conscience of individuals — in Israel as wonder-workers, calling together God's chosen few out of an idolatrous nation, and in Judah as exhorters and seers, supporting and uniting all that remained of ancient piety, explaining each mysterious dispensation of God as it was unfolded, and promoting his gracious spiritual promises in all their extent. The part which Isaiah, Jeremiah, and other prophets took in preparing the Jews for their captivity, cannot, indeed, be fully appreciated without reviewing the succeeding efforts of Ezekiel and Daniel. But the influence which they exercised on the national mind was too important to be overlooked in a sketch, however brief, of the history of the kingdom of Judah. See Prophets.

JUDAH, Marsh, is a name often given to a range of hills to the south and west of Jerusalem, styled in Luke i, 39, 65, the "hill-country of Judah" (ג' בנאל ג' 'יווועא'. The hills are low and conical, uniform in shape even to weariness; the vegetation, save in early spring, is dry and parched, the valleys are broad and assuageless. The present day signs are that the land of corn, and wine, and oil has become desolate. The fenced cities and villages surmount the hills, but they are in ruins; the terraces where once were vineyards and cornfields can be traced along the mountain sides, but they are neglected; wells and pools of water are to be found in every valley, but there is none to drink of them. See Judah, Tribe of.
the priests in pushing the reconstruction of the Temple (Ezra iii, 9); unless this latter be rather the person elsewhere called Hodayah (Ezra ii, 40).

3. One of those who followed the half of the Jewish chiefs around the southern section of the newly-erected walls of Jerusalem, but whether he was a Levite or priest is not stated (Neh. xii, 34). B.C. 446.

4. One of those who accompanied with musical performances the procession around the southern quarter of the walls of Jerusalem lately reconstructed (Neh. xii, 86). B.C. 446. He was perhaps identical with the preceding.

5. Son of Sennah, a descendant of Benjamin, and prefect of Acræ or the Lower City (פִּירַ֨ת יָדֶּ֫קָּרוֹ, over the second city, not “second over the city,” as the A. V. renders following the Sept. and Vulg.) after the exile (Neh. xi, 9). B.C. cir. 440.

Juda hah-Kodesh, or the Holy, son of Simon, of the tribe of Benjamin, and a descendant of Hillel I., is one of the most celebrated characters in Jewish history. He was born at Tiberias, according to accounts, about 186, on the same day on which Akiba suffered martyrdom—an event predicted, according to his admirers, in the verse of Solomon: “One son ariseth, and one sun goeth down.” While yet a youth he was, on account of his extraordinary proficiency in Jewish law, admitted to the Sanhedrin, and on the death of his father followed him in the presidency.

Juda hah-Kodesh was one of the highest officials of the temple, and was known as the “scribe” and the “saint,” and also as the “rabbi.” He was the first of the great rabbis in the Jewish nation, and was known as the “scribe of the scribes.”

Juda hah-Kodesh has been called the “father of the Mishnah” by the rabbis of his time.

Tomb of “Seld Yehuda.”

2. One of the Levites who returned from Babylon with Zerubbabel (Neh. xii, 8). B.C. 586. It is perhaps his sons are alluded to (but unnamed) as aiding in the ceremonies of the temple.

Law, the traditions, the decisions of the members of the supreme court of the land, and the teachings of the sages were all embodied in the Talmudic writings.”
JUDAH JUDGhan

The *Mishnah* (q.v.) may be considered as a branch of this sect. For further details, see *Fürst, Geschichte der Karderturnus*, p. 26 sq.; Grätz, *Gesch. der Juden*, v, 277 sq., 516 sq. (J. H. W.)

Judaism

Judaism, the name by which we designate the religious doctrines and rites of the people chosen by Jehovah as his peculiar people; the descendants of Jacob, to whom the law was given by Moses, and religious light and truth were revealed in the Old Testament; the most important branch of that family of nations conventionally comprised under the title of Semites—a people of many fates and of many names, called by the Bible the people of God; by Mohammed, the people of the Book; by Hegel, "the people of the Geist," and now generally known as Hebrews, Israelites, or Jews. 

Abrahamism.—To the Christian student especially, the early development of these doctrines of this people is interesting, as unfolded in the pages of the older half of the inspired writings that go to make up the basis of his own creed. Judaism is pre-eminently a monotheistic faith, originating with the patriarch Abraham when, in an era of polytheism and flagrant vice, he became the founder of the monotheistic conception and worship of the one living and true God; and from that remote day to this, all the Jewish people pride themselves in being "children of Abraham." It is a fact striking to every student of comparative religion, and in no small degree a proof of the authenticity of the O.T. Scriptures, that this monotheistic faith originated at a time when the religion of all other branches of the same family, which, with the Hebrew, make up the Semitic, differed widely from it in every respect.

The Assyrians, Babylonians, Phœnicians, and Carthaginians all possessed a nearly identical religion, but one that lacked the essential feature of Judaism. They all, it is true, believed in a supreme god, called by the different names of Ilu, Bel, Set, Hadad, Moloch, Chemosh, Baal, El, Adon, Assur, but they also all believed in subordinate and secondary beings, emanations from this supreme being, the manifestation of this one god, and, like other pantheistic religions, the custom prevailed among these Semitic nations of promoting first one and then another deity to be the supreme object of worship. Among the Assyrians, as among the Egyptians, the gods were often arranged in triads, as that of Anu, Bel, and Ea, and other trios with the horns of a bull; Baal was represented by a serpent. These religions, in short, represented the gods as the
Spirits within and behind natural objects and forces—powers within the world, rather than, as among the Hebrews, a spirit above the world. The Hebrews’ God was a God above nature, not simply in it. He stood along unaccompanied by its belonging and it was the doctrine of the divine. His worship required purity, not pollution; its aim was holiness, and its spirit humane, not cruel. Monotheistic from the first, it became an absolute monothestism in its development. In all the Semitic nations, behind the numerous divine beings representing the powers of nature there rose, it is true, by visible one supreme Being, of whom all these were emanations; but there was also among all of them, except the Hebrew branch, a tendency to lose sight of the first great cause, the very reverse of the tendency of the faith of Abraham, whose soul was the contemplation of the perfect Being above all and the source of all. With passionate love he adored this most high God, maker of heaven and earth. Such was his devotional to this almighty Being, that men said, “Abraham is the friend of the most high God.” The difference, then, between the religion of Abraham and that of the supremacy nations was, that while they descended from the idea of a supreme Being into that of subordinate ones, he went back to that of the supreme, and clung to this with his whole soul (Clark, Ten great Religions, chap. x). See Abraham.

This abstractive faith continued to be the faith of the Israelites even until it was supplanted by Moses in Sinai by the Lord himself, through his chosen servant Moses. Thereafter the Abrahamic idea was clothed in forms refined necessary not only by the character of the age, but also by the fluidity of men, to the general idea of the Trinity; the one God, the Creator, by himself, i.e., the essence of the God of the Lord during the ultimate union of the Jewish Church and State—the correlation of life and religion, of the nation and the individual. See Moses; Law.

Prophecy.—Surrounded by idolaters on all sides, with whom they were in contact continually, the Hebrews gradually disobeyed the commandments of Sinai until idolatry destroyed all personal morality, and the chosen people knew not their Lord. To save the race from utter apostasy, holy men were inspired by the Lord to call them back to the purity of the faith and immorality. Amid the trials and woes afflictive to which he visited the nation, he yet declares the perpetuity of the Jewish faith. A Messiah shall eventually gather in the people, and to the Lord alone shall service be rendered. See Messiah. Though the present plant shall wither, the seed shall continue to live, from whose germination shall spring a flower of greater fragrance in the fulness of time. All through the captivity among the Assyrians and Babylonians, even after the destruction of the Temple, the life of the seed was attested by the fruit it bore. See Captivity; Prophecy.

The political and political exactions of the Jews was ameliorated, they served themselves, with that determination characteristic of the Hebrew race, for other and more determined strife. In consequence of their dispersion as a nation, after the Babylonian exile the Mosaic constitution could be but partially re-established. “The whole building was too much shattered, and its fragments too widely dispersed, to reunite in their ancient and regular form.” But from his captivity the Jew had brought with him a reverential, or, rather, a passionate attachment to the Mosaic law and the constitution of the Temple; and the re-establishment of the state was accompanied by the ready and solemn recognition of the law. The synagogue was instituted, and with it many of the institutions which have tended to perpetuate Judaism to the present hour. One of the most important of these was the constant interpretation of the law and the prophets; and as the acquiescence with the law became more intimate, the attachment to it grew deeper and deeper in the national character even in one, which not only their Bible and statute-book, but a guide for the most minute details of common life. “But no written law can provide for all possible exigencies; whether general and comprehensive, or minute and multifarious, it equally requires the expositor to adapt it to the immediate case which may arise, either by his own private judgment, or that of the private conscience. Hence the law became a deep and intricate study. . . . Learning in the law became the great distinction to which all alike paid reverential homage. Public and private affairs depended upon the sanction of this self-forming spiritual aristocracy.

Every duty of life, of social intercourse between man and man, not to speak of its weightier authority as the national code of criminal and civil jurisprudence, was regulated by an appeal to the book of the law” (Milman, History of the Jews, ii, 417). Thus arose the office of the rabbi—the clergy, the learned interpreters of the law, the public instructors, to whom, by degrees, also the spiritual authority was transferred from the priesthood. At this time, also, besides the inspired Scriptures, traditional writings became another ground of authority over the public mind. See Tradition. This was not, however, always the case; historically at Mowile [the public reading of the Law], to that schism in Judaism which originated the Karaite (q. v.). Thus Judaism had fortified itself after the captivity, so that when the Temple was finally again destroyed, and public worship became extinct, the Rabbinical law was able to supplant the original religion of the Jews and from amid the blackened walls of Jerusalem rose, ere the smoke of the ruins had yet ceased, a new bond of national union, the great distinctive feature in the character of modern Judaism. With the Masora (q. v.) also came soon after the Mishna (q. v.) and the Talmud, and after them the Zohar—[see Talmud], that wonderful monument of human industry—formulated Mosaiism—which to the Jew “became the magic circle within which the national mind patiently labored for ages in performing the bidding of the ancient and mighty envoys, who dwelt the sacred line beyond the cloud, the light not venturing to pass” (Milman), and which so securely enwrapp’d the Jewish idea in almost infinite rules and laws that it completely sheltered it from polluting contact in the succeeding dark ages. It is thus that Judaism, weathering many a long and severe storm, has continued to prosper, and flourish to the duration of our race. See Sects.

Sects.—In the early age of Judaism we saw that the simple worship of a supreme Being constituted its peculiar characteristic. At that time, as a sign of the covenant of Abraham with the Lord, the rite of circumcision (q. v.) was introduced, and was soon followed by the formal institution of sacrifice. In the period of Mosaism the Jewish belief became an established form of religion, and then were introduced certain ceremonies and feasts days, together with the priesthood. In the Rabbinitic period, as the law became overlaid by tradition, discussions among the Jews were divided into three distinct sects—the Pharisees (q. v.), who placed religion in external ceremony; the Sadducees (q. v.), who were remarkable for their incredulity; and the Essenes (q. v.), whose peculiar distinction was the practice of ascetic sanctity. Still later sprang up other sects: prominently among them the Essenes and the Karaites, the strict observance of the letter of the law, the opponents of rabbinical interpretations. For a review of Jewish literature, see Rabbinitis.

Modern Judaism.—In the history of the Jews (q. v.) we have seen how greatly the condition of the people was ameliorated about the second Temple, and how the influence of Moses Mendelssohn. But not only in their civil condition did his efforts affect the Jews; he also greatly changed the character of Judaism itself. With him originated a tendency of thought and action,
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which has since spread among the leaders of Judaism generally, to weaken rabbinical authority, and to maintain a more simple Biblical Judaism. These have now been developed into two special phases of Jewish opinion, which are represented by the terms "Conservative" (or Moderate Orthodox) and "Reformed" (or Liberal) Judaism. (See each of these titles below.)

(General.) — A summary of the religious views of the Jews was first compiled in the 11th century by the second great Moses (Maimonides), and it continues to be with the Orthodox the Jewish confession of faith to the present day. It is as follows: 

1. I believe in one perfect faith, that God is the creator (whose name be blessed), governor, and maker of all creatures; and that he hath wrought all things, worketh all them which be for ever.

2. I believe, with perfect faith, that the Creator (whose name be blessed) is one; and that such a unity as is in him can be found in none other; and that he alone hath been our God, is, and forever shall be.

3. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the Creator (whose name be blessed) is not corporeal, nor to be comprehended with any bodily properties; and that there is no bodily essence to be changed, increased, or diminished.

4. I believe, with a perfect faith, the Creator (whose name be blessed) to be the first and the last; that nothing was before him, nor shall there be after him, nor shall he be alone.

5. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the Creator (whose name be blessed) is to be worshipped, and none else.

6. I believe, with a perfect faith, that all the prophets are true.

7. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the prophecies of Moses our master (may he rest in peace) were true; that he was the father and chief of all wise men that lived before him, and shall live after him.

8. I believe, with a perfect faith, that all the law which at this day is found in our hands was delivered by God himself to our master Moses (God's peace be upon him).

9. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the same law is never to be changed, nor any other to be given us of God (whose name be blessed).

10. I believe, with a perfect faith, that God (whose name be blessed) has enlightened all the peoples of the earth with the brightness of men, as it is written in the prophecies: he fashioneth their hearts alike, he understandeth all their works.

11. I believe, with a perfect faith, that all the prophets (whose name be blessed) will recompense good to them that keep his commandments, and will punish them who transgress them.

12. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the Messiah is yet to come; and although he retard his coming, yet I will wait for him till he appear.

13. I believe, with a perfect faith, that the dead shall be restored to life when it shall seem fit unto God the creator (whose name be blessed, and memory celebrated without end. Amen).

Doctrine of Immortality.—In regard to the future life, there is mentioned in the Scripture a resurrection of the righteous (q.v.), the Jews believe in the ultimate salvation of all men. Like the Roman Catholics [see PURGATORY], the Jews offer up prayers for the souls of their deceased friends (comp. Alger, Hist. Doct. Future Life, ch. viii. and ix.).

Starches.—Since the destruction of their Temple and their dispersion the sacrifices have been discontinued, but in all other respects the Mosaic dispensation is observed intact among the Orthodox Jews.

Worship.—Their divine worship consists in the reading of the Scriptures and prayer. But while they do not in the Synagogue, they expound all to say their prayers at home, or in any place where circumstances may place them, three times a day, morning, afternoon, and evening; they repeat also blessings and particular praises to God, aside from them, at their meals and on other occasions.

In their morning devotions they use the phyllacterys (q.v.) and the Talith, except Saturdays, when they use the Talith only. See FRINGE.

Calendar.—The Jewish year is either civil or ecclesiastical. The civil year commences in the month of Tisri (September-October), and falls into some part of our September, on the view that the world was created on the first day of this month (Tisri). The ecclesiastical year commences about the vernal equinox, in the month of Nisan, the latter part of our month of March and the first half of April. The seventh month of the civil year they call the first of the ecclesiastical year, because this was en-

IV.—X X X

Feast Days. — The feasts which they observe at present are the following: 1. Passover, on the 14th of Nisan, and lasting eight days. On the evening before the feast the first-born of every family observes a fast in remembrance of God's mercy toward the nation. They fast at this feast in a solemn, fasted, and religious manner, and during the holy days the first and last days. 2. Pentecost, or the Feast of Weeks, falling seven weeks after the Passover, is at present celebrated only two days. 3. Trumpets, on the 1st and 2d of Tisri, of which the first is called New-year's day. On the second day is read the 22d chapter of Genesis, and an account is given of the offering of his son Isaac, and God's blessing on him and his seed. Then they blow the trumpet, or, more accurately, the horn, and pray, as usual, that God would bring them to Jerusalem. 4. Tabernacles, on the 15th of Tisri, and lasting nine days; the first and the last two days being observed as feast days, and the other four as days of labor. On the first day they take branches of palm, myrtle, willow, and citron bound together, and go around the altar or pulpit singing psalms, because this ceremony was formerly performed at their Temple. On the seventh day they build a booth, and sit in it. This booth, or tabernacle, is called the Succoth, or law of Moses, out of the ark, and carry them to the altar, and all the congregation follow in procession seven times around the altar, in remembrance of the Sabbatical year, singing the 29th Psalm. On the evening of this day the feast of solemn assembly, or of rejoicing, commenced, and the various messengers of the prophets, and entreat the Lord to be propitious to them, and deliver them from captivity. On the ninth day they repeat several prayers in honor of the law, and bless God for his mercy and goodness in giving it to them by his servant Moses, and read that part of the Scriptures which gives expression of his death. 5. Pentecost, on the 14th and 15th of Adar (or March), in commemoration of the deliverance from Haman (Esth. ix.). The whole book of Esther is read repeated, with liberal almsgiving to the poor. 6. Besides these festivals appointed by Moses and Mordecai, they celebrate the destruction of the阵 and in commemoration of their victory over Antiochus Epiphanes. This festival lasts eight days, and is appointed to be kept by lighted lamps. The reason they assign for this is, that, at this purification and redemption of the Temple after the deliverance from Antiochus, there was not enough of pure oil left to burn one night, but that it miraculously lasted eight days, when they obtained a fresh supply. 7. Expiration day, the 10th day of Tisri, is observed by the Jews, though they have neither temple nor priest. Before the feast they seek to re-establish friendly relations with their neighbors, and, in short, do everything that may serve to evince the sincerity of their repentance. For twenty-four hours they observe a strict fast, and many a pious soul does not quit the synagogue during these long hours, but remains in prayer through the night. See FESTIVAL. Mission and Preservation of the Jews. — The preservation of the Jews as a distinct nation, notwithstanding the miseries which they have endured for many ages, is a wonderful fact. The religions of other nations have depended on temporal prosperity for their duration; they have triumphed under the protection of conquerors, and have been and given place to the succession of weak monarchs. Paganism once spread the known world, even where it no longer exists. The Christian Church, glorious in her martyrs, has survived the persecution of her enemies, though she cannot heal the wounds they have inflicted; but Judaism, hated and persecuted for so many centuries, has not merely escaped destruction, it has been powerful and flourishing. Kings have employed the severity of laws and the hand of the executioner to eradicate it, and a socitiable populace have injured it by their massacres more than kings. Sovereigns and their subjects, pagans, Christians, and Mohammadans, opposed to each
other in everything else, have formed a common design to annihilate this nation without success. The bush of Moses has always continued burning, and never been consumed. The expulsion of the Jews from the great cities of kingdoms has only scattered them throughout the world. They have lived from age to age in wretchedness and obscurity. Their language has flowed from generation to generation, and they have continued to our day, in spite of the disgrace and hatred which everywhere clung to them, while the greatest empires have fallen and been almost forgotten. Every Jew is at this moment a living witness to the Christian as to the authenticity of his own religion, an undying evidence that Christianity is the last word of a revelation from God; and the patient endurance of the descendants of Abraham is an evidence that Providence has guarded them throughout all their miseries. Hence the Christian should regard with compassion a people so long preserved by this peculiar care amidst calamities which would have destroyed any other nation.

"I would look at the ceremonies of pagan worship," says Dr. Richardson, "as a matter of little more than idle curiosity, but those of the Jews reach the heart. This is the most ancient form of worship in existence, in which the whole of heaven was worshipped when all the other nations in the world were sitting in darkness, or falling down to stocks and stones. To the Jews were committed the oracles of God. This is the manner in which Moses and Elias, David and Solomon, worshipped the God of their fathers; this worship was not an institution of man, but was the worship the Lamb, and, singing hosannas to the son of David, confide their power to save."  

Restoration of the Jews—The Jews, as is well known, deny the accomplishment of the prophecies in the person of Jesus. The Reformed Jews (see below) deny the promise of a personal Messiah altogether; but the orthodox, the greater part of the Jews, hold that the Messiah has not yet come, but that they will be redeemed at the appointed time, when he of whom the prophets spoke shall make his appearance in great worldly pomp and grandeur, subduing all nations, and restoring the sceptre of universal rule to the house of Judah. Then there shall reign universal peace and happiness in all the earth, never again to be interrupted, and to the Jews it shall be a blessing; in those only who have strayed into the Christian and Mohammedan folds; then idolatry shall cease in the world, and all men acknowledge the unity of God and his kingdom. (Comp. Zech. xiv, 3. "And the Lord shall be king over all the earth: in that day shall there be one Lord, and his name one.") This restoration shall be effected not on account of any merits of their own, but for the Lord's sake; so as to secure their own righteousness, and the perfection to which they shall attain after their deliverance. (Atonement for sin is made by the fulfilling of the law and by circumcision, and not, as the Christian holds, by the sacrifice of the Messiah.) For the Christian doctrine of the Restoration of the Jews, see Restoration.

JUDAISM, CONSERVATIVE. The gradual emancipation of the Jews in Germany, which, however, did not become final anywhere until 1848, and which was rendered complete by the revolution and the constitution of 1860, insensibly diminished the influence of Talmudic studies and of Rabbinical lore as the paramount obligation of life. Compelled, happily, to bear their own share in their deliverance from oppression, the Jews became more attached to the land of their nativity, and more and more estranged from the traditional allegiance to the kingdom of Israel. Their love for Palestine, intense and impassioned as ever, has assumed a different form. Their union and fellowship no longer represented a nationality yearning to be released from capture, but found in the indissoluble affection of race and a common faith, not inconsistent with ties of citizenship in the world.

In 1807, when Napoleon convened the so-called Jewish Sanhedrin, with a view of establishing the relations between the empire and the Jews resident in France, the first official and authoritative expression of the transformed Jewish sentiment was published. In effect, it was a defense of the Jew who had for centuries been denied the rights of a citizen, and who was subject to persecution. It declared that the Jews of France recognize in the fullest sense the French people as their brethren; that France is their country; that the Jews of France recognize as paramount the laws of the land, and their religious tribunals have no authority in conflict with civil ones; that the civil government joins in the pursuit of a useful trade and prohibits usury; that polygamy is forbidden and divorce permitted.

The Jews of France were equal to the promise of the Sanhedrin. They proved good citizens, and faithfully adhered to their religious belief and practice. The chief rabbi of France has been recognized as of corresponding dignity with the archbishop of Paris, and in the distribution of state aid to ecclesiastical institutions the Jews have been admitted to their proportionate share. The Jews of France, like those of Great Britain and Holland, have contributed largely to the exalted condition of their race, and it has not materially changed to this day. The Portuguese ritual is followed at one of the Paris synagogues, as at London and Amsterdam. The German or Polish ritual is otherwise the rule.

In Great Britain, about the year 1842, the key-note of progress was struck by the Jewish congregation at London, followed by that of Manchester. There are now only two congregations in the United Kingdom deny- ing the authority of the chief rabbi. In Great Britain, France, and Holland there exists a recognized ecclesiastical authority. The administration of religious affairs is conducted nearly upon the Episcopal system. The spirit of the churches in these three countries is extremely conservative. Nevertheless, great latitude is allowed to individual believers, and what would have been regarded as capital sins a century ago are considered trivial today. It may be said that the Jews have thoroughly assimilated themselves to the rest of the population. In France their conservatism is formal rather than substantial, and the nonconformist is treated with great liberality. That he violates the sanctity of the Jewish Sabbath is not necessarily a disqualification for high office in the church, nor does it detract from his worth as a citizen to live consistently with their professions; the laity are not sharply criticized. In England conservatism is decided, authoritative, uncompromising. Nonconformists are on sufferance, and are rarely allowed a voice in the administration of synagogal affairs. In Holland liberty has dealt kindly with the Jewish people, who are prominent in the state and in commerce, in science, in learning, and in art, and are at once conservative and tolerant in their religious views, while consistent in the conduct of the synagogue. There are successful Conservative colleges or theological seminaries at Paris, London, Amsterdam, Breslau, Berlin, and Wurzburg.

Conservative Judaism is paramount in Belgium and Italy, and has held its own in some parts of Austria also. The great Rapoport (q. v.) of Prague, one of the finest scholars of that century, may be regarded as the type of Conservative Judaism. The Reform of 1859, with its compromises and concessions, has, to a great extent, arrested the forward movement in its relations to the world, and the traditional legislation, once so prominent in the state and in commerce, in science, in learning, and in art, and are at once conservative and tolerant in their religious views, while consistent in the conduct of the synagogue. There are successful Conservative colleges or theological seminaries at Paris, London, Amsterdam, Breslau, Berlin, and Wurzburg.

Conservative Judaism is paramount in Belgium and Italy, and has held its own in some parts of Austria also. The great Rapoport (q. v.) of Prague, one of the finest scholars of that century, may be regarded as the type of Conservative Judaism. The Reform of 1859, with its compromises and concessions, has, to a great extent, arrested the forward movement in its relations to the world, and the traditional legislation, once so prominent in the state and in commerce, in science, in learning, and in art, and are at once conservative and tolerant in their religious views, while consistent in the conduct of the synagogue. There are successful Conservative colleges or theological seminaries at Paris, London, Amsterdam, Breslau, Berlin, and Wurzburg.

Conservative Judaism is paramount in Belgium and Italy, and has held its own in some parts of Austria also. The great Rapoport (q. v.) of Prague, one of the finest scholars of that century, may be regarded as the type of Conservative Judaism. The Reform of 1859, with its compromises and concessions, has, to a great extent, arrested the forward movement in its relations to the world, and the traditional legislation, once so prominent in the state and in commerce, in science, in learning, and in art, and are at once conservative and tolerant in their religious views, while consistent in the conduct of the synagogue. There are successful Conservative colleges or theological seminaries at Paris, London, Amsterdam, Breslau, Berlin, and Wurzburg.

Conservative Judaism is paramount in Belgium and Italy, and has held its own in some parts of Austria also. The great Rapoport (q. v.) of Prague, one of the finest scholars of that century, may be regarded as the type of Conservative Judaism. The Reform of 1859, with its compromises and concessions, has, to a great extent, arrested the forward movement in its relations to the world, and the traditional legislation, once so prominent in the state and in commerce, in science, in learning, and in art, and are at once conservative and tolerant in their religious views, while consistent in the conduct of the synagogue. There are successful Conservative colleges or theological seminaries at Paris, London, Amsterdam, Breslau, Berlin, and Wurzburg.
form or of scholastic authority. Conservative Judaism has no history in these countries, yet its scholars have done the world a service in the preservation of Hebrew literature, and in rescuing from oblivion ancient thought so peculiarly habituated and disguised. It is worthy of note that the chief rabbi at Jerusalem preserves great state, and is regarded as a functionary of signal consequence, presiding over the congregations, of which full one half came to this country only within the last twelve years. The synagogues rival the most beautiful and costly churches in the principal cities. In 1840 there were scarcely ten thousand Jews and not more than a dozen congregations in the United States. Their synagogues now number two hundred and fifty. The Conservative ministry is not strong. Only recently has any active interest been displayed in the higher Hebrew education, the preparation of candidates for clerical stations. Maimonides College, established in 1865 at Philadelphia, has not been successful. The Conservative Synagogues are variously named, some of them are charitable, educational, or political—otherwise recognizing no will or exposition of Jewish doctrine superior to that of their respective ministers or secular officials. The co-operative movements for aiding oppressed Israelites in foreign countries, and for representing anticipated dangers or checking legal discriminations at home, resulting in the establishment of the "Board of Delegates of American Israelites," are not confined to the Conservative or to the Progressive congregations. Doctoral questions are discussed in this organization, which is purely voluntary, and assumes no authority except what may be infallible with time to interpret the sentiments of American Israelites.

The Conservatives have of late years paid attention to religious education. Elementary schools are attached to most congregations, and in New York a society was formed in 1865 for the gratuitous instruction in Hebrew and in English of children whose parents are not attached to any synagogue, or are unable to contribute to its support. (M. H.)

JUDAISM, REFORMED, also called progressive or modern Judaism, is the Jewish religion as reformed in the 19th century in Germany, Austria, America, and in some congregations of France and England. The places of worship are called temples, distinguished from other Jewish synagogues by choir, organ, regular sermons, and part of the liturgy in the vernacular of the country, and in America also by family pews. The ministers of these temples are rabbis or rebbes, chosen, although by the congregation, from among the learned of the people, and are paid salaries. The children of the congregation are instructed in Hebrew lore, and are graduates of colleges or universities; or preachers by the choice of the congregation, who are mostly academic students; and cantors, capable of reading the divine service and leading the choir. In some congregations the offices of preacher and cantor are united in one person. Large congregations are conducted by the ordained rabbi and the cantor; the former is the exarch of the law, and the latter presides over the worship, and is also called Hazan, or Reader (q.v.). Every congregation elects secular officers to conduct the temporal affairs. The ministers are elected by the congregation for a stated period. A school for instruction in religion, Hebrew, and Jewish history is attached to every temple. Like all other Jews, the reformed also are unitarian in theology, and acknowledge the Old Testament Scriptures as the divine source of law and doctrine, but reject the additional authority of the Talmud, in place of which they appeal to reason and conscience as the highest authority in expounding the law and doctrines. They believe in the eternity of the soul, future reward and punishment, the perfectibility of human nature, the final and universal triumph of truth and righteousness. They reject the belief in the coming of a Messiah; the gathering of the Jewish people to Palestine to form a separate government, and to restore the ancient polity of Israel, its worship and Levitical priesthood; the resurrection of the body and the last judgment day; and the authority of the Talmud above any other collection of commentaries to the Bible. All these doctrines are expressed in their prayer-books and catechisms. Their hermeneutics is rationalistic. They reject the evidence of miracles, relying exclusively upon the internal evidence of the Scriptures, and the common consent of all civilized nations to the divinity of the scriptural laws and doctrines. Except in the case of Moses, of whom the story must be understood metaphorically, "the appearance and speaking of angels, as also the appearance and speaking of God, were subjective, in the vision, waking or dreaming, appearing objectively to the prophet, which was not the case in reality. In this respect they follow the guide of Moses Maimonides. They base their theologies on the "Mishneh Torah" and "Thora ha-Gadol," or "Thora ha-Mishna." In respect to doctrine, they hold that all religious doctrines must be taken from the Bible, and must be in harmony with the loftiest and purest conceptions of the Deity and humanity suggested by the Scriptures, and confirmed by reason and common-sense. They hold that all laws contained in the Decalogue, expressed or implied, are obligatory forever, both in letter or spirit. All laws not contained in the Decalogue, expressed or implied, are local and temporal (although the principle expressed by some may be eternal) and could have been intended for certain times and localities only. The last theories of Judaism were developed by various Jewish authors between the years 1000 and 1500; partly they are also in the ancient Rabbinical literature, but were dropped after 1500, and taken up again by the disciples and successors of Moses Mendelssohn toward the close of the last century and gradually developed to the present system. (I. M. W.)

From a few late articles in the "Israilite" (Nov., 1871), by the distinguished writer of the above article on Reformed Judaism, we learn that he regards as the first reformer in the camp of Judaism the celebrated gaon Saadta (q.v.) ben-Joseph, of Egyum, who flourished in the first half of the 10th century; as the second, the famous body-physician of the caliph of Cairo, Rambam, the classical Moses Maimonides. Of perhaps minor influence, but also as active in the field of reform, he introduces us next to Bechai ben-Joseph, of Saragossa, and Ibn-Gebirol (q.v.), of Malaga, who flourished in the 11th century. He even counts among the reformers the celebrated French rabbi Isaac, of Troyes, better known under the surname of Rashi (q.v.); and on the side of reform or progressive Judaism are also ranked by Dr. Wise the celebrated "Emmeach Ramah (Exalted Faith), who fell a victim to fanaticism in A.D. 1180 at Toledo, in Spain, and with whom close up the two centuries that elapsed between the appearance of Saadta and Maimonides, in which deaths "all Jewish philosophy had become peripatetic," the Jewish philosophical writers of this period considering their main object "the self-defence of Judaism on the one hand, and the expounding of the Bible and Talmud as rational in as possible, in order to reconcile and harmonize faith and reason."
Judaizing Christians

With the 13th century undoubtedly opens a new epoch in Judaism, for it is here that we encounter the great Jewish master mind Moses Maimonides, of whom it has been truly said that “from Moses [the lawgiver] to Moses [Mendelssohn] there was none like Moses [Maimonides].” Since the days of Ezra, no man has exercised a greater, and lasting influence on the Jews and Judaism as this man, and we need not wonder that Orthodox, Conservative, and Reformed Jews alike lay claim to this master mind; but it must be confessed that, after all, he really belongs to the Progressive Jews only. It is true the creed drawn up by the second Messiah, in the possession of all Jews, is Orthodox clinging to it with even more tenacity than the Conservatives and the Reformed, but his theologicophilosophical works gained authority mainly among the Reformed thinkers of the Judaistic faith. After that, of course, Jewish literature abounds with names whose productions betray a rationalistic tendency, for all Jewish thinkers up to date, Baruch Spinoza, Moses Mendelssohn, and the writers of the 19th century included, are more or less the disciples of Maimonides, so that no Jewish theologicophilosophical book, from and after 1900, can be picked up in which the ideas of Maimonides do not form a prominent part.” In our own days the Reform movement first became very prominent. In Germany, where Judaism has always been strong on account of the high literary attainments of the German Jews, the separation between the Orthodox and Reformed, and the two establishments alike independent, lasting and permanent congregations first originated, and the celebrated Holdheim (q. v.) was among the first as pastor of a temple in 1846. Other Jewish rabbis of note, identified with the Reform movement in Germany, are Stein, of Frankfurt-on-the-Maine; Einhorn, now of New York City; Deutsch, now of Baltimore, Md.; and Ritter, the successor of Holdheim, and historian of the Reform agitation. In the U. States those prominently identified with the Reform question are Drs. Adler and Gutheim, of the Fifth Avenue Temple, New York City; Mr. Ellinger, editor of the Jewish Times, New York City; Dr. Lewin, of Brooklyn; editor of the New Era; Dr. Isaac M. Wise, editor of the Israelite, etc. See Jost, Gesch. des Judenstaates u. s., Sekten, iii, 349 sq., Graetz, Gesch. d. Juden, x; Ritter, Gesch., d. Juden, Reformations, Berlin, 8 vols. tvo; Geiger, Judaiz. u. Its History, Engl. tr. by M. Mayer (N. Y., 1870, 8vo); Ritter, Gesch. d. Juden, rabbin., Historien, abrigés des Juiys et de leur croyance (Paris, 1868); Raphael, D. C. Lewin, What is Judaism (N. Y., 1871, 12mo); New Era, May, 1871, art. iv; Brit. and For. Evang. Rev., April, 1869; Kitto, Journ. Sac. Literature, viii; Atlantic Monthly, 6th, 12th, and the works cited in the article Jews. (J. H. W.)

Judaizing Christians, a term frequently employed to designate a class of early Christians, of whom traces appear in the N.-T. epistles, and still more distinctly in the succeeding century. They are believed to have been converted from Judaism, who still clung to the Mosaic institutions, particularly circumcision. They appear a direct result of two classes or two currents of the ceremonial law binding only upon Christians descended from the Jews, while others looked upon it as obligatory also for the heathen. The head-quarters of the Judaizing Christians is said to have been first at Antioch. The council held at Jerusalem decided that the heathen should not be subject to circumcision. The more zealous Judaizing Christians, thus opposed by the apostles, abandoned Palestine, and went about trying to convert the heathen to their views, but with little success. They were probably the “false apostles,” persons “bearing a false name,” so mention of Paul, and known in history, the more moderate as Nazarenus (q. v.), the others as Ebionites (q. v.). See D. van Heyst, De Jud. Christianismo (1829).—Pieper, Universal Lexikon, ix, 159.

Ju'das (Iouda), the Grecized form of the Hebrew name Judah, and generally retained in the A. V. of the Apocrypha and N. T., as also in Josephus, where it occurs of a considerable number of men. See also JUDE: Jude.

1. The patriarch Judah (q. v.), son of Jacob (Matt. i, 2, 3)
2. One of the Levites who renounced his Gentile wife after the captivity (1 Esdr. ix, 23); the JU'DAM of Ezra x, 23.

3. The third son of Mattathias, and the leading one of the three Maccabees brothers (1 Macc. ii, 4, etc.). See Maccabees.

4. The son of Calphi (Alpheus), a Jewish general under Jonathan Maccabaeus (1 Macc. xi, 70).

5. A Jew occupying a conspicuous position at Jerusalem at the time of the mission to Aristobulus (q. v.) and the Egyptian Jews (2 Macc. i, 10). He is thought by some to have been the same with

6. An aged person, and a noted teacher among the Essenes at Jerusalem, famous for his art of predicting events, which was confirmed in a remarkable manner by the death of Antigonus (q. v.) at the order of his brother Aristobulus, as related by Josephus (Ant. xiii, 11, 2, 6).

7. A son of Simon, and brother of John Hyrcanus (1 Macc. xvi, 2), murdered by Ptolemaeus the usurper, either at the same time (R.C. Cir. 135) with his father (1 Macc. xvi, 15 sq.), or shortly afterwards (Josephus, Ant. xiii, 8, 1; see Hinnom, or More. L. c.).—Smith.

8. A noted leader of a sect of Jews (Tos. Sanh. 83b) famous for his physical strength), and one of the three principal bandits mentioned by Josephus (Ant. xvi, 10, 2; War, ii, 4, 1) as infesting Palestine in the early days of Herod. This person, whom Whitton (ad loc.) regards as the Theudas (q. v.) of the Thras, 36), temporarily got possession of Sepphoris, in Galilee. What became of him does not particularly appear, but it may be presumed he shared the fate of the others named in the same connection.

9. Son of one Saripheus, or Sepher, and one of the two eminent Jewish teachers who incited their young disciples to demolish the golden eagle caged by Herod over the Temple gate, an act of sedition for which the whole party were burned alive (Josephus, Ant. xviii, 6, 2-4; War, i, 83, 2-4).

10. A person surnamed “the Galilean” (Παλαιολόγιος). Acts xiii, 7; also by Josephus (Ant. xvi, 4, 4; 36, 5, 2; War, ii, 8, 1), and likewise “the Galilean” (Παλαιολογιστής, Ant. xviii, 1). He was born at Gamasset, a fortified city on the Sea of Galilee, in Lower Gaulonitis; and after the deposition of Archelaus, during the thirty-seven-year after the battle of Actium (Josephus, War, ii, 11, 2; e. A.D. 6, he excited the insurrection among the Jews, in concert with a well-known Pharisee named Sadox, against the Roman government exercised by the procurator Coponius, on occasion of a census levied by the emperor Augustus, asserting the popular doctrine that the Jews ought to acknowledge no dominion but that of God. He was destroyed, and his followers scattered by Cyrenius, then procurator of Syria and Judea. We also learn from Josephus that the scattered remnant of the party of Judas continued after his destruction to work on still in secret, and labor to maintain his free spirit and religious principles among the people (Josephus, War, ii, 17, 7-19). See E. A. Schulze, Diasor, D. Judas Galileos epygemos sunes, Frankfurt, 1761; also in his Exercit. philosoph. jurispr. nov. p. 104.8. See SICAHIL.

11. Son of Simon (John vi, 71; xviii, 2, 36), surnamed (always in the other Gospels)的心情, to distinguish him from the other apostle of the same name. See JOHN. In addition to this epithet the Evangelists usually distinguish him by some allusion to his treasurer-h绝 towards his Master.

1. Commentary of the Sermone.—The epithet lecicrTo (Τεκανομιον) has received many interpretations more or less conjectural.
(1) From Keritö (Josh. xv, 25), in the tribe of Judah, the Heb. קֶרֵיתּוּת, 'Ish-Keritö', passing into Ἰσθ ᾶ τ ῦ θ ο ὴ, ‘a man of Tob’—appears in Josephus (Ant. vii, 6, 1) as Ἰσθ ᾶ τ ῦ θ ο, ‘Istoth'. In connection with this explanation may be noticed the reading of some MSS. in John vii, 17, Ἱστὰ ῦ θ ο, that received by Lachmann and Tischendorf, which makes the name Iscarit belong to Simon, and not, as elsewhere, to Judas only. On this hypothesis, his position among the Twelve, the rest of whom belonged to Galilee (Acts ii, 7), would be exceptional; and this is perhaps an additional reason why this locality is noted. This is the most common and probable opinion. See Keim. 

(2) From Karka (A.V. ‘Kartan,’ Josh. xxi, 32), in Galilee (so Ewald, Gesch. Israelit., v, 321). 

(3) As equivalent to Isacharite, or Ἰασχαρίωτας (Grotius on Matt. x, 4; Hermann, Miscell. Groning., iii, 588). 

(4) From the date-trees (σαμαριταίς) in the neighborhood of Jerusalem or Jericho (Bartolucci, Bibl. Rabbin., iii, 10; Gill, Comm. on Matt. x, 4). 

(5) From נְסָרְתָן (={'soreerta}, Gill, L.c), a lea-thern apron, the name being applied to him as the bearer of the bag, and—"Judas with the apron" (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. in Matt. x, 4). 

(6) From נְסָרְתָא, ascarn,—strangling (angina), as given after his death, and commemorating it (Lightfoot). The position of his name in the lists of the apostles, his sudden and unexpected death, and the disease tending to suffocation previously (Heimius, in Suicer, Thes. a.v., Ισχαρίας). This is mentioned also as a meaning of the name by Origen, Tract. in Matt. xxxvii. 

2. Personal Notices.—Of the life of Judas, before the appearance of his name in the lists of the apostles, we know absolutely nothing. It must be left to the sagacious vision of a poet (Keble, Lyra Innocentium, ii, 13) or the fantastic fables of an apocryphal Gospel (Thilo, Cod. Apoc. N. T., Evang. Infantum, c. 85) to portray the infancy and youth of the traitor. His call as an apostle implies, however, that he had previously declared himself a disciple. He was drawn, as the others were, by the preaching of the Baptist, or his own Messianic hopes, or the "gracious words" of the new teacher, to leave his former life, and to obey the call of the Prophet of Nazareth. What baser and more selfish motives may have been the cause of his choice or the cause of the fact that he selected the last of the apostles, that is a question we can only judge by reasoning backwards from the sequel. Gifts of some kind must have been, rendering the choice of such a man not strange to others, not unfit in itself, and the function which he exercised afterwards among the Twelve may indicate what they were. The fact, however, that in the lists of the apostles in the Synoptic Gospels, is due, it may be imagined, to the infamy which afterwards rested on his name, but, prior to that guilt, it would seem that he externally differed in no marked particular from the other apostles, and he doubtless exercised the same mission of preaching and miracles as the rest (Matt. x, 4; xxxvi, 14-47; Mark iii, 19; iv, 10, 43; Luke vi, 16; xxii, 3, 47, 48; John vi, 71; xii, 4, xiii, 2; xiv, 22; xviii, 2, 3). A.D. 27. 

The gerrms (see Stier's Words of Jesus, at the passages where Judas is mentioned of the evil, in all likelihood, unfolded themselves gradually. The rules to which the Twelve were subject in their first journey (Matt. x, 9, 10) sheltered him from the temptation that would have been most dangerous to him. The new form of life, of which we find the traces in Luke viii, 3, brought him, as it were, into an unknown world. He was recognised as a body, travelling hither and thither with their Master, receiving money and other offerings, and redistributing what they received to the poor, it became necessary that some one should act as the steward and almoner of the small society, and this fell to Judas (John xii, 6; xiii, 29), either as having the gifts that qualified him for it, or, as we may conjecture, from his character, because he sought it, or, as some have imagined, in rotation from time to time. The Galilean or Judean peasant (we have no reason for thinking that his station differed from that of the other apostles) found himself intrusted with larger sums of money than before (the three hundred denarii of John xiiii, 8 are spoken of as a sum which could be reasonably trusted with, and with this there came covetousness, unfaithfulness, embezzlement. It was impossible after this that he could feel at ease with one who asserted so clearly and sharply the laws of faithfulness, duty, unselfishness; and as the words of Jesus, "Have I not chosen you Twelve, and one of you is a devil?" (John vi, 70) indicate that even then, though the greed of immediate or the hope of larger gain kept him from "going back," as others did (John vi, 66), hatred was taking the place of love, and leading him on to a fiendish malignity. The scene is Bethany (John xiii, 1-9; Matt. xxvi, 6-18; Mark xiv, 3-9) showed how deeply the canker had eaten into his soul. The warm outpouring of love calls forth no sympathy. He utters himself, and suggests to others, the complaint that it is a waste. Under the plea of caring for the poor he covers his own miserable theft. The narrative that follows (Matt. xvi, Mark xiv) tells us this history in close connection (apparently in order of time) with the fact of the betrayal. During the days that intervened between the supper at Bethany and the paschal or quasi-paschal gathering, he appeared to have concealed his treachery. He went with the other disciples to Bethany to attend the funeral of the child on the acted parable of the barren and condemned tree (Mark xi, 20-24), and shared the vigil in Gethsemane (John xviii, 2). At the beginning of the Last Supper he is present, looking forward to the consummation of his guilt as drawing nearer every hour. All is at first as if he were still faithful. He is admitted to the feast. His feet are washed, and for him there are the fearful words, "Ye are clean, but not all." At some point during the meal (see below) come the sorrowful words which showed him that his design was known. "One of you shall betray me," Others, in their sorrow and confusion, "Is it I?" He, too, must ask the same question, lest he should seem guilty (Matt. xxvi, 25). He alone hears the answer. John only, and through him Peter, and the traitor himself, understand the meaning of the act which pointed out that he was the guilty one (John xiii, 26). After this both Peter and Jesus and the other disciples are convinced with the word he had hitherto uttered. Then he completes the sin from which even those words might have drawn him back. He knows that garden in which his Master and his companions had so often rested after the weary work of the day. He comes, accompanied by a band of officers and servants (John xviii, 3), with the wretch which was probably the usual salutation of the disciples. The words of Jesus, calm and gentle as they were, showed that this was what the spirit of the treachery, and the suffering it inflicted more acute (Luke xxii, 48). 

What follows in the course of that night the Gospels do not record. Not many students of the N.T. will follow Heumann and archbishop Whately (Essays on Danger) in the hypothesis that Judas was the "other disciple" that was known to the high-priest, and brought Peter in (comp. Meyer on John xviii, 15). It is possible, indeed, that because he was in league with the high-priest's officers should return with them to wait the issue of the trial. Then, when it was over, came the reaction. The fever of the crime passed away. There came back on him the recollection of the sinless righteousness of the Master he had wronged (Matt. xxvii, 3). He feels a keen remorse, and the guilt that had tempted him it becomes hateful. He will get
rid of the accursed thing, will transfer it back again to those with who it had lured him on to destruction. They mock and sneer at the fool whom they have used, and then there comes over him the horror of great death. He is owned by his own sin with "an exceeding bitter cry," but he dares not turn, with any hope of pardon, to the Master whom he has betrayed. He hurries the money, which the priests refused to take, into the sanctuary (vadis) where they were assembled. For him there is no longer sacrifice or purification. He eats the last morsel of the son of man himself (John xvi. 12). "He departed, and went and hanged himself" (Matt. xxvii. 5). He went "unto his own place" (Acts i, 25). A.D. 29. See below.

With the exception of the stories already mentioned, there are but few traditions that gather round the history of Judas. It appears, however, in a strange, hardly intelligible way in the history of the wilder heresies of the 2d century. The sect of Cainites, consistent in their inversion of all that Christians in general believed, was reported to have honored him as the only apostle that was in possession of the true graces, to have made him the object of their worship, and to have had a gospel bearing his name (comp. Neander, Church Hist. i, 158; Ireneaus, adv. Haer. i, 35; Tertullian, De Prese. c. 47). For the apocryphal gospel (Ephippius, Haer. xxxviii. 1), see Fabricius, Codex Apoc. i, 382. See Gospels, Syrocanan.

3. Our Lord's Object in his Selection as an Apostle.—The choice was not made, we must remember, without a prevision of its issue. "Jesus knew from the beginning . . . who should betray him" (John vi, 64); and the distinctness with which that evangelist records the successive stages of the guilt of Judas, and his Master's discernment of it (John xii, 4; xiii, 2, 27), leaves with us the impression that he, too, shrank instinctively (Bengel describes it as "singularis antipathia," Gnomon N. Test. on John vi, 64) from a nature so opposed to his own. He could not have expected fully to solve the question why such a man was chosen for such an office, nor is it our province to sound all the depths of the divine purposes, yet we may, without presumption, raise an inquiry on this subject.

(1.) Some, on the ground of God's absolute foreknowledge, contend with Ullmann, with Calvin, that the judgments of God are as a great deep, and with Ullmann (Sündenjung. Jesu, p. 97), that Judas was chosen in order that the divine purpose might be accomplished through him. See PREDESTINATION.

(2.) Others, less dogmatic in their views, believe, with Eichhorn, with Achtemeier (Neutestamentliche Theologie, § 77), that there was a discernment of the latent germs of evil, such as belonged to the Son of Man, in his insight into the hearts of men (John ii, 25; Matt. ix, 4; Mark xii, 15), yet not such as to exclude emotions of sudden sorrow or anger (Mark iii, 6), or astonishment (Mark vi, 5; Luke vii, 9), admitting the thought "with men this is impossible, but not with God." Did he, in the depth of that insight, and in the fulness of his compassion, seek to overcome the evil which, if not conquered, would be so fatal? It gives, at any rate, a new meaning and force to many passages of scripture referring to remission, if it is true that they either have been spoken in the hearing of Judas, and may have been designed to make him conscious of his danger. The warnings as to the impossibility of a service divided between God and mammon (Matt. vi, 19-34), and the destructive power of the "cares of this world," and the "riches of unrighteousness" (2 Cor. iii, 19, 22, 23), the pointed words that spoke of the guilt of unfaithfulness in the "unrighteous mammon" (Luke xvi, 11), the proverb of the camel passing through the needle's eye (Mark x, 30), must have fallen on his heart as meant specially for him. In the parable of the two sons that heard the question, Who, then, can be saved? (Mark x, 26). Of him, too, we may say that, when he sinned, he was "kicking against the pricks," letting slip his "calling and election," frustrating the purpose of his Master in giving him so high a work, and educating him for it (compare Chrysostom, Hom. on Matt. xxvi, xxvii, John vi).

(3.) But to most persons these will appear to be arbitrary or reconcile arguments. Important reasons of a different character are, more, we think, owned by the son of man. He had a great number of other reasons. He had the soul he was to lose; he had the soul that contained the secret of his life; he had the soul of one who knew the procedure, and they are not very far to seek. The presence of such a false friend in the company of his immediate disciples was needed, first of all, to complete the circle of Christ's trials and temptations. He could not otherwise have known by personal experience what many of them could not have known, but some who were most likely to be of a sacrificing, humble, and uncomplaining nature. For the deceit and treachery of Judas he would not have been in all things tempted like his brethren. Then on this account it was evident, by his very situation, that when the Master found the man whom he sought, he might slay the traitor. Yet it was not so that Judas was used as an instance of a particular sin. Judas was not used as an instance of the guilt of a person who was more, because he was a true believer. It was not the case that Judas was a man who knew if he was saved or not. It is not the case that Judas was so useful a man, and Judas was not a good man. It is not the case that Judas was a man who was deceived. But it is the case that Judas was the man who was to enter into David's heritage, and rise from the dust David's throne. Of the things written in the Psalms concerning him—written there as derived from the death of David's soul experience and sharp conflict with evil, but destined to remain in a still greater conflict than he—few have more affecting prominence given to them than those which relate to the hardened wickedness, base treachery, and reprobate condition of a false friend, whose words were smooth as butter, but whose actions were drawn swords, who ate of his meat, but lifted up his head against him (comp. Ps. xlix, xviii, xliii, xiii, 18; and see Aithiophiel). Other prophecies also, especially two in Zechariah (x, 12, 13; xiii, 6), waited for their accomplishment on such a course of ingratitude and treachery as that pursued by Judas. Further, the relation in which this false and unfaithful and treacherous man stood to the rest of the Master's followers was of great importance for his presence and agency. It was well that those who stood at a greater distance from the Saviour failed to discover any fault in him; that none of them, when the hour of trial came, could say of him, as of the man of Galilee, that the word of prediction had been exercised, and the most anxious efforts had been made to enable them to do so. But it was much more that even this bosom friend, who had been privy to all his counsels, and had seen him in his most unguarded moments, was equally incapable of finding any evil in him; he could not betray Jesus in his enemies, but he could furnish these enemies with no proof of his criminality; nay, with the bitterness of death in his soul, he went back to testify to them that, in delivering up Jesus, he had betrayed innocent blood. What more conclusive evidence could the world have had that our Lord was the Messiah? Even the very event by which the appearance of such a person as Judas among the immediate attendants of Jesus was needed as an example of the strength of human depravity—how it can lurk under the most sacred professions, subseit in the holiest company, live and grow amid the clearest light, the most solemn warnings, the tenderest entreaties, and the divinest works. The instruction afforded by the incarnation and public ministry of the Son of God would not have been complete without such a memorable exhibition by its side of the darker aspects of human nature: the fact, that such materials required for her future warning and admonition: and on this account also there was a valid reason for the calling of one who could act the shameful part of Judas Iscariot.

4. Motives of Judas in the Betrayal of his Master. The Scripture account leaves those to conjecture (comp. Neander, Leben Jesu, § 264). The mere love of money may have been strong enough to make him clasp at the biree offered him. He came, it may be, expecting more (Matt. xxvi, 15); he will take that. He has lost the chance of dealing with the three hundred denarii; it will be something to get his old back. It may have been that he felt that his Master saw through his hidden guilt, and that he hastened on a crisis to avoid the shame of open detection. Mingled
with this there may have been some feeling of vindictiveness, a vague, confused desire to show that he had power to stop the career of the teacher who had reproved him. Had the words that spoke of "the burial of" Jesus, with the Lazarus and the seven thousand, been instrumental in any conspiracies of the priests, led him at last to see that the Messianic kingdom was not as the kingdoms of this world, and that his dream of power and wealth to be enjoyed in it was a delusion? (Ewald, Gesch. Israel, v, 441-446). There may have been the thought that, after all the literature and analysis, that sixty years might prove his innocence, or by some supernatural manifestation effect his escape (Lightfoot, Hor. Heb. p. 886; andWhitby on Matt. xxvii, 4). Another motive has been suggested (compare Neander, Leben Jesu, l. c.; and Whately, Essays on Dangers to Christian Faith, and those three) an entirely different kind, arising altogether the character of the act. Not the love of money, nor revenge, nor fear, nor disappointment, but policy, a subtle plan to force on the hour of the triumph of the Messianic kingdom, the belief that for this service he would receive as high a place as Peter, or James, or John. Of this it will make the priest the traitor. If he could place his Master in a position from which retreat would be impossible, where he would be compelled to throw himself on the people, and be raised by them to the throne of his father David, then he might forge for himself the most brilliant of all possible conclusions, with all his desires for wealth and power gratified to the full. Ingenious as this hypothesis is, it fails for that very reason. It attributes to the groveling peasant a subtlety in forecasting political combinations, and planning stratagems accordingly, which is hardly compatible with his character and learning, hardly consistent either with the pettiness of the faults into which he had hitherto fallen. It is characteristic of the wide, far-reaching sympathy of Origen that he suggests another motive for the suicide of Judas. Despairing of pardon in this life, he would rush on into the world of the dead, and there receive his just reward, among his own kind, his bowels gutted. (5) That the work of suicide was but half accomplished, and that, the halter breaking, he fell (probably from some elevated place, see Hackett, Illustra. of Script. p. 266) with such violence that his abdomen burst with the fall. (6) That for this reason, and not because the priests had bought him with the price of blood, the field was called Acededama. But it may readily be supposed that the potter's field which the priests had bought was the same as that in which the traitor met so terrible a death. See Acededama.

7. On the occasion of Judas's final salvation, it is difficult to see how any dispute could well arise in view of his self-murder (comp. 1 John iii, 15). But aside from this, two statements seem to mark his fate in the other world as distinctly a reprobate one.

(1) His unmitigated remorse, as expressed in Matt. xxvii, 5. This passage has often been appealed to as illustrating the difference between metaphysis and metaphysis. It is questionable, however, how far the N. Test. writers recognise that distinction (compare Grotius, ad loc.). Still more questionable is the notion that Matthew describes his disappointment at a result so different from that which he had hoped for. Yet this is nevertheless clearly an instance of "the sorrow of the world that worketh death" (2 Cor. vii, 10). See Repentance.

(2) His "going to his own place" (Acts i, 25), where the words ἐκβιοῦσα ἀπόσπασεν of the old manuscripts, probably meant to express the same impression of some dark region in Gehenna. Lightfoot and Gill (ad loc.) quote passages from Rabbinical writers who find that meaning in the phrase, even in Gen. xxxii, 55, and Num. xxiv, 25. On the other hand, it should be remembered that interpreters reject that explanation (compare Meyer, ad loc.), as that one great Anglican divine (Hammond, Comment, on N. Test. ad loc.) enters a distinct protest against it. Similarly
Dr. Clarke (Commentary, ad loc.) argues against the whole of our conclusions respecting the violent death of Judas, but his reasoning, as well as that of the other cases named, is far from satisfactory.

8. Literature.—Special treatises on the character of Judas are the following: Zandt, Comment, de Judae prodiore (Lips. 1679); Rau, Anmerk. s. d. Character des Judas (Lemgo, 1778); Schmidt, Apologia d. Judas, in his Exeget. Beitr, i. 18; ii. 342; Lechien, De culpa Judae (Sedul. 1785); Dahm, Judae Ieschiordis (Heidelberg, 1810); Schollmeyer, Jesus und Judas (Lüneb. 1886); Augusti, Thol. Bibl. i, 497, 590; Ferency, De consoiso proditionis Judae (Utr. 1892); Gerling, De Judae siccce carnem conivissa (Hal. 1744); Heinekenst, De Judae Iscor. (Vithec. 1712); Philipp, Ueb. d. Verdorther Judae (Naumb. 1754); Rütz, De Herode et Judae (Hass. 1789); Journ. Sac. Lit. Jud. 1863.

On his death, see Cassaubon, Exerc. antiqu. 16, p. 527; Alberti, Oeconom. p. 222; Paulus, Comment. iii, 506; Barabati, Dissert. novissima Judae Iscor. Jata (Regiom., 1665); Gütze, De suspensio Judae (Vithec. 1688); Neumüller, De Judae supponis extanto (Chemo. 1740); Oldendorp, De Judae in tempore occiso (Hannov. 1754). For other monographs, see Volbeding, Index, p. 32, 54; Hase, Leben Jesu, p. 191. See Jesus Christ.

12. A Jew residing at Damascus in the Straight street at the time of Paul's conversion, to whose house Ananias went (Acts ix, 11). A.D. 30. "The 'Straight Street' may with little question be identified with the 'Street of Bazaars,' a long, wide thoroughfare, penetrating from the southern gate into the heart of the city, which, as all the Syro-Greek and Syro-Roman towns, it intersects in a straight line. The so-called 'House of Judas' is still shown in an open space called 'the Shekh's Place,' a few steps out of the 'Street of Bazaars': it contains a square room with a stone floor, partly walled off for a tomb, shown to Mammreli (Early Tr., Bohn, p. 494) as the 'tomb of Ananias.' The house is an object of curiosity (1541, in 1744), respected by Christians as well as Jews (Stanley, Syr. and Pal., p. 412; Conybeare and Howson, i, 102; Pococke, i, 119). See DAMASCUS."—JUDAS-LIGHT.

13. Surnamed BARBARAS, a Christian teacher sent from Jerusalem to Antioch along with Paul and Barnabas (Acts xiv, 27, 28). A.D. 47. He is supposed by some (see Grotius, Wolf, ad loc.) to be one of the seventy disciples, and brother of Joseph, also surnamed Barsabas (son of Sabas), who was proposed, with Matthias, to fill up the place of the traitor Judas (Acts i, 25); but others (Augusti, Ueber. d. Kathol. Br. ii, 86) identify him with the Judas Thaddaeus who was with Jesus in the面包 (iv, 29). Schott supposed that Barsabas means the son of Sabas, or Zabas, which he fancifully regards as an abridged form for Zabebed, and concludes that the Judas here mentioned was a brother of the elder James and of John. Judas and Silas are mentioned together (in the above description of the Church to determine the obligation of the Mosaic law as "prophets" and "chief men among the brethren" at the metropolis, "perhaps a member of the Presbytery." (Neander, Pl. and Tr., i, 123). After employing their prophetic gifts for the confirmation and support of the Christians in the faith, Judas went back to Jerusalem, while Silas was either retained at Antioch (for the reading Acts xiv, 64 is uncertain; and while some MSS. followed by the Vulgate, add minos Ιωαννος υπερ θρησκευω, the best omit the verse altogether) or speedily returned thereto. See Luke.

14. Son of one Jairus, and leader of a company of Jews during the siege of Jerusalem by the Romans, from which he escaped by an underground passage: he was afterwards slain while leading the defence of the castle of Machærus against the Roman troopers (Josephus, War, vii, 6, 5).

Judas-Light, or Judas of the Paschal, was the name of a wooden imitation of the candle which held the real paschal in the seventh branch standing upright, the rest diverging on either side. See Walton, Sac. Archæol. a. v.

Judd, Gaylord, a Methodist Episcopal minister, was born at Watertown, Conn., Oct. 7, 1874, and converted in 1885. He was licensed as a local preacher in 1909, and thus showed faithfully for this ministry. He entered the General Conference in 1921; was supernumerary in 1934; and died at Cedar, Tioga Co., N. Y., in 1859. He was a sound and evangelical preacher, and "had a good report of all men." Many souls were converted to the Christian ministry, and his memory is precious in the Susquehanna Valley, the principal field of his labors. —Minutes of Conferences, 1859, vii, 162.

Judd, Sylvester, a Unitarian minister of some note, was born in Westhampton, Mass., July 23, 1813, and was educated at Yale College. He was of Orthodoxy parentage, but shortly after the completion of his collegiate studies he changed his religious opinions, and went to Cambridge Divinity School to prepare for ministerial duties in the Unitarian Church. He was called to Augusta, Maine, and there spent his life. He died in 1853, "at the very beginning of a course of high usefulness, of a life which seemed essential to the Church." Judd was a man of rare and original ideas having a giving and as a literary character enjoyed a good reputation for ability. See Life and Character of the Rev. S. Judd (Bost. 1864), p. 531; Christian Examiner, 1853, p. 63 sq.

Judd, Willard, a Baptist minister, was born in Southington, Conn., Feb. 23, 1804. After teaching for a short time, he settled in Cannan, N. Y., and was licensed to preach in 1826. He then removed to Herkimer Co., and preached alternately in Salisbury and Oppenheim until Aug. 28, 1829, when he united with the Church in Salisbury. He continued his labors here with great success until 1835, when his health compelled him to abandon the ministry. In 1839 he accepted an appointment as classical teacher in Middlebury Academy, at Wyoming, which situation he held until his death in Feb. 1840. Mr. Judd published A Review of Professor Stuart's Work on Baptism (1836, and later revised and enlarged). A collection of several of his miscellaneous papers, with a brief memoir of his life, was published after his death.—Sprague, Annals, vi, 750.

Jude, or, rather, Judæ (Ἰωάννης, q. q. JUDE, see JUDA). There were two of this name among the twelve apostles—Judæ, called also LÉBRÈS and THADDÆUS (Matt. x, 4; Mark iii, 18), and Judas Iscariot. Judas is likewise the name of one of our Lord's brethren (Matt. xii, 40, 50, 53), but it is not agreed whether our Lord's brethren are named above with Judas (Luke, viii, 16, 18, 19; Acts i, 13) calls him Ιωάννης ἢ Ιωαννος, which in the English Auth. Ver. is translated "Judas, the brother of James." This is defended by Winer (Gramm. of N. T. Dict.), Arnaud (Récit. Crat. sur l'Histoire de Jude), and accepted by Burton, Aldred, Tre- gelles, Michaelis, etc. The elliptical ἢ Ιωάννης ἢ Ιωαννος is supplied by the old Syriac translator (who was unacquainted with the Epistle of Jude, the writer of which calls himself Ιωάννης ἢ Ιωαννος, Jude, verse 1), with the word ἢ, and not brother. We see it in Judæus Thadathæus (see notes for us to 1 Tim. xiv, 5), but the opinion that our Lord's brethren were children of Joseph by a former wife (Eacha or Salome, according to an apocryphal tradition), which was the sentiment of the majority of the fathers (still received in the Oriental Church).
er the opinion adopted in the Western Church, and first broached by Jerome (Cont. Heliand.), that the brethren of our Lord were his cousins, as being children of Mary, the wife of Clopas, who must therefore be considered as the same with Alpheus. If we consider James, the brother of Joseph, and one of the Twelve, Jude, the brother of James, must consequently be placed in the same category; but if they are one and the same, Jude must be considered as the person who is numbered with our Lord's apostles. The most plausible solution of this question is, that the epithet of Jude the apostle is given by the early Christian writers to the brother of James and Judas, and not to Jude, mentioned among the apostles, as also the authors of the epistles bearing their respective names, being half-brothers of Christ, as the reputed son of the common parent Joseph. See ALPHEUS; JAMES; JOSEPH; MART.

The tradition referred to as to the time of the vocation of the apostle Jude to that dignity. Indeed, the only circumstance relating to him which is recorded in the Gospels consists in the question put by him to our Lord (John xiv, 22): "Joshua saith unto him (not Iscariot), Lord, how is it that thou wilt manifest thyself to us, and not to the world?" Nor have we any account given of his proceedings after our Lord's resurrection, for the traditioiary notices which have been preserved of him rest on no very certain foundation (Lardner's History of the Apostles). There may be some truth in the tradition which connects him with the foundation of the church at Edessa; though here again there is much confusion, and doubt is thrown over the account by its connection with the worthless fiction of "Abgarus, king of Edessa" (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. i. 13; Jerome, Comm. in Matt. x). Niceneopliaus (Hist. Eccl. ii. 40) makes Jude die in Asia, in the summer after the ascension. He makes him go to Palestine, Syria, and Arabia. The Syrian tradition speaks of his abode at Edessa, but adds that he went thence to Assyria, and was martyred in Phoenicia on his return; while that of the West makes Persia the field of his labors and the scene of his martyrdom. Jude the apostle is one of the Twelve, and the brother of James the Less, and the apostle Simon (the same, also, of one of our Lord's brethren), on the 8th of October. Eusebius gives us an interesting tradition of Hegesippus (Hist. Eccl. iii. 20, 32) that two grandsons of Jude, "who, according to the flesh, was called the Lord's brother" (comp. 1 Cor. ix, 3), were seized and carried to Rome by order of Domitian, whose apprehensions had been excited by what he had heard of the mighty power of the kingdom of Christ; but that the emperor having discovered their answers to his inquiries, and the appearance of their hands, that they were poor men, supporting themselves by their labor and their art, took pity on them, and dismissed them, and ordered to be put in chains till the time of Trajan. Niceneopliaus (i. 23) tells us that Jude's wife was named Mary. For further discussion, see Bertholdt, Einl. v, 2673; vi, 31, 79; Perani Vita Apostol. p. 166; Asseman, Biblioth. Orient. ii, 11; i. 305, 611; Bayer, Itiner. Later. ii, 68, 100; De Wette, Einl. in N. T. p. 340; Harenberg, in Miscell. Lips. nov. iii, 373; Michaelis, Einl. ii, 1489; and the monographs cited by Volbretting, Index, p. 32. On the pretended Gospel of Thaddaeus, see Kleuker, Apokr. N. T. p. 67 sq. See LEBAUS.

JUDE, EPISCOPE OF. The last in order of the catholic episcopies.

1. Author. The writer of this epistle styles himself, verse 1, "Jude, the brother of James" (αδελφὸς Ἰωάννου), and has usually been identified with the apostle Judas Lebbeus or Thaddaeus, called by Luke (vi, 16) ὦμοίως Ιωάννου, A. V. "Judas, the brother of James." It has been seen above that this mode of supplying the elliptic, though plausible in itself, is uncertain in its application, and that Jesus leueus loquendi, is, nevertheless, quite justifiable, although there are strong reasons for rendering the words "Judas, the son of James." Jerome, Tertullian, and Origen among the ancients, and Calmet, Calvin, Hammond, Hänlein, Lange, Vatablus, Arnaud, and Tregelles among the moderns agree in regarding the epistle to the apostle. Whether it were the work of an apostle or not, it has from very early times been attributed to "the Lord's brother" of that name (Matt. xiii, 55; Mark vi, 3); a view in which Origen, Jerome, and (if indeed the Adumbrations are genuine) the Jamis Ammonius Alexandrinus agree; which is implied in the words of Chrysostom (Hom. 48 in Joann.), confirmed by the epigraph of the Syriac versions, and is accepted by most modern commentators—Arnaud, Bengel, Burton, Hug, Jesseis, Ohlhausen, Tregelles, etc. The objection that has been felt by Neander, and by the more recent opponents of the critical method, was, though he had been "the Lord's brother" he would have directly styled himself so, and not merely "the brother of James," has been anticipated by the author of the "Adumbrations" (Bunsen, Anwelt. Ante-Nicene, i, 350), who says, Jude, who wrote the catholic Epistle, brother of the sons of Alphaeus, wrote it extremely reluctantly, and that he was aware of his relationship to the Lord, did not call himself his brother; but what said he? "Jude, the servant of Jesus Christ" as his Lord, but "brother of James." We may easily believe that it was through humility, and a true sense of the altered relations between them and him who had been declared to be the Son of God with power . . . by the resurrection from the dead" (comp. 2 Cor. v, 16), that both Jude and James forbore to call themselves the brethren of Jesus. The arguments concerning the authorship of the epistle are ably summed up by Jensen (Jub. Lipp. 1821) and Arnaud (Roche, Critique sur l'Epitre de Jude, Strasb, 1851, transl. in the Brit. and For. Eccl. Rev. July, 1869); and, though it is by no means clear of difficulty, the most probable conclusion is that the author was Jude, one of the brethren of Jesus, and brother of James, as also the maternal uncle, the son of Alpheus. See BRETHREN OF OUR LORD.

2. Genuineness and Canonicity. Although the Epistle of Jude is one of the so-called Antilegomena, and its canonicity was questioned in the earliest ages of the Church, there never was any doubt of its genuineness among those by whom it was known. It was too unimportant to be a forgery; few portions of holy Scripture could, with reverence be it spoken, have been more easily spared; and the question was never whether it was the work of an impostor, but whether its author was of sufficient weight to warrant its admission into the canon. Josephus, an extremely reliable historian, declares in its favor, and the more widely it was known the more generally it was received as canonical, until it took its place without further dispute as a portion of the volume of holy Scripture. See ANTILEGOMENA.

This epistle is not cited by any of the apostolic fathers; the passages which have been adduced as containing allusions to it (Hermas, Post. Viss. iv, 3; Clem. Rom. Ep. ad Cor. ch. xi; Polycarp, Ep. ad Phil. ch. iii) presenting no certain evidence of such. It is, however, formally quoted by Clement of Alexandria (Paedog. iii. 9, 17, 35), and the Scripturists. Eusebius testifies (Hist. Eccl. v, 14) that he treated it in his Hypotyposeis; it is also treated in the Adumbrations.
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ascribed to Clement, and preserved in a Latin version.

Tertullian refers to the epistle as that of Jude the apostle (De Habil. Mulieb. ch. iii). It appears in the Muratori Fragmenta as being only a letter of bishop Alexandrian, repeatedly

refers to it, and occasionally as the work of the apostle Jude (Hom. in Matt. xiii, 55, in Opp., ed. de la Rue, iii, 403; Cum in Ep. ad Rom., in Opp. iv, 519; Hom. in Jos., in Opp. ii, 411; De Princip., in Opp. i, 138, etc.); though in one place he speaks as if doubt was entertained by some, whether it were from the bishop of Alexandria, or from Jude himself (in Opp. Just. 814). It is not in the Peshito, and does not appear to have been known to the Syrian churches before the 4th century, near the close of which it is quoted by Ephra-

em Syrus (Opp. Sgr. i, 136). Eusebius ranks it among the Antilegomena, but this rather because it was not universally known than because known it was by any regarded with suspicion (Hist. Eccles. ii, 23; iii, 25).

By Jerome it is referred to as the work of an apostle (in Tit. i; Ep. ad Paulin. iii), and he states that, though suspected by some, in consequence of containing a quotation from the apocryphal book of Enoch, it had obtained such authority as to be reckoned part of the canonical Scriptures (Catal. Script. Eccles.).

From the 4th century onwards, the place thus conceded to it remained unquestioned (Westcott, Canon of the N. Test.). Thus the epistle is quoted by Malchian, a presbyter of Antioch, by the bishop of Alexandria, and by the bishops of Rome (Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. vii, 30), and by Palladius, the friend of Chrysostom (Chrysostom, Opp. xiii, Dial. cc.18, 20), and is contained in the Laodicene (A.D. 383), in the Synopsis of Chrysostom, and in the Synopsis of Eusebius of Cæsarea.

Various reasons might be assigned for delay in receiving this epistle, and the doubts long prevalent respecting it. The uncertainty as to its author, and his standing in the Church; the unimportant nature of its contents, and the absolute absence of any reference to it in the Autentia Ep. Judae, Lapa. 1821.

There is nothing, however, in the epistle itself to cast suspicion on its genuineness; on the contrary, it rather impresses one with the conviction that it must have proceeded from the writer whose name it bears. Another, forging a work in his name, would hardly have omitted to make prominent the personality of Judas, and his relation to our Lord, neither of which comes before us in this epistle (Bleek, Einl. im. d. N. Test. p. 557). See Cases.

III. Time and Place of Writing.—There are few, if any, external grounds for deciding these points, and the internal evidence is but small.

1. The question of date is connected by many with that of its relation to 2 Peter (see below), and an earlier or later period has been assigned to it according as it has been considered to have been anterior or posterior to that epistle. Attempts have also been made to prove a late date for the epistle, from an alleged quotation in it from the apocryphal book of Enoch (verse 13); but it is by no means certain that the passage is a quotation from the now extant book of Enoch, and scholars have yet to settle when the book of Enoch was written, and that from this nothing can be inferred as to the date of this epistle.

From the character of the errors against which it is directed, however, it cannot be placed very early; though

there is no sufficient ground for Schleiermacher's opinion that "in the last time" (Hebrews 9, verse 18), comp. 1 John ii, 18, Hebrews 6, verse 19) forbids our placing it in the apostolic age. It is true, the book of Enoch was written not later than c. A.D. 64 and 66, Davidson before A.D. 70, Credner A.D. 80, Calmet, Estius, Witsius, and Neander, after the death of all the apostles but John, and perhaps after the fall of Jerusalem; although considerable weight is given to the argument of De Wette (Eisen. im. N. Test. p. 300), (M cruc. Hom. in Matt. 814) is no assurance that anything had taken place, some warning would have been drawn from so signal an instance of God's vengeance on the "ungodly." From the allusion, however, to the preaching of the apostles, we may infer that it was among the later productions of the apostolic age; for it was written whilst persons were still alive who had heard apostolic preachers, but when this preaching was beginning to become a thing of the past (ver. 17). On the other hand, again, if the author were really the brother of Jesus, especially an elder brother, we cannot well suppose him to have lived much beyond the middle of the first century. We may therefore conjecturally place it about A.D. 66.

2. There are still less data from which to determine the place of writing. Burton, however, is of opinion that inasmuch as the descendants of "the Judas, the brother of James, and the rest of the circumcision, dwelt at Jerusalem," and mention of the places of the seat of the apostle, were found in Palestine, he probably "did not absent himself long from his native country," and that the epistle was published there, since he styles himself "the brother of James," an expression most likely to be used in a country where James was well known (Eccles. Hist. i, 394). With this locality will agree all the above considerations as to date.

IV. Persons to whom the Epistle is addressed.—These are described by the writer as "the called who are sanctified in God the Father, and kept for Jesus Christ." From the resemblance of some parts of this epistle to the second and third of John, and in the peculiar qualities of the epistle, were found in Palestine, he probably "did not absent himself long from his native country," and that the epistle was published there, since he styles himself "the brother of James," an expression most likely to be used in a country where James was well known (Eccles. Hist. i, 394). With this locality will agree all the above considerations as to date.

V. Object, Contents, and Errors inveighed against.—The purpose which the writer had in view is stated by himself. After the inscription, he says that, intending to write concerning salvation, learning that it was, he was, compelled to utter a solemn warning in defence of the faith, imperilled by the evil conduct of corrupt men (ver. 8). Possibly there was some observed outbreak which gave the occasion. The evil for a while had been working in secret,—"certain men crept in among the flock of God, dissevering the peace, speaking evil of our master and our saviour Jesus Christ, and not walking in the liberty of the Son, but keeping the tradition of the elders" (vers. 5-7).

The next describes minutely the character of those whom he censures, and shows how of
old they had been prophetically marked out as objects of deserved vengeance (ver. 8-16). Then, turning to the faithful, he reminds them that the apostles had forewarned them that evil men would rise in the Church (ver. 17-19); exhorts them to maintain their own steadfastness; and concludes with an ascription of praise to him who alone could keep his people from falling (ver. 24, 25). The whole was thoroughly applicable to a time when iniquity was abounding; and the love of many waxing cold (Matt. xxiv, 12).

The design of such a train of thought is obviously to put the believers to whom the epistle was addressed on their guard against the misleading efforts of certain persons to whose influence they were exposed. Who these persons were, or to what class of errants they belonged, can only be matter of conjecture. Some, indeed (De Wette, Schwengler, Bleek), think the persons alluded to held no peculiar opinions, and were simply men of lax morals; but, from the manner in which the writer refers to them, it is evident that they were, to use the words of Paul (2 Tim. iii, 5), "seducers, perverted, corrupters of the gospel of Christ." These, however, are merely corruptly practised, but teachers of error as well."

Their opinions seem to have been of an antimonic character (ver. 4, 18, 19), but there is nothing to connect them, except in a very vague and distant way, with any of the later gnostic systems. The writer formally charges them with "denying," and even with "rescuing our Lord Jesus Christ," language which De Wette admits usually applies to error of doctrine, but which here, without any reason, would understand of feeling and conduct. The licentious courses in which they indulged led Clement of Alexandria to think that they were the prototypes of the Carcopitans and such like: "Of these," and such as these," he says, "I think that Jesus spoke prophetically in his epistle" (Strom. iii, 451, Syb.). But this does not imply that they had formed a system like that of the Carcopitans, but only that the notions and usages of one admixed themselves of the other. Perhaps there have been in all ages persons who have sought by perverted doctrine to gain a sanction for sensual indulgence, and such undoubtedly were found disturbing the peace and corrupting the purity of the churches of Christ in different places as early as the second and perhaps the first century. Against whom Jude writes are apparently of this class, but in their immorality the practical element was more prominent than the speculative.

VI. Style.—The main body of the epistle is well characterized by Alford (Gk. Test. iv, 147) as an impassioned invective, in the impetuous whirlwind of which the writer pours out his feelings, using the examples of divine vengeance on the ungodly; heaping epithet upon epithet, and piling image upon image, and, as it were, laboring for words and images strong enough to depict the polluted character of the licentious apostates against whom he is warning the Church; returning again and again to the subject, as though all language was insufficient to give an adequate idea of their profligacy, and to express his burning hatred of their perversion of the doctrines of the Gospel.

The epistle is said by De Wette (Eislet. in N. T. p. 306) to be entirely in good Greek, though there are some peculiarities of diction which have led Schmid (Eislet. i, 314) and Bertholdt (vi, 8194) to imagine an Aramaic original.

VII. Relation between the Epistle of Jude and 2 Peter.—The larger portion of this epistle (ver. 3-16) closely resembles in language and subject a part of the second Epistle of Peter (ver. 1-19). In both the heretical enemies of the Gospel are described in terms so similar as to preclude all idea of entire independence. Jude's known habit of quotation would seem to render the supposition most probable that he has borrowed from Peter. Dr. Davidson, however (Introct. to the N. Test. iii, 307), maintains the priority of Jude. As Jude's Epistle apparently emanated from Palestine, and (if the above date be correct) from Jerusalem, it may in some sort be regarded as an echo of Peter's admonitions uttered not long before at the Roman capital. This question will be more fully examined under Peter, second Epistle or.

VIII. Apocryphal Quotations.—This epistle presents one peculiarity, which, as we learn from Jerome, caused its authority to be impugned in very early times—the supposed citation of apocryphal writings (ver. 5, 14, 15).

1. The form of some of these passages, containing the reference to the context of the archangel Michael and the devil "about the body of Moses," was supposed by Origen to have been founded on a Jewish work called the "Assumption of Moses" (Ἀναπαύσις Μωίσεως), quoted also by Eusebius (ii, 629). Origen's words are expressed, "Which little work the apostle Jude has made mention of in his epistle" (De Principi. ii, 2; vol. i, p. 138); and some have sought to identify the book with the הָנָה הַנָּשָׁה, "The Demise of Moses," which is, however, proved by Michaelis (iv, 882) to be a modern composition. Attempts have also been made by Lardner, Macknight, Virtings, and others, to interpret the passage in question as a reference to the story of the journey of the Tabernacle (Num. xi, 24); by James (v, 17), and Stephen (Acts vii, 22, 28, 30). (See further, Zirkel, De Mosis ad Superos translatiio, Wurzcb. 1798.) See MOSES, ASSUMPTION OF.

2. As regards the supposed quotation from the book of Enoch, the question is not so clear whether Jude is making a citation from a work already known to his readers—which is the opinion of Jerome (l.c.) and Tertullian (who was, in consequence, inclined to receive the book of Enoch as canonical Scripture), and has been held by many modern critics—or is employing a tradi- tionary prophecy not at that time committed to writing (a theory which the words used, "Enoch prophesied, saying," ἐξορθοφθαιτον... ἐν τοῖς γενικ... seem rather to favor), but afterwards embodied in the apocryphal work already named. This is maintained by Tregelles (Horne's Introd. 10th edit., iv, 621), and has been held by Cave, Eusebius (Hist. eccl. viii, 11), and Calvin (comp. Jerome, Comm. in Eph. c. v, p. 647, 8; in Tit. c. i, p. 708). The present book of Enoch actually contains (ch. ii of The Book of Enoch, in Ethiopic and English, by Dr. Laurence, 3d ed. Lond. 1868) the very words cited by Jude; but some modern critics maintain that they are derived from that book out of Jude's epistle. See Enoch, BOOK OF.

But why should not an inspired author appropriate a piece of an apocryphal writing? If it contained elements of truth, or was simply apposite to his purpose, why should he not use it? He does not (as some al- locate) attribute to it any inspired authority, nor ever vouch for its accuracy. It is never objected in derogation of the apostle Paul that, both in speech and writing, he cited heathen authors, sometimes with a special reference (Acts xvii, 28; 1 Cor. xv, 38; Gal. v, 23; Titus i, 12). It has also been asserted that in various parts of the New Testament citations are alluded (through various citations) to several of the books commonly called apocryphal, and to other Jewish productions (see Gough's N.T. Test. Quotations, p. 276-296). Common provbers, we know, have been introduced into Scripture (1 Sam. xxiv, 19; 2 Pet. ii, 22, where the former part only of the prov-verb cited is from the Or Testament).

But there is no decisive proof that Jude could have seen the so-called book of Enoch. For, though this has been ascribed in part to the Maccabean times, and is said to have assumed its present shape prior to our Lord's advent (see Westcott, Introduction, p. 58, note), yet this is a theory on which critics are by no means agreed.
One of the latest has the question investigated, Prof. Volkmar, of Zurich (Zeitschrift der deutsch. mor.-gen. Gesellschaft, 1860), maintains that it was composed by one of the disciples of Rabbi Akiba, in the time of the sedition of Barcochba, about A.D. 132. Dr. Alford, in his notes on VOLKMAR'S statement inferred that "the book of Enoch was not only of Jewish, but of distinctly antichristian origin" (Proleg. to JUDE, p. 196). We are authorized, then, in believing that Jude merely incorporated into his epistle the tradition or copy of Enoch's prophecy, which was afterwards embodied in the book as we now have it. See Tradition.

IX. Commentaries.—Special exegetical helps on the whole Epistle of Jude exclusively are the following, of which we designate the most important by an asterisk prefixed: Didymus Alexandrinus, in Ep. Jude (in BIBL. MAX. P. v. B.; and B. P. Galland, vi.); Bell, Expositio (in Opp. v.); Luther, Auslegung (Wittenberg, 1524, 4to and 8vo); Maffe, Explicatio (Venet. 1567, 8vo); Ridley, Expositio (Lond. n. d. 16mo); De Bree, Expositio (Sagitt. 1582, 4to); Radeus, In Judea (Antw. 1584, Gen. 1599, 8vo); Dandus, Commentarius (in Iun. 1665, 8vo); Farsen, Commentarius (Coloni, 1595, 8vo); Juvenis, Nota (Lugd. Bat. 1598, 8vo; also in Opp. 1585); Willet, Commentarius (Lond. 1603, Canbr. 1614, fol.; also Catholicorum, in "Harmonie," etc.); Turnbull, Sermones (Lond. 1608, 4to); Lancelot, Exegetica (Antw. 1613, 1626, 8vo); Boulde, Commentaries (Paris, 1643, 8vo); Packard, Commentaries (Francof. 1626, 4to); Rost, Commentarius (Rostock, 1627, 4to); Stumpf, Explicatio (Coburg, 1627, 8vo); Oter, Sermones (Lond. 1633, 8vo); Gerhard, Adnotationes (Jen. 1641, 1660, 1665, 4to); Du Bois, Explanationis (Paris, 1644, 8vo); Jerôme, in Judae (Lond. 1652-54, 8vo); Glasgow, 1783; Lond. 1839, 8vo); Calovius, Explicatio (Vitember, 1654, 1719, 4to) Manton, Lectures (Lond. 1658, 4to); Broughton, Exposition (Lond. 1662, fol.; also in Works, p. 422); Wandelin, Prodomus (Haenus, 1668, 4to); Rappolt, Observationes (Lipsiae, 1673, 4to); Grotius, Commentarius (L. B. 1676, 4to); Vergerius, Commentarius (L. Bat. 1677, 4to); Vischer, Verklarung (Amstel. 1681, 4to); also in German, Bremen, 1744, 4to); Titelmann (Scheneck), Commentarius (Marp. 1683, 8vo); Antonii, Verklaring (incl. 1 Petr.) (Leuward. 1683, 1697, 4to; also in German, Bremen, 1706, fol.); Marthin, Commentarius (Lipsiae, 1687, 4to); Pecht, Commentarius (Rost. 1690, 4to); Nemeth, Explicatio (1700, 4to); Dorschke, Commentarius (fragment. in germ. Commentarios, Franc. et Lips. 1700, 4to); Perkins, Exposition (in Works, Cambridge, 1701, etc.; i.ii. 479); Szatmari, Explicatio (Francof. 1701, 8vo); Martin, Exposition (Lugd. 1703, 4to; also in Meletemata, p. 328); Feustling, Commentarius (Vitember, 1707, fol.); Queide, in Epistolam et vitam Jude (Gryph. 1709, 4to); Creighton, Outlining (Haarlem, 1719, 4to); Weiss, Commentatio (Helmstadt, 1725, 4to); Walthier, Exegesis (Giebelh. 1724, 4to); Backer, Erklärung (Erfurt, 1727, 4to); Betzmann, Einleitung (Brunsw. 1731, 4to); Van Seelen, Judas antifanaticus (Lub. 1732, 4to); Semler, Commentatio [on var. read.] (Hal. 1747, 1784, 4to); Schmidt, Observationes (Lipsiae, 1786, 4to); Herder, Briefe sweener Brüder (Leuographical, 1775, 8vo); Pooms, Commentarius (Vitember, 1786, 4to); Holder, Erklärung (Jen. 1789, 4to); Hartmann, Commentarius (Coloni, 1783, 4to); Kahler, Anmerkungen (Hind. 1789, 8vo); *Hänelin, Commentarius (Erlanghen, 1799, 1801, 8vo); Harenberg, Expositio (in Miscell. Lips. nov. iii. 379 sq.) Elias, Dissertation (Utria. 1800, 8vo); Brun, Exposition (in French, Strassb. 1818, 4vo); Bickersteth, Exposition (London, 1846, 12mo); Macgivillar, Lectures (London, 1846, 8vo); *Stier, Auslegung (Berlin, 1850, 8vo).
cient Eastern analogy to suppose that they forfeited the judicial prerogative before they were overshadowed by the monarchy, and in David's time this is contrary to the tenor of history. During the oppression of Egypt the nascent people would necessarily have few questions at law to plead, and the Egyptian magistrate would take cognizance of them. As a matter of fact, Joseph and others of the existing judges in every town, etc., to choose their own colleagues, as vacancies fell, from among the limited number of persons who, being heads of families, were competent. Generally speaking, the reputation for superior wealth, as some guarantee against facilities for corruption, would add to the character of any person elected in connection with personal qualities, would tend to limit the choice to probably a very few persons in practice. The supposition that judicature will always be provided for is carried through all the books of the Law (see Exod. xxi, 6; xxii; Lev. xix, 15; Numb. xxxvi, 24; Deut. i, 16; xvi, 17; xxxv, 1). All that we know of the facts of later history confirms the supposition. The Hebrews were sensitive as regards the administration of justice; nor is the free spirit of their early commonwealth in anything more manifest than in the resentmment which followed the venal or partial judge. The fact that justice was not considered to be theAct of God largely contributed to keep up this spirit of independence, which is the ultimate check on all perverisions of the tribunal. The popular aristocracy (if we may so term it) of heads of tribes, sections of tribes, or families, is found to fall into two main orders of varying prominence, one of which, the sacerdotal, the other of the citizens, upward. The more common name for the higher order is "princes," and for the lower, "elders" (Judg. viii, 14; Exod. ii, 14; Job xxxii, 7, 8, 9; Ezra x, 8). These orders were the popular element of judicature. The other hand, the officio judges were imbued with a keen sense of allegiance to God as the Author of Law, and to the Covenant as his embodiment of it, and soon gained whatever forensic experience and erudition those simple times could yield; hence they brought to the judicial task the legal acumen and sense of general principles which complemented the other element. Thus the Hebrews really enjoyed much of the virtue of a system which allows separate provinces to judge and jury, although we cannot trace any such line of separation in their functions, save in so far as has been indicated above. To return to the first or popular branch, the need for the ex-officio judges arose from the occurrence of phraseology amid much diversity, that in every city these two ranks of "princes" and "elders" had their analogies, and that a variable number of heads of families and groups of families, in two ranks, were popularly recognised, whether with or without any form of election, as charged with the duty of administering justice. Souch (Judg. vii, 14) may be taken as an example. Evidently the ex-officio judges of Moses' choice would have left their successors when the tribe of Gad, to which Souch pertained (Josh. xiii, 27), settled in the other hand, the towns and what would be more simple than that the whole number of judges in that tribe should be allotted to its towns in proportion to their size? As such judges were mostly the head men by genealogy, they would fall into their natural oral places, and symmetry would be preserved. The Levites also were not entire, but were divided among the tribes; if and when they preserved their limits, there were probably few parts of Palestine beyond a day's journey from a Levitical city. One great goal which the priesthood had, in their jurisdiction, upon men's ordinary life was the custody in the sanctuary of the standard weights and measures, to which, in cases of dispute, reference was doubtless made. It is, however, reasonable to suppose that in most towns sufficiently exact models of them for all ordinary questions would be kept, since to refer to the sanctuary at Shiloh, Jerusalem, etc., in every case of dispute between dealers would be nugatory (Exod. xxx, 15; Numb. iii, 47;
Exek. xlv, 12). Above all these, the high-priest in the anti-regal period was the resort in difficult cases (Deut. xvii, 12), as the chief jurist of the nation, and one who would, in case of need, be perhaps oracularly directed; yet we hear of none acting as judge save Eli, nor is any judicial act recorded of him—though perhaps his not re- stricting his son to be none but to fail in his judicial duties. Now the judicial authority of any such supreme tribunal must have wholly lapsed at the time of the events recorded in Judg. xix. It should not be forgotten that in some cases of “blood” the “con- gregation” themselves were to “judge” (Numb. xxxvi, 24). Thus in the case of Jotham, as thus in the regular course of constitutional law. It is also a fact of some weight, negatively, that none of the special deliverers called judges was of priestly lineage, or even became as much noted as Deborah, a woman. This seems to show that any central action of the high-priest on national unity was null, and of this supremacy, had it existed in force, the judicial prerogative was the main element. Difficult cases would include cases of appeal, and we may presume that, save so far as the authority of those special deliverers made itself felt, there was no judicial action from Joshua onwards. In the case of Jotham, the current phrase of those deliverers that they “judged” Israel during their term, shows which branch of their authority was most in request, and the demand of the people for a king was, in the first instance, that he might “judge them,” rather than that he might “mow the head of a king,” or Sam. viii, 4-17. The Peculiar Traits and Functions of the “Judges” in the Period designated by their Rule.—The station and office of these shophetim are involved in great obscurity, partly from the want of clear intimations in the history in which their exploits and government are recorded, and partly from the prejudice of parallelism in the history of other nations by which our notions might be assist- ed. The offices filled by Moses and Joshua, whose presence was so essential for the time and the occasion, were not at all involved in the general machinery of the He- brew government. They were specially appointed for particular services and the performance of which they were invested with extraordinary powers; but when their mission was accomplished, society reverted to its permanent institutions and its established forms of gov- ernment. As above seen, every tribe had its own he- roes; and the “shophetim” who presided over its affairs administered justice in all ordinary cases, and led the troops in time of war. His station resembled that of the Arabian emirs, or rather, perhaps, of the khans of the Tartar tribes inhabiting Persia and the countries further east. He was assisted in these important duties by the “subordinates” or officers, the chiefs of families, who formed his council in such matters of policy as affected their particular district, supported his decisions in civil or criminal inquiries, and commanded under him in the field of battle (Numb. xxvi, xxvii; Josh. vii, 16-18).

This was, in fact, the old patriarchal government, to which the Hebrews were greatly attached. It was an institution suited to the Wants of men who live dispersed in loosely connected tribes, and not to the wants and exigencies of a nation. It was in principle segregative, not aggregative, and although there are traces of unit- ed agreement through a congress of delegates, or rather, of national chiefs and elders of the tribes, this was an inefficient instrument of general government, seeing that it was only applicable or applied to great occasions, and could have no bearing on the numerous questions of an administrative nature which arise from day to day in every state, and which there should have existed. It was, therefore, that the judge, in his function of the king of the chosen people, and acting in them in his place—tabernacle. Here he was always ready, through his priest, to coun- sel them in matters of general interest, as well as in those having reference only to particular tribes; and to his court they were all required by the law to repair three times every year. Here, then, was the principle of a general administration, calculated and designed to unite the tribes into a nation by giving them a common government in all the higher and more general branches of administration, and especially for all the political and ecclesiastical relations of the com- munity. It was on this footing that the law destined the government of the Hebrews to proceed, after the pe- culiar functions of the legislator and the conqueror had been fulfilled. See TETZERACHT.

The fact is, however, that, through the perversity of the people, this settlement of the general government on theocratical principles was not carried out in its proper form and extent, and it is in this neglect we are to seek the necessity for those officers called judges who were from time to time raised up to correct some of the things which resulted from it. It is very evident from the whole history of the judges that, after the death of Joshua, the Israelites threw themselves back upon the segregative principles of their government by tribes, and all but utterly neglected, and for a long period del- ivered over to the wolves of that age, it is only after a general government was established. There was, in fact, no human power adequate to enforce them. They were good in themselves, they were gracious, they conferred high privileges, but they were enforced by no sufficient authority. No one was amenable to any tribunal for personal neglect or violation of the data, or for any in- vention or misappropriation of public affairs to the divine King. Omissions on these points involved the absence of the divine pro- tection and blessing, and were left to be punished by their consequences. The man who obeyed in this and other things was blessed; the man who did not was not blessed; and general obedience, with national blessing, and general disobedience with national punishment. The enormities and transgressions into which the people fell in consequence of such neglect, which left them an easy prey to idolatrous influences, are fully recorded in the Book of Judges. The people could not grasp the idea of a divine and invisible king; they could not bring themselves to recur to him in all those cases in which the judgment of a human king would have determined the course of action, or in which his arm would have worked for their deliverance. There- therefore it was that the Lord would command to the guidance of faithful men, who acted for the most part as agents of the divine will—regents of the invisible King, and who, holding their commission directly from him or with his sanction, would be more inclined to act as dependent vassals of Jehovah than kings, who, as members of royal dynasties, would come in contact with notions of inde- pendent rights and royal privileges, which would draw away their attention from their true place in the theoc- racy. In this greater dependence of the judges upon the divine King we see the secret of their institution. The Israelites were disposed to rest upon their separ- ate interests as tribes, and having thus allowed the standing general government to remain inoperative through disuse, they would, in case of emergency, have been disposed "to make themselves a king like the na- tional" had their attention not been directed to the ap- proach of the Assyrian enemy. It was thus, while they existed, the reason of our inability to find any similar office among other nations. In being thus peculiar it resem- bled the dictatorship among the Romans, to which office, indeed, that of the judges has been compared. But there is this great difference, that the dictator laid down his power as soon as the crisis which had called
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for its exercise had passed away, and in no case could
this unwonted supremacy be retained beyond a limited
period (Livy, i, 34; but the Hebrew judge remained
invited with his high authority the whole period of his
life, and is therefore usually described by the sacred his-
torian as presiding to the end of his days over the tribes
of the land. He was a man of peace and security which his milita-
ry skill and counsel had, under the divine blessing, re-
stored to the land.

It is usual to consider the judges as commencing their
career with military exploits to deliver Israel from for-
exign oppression, but this is by no means invariably the case.
Eleazar the son of Arad, a mighty man, Deborah judged Israel before she planned the war against Jabin; and of Jair, Izban, Elon, and Abdon, it is at least uncertain whether they ever held any military command. In many cases it is true that military achievements were the means by which they elevated themselves to the rank of judges; but in general the appointment may be said to have varied with the exigencies of the times, and with the particular circumstances which in
times of trouble would draw the public attention to per-
sona who appeared suited by his gifts and influence to
solve the crisis. It is noted that in questions arising between tribe and tribe, to admin-
ister public affairs, and to appear as their recognised
head in their intercourse with their neighbors and op-
pressors. As we find that many of these judges arose
during times of oppression, it seems to us that this last
class of judges was a distinct class, and that much must have had a remarkable influence in the appoint-
ment of the judge. Foreigners could not be expected

to enter into the peculiarities of the Hebrew constit-
ution, and would expect to receive the proposals, remon-
strances, or complaints of the people through some per-
sion to represent the whole nation, or that part of it
which their intercourse applied. The law provided no
such officer except in the high-priest; but as the He-
brews themselves did not recognise the true operation of
their theocracy, much less were strangers likely to do so.
On the officer they appointed to represent the body of the people, under circumstances which compelled
them to deal with foreigners mightier than themselves, it
would naturally devolve the command of the army in
war, and the administration of justice in peace. This
last was among ancient nations, and it is still in the
East, the rule of the period when the Hebrews were a
ruler, and the interference of the judges was probably
confined to the cases arising between different tribes, for
which the ordinary magistrates would find it difficult to
secure due authority to their decisions.

In nearly all the instances recorded the appointment
seems to have been by the free, unsolicited choice of the
people. The election of Jephthah, who was nominated as
the fittest man for the existing emergency, probably
resembled that which was usually followed on such oc-
casions; and probably, as in his case, the judge, in ac-
ccepting the office, took care to make such stipulations
as he deemed necessary. The only cases of direct divine
appointment are those of Gideon and Samson, and the
last stood in the peculiar position of having been from
before his birth ordained "to begin to deliver Israel."
Deborah was called to deliver Israel, but was already a
judge. Samuel was called by the Lord to be a prophet,
but a judge, the whole nation, or that part of it
which the people recognised as dwelling in him; and as to Eli,
the office of judge seems to have devolved naturally, or,
rather, ex-officio, upon him; and his case seems to be
the only one in which the high-priest appears in the character
which the theocratical institutions designed for him.

The following clear summary of their duties and privi-
ileges is from Jahn (Hdbl. Archdol. II, i, 22 sq.; Heb. Commen-
twealth, Stowe's transl., § 28): "The office of judges or regents was held during life, but it was not
hereditary; neither could they appoint their successors.
Their authority was limited by the law alone; and in
do-
ing, it may be presumed, in abeyance during the period of the judges, seem to have merged in the monarchy. The kingdom of Saul suffered too severely from external foes to allow civil matters much prominence. Hence of all the critical judicial cases one (1 Sam. xi, 13) was the mere remission of a penalty popularly demanded; the other the pronouncing of a sentence (ib. xiv, 44, 45), which, if it was sincerely intended, was overruled in turn by the right sense of the people. In David's reign it was evidently the rule for the king to hear causes, and not merely to be present, or even to preside by deputy (though this might also be included), the "fountain of justice" to his people. For this purpose, perhaps, it was prospectively ordained that the king should "write him a copy of the law," and "read therein all the days of his life" (Deut. xvii, 19, 10). The same class of cases which were reserved for Moses would probably fall to his lot, and the high-priest was, of course, ready to assist the monarch. This fact is further presumable from the fact that no officer analogous to a chief justice ever appears under the kings. It has been supposed that the same indifference to all Israel to David's policy caused an influx of such cases, and that advantage was artfully taken of this by Absalom (2 Sam. xv, 1-4); but the rate at which cases were disposed of can hardly have been slower among the ten tribes after David had become their king, than it was during the previous anarchy. It is not probable that David's uniformly successful wars wealth and population increased rapidly, and civil cases multiplied faster than the king, occupied with war, could attend to them, especially when the summary process customary in the East is considered. Perhaps the arrangements mentioned in 1 Chron. xxviii, 4; xxvi, 29; compare 1 Sam. vii, 32, were perhaps (including judges), of the 6000 Levites acting as "officers and judges," and amongst them specially "Chenenniah and his sons," with others, for the trans-Jordanic tribes, may have been made to meet the need of suitors. In Solomon's time, whose reign is described as being fertile in civil questions, the "wisdom to judge" was the fitting first quality (1 Kings iii, 9; comp. Psal. lxxi, 1-4).

As a judge Solomon shines "in all his glory" (1 Kings iii, 16). No criminal was too powerful for his justice, as some had been for his father's (2 Sam. iii, 39, 1 Kings ii, 5, 6, 33, 34). The examples of direct royal exercise of judicial authority are 2 Sam. i, 15; iv, 9-12, where sentence is summarily executed, and the supposed case of 2 Sam. xiv, 1-21. The denunciation of 2 Sam. xii, 5, 6, though not formally judicial, is yet in the same spirit. Solomon similarly proceeded in the case of Beeroth (1 Kings iv, 16), and the murder of his son Adonijah (1 Kings xiv, 5, 6). It is likely that royalty in Israel was ultimately unfavorable to the local independence connected with the judicature of the "princes" and "elders" in the territory and cities of each tribe. The tendency of the monarchy was doubtless to centralize, and we read of large numbers of king's officers appointed to this and cognate duties (1 Chron. xxiii, 4; xxvi, 39, 32). If the general machinery of justice had been, as is reasonable to think, deranged or retarded during a period of anarchy, the Levites afforded the fittest materials for its reorganization, fitting to some extent not only locally, and by special duties, exemptions, etc., from the mass of the population, they were more easily brought to the steady routine which justice requires, and, what is no less important, were, in case of neglect of duty, more at the mercy of the king (as shown in the case of the murderers of Absalom (2 Sam. xvi, 17)).

If the general machinery of justice had been, as is reasonable to think, deranged or retarded during a period of anarchy, the Levites afforded the fittest materials for its reorganization, fitting to some extent not only locally, and by special duties, exemptions, etc., from the mass of the population, they were more easily brought to the steady routine which justice requires, and, what is no less important, were, in case of neglect of duty, more at the mercy of the king (as shown in the case of the murderers of Absalom (2 Sam. xvi, 17)). But subsequently, when the Levites withdrew from the kingdom of the ten tribes, judicial elders probably again filled the gap. There they conducted the mock trial of Naboth (1 Kings xxi, 8-19). There is in 2 Chron. xix, 5, etc., a special notice of a reappointment of judges by Jehoshaphat, and of a distinct court, of appeal, perhaps, at Jerusalem, composed of Levitical and of lay elements. In the same place (as also in a previous one, 1 Chron. xxiii, 32) occurs a mention of the "king's masters" as a branch of jurisprudence. The rights of the prerogative having a constant tendency to encroach, and needing continual regulation, these were placed in the hands of a department somewhat like the English Exchequer.

One more change is noticeable in the pre-Babylonian period. The "princes" constantly appear as a powerful political body, increasing in influence and privileges, and having a fixed centre of action at Jerusalem, till in the time of Nehemiah they were probably in the hands of the duties of a privy council, and especially a collective jurisdiction (2 Chron. xxxviii, 21; Jer. xxvi, 10, 16). These "princes" are probably the heads of great houses in Judah and Benjamin, whose fathers had once been the pillars of local jurisdiction, but who, through the attractions of a court, and probably also under the constant alarm of hostile invasion, became gradually residents in the capital, and formed an oligarchy which drew to itself, amidst the growing weakness of the latter monarchy, whatever vigor was left in the state, and encroached on the sphere of justice. The employment in offices of trust and emolument would tend also in the same way, and such chief families would probably monopolize such employment. Hence the constant bane of the prophetic strain, denouncing the neglect, the perversion, the corruption of judicial functions, after the manner of Jer. ix, 8; xi, 10, 11; Jer. ii, 8; vi, 15, 17; vii, 5; Ezek. xxii, 27; Jer. xiv, 8, 9; Hos. v, 10; vii, 5, 7; Amos v, 7, 15, 24; vi, 12; Hab. 1, 4, etc.). Still, although far changed from its broad and simple basis in the earlier period, the administration of justice had little resembling the "st and rigid system of the later thee." This exact change arose from the fact that the patriarchal seniority, degenerate and corrupted as it became before the captivity, was by that event broken up, and a new basis of jurisdiction had to be sought for. See SANEDRIN.

For the details of procedure, little more is known than may be gathered from the two examples, Ruth iv, 2, of a civil, and 1 Kings xxii, 8-14, of a criminal character; to which, as a specimen of royal summary jurisdiction, may be added the well-known "Judgment" of Solomon. Boaz apparently empanelled, as it were, his "elders" when he meets "in the gate," the well-known site of the Oriental court, and cites the other party by "Ho, such a one," and the people appear to be invoked as attesting the legality of the proceeding. The whole affair bears an extemporaneous aspect, which may, however, be of secondary merit (compare John xix, 19). The transactions of Job, that of the "conflicting waters," and especially the "conflicting waters," and especially the appeal of Job xix, 19, we have a wish expressed that a "time to plead" might be "set" (comp. the phrase of Roman law, diem dicere). In the case of the involuntary homicide seeking the city of refuge, he was to make out his case to the satisfaction of his elders (Josh. xx, 4), and if failing, or the congregation deciding against his claim to sanctuary there (though how its sense was "to be taken does not appear), he was not put to death by act of public justice, but left to the "avenger of blood" (Deut. xxi, 12). The expressions between "blood and blood" and "blood and blood," are almost always a presumption of legal arising. The latter expression seeming to imply something like what we call a "cross-suit." We may infer from the sanctimony, or rather, almost entire absence of direction as regards forms of procedure, that the legislator was content to leave them in the hands of the persons concerned, or, if being impossible by any jurisprudential devices to anticipate chimacne. It is an interesting question how far judges were allowed to receive fees of suitors: Michaelis reasonably presumes that none were allowed or customary, and it seems, from the words of 1 Sam. xii, 5, the such transactions as were done "before the Lord" were not.

There is another question how far advocates were usual. There is no reason to think that, until the period of Greek influence, when we meet with words based on evr-
of the highest importance, as giving a key to the following portion. It is a summary view of the history: the people fall into idolatry; they are then oppressed by a foreign power; upon their repentance they are delivered by a judge, after whose death they relapse into idolatry.

2. Body of the History (chap. iii, 7-xxvi). The words "And the children of Israel did evil in the sight of the Lord," which had already been used in ch. ii, 11, are employed to introduce the history of the thirteen judges comprised in this book. An account of six of these thirteen is given at greater or less length. The account of Gideon, in the remaining two, is very short, and is added as a connecting link to the longer narratives. These narratives are as follows:

(1) The deliverance of Israel by Othniel, iii, 7-11.
(2) The history of Ehud (and in iii) that of Shamgar, iii, 12-31.
(3) The deliverance by Deborah and Barak, ch. iv-v.
(4) The whole passage in vi-x, 5. The history of Gideon and his son Abimelech is contained in chap. vi-x, and followed by the notice of Tola (x, 1, 2) and Jair (x, 3, 5). This is the only case in which the history of a judge is continued until that of his children. But the exception is one which illustrates the lesson taught by the whole book. Gideon's sin in making the ephod is punished by the destruction of the institution of the priest's office by his son Abimelech, with the help of the men of Shechem, who, in their turn, become the instruments of each other's punishment. In addition to this, the short reign of Abimelech would seem to be recorded as being an unauthorized and profligate reign. The question generally goes:

(5) Ch. x, 6-xii, 7, to which is added the mention of Ibzan (xii, 8-10), Elon (11, 12), Abdon (13-15).
(6) The history of Samson, consisting of twelve exploits, and forming three groups connected with his love of three Philistine women, chap. xiii-xvi. We may perhaps refer to this portion of the book that it is almost entirely a history of the wars of deliverance: there are no sacerdotal allusions in it; the tribe of Judah is not alluded to after the time of Othniel; and the greater part of the judges belong to the northern half of the kingdom.

A closer inspection, however, discloses a more interior, and therefore truer arrangement of this, the main part of the book, and one better calculated to bring out the theocratic government of God, which, as we have seen in the preceding article, was the cardinal idea of the office known as "the judge." This is further confirmed by the commission by the Angel of the Covenant, who went before the people in all their marches (Exod. iii, 1-6; xiii, 21; xiv, 19, etc.), and to fit him for his office Moses was filled with the Spirit of the Lord, which was given to him in a measure apparently not given to any mere man after him. But the Spirit, which was communicated to a certain degree to men for various tasks in connection with the Church and people, was especially communicated from Moses, in whom the fulness resided (fulness such as was possible under the Old-Testament dispensation), to the seventy elders who assisted him in the administration, and to Joshua, who was called to be his successor (Num. xi, 17, 25; xiiii, 16, 18, 20). Agreeably to this, the true grouping of the events in the time of the judges must be looked for in connection with the coming forth of the Angel of the Covenant, and the corresponding mission of the Spirit of the Lord into the hearts of his people. No less is this the case with the coming forth of the judgment of the Lord (chap. i, ii, 11); and with the coming forth of the Angel of God (chap. ii, 9, 12). The only possible rendering is, "the Angel of the Lord," "the Angel of God," and this is amply confirmed by the attributes of Godhead which are assigned to the judge in the narratives.) Yet, while we notice these epochs of special manifestation, we must remember that God was always present with his people, at the head of their government, and working in a more orderly manner in calling out agents for preserving and recovering the visible Church and holy nation. Besides, there was the standing method of consulting him by Urim and Thummim.
through the high-priest, and there was his way of expressing in advance the blessing of the people by prophesies; of both of these there are recorded instances in this book, although the prophetical agency is rare and feeble till the time of Samuel (1 Sam. iii, i, 19-21), with whom the succession of prophethood began (Acts iii, 22).

Now the appearance of the Angel of the Lord and the Spirit in a special sense is four times noticed in the body of the history, and nowhere else, except in the poetic allusion in ch. v, 23. (1) The Angel of Jehovah went up from Gilgal to Bochim, and reproached the people for neglecting his work of redemption; threatening to help them no more; yet in reality the very object of this threat, suggesting that his free grace would help them, as in fact they immediately gained a victory over their own sinful selves (i, 1-5). The outward victory over oppressors was soon gained by Ochniel (iii, 10) when "the Spirit of the Lord came," literally was, "upon him, and he judged Israel, and went out to war." (2) The Angel of the Lord came and gave a mission to Gideon to deliver Israel (vi, 11, etc.), and to fit him for it (ver. 34), "the Spirit of the Lord came upon," literally clothed, "Gideon, and he blew the trumpet." (3) A passage (x, 10-16) is so similar to the Angel and Gideon that we do not know how to avoid the impression that it is the Angel himself who speaks in that immediate manner which is peculiar to this book; certainly there is no hint of any prophet in the case, and a message like this from the Urim and Thummim is nowhere on record in Scripture. The closing words of the Angel are, "I have chosen thee, and thou shalt save Israel." (4) The Angel of the Lord appeared to the parents of Samson, announcing the birth of his son, who was to begin to "deliver," or rather "save," Israel (xiii, 3-25). This occurs with the usual correspondence (ver. 24, 25), "the child grew, and the Lord blessed him; and the Spirit of the Lord began to move him at times, and he judged Israel, and he went abroad among the people of Israel. And the Spirit of the Lord came upon him from the time of his choosing by the Lord and given to him from his birth." It is said repeatedly afterwards, that "the Spirit of the Lord came mightily upon him." This arrangement suggests the four periods of history given below (§ 1x). The appearance of the angel of the Lord and the mission of the Spirit, however, belong not to the very commencement of the period, but rather to the continuance or close of a term of sin and disgrace. Perhaps in Gideon and Jephthah's cases the appearance of the angel and the mission of the Spirit were almost contemporaneous; but in the first case and in the last there must have been some distance of time between them, not now ascertainable, but possibly amounting to several years, and determined in each case by the particulars of the crisis which demanded these manifestations.

The second series of incidents: a. The conquest of Laish by a portion of the tribe of Dan, and the establishment there of the idolatrous worship of Jehovah already instituted by Micah in Mount Ephraim (ch. xvii, xviii). The date of this occurrence is not marked, but it has been thought to be subsequent to the time of Deborah, when her song contains no allusion to any northern settlements of the tribe of Dan.

b. The almost total extinction of the tribe of Benjamin by the whole people of Israel, in consequence of their supporting the cause of the wicked men of Gibeah, and the means afterwards adopted for preventing its recurrence. (Seventh-century b.c. See Joshua ii, 1-21.) In some degree marked by the mention of Phinehas, the grandson of Aaron (xx, 28), and by the proof of the unananimity still prevailing among the people.

III. Deisyn.—The above analysis clearly indicates a unity of plan on the part of the writer, who leads us (i, 11, 23) from the central idea of the theocracy, to prove that the calamities to which the Hebrews had been exposed since the death of Joshua were owing to their apostasy from Jehovah, and to their idolatry. "They forsook of the Lord, and served Baal and Ash-tharoth" (ii, 13), i.e. such crimes which they were deservedly punished and greatly distressed (ii, 15). Nevertheless, when they repented and obeyed again the commandments of the Lord, he delivered them out of the hand of their enemies by the Shophetim whom he raised up, and made them prosper in their wars against Moab (ii, 12). They had certainly collected the most important elements of the Hebrew history during the period between Joshua and Eli. Some episodes occur, but in arguing his subject he never loses sight of his leading theme, to which, on the contrary, he frequently recur while stating facts, and shows how it x. It was a peculiar passion of those oriental peoples to believe the only way to happiness was to shun idolatry and obey the commandments of the Lord. The appendix further illustrates the lawlessness and anarchy prevailing in Israel after Joshua's death.

Yet the word of the passage in which the author thus concludes his main object must not be pressed too closely, as if implying a perfect remedy of all political sin. It is a general view, to which the facts of the history correspond in different degrees. Thus the people is contemplated as a whole; the judges are spokes of the reverence due to the institution, and the deliverances appear complete. But it would seem that the people were in no instance under exactly the same circumstances, and the judges in some points fall short of the ideal. Thus Gideon, who in some respects is the most eminent of them, is only the head of his own tribe, and has to appease the men of Ephraim by suitably appropriating language in the moment of victory over the Midianites; and he himself is the means of leading away the people from the pure worship of God. In Jephthah we find the chief of the land of Gilead still affected to some extent by personal reasons (xii, 1): his war against the Ammonites is confined to the east side of Jordan, the cause of its issues probably also freed the western side from their presence, and it is followed by a bloody conflict with Ephraim. Again, Samson's task was simply "to begin to deliver Israel" (xiii, 5): and the occasions which called forth his hostility to the Philistines are of a kind which place him on a different level from Deborah or Gideon. This shows that the passage in question is a general review of the collective history of Israel during the time of the judges, the details of which, in their varying aspects, are given faithfully as the narrative proceeds.

This view of the author's design may lead us to expect that we have not a complete history of the time—a fact which is clear from the book itself. We have only accounts of parts of the nation at any one time. We may easily suppose that there were other incidents of a similar nature to those recorded in ch. xxvii, xxviii, not recorded in the history itself there are points which are obscure from want of fuller information, e.g. the reason for the silence about the tribe of Judah (see also xxviii, 16; ix, 26). Some suppose even that the number of the judges is not complete, but there is no reason for this opinion. "Budan" (1 Sam. xii, 11) is probably the
same as Abdon. Ewald (Geisch, ii, 477) rejects the common explanation that the word is a contracted form of Ben-Dum, i.e. Samson. Ja'el (v, 6) need not be the name of an unknown judge, or a corruption of Jair, as Ewald thinks, but is probably the wife of Heber. "The days of Ja'el would carry the misery of Israel up to the time of the victory over Sisera, and such an expression could hardly have been used as an expression at that time (see v, 24). Had the writer designed to give a full and connected history of the Hebrews in the period between Joshua and the kings, he would doubtless have described the state of the domestic affairs and of the government in the several tribes, as well as that which attended to each other, and the extent of power exercised by a judge, with other particulars such as do not appear in the narrative.

IV. Sources of the Materials.—Parts of the work are undoubtedly taken from ancient records and genealogies, others from traditions and oral information. From ancient authentic documents are probably copied the song of Deborah (chap. v), the beautiful parable of Jotham ix, 8-15), and the beginning of Samson's epiphanic, or triumphal poem (xv, 16). See also chap. xiv, 18, 18; xiv, 7. In their genealogies the Hebrews usually insert names of the lines not mentioned in the narratives, which may have been derived from the characters of the circumstances that preceded the conception of Samson, which were given as the parents related them to others (chap. xiii). These genealogies were sometimes further illustrated by tradition, and several incidents in the history of Judges have been thus mentioned. For instance, some of the persons mentioned in Judges have been named in some of the other books of the Old Testament, such as Samson, Amos, and others.

In the appendix also of this book, but nowhere else, a priest has the honorary title of father given him (xvii, 10; xviii, 18). But, though the author sometimes retains the names of his ancestors, still the whole of the composition is written in a particular style, distinguishing it from all other books of the Old Testament. The idea of the Israelites being overcome by their enemies he expresses often in this way: ‘The anger of the Lord was hot against Israel, and he sold them into the hands of their enemies’ (i. 4; iv, 10; xii, 7). A courageous and valiant warrior is described as a man upon whom rests the spirit of Jehovah, or as a person whom the spirit of Jehovah clothed (vii, 3; ix, 19; xiv, 19; xvi, 14, etc.).

Stähelin (Kritis. Untersuch., p. 106) thinks that iii, 7—x. presents the same but more clear and diction throughout, and that there is no need to suppose written sources. So Havercamp (Entrichtung, l, p. 68, 79) only recognises the use of documents in the appendix. Other critics, however, trace them throughout. Bertheau (On Judges, p. xxv-xxxiii) says that the difference of the diction in the principal narratives, coupled with the fact that they are united in one plan, points to the incorporation of parts of previous histories. Thus, according to him, the author found the substance of iv, 2-24 already accompanying the song of Deborah; in ch. vi-x the two distinct authorities are used—a life of Gideon, and a history of Shechem and its usurper; in the account of Jephthah a history of the tribes on the east of Jordan is employed, which meets us again in different parts of the Pentateuch and Joshua; and the history of Samson is taken from a longer work on the Philistine wars. Ewald's view is similar (Geisch, i, 184 sq.; ii, 480 sq.).

V. Unity.—This has already been fully vindicated in the above remarks on the design of the writer (§ iii). The attacks that have been made upon the unity of the book are rested on very trifling grounds. The chief one is the existence of the appendix, though it is not difficult to see the two great reasons for this part of the book assuming such a form: the one, that the historical development was too rapid, so that the plan was not to be interrupted; the other, that the two events which it narrates are to be looked on less as single events than as permanent influences. The permanence of the worship at Dan is expressly mentioned (xviii, 30, 31), and the captivity of the land" for the ten years. Samuel assumed office is traced to it with tolerable distinctness. The permanence of the moral evil which came out at Gibeah is not so plainly intimated; on the contrary, it might have been supposed to be eradicated by the vengeance taken on Benjamin. Yet the evil to be found in the whole tribes is indicated by their share in the terrible chastisement; and there is a hint of the continuance of some equally potent mischievous influence in the similar slaughter of the tribe of Ephraim by Jephthah. The prophet Hosea in so many words forms us that the days of Gibeah never ceased in Israel, and that the evil had continued (xi. 8). The author's statements may have been derived from a tradition taken away (Hos. ix. 9; x, 9). There have been, indeed, some very unsuccessful efforts to establish a difference of the words in use and the style of composition in the appendix and in the body of the book, but there has been little appearance of success in the undertaking. Even these objections have been the several critics in expelling the unity between the appendix and the introduction, on account of which some of them have gone so far as to say that both these may belong to a later editor, who prefixed and annexed his new materials to a previously existing work, the history of the judges strictly so called. The authorship of the whole of the Book of Judges will be examined below (§ vii). The attempts to discover contradictions in the book, with a view to show a plurality of authors, have also signalised failed.

VI. Relation to other Books of Scripture.—This is somewhat connected with the points discussed in preceding and following heads. The coincidences with the two adjoining Biblical books, however, are so striking as to call for a distinct notice.

1. Relation to the Book of Joshua.—Josh. xvii-xvi must be compared with Judg. i in order to understand fully how far the two books differ from each other. The composition of the book begins with a survey of the land and the people of Canaan. Nothing is said in chap. i about the tribes on the east of Jordan, which had already been mentioned (Josh. xiii, 13), nor about Levi (see Josh. xiii, 33; xxii, 1-42). The carrying on of the war by the tribes singly is explained by Josh. xviii, 28. The book begins with a reference to Joshua's death, and ii, 9-10 resumes the narrative, suspended by i-ii, 5, with the same words as are used in concluding the history of Joshua (xxvii, 28-31). In addition to this, the following passages appear to be common to the two books: Judg. i, 10-15; 20, 21, 27, 29, compared with Josh. xv, 14-19, 19; xvi, 1-10; reference to the conquest of Laish (Judg. xviii) occurs in Josh. xix, 47.

2. Relation to the Books of Samuel and Kings.—We find in i, 29, 30, 33, 36, a number of towns upon which, "when Israel was strong," a tribute of bond-service was levied: this is supported to some extent by the time of Solomon (1 Kings ix, 19-22). The conduct of Saul towards the Kenites (1 Sam. xv, 6), and that of David (1 Sam. xxx, 29), is explained by i, 16. A reference to the conclusion of the Philistine wars is implied in iii, 5. The allusion to Abimelech (2 Sam. xi, 21) is explained by ix, 19. Chapters xvii-xvi of the book of Ruth are more independent, but they have a general reference to the subsequent history.

The question now arises whether this book forms one link in a historical series, or whether it has a closer connection either with those that precede or follow it. We cannot infer anything from the agreement of its
JUDGES, BOOK OF 1078 JUDGES, BOOK OF

view and spirit with those of the other books. The object of the writer was to give an account only of the "Judges" proper. Hence the history ceases with Samson, excluding Eli and Samuel; and then at this point two historical pieces are added—ch. xvii.—xxii. and the book of Ruth, supplemental to the general plan and to each other. This is less well explained by Ewald's supposition that the books from Judges to 2 Kings form one work. In this case the histories of Eli and Samuel, so closely united between themselves, are only deferred on account of their close connection with the rise of the monarchy. Judg. xxvii.—xxxi. is inserted both as an illustration of the aspect of Israel during the life and reign of the judge in which respect it agrees with ch. i.—xvi., and as presenting a contrast with the better order prevailing in the time of the kings. Ruth follows next, as touching on the time of the judges, and containing information about David's family history which does not occur elsewhere. The connection of these books, however, is denied by De Wette (Einleit. § 186) and Thiersch (Kurs.-gefi. Erzg. Handb. Sam. p. xv, Königre, p. 1). Bertheau, on the other hand, thinks that one editor may have been traced from Genesis to 2 Kings, whom he believes to be Ezra, in the Persian period of Jewish history. The question was mentioned by E. (ii, 6.—xxvi.), and the last occurrence of which (xxv, 19) implies some distance from the time of Samuel. But i, 21, according to the most natural explanation, would indicate a date, for it is the only reference to the covenanting of Jeshurun by David (2 Sam. v, 6.—9). Again, we should at first sight suppose i, 28, 30, 33, 55, to belong to the time of the judges; but these passages are taken by many modern critics as pointing to the time of Solomon (comp. i Kings xi, 21). The first portion of the book (chap. i.—xxvi.) is the work of a E retailers Ewald thinks (Geist, § 202), the latter portion, that is the commencement of a larger work reaching down to above a century after Solomon (see also Davidson, Introduction, p. 649), but this is equally gratuitous. The author of the second division always describes the period of which he speaks thus: "In those days there was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes" (xvii, 6; xviii, 1; xix, 1; xxi, 25), but this expression never once occurs in the first division. Hence many modern critics conclude that the author of the first sixteen chapters of our book was different from him who wrote the latter part (see BDB, Art. "Nachrichtig, kritische Einleitung in die sämtlichen Schriften des A. und N. T. p. 876; Eichhorn's Einleitung in das A. Test. iii, § 457; S. Davidson, in Horne's Introd., new ed., ii, 648; but Keil the contrary, Einleit. p. 182). The authorship of the first sixteen chapters has been assigned to Joshua, Samuel, and Ezra. That they were not written by Joshua appears from the difference of the method of relating subjects, as well as from the difference of the style. In the book of Joshua there is a continual reference to the law of Moses, which is much less frequent in the book of Judges; and in Joshua, again, there are no such interferences with events that are common in Judges (iii, 1, 4; viii, 27; ix, 56). The style of the book of Joshua is nearer than that of Judges; the narration is more clear, and the arrangement is better (compare i, 10, 11, 20, with Josh. xiv, 6.—15, and xv, 13—19: also li, 1, 2—10, and Josh. xiv, 26—31). That the book of Judges was composed by Samuel, although an invention of the Talmudists, unsupported by any external evidence, is nevertheless the most plausible authorship that has been assigned to it, at least so far as relates to the first division. The opinion that this portion was written by Samuel may not be entertained by any one who attentively peruses the original; for it has a philosophy of its own, and certain favorite ideas, to which it constantly reverts, but of which there is not a trace in Ezra. If Ezra had intended to continue the history of the Hebrews from Joshua down to Eli in a separate work, he would not have given a selection of incidents to prove a particular theme, but a complete history. The orthography of the book of Ezra, with many phrases characteristic of his age, do not appear in the book of Judges. The prefix ו occurs, indeed, (v, 7; vi, 17; vii, 12; viii, 28), but this cannot be referred to in proof that the language of the text of Ezra, for it belonged to the dialect of North Palestine, as Ewald and others have shown, and the Hebrew form of the verbal peculiarities are explained in a similar manner (see Ottmar, in Heek's Magazin, vol. iv; De Wette, Lehrbuch der Einleitung in die Bibel, Berlin, 1833—39). The first sixteen chapters must have been written under Saul, whom the Israelites made their king in the hope of improving their condition. The events of the period of that time are traced in them, and the author must consequently have lived near the time when they were yet current. He says that in his time "the Jebusites dwelt with the children of Benjamin in Jerusalem" (i, 21); now this was the case only before David, who conquered the town and drove out the Jebusites. Consequently, the author of the first division of the book of Judges must have lived and written before David, and yet be acquainted with a regal form of government, which can only point to the reign of Saul. If he had lived under David, the法人ism of the book by that monarch, as the nature of his subject did not allow him to pass it over in silence. The omission, moreover, of the history not only of Samuel, but also of Eli, indicates an author who, living in an age very near that of Eli, considered his history as generally known, because it is repeated in Judges. The exact date of the appendix is more difficult to determine, but its author certainly lived in an age considerably later than that of the recorded events. That in his time the period of the events which he relates had been long forgotten is, however, hardly a fair inference from the frequence by a later editor of the expression "in those days there was no king in Israel" (xvii, 6); and it is gratuitous to suppose that certain particulars of his narrative could no longer be ascertained, and that this caused him to omit the name of the Levite whose history is given in ch. xix. In his time, indeed, the house of God was in Shiloh (xxvii, 28); and it will be re-considered that it was David who brought the ark to Jerusalem. But it must be borne in mind that it had frequently changed places during the Philistine war, and it remained a long time away from Shiloh even after Eli's death. The author of this portion of the book, as were priests of the graven image in Dan, or Laish, "until the day of the captivity of the land" (xxviii, 20). This latter circumstance has been assumed by Le Cerfe and others to prove that the appendix was not published until after the Babylonian captivity, or at least until after that of Israel by Shalmanasar and Assur-balaa, but it cannot be understood of the domination of the Philistines over the Israelites, which would very improperly be called "the captivity of the land," this expression always implying the deportation of the inhabitants of a country. But we may reasonably suppose that this expression was borrowed by a later editor from another circumstance that the author, in mentioning Shiloh, adds, "which is in the land of Canaan" (xxii, 12), and that the topographical description of the site of Shiloh is given (xxi, 19), has let some interpreters to assume that the author of the appendix must have been a contemporary of the Israelite such remarks would have appeared trivial (see Briefe einiger Holländischer Gottesgelehrten über R. Ni- mon's kritische Geschichte des A. T., edited by Le Cerfe at Zürich, p. 490). The inference is certainly specious, but, from an examination of the context, it appears that the Israelites were not to be entertained by any one who did not enter into the town, a without the town of land of Canaan, and that this led the author to add to Shiloh that it was in Canaan; while the second passage describes, not the site of Shiloh, but of a place in its neighborhood, where an annual feast was celebrated, when the daughters of which came out to dance, to sing, and to play on instruments of me-
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is the case in the wars of all uncivilized people; the inhabitants of cities are destroyed wholesale (viii, 16, 17; xx). Hospitality and the protection of strangers received as guests is considered the highest virtue: a father will rather resign his daughter than allow violence to be done to a stranger who stops in his house for the night (ch. xx, 21).

In the state of oppression in which the Hebrews often found themselves during the period from Joshua to Eli, it was to be expected that men, filled with heroism, should now and then rise up and call the people to arms in order to deliver them from their enemies. Such valiant men are introduced by our author, and he extols them, indeed, with high praise; but, on the other hand, there are instances of silent respecting their faults, as may be seen in the instances of Ehud, whom he reports to have murdered a king to recover liberty for his country (iii, 16 sq.); of Gideon, who is recorded to have punished the inhabitants of Succoth and Penuel cruelly for having refused bread to his weary troops (viii, 16, 17); and of Jephthah, whose inconsiderate vow deprives him of his only daughter (xi, 34). This cannot be a fiction; it is no panegyric on Israel to describe them in the manner the author has done. Now this frank, impartial tone pervades the whole. It begins by displaying the truth to Israelites as a refractory and obstinate people; and the appendix ends with the statement of a crime committed by the Benjamites, which had the most disastrous consequences. At the same time, due praise is bestowed on acts of generosity and justice, and valiant feats are carefully recorded.

But are not the exploits of its heroes exaggerated in our book, like those of Scosestris, Semiramis, and Hercules? Their deeds are, no doubt, often splendid, but they do not surpass belief; provided we do not add to the narrative anything which the original text does not sanction, nor give to particular words and phrases a meaning which does not belong to them. Thus, when we read that "Shamgar slew of the Philistines 600 men" (iii, 31), it would perhaps have been correct if the Hebrew חֶֽשְׁגָּר had been rendered by "put to flight;" and it should further be recollected that Shamgar is not stated to have been alone and unassisted in repelling the enemy: he did it, no doubt, supported by those brave men whose leader he was. It frequently happens that the leader is attributed what has been performed by his followers. Nor can it offend when, in the passage quoted above, it is said that Shamgar repelled the Philistines with an ox-goad; for this was exactly the weapon which an uncultivated Oriental warrior, who had been brought up to husband-work, would naturally choose in preference to other instruments of offence. From the description which travellers give of it, it appears to have been well suited to such a purpose. See GOAD. It is chiefly the prodigious strength of Samson, however, which to very many readers seems exaggerated, and surpassing all belief. He is, e.g., reported to have, unarmed, slain a lion (xiv, 5, 6); to have caught 300 jackals (דֶּנַּלְיוֹן), bound their tails to one another, put a firebrand between two tails, and let them go into the standing corn of the Philistines, which was thus burnt up (xiv, 4, 5, 8); to have broken, with perfect ease, the new cords with which his arms were bound, etc. (xv, 14, 16, 7-9, 11). Now there is in these and other recorded feats of Samson nothing which ought to create difficulty, for history affords many instances of men of extraordinary strength, of whom Goliath among the Philistines is not the least remarkable; and for others we refer to T. Ludolf, Historia Asiaeïper, 1, 10; to the Aen. of Virgil; Descriptio Franciae, 1, 2; Schilling, Missionsbericht, 1q, 79. Lions were also slain by other persons unarmed, as by David (1 Sam. xvii, 36) and Benaiath (2 Sam. xxiii, 20). It was easy to show that, when properly understood, his other exploits do not necessarily exceed the limits of human power. Extraordinary indeed they were, but, even if regarded as not alleged by the Scripture itself to have been supernatu-
ral, they are far from fabulous. Considering the very remote period at which our book was written—considering also the manner of viewing and describing events and persons which prevailed with the ancient Hebrews, and which very much differs from that of our age—taking into account, indeed, the brevity of the narrative, which consists of historical fragments, we may well wonder that there do not occur in it more difficulties, and that not more doubts have been raised as to its historical authority (see Herder, Gedet der Hebräischen Poesei, ii, 294, 52; Lischhorn, Repertorium der Hebräischen Literatur, vii, 78). For a further elucidation of the above and other difficulties, see the several subjects in their alphabetical places.

IX. Chronological Difficulties.—The time commonly assigned to the period contained in this book is 299 years. For this number is not derived directly from it. The length of the interval between Joshua's death and the invasion of ChusHan-rishathaim, and of the time during which Shamgar was judge, is not stated. The dates which are given amount to 410 years when reckoned consecutively; and Acts xii, 20 would show that this was the only adoption of the 450 years. But the 450 years do not seem to result from adding 40 years for Eli to the 410 of this book. But a difficulty is created by xi, 26, and in a still greater degree by I Kings vi, 1, where the whole period from the exodus to the building of the Temple is stated at 480 years (Septuag., 440). One solution is the adoption of the 450 years: under the 20 of the Philistines compels us to suppose that his first 20 were contemporaneous with Jair’s government, down to whose death Keil admits that there is no trace of division: hence he is driven to the desperate resource of denying that Eli was a judge at all, except in the name. But in the name of I Kings, v, 1 Kings, vii, 1, and in another form, by Kennicott pronounces against it (Disp. Gen., 80, § 3) because it is omitted by Origen when quoting the rest of the verse. It is also urged that Josephus would not have reckoned 592 years for the same period if the present reading had existed in his time. But it is defended by Tholuck (ad loc.), and is generally adopted, partly on account of its agreement with Egyptian chronology. Most of the systems therefore shorten the time of the judges by reckoning the dates as inclusive or contemporaneous. But all these combinations are arbitrary. The same may be said of Keil’s interpretation which is one of those least open to objection. He reckons the dates successively as far as Jair, but makes Jephthah and the three following judges contemporary with the 40 years of the Philistine oppression (comp. x, 6-xxii, l); and by compressing the period between the division of the land and the Judges, he makes 450 years, or 10 years, which were years to the death of Saul into 39, he arrives ultimately at the 480 years. Ewald and Bertheau have proposed ingenious but unsatisfactory explanations—differing in details, but both built upon the supposition that the whole period from the exodus to Solomon was divided into 12 generations of 40 years; and that, for the period of the judges, this system has become blended with the dates of another more precise reckoning.

But the whole theory of the parallel or contemporaneous rule of two or more judges, upon which all these shortening of the period in question proceed, is purely arbitrary. There is nothing in the book of Judges to warrant the supposition that the national unity was completely broken up, so that there ever were two independent judges ruling different parts of Israel: such a schism first appeared in the days of Ithobaal and Jezebel, and then our attention is strongly called to it. The Ammonitish oppression is distinctly stated to have extended far beyond the eastern tribes, into Judah, and Benjamin, and Ephraim, all being included in that “Israel which they oppressed.” Nor is there anything in the history which suggests the restitutio ad integrum of Jephthah’s jurisdiction to the east of Jordan. On the contrary, Mizpeh of Gilead (xi, 29) seems to be distinguishable from Mizpeh simply so called, where he took up his house (ver. 34), where he uttered all his words before the Lord (ver. 11), and where the children of Israel had assembled together, but his father and his mother changed (x, 17); and it will be difficult to assign a reason for thinking that this was not the Mizpeh in Benjamin, where at other times the people of the Lord were used to meet in those days (xx, 1; 1 Sam. vii, 5, 6; x, 17). Jephthah’s successors, whose rule must also be made contemporaneous with the Philistine oppression during 40 years, had no special connection whatever with the eastern tribes. Ish-baal belonged to Beth-lehem, and was buried there; Elion stood in the same relation to the tribe of Zebulon, and Abdon to Pirathon, in the land of Ephraim. So far as we know, these are fair specimens of the connections which the judges had with the different localities of the land of Israel, and there is no ground for restricting the rule of these tribes to the eastern part of the land. We are pretty sure that this was not the case with Deborah and Barak, nor with Gideon, nor, certainly, with Samuel; why imagine it with any of the rest? What time could be suggested less likely for such a revolution in the constitution of Israel than the close of the judges, by which we may understand the last of the successive judges, in whose administration there was so little to record for the instruction of posterity? Or, if there had been a threatening of such disintegration of the commonwealth, would it not be prevented by the nomination of the high-priest Eli to the office of judge? Yet that office was taken in the forty years which were falling under the first 20 of the Philistines compels us to suppose that his first 20 were contemporaneous with Jair’s government, down to whose death Keil admits that there is no trace of division: hence he is driven to the desperate resource of denying that Eli was a judge at all, except in the name. But in the name of I Kings, v, 1 Kings, vii, 1, and in another form, by Kennicott pronounces against it (Disp. Gen., 80, § 3) because it is omitted by Origen when quoting the rest of the verse. It is also urged that Josephus would not have reckoned 592 years for the same period if the present reading had existed in his time. But it is defended by Tholuck (ad loc.), and is generally adopted, partly on account of its agreement with Egyptian chronology. Most of the systems therefore shorten the time of the judges by reckoning the dates as inclusive or contemporaneous. But all these combinations are arbitrary. The same may be said of Keil’s interpretation which is one of those least open to objection. He reckons the dates successively as far as Jair, but makes Jephthah and the three following judges contemporary with the 40 years of the Philistine oppression (comp. x, 6-xxii, l); and by compressing the period between the division of the land and the Judges, he makes 450 years, or 10 years, which were years to the death of Saul into 39, he arrives ultimately at the 480 years. Ewald and Bertheau have proposed ingenious but unsatisfactory explanations—differing in details, but both built upon the supposition that the whole period from the exodus to Solomon was divided into 12 generations of 40 years; and that, for the period of the judges, this system has become blended with the dates of another more precise reckoning.

But the whole theory of the parallel or contemporaneous rule of two or more judges, upon which all these shortening of the period in question proceed, is purely arbitrary. There is nothing in the book of Judges to warrant the supposition that the national unity was completely broken up, so that there ever were two independent judges ruling different parts of Israel: such a schism first appeared in the days of Ishbaal and Jezebel, and then our attention is strongly called to it. The Ammonitish oppression is distinctly stated to have extended far beyond the eastern tribes, into Judah, and Benjamin, and Ephraim, all being included in that “Israel which they oppressed.” Nor is there anything in the history which suggests the restitutio ad integrum of Jephthah’s jurisdiction to the east of Jordan. On the contrary, Mizpeh of Gilead (xi, 29) seems to be distinguishable from Mizpeh simply so called, where he took up his house (ver. 34), where he uttered all his words before the Lord (ver. 11), and where the children of Israel had assembled together, but his father and his mother changed (x, 17); and it will be difficult to assign a reason for thinking that this was not the Mizpeh in Benjamin, where at other times the people of the Lord were used to meet in
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First Period (Chap. III.-v).

1. Seruataue. Chushan Rishabathaim, of Mesopotamia. 8 8
2. Judge. OTHNIEL. 40
3. Judge. Eglon, king of Bashan. 18
4. Judge. EBUD. 80
5. Judge. Shamgar, "slayer of the philistines"). 20
6. Judge. Deborah. 40
7. Judge. Barak. 206

Second Period (Chap. vi.-x).

1. Seruvad, Midian, Amelek, and children of the East. 7
2. Judge. GIDEON. 40
4. Judge. Abimelech. 3
5. Judge. Tola. 22
6. Judge. Jair. 90

Third Period (Chap. x. 6-xii).

2. Judge. Jephthah. 6
3. Judge. Ibzan. 1
4. Judge. Elon. 10
5. Judge. Ardon. 49

Fourth Period (Chap. xiii.-xvii).

2. Judge. Samson. "in the days of the philistines" 40

Patr. Gallandii, xiv; Ephaeser Syrus, Explanatio (in Opp. iv, 308); Theodoret, Quæstiones (in Opp. i, 1); Isid. Hispalensis, Commentaria (in Opp. i); Bude, Quæstiones (in Opp. p. 8); Rupertus Tuienensis, In Jud. (in Opp. III, 382); Cornutus, Commentarius (in Pez. Theol., IV, i, 127; Rabbi Tanchum, Commentarius (from the Arabic, by Schnurter, Tubing. 1791, 8vo; by Haarbrucher, Hal, 1842, 8vo); Boeblus, 8r4 (including Josh., etc.)
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Judgematics. See JUDAH JUDGIAN.

Judging, RASHI, the act of carelessly, precipitately, wantonly, or maliciously concerning others. This is an evil which abounds too much among almost all classes of men. "Not content with being in the right ourselves, we must find all others in the wrong. We claim an exclusive possession of goodness and wisdom; and from approving warmly of those who join us, we proceed to condemn, with much acrimony, not only the principles, but the characters of those from whom we differ. We rashly extend to every individual the severe opinion which we have unwarrantably conceived of a whole body. This man is of a party whose principles we reclaim slavishly, and therefore his whole sentiments are corrupted. That man belongs to a religious sect which we are accustomed to deem bigoted, and therefore he is incapable of any generous and liberal thought. Another is connected with a sect which we have been taught to account relaxed, and therefore can have no sanctity. We should do well to consider, 1. That this practice of rash judging is absolutely forbidden in the sacred Scriptures (Matt. vii. 3). 2. We thereby authorize others to requite us in the same kind. 3. It often evidences our pride, envy, and bigotry. 4. It argues a want of charity, the distinguishing feature of the Christian religion. 5. They who are most forward in consuming others are often most defective themselves." See Barrow’s Works, v. i, ser. 20; Blair’s Sermons, ser. 10, vol. ii; Saurin’s Sermons, ser. 4, vol. v.

Judgment, considered as a technical and scientific term of logic, is an act of the mind by which something is affirmed. In this restricted sense it is one of the simplest acts or operations of which we are conscious in the exercise of our rational powers. The intellectual faculty called judgment is the power of determining anything to be true or false. In every instance of memory or perception there is involved some judgment, some feeling of relationship, of space, or time, or of contrast, of cause and effect, of possibility and necessity. Consciousness necessarily involves a judgment; and, as every act of mind is an act of consciousness, every act of mind consequently involves a judgment. It is a process not only subsequent to the acquisi

tion of knowledge, but "involved as a condition of the acquisitive process itself. There is not only included what is popularly understood as comparison (when the properties of bodies are compared), but that elementary faculty, that fundamental law or innate idea, which, in the first instance, makes us cognizant of the property. Hence Sir William Hamilton’s division into derivative and primitive cognitions, the derivative being of our own fabrication, formed from certain rules, and being the tardy result of perception and memory, of attention, reflection, abstraction. These are derived from expen-
rience, and, as such, are contingent; and as all expe-
rience is contingent, all the knowledge derived from
experience is contingent also. But, as there are con-
tions of the mind which are not contingent, which are
necessary, in the sense Locke uses the term, which thought
supposes as its fundamental condition, these are denomi-
nated primitive cognitions; these primitive and gen-
eral notions being the root of all principles, these are the foun-
dations of the whole edifice of science. For the discovery
of this great truth we are indebted to Leibnitz, who, in
controversy with Locke’s view of ideas, asserted the
existence of a principle of human knowledge independ-
ent of and superior to that which is afforded by the
senses. Kant, adopting Leibnitz’s view, furnishes a
test by which these two elements are distinguished from
each other: the former, being contingent, are fluctu-
ating and uncertain; they may be in the mind, or they
may not. Every fresh scene in which we are placed
completely alters the sensations, and the particular sen-
sational judgments of which we are conscious. On
the contrary, our primitive judgments are steady, abiding,
unalterable. These are judgments, he asserts, of
two kinds, analytic and synthetic. An analytic judg-
ment is simply a declaration of something necessarily
belonging to a given notion, as that every triangle has
three sides. A synthetic judgment may be a declara-
tion of something which does not actually belong to a
notion, and yet the whole mind is in a manner kind
of evidence or other, to attribute it to it, as “Every event has
an efficient cause.” Here we do more than analyze the
expression; we attribute altogether a fresh notion to it,
and form a judgment by which our knowledge is ex-
tended. Both these judgments are found in the pure
sciences, and form the very principles upon which they
are pursued. It may be well to remark, however, that
Comte, Spencer, Mill, etc., following Locke, deny the
existence of these primitive judgments alto-
gothen, even the axioms which stand at the head of
mathematical reasoning. So far from being
subjective, they are truly inductive, derived from ob-
servation; only that observation is so constant, and
that induction is so easy and immediate, that we fall easily
into an illusion that these laws are intuitive, where-
as they are, in fact, experimental. For instance, the
axioms of Euclid, which are the basis of Euclid’s
Geometry are not metaphysical—written on the in-
llect, and drawn out of the brain—they are only state-
ments of laws observed and experienced. See Watts,
Logic, ch. iv., p. 251; Locke, On the Understanding, 1
Savage, Elements of Logic, 1; Duncan, Logic, 1; Reil,
On the Intellectual Powers, p. 497, etc. (E. de P.)

JUDGMENT, RIGHT OF PRIVATE. The Church of
Rome denies the right as claimed by Protestants on the
following grounds: that the Church, being assisted by
the Spirit of God in searching the Scriptures, having the
promise of the presence of Jesus to the end of the world,
and having the possession of the unwritten word as a
commentary on the written, is the only safe interpreter
of holy Scripture, and the supreme judge by whose de-
finite sentence all controversies with regard to the
meaning of particular passages or the general doctrine of
holy Scripture must be determined. This is a distinc-
tion, however, between the learned exegesis, as ap-
plied to the sacred writings, and that interpretation
which emanates from the Church. The interpretation
of the Church does not descend to the details which
must claim the attention of the scientific exegetist.
Thus, for example, she does not hold it her duty, nor in-
clude it in the compass of her rights, to determine when,
by whom, and for what object the book of Job was
written; or what particular inducement engaged St.
John to publish his Gospel, or St. Paul to address an
epistle to the Romans; in what order the events of the
apostles followed each other, etc. As little does she
undertake to explain particular words and verses,
their bearings one on the other, or the connection exist-
ing between larger portions of the sacred book. An-
tiquities, in the widest sense of the word, fall not within
the domain of her interpretation; in short, that inter-
pretation extends only to doctrines of faith and morals.
Within these limits she declares it to be the duty of
Christians to acquiesce in this infallible determination,
and that it is presumption and impiety, and a sin for
which they deserve everlasting punishment, to oppose
their own private judgment, which cannot of itself as-
tain the truth, to the decision of the Church, which can-
ot err.

To this extraordinary claim Protestants agree in op-
posing this principle, that the holy Scriptures are the
only rule of faith. But, while there is a general agree-
ment as to this, i.e. to receive the Scriptures as a suffi-
cient rule of faith, and as the only authoritative rule,
there are wide diversities of opinion concerning the
power reserved to the Church as to the doctrines of
religion. The extreme view is that the Church at no
time possesses the right of intermeddling in articles of
faith. The essential articles of faith are so few, so sim-
ple, and so easily gathered out of clear and explicit
proofs, that it is in no possible case for any to exercise
the exercise of his reason to miss them; that no harm can
arise from allowing any man to interpret the Scriptures
as he pleases; and, that, as Scripture may be sufficiently
understood for purposes of salvation without any foreign
assistance, all creeds and confessions of faith confound
and suppress the human mind and the authority are
unnecessary even upon the prerogative of the supreme Teacher,
and an invasion of the right of private judgment. Such
furthermore maintain that all divisions among Chris-
tians have grown out of the attempt of the Church so
forcibly to impose uniformity of belief as to the doc-
tines of holy Scripture.

This view of the right of private judgment is gen-
erally held by the followers of Socinus, and among its
ablest champions at the present day are some of the
leading minds of the Church of England, who, on ac-
tual examination, have dealt very hardly with the uni-
ariate, Catholic, Broad Church, by the friends of that party:
Lattitudinarian, or Independent, by its enemies. Bele-
iving that the superficial differences between Christians
are as nothing in comparison with their essential agree-
ment, they are willing that the portals of the Church
should be open to all denominations, whether Roman,
Protestant, or otherwise. This is clearly set forth by the late Dr. Arnold: “All
societies of men, whether we call them states or church-
es, should make their bond to consist in a common ob-
ject and a common practice rather than in a common
belief. If we, as believers, have in common the word of
God, we have in common more than enough to bind us
than truth. We may consent to set together, but we
cannot consent to believe together; many motives may
persuade us to the one: we may like the object, or we
may like our company, or we may think it safest to join
them, or most convenient, and any one of these motives
is quite sufficient to induce a unity of action, action be-
ing a thing in our own power. But no motives can per-
suade us to believe together; we may wish a statement
to be true, we may admire those who believe it, we
may find it very inconvenient not to believe it; all this helps
us nothing; unless our own mind is freely convinced and
the foundation of our doctrine is true, we cannot by possibil-
ity believe it.

Such a union of action appears historically to have
been the original bond of the Christian Church. Who-
ever was willing to receive Christ as his Master, to
join his people, and to accept his doctrine was
admitted to the Christian society. We know that in
the earliest Church there existed the strangest varieties
of belief, some Christians not even believing that there
would be a resurrection of the dead. Of course it was
not intended that such varieties should be perpetual; a
broad union of belief, it was presumed, was the point
to observe is that the union of belief grew out of the
union of action; it was the result of belonging to
the society rather than a previous condition required for
belonging to it, for no human power can presume to
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inquire into the degree of a man's positive belief. A general, hearty belief in Christianity is to be regarded by
the Church, not as its starting-point, but as its highest
perfection. To begin with a strict creed and no effi-
cotten errors, is not the care of the Church; but to
belief; to begin with the most general confession of
faith imputed, that is, as a test of membership, but
with vigorous Christian institutions, is the way most
likely to lead not only to a real and general belief, but
also to a lively perception of the highest points of Chris-
tian truth in relation to the doctrine of Holy Scrip-
ture, and Christianity should be tolerated when they are
combined with moral obedience; tolerated, because in this
way they are most surely removed; whereas a corrupt or
disorganized Church, with a minute creed, encourages
intellectual objections; and if it proceeds to put them
down by force, it is the rule of faith, and another to
science, punishing an unbelief which its own evil had
provoked, and, so far as human judgment can see, has
in a great measure justified. In primitive usage, a her-
ede was not properly he who did not believe what the
Church taught, but he who withdrew his allegiance
from its society, refusing to conform to its system, and
setting up another system of his own.

To most Protestants, however, this plan seems very
defective. Regarding the Christian Church as a soci-
ety created by divine institution, it possesses all the
resources of the sacred law, and the resources for
saving apostles to their successors, and of the exercise of
which the apostles have left examples. They deem it to
be incontrovertible that these successive teachers in the
Christian Church were intended to be interpreters and
exponents of the sacred book; that they are invested
with authority in relation to the doctrine of Holy Scrip-
ture; and that, as a mere acknowledgment of the truth
of Scripture is not a sufficient security for soundness
of faith, it is lawful for the Church to employ additional
guards to that "form of sound words" which it is
required to hold fast and to defend. It is not a thing to
be considered the rule of faith, and another to say that it is
the judge to determine what that rule is. The
latter it can as little be as the code of civil law can
exercise the functions of the judge; it forms, indeed,
the rule of judgment, but it does not itself pronounce judg-
ment. Hence the twentieth article of the Church of
England declares that "the Church hath authority in
matters of faith." So the Westminster Confession, "It
belongeth to synods and councils ministerially to
determine controversies of faith." See Rogers, Reason
and Faith; Wilson, Apostolic Fathers; Elliot, Delimitation
of the Holy Scripture (Index); Litton, Church of Christ, p. 77
sq. (E. de P.)

JUDGMENT, THE LAST, the sentence that will be
passed on our actions at the last day, when the everlast-
ing designs of God concerning this lower creation shall
be accomplished, an end put to time, and the destinies of
the human race fixed for eternity. This is one of the
peculiar doctrines of revelation, a doctrine of the Gospel
of Jesus Christ. There were, indeed, some hints of it in
the Old Testament; but it is in the New Testament that we
have it frequently and particularly declared and
described, with the circumstances where it will be
attained. It is a doctrine of certain, in which the
Church, as it were, agrees, unable to reason, which fully concurs with revelation in
directing our minds to a state of retribution, there being
no alternative, if we hold not the truth of a judgment
to come, but the holding that the creation is not under
a moral government. The Church is the doubt that we live under a retributive government,
and that cognizance is taken of our actions by an invisible
but ever-present Being, whose attributes render him the
determined foe of vice, and the steadfast upholder of
righteousness. On the other hand, there has been an
irresistible demonstration from the experience of all
ages, that no accurate proportion is at present main-
tained between conduct and condition. The wicked
triumph in their iniquity, while virtue is despised; her
humble votaries are borne down by the gloom of advesi-
ty, or reared in the midst of sorrows and tears. In every
age of the world, therefore, men have been perplexed by
what seemed opposite evidences as to the superintend-
ent care of a benevolent Being, who, in order to escape
the difficulty is an appeal to the future; for
either the idea is erroneous of one living under a moral
government at all, or that moral government must have
another scene of display where its impartiality shall be
vindicated, and every discrepancy removed. See Fuller,
Works, ii. 78, 106, 152, 211, 367, 392, 437, 441, 459, 671,
888, 906; Dwight, Theology; Irving, Argument for Judg-
ment to come. See JUDGMENT DAY. (E. de P.)

JUDGMENT DAY, a term generally used to design-
ate that important day which is to terminate the pre-
sent dispensation of grace; at the end of the world, when
time shall be no more, and the state of all men be unchangeably fixed (2 Pet. iii, 7).

I. Proof of a general Judgment.—The arguments for
this are these: 1. The justice of God requires it; for it is
evident that this attribute is not clearly displayed in the
dispensations of grace in the present state (3 Thess.
1,6,7; Luke xiv, 14). 2. The acknowledged work of natural
science are testimonies in favor of this belief (Rom. ii,
15; Dan. v, 5, 6; Acts xxiv, 25). 3. It may be con-
cluded, from the relation men stand in to God, as crea-
tures to a Creator. He has a right to give them a law,
and to make them amenable for their acts; hence, he will
rise in judgment (Gal. iii, 10, 12). 4. The resurrection of Christ is a certain proof of it. See Acts xvii, 31; Rom. xiv, 9. 5. The Scripture,
in a variety of places, sets it beyond all doubt (Jude
14, 15; 2 Cor. v, 10; Matt. xxv; Rom. xiv, 10, 11; 2
Thess. i, 7, 10; 1 Thess. iv, 16, 17). See above, Judg-
ment, Last.

II. The Judge.—The Bible declares that God will
direct the world by Jesus Christ (Acts xvii, 31). The
iuous God will be the Judge, as to original authority,
power, and right of judgment; but according to the
economy settled between the three divine persons, the
work is assigned to the Son (Rom. xiv, 9, 10), who will
appear in his human nature (John v, 27; Acts xvii, 31),
with great power and glory (1 Thess. iv, 16, 17), visible
to every eye (Rev. i, 7); penetrating every heart (1 Cor.
iv, 5; Rom. ii, 16); with full authority over all (Matt.
xxviii, 18, 20), and acting with strict justice (2 Tim. iv, 8).
As for the concern of others in the judgment, angels
will be no otherwise concerned than as attendants, gath-
ering the elect, raising the dead, etc., but not as advising
or judging. Saints are said to judge the world, not as
judges with Christ, but as approvers of his sentence, and
as their special representatives and executors in
judgment against their wicked neighbors (1 Cor. vi, 2, 3).

III. The Persons that will be judged.—These will be
men and devils. The righteous will probably be tried
first, as represented in Matt. xxxv. They will be raised
first, though perhaps not a thousand years before the
rest, as some have supposed (see MILLENNIUM); since
the resurrection of all the bodies of the saints is spoken
of as in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye, at the
last trump, in order to their meeting the Lord in the
air, and being with him, not on earth, but forever in
heaven (1 Thess. iv, 13, 16; 1 Cor. xv, 51, 52; Rev.
iv, 17).

IV. The Rule of Judgment.—We are informed that
the books will be opened (Rev. xx, 12): 1. The book of
divine omniscience (Mal. iii, 5), or remembrance (Mal.
iii, 15); 2. The book of consciousness (Rom. ii, 16); 3.
The book of Providence (Rom. ii, 4, 5); 4. The book of
the dead (John v, 27); 5. The law, and Gospel (John.
iv, 40; Rom. ii, 15, 16); 6. The book of life (Luke x, 20; Rev.
iii, 5; xx, 12, 15).

V. The Time of Judgment.—The soul will be either
happy or miserable immediately after death, but the
general judgment will not be till after the resurrection
(Heb. ix, 27). There is a day of the Lord, when he will
judge the world, but it is unknown to men. See INFERIORATE STATE.

VI. The Place.—This is also uncertain. Some sup-
pose it will be in the air, because the judge will come in
JUDGMENT-HALL
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the clouds of heaven, and the living saints will then be changed, and the dead saints raised, and both be caught up to meet the Lord in the air (1 Thess. iv. 16, 17). Others think it will be on the earth, on the new earth, on which they will descend from the air with Christ. The place where, however, is of no consequence, when compared with the state in which we shall appear. As the Scriptures represent it as certain (Eccles. xi. 9), universal (2 Cor. v. 11), righteous (Rom. ii. 5), decisive (1 Cor. xv. 22), and eternal as to its consequences (Heb. vi. 9), let us be concerned for the welfare of our immortal interests, flee to the refuge set before us, improve our precious time, depend on the merits of the Redeemer, and adhere to the dictates of the divine Word, that we may be found in him in peace. See Bates, Works, p. 449; Hopkins and Stoddard, On the Last Judgment; Gill, Body of Divinity, ii, 467, 8vo; Boston, Fourfold State; Heyer, Works, new edition, i, 72, 73; ii, 28, 223; iv, 155. See Resurrection.

Judgment-hall. See PRETORIUM.

Judgment-seat (βίσχος, properly a step, hence a rostrum or stage for speakers; as a "throne", e.g. Herod's in the theatre at Cesarea, Acts xii, 21), an elevated seat or tribunal (in James ii. 6, the term is καρυόπτων, a court of justice), especially of the Roman governor (Matt. xxvii. 19; John xix. 13; Acts xvii. 12, 16, 17; xxv, 6, 10, 17); hence of the final bar of God (Rom. xiv. 10; 2 Cor. v. 10). See PAVEMENT.

Roman Judgment-seat. (From a unique example at Wilton House.)

Judgments or God. 1. This expression is of frequent occurrence in the Scriptures, and its sense is generally determined by the connection. When God's judgments are spoken of, the term may denote either the secret decisions of the divine will (Ps. x. 5; xxxvi. 6, 8), or the declarations of God's will revealed in the Scriptures (Exod. xxvi, 1; Deut. vii, 12; Neh. ix, 18; Ps. cxix, 7-15), or the inflictions of punishment on the wicked (Exod. vi. 6, xii; Prov. xxix. 22; Ezek. xxv. 11; Rev. xvi. 7). The Scriptures give us many awful instances of the display of divine justice in the punishment of nations, families, and individuals, for their iniquities. See Gen. viii. ix; xiii; Exod. xv, Judg. i, 6, 7, 12; Acts xxvii, 33; Esther xiv, 14, with vii, 10; 2 Kings xi; Lev. x, 1, 2; Acts v, 1-10; Isa. xxx, 1-6; 1 Sam. xv, 9: 1 Kings xi, 25, 33.

2. In a less legitimate application, the strange trials to which those suspected of guilt were put in the Middle Ages, conducted with many devout ceremonies by the ministers of religion, and pronounced to be the judgments of God! The ordeal consisted of various kinds: walking blindfold amid burning ploughshares, holding a hot stone in the hand, or plunging the arm into boiling water. The popular affirmation, "I will put my hand into the fire to confirm this," appears to be derived from this solemn custom. Challenging the accuser to single combat, when frequently the stoutest champion was allowed to supply their place; swallowing a mouse or the bloody hand; sinking or swimming in a river for witchcraft, or weighing a witch: stretching out the arms before the cross, till the champion soonest wearied dropped his arms and lost his estate, which was decided by the very short chancery suit called the judicium crucis.

Those who were accused of robbery were put to trial by a piece of barley bread, on which the massa had been said, and, if they could not swallow it, were declared guilty. Probably the saying, "May this piece of bread choke me," comes from this custom. Among the proofs of guilt were the Blessubg of a corpse. If a person was murdered, it was believed that at the touch of the proach of the murderer the blood rushed out of the body in various parts. By the side of the bier, if the slightest change was observable in the eyes, the mouth, feet, or hands of the corpse, the murderer was conjectured to be present; and it is probable that many innocent spectators have suffered death in consequence.

It is well to mark, in extenuation of these absurd practices of our rude ancestors, that these customs were a substitute for written laws that then recognized barbarous period had not; and as no community can exist without laws, the ignorance of the people had reference to these customs, which, bad and absurd as they were, served to close controversies which otherwise might have given birth to more destructive practices. Ordeals are, in truth, the rude laws of a barbarous people who have not yet obtained a written code, and not advanced enough in civilization to enter into refined inquiries, the subtle distinctions and elaborate investigations which a court of law demands.

It is a well-established fact, however, that they were acquainted in those times with secrets to pass unharmed these singular trials. This was especially the case with ordeals of fire and boiling water. Doubtless the more knowing ones possessed these secrets and medications which they had at hand to pass through these trials in perfect security. See Jortin, Remarks on Eccles. Hist. iii, 246 sq. See ORDEAL. (E. de F.)

Judicature, Courts of. See Judge; Court; Trial; Triennial; Council, etc.

Judges electi, select judges, is a term applied to a number of judgesationally selected to hear and to act from an excommunicated presbyter or deacon against his own bishop. The Council of Sardica allowed an appeal to the metropolitan; and in such a case the metropolitan had three ways of proceeding—either to select a number of judges, generally twelve, to hear the case; or to refer the matter to a provincial synod; or to hear the cause himself without a synod. It is, however, doubtful whether a metropolitan had power to depose his own bishop. See Devey, 162, 387, 409, 412.

Judicial Blindness or Hardness, a term employed to express a state of moral incorrigibility. So we read, Mark iii. 5, "Being grieved for the blindness—hardness—of their hearts." In part hast happened to Israel." Eph. vi. 18, "Because of the blindness—hardness—of their hearts." 2 Cor. iii. 14, "Their minds were blinded—hardened." and elsewhere. This expression is of special interest to the theologian on account of two questions connected with it.

1. Is it an infestation of God?—From such passages as Isa. vi. 10, some have said that God commands the prophet to do a certain thing to this people, and then punishes the people: nay, this appears stronger still,
where the passage is quoted, as (John xii, 40), He hath blinded their eyes and hardened their hearts; which and seems to be contradictory to Matt. xiii, 15, where the people themselves are said to have closed their own eyes; and so Acts xxviii, 27. These seeming contradiction are, very easily reconciled, as if He, by using plenty and abundance, affords the means of the people's abusing his goodness, and becoming both over-fat with food and intoxicated with drink; and thus his very beneficence may be said to make their heart fat, and their eyes heavy, when the same time the people, by their own act, their overfeasting, become unaabbled, indolent, bloated, over-fat at heart, and, moreover, so stupefied by liquor and strong drink, that their eyes and ears may be useless to them: with wide-open eyes, staring, they may stare, but not perceive; and listening, they may hear, but not understand; and in this state, they will continue, preferring it to a more sedate, rational condition, and refusing to forbear from prolonging the causes of it, lest at any sober interval they should see truly with their eyes and hear accurately with their ears, in consequence of which they should be shocked at themselves, and converted, be changed from such mis-conduct, and I should heal them—shure these die- lusory effects of their surfeits and dissoluteness. Comp. Isa. v, 11; xxviii, 7. This is equally true in spiritual matters. In short, the expressions in question are to be understood in the same sense as the hardening of Pha- raoh's heart under a persuasion by his own wilful breach of the providences of God (Rom. ix, 17, 18). See PRE- DESTINATION.

2. Is this state hopeless? —That sinners may, by a course of persistent opposition to God, so far destroy or deaden the grace and presence of God as to be beyond the hope (not absolutely the power) of divine grace; it is a fearful fact, and one corroborated by the Holy Scriptures (1 Tim. iv, 2; Rom. i, 28; 2 Thess. ii, 11. Heb. vi, 6). But this condition, again, is not so much the result of God's de- termination as of their own inveterate perversity. See UPRIGHTNESS OF GOD.

JUDICIAI DEI. See JUDGMENTS OF GOD.

Judith (Heb. יְוּדִית, yūdīth, Jevvitha, Septuag. Ιωάννα, the name of two females; properly the feminine form of יְוָדִי, yāḏīy, Jowda, comp. Jer. xxxvi, 14, 21), but in the passage of Genesis it is generally taken as the correlative of Judith, i. e. "praised."

1. The daughter of Beeri, the Hittite, and one of the first two wives of Esau (Gen. xxxvi, 34). She is else- where more correctly called ANAHIRAH, the daughter of Esrail (Gen. xxvi, 32, 33; xxxvi, 2, 4). See Beeri.

2. The heroine of the apocryphal book which bears her name, who appears as an ideal type of piety (Jud. vii, 6. 8), beauty (xvi, 21), courage, and chastity (xvi, 29 sq.). Her supposed descent from Simeon (ix, 2), and the manner in which she refers to his cruel deed (Gen. xxix, 26 sq.), mark the conception of the character, which evidently belongs to a period of stern and perilous conflict. The most unscrupulous daring (ch. xiii) is combined with zealous ritualism (xii, 1 sq.), and faith is turned to action rather than to supplication (viii, 51 sq.).

Clement of Rome (Ep. i, 55) assigns to Judith the epi- thet given to Joel (Joaeli v επαρεν): and Jerome sees in her exploit the image of the victory of the Church over the power of evil (Ep. lxxix, 11, 508: Judith ... in typo Ecclesiae dolomi capite truncavit; compare Ep. xxii, 10, 105). According to the Greek text, Judith was the rich widow of Manasseh of Bethulia; to which the Vulgate adds that she was the daughter of Merari, or more properly Beeri (ךָרַי), as the Hebrew version has it; the latter also places her in the days of Maccabees, which is undoubtedly correct. See JUDITH. BOOK OF.

JUDITH, BOOK OF, one of the most interesting of the apocryphal books, which has called forth a greater variety of opinions among interpreters since the days of the Reformation than almost any other of the Deutero-canonical productions. Its historical bearings are es- pecially important.

I. Title and Position of the Book. —The book is named after its heroine, מִרְי: Jevvitha. St. Jerome's opinion, that it is so called because Judith was the authoress of it (Comment. in Agg. i, 6), is rightly rejected by every scholar of the Septuagint. The book, according to the Vulgate, and in Wycliffe's translation, Judith is placed between Tobit and Esther. This is followed by Coverdale, the Geneva version, the Bishops' Bible, and the A. V., where, from the nature of the division, it is put be- tween Tobit and the apocryphal Esther. In the Vat- sian copies it is placed between Tobit and the Wisdom of Solomon; in the Zurich Bible, between Baruch and the apocryphal Esther; whilst Luther puts it at the head of the apocryphal books.

II. Design and Contents of the Book. —The object of this book evidently is to show that as long as God's peo- ple walk in his commandments blamelessly, no matter how distressing the circumstances in which they may temporarily be placed, the Lord will not suffer the ene- my to triumph over them, but will in due time appea for their deliverance, and cause even those who are not Jews to acknowledge that the God of Israel is the only true God. In external form this is shown by the character of the record of a historical event, describing the complete defeat of the Assyrians by the Jews through the prowess of a woman.

In the twelfth year of his reign, Nebuchadnezzar, or, as he is called in the Greek, Νομόσασισσομοσος, king of Assyria in Asia Minor, who dwelt in the hill-country, by Euphrates, Tigris, Hydas- pes, and by the plain of Arioch, king of the Elymas- ans, made war against Arphaezad, king of Medias, who had fortified himself in Ecabata (i, 1-7); and, despite the inhabitants of the countries of the West, Peria, Li- banus, anti-Libanus, Carmel, Gaalad, Gallilee, Esdracon, Samaria, etc., refusing their aid (ver. 8-12), conquered Arphaezad, and returned home to Nineveh in the seven- teenth year of his reign (ver. 13-16). The following year, determined to carry out his resolution to wreak his vengeance on those nations who refused their aid, he dispatched his chief general Holofernes, at the head of 120,000 infantry and 12,000 cavalry (i, 22), who soon subdued Mesopotamia, Syria, Libya, Cilicia, and Idumea (ii, 23; iii, 8), and marched on Judea (ver. 9, 10). The inhabitants of the sea-coast made a voluntary submission, which, however, did not prevent them from being laid waste, their sacred groves burned, and their idols destroyed, in order that divine honors should be paid only to Nebuchadnezzar. Holofernes, having finally encamped in the plain of Esdracon (i, 8), re- mained inactive for a whole month—or two, according to the Latin version. But the children of Israel, who had newly returned from captivity, hearing of Holofernes' atrocities, and being afraid of his despoiling the Temple, determined to resist the enemy, and pre- pared for war under the direction of their high-priest Joachim, or Erach. The inhabitants of Bethulia, at once took possession of the high mountains and fortified their houses (i, 5), whilst the inhabitants of Bethulia and Beto- mestham, according to the command of the high-priest Joachim, guarded the passes of the mountains near Do- hmac (ver. 6-8); and, having made all the necessary preparations, they held them fast, and kept the road for protection (ver. 9-15). Furaged, as well as aston- ished at their audacity in preparing to fight against him, Holofernes made inquiries of the chiefs of Ammon and Moab who this people was (v, 1-4). Achor, the leader of the Ammonites, then gives him the history of the Jews, and tells him that no power could vanquish them unless they sin against their God (ver. 5-21). The proud army, however, becomes exceedingly angry with this statement (v, 1-9), and Holofernes orders Achor to be thrown into the Jewish camp, in order that he may be destroyed in the general destruction which was impending over the people whom he described as in-
vincible (ver. 10-13). The Jews pick him up, and lead him to the governor of Bethulia, to whom he relates this, and who comforts him (ver. 14-21). The next day Holophernes marches against Bethulia, takes the mountain passes, seizes all the supplies of water (vii, 1-7), and lays siege to the city (ver. 8-19), which lasts forty days, when two young people urge the governor, Oziel, to surrender it, and he decides to do so unless relieved within five days (ver. 20-32). The pious widow Judith, however, denounces this decision as tempting the Almighty (viii, 1-31), and conceives a plan for delivering the people (ver. 32-56). With this view she entices the head of Holophernes, and all his officers, to the city, and persuades them to surrender, and to permit the gates of the city to be opened for her. Having prayed to the God of her fathers for the overthrow of the enemy (ix, 1-14), she arranges herself in rich attire, and, accompanied by her maid, who carries a bag of provision, goes to the camp of Holophernes (x, 1-11). The guards, seeing this beautiful woman, and hearing her story, conduct her to the general (ver. 12-23), whom she tells that the Jews would now be vanquished, because they had sinned against God in eating the victuals consecrated to the Temple (xi, 1-2), and that the Lord had fled from the assembled delinquents, and would show him the access to the city, only requesting that she should be permitted to go out of the camp to pray in the night (ver. 16-19). Holophernes, smitten with her charms, gives her a sumptuous entertainment, and invites her to remain alone with him until the next night (xii, 1-9). When heavily asleep in consequence of having drunk too freely, Judith seizes his falchion, strikes off his head, gives it to her maid outside, who puts it in the bag which contained the provisions; they both leave the camp as usual under the pretence of devotion, and return to Bethulia, displaying the head of Holophernes, amidst the rejoicing, and thanksgivings of the people (xiii, 1-20). Achior, hearing of this wonderful deliverance, is at once converted to Judaism, whilst Judith counsels the Israelites to surprise the enemy next morning (xiv, 1-10), who, being panic-stricken at the loss of their general, are soon discomfited, leaving immense spoil in the hands of the Jews (xv, 11-xx, 11). The women of Israel then express their gratitude to their sister (ver. 12-13), whilst Judith bursts forth in a sublime song of praise to the God of their salvation (xvi, 1-17), whereupon all of them go down to the river, to wash the bodies of their deceased compatriots, and sacrifices and feastings (ver. 18-20). Judith afterwards returns to her native place, Bethulia, manumits her maid, and dies at the advanced age of 105 years, greatly lamented by all the nation, whose peace no enemy dared to disturb for a long time (ver. 21-25). The Jews enjoying a profound and just peace, celebrate a yearly festival (according to the Vulgate) is instituted in honor of the victory.

III. Original Language, Versions, Condition of the Texts, etc.—That this book was originally written in Hebrew or Syro-Chaldaic is distinctly declared by St. Jerome, who says that "Judith is read by the Jews among the Hagiographa... and, being written in Chaldee (Chaldee sermones, so called) is reckoned among the histories," and that he used a Chaldee copy to correct thereby the vitiated readings of the MSS. (Pref. ad Jund.). This is, moreover, corroborated by the Byzantine historian John Malalas (fl. circa A.D. 880), who, having embodied the contents of Judith in his Chronographia, remarks, Τὸς εἶναι ἐν τῆς Εὐαγγελίας καὶ τοῖς γραφομένωι (i.e., ed. Oxon. 1691). Besides, the Greek contains unmistakable indications that it was made from a Hebrew or Aramaean original, e.g. giving the Hebrew use of the relative in ἐν τῷ ἐστὶν ἐν αὐτῷ (x, 2), ὑπὸ τὸ μᾶς ὄνομα (xvi, 4), the literal rendering of τοῦ ἐν τῷ παραβουλή (xii, 7), which has occasioned so much difficulty to interpreters, but which is easy enough when it is borne in mind that the Hebrew preposition ש is signified by more; the many Hebraisms (7, 16, 16, 7, 16, 18, 23, 13, 8, 10, 10, 1, 2, 6, 11, 15; v, 9, 12, 14, 16, 15; v, 15, 18; x, 7, 28; x, 5, 16; vii, 18, 19; viii, 19, and the mistranslations of the Hebrew (ii, 8; ii, 3, 1, 9, 10; v, 15, 18; vii, 27; x, 11). Gesenius, and especially Movers, have been very successful in their efforts to correct the present geographical errors by the supposition of a Hebrew original. Barteni, (9) the latter conclusion is, according to the ancient Jewish tradition (xii, 12) the two arms of the Nile. For γαλαγοι are read γαλαγοί, and considers Rassas to be an oversight for Tarshish. Origen was therefore misinformed when he was told that Judith did not exist in the Hebrew Βιβλία μέχρι ἐγκόσμων οὗτος τὸ Βιβλίον αὐτοῦ. And the Septuagint is so frequent in τοὺς οὐρανοὺς κατὰ ἑπτάκοσις Ιερουσαλήμ, ὡς αὐτῶν μάθων ιερογλυφικάς ἱστορίας, Ep. ad Afric., sec. 13). The Old Latin and the Syriac versions were made from the Septuagint, which, however, does not represent a fixed Hebrew or Aramaean original text, as may be seen from the various corrections of it differing greatly from each other. This is, moreover, corroborated by the fact that the Old Latin, the MSS. of which also deviated greatly from each other, and which St. Jerome corrected according to an Aramaean codex, differs materially from the Septuagint, of which the oldest MSS. are those of the 2nd century, with Sept. iv, 10; Vulg. v, 12, with Sept. v, 11-14; Vulg. v, 26-29 with Sept. v, 23-25; Vulg. vi, 15 with Sept. vi, 19; Vulg. vii, 18-20 with Sept. vii, 29; sometimes less (comp. Vulg. vii, 9, 10 with Sept. viii, 8, 15; Vulg. vii, 12-19 with Sept. viii, 17-23; Vulg. ix, 5-11, 12-15; with Sept. x, 22-24; not different (comp. i, 6, 8, 9, iv, 5; viii, 1), and sometimes the numbers (i, 2; ii, 1; vii, 2, etc.). A very minute collection of the variations between the Vulgate and the Sept. is given by Capellus, Commentarius in V. T. (Amstel, 1695), p. 574, etc.; and Eichhorn, Einleitung in das Alte Testament, p. 375. There are also extant several Hebrew recensions of Judith. Three of these have been published by Jellinek in his Beth Ha-Midrash, vols. i and ii, Leipzig, 1858, and the one which comes nearest to the Greek and Latin versions certainly removes all the difficulties against the historical character of the book contained in those versions. They are called הכהנים הכהנים הכהנים בֶּת הַמִּדְרָשׁ, הַמִּדְרָשׁ (Beth Ha-Midrash, i, 130-136), and הַמִּדְרָשׁ (Beth Ha-Midrash, ii, 12-22). Other Hebrew editions (אר verfügbar וספירה have been published at Berlin (1766, 5vo), Venice (5, 8vo), and Frankfort-on-the-Main (ed. S., London, 1715, 8vo); Coverdale and the Bishops' Bible, following Luther and the Zurich Bible, have translated from the Vulgate, whilst the Geneva version, which is followed by the A. V., has a translation of the Greek text.

IV. Historical Character of the Book.—There are three theories about the nature of this book:

a. Up to the time of the Reformation, the view that this book records actual history was universally entertained among Christians. The difference of opinion which obtained during those fifteen centuries, and which still exists among the defenders of its historical character, is about the time when the book occurred, involving as a necessary consequence the identification of the principal characters, etc. The limits of the range of time within which they have alternately been placed are B.C. 784-459. The most ancient opinion, however, is that the circumstances here described occurred after the Babylonian captivity, which is supported by the book itself (comp. iv, 3, v, 18, 19, Sept.; v, 22, 23, Vulg.). Still, as it does not tell us what this Nebuchadnezzar was, the advocates of this view have tried to identify him with every Persian monarch in succession to the Median, but others, take him to be Cambyses; Julius Africanus and Georgius Syncellus regard him as Cyrus; Mecassar. Estius, etc., make him to be Darius Hystaspis; whilst Sulpicius Severus and others identify him with Aras-saces Orzes (comp. Suidas, s. v. Judith; Bellarmine, De Verb. Det., i, 19; Scholz, Einleitung in den Hebréen Schrif-
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(ad Athis.) conjectures that this was the Holofernes of Judith. From its termination the name is supposed to be of Persian extraction (compare Orophernes, Polybius, xxxiii, 12), as Tisaphernes, Artaphernes, etc.

c. As the book itself, however, gives no intimation whatever that it is a fiction or an allegory, but, on the contrary, is written in such a way as to be read as history and not as fiction, it is evident from its minute geographical (i, 7; ii, 21 sqq.; iii, 9 sqq.; iv, 4 sqq.), historical (i, 5 sqq.), and chronological (i, 13, 16, viii, 4, xvi, 23) descriptions, that the author, his history, his war, and his other cities take it to contain a substance of true embellishment.

This view is supported by the following facts: 1. Notwithstanding the arbitrary and uncritical manner in which the deuterocanonical historians dispose of their materials, they have always a certain amount of truth, around which they cluster the traditional embellishments. 2. A summary of the contents of Judith is given in the ancient Jewish prayer for the first and second Sabbaths of the Feast of Dedication—beginning with אֲלֵה יָמֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל וְאַרְנָבַי וַעֲרָבָי; among the events which occurred in the times of Antiochus Epiphanes, and which it cannot be supposed that the Jews would make it the basis of thanksgiving when the deliverance was never wrought, and the whole of it was nothing but a fiction. 3. There are many facts in the book which record facts independently of the book of Judith. There is one, in particular, which gives a better recension of this book than either the Septuagint or the Vulgate, bears as much resemblance to the Septuagint and Vulgate as these two versions bear to each other, and removes many of the difficulties which the historical truths it inasmuch as it begins with ch. v, 5, and thus shows that the Septuagint, from which the other versions were made, has put together two different records.

Those, however, who understand the book to be an allegory, have attempted to verify the Jewish population, as to earthly resources, yet, by favor with God and man, prevailing over the powers of the world, do not thus relieve the fable from grave moral objections. An intelligent Jew, well read in the Hebrew Scriptures, could not have thought of setting up Judith as a proper emblem of female heroism and virtue. Her plan of procedure is marred throughout by hypocrisy and deceit; she even prays to God that he would prosper her deceit (ix, 12), and praises the cruelty of Simeon in slaying the Shechemites, as if his deed bore on it the sanction of heaven, though Jacob, the father of Simeon, had avowed in the name of God to eternal repro\-

The spirit of vengeance, resolve in its aim, un\-

scrupulous in the means taken to accomplish it, is the prevailing animus of the story—a spirit certainly opposed to the general teaching of Old as well as New Testament Scripture, and incapable of being embodied in a heroic story except by one who had much more regard for the political than the moral and religious ele\-

ments in Judaism.

V. Author and Date.—The difference of opinion upon this subject is as great as it is upon the character of the book. It is not named either by Philo or Josephus; nor have we any indication whatever by which to form a conjecture respecting its author. But it has been supposed by some that it could not have been written by a contemporary, from the circumstance of the family of Achior being mentioned as still in existence, and of the ancient Midian being still celebrated as the original of the New Moon being mentioned (vii, 6, comp. with Mark xv, 42). De Wette (Einleitung) conceives that the whole composition bespeaks an author who was a native of Palestine, who could not have lived beyond the end of the 1st century of the Christian era (the date assigned to it by Eichhorn), inasmuch as it is then cited by Clement of Rome, but that the probability is that it was much earlier written. Movers, a Roman Catholic professor at Bonn, a man of great penetration in similar investigations respecting the canonical or deuterocanonical books, has fixed the date of its composition in the year B.C. 104. "The author," he observes, "who has transferred the geographical relations of his own time to a former period [see, however, Foster, Geography of Arabia, 1844, i, 183], makes the Jewish territory appear less extensive than it was, and the city of Babylonia against which Holofernes directed his attack, the first Jewish city at the entrance into Judaea (iv, 7), reckoning the territory intervening between this and Samaria as tributary to the Jewish high-priest. This state of affairs continued from the time of John Hyrcanus to Pompey's invasion of Judaea, Holofernes had seized upon Samaria, and wrested Scythopolis, with the surrounding territory, from Epirates, the general of Ptolemy Lathurus (Josephus, Ant. xiii, 10, 3), B.C. 110, according to Usher. But Samaria and Scythopolis, with other acquisitions of the Maccabees, were wrested from the Jews when Pompey, B.C. 48, reduced Judaea to its ancient limits. The sea-coast (iii, 1) independent of the Jews, continued, since the last years of the reign of Alexander Janneus, to be a Jewish possession; but Carmel, which (i, 8) was inhabited by the Jews, numbered its inhabitants in the time of Hyrcanus, and did not reign, and he first seized it after the war with Ptolemy Lathyrus (xiv, 15, 4,)." It is to this war that Movers considers the book of Judith to refer, and he supposes it to have been written after the unfortunate battle at Asosich, in Galilee (or, rather, Asophen on the Jordan: Movers, Uber die Umgebung der Destrucrion, etc., in the Bowar Zeitschrift, xiii, 36 sqq.). De Wette conceives that this hypothesis is opposed by the following geographical combinations: 1. Galilee belonged to the Asosichus, the proof of which, indeed, is by no means certain, while the following indications thereof present themselves: (a) Asosichus seems to have belonged to Alex\-

ander Janneus, as it received Ptolemy Lathyrus (Josephus, Ant. xiii, 12, 4, comp. with xv, 4). (b) Hyrcanus had his son Alexander Janneus brought up in Galilee (xiii, 12, 1). (c) Antigonus returned from Galilee (War, i, 6, 8). (d) Aristobulus seized upon Iturea (iv, xii, 1, 8), which presupposes the possession of Galilee. (e) Even after the limits of Galilee were circumscribed by Pompey, it still belonged to the Jewish high-priest (War, i, 10, 4). 2. Idumea belonged to the Jewish state, but the sons of Esau came to Holophernes (vii, 4, 18). 2. The story of the war with Ptolemy Lathyrus, De Wette's view, the irruption of Holophernes would rather correspond with the movements of the Cyprian army, which proceeded from Asosich to Sephoris, and thence to Asophen (Einleitung, § 307).

Wollf and others ascribe the authorship to Achior. B.C. 536-629; Huetius in Propr. Evangel. p. 217, Calv. (Instaur. Pretium, p. 142, etc., to Joshua, the son of Josuedek, the companion of Zerubbabel, B.C. 536-515; St. Jerome, etc., to Judith herself; Ewald, Vaihinger, etc., to the time of John Hyrcanus, B.C. 130-129; Volmar, who takes it to be an allegorical description of the victo\-

ry over the Medes and Jews over Holofernes, the disengagement of Trajan, maintains (originally in the Theol. Jahrbuch, 1856, p. 362; and 1857, p. 448 sqq.; afterwards in Hinbl. d. Einl. d. Apok. Thub. 1890) that it was written for the twelfth of Aadar, A.D. 117-118, to commemo\-

rate this day (סילassi בוי). He makes Nebuchadnez\-

zezar stand for Trajan, Nineveh for Antioch, Assyria for Syria, Arphaxad for the Parthians, En-dor for Meta\-

phassa, Holofernes for Lucullus, and the deduction of Judith for Judaea. This explanation assumes the spuriousness of the reference in the Prophets and this date (i, 6), which is too early for the date assigned. It has been adopted by Baur, Hitzig (in HilGENfeld's Zeitschr. 1808, p. 240 sqq.), and Schenkel; but it is opposed by Higges.
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He was the eldest son of Adoniram and Abigail Judson. Before he was ten years of age he had acquired a reputation as a superior student, and in 1807 graduated with the highest honors from Providence College (now Brown University), being not yet twenty years old. For a short period subsequently he was unsettled in his religious beliefs, but, assured by his father of the necessity of continuing under peculiar circumstances, he became an earnest inquirer after the truth, and, though not a Christian, was admitted as a "special student" in the divinity school of Andover, and while there was converted, and joined the Congregational Church. In 1809 he declined a tutorship in Brown University, and in 1810, formed the resolution of becoming a missionary to India, and went there. Several young men joined the seminary at this time who had also been for some time impressed with the need of missions to heathen peoples. Judson became intimately associated with them, and their zeal finally led them to press this object on the attention of the American churches, and, though not properly the cause, they were the occasion of the formation of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions, who sent Mr. Judson to England to confer with the London Missionary Society as to the practicability of an affiliation between the two, and being forced by their joint action to abandon the project.

Mr. Judson left America on this errand January 1, 1811, but on the way was captured by a privateering vessel, carried to France, and did not reach London till April 6, 1811. His mission failed in its primary object, but was of advantage to the cause of missions in the American Church, and the American Board was enabled to assume the responsibility of sending out its own missionaries.

Mr. Judson, after marrying Ann Hasseltine, Feb. 5, 1812, embarked for India on the 19th of the same month, under the auspices of this new organization. His views of the necessity of baptism on the voyage, almost immediately after his arrival he sought immi-
novation at the hands of Dr. Carey, the Baptist missionary at Serampore. The Baptists in America were already possessed of considerable missionary zeal and intelligence, and, on learning of Dr. Judson's change of view, were roused to intense earnestness, and in 1814 they organized a denominational missionary society, and took Dr. Judson under their patronage. The hostility of the East India Company towards missionaries was at that time so intense, that within ten days after Judson's arrival in India he was peremptorily ordered to leave the country, and being forced to comply, he took passage in a vessel for the Isle of France, Nov. 30, 1812. He subsequently returned to Madras, but, finding the East India Company uncompromising in their opposition, he departed for Bombay, and reached Rangoon July 15, 1818. Accepting Burmah as his mission-field, Mr. Jud-
son addressed himself to the task of acquiring the lan-
guage of that country, and not only attained to the greatest familiarity with it, but spoke and wrote it with "the elegance of a cultured scholar." At an early pe-
riod in these pursuits he published some "Grammatical Notices" of the language, which in a few short pages (only twenty-six) furnished "a most complete grammar of this difficult tongue." In imitation of the Burmese rest-houses attached to their pagodas for the accommodation of pilgrims and worshippers, Mr. Judson instituted a Zyiul in the public street for the reception of and conversation with inquirers about the gospel. This was ever a notable feature of his ministry, as he spent whole days thus with the people. Meeting with some success among the people, he resolved to go to Ava, the capital, and "lay his missionary designs before the throne, and solicit toleration for the Christian religion."

His efforts were ineffectual, and he returned to Rangoon, and made a short trip to Calcutta for the recovery of Mrs. Judson's health. On July 20, 1822, Dr. Price, a newly-arrived missionary physician, was summoned to attend on the king at Ava, and Mr. Judson was compelled to accompany him as interpreter. While at Ava Mr. Judson became known as the "Religion propagating
teacher," and, as his missionary prospects seemed favorable, though he went to Rangoon temporarily, he returned to Ava to prosecute his work. War breaking out between the British-India and the Burmese governments, all the foreigners at Ava came under suspicion as spies, and in January, 1826, Mr. Judson was arrested. His horrible experiences of that incarceration cannot readily be described. On March 25, 1826, Mr. Judson himself wrote, "Through the kind interposition of our heavenly Father, our lives have been preserved in the most imminent danger from the hand of the executioner, and in regard to the most alarming, most alarming, protracted imprisonment of one year and five months; nine months in three pairs of fetters, two months in five, six months in one, and two months a prisoner at large." After his release he rendered most important service to the British government in the formation of the treaty at Yandabo, and later in a commercial treaty. While absent with the government embassy as interpreter, his first wife, one of the noblest of women, died. Mr. Judson shortly after (1827) returned from Ava and settled at Amherst, but subsequently removed to Maulmain, as even then it was a much more important post. From this time his life was variously employed in his mission-work at Maulmain, Rangoon, Prome, and other places, and became interested in the Karedens (q.v.), among whom he made several missionary tours. In 1834 he married Mrs. Sarah Boardman, and completed his revision of the whole Burmese Bible, in the revising and perfecting of which, however, he spent sixteen years more. This was the great work of his life, and "the best judges venture to hazard the opinion that three centuries hence Judson’s Bible will be the Bible of the Christian Church of Burmah" (Cutclla Review, xiv, 454). He also compiled a short Burmese and English dictionary. With a larger work of this kind he was occupied at the time of his death. In 1839-40 his health failed, and he was obliged to take several voyages for its recovery. In 1846, in consequence of the failing health of Mrs. Judson, he left for America. Mrs. Judson died at St. Helena, and Mr. Judson, continuing his voyage, reached Boston on October 15. He was received in America "with affectionate and enthusiastic veneration that knew no bounds. His eminent position as the founder and pioneer of the mission; his long and successful labors in the East; his romantic and eventful life, associated with all that is most beautiful and lofty in human nature; his world-wide fame, and his recent afflictions, encircled him in the people’s mind with the halo of an apostle." But Mr. Judson’s heart was in Burmah. After marrying Miss Emily Chubbuck in June, 1846, he set sail for Asia, and arrived at Rangoon on Nov. 30 of that year. His health, however, again declined, and he was obliged once more to return to the sea for relief, but died on his way to the Isle of Bourbon, April 12, 1850, and was buried at sea. (J. T. G.)

Judson, Ann Hasseltine, was born at Bradford, Mass., Oct. 22, 1789. She was married to Adoniram Judson on Feb. 5, 1812, and was the first American woman to devote herself to foreign mission service. She became "intimately associated with her husband in all his plans of benevolence, and bore an important part in the establishment" (Walter’s "Judson," 414). In 1824, in consequence of protracted ill health, leaving her husband in Burmah, she proceeded alone to America, where she remained, adding, however, much to the interest and advancement of missions by the publication of a very interesting account of the state of the Burmese, and a series of letters to Mr. Butterworth, a member of Parliament, whose hospitality she enjoyed while in England, till 1823, when she rejoined her husband at Rangoon, and proceeded with him to Ava. It was during the trying scenes of the succeeding two years, with her husband, that the devoted care, tact, and heroic resolution were so manifest. Her whole time, with the exception of twenty days when she was confined by the birth of her child, was devoted to the alleviation of the sorrows of her husband and his fellow-prisoners. She was perfectly familiar with the Burmese language, and possessed of a "presence which commanded respect even from savage barbarians, and incensed her with a moral atmosphere in which she walked unharmed in the midst of a hostile city and unrestrained." Her influence was acknowledged as contributing largely to the submission to the English terms of peace by the Burmese government. She died at Amherst on Oct. 24, 1826, during the absence of her husband, of disease which her sufferings and proximation at Ava had rendered her constitution incapable of resisting. "To great clearness of intellect, large powers of comprehension, and intuitive female sagacity, ripened by the constant necessity of independent action, she added that heroic disinterestedness which naturally loses all consciousness of self in the prosecution of a great object. These elements were, however, still veiled, and were hidden from public view by a veil of unusual feminine delicacy." (J. T. G.)


Judson, Sarah Boardman, was born in Alstead, N. H., Nov. 4, 1803. She was the daughter of Ralph and Abia Hull, and was married to the Rev. George D. Boardman in 1825, with whom she proceeded to Tavoy, Burmah, and in his missionary work shared great dangers and sufferings. Her husband died in 1831. Two of her children had previously died, and with one child, a son, left to her, she continued to prosecute her missionary work. In 1838 she married Mr. Judson, and in 1846, in consequence of failing health, she left Ava, and for America, accompanied by her husband. On their arrival at St. Helena Mrs. Judson died, Sept. 1, 1845. She translated the New Testament and Burmese treatises into Poguan, and "Pilgrim’s Progress" into Burmese. Of her a writer in the "Cutclla Review" says (vol. xiv.), "Exquisite sensibility, a poet’s soul and imagination, great natural abilities, thorough unselfishness, and a woman’s depth of love and affection, all shrouded by the most unpretending meekness and devotion, were some of the elements which blended together to form a character of extreme delicacy." Her "Letters to her son" are said to be "written on the green grass, etc., is enough to entitle her to high praise as a poet." (J. T. G.)

"Ju’el ([ion’i]), a Grecized form (1 Esdr. ix. 34, 35) of two Heb. names: a, in the former verse Uz (Krn. x. 34); b, in the latter Josk. (Ezra x. 43)."
tribes of Europe. Originally it was the name of the festival of winter solstice, and the practices of that festival have in the main been incorporated in the Christmas feast, they term it Jul. See Jules.

Jules are a spiritus and demons among the northern tribes, especially the Laplanders, to whom divine adoration is paid. They suppose them to dwell under particular trees, and proceed thither to offer up sacrifices once a year, at Christmas time, whence the name of the Christian festival corresponds to their Jul (q. v.). See Broughton, Biblioth. Ant. Sacra, s. v.; Thorpe, Northern Mythol. ii, 49 sq.

Julia (Joulia, fem. of Julius), a Christian woman of Rome, to whom Paul sent his salutations (Rom. xvi, 15); she is named with Philologus, and is supposed to have been his wife or sister. A.D. 55.—Kitto, "Origens supposes that they were master and mistresses of a Christian household which included the other persons mentioned in the same verse. Some modern critics have conjectured that the name may be that of a man, Julius."

Julian the Apostate, emperor of Rome A.D. 361—363, is especially celebrated by his able and vigorous, but vain attempt to restore the ancient Greco-Roman paganism in the Roman Empire to its former power and glory. He was the nephew of Constantine the Great, the first Christian on the throne of the Caesars, and was educated under the restraining influence of the court Christianity of his cousin, the August, empress Constantina. He was a monastic, intolerant, tyrannical, and hypocritical form of this belief repelled the independent youth, and made him a bitter enemy of Christianity, and an enthusiastic admirer of the heathen poets and philosophers, whose writings inspired him to the extent of the severe prohibitions against them he managed secretly to procure and to study, especially during his sojourn at the University of Athens. "The Arian pseudo-Christianity of Constantius produced the heathen anti-Christianity of Julian, and the latter was a well-deserved punishment of the former." But he shrewdly concealed his real convictions, and hypocritically conformed to all the outward rites of Christianity till the death of the emperor. His heathenism was not a simple, spontaneous growth, but an artificial and morbid production. It was the heathenism of pantheistic eclecticism and Neo-Platonism, a strange mixture of philosophy, poetry, superstition, and superstition, at least, in great part an imitation or caricature of Christianity. With all his philosophical intelligence, he credited the most insipid legends of the gods, or gave them a deeper mystic meaning by the most arbitrary allegorical interpretation. He was in intimate personal intercourse with Jupiter, Minerva, Apollo, Hercules, who paid their nocturnal visits to his heated fancy, and assured him of their special favor and protection. His moral character corresponded to this pseudo-philosophy. He was full of affectation, vanity, sophistry, loquacity, and dissimulation. Everything he said, or wrote, or did was studied and calculated for effect. His apostasy from Christianity Julian dates from his twentieth year, A.D. 351. But while Constantius lived he concealed his pagan sympathies with consummate hypocrisy for ten years, and outwardly conformed to all the rites of the Church. After his death he made the world with brilliant military successes and executive powers as Caesar in Gaul, which was at that time threatened by barbarians, and won the enthusiastic love of his soldiers. Now he raised the standard of rebellion against his imperial cousin, and in 361 openly declared himself a friend of the gods. But before the end of the year Constantius in the same year he became sole emperor, and made his triumphal entry into Constantinople. He immediately set to work with the utmost zeal to reorganize all departments of the government on the former heathen basis. He displayed extraordinary tal-
ent, industry, and executive tact. The eighteen short months of his reign (Dec. 861–June, 863) comprehended the plans of a life-long administration. He was the most gifted, the most learned, and most active, and yet the least successful of Roman emperors. His reign was an utter failure, teaching the important lesson that it is useless to swim against the stream of history and to impede the onward march of Christianity. He proved, beyond the possibility of doubt, that paganism had out-lived itself, and that Christianity was the only living religion which had truly conquered the world, and carried all the hopes of humanity. He died in the midst of his plans in a campaign against the East—tragically predicting the result in a letter to his son (according to another tradition), "Soiliean, thou hast conquered!"

Julian did not resort to open violence in his attempt to destroy Christianity in the empire. He affected the policy of philosophical toleration. He did not wish to give the Christians an additional glory of martyrdom. He hoped to attain his end more surely in an indirect way. He endeavored to revive heathenism by his own personal zeal, and by the worship of the gods. But his zeal found no echo, and only made him ridiculous in the eyes of the cultivated heathen themselves. When he endeavored to restore the oracle of Apollo at Delphi, and arranged for a magnificent display, only a solitary priest appeared in the temple and ominously offered—a goose. He also attempted to reform heathenism by incorporating it with the morals and benevolent institutions of Christianity. But this was like galvanizing a decaying corpse, or grafting fresh scions on a dead tree. As to the negative part of his assault upon Christianity, Julian gave liberty to all the sects, in the hope that they might devour each other, but, instead of that, he only gave new vigor to the cause he hated. He forbade the Christians to read the classical authors, and deprived them of the benefit of the public schools of their own, that they might either grow up in ignorance, or be forced to get an education from heathen teachers. He assisted the Jews in rebuilding the Temple of Jerusalem in order to falsify the prophecy of Christ, but the attempt, three times repeated, signally failed, by an interposition of Providence approaching to the character of a miracle. (Respecting this question, see the judicious remarks in Lardner's *Jewish and Heathen Testimonies*, vol. iv.) Finally he wrote a book against Christianity, in which he united all the arguments of Porphyry, Celsus, Lucian, and other enemies before him, and infused into them his own bitter and sarcastic spirit. But this attack called for able refutations from Gregory of Nazianzum, Cyril of Alexandria, and others, and contains a number of incidental admissions which confirm the truth of most of the leading facts of the Gospel history. Dr. Lardner (in his learned book on the *Credibility of the Gospel History*, in the London edition of his works by Kipps, vii, 638–639) thus sums up the involuntary testimony of this ablest and bitterest of all the heathen opponents of Christianity:

"Julian has borne a valuable testimony to the history, and to the books of the New Testament. He allows that Jesus was born in the reign of Augustus, at the time of the taxing made in Judaea by Cyrenius; that the Christian religion had its rise, and began to be propagated, in the times of the emperor Tiberius and Claudius. He bears witness to the genuineness and authenticity of the four gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, and the Acts of the Apostles; and he so quotes them as to intimate that they were the only historical books received by Christians as of authority, and the only authentic memoirs of Jesus Christ and his apostles, and the doctrines preached by them. He allows their early date, and even argues for it. He also quotes, or plainly refers to, the Acts of the Apostles, to St. Paul's Epistles to the Romans, the Corinthians, and the Galatians. He does not deny the miracles of Jesus Christ, but allows him to have 'healed the blind, and the lame, and dumb, and the sick,' and to have 'rebuked the winds, and walked upon the waves of the sea.' He endeavors, indeed, to diminish these works, but in vain. The account is considerably thereby the more precious as coming from a divine mission. He endeavors also to lessen the number of the early believers in Jesus, and yet he acknowledges that there were 'multitudes of such men in Greece and Italy' before St. John wrote his Gospel. He likewise attempts to diminish the certainty with which the miracles of Jesus, and successful preachers of his Gospel; so that upon the whole, he has undesignedly borne testimony to the truth of many things recorded in the books of the New Testament. He aimed to overthrow the Christian religion, but has confirmed it: his arguments against it are the strongest for it. He was the greatest, the weakest Christian. He justly exerts to some things introduced into the Christian profession by the later professors of it, in his own time or sooner, but has not made one objection of moment against the Christian religion as contained in the genuine and authentic books of the New Testament."


Julian of Eclanum. See Pelagius; Pelagianism.

Julian of Halicarnassus. The bishop celebrated as the leader of a faction of the Monophysites, who bore his name, flourished in the early part of the 6th century. When the Monophysite bishops were deposed in 519 he was sent as legate to the Alexandrians for safety. For further details, see Monophysites.

Julian, St. See Pomerius.

Julian of Toledo. See Toledo, Council of (14th); Spain.

Julianus)* Cæsarianus, Cardinals, one of the most distinguished characters of the Church of Rome in the Middle Ages, prominently connected with the efforts to heal the great breach within the western Church of the 15th century, and the union of the Eastern and Western churches at the Council of Florence was born at Rome in 1388, the descendant of a noble family noted in the annals of Italian history. He was educated at the University of Perugia, and early evinced the possession of great ability and unassuming talents. He particularly interested himself in the study of the
Roman law, and soon acquired the reputation of being one of the foremost thinkers, and was honored with a professor's chair at Padua. He was not suffered, how- ever, to continue long in the rostrum, for the Church of his day needed men of decision and energy to allay the strife which was raging fiercely, and threatening the de- struction of the hierarchal edifice so lately dishonored in the papacy of Martin V, and the Church was hara- kiri for those who would undertake the task. See INNOCENT XXIII. Seventy years of an- archy and orphanage, sometimes familiarly termed the Babylonish captivity of the Church of Rome, the illus- trious Colonna, better known as Martin V, was to obli- mate, as well as to rebuild on a firm foundation both the papal bulwark and the cardinal character, received on such a task his own talents, however great, were not suf- ficient, and the wise, far-seeing policy of the legate was not slow to recognise the uncommon endowments of young Julian, who was accordingly appointed apostolic protonotary, an- gler, auditor of the Rota Romana. Cardinal Branda- in particular became interested in the rising Cesarini; and when, in 1419, he was sent as papal legate to Bo- hemia to bring back the erring (?) sheep of the Sla- vonic fold, Julian was the legate's companion and main- stay. Though this mission failed to accomplish its objects, it was, however, a great step on his career. In the absence of the Romans, and in 1426 (May 22) was promoted to the cardinalate of Santo Angelo. When, in 1431, a diet was summoned at Nuremberg "to con- cert immediate and vigorous action for crushing the hitherto successful rebellion," it was none other than cardinal Julian who was prominent. His opinions were confirmed by Eugenius IV) to represent him in that ec- clesiastical body, as well as in the general council which, in accordance with the celebrated decree "Frequentia" of the Council of Constance, was soon to meet at Basle. It had been determined to extirpate the Hussites by all means, and, in the papal bull on the same subject, the open arms of the Church, the cardinal legate boldly exchanged the mitre for the helmet. Quickly an army of Crusaders was gathered, and in himself blending to- gether the characters of the priest and the soldier, he sought to kindle in the hearts the fires of religious zeal and patriotic devotion. But neither the potency of a blessed banner and a consecrated sword, nor the spectac- le of an ecclesiastic urging on an army to a war of faith, had sufficiently impressed Rome's most faithful adhe- rents to brave "the face of a religious influence like that of Hussites," who were rooted in national sympathies, such as Rome could never awaken in the day of her greatest power," and ignominiously the papal legate again failed in his mission. Meanwhile, however, the Council of Basle had convened, opened in the absence of the legate by two of his deputies, and thither Julian di- rected his steps. He assumed its presidency Sept. 9, 1431, determined by peaceful measures to essay once more the accomplishment of a task which he had found it impossible to secure on the field of battle; and to his honor be it said that all the inducements which were now held out to the Hussites were the offerings of a sincere and pious soul, which had dwelt among the things else the glory of God and the honor of his Church. 'The sanguine and undaunted legate, who had been the first to beckon on the military campaign as the only remedy for the spreading disease, was now the first to fall back upon that council which he had hitherto supposed so little good. 'As I saw no other remedy left' (are his own words), 'I animated and encouraged all to remain steadfast in the faith, and to fear nothing, since on this very account I was going to the council where the whole Church would assemble'" (Jenkins). How much Julian did to obtain Eugenius's sanction to the continuance of the council which that pontiff was determined to abrog- ate, and how Julian, notwithstanding the publication of a bull abrogating the council, and convoking it eighteen months later at Bologna, continued the session, and with what liberality and sagacity he counselled in the deliberations of this synod, and with what earnest-
Julian Calendar. See Calendar, Roman.
Julian Cross, or Cross of St Julian, is the name of a croset placed saltireways. See Cross.
Julian Epoch; Julian Year. See Chronology, Christian.
Juliana, St. See Corpus Christi.
Julianists. See Julian of Halicarnassus.
Juliano, a Spanish Roman Catholic of the 17th century, who, while travelling in Germany, was converted to the Protestant faith. His zeal for the diffusion of the Word of God led him to undertake the dangerous enterprise of converting into Spain a large quantity of Bibles concealed in casks, and packed up as Rhenish wine. A pretended Protestant betrayed him. He was seized by the Inquisition, and, together with eight hundred purchasers of his precious treasure, was condemned to the torture and to death.—Fox, Book of Martyrs, p. 136.

Julias, the name given by Philip the Tetrarch to Bethsaida in honor of Julia, the daughter of the emperor Augustus. See Bethsaida.

Julitta of Cappadocia, a female martyr of the 4th century, under Diocletian, was a Lycaonian of royal descent, and greatly celebrated for her Christian virtues. To avoid the bigotry of the pagan governor, she withdrew from Iceniun, her native city, to Tarso. But here, with her daughter Cyrrica, she was seized, and confessing herself a Christian, was ordered to the rack. Her beautiful boy, for repeating his mother's words, "I am a Christian," was dashed in pieces on the pavement before her eyes, for which the dying mother gave thanks to God. After patiently suffering various torments, she was beheaded, April 16, A.D. 306.—Fox, Book of Martyrs, p. 55.

Julius, (Ioannes, for the Latin Julius, the name of an honorable Roman family), the centurion of the imperial cohort who had the charge of conducting Paul as a prisoner to Rome, and who treated him with much consideration and kindness on the way (Acts xxv. 8, 43, comp. ver. 11, 31). A.D. 55.—Kitto. "Augustus's band," to which Julius belonged, has been identified by some commentators with the Italian band (Acts x, 1); by others, less probably, with the body of cavalry denominated Sebastei by Josephus (Ant. xix, 9, 2, etc.). Conybeare and Howson (Life of St. Paul, ch. xxii) adopt in the main Wieseler's opinion, that the Augustan cohort was a detachment of the Praetorian Guards attached to the person of the Roman governor at Cæsarea; and that this Julius may be the same as Julius Pascu (Tacit. Hist. ii, 92; iv, 11), sometime centurion, afterwards prefect of the Praetorians. See Italiæ Paul.

Julius, a Christian martyr, was a Roman senator in the 2nd century. A convert to Christianity, he was ordered by the emperor to sacrifice to him as Hercules. This Julius absolutely refused to do, and he was imprisoned, and finally beated to death with clubs.—Fox, Book of Martyrs, p. 22.

Julius Africanus, an ecclesiastical writer who flourished in the beginning of the 3rd century, was, according to Suidas (s.v. Africanus), a native of Libya, but resided generally at Emmaus (afterwards Nicopolis, in Palestine), at Ephesus, at Rome, and at Alexandria. Quadratum, Quartum, Augustinianus, Liban. Little is known of his personal history. Eusebius (Hist. Ecc. vi, 31) relates that he undertook a journey to Alexandria to listen to Heraclias, the teacher of the
cathedrums in that city, as also that he was sent by the inhabitants of Emmaus to ask of the emperor Heliogabalus the restoration of their city, which was granted (see Jerome, De vir. illust. c. 63). He was a friend of Origen; and, as in letters addressed to him when the latter was already some fifty years old, he styles him "son." He was a beloved disciple from the time he was a little child, and was a B.C. 222, in the year 238, while the expression "colleague" seems to imply that he also was a priest. He was, according to Jerome, in the full vigor of life during the reign of Heliogabalus and Alexander Severus. We have no information concerning the precise date of his death; it occurred during the reign of Alexander Severus near the end of the third century—some say about A.D. 232. He enjoyed great reputation for learning among the ancients. He is the author of the oldest Christian history of the world, the Chronographia, or De temporiibus, which Eusebius considered very trustworthy; it extended from the creation to the third year of the reign of Heliogabalus (221). Unfortunately, the complete work is not in our possession; a portion, however, was preserved to us by copious extracts, which subsequent Church historians made from it, and these (fifty-six fragments) have been collected by M. Porcher. The best single prototype letter to Origen concerning the authenticity of the history of Susannah and the Elders, and another to Aristides on the differences between the genealogies of Christ by Matthew and Luke. In this last letter, speaking against the opinion of a fraus pia having been perpetuated, he gives a number of much advanced emperors. According to Suidas, it was a collection of Empiric formulas for curing diseases by sorcery, etc. But, as this does not seem to agree with what we know of the general character of the man, Dupin thinks that there must be some mistake, and that there probably existed both a Julius Afric anus and a Julius Sextus, who have been confounded one with the other. Finally, he has also been considered the author of several treatises—De trinitate, De circumscriptione, De Attalo, De Pauci, De Stibbiarum—which are evidently not his, but Eusebius' addition. His death is mentioned by the Novatian. See Mohler, Patrologie, i. 577-580; Routh, Rel. Sacr. ii, 108 sq.; Herzog, Rituels-Encyclop. vii, 155.

Julius Caesar, the first emperor of the Romans, deserves a place in our work on account of his connection with Jewish history. He was born at Rome, July 12, B.C. 100, and was educated in Greece, whither the Roman youths of his day were wont to resort for instruction. After having successively held the offices of tribune, questor, aedile, high-priest, and praetor or governor of Spain, Caesar was one of the three parties who constituted the triumvirate of Rome, B.C. 60. He now set out for Gaul, ostensibly aiming at the subjugation of the Gauls, but actually to form and discipline an army that might enable him to force his coadjutors to leave to him alone the government of the Romans. The success with which his efforts, both as a soldier and a politician, were rewarded, are known to us from the history of the Gallic War that flowed from his own pen, as well as from other distinguished classical historians. When he went to Gaul he was to remain there five years, but the expiration of that time finding him involved in wars with the barbarians, five years more were added. Germany, Britain, and other countries beyond the Rhine were overrun in turn; and, when, at the death of Crassus, Caesar and Pompey alone were left to contend for supremacy, a quarrel naturally enough arose between the two rivals. Pompey was the favorite of the people, and therefore easily controlled the senate; if only once Caesar could be obliged to disband the army, as whose hero the victorious general of the Gallic wars was worshiped, there could be no longer any need for contention, and Pompey alone would be intrusted with the responsibility of the Roman government. A decree was quickly passed by the Roman senate commanding Caesar to disband his forces; but Caesar not only refused to comply with the demand, but actually marched against Pompey, whom he soon overtook, and who, after being defeated in the battle of Pharsalos, B.C. 49, was made dictator. Of the pursuit of Pompey and the fate of the latter we need not speak here; but the noble conduct of the Roman general towards his fallen enemy and towards his assassins is so meritorious in its character, that it deserves at least, in passing, a Christian commendation. When the rate of the death of Pompey reached Rome, Caesar was again appointed dictator for one year and consul for five years, and was invested with tribunicial power for life. His adherence to the cause of Cleopatra led him to enter Egypt and to engage in the "Alexandrine war," which also he brought to a successful termination in March, B.C. 47. In September of this year he returned to Rome, and was once more appointed dictator. But with the death of Pompey his partisans had by no means vanished. It is true that they had quit Pompey, but in Africa they were still dutiful to the memory and principles of their late master. To Africa, therefore, Caesar directed his steps; the party of Pompey was quickly attacked and subdued. The feud of Metellus, of Scipio, of Cato, and Juba was sad indeed, but the display of noble and wise generosity which Caesar now displayed towards those who had fought against him, but were now arrayed by him against his brother, proved to him that he was possessed of a great, magnificent nature. He was not a man that could stoop to the vulgar atrocities of Marius or Sulla, and so he majestically declared that henceforth he had no enemies, and that hereafter he would make no difference between Pompeians and Cassareans. Returned to Rome, he celebrated his victories in Gaul, Egypt, Pontus, and Africa by four great triumphs, during which the whole Roman populace was feasted and fitted by his magnificent liberality. But the display in which Caesar indulged soon led the Romans to fear that he aimed higher than the dictatorship—that the true government was his object. Roman patriotism had not yet expired. Many there were, in the Eternal City in whose veins flowed republican blood, and the man who dared to conspire to deprive them of the liberties they had so long enjoyed was doomed to fall at their hands. He thereby formed the only surety of the continuation of their long-enjoyed privileges of a free and unrestric ted government. While Caesar was planning how soon 'to wear the insignia of royalty, Brutus and other senators were sharpening their weapons to take his life. On the fifteenth of March, B.C. 44, after Caesar had taken his accustomed seat in the senate at the Capitol, a friend gave him a paper containing an account of the
Julius Echter was a reformer who worked against the papacy. He opposed the coronation of the Holy Roman Emperor Charles V. Echter was born in 1500 and died in 1553. He was a member of the Catholic Church and played a significant role in the Reformation. He was known for his writings and speeches against the papacy. Echter was a key figure in the Reformation Movement, and his ideas and writings helped to shape the course of the Reformation in the Catholic Church. His contributions to the Reformation were significant and his legacy is still felt today.
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cle, cardinal Antonio del Monte, he entered the Church, and soon became archbishop, and was intrusted with the administration of different dioceses. Paul III made him cardinal of St. Vitale and bishop of St. Palestina, and after he had lived in his retirement the Council of Trent (q. v.). After his elevation to the pontificate (1551) the sitings of the Council of Trent, suspended under his predecessor (1549), closely allied to Charles V, he spent his reign in quarrelling with France, Venice, and also with Ferdinand, king of the Romans, and brother of Charles V. His name is linked with English history by his efforts to organize with Mary the reunion of England with Rome, See Pole. Julius III died in March, 1555, leaving behind him a very indifferent character, marked by incapacity and misconduct. While a cardinal, he was responsible for the firmness, conduct and activity. The after-becoming pope he gave himself up to luxury and pleasure, and went so far in his disregard of all consistency as to give the cardinal's place left vacant by his election to one of his servants, whose only merit consisted in having taken care of his pet mon violin and groans. See Pole, Vitae Pontiff.: Hoefer, Nouv. Biog. Générale, xxvii, 165; Herzog, Real-Encyclop., vii, 158; Ranke, Popacy, ii, 301 sq.; Bowyer, Hist, of the Popes, vii, 438 sq.

Jumenta, cattle. Heretics who denied the resurrection of the dead were accustomed to bestow opprobrious epithets on those who persisted in maintaining the truth of Scripture. Sometimes they called them carnies, animals, jumenta, carnal, sensual, cattle; also Judas, the traitor; and Barabbas, the robber. The Jumiers of Barak's is a name for those persons who, as an inference from 2 Sam. vi, 16, believe that religious worship must be accompanied by violent agitations, convulsive leaping and dancing. This singular religious belief is said to have originated among the congregations of Mr. Whitefield, in the western part of Wales, about 1760, but it soon found friends among the Quakers, and its banishment was among the first acts of the king. The Jumiers found special defenders in the Welsh poet William Williams (q. v.), Harris Rowland (q. v.), etc. They are sometimes called Barakite because frequently they do not confine their religious exuberances to jumping and dancing, but accompany them with inverted recumbency, often degenerating into a sort of bellowing. Discontented in England, the Jumiers emigrated to the United States, and here they continue to flourish moderately. We believe they have some adherents in Pennsylvania and Ohio, and particularly in Western New England. Even the attempt of Def. of the Denomination of the Christian World (London, 1811), relates his experience in a meeting of the Jumiers which he attended: "About the year 1761 I myself was very accidentally present at a meeting which terminated in jumping. It was held in the open air, on a Sunday evening, near Newport, in Moomouthshire. The preacher was one of lady Huntington's students, who concluded his sermon with the recommendation of jumping; and I must allow him the praise of consistency, for he got down from the chair on which he stood and jumped along with his hearers. The arguments he adduced for this purpose were, that David danced before the ark, that the baby leaped in the womb of Elizabeth, and that the man whose lameness was removed leaped and praised God for the mercy which he had received! He expatiated on these topics with uncommon fervency, and then drew the inference that this ought to be an exercise of the joy for the blessings which Jesus Christ had put into their possession. He then gave an impassioned sketch of the sufferings of the Saviour, and thereby roused the passions of a few around him into a state of violent agitation. About nine men and seven women for some little time rock to and fro, screwed up their faces, and then jumped with a kind of frantic fury. Some of the audience flew in all directions; others gazed on in silent amazement. They all gradually dispersed except the jumpers, who continued their exertions from eight in the evening till near eleven at night. I saw the conclusion of it; they at last knelt down in a circle, holding each other by the hand, while one of them prayed with an awful fervency, and the others were rolling off their knees, departed; but previous to their dispersion they wildly pointed up towards the sky, and reminded another one that they should soon meet there, and never again be separated."

Jung. See Stilliging.

Junius, or rather Junius (Tousin, a deriv. of Junius, the name of a Roman family), a Christian at Rome, to whom Paul addressed a salutation in connection with Andronicus, as being his "kinsmen and fellow-laborers, who are of note among the apostles," and were in Christ before himself (Rom. xvi, 7); hence probably of Jewish extraction. A.D. 55. As the gender of the epithets applied is uncertain (συζυγεθες και συναστα-λεγομενοι), (e.g. Origen, Christians of other fathers) have supposed a female (Tousin comes equally well from Tousin) to be meant (but see Michaelis, in Pott's Sylog. vii, 128.

Junilius of Africa, generally believed to have been bishop in the 6th century, is known by his work De legibus patriisque Christianis, dedicated to his patron, St. Primasius, probably the one of Hadrumetum who in 553 indorsed the Constitutum of Vigilius. Junilius himself claimed no originality, but acknowledged his obligation to a certain Paulus of Persia, supposed to have been Paulus of Bassora, who afterwards became metropolitan of Nisibis (though he was not a Persian). The work is in the form of a dialogue between a master and his pupil, and is a sort of introduction to the sacred writings. The first book, on Scripture, is divided into two parts, on the outward expression and the inward meaning; the outward expression contains five particulars—the species of writing, its authority, its author, its style, and its order of place. The inward meaning has reference especially to three particulars, God, this world, and the next. The second book treats of this world, its creation, its government, the properties and accidents of nature, the nature of will, and the consequence of results of will. Junilius then speaks of types, of predictions before and under the law concerning Christ and the calling of the Gentiles, and of Reason in its agreement with the commands of Scripture. Special attention is due to the fact that Junilius does not count the Chronicles, or the Apocrypha, or the Books of the Maccabees among canonical books. The work has been published as Junilius de Patriis Divinae Legis, libri ii (Basil. 1545, 8vo; Francfort ad Oder, 1593, 8vo; and in Biblioth. Patrij. i.—Herzog, Real-Encyclop., viii, 174 sq. Clark, Success. of Soc. Lat. ii, 325.

Juniper (ζύμη), rothem, prob. so called from its use in boiling; Sept. in 1 Kings xix, 5, "Rūσου v. τ. Ρωύνιμον; in verse 5, "ροξωρον; in Job xxx, 4, "ορούμενος. Vulg. juniperus, but in Psal. cxxi, 4, "ορολούμενος; and in Proverbs xxxi, 3, "ορολούμενος; a shrub or tree mentioned as affording shade to Elijah in his flight to Horeb (1 Kings xix, 4, 5), and as affording material for fuel, and also, in extreme cases, for hatching eggs (Psalm xvi, 4; Job xxxi, 4). The older translators seem to have been unacquainted with it, while the modern versions have generally followed the Vulgate in referring it to the juniper (see Stengel in the Biblioth. Brem. vii, fasc. 5; Hiller, Hierophyl. i, 258; Sprengel, Geogr. & Botan. i, 20), which, however, seems to be indicated by a different Hebrew word. See Heath.

The different species of juniper have by some botanists been ranked under Ceduus, the true species being distinguished by the title of Ceduus boreiformis, and the pines by that of Ceduus conifera. Of Junipers, the species of the Greeks is oblong and jointed, and then jumped with a kind of frantic fury. Some of the audience flew in all directions; others gazed on in silent amazement. They all gradually dispersed except the jumpers, who continued their exertions from eight in the evening till near eleven at night. I saw the conclusion of it; they at last knelt down in a circle, holding each other by the hand, while one of them prayed with an awful fervency, and the others were rolling off their knees, departed; but previous to their dispersion they wildly pointed up towards the sky, and reminded another one that they should soon meet there, and never again be separated."
in the mountains of southern latitudes, usually forming a low shrub, but in some situations being fifteen feet, and even thirty feet high. *J. oxycedrus*, the sharp or prickly, or brown-berried juniper, closely allied to the common juniper, is an evergreen shrub, from ten to twelve, but sometimes even twenty feet high. It was found by M. Bové on Mount Lebanon. *J. drupacea*, or large-fruited juniper, is a species which was introduced into Europe from the East under the Arabic name *kabbel*. This name, however, is applied rather to all the species than to any one in particular. It is a native of Mount Cassius, and is thought to be the same as the greater juniper found by Belon on Mount Taurus, which he describes as rising to the height of a cypress. *J. Phoenicea*, or Phoenician juniper, is the great juniper of Dioscorides, and is a native of the south of Europe, Russia, and Syria. It has imbricated leaves, bears some resemblance to the cypress, and attains a height of from twenty to thirty feet. *J. Lycia*, or Lycian juniper, is a dwarf species, and *J. Subina*, or the common Savine, is usually a low spreading shrub, but sometimes rises to the height of ten or twelve feet. It is a native of the south of Europe and Syria. Of these species, *J. oxycedrus* and *J. Phoenicea* are the only species which could have been the beriah of Scripture. Some were of opinion that the wood of *J. oxycedrus*, rather than that of the so-called cedar of Lebanon, was used in ancient times for its durability, and which was therefore employed in making statues. It is to the wood of certain species of juniper that the name of cedar-wood is now specially applied. See Cedar.

The *rotem*, however, is no doubt the plant still called by the Arabs *rotem*, and commonly known as Spanish broom. In London's *Encyclopædia of Plants* it is named *Spartium monoasperum*, or white single-seeded broom, and is described as a very handsome shrub, remarkable for its numerous snow-white flowers. Onbek remarks that it grows like willow-bushes along the shores of Spain, as far as the flying sands reach, where scarcely any other plant exists except the *Ononis serpena*, or creeping reatherose. The use of this shrub is very great in stopping the sand. The leaves and young branches furnish delicious food for goats. It converts the most barren spot into a fine odoriferous garden by its flowers, which continue a long time. It seems to shelter hogs and goats against the scorching heat of the sun. The twigs are used for tying bundles, and all kinds of herbs that are brought to market are fastened together with them. The Spaniards call it *rotem*, from the Arabic name *rotem*. It is now referred by all botanists to the genus *Genista*, and called *G. monosperma*. It is described by De Candolle as a branching and erect shrub, with slender, wandlike, flexible branches; leaves comparatively few, linear, oblong, pressed to the branches, pubescent; inflorescence in few flowered lateral racemes; pedicels white, silky, nearly equal to one another; legumes oval, inflated, smooth, membranaceous, one to two seeded. It occurs on the sterile shores of Portugal, Spain, Barbary, and Egypt. It was found by Forskal at Suez, and named by him *Genista Spartium* with *rotem* as its Arabic name. Bové also found it at Suez, and again in different parts of Syria. Belon also mentions finding it in several places when travelling in the East. Burkhardt also frequently mentions the shrub *rotem* in the deserts to the south of Palestine, and he sometimes covered with this shrub, and that such places are favorite places of pasturage, as sheep are remarkably fond of the poda. Lord Lindsay again, while travelling in the middle of the valleys of Mount Sinai, says, "The *rotem*, a species of broom, bearing a white flower, delicately streaked with purple, afforded me frequent shelter from the sun while in advance of the caravan" (*Letters*, p. 188). Dr. Robinson, in his journey from Akabah to Jerusalem, says (*Researches*, ii, 124): "The shrubs which we had met with throughout the desert still continued. One of the principal of these is the *rotem*, a species of the broom-plant, the *Genista rotem* of Forskal. This is the largest and most conspicuous shrub of these deserts, growing thickly in the water-courses and valleys. The Arabs always selected the place of encampment, if pos-
able, in a spot where it grew, in order to be sheltered
by it at night from the wind; and during the day, when they
often went on in advance of the camels, we found them
not unfrequently sitting or sleeping under a bush of
reeds to protect them from the sun. It was in this
way that the prophet Elijah lay down and slept beneath
the same shrub (1 Kings xix. 4, 5, "under a juniper-tree"). It affords shade and protection, both in heat and storm,
to travellers (Virgil, Georgy, ii. 54, 438, and Bonar describes
it as particularly useful for shelter in the peninsula of
Arabia). In the other passages the meaning is not so clear,
and therefore different interpretations have been given.
Thus Job (xxx. 4) says of the half-famished people who
despised him, "Who cut up mallows by the bushes, and
rothem-roots for the herd." Though the broom-root
may perhaps be more suitable for diet than the juniper,
yet they are both too bitter and medicinal to be consid-
ered or used as nutritious, and therefore some say that
"when we read that rothem-roots were their food, we
are to suppose a great deal more than the words express,
namely, that the herd was so vicious that it was
not at liberty to stray from even these roots," which were neither refresh-
ning nor nourishing. Dr. Thomson's ingenious suggestion
(Land and Book, ii. 488), that perhaps the mallows
only were used for food, and the rothem-roots as fuel
to cook them with, seems hardly tenable from the phrase-
ology of the passage. He supposes (A Reader's Com-
panion, p. 384), that the herd was so vicious that
instead of the roots of this broom we are to understand
a plant which grows upon these roots, as well as upon
some other plants, and which is well known by the
English name of broom-rape, the orobanchia of botanists.
These are sometimes eaten. Thus Dioscorides (ii. 136)
observes that the orobanchia, which grows from the roots
of broom, was sometimes eaten raw, or boiled like as-
paragus. Celsius again suggests an amendment in the
sentence, and thinks that we should understand it to
mean that the broom-roots were required for fuel,
and not food, for the herd. This qualifying fuel and
food, though very similar to each other, are very differ-
ent in their derivation (see Gesenius, Theol. p. 1317;
and on the contrary, Michaelis, New Orient. Bibli., v. 3, 5),
and this sense is confirmed by some of the Talmudical
writers, as R. Levi ben-Gerson, in his remarks on this pas-
sage, states that the broom is the only fuel procurable to
many of these desert situations (see Thevenot, Trav., i.
222). In Ps. cxx. 4, David observes that the calam-
ities of his enemies were "like arrows of the mighty,
with coals of rothem." The broom, being no doubt very
commonly used as fuel in a country where it is abun-
dant, may have afterwards come to be used rather for
its own sake, and its original meaning may have been
in a comparison; but it is also described as sparkling,
burning, and cracking more vehemently than other
wood, and the Arabs regard it as yielding the best char-
coal. Thus the tree which afforded shade to Elijah
may have furnished also the "coals" or ashes for baking
the cake which satisfied his hunger (1 Kings xix. 6).
See Celsius, Hierobot., i. 246; Oedemann, Vern. Sammlun-
gen, ii. 8; Forskall, Flora Ag. et Arab. p. ivi and 214;
Schultens, Comment. auf Job, ad loc.; Robinson, Research,
i. 599; Burckhardt, Syria, p. 488; Flinsi, H. N. xxiv, 9,
25; Balfour, Plants of the Bible, p. 50; Stanley, S. and P.

Junius, Francis, son of the following, was born at
Heidelberg, 1589. In early life he studied mathematics,
but finally turned his attention to literature and the-
ology. After finishing his studies he went to France to
work at the law. In 1600 he went to England, and
was received into the house of the earl of Arundel, where he lived as his librarian for thirty years. In
1630 he returned to the Continent, in order to pass some
time in the bosom of his family. For two years he lived
in Friesland, in a district where the ancient Saxon
tongue was still preserved, that he might perfect his
knowledge. In 1675 he returned to England, and in 1676
went to Oxford, whence he retired to Windsor, to his
nephew Isaac Vossius, and died there Nov. 19, 1677. He
was a very learned philologist, as is evinced by his
written, which are De pictura Veterum, libri iii (Am-
sterdam, 1637, 4to)—Observationes in Willeramii Para-
phrasis Franciag Aurelii Ciceronicum (Amsterdam,
1655, 4to). His Latin work is De cultu scholastica et
quattuor Evangelistarum Latin a Tation, confec-
tam (Amsterdam, 1655, 8vo)—Quatuor D. N. J. C. Evang-
eliorum Versiones peramplissae dux, Gothico estlcula et An-
gelico-razouano, etc. A confectum aristarcham Canthorum. Buccest, Anglico et,
etc. (Dordrecht, 1655, 4to). His Paradigmata Par-
aphrasis poetica Genesenses (Amsterdam, 1655, 4to). His
Erythmologicum Anglicanum was edited by Edward Lye,

Junius, Francis (François Du Jon), an emi-
inent French Protestant theologian, was born at Bourges
in 1545. He studied law at first, but embracing the
principles of the Reformation, for which his father suf-
fered persecution, he removed to Geneva in 1562, to
study the dead languages and theology. In 1565 he
took charge of a Walloon congregation at Antwerp; the
party troubles of the time, however, obliged him to with-
draw first to a church in Limburg, and finally to Ger-
many. Frederick II welcomed him at Heidelberg, and
he obtained a chair in the Palatinate. During the war
of 1568 he lived in the Low Countries, and was
chaplains of the Prince of Orange. He afterwards
again returned to his charge, and remained there until
1575, when he was called to Heidelberg by the elector, to
take part with Thomae in the translation of the Old Tes-
tament. After being also for a while professor of
theology at Heidelberg, he returned to France in 1592 with
the duke of Bouillon, and was employed by Henry IV
on a mission to Germany. Later he accepted a profes-
sorship at Leyden, where he remained until his death in
1602. His most important work was the translation of
the Old Testament, which he executed in conjunc-
tion with Tremellios. It appeared in five parts,
the first containing the five books of Moses (Frankfort,
1575, folio); the second embracing the historical books,
1576; the third the poetical books, 1573; the fourth
the prophets, 1579; and the last the Psalms, 1579.
After the death of Tremellios the translation was
revised by his colleague, and printed at London,
1584, 8vo. In the course of twenty years it passed
through twenty editions, and was printed for the
first time at Zurich, 1579, 8vo. Junius lived to superintend
the third edition, which was still better than the second,
and is the ancient text of the French Bible. During
the same year the French Testament, published in
1624, folio, containing a good index by Paul Tossanius.
"The index was published in a volume by itself at Frankfort, 1687, folio, and repeated
after. The translation cannot be called elegant; it
is too literal, and is sometimes obscure on that ac-
tount. It is also disfigured with useless glosses and
rabbinical traditions" (Kitto). He wrote besides, Apost-
calypticae AnaLysis (1592); Grammatica Lingua Hebraeor
(3d edition, 1598); Acta Apostolorum et epistola 2 S.
Pauli ad Corithian, ca Arabica translatione Latina red-
dita: —Procatamenca ad V. T. interpretationem: —Pre-
lectiones in 3 prora capita Genesenses: —Explicitio 4 pri-
orum Paulorum: —Psalms 101, seu principi Chris-
tiani institutio: —Comment. in Eschecim: —Expositio
Danielae: —Lexicon in Canonem: —Sacra paraliola: —
Notes in Epistolam S. Jude. His Opera theologica were
published at the same epoch, in two volumes, and be-
parly exegetical, partly philological and polemic.
His autobiography, which is published at the beginning
of his works, was written in 1555, and is the source of
his biographies published by Melch. Adam and in Bayle's
Dictionary. His Latin work is De Franciae Provinciae: —
Herzog, Real-Encyclop., s. v.; Kautz, s. v. (J. H. W.).

Junius, Robert, a Dutch missionary, a native of
Delft, who flourished in the 17th century, was sent by
the Dutch government to the western part of the island
of Formosa in 1634, and was eminently successful in his
missionary labor. He is said to have baptized no less than six thousand persons. He also provided good educational advantages for the natives, and over six hundred young men crowded the schools he had founded. Of his other labors there is little that we are sure is true. His literary labors were confined to efforts in behalf of the people to whom he was sent. He composed some prayers, and translated certain Psalms into the Formosan language. He returned to Holland in after days, but the year of his death is not known to us. See Mosheim, Eccles. Hist. iii. bk. iv. cent. xviii. sect. 1. note 24.

Junakin, Gzonon, L.L.D., a Presbyterian minister, was born in Kingston, Cumberland County, Pa., Nov. 1, 1790, entered Jefferson College in 1809, and graduated in 1818. While at college he was converted (1811), and upon the completion of his collegiate studies he entered at once on a theological course of study under Dr. John M. Mason in New York city, where ordained at Gettysburg, Pa., in 1818, and remained in the pastorathe, though teaching and editing a paper a part of the time, till 1830. He was principal of Pennsylvania Manual Labor Academy at Germantown, Pa., from 1830 to 1832; president of Lafayette College, Easton, Pa., from 1833 to 1841; president of the University, from 1841 to 1844; was then recalled to the presidency of Lafayette College; and was president of Washington College, Lexington, Va., from 1848 to 1861, when, on the accession of Virginia, he left the college, his home, and his property. Lafayette College thereafter honored him with an honorary degree of Doctor of Laws. Upon the last day of May, 1860, Dr. Junakin told his congregation that for many years maintained a great influence in the Church courts, sustained by his thorough knowledge of every subject on which he attempted to speak, and the keen logic with which he expressed the fallacies in the arguments of his opponents. In 1844 he was moderator of the General Assembly. In 1838 he received the degree of D.D. from Jefferson College, and in 1856 that of L.L.D. from Rutgers College. Dr. Junakin performed an amazing amount of work in his lifetime. His preaching record shows that he delivered a larger number of sermons than most pastors do, while his toils in building up and reviving colleges, in laborious agencies, in ecclesiastical labors in the Church courts, in the professor's chair, at the editor's desk, and through the press, in his numerous books, sermons, and essays, make us wonder how he could find the time and energy for doing so much. He published The Educator, a periodical, in 1838; The Vindication, containing a history of the trial of the Rev. Albert Barnes by the Second Presbytery and by the Synod of Philadelphia, in 1838; A Treatise on Justification, in 1839; The Little Stone and the Great Image, or Lectures on the Person of Christ, in 1839; The Great Apostacy, a sermon on the Romanism, in 1835; Political Fallacies, in 1862; A Treatise on Sanction, in 1864; and The Tabernacle, or the Gospel according to Moses, in 1865. See Index volume (No. 2) to Princeton Review, p. 226 sq.

Juno, the Roman name of the queen of heaven, essentially identical with the Grecian Hera. Juno was the daughter of Kronos (Saturn) and Rhea. She was the most high and most powerful divinity of the Greeks and Romans next to Jupiter (the Greek Zeus), of whom she was the sister and wife. Argus and Samos claimed the honor of her birth. According to Homer, she was educated by Oceanus and Thetis; according to others, by the Hours. Her marriage with Jupiter on the island of Crete was honored by the presence of all the gods. This marriage, according to Homer, was consummated without the knowledge of their parents. Others say that he subdued her by artifice on the island of Samos, and there married her. According to the Oraculum Zeal, she was proud, ambitious, and jealous; and in the Homeric poems she is represented as an obstinate, quarrelsome shrew, and her temper a source of continual discord between herself and her lord. She often spitefully favors persons who were the objects of his displeasure, and he, in return, treats her with all that severity which, in ancient times, the husband was accustomed to use towards the wife. He scolds and often beats her, and on one occasion, when she had driven Hercules, the favorite of her husband, to Cos by a storm, Jupiter was so angry that he bound her hands and feet, loaded her with two amphoras, and suspended her from Olympus; and, to add to the inconveniences of her situation, none of the gods were allowed to help her. All, in fine, who assumed to themselves or attributed to others a superiority to her, experienced her vengeance. But she is, notwithstanding, a female of majestic beauty, the grandest of the Olympian goddesses, well calculated to inspire awe, although wanting the soft, insinuating, and heart-touching, which are items of justice in the only wedded goddess in the Greek mythology; she naturally presided over marriage and the birth of children. It is a significant feature of the Roman character that Juno, in addition to her other qualities, was the guardian of the nuptials, and was watching over the health of the mother and housewife; and a temple, containing the mint, was erected to her on the Capitoline as Juno Moneta (the Money-coiner). In the Roman conception she was also the goddess of chastity, and prostitutes were forbidden to touch her altar. She was, in short, the protector of women. She not only supervised the fertility of marriage, but also over its inviolable sanctity, and unchastity and inordinate love of sexual pleasures were hated by the goddess. Women in childbirth invoked Juno Lucina to help them, and after the delivery of the child a table was laid out for her in the house for a week, for no person would be allowed to enter were likewise under her protection. The month of Juno, which was originally called Junonius, was considered to be the most favorable period for marrying. As Juno has the same characteristics as her husband in so far as they refer to the female sex, she presides over all human affairs, which are based upon justice and faithfulness, but especially over domestic affairs, in which women are more particularly concerned. The companions of Juno were the Nymphs, Graces, and Hours. Isis was her particular servant. Among animals, the goose and the swan were sacred to her. Her usual attribute is the royal diadem, formed like a long triangle. She is drawn in a carriage by two peacocks. She had several temples in Rome. The first day of every month, and the whole of June, were sacred to her. See Smith, Dict. of Greek and Roman Biography, ii. 638.

Jupiter (the Latin form of the Greek name Zeus, Ζεύς, Genit. Διός), the principal deity of the Greek and Roman mythology, in which he is said to have been the son of Saturn and Ops. He is supposed to represent the fertilizing power of the heavens (see Creusus, Ζεύς, bolithic), and in this capacity, he is represented as the ruler both of the gods and of men. His attributes. See Walsh, Dissert. in Acta Apost. iii. 173; compare Horace, Odys. i. 5; Ovid, Fasti. v. 400; Metamorph. viii. 620; Tzetze. in Lyceoph. 681; "Hermes ergo if Diōς," Apollod. Bibl. iii. 2. 10; Homer, Iliad, iv. 622; Virg. Aen. iii. 21; ix. 627; Xen. de vit. ani. viii. 12. The Roman name is Juppiter, Hor. Flora. 229: Jove, Marlowe; Diana. (See Schmeller, Jn. Jovis n. orandi ad A. Altctor, 1740.) This deity is alluded to in several passages of the Bible, and Josephus frequently refers to his worship. The following statements are chiefly from kitten's Cyclopaedia, s. v.:

1. It is stated in 2 Kings xiii. 20, that in the kingdom of Judah there was an old man of Athens (Sept. Aττανσις; Vulg. Aττανσις) (some say "an old man, Athenensis" but Grocius, following the Latin, suggests instead of Aττανσις to read Ἀττανσις) to compel the Jews to depart from
the laws of their fathers, and not to live after the laws of God; and to pollute also the Temple in Jerusalem, and to call it the temple of Jupiter Olympius (Διὸς Ὀλυμπίου), and that in Gerizim, of Jupiter the defender of.mountains (Ὑπαρχόντος τοῦ Ἰδίου, Vulg. Alpes, 5, 5). Here they did desire that dwellth in the place," Olympius was a very common epithet of Zeus, and he is sometimes simply called Ὀλυμπίουs (Homer, Il. xii, 108). Olympia, in Greece, was the seat of the temple and sacred grove of Zeus Olympia, and it was here that the fathers of Zeus Olympia, and in the place where the feast of Phidias at Olympia was held. Caligula attempted to have this statue removed to Rome, and it was only preserved in its place by the assurance that it would not bear removal (Josephus, Ant. xix, 1, 1). Antiochus Epiphanes, as related by Atheneus, surpassed all other kings in his worship and veneration of the gods, so that it is impossible to count the number of the statues he erected. His especial favorite was Zeus. The Olympian Zeus was the national god of the Hellenic race (Thucydides, iii, 14), as well as the supreme ruler of the heathen world, and, as such, formed the true opposition to Jehovah, who was revealed himself as the God of Abraham. Antiochus commenced, in B.C. 174, the completion of the temple of the Zeus Olympius at Athens (Polybius, Reliq. xxvi, 10; Livy, Hist. xiii, 20), and associated the worship of Jupiter with that of Apollo at Daphne, erecting a statue to the former god resembling that of Phidias at Olympia (Anm. Marcell. xxii, 13, 1). Games were celebrated at Daphne by Antiochus, of which there is a long account in Polybius (Reliq. xxxi, 3) and Atheneus (v, 5). Coins also were struck referring to the god and the games (Mionnet, v, 215; Müller, Antiq. Athos, p. 62-64). On the coins of Elia, the worship of wild olive (coroos) distinguishes Zeus Olympia from the Dodonian Zeus, who has an oak wreath.

Antiochus, after compelling the Jews to call the Temple of Jerusalem the temple of Jupiter Olympia, built an idol altar upon the altar of God. Upon this altar sacrifices were offered every day, and the breath of their flesh was sprinkled about the Temple (1 Macc. i, 46; 2 Macc. vi, 5; Josephus, Ant. xii, 5, 4; xiii, 8, 2; War, i, 1, 2). The idol altar which was upon the altar of God (τοῦ βασιλέως ἡμῶν ἡ εἰρήνη τοῦ Σαλαμιστόρος) was considered by the Jews to be the "centre of desolation" (Σαλαμιστόρος τὴν εἰρήνην). 1 Macc. i, 54 foretold by Daniel (xi, 81; xii, 11) and mentioned by our Lord (Matt. xxiv, 15). Many interpretations of the meaning of this prophecy have been given. See ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION.

The grove of Daphne was not far from Antioch (Δαφνίς πρὸς Ἀστέριον), 2 Macc. iv, 38; Josephus, War, i, 12, 15), and at this city Antiochus Epiphanes erected a temple for the worship of Jupiter Capitolinus. See Daphne. It is described by Livy as having its walls entirely adorned with gold (xii, 20). To Jupiter Capitolinus the Jews of Jerusalem, in whatever country they might be, were compelled by Vespasian to pay two drachmas, as they used to pay to the Temple at Jerusalem (Josephus, War, vii, 6, 6; Dion Cass. lxvi, 7). Hadrian, after the second revolt of the Jews, erected a temple to Jupiter Capitolinus in the place where the temple of Gaul formerly stood (Dion Cass. lxxix, 12). There is, probably, reference made to Jupiter Capitolinus in Dan. xi, 38, alluding to Antiochus Epiphanes: "But in his estate shall he worship the god of forces" (fortresses, δυνάμεως, see Gesenius, Theaur. a. v. τιμή, p. 1011), for under this name Jupiter was worshipped by the victorious general on his return from a campaign, and it was in honor of Jupiter Capitolinus that he celebrated his triumph. Various conjectures have been made relative to this passage, but the opinion of Gesenius seems most probable. See MAUZIM.

In the passage from 2 Macc. above quoted a temple was also ordered to be set up to Zeus Xenius on Mount Gerizim. Josephus gives a different account. He relates that the Samaritans, who, when it pleased them, denied that they were of the kindred of the Jews, wrote to Antiochus, the god (Σελεύς οἱ κοιναὶ) Epiphanes, begging him to allow the temple on Mount Gerizim, which was called "the house of the Lord" (הַגֵּן יִשְׂרָאֵל), to be erected. Caligula attempted to have this statue removed to Rome, and it was only preserved in its place by the assurance that it would not bear removal (Josephus, Ant. xii, 5, 5). This petition is said to have been granted. The epithet Σελεύς is given to Zeus as the supporter of hospitality and the friend of strangers (Plutarch, Aes. xato. 20; Xenop. Aenab. iii, 2, 4; Virgil, Enid. i, 785, etc.), and it is explained in 2 Macc. by the clause "as they did desire (Greek καὶ Ζεύς ἢργους, as they were; Vulg. prout erat hi, as they were) who dwell in the place." Ewald supposes that Jupiter was so called on account of the hospitable disposition of the Samaritans (Geschich. iv, 283, note), while Jahn suggests that it was because the Samaritans, in their letter to Antiochus Epiphanes, said that they were strangers in that country (Hebrew Commonwealth, i, 819); Grotius says because the dwellers of the place were pilgrims from the regions of Myria and Mesopotamia, specially referring to their idolatrous practices (2 Kings xvii, 24 sq.).

2. The appearance of the gods upon earth was very commonly believed among the ancients. Accordingly we find that Jupiter and Mercury are said to have wandered in Phrygia, and to have been entertained by Bau- nax and Pan in the country of Anice (Met. vii, 11). "Ye henceforth know not what," (John iv, 22), to be called the temple of Jupiter Hellenius (Ant. xii, 5, 5). This petition is said to have been granted. The epithet Σελεύς is given to Zeus as the supporter of hospitality and the friend of strangers (Plutarch, Aes. xato. 20; Xenop. Aenab. iii, 2, 4; Virgil, Enid. i, 785, etc.), and it is explained in 2 Macc. by the clause "as they did desire (Greek καὶ Ζεύς ἢργους, as they were; Vulg. prout erat hi, as they were) who dwell in the place." Ewald supposes that Jupiter was so called on account of the hospitable disposition of the Samaritans (Geschich. iv, 283, note), while Jahn suggests that it was because the Samaritans, in their letter to Antiochus Epiphanes, said that they were strangers in that country (Hebrew Commonwealth, i, 819); Grotius says because the dwellers of the place were pilgrims from the regions of Myria and Mesopotamia, specially referring to their idolatrous practices (2 Kings xvii, 24 sq.).

3. The word Ρέδια (fair or fine weather) is derived from ἡδρα and δαί. Jupiter, as lord of heaven, had power
JURE DIVINO

over all the changes of the weather. The Latins even used his name to signify the air—sub Dio (Horace, lib. ii, od. iii, 23), sub Jove frigido (Horace, lib. i, od. i, 25, etc.), comp. “the image which fell down from Jupiter,” A. Vers.; qui rov birotocoi, Act. xix, 55). The word also occurs in Matt. xvi, 15. (For a full account of Jupiter and Zeus, see Smith’s Dict. of Biography, s. v.; and for a list of the epithets applied to this god, see Rawlinson, Herod. vol. i, Appendix, p. 680.)

Jure Divino, an expression meaning "by divine right," used in connection with the question of the source of ecclesiastical authority. The "divine" for that authority contend that the episcopal discipline and orders, having issued immediately from the authority of God, are the exclusive channel through which holy ordinances can be lawfully or efficaciously exercised. Others, again (who consequently relinquish the jure divino claim), while maintaining that the episcopal regimen is agreeable to the will of Christ and the practice of his apostles, do not find a warrant for holding the above exclusive views, nor for asserting the utter invalidity, while they still admit the irregularity of such bodies. In their opinion, the claims of a Christian ministry rest not on any unbroken succession, but on the basis of the divinely sanctioned institution of a Christian Church. The authority, therefore, with which a Christian minister is invested they consider to be derived from Christ only by virtue of the apostolic commission to Christian congregations; and they hold that it comes direct from the Church in whose name and behalf he acts as its representative, and just to that extent to which it has empowered and directed him to act. They consider that the system which makes the sacramental virtue of holy orders inherent indefeasibly in each individual minister, detracts from the claims of the Church, makes the Church a sort of appendage to the priesthood, and, in fact, confounds the Church with the clergy, as if the spiritual community consisted only of its officers.—Eden, Eccles. Dictionary, s. v. See Succession.

Jurius, Pierre, an eminent French Protestant theologian, was born at Mer, in the diocese of Blois, in 1587. He was the son of a Protestant minister, and nephew of the celebrated Rivet and Du Moulin. He possessed uncommon talents, and when barely nineteen received the master's degree, and after travelling in Holland and England, returned to his country to succeed his father in his pastoral office. His reputation for learning in 1674 obtained for him the situation of professor of theology and the Hebrew language in the Huguenot seminary at Sedan. When in 1681 the Protases were deprived by Louis XIV of the permission to give public instruction in that town, he retired to Rouen, and from thence went to Rotterdam, where he was appointed professor of theology. In that city the ardoir of his zeal soon drew him into controversy with Bayle, Basnage, and Saurin, in the heat of which he manifested the same ranor which unfortunately disgraces most of his critical writings. He allowed himself likewise to fall into various errors by too much indulging a naturally lively imagination in the interpretation of prophecy. In his Commentary on the Apocalypse he even predicted the establishment of Protestantism in France during the year 1686. Those who differ from him in this respect cannot succeed his father in his pastoral office. His reputation for learning and piety, he treated with a most uncrowning severity. Grotius and Hammond, perhaps the two greatest theologians of their age, because they differed from him on the subject of the Antichrist predicted in the book of Revelation, he styles "the disgrace of the Reformed Church, and even of Christianity." The same spirit is manifested in his well-known controversy with the great Bossuet, whom he does not scruple to accuse of falsehood and dishonesty, though, on the other hand, it must be allowed that the recriminations of this celebrated defender of the Church of Rome, if more politely expressed, are equally severe and destitute of truth; the great object of Bossuet being, it would appear, to charge his antagonist with holding the heretical opinions of the Socinians (Bossuet, Hist. des Variations, iv, 64; v, 238-239). With all these defects, Jurieu stands deservedly high as a controversialist. His learning was most exhausted in his writings and in the criticism of his authorities, and he had a special talent in discovering the weak point in the cause of his antagonists. In respect of style and eloquence he is immeasurably behind Bossuet, but he is at least his equal in polemical talent, and by some is considered his superior in erudition. His reiterated denunciations of the theologians of every shade as a storehouse of great research. Jurieu's private life was becoming that of a Christian minister; he was charitable to the poor almost from his means, and employed his influence abroad in alleviating the sufferings of his exiled brethren. He died Jan. 11, 1718. His principal works are: Histoire du Calvinisme et du Papisme mis en paradoxe. (etc. Rotterdam, 1689, 2 vols. 12mo; 2d edit., ibid. 1693, 12mo)—Lettres Pastorales (Rotterdam, 1686-7, 3 vols. 12mo)—Le Vrai Système de l'Eglise (Dord. 1686-80);—L'Ordre, M. de Guénin (Deventer [Rotterdam], 1684, 2 vols. 12mo);—Propriétés Unisent (Amst. 1685, 8vo)—Apologie pour l’Accompagnement des Propriétés (1687, which has been translated into English, Lond. 1687, 2 parts, 8vo)—La Religion des Lutinistes (Rotterdam, 1689, 8vo);—Histoire des Dogmes et des Cultes des Huguenots (Amst. 1681, 12mo);—La politique du clergé de France (Amst. 1681, 12mo).—English Cyclopedia; Herzog, Real Encyclop. vii, 126; Hoeftz, Nouv. Bioire. Générale, xxvii, 267 sq. No one is acquainted with the reason for the title, Juridic, of the above work; but it is probable that he meant to imply that he was a lawyer in the ecclesiastical courts of France.

Jurdination is an ecclesiastical term denoting the power of appointing a bishop by virtue of the apostolic commission, of governing and administering the laws of the Church within the bounds of his diocese. The same term is also used to express the powers within which a bishop exercises his power, i.e. his diocese. To define this power of the ecclesiastic property of the diocese is to define the limits of the ecclesiastical property of the diocese. Of old the earl and bishop sat in the same court. Afterwards the bishop held his courts by himself, though temporal lords sat in synod with bishops—"the one to search the laws of the land, and the other the laws of God." The question of jurisdiction, after the period of the Council of Constance, became agitated between the ecclesiastical and secular sovereigns. The things, the latter argued, and reasonably, that are Cesar's belong to Cesar, and it is treason to take them from him; the things that are God's belong to God, and it is impious to take them from him. The Church is a free society, which is in no need of a perfect power of government within its own dominion, and a purely spiritual sentence should be beyond review by a civil court. See Investiture; Keys, Power of.

Jus Asyli, the right of protection. From the 4th century, the privilege of asylum, or the right of protecting criminals, was possessed by Christian churches and altars. This privilege had belonged to sacred places among Hebrews, Greeks, and Romans, and from it may have been adopted by Christians. It seems to have been first introduced into the Christian Church in the time of Constantine; but the right was subsequently much circumscribed by various restrictions. It was found to be a serious hindrance to the administration of justice. Since the 16th century the privilege has been almost entirely abolished.—Farrar, Eccles. Dict. s. v. See Asylum.

Jus Devolutum (derived right). When, in the Establishment of Scotland, a patron does not present to a parish within six months after the commencement of the vacancy, the right of presentation falls to the presbytery, tanquam iure devoluto. Still further to guard against abuse, it has been enacted (act 1719, c. 29) "that if any patron shall present any person to a vacant church who shall not be qualified, by taking and
subscribing the said oath in manner aforesaid, or shall present a person to any vacancy who is then or shall be pastor or minister of any other church or parish, or any person who shall not accept or declare his willingness to accept the same. In 1822, he was present when the said appointment was made, but the persons present did not act in accordance with the said appointment. In 1826, he was present when the said appointment was made, but the persons present did not act in accordance with the said appointment.

Justice (ἱστορία), righteousness, as an internal trait of character; ἡσυχία, quietness, as a judicial act, as applied to men, is one of the four cardinal virtues. It consists, according to Cicero (De Finibus, lib. v, cap. 28), in suo quaeque tribuendo, in accordance with every one his right. By the Pythagoreans, and also by Plato, it was regarded as including (Rom. xiii, 14; 1 Cor. xvi, 14). That we help one another means in our translation of the Scriptures to help one another, signifies as an extensive significance. As opposed to equity, justice (ῥό τηρεῖν) means doing merely what positive law requires, while equity (ῥό τις) means doing what is fair and right in the circumstances of every particular case. Justice is not founded in law, as Hobbes and others hold, but in our idea of what is right. Laws are just or unjust in so far as they do or do not conform to that idea. Justice may be distinguished as ethical, economical, and political. The first consists in doing justice between man and man; the second, in doing justice between the members of a family or household; and the third, in doing justice between the members of a community or commonwealth (More, Enquiry into Ethicus; Grove, Moral Philosophy). Dr. Watts gives the following rules respecting justice: 1. It is just that we honor, reverence, and respect those who are superior to us in any kind (Eph. vii, 1, 3; 1 Pet. ii, 17; 1 Tim. v, 17). 2. That we show particular kindness to those near relations (Proverbs, xvii, 17). 3. That we love those who are good, and show gratitude to those who have done us good (Gal. iv, 15). 4. That we pay the full due to those whom we bargain or deal with (Rom. xiii, 8; Deut. xvi, 14). 5. That we help our fellow-creatures in cases of great necessity (Exodus, xxi, 4). 6. Reparation to those whom we have wilfully injured" (Watts, Sermons, serm. xxiv, xxvi, vol. ii). See Wollaston, Religion of Nature, p. 187, 141; Jay, Sermons, i, 181.

Justice of God is that perfection whereby he is infinitely righteous, both in himself and in all his proceedings. Mr. Ryland defines it thus: "The ardent inclination of his will to prescribe equal laws as the supreme governor, and to dispense equal rewards and punishments as the supreme judge" (Rev. xvi, 5; Psa. cxliv, 7; xvii, 1, 2). The expression of the Supreme in the necessary result of the divine holiness, as exhibited in all his external relations to intelligent creatures. As holiness, in relation to God, is subjective, declaring his perfect purity, justice is objective, exhibiting his opposition to sin as the transgression of his law. (These two aspects are exactly exhibited by the two Hebrew terms above.) Divine justice is distinguished as legislative, or rectoral or distributive. Legislative justice must approve and require that rational creatures conform their internal and external acts to the dictates of the moral law, which, either by the influence of the Holy Spirit on the conscience or by direct revelation, has been made known to all men. Rectoral or distributive justice is God's dealing with his accountable creatures according to the sanctions of his law, rewarding or punishing them according to their deserts (Psa. lxxxix, 14). The latter is again distinguished as communicative, or distributive, or just and right (Rom. xii, 7, 8). Punitive or vindictive justice is the infliction of punishment for any sin committed by men (2 Thess. i, 6). That God will not act as a vindicator is evident from the language of the word of God (Exod. xxxiv, 6, 7; Numb. xiv, 18; Neh. 1, 3): 2. From the nature of God (Jas. i, 18, 14; Psa. v,
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5, 6; Heb. xii, 29); 3. From sin being punished in Christ, the surety of his people (1 Pet. iii, 18); 4. From all the various natural evils which men bear in the present state. The use we should make of this doctrine is this: 1. We should learn the dreadful nature of sin, and the iniquity of the sinner (Ps. i, ix, 17). 2. We should highly appreciate the Lord Jesus Christ, in whom justice is satisfied (1 Pet. iii, 18). 3. We should imitate the justice of God by cherishing an ardent regard to the rights of God and to the rights of mankind. 4. We should abhor all sin, as it strikes directly at the justice of God. 5. We should derive comfort from the consideration that the judgment of all the earth will do right as regards ourselves, the Church, and the world at large (Ps. xcv, i, 2).

JUSTICE, ADMINISTRATION OF. This seems to have been one of the first subjects which claimed the attention of the great lawyer of the Hebrews. It appears from the advice of Jethro to Moses when "Israel was encamped at the Mount of God" (Exod. xviii, 15-24). When Moses had seen how laboriously Moses was occupied in "judging between one and another," he advised him to make some other provision in relation to the matter, and to restrict himself to the work which properly belonged to him, as the inspired teacher and leader of the people. This was accordingly done. The magistracy was taken from him in a form adapted to the existing wants of the people, and by reference to the record we shall find how fully it covers every essential point in the case. The value of evidence in conducting trials; the principles upon which verdicts should be rendered, both in civil and criminal cases, together with the great institution of trial by jury, are all found in greater or less development in the statutes and ordinances given from God to the Hebrews.

Their courts of justice were of various grades, some known as high courts of appeal, and others so simple and multiplied as to carry the administration of justice to every man's door, and effectually to secure the parties against that ruinous evil, "the law's delay." "Judges and offices shall thou make in all thy gates," was the command; and to what minute subdivision this creation of tribunals was carried out, we see in the ordinance directing that there should be "three thousand rulers over hundreds, rulers over fifties, and rulers over tens, who should judge the people at all seasons."

The candidates for office were not to be selected from any one privileged class. They were taken "out of all the people," they were required to be well known for their "intelligentsia" and "moral worth," and their fitness for the station to which they were chosen. They were to be "able men, such as fear God; men of truth, hating covetousness;" "wise men, and understanding, and known among the tribes;" and these qualifications being not only all-important, but all-sufficient, none others were required.

With a judiciary constructed after this manner, justice could be administered promptly and freely; and, on the other hand, a remedy was provided against the evils of hasty decision, which could not fall in the end to discover and punish in the right of the case. And if "the best laws are those which are best administered," we shall find the ordinances given to the Hebrews for carrying the laws of the land into effect admirably adapted to their end, giving equal security to the poor and to the rich against violence and wrong. See JUDGE; TAN-

JUSTIFICATION (some form of the verb Ἰησοῦ, Ἰησοῦ, a forensic term equivalent to acquittal, and opposed to condemnation; in an apologetic sense it is often synonymous with vindication or freeing from unjust imputation of blame.

I. Dogmatic Statement. — This term, in theological usage, is employed to designate the judicial act of God by which he pardons all the sins of the sinner who believes in Christ, receiving him into favor, and regarding him as relatively righteous, notwithstanding his past actual unrighteousness. Hence justification, and the remission of sins, are attributes of God, and the judicial act of God, to one and the same privilege of his believing people (Acts xiii, 38, 39; Rom. iv, 5, 8). So, also, "the justification of the ungodly," the "covering of sins," "not visiting for sin," "not remembering sin," and "impunity with God" imply that the justifying person is received with favor, and express substantially the same thing which is designated by "imputing or counting faith for righteousness." See PARDON. Justification, then, is an act of God, not in or upon man, but for him and in his favor; an act which, abstractly considered, respects man only as its object, and translates him into another relative state; while sanctification respects man as its subject, and is a consequent of this act of God, and inseparably connected with it. See REGULATION.

The originating cause of justification is the free grace and spontaneous love of God toward sinners (Rom. i, 17; iii, 24; vii, 9, 4, 5). Our Lord Jesus Christ is the sole meritorious cause of our justification, inasmuch as it is the result of his atonement for us. The sacrificial death of Christ is an expiatory of infinite wisdom, by which the full claims of the law may be admitted, and yet the penalty avoided, both the condition or equivalent has been provided by the sufferings of him who died in the sinner's stead (Eph. i, 7; Col. i, 14; Rev. v, 9). Thus, while it appears that our justification is, in its origin, an act of the highest grace, it is also, in its mode, an act most perfectly consistent with God's essential righteousness, and demonstrative of his inviolable justice. It proceeds not on the principle of abolishing the law or its penalty, for that would have implied that the law was unduly rigorous either in its precepts or in its sanctions. See ATONEMENT.

Faith is the instrumental cause of justification, present faith in him who is able to save, faith actually existing and exercised. See FAITH. The atonement of Jesus is not accepted for us, to our individual justification, until we individually believe, nor after we cease to live by faith in him. See FAITH.

The external results of justification are the restoration of amity and intercourse between the pardoned sinner and the pardoning God (Rom. v, 1; James ii, 23): the adoption of the persons justified into the family of God, and their consequent right to eternal life (Rom. viii, 17); the "adoption of a son" by the Holy Spirit" (Gal. iv, 6); the "HEIR'S OF GOD" (Gal. iii, 28); Gal. iii, 14; iv, 6), producing transeuntion of con-

We must not forget that the justification of a sinner does not in the least degree alter or diminish the evil nature and desert of sin. Though by an act of divine clemency the penalty is remitted, and the obligation to suffer that penalty is dissolved, still it is naturally due, though graciously remitted. Hence appear the propriety and duty of continuing to confess and lament our own personal guilt, and to humble and contrite heart (Ezek. xvi, 62). See PENITENCE.

II. History of the Doctrine. — 1. The early Church Fathers and the Latin Church. — Ecclesiastical science, from the beginning of its development, occupied itself with a discussion of the relation of faith, but the same, and even those who attributed the greatest importance to the latter recognised faith as the foundation. A merely logical division into subjective and objective faith, and an intimation of a distinction between a historic and a rational faith (in Clemens Alex., Stromata, ii, 45); the Theologian, De Trinitate, i, 67, for example, of little consequence. Two conceptions became prevailing: Faith as a general religious conviction, particularly as confidence in God, and the acceptance of the
tire doctrine of the Church, *fides catholica*. The formula that faith alone without the works justifies is found in the full Pauline sense in Clemens Romanus (1 ad Corinthios, c. 32), and is sometimes used by Augustin
tolemically in order to defend the freedom of grace and the priority of faith. More generally it is used in an argument against the necessity of the former. In the Jewish law (Ireneus, iv. 25; Tertullian, ade. Marcell. v. 3). The
cumenical synods were instrumental in gradually giving
the conception of *fides catholica* the new sense that salvation could be found only by adherence to eccle
sian doctrine. Augustine defended this new sense of salvation without faith, and in opposition to which Augustine insisted that the difference is absolute, and that without faith no good works at all are possible. As salva
 nation was thought to be conditioned by works also, it was held, even when it was regarded as necessary as of God, it was regarded as a sacrament. The impor
ance attributed to abstention created gradually a dis

tinction between commands and advice, and the belief that the fulfillment of the latter a virtue greater than required would arise (Hermas, Pastor Simil. iii. 6, 3; Gregory, In Epistulam ad Rom. iii; Ambrose, De Vir

da. iv. 508).

2. The Greek Church. — Little discussion and little controversy has occurred in this doctrine in the Greek Church. Faith and works together are regarded as the conditions of salvation. The words of James are refer

to first, yet faith is declared to be the stock from which the good works come as the fruits. The descrip

tion of faith proceeds from the definition in the Epistle to the Hebrews to the acceptance of the entire ecclesi
astical tradition. Man is said to participate in the merit of the Mediator not only through faith, but also through the fulfillment of the commandments of God and of the Church, and, in particular, prayers, fasting, pilgrimages, and monastic life. They are considered useful and necessary only as a means of promoting sanctification, but not as per se necessary for salvation. Hence, through the terrors of conscience. Hence justification is a divine judicial act, which, through the apprehension of the jus

tice of Christ, apprehended in faith, accepts the sinner as just, though he is not just. This strict distinction between justification and sanctification is manifested on the one hand against Scholasticism, which, through its Pelagian tendencies, seemed to offend against the honor of Christ, and to be unable to satisfy conscience, and on the other hand against Osianider, who regarded justification as being completed only in sanctification. The works even of the regenerated, according to the natural side, were regarded by the Reformers as sins. The Reformed theology in general agreed with the doc

tine of justification as stated above, yet did not make it to the same extent the fundamental doctrine of the whole theology. According to Calvin, justification and sanctification took place at the same time; or, as he put it, 'faith forms in the heart of the believer a complete form of the soterioustruths of the Gospel, without any reference to human action or to a life of good works. Theologians of the Lutheran Church distinguished in faith knowledge, assent, and confidence, assigning the form
to two to the intellect, the latter to the will. From the *fides generalis* they distinguished the justifying faith (specialis seu salvifica), and rejected the division into *fides informat et formata*. As a distinguishing mark, they demanded from a true faith that it be efficient in charity. For works they took the Decalogue as a rule; a certain necessity of works was strictly limited. But, however firmly they clung in general to the conception of justification as something essentially exterior (actus for


tentiarius) and foreign (imputatio justitiae Christi), some dogmatic writers held that justification had really
changed something in man, and indeed presupposed it as changed. Hollas pronounced this doctrine openly and inc autocritically, while Quenstedt designated these preceding acts as merely preparatory to conversion.

II. Doctrine of the Roman Catholic Church since the Reformation.
The Council of Trent, to make their compromises with the Pauline formula, recognized faith as the beginning and the foundation of justifica tion, but the full sense which Protestantism found in it was re jected. This faith is the general belief in divine revelation, though in transition to a special faith, yet a mere knowledge which makes room for mortal sins. Justifica tion is remission of sins and sanctification, through an infusion of the divine grace, in so far as the merit of Christ is not merely imputed, but communicated. It is given through grace, but as a permanent state it grows through the merit of the good works according to the commandments of God and the Church, through which works the justified, always guided by the grace of God in Christ, have to render satisfaction for the temporal punishment of their sins and to deserve salvation. Not all the works done before justification are sins, and to the justified the fulfillment of the commandments of God is quite possible, although even the saints still commit small, venial sins. A further development of this doctrine is found in the writings of Bellarmine. He admits faith only as fide generalis, as a matter of the intellect, yet as a consent, not a knowledge. Though only the first among mankind was destined for this justification, salvation for all is asserted. The Council of Trent had rejected the imputation of the merits of Christ only as the exclusive ground of justification; Bellarmine rejected it altogether. He explicitly proclaimed the necessity of good works for salvation, though only a relative salvation, the open supererogationism, which were not mentioned at Trent, though they remained unchanged in tradition and practice, are further developed by Bellarmine.

According to him, they go beyond nature, are not destined for all, and are not commanded under penalties.

III. Modern Protestantism.
This doctrine has denied all foreign imputation, also that of the merit of Christ. When supranaturalism in general declined, the points of difference from the Roman Catholic Church were frequently lost sight of. Kant found in the doctrine of justification the relation of the always unsatisfactory reality of our mingled future and the future which is recognized in the intuition of God. De Wette declared it to be the highest moral confidence which is founded on the communion with Christ, and turns from an unhappy past to a better future. Modern mystics have often found fault with the doctrine as being too outward, which approached the doctrine of the Roman Church. The Hegelian School taught that justification is the reception of the subject into the spirit, i.e., the knowledge of the subject of his unity with the absolute spirit. Following the doctrine of the Church, the severe Kanitz inquired what is the knowledge of the subject of his unity with the absolute spirit, or, according to Strauss, with the concrete idea of mankind. According to Schleiermacher, it is the reception of the communion of life with both the archetypal and historical Christ, and the appropriation of his perfection. Justification and sanctification are to him only different sides of the carrying out of the same divine decree. Many of the recent dogmatic writers of Germany have again proclaimed this doctrine to be the essential principle of Protestantism, some (Dörner, Das Prinzip unserer Kirche, Kö1, 1841) taking justification in the sense of a new personality founded in Christ, others (Hundeshagen, Der deutsche Protestantismus, Frankfort, 1847) in the sense that God, surveying the whole future development of the communion, to the former refinement, is the believer, views him as righteous. One of the last dogmatic manuals of the Church (Schweizer, ii, 526 sq.) distinguishes conversion and sanctification as the beginning and progress of a life of salvation, which justifies in the former sense, establishes the believer, views him as righteous. One of the last dogmatic manuals of the Church (Schweizer, ii, 526 sq.) distinguishes conversion and sanctification as the beginning and progress of a life of salvation, which justifies in the former sense, establishes the believer, views him as righteous.

Justification is the beginning and foundation of justifica tion, but the full sense which Protestantism found in it was re jected. This faith is the general belief in divine revelation, though in transition to a special faith, yet a mere knowledge which makes room for mortal sins. Justifica tion is remission of sins and sanctification, through an infusion of the divine grace, in so far as the merit of Christ is not merely imputed, but communicated. It is given through grace, but as a permanent state it grows through the merit of the good works according to the commandments of God and the Church, through which works the justified, always guided by the grace of God in Christ, have to render satisfaction for the temporal punishment of their sins and to deserve salvation. Not all the works done before justification are sins, and to the justified the fulfillment of the commandments of God is quite possible, although even the saints still commit small, venial sins. A further development of this doctrine is found in the writings of Bellarmine. He admits faith only as fide generalis, as a matter of the intellect, yet as a consent, not a knowledge. Though only the first among mankind was destined for this justification, salvation for all is asserted. The Council of Trent had rejected the imputation of the merits of Christ only as the exclusive ground of justification; Bellarmine rejected it altogether. He explicitly proclaimed the necessity of good works for salvation, though only a relative salvation, the open supererogationism, which were not mentioned at Trent, though they remained unchanged in tradition and practice, are further developed by Bellarmine. According to him, they go beyond nature, are not destined for all, and are not commanded under penalties.

Modern Protestantism.
This doctrine has denied all foreign imputation, also that of the merit of Christ. When supranaturalism in general declined, the points of difference from the Roman Catholic Church were frequently lost sight of. Kant found in the doctrine of justification the relation of the always unsatisfactory reality of our mingled future and the future which is recognized in the intuition of God. De Wette declared it to be the highest moral confidence which is founded on the communion with Christ, and turns from an unhappy past to a better future. Modern mystics have often found fault with the doctrine as being too outward, which approached the doctrine of the Roman Church. The Hegelian School taught that justification is the reception of the subject into the spirit, i.e., the knowledge of the subject of his unity with the absolute spirit, or, according to Strauss, with the concrete idea of mankind. According to Schleiermacher, it is the reception of the communion of life with both the archetypal and historical Christ, and the appropriation of his perfection. Justification and sanctification are to him only different sides of the carrying out of the same divine decree. Many of the recent dogmatic writers of Germany have again proclaimed this doctrine to be the essential principle of Protestantism, some (Dörner, Das Prinzip unserer Kirche, Kö1, 1841) taking justification in the sense of a new personality founded in Christ, others (Hundeshagen, Der deutsche Protestantismus, Frankfort, 1847) in the sense that God, surveying the whole future development of the communion, to the former refinement, is the believer, views him as righteous. One of the last dogmatic manuals of the Church (Schweizer, ii, 526 sq.) distinguishes conversion and sanctification as the beginning and progress of a life of salvation, which justifies in the former sense, establishes the believer, views him as righteous.
give myself to my own contemplations. I chose a spot by the sea-side." Whether Justin still resided at this time at Flavia Neapolis—and in that case the quiet resort must have been the shores of the Dead Sea, perhaps in the walled city, or on some unfrequented spot of Lake Gennesareth—or whether, as seems more probable, he then resided at Ephesus, is a matter of dispute. In favor of Ephesus are Schrockh, Tillemont, Hilgenfend, Dorner, etc. But, be the name of the place Flavia Neapolis or Ephesus, it was the city of that name. Justin was attracted to it, no doubt, chiefly by the grandeur of the object he was seeking to solve, and the loveliness of the spot—that we find him one day, while wrapped up in thought, pacing up and down by the side of the sea, which moaned in melancholy unison with his reflections, accented by the stars of venereal aspect the moon, and, and soon the two are engaged in earnest converse on the subject uppermost in young Justin's mind. Somewhat enamored of the Platonistic philosophy, he argues in its favor with the apparently present senior, and contends that at some future day it will conduct him into that near heaven, by illumining sophists. His doubts, however, are soon dispelled, for some two or three points of doctrine belonging to that system, and finally the doubting and indolent disciple is visited with the cure and not gentle apostrophe, "You are a mere dealer in words, but no lover of action and truth; your aim is not to be a practiser of good, but a clearer disputant, a cunning sophist." Once more the inquiring youth is baffled in his attempt to lay hold of the truth; he is again convinced that even from the foremost of heathen philosophers he cannot obtain the pearl for which he is seeking so earnestly. But with this intelligence there comes also the direction, "Search the Scriptures; feed upon the Holy Scriptures; masticate with them, as one who, guided by the Spirit of God, saw and revealed the truth, and even foretold events future to their day; read the last and heroic words of the disciples of him who came to raise a fallen world, and to restore to it eternal and imperishable felicity. Pray,"—ended the venerable Christian, "and your eyes will be opened; for none can perceive and comprehend these things except God and his Christ grant them understanding." Justin was impressed; he had often heard the Platonists calumniate the Christians, but he had always discredited the common epithets with scorn. The tranquility and fortitude with which these followers of Jesus encountered death and all other evils which appear terrible to man, and he could never condemn as profligates those who could so patiently endure. He had long believed them innocent of the crimes imputed to these consistent martyrs. He was now prepared to think that they told the truth. He reflected on the words of the venerable stranger, and was convinced that they inculcated the "only safe and useful philosophy." From this time (the exact date is doubtful; the Bolsheviks place it in A.D. 119; it is generally believed, with Caeser, that it was written, and oc- curred in A.D. 133) his personal history becomes obscure, as he has but little to relate of himself hereafter, and as from other sources we cannot gather much on which we can depend. Certain it is that he at once enlisted in active service in behalf of the new cause. Retaining the name of Justin, he became a zealous Smith, and wrote against the Gnostics. A sequel, or one of the latest editors of the works of Justin Martyr, J. F. C. Otto, who makes four distinct classes.

(1.) Undeveloped Works.—1. Ἀπολογία πρώτη ὑπὸ Ἱεροσόλυμα ἡμῶν Παντοκράτορα, &c., Of Christian Martyr, J. F. C. Otto, who makes four distinct classes.
as his second Apology, is one of the most interesting remains of Christian antiquity. It is addressed to the emperor Antoninus Pius, and to his adopted sons "Verissimus the Philosopher," afterwards the emperor M. Aurelius. The "Verissimus the Philosopher," as the common reading, not that of Eusebius), afterwards the emperor Verus, colleague of M. Aurelius. From the circumstance that Verissimus is not styled Caesar, which dignity he acquired in the course of the A.D. 139, it is inferred by many critics, including Pagani, Neander, Otto, Schenkel, that the Apology was written previously, and probably early in that year. Eusebius places it in the fourth year of Antoninus, or the first year of the 230th Olympiad, A.D. 141, which is rather too late. Others contend for a still later date. Justin himself, in the course of the work (c. 46), states that Christ has passed a hundred and fifty years before he wrote, but he must be understood as speaking in round numbers. However, Tilllemont, Grabbe, Fleury, Cellier, Marx, and others, fix the date of the work in A.D. 150. Its contents," says bishop Kaye, "may be reduced to the following heads: [1] Appeals to the ruling powers, and an exposition of the expostulations with, and even on the unfairness of the proceedings against the Christians, who were condemned without any previous investigation into their lives or opinions merely because they were Christians, and were denied the liberty allowed the inhabitants of the empire, of worshipping the God whom they themselves preferred. [2] Rebuttal of the charges of atheism, immorality, and disaffection towards the emperor, which were brought against the Christians: these charges Justin refuted by appealing to the purity of the Gospel presented and the argument presented in the condition of those who embraced Christianity: and by stating that the kingdom to which Christians looked forward was not of this world, but a heavenly kingdom. [3] Direct arguments in proof of the truth of Christianity, drawn from miracles and prophecy. With respect to the miracles, Justin has treated of them after many other writers had treated of them, in refuting the objection that the miracles of Christ were performed by magical arts. With respect to the latter, he states in forcible terms the general nature of the argument from prophecy, and shows the accomplishment of many particular prophecies in the person of Jesus; inferring, from their accomplishment, the reasonableness of entertaining a firm persuasion that the prophecies yet unfulfilled—that, for instance, respecting Christ's second advent—will in due time be accomplished. [4] Justin does not confine himself to defending Christianity, but occasionally brings in the annihilation of the heathen and the success of the Gentile polytheism and idolatry. In further confirmation of the ingenious, or, rather, beneficial character of Christianity, Justin concludes the treatise with a description of the mode in which proselytes were admitted into the Church, of its other rites and customs, and of the habits and manner of life of the primitive Christians." To this Apology, the larger one of the two, are generally appended three documents: (1) Άκροαν υπ' άυτον Χριστιανών ἴματος, Λεγενναῖον αὐτους Κατάθλησε, Μεταλλευτής, Αποστόλους ὇λους, Ἰησοῦν Ὀρθά, Κοινωνίας Ἀσίας. This Greek version of the emperor's letter was made and is given by Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. iv, 8). Justin has subjoined to his work the Latin original (Eccl. Hist. iv, 8), which probably is still preserved by Rufinus in his version of Eusebius, for which, in any case, the Latin version of Justin was afterwards substituted. (2) Αὐτοκεφαλία ἴματος τῷ κωνικῷ τῆς Άσιας, Αποστόλους Ὀρθά Ἐπισκόπων τῆς Ἀσίας. This is the earliest version of the first book, probably that which was after called the "Greek Apology," and was written, according to the text of the letter itself, as it appears in Eusebius, not by Antoninus, but by his successor, M. Aurelius. (3) Μάρκαν βεβαιῶς ιστολογία τῆς σύγχρονης ἡμείς ὑπάρχουσας, ἐν ἑάν μαρτυρίῳ Χριστιανών αἰτίας τῇ γενέσει τῆς οἰκίας αὐτών, Μαρκαί Φιλάππου Ἐπίσκοπος ad Semitam qui testatur Christianos victoriam caesaribus concessisse, Paulus, Μαρκαί πρωτοειδής λόγος, φασί, ἐπιτυχώς Ἀρμενίων. This, like the preceding, has been generally attributed to Justin, though it is said by Tertullian, Apologies, cap. 5, that a letter of the same tenor was written by the emperor, relates to the same subject of the so-called thundering legion (q. v.). 2. Ἀπολογία ἦλθη ὑπάρχουσα τῶν Ἰουνιτών πλεῖον τῆς Τρισέργυς- σπύρων, τῶν ἤρωων τοῦ προφετηθέντος Ιωάννου τό Προφήτην, τῶν Ἰουών τοῦ Ἰουουνίτων τῶν Ἐθνών τῶν Ἐθνών. This second and shorter plea for the Christians was addressed probably to the emperors M. Aurelius and Lucius Verus, or, rather, to Aurelius alone, as Verus was engaged in the East in the Parthian war. (See below.) Neander adopts the opinion of Strowy, himself, and Stow, that it was addressed to Aurelius and Verus has been lost, but their opinion has been refuted by several writers, especially by Otto. Granted, then, that this Apology was presented to Aurelius and Verus has been lost, but their opinion has been refuted by several writers, especially by Otto. Granted, then, that this Apology was presented to M. Aurelius, we find it "occasionally by the punishment inflicted on three persons at Rome, whom the prefect of the city, had put to death merely because they were Christians. After exposing the injustice of this proceeding, Justin replies to two objections which the enemies of the Gospel were accustomed to urge. The first was, 'Why, if the Christians were certain of being received into heaven, they did not hasten the visitation of the Angel of death, seeing that it was not in heaven, but on earth that they lived; that if the regenerate had the trouble of putting them to death?' Justin's answer was, 'If, that, if they were so to act, they would contravene the designs of God by diminishing the number of believers, preventing the diffusion of true religion, and, as far as possible, lessen the number of those within the Christian Church.' The second objection was, 'Why, if they were regarded by God with an eye of favor, suffered they to be exposed to injury and oppression?' Justin replies that the persecutions with which they then were, and with which many virtuous men among the heathen had before been visited, originated in the enmity of a fewmen, the offspring of the apostate angels, who were permitted to exercise their power until the designs of the Almighty were finally accomplished. Another objection, of a different kind, appears to have been urged against the Christians: that, in exhorting men to live virtuously, they insisted, not upon the beauty of virtue, but upon the eternal rewards and punishments which awaited the virtuous and wicked. Justin replies that these are topics on which every believer in the existence of God must insist, since that belief is involved in the religious life of a good man, and he must overthrow the bad. With respect to direct arguments to prove the divine origin of Christianity, that which Justin principally urges is drawn from the fact that no man ever consented to die in attestation of the truth of any philosophical tenet; whereas men, even from the earliest ranks of society, are prepared to die for the sake of the Gospel. Towards the conclusion of the tract, Justin states that he was himself induced to embrace Christianity by observing the courage and constancy with which its professors encountered all the terrors of persecution." Two Fragmenta, given by Grabbe in his edition of Justin (Spicileg. secund. ii, 101), which vary considerably from the text of the second Apology, in the present copies of which they are not found; but the correctness of this suppression is very doubtful. 3. Πρὸς Τρισέργυν Ἰουώνιτων Ἰουών.
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This dialogue, in which Justin defends Christianity against the objections of Trypho, professes to be the record of an actual discussion, held, according to Eusebius (Hist. Eccles. iv. 18), at Ephesus. Trypho describes himself as a Jew, "flying from the war now raging," probably occasioned by the war between the Parthians and Romans in A.D. 132-134. But, though the discussion probably took place at the time, it was not committed to writing, at least not finished, till some years after, as Justin makes a reference to his first Apology, which is assigned, as we have seen, to A.D. 138 or 139. It has been conjectured that the answer, addressed to the Talmudists, teacher or colleague of the celebrated Rabbi Akiba, but he does not appear as a rabbi in the dialogue. The dialogue is perhaps founded upon the conversation of Justin with Trypho rather than an accurate record of it. After an introduction, in which Justin gives an account of the manner of his conversion to Christianity, and earnestly exhorts Trypho to follow his example, Trypho replies to the exhortation by saying that Justin would have acted more wisely in adhering to any of the philosophical sects to which he had formerly been attached than in leaving God, and placing his trust in a rabbi of the Talmudists. Justin, however, maintains that the belief of the orthodox Christians, but that he himself maintained that the dead would rise again in the body, and live for a thousand years in Jerusalem, which would be rebuilt, and beautified and enlarged. He appeals in support of his opinion to Isaiah, and to the Apocalypse, which he assigns to John, one of Christ's apostles. Justin then concludes the interview by debating the conversion of the Gentiles. He contends that the Christians are the true people of God, inasmuch as they fulfil the spiritual meaning of the law, and do not merely conform, like the Jews, to the letter. They have the true circumcision of the heart; they are the true children of Abraham, and typified by Jesus, the high-priest in the prophecy of Zechariah; they offer the true spiritual sacrifices which are pleasing to God, agreeably to the prophecy of Malachi; they are the seed promised to Abraham; they are actuated by the principle of faith which alone called Abraham; they are, in a word, the true Israel. The dialogue with Trypho appears to be mutilated, but to what extent is a matter of dispute. Two fragments are assigned to it by Grabe (Spicilegium, sec. ii, 175), but it is doubtful with what correctness. It is to be observed, says Smith (Dictionary of Greek and Roman Biography), "that, though Otto ranks the Dialogus cum Tryphone among the undisputed works of Justin, its genuineness has been repeatedly attacked. The first assault was by C. G. Koehl, of Apenrade, in the duchy of Sleswick (Justini Martyris Dialogus cum Tryphone, ec. &c., on the basis of convicetus), this attack was regarded as of little moment. That of Wetstein (Proleg. in Nov. Test. i, 66), founded on the difference of the citations from the text of the Sept. and their agreement with that of the Hexaplar edition of Origen, and perhaps of the version of the Septuagint, is the most popular. Another difference is, that Justin, was more serious, and has called forth elaborate replies from Krom (Diatribe de Authentia Dialogi. Justini Martyr. cum Trypho, etc., 1782, 4to.), Eichhorn (Eindiegung in das A.T.), and Krehl (Betrage zur Einleuung, etc.). The attitude was renewed at a later period by Lange, but with little result. An account of the controversy is given by Semisch (book ii, sect. i, ch. ii), who contends earnestly for the genuineness of the work. It may be observed that the genuineness even of the two Apologies was attacked by the learned but eccentric Hardmann." (2) Disputed or Doubtful Works.—4. Λόγος ποιητής "Ελάμφωνος, Ορατος ad Graces. "If this is indeed a work of Justin, which we think very doubtful, it is probably that described by Eusebius (Hist. Eccl. iv. 18) as treating περί της των δαμασκενων φασιων (compare Photius, Biblioth. cod. 129), to which Justin refers, and which he describes as being "de Demonum natura," for it is a severe attack on the flagitious immorality ascribed by the heathens to their deities, and committed by themselves in their religious festivals. Its identity, however, with the work respecting demons is doubted by many critics. Cave supposes it to be a portion of the work next mentioned. Its genuineness has been on various grounds disputed by Oudin, Semler, Semisch, and others, and is doubted by Grabe, Dupin, and Neander. The grounds of objection are well stated by Semisch (book ii, sect. ii, c. 1); but the genuineness of the piece is asserted by Tillemon, Leclerc, Cave, Maris, De Wette, Baumgarten-Crux.
tours, placed among the works of doubtful genuineness. But it is now generally allowed that the precision of its orthodoxy, and the use of various terms not in use in Justin’s time, make it evident that it was written at any rate after the composition of the Ante-Nicene, and probably after the Nestorian controversy. Grabe, Ceillier, and some others ascribe it to Justinus Sicus. 10. Άπαντημα ποιὰ τῶν ἐρυθρών πυρὸς ἀναγκαῖος Σμύρνημα, ἐπιστολῶν τῆς Ἐρυθράς καὶ Μαραίτης Χριστιανῶν τῇ Νικαίᾳ τῆς Νεα-Νικαίας. This is a fragment of a letter addressed to the Christians of Nicæa, and it is quite possible that it was written by Justinus himself. It is, however, a suggestion rather than a proof of the genuineness of the work.

7. Epistolæ ad Zenum et Serenam, commencing Επιστολὴ Σμύρνης, and E. H. Buxtorf, Επιστολὴ Κωνσταντιναπολίτης, Επιστολὴ Εἰρηναίας, and Επιστολὴ Σερονήσιων. These pieces are by the learned, and are retained in the Greek and Latin versions.

8. Η Μετάφρασις τῶν γεγονότων ἀπὸ τοὺς ἱστορικούς, Λιβαρ διοικήσεις Χριστιανῶν, mentioned by Justin in his Apologia Prima (p. 26, p. 70, ed. Maran; 1, 194, ed. Otto), and therefore ascribed to Justin himself in the time of his imprisonment. 11. Λάτινος κατὰ τῆς ἱστορίας εἰσαγωγὴς, Brief Resolutions of Doubt unanswerable to Party, mentioned by Photius (Bibl. cod. 125).

9. Epistola ad Zenum et Serenam, commencing Επιστολὴ Σμύρνης, and E. H. Buxtorf, Επιστολὴ Κωνσταντιναπολίτης, Επιστολὴ Εἰρηναίας, and Επιστολὴ Σερονήσιων. These pieces are by the learned, and are retained in the Greek and Latin versions.

10. Απεισκεπτομένη τῶν γεγονότων ἀπὸ τοὺς ἱστορικούς, Λιβαρ διοικήσεις Χριστιανῶν, mentioned by Justin in his Apologia Prima (p. 26, p. 70, ed. Maran; 1, 194, ed. Otto), and therefore ascribed to Justin himself in the time of his imprisonment. 11. Λάτινος κατὰ τῆς ἱστορίας εἰσαγωγὴς, Brief Resolutions of Doubt unanswerable to Party, mentioned by Photius (Bibl. cod. 125).
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allype, but without saying that it was in a separate work. The authorship of the work Ἡ πρώτη τοῦ μαθητή, De Unicerro, mentioned by Photius (Bibl. cod. 48), was, as he tells us, disputed, some ascribing it to Justin, but apparently with little reason. It is now assigned to Hippolytus (vol. iii., p. 863). It begins by saying: "Nearly all the works of Justin, genuine and spurious (viz. all enumerated above in the first three divisions, except the Oratio ad Graecos and the Epistola ad Diognetum), were published by Robert Stephens, Paris, 1551, fol. This is the edition of 1551. It was a reprint of the lost work, but the Cohortatio ad Graecos had been published earlier, with a Latin version, Paris, 1539, 4to. There is no discrimination or attempt at discrimination in this edition of Stephens between the genuine and spurious works. The Oratio ad Graecos, and the Epistola ad Diognetum, with a Latin version and dates, were published by Henry Stephens, Paris, 1592, 4to, and again in 1597. All these works, real or supposed, of Justin were published with the Latin version of Langus, and notes by Fred. Syllburgius, Heidelberg, 1503, fol; and this edition was reprinted, Paris, 1615 and 1636, fol, with the addition of some other writings by Justin, and with an apparatus criticus (or rather Wittenberg), 1686, fol, with some further additions. A far superior edition, with the remains of Tatian, Athenagoras, Theophilus of Antioch, and Hermias the Philosopher, with a learned preface and notes, was published, "opera et studio unius ex Monarchia cogereta, S. Hippolitii Episcopi Romani," Geneva, 1742, fol. In this the genuine pieces, according to the judgment of the editor (Nos. 1-6 in our enumeration), are given in the body of the work, together with the Epistola ad Diognetum, of the authorship of which Mr. Marriott was in doubt. The two Apologies were placed in their right order for the first time in this edition. The remaining works, together with fragments which had been collected by Grabe (who had first published in his Speciologically SS. Patrum the fragment on the Resurrection from Joannes Damascenus) and others, and the Martyr, with a Latin version of which the Greek was first published in the Acta Sotetorum, Aprilis, vol. ii, were given in the Appendix. From the time of Maran, no complete edition of Justin was published until that of Otto (Jena, 1842-44, 2 vols. 8vo; new edition, 1847-50, 3 vols. 8vo). The first volume contains the Oratio et Cohortatio ad Graecos, and the Apologia Secunda. The second contains the Dialogus cum Tryphone, the Epistola ad Diognetum, the fragments, and the Acta Martyri Justinii et Sociorum. Numerous valuable editions of the several pieces appeared, chiefly in England. The Apologia Prima was edited by Thrilby, and published, Dublin, 1722, folio. The Oratio et Cohortatio ad Graecos, Cohortatio ad Graecos, and De Monarchia, by Hutchin (Oxford, 1703, 8vo); and the Dialogus cum Tryphone, by Jebb (Lond. 1719, 8vo). These three editions had the Latin version of Langus, and various notes. The Apologia Prima, Apologia Secunda, and Dialogus cum Tryphone, from the text of Robert Stephens, with some corrections, with the version of Langus, and notes, were edited by Thrilby, and published, Lond. 1722, folio. It has been conjectured that this valuable edition, though published under the name of Thrilby, was really by Marckley. The Apologia Prima, Apologia Secunda, Dialogus cum Tryphone, and the fragments, are given in the first volume of the Bibliothea Patrum of Galland. We do not profess to have enumerated all the editions of the Greek text, and we have not noticed the Latin versions. Full information with respect to these will be found in the 'Memorabilia Sacrae Antiquitatis' of Dr. Spear. These works are English translations of the Apologies of Reeves, of the Dialogue with Trypho by Brown, and of the Exhortation to the Gentiles by Moses."

Theological Views.—Of the more striking peculiarities of Justin's theological system, we present the reader a selection from a passage in the 'Memoirs of a French Lay Professor,' C. E. Stowe: "There is in every man a germ of the divine reason, a seed of the Logos, whereby man is related to God, and becomes capable of forming an idea of God. By this spark of the divine intelligence the better men among the pagan philosophers were illuminated; but more especially, and far beyond these, the previous revealed men in the Old Testament. Still this revelation was only fragmentary and partial. Only in Christ was the Logos, the divine reason, perfectly revealed. The Logos, the Word, is himself God, yet from God; the Word the First-begotten, the Power, the primitive Revelation of God. He is the uncreated, uncreated, uncreated, yet without any dividing line sur
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or evangelist is expressly named, but reference is always made directly to Christ. "Justin's exegesis of the Old Testament is typological and Messianic throughout, finding references everywhere to Christ."


Justin and the Gnostic, who flourished towards the end of the second century, has only recently become known through the Philosophoumena of Hippolytus (v, 22; § 15), and of his personal history and origin very little information has come down to us. His system has a Judaizing cast, and is mostly based upon a mystical interpretation of Genesis. He propagated his doctrines secretly, binding his disciples to silence by solemn oaths. In his genius Justin made use of Greek mythology, especially the tradition of the twelve conflicts of Hercules. He assumes three original principles, two male and one female. The last he identifies with Eden, which marries Elohim, and becomes thus the mother of the angels of the spirit-world. To the tree of life in Paradise represents the good, the tree of knowledge the evil angels. The four rivers are symbols of the four divisions of angels. The Naas, or the serpent-spirit, he made, unlike the Ophites, the bearer of the evil principle; he committed adultery with Eve, and Eve seduced Adam; he adulterated the laws of Moses and the oracles of the prophets, he nailed Jesus to the cross. But by this crucifixion Jesus was emancipated from his material body, rose to the good God to whom he committed his spirit in death, and thus became the deliverer. — Schaff, Church History, i, 242, 243. See Gospels.

Justin of Sicily. See JUSTINUS.

Justin, or the Elder, Roman emperor of the East, born A.D. 450, was originally a swineherd. The soldiers of the Pretorian band forced him to accept the imperial dignity on the death of Anastasius in 518. He is noted in ecclesiastical history for his interference in behalf of the orthodox bishops who had been banished by the Arians, but whom he recalled, and for several edicts which he published against the Arians. Hearing of the destruction of Antioch by an earthquake, he laid aside the imperial robe, clothed himself in sackcloth, and passed several days in fasting and prayer, to avoid divine judgment. He refused that city and other places which were destroyed by the same calamity. He died in 527. See Smith, Dict. of Gr. and Rom. Bibl., ii, 677 sq.

Justin, Sr., is said to have been born at Antioch, of Christian parents, and to have suffered martyrdom at Nicomedia in 304. St. Cyrilian, surnamed the Magician, is charged with the attempt of her seduction by magic, and was sent to Alexandria to embrace the Christian faith. During the persecution ordered by Diocletian and Maximian they were arrested together, and, after suffering torture with great firmness, were sent to Diocletian at Nicomedia. The latter caused them at once to be beheaded. The Greek Church commemorates them on the 2d of October, and the Roman Church on the 26th of September. The emperor Theodosius II. the Younger, wrote a poem in three caesuras in honor of St. Justin and St. Cyrilian, 521. See Biblioth. chrys. exxt., Tbabot, Memoire, vol. v; Dupin, Biblioth. des Auteurs Eccles. au troisieme siecle; Hoefer, Nouv. Bibl. Gén., xxvi, 309.

Justin of Padua, St., patroness of Padua, and, together with St. Mark, of Venice also. According to the hagiographers, she was a native of the former city, and suffered martyrdom there in 304, under Diocletian, and at that time was under Nero. She was beheaded on the event, however. Her relics, which were lost, were recovered (?) in 1177, and are preserved in a church of Padua which bears her name. In 1117 a convent of Benedictines in the neighborhood reformed their rules, taking the name of Congregation of St. Justin of Padua. This reform was followed by another in 1498, under the care of Luigi Barbo, a Venetian senator, whose pope Alexander VI created first abbot of the order. The congregation spread, and the monastery of Mount Cassin, having joined it in 1504, was made its head-quarters by Julius II. Moreri considers the legend of this saint's ascension to heaven false, yet the Roman Church commemorates her on the 7th of October. See Tillemont, Hist. de la Persécution de Diocletien, art. 55; Baillie, l'ès des Saints, Oct. 7th.—Hoefer, Nouv. Bibl. Gén., xxvii, 310.

Justinian I, the Great (Flavius AECIUS JUSTINIANUS), emperor of the East, was born in 483 of an obscure family. He shared the fortunes of his uncle Justin, who, from common reflections, was raised to the imperial throne, and, after the death of his uncle, Aug. 1, 527, was himself proclaimed emperor. He obtained great military successes over the Persians through his celebrated general Belisarius; destroyed the empire of the Vandals in Africa, and put an end to the dominion of the Ostrogoths in Italy, which succeeded restored to the Roman empire a part of its vast possessions. But Justinian was by no means satisfied with the renown of a conqueror. Learned, unrestrainedly active, and ecclesiastically devout, he aspired to the united renown of a lawyer, theologian, and champion of the preserved Christian orthodoxy as well; and, in some respects, brilliant reign of nearly thirty years is marked by earnest though unsuccessful efforts to establish the "true faith" for all time to come. Indeed, he regarded it as his especial mission to compel a general uniformity of Christian doctrine, and to increase the divisions in church and state, as he was greatly misused by his famous wife, who, though animated by great zeal for the Church, was blindly devoted to the Monophysites. Yet, however unfortunate the efforts of Justinian in behalf of Christian orthodoxy re- sulted, so much is certain, that his aim was noble and lofty, and that he was actuated by the holiest of purposes. It is said of him that he spent whole nights in prayer and fasting, and in theological studies and discussions, and that he placed his throne under the especial protection of the Virgin Mary and St. Michael. He adorned the capital and the provinces with costly temples and institutions of charity. Among the churches which he rebuilt was that of St. Sophia at Constantinople, which had been burned in one of the civil commotions. This church is esteemed a masterpiece of architecture. The altar was entirely of gold and silver, and adorned with a vast number and variety of precious stones. It was by this emperor that the fifth Ecumenical Council was convened at Constantinople (A.D. 553) to secure the end for which Justinian was the means of promoting, the extermination of heresies. His fame, however, rests chiefly on his great ability as legislator. Determined to collect all previous legislative Roman enactments, he un-
trusted to a number of the ablest lawyers of Rome, under the direction of the renowned Tribonianus, the task of a complete revision and digested collection of the Roman law from the time of Hadrian to his own reign; and thus arose, after the short lapse of seven years, the celebrated Codex Justinianus, "which henceforth became the universal law of the Roman empire, the sole text-book in the academies at Rome, Constantinople, and Berytus, and the basis of the legal relations of the greater part of Christian Europe to this day." This body of Roman law, which is "an important source of our knowledge of the Christian life in its relations to the state and its influence upon it," opens with the imperial edict on the Trinity (for which, see Schaff, Church History, iii, 769) and the imperial anathema against the prominent Christian heretics. The whole collections of Justinian are now known under the style of Corpus Juris Civilis. The editions with Goethendrius's notes are much esteemed. The four books of Justinian's Institutions were translated into English, with notes, by George Harris, LL.D. (Lond. 2d ed. 1761, 4to, Lat. and Eng.). Justinian also wrote a libellus confessionis fidei, and a hymn (μονογραφίας διας και λογος του Θεου, etc.). (J. H. W.)

Medal of Justinian.

Justinus or Sicily, bishop of one of the sees in that island in the latter part of the fifth century, was present at a council held at Rome A.D. 483 or 484, under pope Felix III, in which Petrus Fullo (Ἰωαννᾶς) or Peter the Fuller, was condemned as a heretic for having added to the "trisagion" the heretical words "who suffered for us." Several bishops, among whom was Justin, desist of recalling Peter from his errors, addressed letters to him. Justin's letter to Peter, in the original Greek, with a Latin version, Epistola Justinii Episcopi in Sicilia, ad Petrum Fulloonem εις κακουργεον, is given in Iun Coenitio (vol. iv, col. 110a, etc., edit. Labbe; vol. ii, col. 830, edit. Hardouin; vol. vii, col. 111s, edit. Mansi). The genuineness of this letter, and of six other letters of similar character from various Eastern or Western bishops, which are also given in the Concilia, is disputed by Valutus (Obser. Eccles. ad Ecce Gravis Libri duo, lib. i De Petro Antiochiano, Episcop, c. 4), but defended by Cave (Hist. Lit. i, 454), who, however, contends that the Greek text is not the original, but a version from the Latin. Pagi (Crit. in Baroni Amnades, ad ann. 485, c. 15) proposes to correct the reading of the title of Justin's letter from "Episcopi in Sicilia" to "Episcopi in Cilicia"; others would read the name "Justinianus," but on which authority we do not know. Dodwell and others ascribe to this Justin the Responsiones ad Orthodoxos, and the Expositio Decretalium, reputed to be by Justin Martyr, and printed with his works. See Fabritius, Bibl. Gr. vii, 53; xi, 661; xii, 653.—Smith, Dict. Greek and Roman Biog. s. v.

Justinus (Ἰωαννᾶς, for Lat. Justus, Justin; just; a frequent name among the Jews, equivalent to יוחנן, Josephus, Life, 9, 65, 70), the name or surname of several men. Schützgen (Act. Ap.) says by quotation from Rabbinical writers that this name was not unusual among the Jews.

1. Another name for Joseph (q. v.), surnamed Bar-saba, who was one of the two selected as candidates for the vacant apostolate of Judas (Acts i, 29).

2. A proselyte at Corinth, in whose house, adjoining the synagogue, Paul preached to the Gentiles after leaving the synagogue (Acts xvii, 7). A.D. 49.

3. Otherwise called Jesus, a Jewish Christian, named in connection with Mark by Paul as being his only fellow-laborer at Rome when he wrote to the Colossians (Col. iv, 11). Tradition (Acts, Sermo dom. Juni, iv, 67) names him as the bishop of Eleutheropolis! Justinus, St., is the name of a Christian martyr who, with his brother Pastor (aged respectively twelve and nine years), when the persecution of Diocletian against the Christians began, in the face of certain martyrdom boldly avowed himself a Christian. For this alone they were cruelly dragged; and Dacian, at that time the governor of Spain, enraged at their courageous resignation, finally caused them to be beheaded.

Another St. Justinus, celebrated in history, was bishop of Lyons, in France. His life gives us an insight into the customs of the 4th century. The monks, both in the East and the West, sought at that time to prevent as far as possible capital punishment, and often represented those who had undergone it in punishment of their crimes as martyrs. A man who, in an excess of rage, had killed several persons in the streets of Lyons, fled to the bishop's church for protection. Justinus, in order to shield him, delivered him into the hands of the authorities on the condition that he should be but lightly punished, but the mob took him out of the hands of the officers and killed him. Justinus, considering himself responsible for the death of this man, and henceforth unworthy of his office, fled to Egypt, where he remained unknown in a convent, and there died about 390.


Justinus of Tiberias (in Galilee), son of Pistus, one of the chief converts to Judaism by Jewish historians, flourished in the beginning of the Christian era. He was in the employ of king Agrippa as private secretary when the revolution in Galilee broke out, and though the city of Tiberias had been especially favored by the king, the Tiberian Jews soon followed in the course of their neighbors and gathered under Pistus and his son Justinus, who, besides the advantage of a Greek education, was a great natural orator, and easily swayed the masses. As we have shown in our articles on Josephus and John of Gischala, Josephus desired ever the leadership, be it among his own nation or among the Romans, and Justinus having made early advances in favor of the revolution, and quickly gained the confidence of the people, Josephus feared and hated him, and, as soon as the war terminated, took special pains to convince the Romans that Justinus was the greater rebel of the two. The conduct of Josephus towards Justinus became still more unjustly severe after the latter had ventured to write a history of the war, now unhappily lost, in which the treacherous action of Josephus was laid bare. Indeed, Josephus himself makes the only avowed object of the publication of his "life" his vindication from the calumnies of his enemies, who is accused of having falsified the history of the war with Rome (Jos., Ant. 14, 203, 33, 66, 74), as well as of having delayed the editing of the book until the decease of Agrippa and the other great men of the time, because his accounts were false, and he feared the consequences of his unjustness and untruthfulness. Justinus, according to Philo (Bibl. col. 33), also wrote a history of the Jews.
from the times of Moses down to the death of Herod, in the third year of the reign of Trajan, but this work also is unfortunately lost. Some writers (Eusebius, Hist. Eclecs. iii, 9; Stephanus Byzant. a. v. Trisapoc) speak of a special work of his in the Jewish War, but this may refer only to the last portion of his chronicle, which Dio-genès Laertius (ii, 41) calls a Στιγμα. Suidas (s.v. Ιονετος) mentions some other works of Justus, of which, however, nothing is extant. See Grätz, Gesch. der Juden, iii, 397 sq.; Stud. und Krit. 1858, p. 56 sq. (J. H. W.)

Jutland, a province of Denmark, contains, since the Peace of Breslau (Dec. 30, 1864), which recognized the frontier between Denmark and Germany, 7,938 square miles, and in 1880 had 788,119 inhabitants. It constitutes the northern part of the Cimbrian peninsula, and is bounded on the north by the Skagerrack, on the east by the Kattegat, on the south by Schleswig, and on the west by the German Sea. Originally the Cimbri are said to have lived there; subsequently the country was occupied by the Juts, a Saxon tribe. At the beginning of the 10th century it was conquered by the Danish king Gorm, and since then it has been a part of the kingdom of Denmark. Christianity was introduced into Jutland by Ansar (q.v.), and the Christianization of the country was completed within a comparatively short period. The first church was erected at Ribe. The Reformation was first carried through in the city of Viborg by the efforts of Hans Yansen, a young peasant from the island of Fyn. Jutland has now four Lutheran dioceses—Aalborg, Viborg, Aarhus, and Ribe. See Denmark.

Juttah (Hebrew Yuttah, יטְחָה, Josh. xv, 55; Vulg. Jota; or Yuttah, יְטוּת, perhaps inclined, otherwise i. q. Jothab, Josh. xxi, 16; Vulg. Jeta; Sept. Ἰραβ v. Ἰταραβ and Ἰταραβ), a Levitical city in the mountains of Judah, named in connection with Ziph, Jezreel, etc., in the neighborhood of Massah and Cerenel (Josh. xv, 55). It was allotted to the priests (xxi, 16), but in the catalogue of 1 Chron. vi, 57-59, the name has escaped. Eusebius (Onomast. s.v.) calls it a large village by the name of Jettas (Ἰετασ), and places it eighteen miles south of Eleutheropolis, in the district of Daromos (the south). It is doubtful the village discovered by Dr. Robison (Researches, ii, 628), four miles south of Hébron, and still called Yutta, having the appearance of a large Mohammedan town, on a low eminence, with trees around, and where the guides spoke of the existence of old foundations and former walls. Schwarz calls it Zeda in his Israeliten Jutta auf dem Kap. The selection of Juttah as a city of the priests suggests the idea of its having already been a place of importance, which is seemingly confirmed by early and numerous allusions to it in the inscriptions on the Egyptian monuments. There it appears to be described under the names Tuth, Tuhm, and Tahouas as a fortress of the Anakim near Arba or Hebron; and it is not a little remarkable that another Egyptian document, the Ta perceptus, expresses the word in almost the selfsame manner, Ἰταραβ and Ἰταραβ (Jou, Soc. Lit. April and July, 1822, p. 231, 316; D'Alrous and D'Eggleston); and Fairbairn, s. v. The "city of Judah" (Luke i, 39), whether Mary went to visit Elizabeth, the mother of John the Baptist, (see John, 31), where Zecharias therefore appears to have resided, has usually been supposed to mean Hebron; but, if the reading be correct, the proper rendering would be "Juttah," where the elision in Luke would be inadmissible (see Bornemann, Schol. in Luc. p. 12), notwithstanding the absence of the article (Winer's Grammat. N. T. p. 136). But, as this was not intended (see Rob. Valesius, Epist. ad Casaubon, 1613, p. 669), Reland (Parad. Hist.) has suggested a conjectural reading of "Jut-tah" for "Juttah," and favored it on the ground that the word may have been taken from Luke, which has met with favor among critics (see Harenberg, in the Nor. Miscell. Lips. iv, 595; Paulus, Kuinard, ad loc.), although no varying reading exists to justify it.

Juvencus, Caius Vettius Agclusius, one of the earliest Church historians and Christian poets, a native of Spain, was a contemporary of Constantine, and a presbyter of the Church. Living at the time when Christianity ascended the throne of the Roman Empire, he endeavored to clothe the recital of Biblical events in the classic and elegant style of the best profane writers. About 330 he composed his Historia evangeliaca, a work in four books, dedicated to Constantine. It is the reproduction of the Gospel narratives in a new order of arrangement, the text closely following the Greek, especially St. Matthew's, and in the style imitating Laeti-tius, Ovid, and especially Virgil, thus making a sort of epic poem, after the model of the .Emid. — The liberal praises bestowed upon Juvencus by divines and scholars, from St. Jerome down to Petrarch, must be understood to belong rather to the substance of the poem than to the form in which the materials are presented. We may honor the pious motive which prompted the undertaking, and we may bestow the same commendation upon the laborious ingenuity with which every particular recorded by the sacred historians, and frequently in the very words, are rendered in this work. The very plan of the composition excludes all play of fancy and all poetical freedom of expression, while the versification, although fluent and generally harmonious, too often bids defiance to the laws of prosody, and the language, although evidently in many places copied from the public and private correspondence here and in Italy, is marked with evidences of corruption and decay. The idea that this production might be employed with advantage in the interpretation of the Scriptures, insomuch as it may be supposed to exhibit faithfully the meaning attached to various obscure passages in the early age to which it belongs, will not, upon examination, be found to require much attention" (Professor Ramsay, in Smith, s. u. Jezra). He also wrote parts of the Old Testament in the same manner, but of these we know only his Liber s. e. Genesis (according to Jerome, De script. ii, 84, he wrote "non multa, quare neminem sane lectoris intellectum delenit") of the Historia evangelica was first printed by Deventer, s. l. (probably 1490); then reprinted, as in the Collectio vet. Poet. ecol. of Fabricius (Basil. 1654); the Bibli. M. Lugov. i, 55 sq.; by E. Resch (Francfort and Lpa. 1710); and later from a manuscript in the collection of the Vatican by F. Arentii (Rome, 1792, 4to), and in the first book of Gebers. Extracts of the Genesis were given in Martene's Nor. Collect. tom. i. and lately by J. B. Pitta, in his Spiritualium Sodalismus (Paris, Didot, 1852; comp. Proleg. xli sq.), published for the first time from both the Genesis and other fragments from the Old Testament, forming the basis of the Hebrew history of his edition of the Hebrew Bible, Rom. Lit. Gesch. (Suppl.) 1; Smith, Dict. Five and Nine, s. v. Juxon, William, a celebrated English prelate, distinguished for his faithfulness to the unfortunate king Charles, was born at Chichester in 1632, and was educated at St. John's College, Oxford, where he obtained a fellowship. He first studied at Cambridge, and was preferred to a prebend in the city of York, was made a judge, and in 1661 was made a dean of Hereford, dean of the Chapel Royal, and, in 1683, bishop of London. The sweetness of his temper, the kindness and courtesy of his manners, and his uniform benevolence, made him bishop Juxon a general favorite, and he was no sooner placed in his see than he endeavored to hold a secular office under Government. This was one of Laud's fatal errors. He did not perceive and make allowance for the change of public opinion. Bishops had, before the Reformation, become great men
by holding secular appointments, and the archbishop thought to restore the order to its ancient importance in men's eyes by reverting to the exploded system. He forgot that bishops held secular offices formerly from the necessity of the case, and because there were not a sufficient number of the laity qualified, and that the fact itself, though necessary, was still an evil, since it interfered with their higher and spiritual duties. In Land's own time the laity were better qualified than the clergy for office, and the appointment of the clergy was justly offensive, both as an insult to the laity, and as leading the people to suppose that the bishops had nothing to do in their dioceses. Under this false policy, in 1625 Juxon was appointed to the post of lord high treasurer, the highest office at that time in the kingdom, and next in precedence to that of the archbishop and to the great seal, which had not been held by a clergyman since the reign of Henry VII. In 1641 he resigned this office, which, it was admitted by all parties, he had held without reproach. The general harmlessness of his character enabled him to remain for the most part undisturbed at Fulham. Nevertheless, he remained firm to his principles, and steady in his loyalty to the king, by whom he was frequently consulted. He was in attendance upon the king at the treaty in the Isle of Wight, in 1648, and during the king's trial acted as his spiritual adviser. Bishop Juxon was also in attendance upon the king in his last hours upon the scaffold. Juxon continued in his position until the abolition of kingly government, by the House of Lords, and the establishment of a Commonwealth. He then retired to his own estate, the manor of Little Compton, in Gloucestershire, where he passed his days in a private and devout condition. At the Restoration, aged as he was, he was appointed, we might almost say by acclamation, archbishop of Canterbury in 1660. He was not able to exert himself much in his spiritual office, but he was a benefactor to the see, for during the short time he held the archbishopric he expended on the property fifteen thousand pounds; he moreover augmented the vicarages, the great tithes of which were appropriated to the see. He died June 4, 1663. By his last will, archbishop Juxon bequeathed £7000 to his alma mater. He left also £100 to the parish of St. Giles, of which he had been vicar; the same sum to four other parishes in Oxford, and sums for the repair of St. Paul's and Canterbury Cathedrals, and other charitable uses, in all to the amount of £5000. Wood tells us that he was a man of primitive sanctity, wisdom, piety, learning, patience, charity, and all apostolical virtues. Whitelock says of him that he was a comely person, of an active and lively disposition, of great parts and temper, full of ingenuity and meekness, not apt to give offence to any, and willing to do good to all; of great moderation, sincerity, and integrity, in so much that he was the delight of his time. He wrote a Sermon on Luke xxi. 31:—a treatise, entitled ΗΠΟΥΝ ΚΑΙ ΕΠΙΠΗΝ, or Some Considerations upon the Act of Uniformity (London, 1662, 4to.). In this work he shows himself to be no friend to the scheme of a comprehension. A catalogue of books in England, alphabetically digested (Lond. 1658), bears his name. See Hook, Eccles. Biog. s. v. (J. H. W.)

END OF VOL. IV.